



Academic Senate
Youngstown State
University
Youngstown, Ohio
44555



ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 3, 2006

Note: The next meeting of the Academic Senate is scheduled for September 13, 2006, at 4:00 p.m. Information on due dates for agenda items will be available at the beginning of Fall Semester. 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://cc.yzu.edu/acad-senate/index.html>

Note 2: If you want to read or print the pdf version of these minutes and don't have *Adobe Acrobat Reader*, you may download the program at the following link:
 <<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>>.

To save paper, use the Acrobat Reader menus or toolbar to print the file, not the menus or toolbar in your web browser.

Click on the links in the table to go directly to a specific section of the minutes.

Report from the Chair	Report from President and Provost	Elections & Balloting Committee
Academic Programs Committee	Undergraduate Curriculum Committee	General Education Committee

<u>Academic Research Committee</u>	<u>Student Academic Affairs Committee</u>	<u>Resolution of Appreciation for Tom Shipka</u>
--	---	--

[Sign-in Sheet](#)

[Download or Print a PDF version of the minutes](#)

[Top of Page](#)

Call to Order: Tom Shipka, Chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

[Top of Page](#)

Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

Minutes of the April 5, 2006, meeting were approved as posted. To view the minutes, go to [<http://www.cc.ysu.edu/acad-senate/minapr06.htm>](http://www.cc.ysu.edu/acad-senate/minapr06.htm).

[Top of Page](#)

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) / Report from the Chair / Ohio Faculty Council
Report: Tom Shipka, Chair of the Senate, reported:

As is my custom, I will consolidate my several reports. My report today will be brief to provide sufficient time to work through a heavy agenda in our last meeting of the school year.

1. The Ohio Faculty Council will meet at the Ohio Board of Regents suite in Columbus on Friday, May 12, when Professor Robert B. Brown, chair of STRS and professor of mathematics at The Ohio State University, will be the guest. The April meeting of the OFC was cancelled.

Dr. Robert Herbert, YSU provost, has authorized a continuation of YSU serving as the custodian of the Ohio Faculty Council web site as a YSU service to Ohio public higher education. Bob Hogue, James Sacco, and Joan Bevan continue to handle this responsibility and I am grateful to them for their help and cooperation. There is a link to the OFC web page on the Senate web page.

2. Elections required under the Senate Charter and Bylaws are now completed, thanks to Dr. Annette Burden, chair of the Elections and Balloting Committee. Also, nearly all Senate committee appointments for 2006-2007 have been completed. I will be sending a list of 2006-2007 committee members to all committee members and Senate members in the next few days. To the extent that it is possible, I am asking all Senate committees to meet at least once before the start of classes in the fall to select a chair. This is being done so that committees are ready to participate in the reaccreditation process as requested by the provost's office.

3. Vice Chair of the Senate, Dr. Chet Cooper, and I, will leave our Senate posts officially on August 15. Chet will be on Faculty Improvement Leave at that time and my retirement is effective on that date. Pursuant to the ruling of our Parliamentarian, Dr. Bill Jenkins, I will soon convene the Senate Executive Committee, the membership of which is now settled, to select an interim Senate chair for the fall semester and I will publicize that selection as soon as the Executive Committee makes it.

In addition to what I have just read to you, I have additional comments about the Senate which, without objection, I will ask our Secretary, Bob Hogue, to include in the minutes of this meeting for your perusal at a later date. Are there any questions?

[Secretary's note: Dr. Shipka's retrospective on the YSU Academic Senate is contained in [Attachment 1](#).]

[Top of Page](#)

Update from President Sweet and Provost Herbert:

President Sweet reported on the following items:

Enhanced facilities: The YSU Planetarium was substantially improved this year. This is a nice link to our community. Also, the Flad Performance Pavilion and the

Recreation & Wellness center were opened this year. This and other achievements mentioned here are not achievements of Tod Hall, but of our students, faculty, and staff.

Budget items: The FY06 budget coming to a conclusion, and the FY07 budget will soon be starting. The variable we have to continue to work on is enrollment. We hope to get \$1 million of the \$30 million to be allocated to state universities. A tuition proposal is to go before the Board of Trustees in June. Summer enrollment is down, and Fall is about stable. We have asked each unit to give back total of \$1.2 million, with a base adjustment of \$1.5 million. We have to demonstrate that we are addressing the budget crunch. On the horizon, Ken Blackwell, the Republican candidate for Governor, has been a leading advocate for the TEL/TABOR issue on the ballot in November. If that succeeds, the impact on higher education will be about \$400 million. We need to mobilize an information program on this.

South campus development: The new Williamson College of Business Administration building is an important part of this collaboration with the City of Youngstown. The Board is soundly behind it. [Secretary's note: A fact sheet about the Lincoln-Rayen-Wood redevelopment is contained in [Attachment 2](#).]

Labor-Management Council: My final response to the Labor-Management Review Panel is in. We have as an Administration put into place things to improve relations. The Labor-Management Council has met twice. The group is made up of three administrators, four labor presidents, and one student. We want to invite a facilitator to campus. We also plan a workshop for this summer, and we hope to invite people from other campuses that have made progress in this area. Two months ago, Dr. Anderson asked for input to improve communications. Some of these suggestions are in the process of being implemented. The improvement of labor-management relations is the task of everyone is involved.

Community college: The Board of Trustees has asked us to take a look at implementing a Community College related to YSU. This is stimulated in part by the Governor's State of the State address. Mahoning county is the only metro area in state without a community college. Toledo has 38,000 students at UT and Owens Community College. This is not an attempt to change our mission or to turn YSU into a community college. We are not trying to de-emphasize graduate programs or research. Nate Ritchey is chairing a pre-planning group. There are risks and challenges here, but it's something we need to consider.

Provost Herbert:

Priorities of Academic Affairs: A change in academic leadership usually causes a

period of adjustment. What is the direction that we want to take in Academic Affairs? When I was interviewing for the Provost position last year, many people expressed a desire to put academics back at the center of the University. We need to claim that position unambiguously. Prior to that, we need to get our house in order. It is not the job of Tod Hall to do that. We need to put in place a set of procedures that will be broadly consultative. Earlier this year we started a planning process for program review. We want to produce a forward-looking document that is realistic with respect to the educational atmosphere in the state. We had to have a 1.25% cut in FY06. For FY07, we are asked to cut another 1.5%. Our response has been to engage in soul-searching and to engage in strategic program reduction. None of these options was attractive, but alternative was less attractive.

We need to be more accountable in use of our resources. In particular, we need to be accountable in our use of reassigned time. An important cost is the impact on our full/part time ratio, which is impacted by reassigned time.

There seem to be relatively few forums in which faculty and administration participate. Relying on deans and chairs as conduits sometimes works and sometimes doesn't. I would like to have a full faculty meeting chaired by the Provost at start of Fall and Spring semesters. Also, I have been thinking about an Academic Affairs newsletter. The challenge will be to find someone to take on this task. I hope that better communication will show that differences result from different backgrounds, not an us-versus-them attitude.

[Top of Page](#)

Charter & Bylaws Committee: No report.

[Top of Page](#)

Elections & Balloting Committee: **Annette Burden reported. Dr. Burden thanked the members of the committee for their work this year. The results of the elections for Senators and for committee seats requiring elections are contained in [Attachment 3](#).**

[Top of Page](#)

Academic Programs Committee: **Sunil Ahuja** reported. A list of approved program changes is contained in **Attachment 4**.

[Top of Page](#)

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: A list of approved courses is contained in **Attachment 5**.

[Top of Page](#)

General Education Committee: **Bill Jenkins**, Committee Chair, reported.

As a result of a survey of recently-graduated students, it was found that there are significant problems in meeting the Intensive requirements of the General Education Model. So, the General Education Committee is proposing a new policy for the Intensives. The proposed policy is attached to the agenda. (See **Attachment 6**.) The purpose is to move away from requiring only a course-based approach and to allow a program-based approach as well.

Dr. Jenkins moved to adopt the proposal. **Seconded.** **Gabriel Palmer-Fernandez:** It seems as if this will water down the Intensives. This will lower the standards, rather than simply improving the logistics. **Dr. Jenkins:** It is not our intention to lower the standards. We are just trying to spread ways to meet the goals of intensives, including projects like Quest or other activities or assignments. All of these should meet the minimum guidelines for the General Education Intensives. **Dr. Palmer-Fernandez:** Our goal in the General Education Committee during the formation of the current model several years ago was to ask what are the basic needs are for liberal arts education. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee members that the model that we passed was appropriate. I don't see how this proposal maintains those standards. **Dr. Shipka:** Note that the General Education Committee will review all proposals from departments, so there will still be oversight. **Ram Kasuganti:** This still leaves the original option on the table, but departments *may* now propose their own methods for satisfying this. **Louise Popio:** Will there be any requirement on time limit? What if a department keeps the status quo? **Dr. Jenkins:** There is no specific time limit in the resolution, but there is the more general mandate that Intensives be satisfied. Some departments are able to do this well as of now, but we recognize that some departments need other ways to satisfy this. **Dr. Palmer-Fernandez:** My concern is that this is no longer "general" education, because the department would now control the Intensives. **Dr. Kasuganti:** But it was always at the discretion of the department. **Chad Miller:** I understand that concern. I worked on this committee. Right now I'm taking a writing-intensive course. Is that the same writing as I need in a HHS

course? Intensives are generally taken at the upper level. Departments don't always offer enough Intensives. This proposal allows departments to mold the Intensives to their programs. **Tod Porter:** The primary reason for the present problem is that faculty have not brought forth enough Intensives. The approval system is too bureaucratic. Faculty have been unwilling to create the Intensives. We need to make the system for approval more streamlined. **Bob McGovern:** I echo Chad Miller's support for the change. This gives the opportunity to spread Intensives throughout the major. **Dr. Palmer-Fernandez:** We should keep General Education as is. Are we talking about the logistics or the standards? This directly and adversely affects the standards. I oppose the resolution.

A vote on the motion was then taken. Motion passed.

[Top of Page](#)

Academic Research Committee: **Janet Williams** reported and moved approval of the committee's recommended modifications of the Research misconduct policy as contained in [Attachment 7](#). The rationale for the recommended changes is also contained within the attachment. Motion was seconded. **Dr. Shipka** asked about the numbers 9006 versus 1016. **Dr. Williams** replied that 9006 refers to a section of the University Guidebook, while 1016 is a subsection of the Code of Federal Regulations. A vote on the motion was taken. Motion passed.

[Top of Page](#)

Student Academic Affairs Committee: **Richard Baringer** reported and introduced a resolution concerning the creation of a standardized Curriculum Sheet for all majors (see [Attachment 8](#)). to recommend that the University provide curriculum sheets. **Dr. Baringer** moved adoption of the resolution. Motion was seconded. **Tom S:** Who will develop this? **Dr. Baringer:** That wasn't specified in the committee, but we will work with colleges. **Cynthia Hirtzel:** I was present when SGA presented this. In some colleges, these sheets already exist. I assume this doesn't mean that there has to be one format for all majors. **Dr. Baringer:** That is correct. **Bob McGovern** introduced a friendly amendment to change the "Resolved" phrase so that it begins, "Resolved that the Academic Senate, in concurrence with the Student Government Association ..." The amendment was accepted by Dr. Baringer and the seconder. **Mr. McGovern** then moved another friendly amendment that the resolution be modified by adding the following statement at the end of the resolution: "And be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Provost, Deans, and Department Chairs, Academic Advisors, and Program Coordinators. Amendment was accepted by Dr. Baringer and the seconder. A vote was then taken on the motion. Motion passed.

[Secretary's note: The resolution contained in Attachment 8 contains the friendly amendments described above.]

[Top of Page](#)

Unfinished Business: None.

[Top of Page](#)

New business: **Bege Bowers introduced a Resolution of Appreciation for Dr. Thomas A. Shipka (see [Attachment 9](#)) and **moved approval** of the resolution. Motion was seconded. **Motion passed unanimously.****

[Top of Page](#)

Adjournment: The Academic Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

[Top of Page](#)

[Print or Read a PDF File of the May Sign-in Sheet](#)

[Top of Page](#)

[Return to Top of Page](#)

[Return to Senate Homepage](#)

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

YSU ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE ROSTER — May 3, 2006

Arts and Sciences

Departmental (2004-06)

JP Joseph Palardy, Economics
DB Diane Barnes, History
BB Bill Buckler, Geography
IC Iole Checcone, Foreign Lang.
DF Diana Fagan, Biology
WR William Rick Fry, Psychology
AO Tom Oder, Physics & Astronomy

Departmental (2005-07)

nm Tim Wagner, Chemistry
AL Alina Lazar, CSIS
SD Suzanne Diamond, English
JA Joe Andrew, Geol./Env. Studies
JA Jamal Tartir, Mathematics & Stat.
BW Bruce Waller, Phil/Rel. Studies
KL Keith Lepak, Political Science
PG Paul Gordiejew, Sociol. & Anthr.

At Large

CC Chet Cooper, Biology
DF Diana Fagan, Biology
GW Gary Walker, Biology
DM Daryl Mincey, Chemistry
RS Rick Shale, English
SS Sandra Stephan, English
JD Jeffrey Dick, Geology
AB Annette Burden, Mathematics
GP Gabriel Palmer-Fernandez, Phil/Rel.
TS Tom Shipka, Phil/Rel. Studies

Business Administration

At Large, continued

WB Bill Vendemia, Management
JR Jane Reid, Marketing

Departmental

BK Birsen Karpak, Management (04-06)
RS Ray Shaffer, Acctg & Fin. (04-06)
MT Mark Toncar, Marketing (05-07)

At Large

RK Ram Kasuganti, Management
SL Sheen Liu, Acctng. & Finance
CP Clem Psenicka, Management

Education

At Large, continued

SI Sylvia Imler, Teacher Ed.
PC Paul Carr, EARF

Departmental

JW Janet Williams, Teacher Ed. (04-06)
DM Donald Martin, Counseling (04-06)
RB Richard Baringer, Ed. Adm. (04-06)

At Large

SL Sally Lewis, Teacher Ed.
DB Dora Bailey, Teacher Ed.
RR Regina Rees, Teacher Ed.

Engineering and Technology

Departmental

IK Irfan Khan, Civ/Env/Chem (04-06)
DL Dan Laird, Technology (04-06)

Departmental (continued)

PM Philip Munro, ECE (04-06)
ES Elvin Shields, Mech/Ind. (04-06)

At Large

DP Doug Price, Civ/Env/Chem
SP Salvatore Pansino, ECE
JG John George, Technology

Fine and Performing Arts

At Large (continued)

DO Dan O'Neill, Commun/Theater
DF Darla Funk, Music
AM Allan Mosher, Music

Departmental

MN Michelle Nelson, Art (04-06)
FC Frank Castronovo, Comm. (04-06)
TM Till Meyn, Music (04-06)

At Large

KC Kelli Connell, Art
MM Marla Mayerson, Art
DH Dennis Henneman, Commun/Theater
JM John Murphy, Commun/Theater

Health and Human Services

Departmental

KF Kathylynn Feld, Hlth Prof. (04-06)
CO C. Onwudiewe, Crim. Just. (05-07)
BL Bonnie Laing, Social Work (05-07)
CB Cathy Bieber Parrott, Ph.Th. (05-07)

Departmental (continued)

JN John Neville, HPES, (04-06)
LP Louise Pavia, Human Ecol. (04-06)
SL Susan Lisko, Nursing (05-07)

At Large

KS Kim Serroka, Nursing
NL Nancy Landgraaff, Physical Therapy
KL Ken Learman, Physical Therapy
EG Elaine Greaves, Criminal Justice
CH Carol Hawkins, Human Ecology

Administration (15)

Departmental

JK Joseph Edwards
PG Philip Ginnett
RH Robert Herbert
CH Cynthia Hirzel
PK Peter Kasvinsky
IK Ikram Khawaja
PK Paul Kobulnicky
BJ Betty Jo Licata

Departmental

TM Thomas Maraffa
TP Tod Porter
JY John Yemma

At Large

CA Cynthia Anderson
JB Jonelle Beatrice
BB Bege Bowers
BC Bill Countryman

Students

School / College

SM Sherman Miles, A&S
JE Jaclyn Elias, Education
JG Joe Gintert, E&T
AB Andie Bok, F&PA
DB Dana Broomes, HHS
AM Albert Morar, WCBA
(v) (vacant), Graduate Studies

Student Government

BM Bob McGovern, President
AM Amanda Mielke, 1st VP
JI Joe Iesue, 2nd VP

At Large (5)

NC Nicole Cunningham
JH Justin Hitt
JH Josh Hitzman
JT Josh Taylor
LP Louise Popio
CM Chad Miller

Concluding Unscientific Postscript (about the Senate)
- with apologies to Soren Kierkegaard -

Tom Shipka
May 3, 2006

Since the Senate has a full agenda today, I have chosen to divert some of my remarks in my final meeting as Senate chair to a postscript which I ask that Professor Hogue, our Senate secretary, incorporate into the minutes of the May 3, 2006, meeting.

My relationship to the Senate dates back to my arrival on campus in fall 1969. At that time the Senate, recently established, had a peculiar composition and role. Half the members were *ex officio* administrators, the President of the university was chair, and the Senate initiated recommendations through a Faculty Affairs Committee on salaries, fringe benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment. In my first year of employment I was a candidate for faculty senator and won election. It was fascinating to me to watch and hear certain senators give impassioned pleas to restrain faculty compensation. I did not know then and I do not know now whether this was done out of sincere worries about rising student fees or simply to mollify President Pugsley.

In any case, when the bulk of the faculty decided in 1972 that salaries were low, teaching load was high, and job security was shaky, we unionized. I had the privilege to play a major role in that movement from the very start through 1986 when I left the faculty bargaining unit to become a department chair. As president and chief negotiator of the faculty union during the negotiation of our first contract, one of my objectives was to restructure the Senate and to make it compatible with collective bargaining.

Accordingly, Article XIX of the first labor agreement provided:

**The University agrees to recommend to the Constitution and By-Laws
Committee changes in the Faculty Constitution and By-Laws which include:**

- a) An elected presiding officer in the Senate;**
- b) Increase in ratio of faculty to administration in the composition of the Senate;**
- c) Redefining the charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee so that its function will not conflict with the bargaining process;**
- d) Substantial revision of the A-B-C Committee concept. (1973-1975 Agreement, p. 25)**

Elizabeth Sterenberg, secretary of the faculty negotiating team, and a member of the Political Science Department, had the responsibility to draft this language for our team and, once the contract was signed by President Pugsley and myself, another team member, Steve Hanzely of Physics and Astronomy, was appointed to chair an ad hoc committee to implement the changes specified.

From that time through the rest of my career as a campus labor leader, I chose not to participate in the Senate. My decision was based on my view during that time that the Senate, as the primary campus deliberative body on curriculum, academic programs, and academic policies, should operate independently of the faculty union. The Senate and the union had different roles and it would be inappropriate, I thought, for union leaders to be active in the Senate.

When I left the bargaining unit to become a chair in 1986, I reentered the Senate and have been active in it in most years ever since. As I look back at my more recent Senate involvement, two things stand out. As a senator with strong views about the

components of our general education requirements, I was vocal on many occasions when we undertook a makeover of gened. You can blame the critical thinking intensive component on me, for instance. But I did serve a useful purpose now and then. If you browse through the minutes of the meetings in the late 90s when we debated the new general education program, sometimes interminably, I chimed in at virtually every meeting several times with “I move the previous question” to bring debate to a close. Almost always the motion – non-debatable – got the required two-thirds vote. It occurs to me that “He moved the previous question” would be a suitable inscription on my grave marker except that my will provides for cremation.

Since Jim Morrison stepped down as Senate chair, I have had the privilege to chair the Senate. As chair I claim only one important accomplishment. I found a way to get quorums. For a long time the Senate could not conduct business at many scheduled meetings for lack of a quorum. This was especially true after hard copy reminders of meetings gave way to electronic reminders. Some senators chose not to attend because they simply forgot about a meeting; others, I suspect, did not want to attend what was routinely a very long meeting during the era of recasting general education. My cure was simple – resume the sending of hard copy reminders and keep meetings as short as possible. This worked.

So when the history of the YSU Academic Senate is written, if ever, I hope that the author says three things about me – Shipka is one of the architects of the Senate in its current form, he found a way to get the long-winded to sit down and shut up, at least temporarily, and he got people to show up.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve with you and for you in the Senate.

Lincoln-Rayen-Wood redevelopment project

Fact Sheet

What is the Lincoln-Rayen-Wood redevelopment project?

The project's major goals are to integrate downtown Youngstown and the YSU campus by eliminating conditions of blight found in the "gap" area between Rayen Avenue and Wood Street and to improve pedestrian and vehicular linkages between the two districts. The project also aims to encourage reinvestments in the area by extending the YSU campus south to Wood Street, developing a new building for the YSU Williamson College of Business Administration, upgrading off-street parking and improving existing properties. YSU has termed the project the "South Campus Gateway" because it is the gateway to the university from the downtown Youngstown business community, and vice versa.

The plan encompasses a 38-acre area whose boundaries generally are Commerce Street to the south, Lincoln Avenue to the north, Fifth Avenue to the west and Wick Avenue to the east.

The plan, developed in partnership with YSU, the city of Youngstown and the Catholic Diocese of Youngstown, includes three major components: 1.) construction by the university of a new building for the Williamson College of Business Administration on Phelps Street between Rayen Avenue and Wood Street, 2.) the extension by the city of Hazel Street from Wood Street north to Lincoln Avenue, and 3.) enhancements to the St. Columba Cathedral area, including improved parking for the Diocese of Youngstown.

How was this project initiated?

The project is grounded in several years of discussion about how to better link the YSU campus, with its market of about 13,000 students and 2,000 employees, and downtown Youngstown. Since the mid-1980s, the city has studied planned investments in this gap area. More recently, Youngstown 2010 recommended taking steps, including rezoning, to close the gap, and adopted by reference the university's master plan, which recommends the expansion of the campus south to Wood Street.

Why is a new College of Business building needed, why is it being proposed for this area and how much will it cost?

The current building on Lincoln Avenue is not competitive with business college facilities at other universities. In particular, it offers no meeting space for the college's more than 1,800 students to work together in groups, and has no place for the business community or others to convene meetings or conferences.

The site chosen for the new building is the one that best meets the goals expressed to YSU by the city and the donor community. The proposed site will link the campus and downtown. It will be designed to be more than a classroom and office building. It will be accessible for conferences, meetings, classes and will provide space for serving the region's business community.

The building is expected to cost between \$25 million and \$30 million. The university plans to use a combination of state capital funds and private funds to construct the new facility. The university plans on the project being the central part of its Centennial Capital Campaign and its Centennial Celebration in 2008. The city projects that the cost of extending Hazel Street will be about \$2 million.

What specific properties are included in the redevelopment district?

The three owners of the property that the university needs to acquire for the new College of Business building have been receptive to the plan. The university and the city are confident they can reach an agreement with all of those parties to purchase their properties. The main opposition to the plan has come from three other property owners in the redevelopment district. Only one of those properties has been identified in the plan for purchase to make way the extension of Hazel Street.

What is the approval process?

On April 18, the Youngstown City Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the plan to Youngstown City Council. City Council will hold a public hearing at 2 p.m. May 16 in Council Chambers on the sixth floor of City Hall. City Council is likely vote on the plan at its May 17th meeting.

At-Large Senators (2006-2007):

Arts & Science (10 seats):

Sunil Ahuja, Political Science
Annette Burden, Math
Chet Cooper, Biology * (on leave Fall -- Jay Gordon, English substitute for Fall only)
Jeff Dick, Geol. & Env. Sci.
Vernon Haynes, Psychology
Bob Hogue, CSIS
Daryl Mincey, Chemistry
James Schramer, English
Rick Shale, English
L.J. (Tess) Tessier, Philosophy

Business (5 seats):

Ram Kasuganti, Management
Ray Shaffer, Accounting & Finance
Birsan Karpak, Management
Jane Reid, Marketing
David Stout, Accounting & Finance

Education (5 seats):

Dora Bailey, Teacher Ed.
Rich Baringer, Ed. Admin.
Deborah Jackson, Council and Spec Ed.
Sally Lewis, Council and Spec Ed.
Janet Williams, Teacher Ed.

Engineering & Technology (3 seats):

Elvin Shields, Mech/Ind
Jenette Garr, Civil/Env/Chem
Phil Munro, Electrical

Fine & Performing Arts (7 seats):

Darla Funk, Music
Dennis Henneman, Communication & Theater
Cary Horvath, Communication & Theater
Till Meyn, Music
Allan Mosher, Music
John Murphy, Communication & Theater
Misook Yun, Music

Health & Human Services (5 seats):

Louise Aurilio, Nursing
Kathylynn Feld, Health Professions
Tammy King, Criminal Justice
Louise Pavia, Human Ecology
Thelma Silver, Social Work

Department Senators (2006-2008):

Arts & Science:

Biology: Gary Walker
Economics: Ou Hu
Foreign Language: Hervé Corbé

Business:

Management: Tom Rakestraw
Accounting: Sheen Liu

Education:

Counseling and Special Ed.: Jennifer Jordan
EARF: Paul Carr
Teacher Ed.: Regina Rees

Engineering & Technology:

Civ/Env/Chem: Anwarul Islam
Technology: Carol Lamb
Electrical & Computer: Faramarz Mossayebi
Mech/Ind: Hazel Marie Pierson

Fine & Performing Arts:

Art: Stephanie Smith
Communication & Theater: Amy Crawford
Music: Silvio dos Santos

Health & Human Services:

Health Professions: Diane Kandray
HPES: Jennifer Pintar
Human Ecology: Zara Rowlands

Election & Balloting (2006-2008) - done early per Tom Shipka due to Accreditation :

A&S: Annette M. Burden
F&PA: Misook Yun
WCBA: Ray Shaffer
HHS: Michael Murphy
E&T: Hazel Marie Pierson (unless she can find someone else)

Charter & Bylaws (2006-2008) - done early per Tom Shipka due to Accreditation :

Eleanor Congdon, History
Keith Lepak, Political Science
Gary Walker, Biology

Senate Executive (2006-2009) - done early per Tom Shipka due to Accreditation :

A&S: Tod Porter (Fall term 2006), Chet Cooper (Spring term 2007)
F&PA: Darla Funk

General Education (2006-2009) - done early per Tom Shipka due to Accreditation :

A&S: Matt O'Mansky
F&PA: Cary Horvath

Dr. Annette M. Burden

Dr. Annette M. Burden
Assistant Professor, Mathematics
Coordinator, M1501
Youngstown State University
Office: 330-941-1814
Fax: 330-941-3170

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

Date May 1, 2006 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) _____

Name of Committee Submitting Report Academic Programs Committee

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

Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members: 2005-2006 members are Sunil Ahuja (chair), Kathy Akpom, Lauren Cummins, Maria Delost, Jeanette Garr, Marla Mayerson, Joseph Palardy, Bill Vendemia, Jim Ritter (academic advisor), Bege Bowers (ex officio), Jim Mike (ex officio), Teresa Riley (ex officio, UCC chair), Chad Miller (student).

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

The following six proposals have been approved by the committee. These proposals were circulated. No objections were received. These are being reported for informational purposes only.

- APD#005P-04 – *BS Degree in Mathematics* – CHANGE – Mathematics and Statistics.
- APD#005P-06 – *Bachelor of Music with Emphasis in Music Recording* – CHANGE – Dana School of Music.
- APD#010P-06 – *Physical Education—B.S. in Education* – CHANGE – Human Performance & Exercise Science.
- APD#011P-06 – *Exercise Science* – CHANGE – Human Performance & Exercise Science.
- APD#014P-06 – *Clinical Laboratory Science* – CHANGE – Health Professions.
- APD#017P-06 – *Community Health Program* – CHANGE – Health Professions.

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: _____

Sunil Ahuja, Chair

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

Date 04-10-06 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) _____

Name of Committee Submitting Report University Curriculum Committee

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.) Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members T. Riley (Chair), P. Munro, L. Pavia, D. Porter, T. Rakestraw, D. Morgan, S. Phillips, J. Caputo, R. Rees, T. Fullum, A. Morar

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:
The University Curriculum Committee is appending a list of approved courses that have cleared the circulation process.

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? _____

Other relevant data: _____

Teri Riley, Chair

Appendix UCC 1

University Curriculum Committee Approved Courses

The following courses have been approved by the University Curriculum Committee and have circulated for ten days without objection. They are being appended to the Senate Agenda as a record of approval.

UCD #	CATALOG #	COURSE TITLE	ACTION
044-06	CHFAM 1514	Introduction to Early Childhood Education	Change
045-06	CHFAM 1530	Infants and Toddlers: Development and Care	Add
046-06	CHFAM 1531	Infant and Toddler: Integrating Development and Education	Delete
047-06	CHFAM 2633	Early Childhood: Integrating Development and Education	Change
048-06	CHFAM 2650	Introduction to Assessment of Young Children	Change
049-06	CHFAM 2675	Integrated Curriculum for PreKindergarten	Add
050-06	EUT 1502L	Power Plant Fundamentals Lab	Change
051-06	EUT 1502	Power Plant Fundamentals	Change

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

Date April 26, 2006 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 Sracic, Feld, Kasuganti, Sarro, Sweeney, Munro, Gergits, Lovelace-Cameron, Riley, White, Crist, Jenkins, Susanne Miller (ad hoc), Chad Miller and Amanda Mielke (students)

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate: GEC is recommending a new intensive policy that allows departments to design program-based requirements that enable students to complete the intensive requirements beyond the present course-based only approach.

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? Yes
If so, state the motion: That the Academic Senate approve the intensive policy attached as an appendix.

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: _____

William D. Jenkins
Chair

APPENDIX ONE
GENERAL EDUCATION
INTENSIVE REQUIREMENTS
DRAFT 4/24/06

Each department or program must provide for its majors a clearly designated path or paths that enable them to complete the intensive requirements. These paths – either course-based (1), or program-based (2) -- must provide for the meeting of all intensive requirements in any of the following ways:

- 1) Provide a specific list of recommended courses coming from within or outside the department that enable the student to complete two writing intensive courses, one oral communication intensive course, and two critical thinking intensive courses. These courses should not be the entire list of intensives.
- 2) Provide a combination of courses, assignments, presentations, etc, distributed throughout the program. Any program-based alternative will have to include the same number and type of assignments now required for individual GER Intensive classes, as provided for in the intensive criteria established by the Academic Senate (A. Basic Skills – Writing, Oral Communication, and Critical Thinking) and in the requirements of the General Education Model (I.A. 1, 2 and 3).

Some possible program-based alternatives might include:

- a. All writing, critical thinking, and oral communication intensive requirements fulfilled through a number of assignments completed in a number of classes, or through other University programs, such as Quest.
- b. One or more of the intensive areas fulfilled through the course-based path and the other(s) through a program-based alternative.
- c. A combination of program-based assignments and a single intensive course to complete an area. The Critical Thinking requirement could be met, for example, by taking one certified course and completing additional assignments throughout the program (program-based).

The General Education Committee will review all proposals for possible approval.

Appendix Two

Certified General Education Courses

The following courses have been certified and circulated for ten days without objection. They are being appended to the Senate Agenda as an indication of their certification as general education courses.

Writing Intensive

990510 – PSYCH 3728L, Physiological Psychology Laboratory

Oral Communication Intensive

990514 – ECON 3720, Comparative Economic Systems

Janet Williams (ED), Chair, Academic Research Committee
Senate Report – May 3, 2006

The Academic Research Committee addressed three major items during this academic year: (1) a review of the *Handbook of Intellectual Property* and (2) a review of a *Core Facilities Study*.
Work on these two items continues.

Item 3 was the revision of the University Guidebook 9006.01: entitled *Professional Conduct of Faculty, Department Chairpersons, and Professional/Administrative Employees*, Subject: **Scientific Misconduct**. It is this work that is brought to the Senate today for your consideration.

Correction

Before I make a formal motion, please make the following correction in the Research Misconduct Policy document: on page 6, under the “Resolution” bullet, item 1. – change the first line to read: “Upon receiving a **Research** Misconduct Investigation Report from the Dean of.” The word Research is to replace the word **Scientific**.

Motion

On behalf of the Senate Academic Research Committee, I move approval of the University Guidebook 9006.01: *Professional Conduct of Faculty, Department Chairpersons, and Professional/Administrative Employees*, Subject: *Research Misconduct* policy statement.

Discussion

The existing University Board of Trustees *Scientific Misconduct* Policy needed to be revised due to changes in the Federal statute. The particular Federal statute referenced here is the Code of Federal Regulations 42 CFR Part 93, Subparts A through C.

The Committee’s charge was to make sure the revised policy statement complied with the Federal guidelines. After thorough review by the Committee, and some minor editorial revisions, it was judged to be aligned with the guidelines.

The resulting policy statement is *Professional Conduct of Faculty, Department Chairpersons, and Professional/Administrative Employees*, Subject: **Research Misconduct**.

Note the change in the policy title from *Scientific Misconduct* to *Research Misconduct*. The revised policy statement attached to today’s Senate agenda provides you with all of the changes made in order to bring it into alignment with the Federal guidelines.

Respond to any questions; vote follows.

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

Date: April 24, 2006 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) _____

Name of Committee Submitting Report: Academic Research

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.)
Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members: Janet Boehm (HHS), Janet Williams (ED) (Chairperson), Alina Lazar (A&S), Dan Suchora (E&T), Daryl Mincey (A&S), Pat McCarthy (HHS), Cary Horvath (FPA), David Stout (WCBA), Peter Kasvinsky, Admin (ex officio), Jeff Dick, Admin, and James Mike, Admin.

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:
The Academic Research Committee addressed three major items during this academic year: (1) a review of the *Handbook of Intellectual Property* and (2) a review of a *Core Facilities Study*. Work on items 1 and 2 continues. Item 3 was the revision of the University Guidebook 9006.01: *Professional Conduct of Faculty, Department Chairpersons, and Professional/Administrative Employees*, Subject: **Scientific Misconduct**. The existing University Board of Trustees Policy needed to be revised due to changes in the Federal statute. The resulting policy statement is *Professional Conduct of Faculty, Department Chairpersons, and Professional/Administrative Employees*, Subject: **Research Misconduct**. YSU's revised document complies with the Federal guidelines.

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? Yes

If so, state the motion: On behalf of the Senate Academic Research Committee, I move approval of the University Guidebook 9006.01: *Professional Conduct of Faculty, Department Chairpersons, and Professional/Administrative Employees*, Subject: *Research Misconduct* policy statement.

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: Revision of the Scientific Misconduct Policy was necessary to bring the University Guidebook 9006.01 into alignment with the Code of Federal Regulations 42 CFR Part 93, Subparts A through C.

Janet B. Williams
Chair

UNIVERSITY GUIDEBOOK

Subject: Research Misconduct

Developed by: Peter J. Kasvinsky

Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Authorized by: Robert K. Herbert

Title: Provost

EFFECTIVE: June 16, 2005

Policy: In accordance with the requirements of 42 CFR Part 93, Subpart A – C, “General, Definitions, and Responsibilities of Institutions,” the Board of Trustees of Youngstown State University does hereby establish the following policy respecting research misconduct.

RESOLUTION NUMBER: YR 2005 - XX

Purpose:

Among the basic principles of Youngstown State University are the pursuit of truth and the responsible exercise of academic freedom. From these principles derive such ideals and values as the freedom and openness of inquiry, academic honesty, and integrity in scholarship and teaching. The University affirms and honors the preservation, growth, and flourishing of these values throughout all its activities, including teaching and learning, research, scholarly inquiry, and creative scholarly endeavor. Accordingly, research misconduct is inimical to the concept of academic freedom and its responsible exercise. It is from this background that the Board of Trustees implements this policy for handling allegations of misconduct in research. This policy will be applied to all externally funded grants or sponsored programs at Youngstown State University.

Definitions:

Definitions used in this policy shall conform to those cited in 42 CFR Part 93:

- “Research misconduct” for purposes of this policy means fabrication, falsification, plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.
- “Fabrication” is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- “Falsification” means the manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented by the research record.

Deleted: Scientific Misconduct

Formatted: Border: Top: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width), Bottom: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width), Left: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width), Right: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width), Tabs: 1", Left + 3.83", Left + 4.83", Left

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: ARTICLE III.

Deleted: 50

Deleted: A

Formatted: Border: Top: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width), Bottom: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width), Left: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width), Right: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width), From text: 1 pt Border spacing:)

Deleted: ¶
SECTION 35. SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT ¶
¶

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: Responsibilities of Awardee and Applicant Institutions for Dea... [1]

Deleted: interim

Deleted: scientific

Deleted:

Deleted: :

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted ... [2]

Deleted: 35.1

Formatted ... [3]

Deleted: scientific

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: “

Deleted: Scientific

Deleted: or other practices that ... [4]

Deleted: conduct

Deleted: presenting,

Deleted: reporting

Deleted: (A)

Deleted: means the creation of ... [5]

Deleted: (B)

Deleted: ion

- “Plagiarism” is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
- “Respondent” is the person against whom an allegation of research misconduct is made, or who is the subject of the research misconduct proceeding.

Deleted: (C)
Deleted: means representing the words, ideas, or methods of another person as one’s own.

Nothing in these definitions shall be deemed to include honest error, or differences in opinion as research misconduct.

Deleted: ¶
(D) “Other Practices” that violate accepted standards of honesty include but are not limited to:¶
¶
<#>Selective reporting or omission of conflicting data;¶
¶
2) Gross negligence in collecting or analyzing data;¶
¶
<#>Improper use or release of ideas or data that have been received with the expectation that confidentiality will be preserved in accordance with applicable law;¶
¶
<#>Stealing, destroying, or taking or using without permission the property of others or products or research produced by others, such as data, equipment, supplies, computer programs, notes and records, manuscripts, or specimen collections.¶
¶

Regulations:

- It is a violation of this policy for any member of the faculty, professional administrative staff, classified staff, individual working under an independent contract for services, or a student to engage in research misconduct, to retaliate against anyone making a good faith allegation of research misconduct, to obstruct the inquiry into or investigation of allegations of research misconduct, or to make other than in good faith allegations of research misconduct.
 - Except as otherwise required by this policy or by Federal, State, or local law or regulation, it is a violation of this policy for any member of the faculty, administration, classified staff, providing services pursuant to an independent contract, or student body to violate the confidentiality of a proceeding under this policy.
- A finding of research misconduct under this policy requires that:
 1. There be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and
 2. The misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and
 3. The allegation be proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"
Deleted: , honest omission or oversight, or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.
Deleted: ¶
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"
Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
Deleted: scientific
Deleted:
Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Procedures:

- Allegations:
 1. Any person, upon observing or having evidence of suspected research misconduct or believing specific actions, activities, or conduct constitutes research misconduct (as defined in “Definitions” above) may make an allegation. Such person contemplating making an allegation may, and is encouraged to, first discuss the contemplated

allegation in absolute confidence and privacy with the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research as Authorized Institutional Official for research, grants and sponsored programs (Policy 1013.01), who will advise the person(s) about the procedures to be followed under this policy.

2. An allegation of research misconduct may be through any means of communication. The disclosure may be by written or oral statement or other communication to an institutional official or, in the case of research funded by the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), to an HHS official, but it may not be anonymous. Anonymous allegations are by their nature made “*not* in good faith” under this policy.
 3. If an allegation of research misconduct is made to an institutional official, other than to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, details of the substance of the allegation shall be transmitted to the Dean in writing, within one working day. If the allegation is against the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, it shall be transmitted to the Provost for disposition and the Provost will appoint an individual to act for the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research in implementing this policy.
 4. If the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research is in a conflict of interest situation, s/he shall be replaced in the proceedings by the appointment of a substitute by the Provost.
- Inquiry:
 1. Upon receiving a formal allegation of research misconduct, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research will notify the person(s) against whom an allegation is made about the allegation. The person(s) about whom an allegation is made may have at their expense a representative of their choice present during any subsequent proceeding in which they may be asked or required to be involved.
 2. Upon notifying the person(s) against whom an allegation is made, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research will conduct an inquiry in order to determine whether or not an allegation or apparent instance of research misconduct warrants an investigation. In conducting this inquiry, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall be responsible for gathering information and conducting initial fact finding to justify his/her decision about the need for a formal investigation. All materials such as research records, instrumentation, research documents, copies of publications, etc., which are necessary to conduct the research misconduct proceeding will be taken into the custody of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, inventoried, and sequestered in a secure manner. If access to evidence by users, other than the respondent, is required, documentation or other evidence will

be copied to represent an accurate record of original evidence and the copies will be secured. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research is responsible for preparing a written report that states what evidence was reviewed, summarizes interviews conducted, and includes the conclusions of the inquiry. The inquiry report will indicate whether an investigation is warranted. The respondent(s) may respond in writing with comments about any part of the inquiry report within ten (10) days of receipt of the inquiry report, and if they choose to make written comments, those comments shall be made part of the formal inquiry.

3. An inquiry must be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of its initiation unless circumstances warrant a longer period. If the inquiry takes longer than sixty (60) days to complete, the record of the inquiry shall include documentation of the reasons for exceeding such period. Results of the inquiry, including the inquiry report will be transmitted to both the individual(s) who made the original allegation and to the respondent.
 4. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall maintain sufficiently detailed documentation of inquiries to permit later assessment of the reasons for determining that an investigation was not warranted. Such records shall be maintained in a secure manner for a minimum period of seven (7) years after the termination of the inquiry, and shall, upon request, be provided to authorized Federal personnel having a valid reason to review the records contemplating the allegation about the appropriate processes and the procedures that must be followed under this policy once an allegation is made.
- Investigation
1. If the inquiry provides sufficient evidence that an investigation is warranted, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall commence an investigation and, for Department of Health and Human Services supported research, inform the Office of Research Integrity within thirty (30) days of the completion of the inquiry.
 2. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall appoint an *ad hoc* committee of not less than three and not more than five tenured University faculty having appropriate substantive expertise to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the evidence bearing on alleged research misconduct. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall also be responsible for obtaining individuals from outside the University community having appropriate substantive expertise to thoroughly and authoritatively evaluate evidence if such expertise is clearly not present within the University community or if a conflict of interest could arise from using a member of the University community to evaluate the evidence. No member of the *ad hoc* committee may have any relationship or past history with the

respondent that could be considered a conflict of interest or prevent objective determination of a finding in the investigation. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall appoint a chair of the *ad hoc* committee who will be responsible for writing the report of findings of the committee.

3. The investigation shall include examination of all documentation, including but not necessarily limited to relevant research data and proposals, laboratory or field notes, manuscripts, publications, correspondence, and memoranda of telephone calls. Whenever possible, interviews should be conducted with not only individuals involved in making the allegation and individuals against whom the allegation is made, but also any other individuals who might have information regarding key aspects of the allegation. Complete transcripts or recordings of these interviews should be prepared, provided to the interviewed party for comment and suggested revision, and included as part of the investigation record. Persons being interviewed pursuant to an investigation may have a representative of their choice present to advise them. If documents are required to complete the investigation, which have not already been sequestered, they will be requested from the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research by the *ad hoc* Committee Chair and the Dean will obtain them from the appropriate parties.
4. The *ad hoc* committee shall participate in the interviews of all parties involved in the investigation and shall prepare an institutional investigation report of its findings concerning evaluation and assessment of the evidence to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Research. The institutional investigation report shall conform to the requirements of 42 CFR Part 93 in form and substance.
5. Using all available information, including the *ad hoc* committee institutional investigation report, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall prepare a written summary of the investigation, which shall include an assessment of the extent to which the allegation of misconduct is substantiated by the evidence. If an allegation of misconduct is substantiated in whole or in part, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall include in the written summary a recommendation concerning, without limitation, the following matters:
 - (a) Removal from involvement or activity on a particular project;
 - (b) Orderly termination of the entire research project;
 - (c) Suspension of privileges to submit external proposals for research support;

- (d) Suspension of privileges to submit proposals for University Research Council support;
- (e) Special monitoring of future work.

The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall provide copies of this summary and the institutional investigation report to the individual(s) against whom the allegations are made for comment and to the principal administrative officer of the area in which these individuals are employed. The persons who raised the allegations should also be provided with those portions of the report which address their role and opinions in the investigation. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall maintain all documentation to substantiate the investigation's findings. Such records shall be maintained in a secure manner for a minimum period of seven (7) years after the termination of the inquiry, and shall, upon request, be provided to authorized Federal personnel having a valid reason to review the records contemplating the allegation about the appropriate processes and the procedures that must be followed under this policy once an allegation is made.

6. The investigation should be conducted and completed within one-hundred-twenty calendar days of its initiation, including report preparation, review and comment by subjects of the investigation, and submission of the report to required University and Federal officials. If the report cannot be completed within 120 days, and the report must be submitted to a cognizant Federal funding agency, then the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall submit a written request for extension of the 120 days to the cognizant Federal agency that includes an explanation of the delay, an interim progress report on the investigation, and an estimated completion date of the report and other necessary steps.

• Resolution

← - - - - Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

1. Misconduct

Upon receiving a Scientific Misconduct Investigation Report from the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research in which the allegation of misconduct is in whole or in part substantiated, the appropriate principal administrative officer shall be responsible for initiating applicable disciplinary proceedings in accordance with Board policy and/or provisions of an applicable collective bargaining agreement as appropriate. Appeal of disciplinary action is permitted in accordance with Board policy and/or provisions of an applicable collective bargaining agreement as appropriate.

2) Absence of Misconduct

If the results of the inquiry and/or investigation reveal that allegations of misconduct are not supported, then any party making an allegation or against whom an allegation is made and previously notified about the possibility of misconduct or the need to conduct an investigation should be informed of those findings in writing. In announcing a finding that the allegations are not supported, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research should consult with the person(s) who were the subject of the allegations to determine (a) whether the announcement should be a public announcement and (b) what organizations beyond those initially informed should receive the information about the findings of no misconduct as a means to restore, repair, or reassure the reputation of those involved. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research should normally be guided by whether or not a public announcement will be helpful or cause further harm in restoring the reputations of those against whom the allegations were made and should give weight to their views in determining which additional organizations, if any, should be notified.

Notification to Federal Agencies

← - - - - **Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

- The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall immediately notify the cognizant Federal funding agency and the Office of Research Integrity if at any time during an inquiry or investigation conducted under this policy it is determined that any of the following conditions exist:
 1. Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects;
 2. Research activities should be suspended;
 3. Federal or Department of Health and Human Services resources or interests are threatened;
 4. There is an immediate need to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceedings;
 5. It is probable that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly prematurely, in order to protect the rights of those involved and to safeguard evidence;
 6. There is a reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law;
 7. The research community or public should be informed

- When alleged misconduct involves employees or students conducting research supported by Federal agency sponsors, additional agency notification requirements apply, as follows:
 1. When, on the basis of an inquiry, it is determined that an investigation is warranted, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall notify the cognizant Federal funding agency in writing on or before the date the investigation begins that an investigation is being commenced. The notification should inform the cognizant Federal agency at a minimum of the name of the person(s) against whom the allegation(s) have been made, the general nature of the allegation(s), and the Federal grant application(s) or award(s) involved.
 2. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research must submit the final report of an investigation to the cognizant Federal funding agency if the investigation concerns research being supported by Federal funds. This report to the cognizant Federal agency must describe the policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, how and from whom information relevant to the investigation was obtained, the findings, and the basis for the findings. It must include the actual text or an accurate summary of the views of any individual(s) found to have engaged in misconduct, as well as a description of any sanctions or corrective actions taken by the University.

RESOLUTION

Concerning the Creation of a Standardized Curriculum Sheet for All Majors Offered at the University

Whereas in order to expedite graduation time, it is imperative that students are aware of a clear academic path; and

Whereas the most efficient resource from which to choose this academic path is the curriculum sheet of each major provided by the University to each student during the first semester of his or her Freshman year; and

Whereas all resources provided to the student by the University should be thorough enough to allow the student to independently make decisions regarding his or her academic path; and

Whereas current curriculum sheets provided to the students from the University are inadequate, not standardized, and do not allow the student to make pertinent decisions regarding both courses to take and the most efficient time frame in which to take them; and

Whereas the University is in the process of implementing the Degree Audit Report System (DARS), which in essence fulfills curriculum sheet functions electronically:
Now, Therefore, Be It

Resolved, That the Academic Senate, in concurrence with the Student Government Association, recommends that the University provide for students curriculum sheets, in an electronic format or otherwise, that-

1. Conform to the standards of a blank DARS audit; or
2. Provide students with the most up-to-date and accurate information as possible.

And be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution shall be provided to the Provost, Deans, and Department Chairs, Academic Advisors, and Program Coordinators.



**RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION
FOR
DR. THOMAS A. SHIPKA**

May 3, 2006

WHEREAS, Dr. Thomas A. Shipka has been a loyal member of the Academic Senate for many years and has served with fairness, integrity, and his unique brand of good humor as the Chair of the Senate since 2003; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Shipka has been recognized with many awards, including the Watson Merit Award, three Distinguished Professor Awards, and the National Education Association's Davenport Award; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Shipka has brought in over \$1 million in fundraising to support an endowed Professor of Islamic Studies, the Dr. James Dale Ethics Center, and the American Studies Program; and

WHEREAS, through these and many other activities, Dr. Shipka has demonstrated an extraordinary devotion to this university, to this community, and to the cause of higher education throughout the state; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Shipka has announced that he will retire at the end of this academic year;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate of Youngstown State University expresses its sincere appreciation to Dr. Shipka for his service, integrity, and dedication; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution shall be provided to Dr. Shipka along with the best wishes of the Academic Senate for a future filled with quality time on his Honda Silver Wing motorcycle.