

SENATE MINUTES
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
Friday, October 6, 1972

PRESENT: Mr. Livosky, Mr. Pejack, Mr. R. Jones, Mr. Deiderick, Mr. Flad, Mr. Rost, Mr. Barsch, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. J. Lucas, Mr. Ives, Mr. Morris, Mr. Yozwiak, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Snyder, Mr. DeGarmo, Jr., Mr. Sumpter, Mr. J. Foster, Mr. Swan, Mr. Muntean, Mr. Looby, Mr. Hill, Mr. Ringer, Miss Boyer, Mrs. Mackall, Mr. Parm, Mrs. Saulino, Mr. Davis, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Letchworth, Mr. Richley, Mr. Milon, Mr. Tarantine, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Scriven, Mr. Almond, Mr. Hurd, Mr. von Ostwalden, Mr. Spiegel, Mr. Foldvary, Mr. Cohen, Mrs. Niemi, Mr. Hahn, Mr. Miller, Mr. Abram, Mrs. Hotchkiss, Mr. Harris, Jr., Mr. Ellis, Mr. Wales, III, Mr. Greenman, Mr. Bright, Mr. Bertelsen, Mr. Rishel, Miss Hakojarvi, Mr. Hoops, Mr. Zaccaro, Mr. Slawecki, Mr. C. Hankey, Mrs. Miner, Mr. Miner, Mr. Hovey, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ward, Mr. T. Shipka, Mr. Laitaan, Mr. Behen, Mr. Curran, Mrs. Braden, Mr. Vanaman, Mr. Baldino, Jr., Mr. Bronstrup, Mr. Raridon, Miss Mead, Mr. Hanzely, Miss Sterenberg, Mrs. Budge, Mr. Gould, Mr. Aurand, Mr. Naberezny, Mrs. Dykema, Mr. Toskas, Mr. Larene, Mr. Rondy, Mr. DiRusso, Mr. Betres, Miss Cannatti, Mr. Sinko, Mr. Shuster, Mr. Krill, Mrs. Foley, Mr. Paraska, Miss DeCapita, Mrs. Kennedy, Mr. Blue, Mr. Elser, Mr. Van Zandt, Mr. Hotchkiss, Mr. Eshleman, Mr. Earnhart, Mr. Slavin, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Satre, Mr. G. Jones, Mr. Siman, Mr. Katz, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Kessler, Miss Jenkins, Vice President Coffelt, Vice President Rook, Vice President Edgar, and President Pugsley.

PRESIDING? PRESIDENT ALBERT L. PUGSLEY **TIME:** 4:00 p.m. SCHWABEL AUDITORIUM

NOTE: Appended to these Minutes are the following:

APPENDIX I -- REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT AND TENURE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

APPENDIX II -- REPORT TO SENATE BY ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - PROPOSED CHANGE IN GRADING PRACTICES FOR SUPERVISED STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES

APPENDIX III -- MECHANICS OF EVALUATING FIELD EXPERIENCES IN EDUCATION by Visitor Dr. **Wilbert Hammack**, Director of Student Teaching in School of Education

APPENDIX IV -- REPORT TO SENATE BY ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PROPOSED GRADE CHANGE CONCERNING REPEATED COURSE GRADE AND CALCULATION OF Q.P.A. (QUALITY POINT AVERAGE)

The President called for approval of the minutes of the previous Senate meeting (Friday, June 2, 1972). There being no corrections, additions or modifications the President then declared those minutes approved as distributed.

PRESIDENT PUGSLEY: **Remarked** on the new Seating Arrangement in the Senate.

All who are seated in the first eight (8) rows are members of the Senate with voting privileges; visitors are requested to seat themselves in the last two (2) rows.

This is at the request of the Senate Executive Committee,

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, October 6, 1972)

APPOINTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARIAN FOR 1972-73:

Mrs. **Christine Dykema** confessed she wanted to give someone else an opportunity to share in the **Parliamentary** responsibilities, but in view of her vast experience and the satisfaction that the Senate body expressed so eloquently when she said she would like to be **relieved** of her duties Mrs. **Christine Dykema** has consented to **continue** as Parliamentarian for this **academic** year,

At the request of the Senate **Executive Committee** Mrs. **Dykema** is seated on the platform where she can be **most** easily heard by the Senate,

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE (Dr. David Behen)

Dr. **Behen** stated his report would be in two (2) brief parts as follows:

I. **Statement** of the **Committee's** work during the **Summer**;

II. **Statement** of the **Committee's** plans for the current Quarter.

I -- During the **summer** a **subcommittee** of the **Committee**, Dr. Jack Foster, **Chairman**, prepared a revised draft of the **Constitution** and a revised draft of the **Bylaws**, to **bring these** instruments up-to-date.

The **new** editions of the **Constitution** and **Bylaws** were reviewed and approved by the whole **Committee**, some additional **changes** being **made**, and the **new editions** of the **Constitution** and **Bylaws** have now been **distributed**.

NOTE: (If **more** copies of the **Constitution** and **Bylaws** are needed the **Secretary** of the Senate has them - Room 523 Lincoln Building, Ext. 302).

Rather than take the time of the Senate to note and explain in detail each of the changes incorporated in the new **drafts--and** these changes can rather **easily** be discerned by a **comparison** of the old and new **drafts--Dr. Behen** noted the **guiding** principles followed by the **subcommittee**, and the whole **committee**, in preparing the new **drafts**:

- 1) All changes **affected** by **formal** amendment of the **Constitution** and the **Bylaws** have been **incorporated**;
- 2) Editorial changes have been **made** in the language of **various** provisions to make **them** conformable to changed conditions.

Principally, these **minor** emendations have been necessitated by the fact that the University Senate, **originally** composed entirely of Faculty **members**, now **contains** non-Faculty (**i.e., student**) **members**; in **several** places wordings applicable to a Senate body of the original type have required modification to be applicable to a body of the present type.

- 3) One discrepancy was discovered **between** a provision of the **Constitution** (**Article III, Section 4b**) and a Section of the **Bylaws** (**Bylaw II, Section 3d**), and here the wording of the **Bylaws** was altered so **that**, **without** changing the established practice, the two instruments were **harmonized**.
- 4) The **Bylaws** were renumbered in **I, II, III---order**, the old **order** having been **destroyed** by **deletions** and additions.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, October 6, 1972)
REPORT OF CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Behen)

Dr. Behen stated, in closing this part of the report, that he wished to take specific note of, and express appreciation for, the assistance rendered the Subcommittee by one of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee members, Dr. Irwin Cohen. He also stated, on behalf of the Subcommittee and the whole Committee to state we will be more than happy to correct any errors of commission or omission you discover we have made in carrying through the revision process,

II. Statement of the Committee's Plans for the Current Quarter:

The 1972-73 Committee has arranged for its initial, organizational meeting next week,

In addition to the selection of Chairman and Secretary of the Committee, we will start compiling items of agenda. We have already tentatively placed on the agenda of this year's work the following:

- 1) Drafting of a Proposal to cover adequately the problem of the effect of leaves-of-absence on eligibility for Senate membership and service in the Senate.
- 2) Consideration of the question of proxy voice and proxy vote in the Senate, and at meetings of Senate committees, when a member is unable to attend Senate sessions or committee meetings under certain circumstances.
- 3) The drafting of a Proposal for regular constitutional provision of election of student members to the Senate.

The Committee wishes to assure the Senate, the members of Senate committees, and individual members of the University body that we will give serious consideration to all matters, falling within our area of responsibility, that are submitted to us.

DR. PUGSLEY: This Constitution as it has now been prepared requires no specific adoption in this form since it merely reflects the other changes that have been previously authorized?

DR. BEHEN: That is correct.

The precedent has been set in the past with previous revisions; for the Committee here simply put in order those changes which the Senate body had passed.

DR. PUGSLEY: This then becomes the official document as of this time. (Constitution of the Faculty of Youngstown State University; Bylaws of the Constitution of the Faculty of Youngstown State University -- Dated: September 1972)

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUIVE COMMITTEE: (Dr. Esther Niemi)

Dr. Niemi reported:

In February 1971, at the request of one of our faculty members, the Senate Executive Committee appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to study the method of Appointment and Tenure of Department Chairmen.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, October 6, 1972)
REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr, Niemi)

The Ad Hoc Committee consisted of the following members:

CHAIRMAN: Anthony Stocks
Margaret Braden
Theodore Chrobak
William Hanks
Robert R. Hare
Joel Henkel
Matthew Siman
Mark Walker

The Ad Hoc Committee completed its report on May 25, 1972. We thank the Committee for the time and effort expended in this particular study, and since it has completed its study, we hereby dissolve the Ad Hoc Committee.

Its report, in its entirety, will be attached to the Minutes of this Senate meeting for your information and perusal.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Dr. Victor A. Richley)

As members of the Senate may remember the last Senate meeting was held Friday, June 2 and was terminated due to a lack of a quorum,

At the time the meeting was terminated the matter under consideration was the Proposal by the Academic Affairs Committee to consider revising the grading system as it applied to five (5) courses made available by the School of Education.

At that time the Academic Affairs Committee was also prepared to recommend to the Senate a change in the calculation of the quality point average when repeated courses were involved,

Since that time the Chairmanship of the Academic Affairs has passed on to Dr. Earl E. Eminhizer who would ordinarily be here with you today,

Most of the work, however, on the two (2) Proposals to be brought before you today was done during the Spring Quarter and Dr. Eminhizer asked me to be here to bring it to you.

NOTE: SEE APPENDIX II -- REPORT TO SENATE by THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FOR PROPOSED CHANGE IN GRADING PRACTICES FOR SUPERVISED STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES

The new system would result in the assignment of one of the following symbols:

"CR"--To indicate satisfactory completion
"NC"--To indicate unsatisfactory completion
"W"---To be used as currently specified
"I"---To be used as currently specified

To those students enrolled in the following courses:

Education 704--Professional Laboratory Experiences: High School
Education 705--Professional Laboratory Experiences: Elementary
Education 841--Supervised Student Teaching: Elementary
Education 842--Supervised Student Teachings High School
Education 843--Supervised Student Teachings Special Field and Special Education
Education 860--Supervised Student Teaching: Educable Mentally Retarded

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, October 6, 1932)
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT CONT'D.: (Dr. Richley)

Floor **yielded**, by consent of the President, to visitor Dr. **Wilbert Hammack**, Director of Student Teaching in School of Education,
 Text of Dr. **Hammack's remarks** in APPENDIX III. **Brief summary as follows:**

The **evaluation** of a student teacher on 31 criteria **items must be made** by not less than two (2) (but frequently by four (4) or **more**) **supervisory persons** working out of two different institutions--the University and a **Public/Private School System**.

The cooperating school **systems** have **extremes** of resources, **vary** across a broad **spectrum** of educational philosophies, **have clients with** very diverse **cultural backgrounds** representing differing needs and attitudes, The **evaluation** report of student teachers is not a **summative** fact drawn out of these variables, but a **communicative** report of a **developmental process**. To **measure extent** and **accuracy** of cognitive learnings is relatively **uncomplicated** as is assessment of **psycho-motor skills**, but in the affective and conative **domains** which are constantly evolving in an interaction **process** of human development, evaluation is complicated mechanics.

MOTION: Dr. Victor A. **Richley** moved on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee Senate **approval** of the following **Motion:**

A **Credit/No Credit (CR/NC)** grading **system** is to be **implemented** for courses:

Education 704 and 705--Professional **Lab** Experiences and Education 841, 842, 843 and 860--**Student Teaching**. The student grade card for these courses will show **only one** of the **symbols:** CR, NC, W or I.
Seconded.

Dr. Pugsley: Your Motion does not specify a **time** when this would **become** effective?

Dr. Richley: This Quarter, if at **all** possible, if **it** passes.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: Dr. **Irwin Cohen** moved to **Amend** the Motion on the **ON THE FLOOR** : floor by substituting for "CR", "NC", "W", and "I", simply **Credit/No Entry**.
Seconded,

A. ENDMENT TO THE: Dr. **Bronstrup** moved that we **Amend** Dr. **Cohen's** **AMENDMENT** : **Amendment** to include the **"Incomplete"**.

The **Amendment** to the **Amendment** now **reads:**

Credit/No Entry and **Incomplete**.

Seconded,

AYES HAVE IT. AMENDMENT TO AMENDMENT PASSED.

(SEE BELOW)

QUESTION CALLED FOR. This is the **Amendment** to the **Amendment**.

It relates to the inclusion of **'Incomplete'**.
AYES HAVE IT. AMENDMENT TO AMENDMENT PASSED.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, October 6, 1972)
REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Richley)

Now back to the Original **Amendment** as it has been **amended**.

MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION.

Seconded. (You are voting on whether or **not** to close debate),
AYES HAVE IT. DEBATE IS CLOSED.

Dr. Pugsley: Now you will proceed to vote on the **Amended Amendment**.
AYES HAVE IT. The Amended Amendment has passed,

BACK TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION AS IT HAS BEEN AMENDED.
 (It includes **Credit/No Entry** and **"I"**.)

AMENDMENT TO: Mr. David Ives moved an Amendment to the **Motion that**
THE MOTION : this be **made** retroactive back to at least 1968 so **that**
everybody can benefit from what we are trying to do,
 Let future students benefit **from it**.
 Seconded.

Dr. Curran: Asked Mr. Ives to change his Amendment to include a petition by
 the **students** that wish such a change to be **made** on their record, Some
 of the students who have **15** hours of 'A' may **prefer** to have the **15** hours
 of 'A' left on their record. It ought to be **their prerogative**,

Mr. Ives: Leave it up to the student to request the change, Would **grant** the
 petition on the grounds **that** the system has been changed,

Dr. Pugsley: Mr. Ives has been willing to accept your suggestions for
modification of the **Motion**. Is **this** agreeable to the seconder?

ANS: Yea.

Dean Paraska: Dean Paraska moved to refer the **Motion** back to Committee,
 Seconded.

Parliamentarian: It is debatable but only on its merits.
 (Mrs. Dykema)

Dr. Pugsley: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED FOR This is to refer back to
 Committee.
NO'S HAVE IT. (IT DOES NOT GO BACK TO COMMITTEE).

Dr. Jack Foster: Moved the **previous** question.
 Seconded.

Dr. Pugsley: You are now voting on whether to close debate.
APES HAVE IT. DEBATE CLOSED.

NOW VOTING ON MR. IVES' AMENDMENT:

By **student** petition and retroactive **back** to 1968.
NO'S HAVE IT. AMENDMENT DID NOT PASS.

BACK TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION AS IT WAS AMENDED.

You are now voting to close debate.
AYES HAVE IT. DEBATE CLOSED.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, October 6, 1972)
REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Richley)

Dr. Pugsley:

Now to vote on the Original **Amended** Motion which **was:**

CREDIT/NO ENTRY AND INCOMPLETE (Modified to this from way it was
APES HAVE IT. MOTION PASSED. originally presented).

MOTION: Dr. Victor A, **Richley** moved on **behalf** of the **Academic Affairs Committee** Senate approval of the **following** Motion:

Effective **Fall Quarter, 1972**, that **when** a course **taken** for undergraduate credit is repeated, **only** the **last** grade recorded be counted in **calculation** of the **Q.P.A. (Quality Point Average)**, Current students must petition for the Q.P.A. recalculation of previous **as well as** present course-work repeated at **Youngstown State University**.
 Seconded.

AMENDMENT TO: **Mr. David Ives** moved to Amend the wording of the above
MOTION : Motion **as** follows:

from '**only** the last grade **recorded**' to '**only** the higher of the two grades!'.
 Seconded,

Dr. Richley: This Motion does not speak to **the** number of times that a student can repeat a course. This is already established policy in the Catalog,

Dean Paraska: Regarding Repetition of Courses: (See page 48 of current YSU Bulletin 1972-73 Edition):

"A student may **repeat** a **course** once. If the course repeated is a **prerequisite** to another **course**, the repetition **must be successfully completed before** the other course is taken, A course may not be repeated if the student **has** received credit for a more **advanced** course in the same subject. If a course **is** repeated, the repetition is treated merely **as** another course, along with **the** first, in **calculating** the point index, A course repeated, however, **may** be counted only once as credit **toward a student's total academic hours for graduation.**"

Dr. Richley: A "**W**" is not utilized **as** a grade to reflect proficiency. It **simply** reports action that has been **taken** with regard to the enrollment of the student. It simply indicates he has **withdrawn from** the **course**.

Dean Miller: 1) How does a student know **anymore** when he repeats a course with a **number** change?
 2) With the 4-hour change a student would take a course **which** is now 4 hours and had been 5 hours or had been 3 hours **previously**, what does he reduce **his** total quality points by?

Dr. Pugsley: I think these are good questions but they relate **more** to the original question, *than* they do to the **Amendment**.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, October 6, 1972)
REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Richley)

Dean Paraska: May I suggest to Mr. Ives that he Amend his Amendment to read 'highest' instead of 'higher', This would take care of those rare instances where a student has repeated a course more than once,

Mr. Ives: Agreed to above.

Dr. Richley: Current students may petition for past failures.

There was discussion in the Academic Affairs Committee about the possibility of utilizing the higher of the two grades. There was not sufficient support from the Committee, however, to bring such a recommendation to the Senate.

The Committee's sentiment was that the last grade earned more nearly reflected the student's current master of the subject material and therefore, ought to be the one used in determining the Quality Point Average.

In reviewing policies that exist at other State assisted Institutions there is no other State assisted Institution that I know of that utilizes the higher of the two (2) grades.

Dr. Pugsley: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED FOR,
 Voting on the Amendment to permit recording of the
 highest grade.
AYES HAVE IT. AMENDMENT PASSED.

NOW YOU ARE BACK TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION SO AMENDED.

Mr. Montgomery: I would like to make an Amendment to the Main Motion:
 (Student)

That the transcript should not continue to show the student's total performance for grading regarding all grades earned in the courses; that only the highest grade in repeated courses be counted in computing the student's official transcript.

Parliamentarian: Mr. Montgomery wants to make it that it doesn't remain
 (Mrs. Dykema) on the transcript,

Dr. Pugsley: Asked Mr. Montgomery to repeat his Amendment to the Main Motion:

Mr. Montgomery: The transcript should not continue to show the student's
 (student) total performance.....

Dr. Richley: Sorry, but that is not part of the Motion. That sentence is the preamble to the Motion,

Unless something is done to revise the Main Motion that grade will automatically be on the transcript. The Academic Affairs Committee was merely stating its preference that the original "F" in the course show on the transcript, It will if the present system is used.

Dr. Pugsley: If you wish to make an Amendment -- we are not trying to interfere with your ability or your right to Amend the Motion.
 You-will have to tell us what you wish to do.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, October 6, 1972)
REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CONT'D.: (Dr. Richley)

Mr. Montgomery: I wish to Amend to **eliminate** the **original**, the lower grade standing, so that **only** the highest grade be counted in the Quality Point Average, and show on the transcript,
 (Student)

Mr. Toskas: MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION.
 (Student) Seconded.

Dr. J. Foster: What are you calling debate on? What are **you** moving? The Motion to Amend or what?

Mr. Toskas: I am calling to end debate on the **Motion as Amended.**
 (Student)

Dr. Pugsley: The last **Motion** which we had (**and correct me if I am wrong**) **was an attempt** to Amend by **Mr. Montgomery** and we were trying to **clarify** the precise **language**. But I do **not recall** this **clarification** was completed or that it was seconded,

Parliamentarian: At present we are about to vote on closing **discussion** of **all** kinds.
 (Mrs. Dykema)
 If you want to hope that Mr. Montgomery will produce an Amendment and consider an Amendment then you will have to **defeat** the closing of discussion,

There can be no other **discussion** at *this* point,

Dr. Hovey: POINT OF ORDER
 How can the **question** be moved in the midst of **Mr. Montgomery's** holding the floor to present an Amendment?

Parliamentarian: **Mr. Montgomery** sat down and agreed that he had no Amendment.
 (Mrs. Dykema)

Dr. Pugsley: You are going to vote whether or not to close debate.
AYES HAVE IT. DEBATE IS CLOSED.

Dr. Pugsley: How ready to vote on the **Motion** as presented in your mimeographed sheet and as **modified** by the language and accepted by **the** Chairman of the **Committee** and the Amendment,

MOTION NOW READS AS FOLLOWS:

Effective **Fall Quarter**, 1972, that when a **course taken** for undergraduate credit is repeated, only the **highest** grade recorded be counted in calculation of the Quality Point Average. Current students must **petition** to the Dean of their schools for the Quality Point Average **recalculation** of previous as well as present **course-work** repeated at **Youngstown State** University.
AYES HAVE IT. MOTION PASSED.

MEETING ADJOURNED 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vera Jenkins
 SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT AND
TENURE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

May 30, 1972

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT AND
TENURE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

May 30, 1972

INTRODUCTION:

In early February of 1971, the Senate Executive Committee appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Appointment and Tenure of Department Chairmen. The Committee was charged with the task of recommending any changes considered desirable regarding the method of selection of department chairmen or the procedures **employed** to determine their stay in office. According to existing practice, department chairmen are appointed by the President and apparently serve on an academic year to year **basis at the** pleasure of the **President**.¹ It is to this policy that the Committee recommendations are directed*

Following several meetings, the Committee prepared a "Questionnaire on Appointment and Length of Service of Department at YSU" which was distributed to academic deans, assistant deans, department chairmen and full service faculty for **reply**.² In addition, open hearings were held to obtain opinions from members of the university community. The Committee also obtained information from other universities on the procedures they utilize for the appointment of chairmen and the conditions governing their longevity in office. On the basis of these inputs, the Committee recommends that the following policies be adopted-

¹"The head or chairman of the department is appointed by the President upon the **recommendations** of the Dean of the college or school and the Vice President for Academic Affairs," (Faculty Handbook, September, 1971). There is no statement in the Handbook as to the role of faculty in the appointment procedure, the term of office of a chairman, or the procedure by which a **chairman** may be removed from his position.

² Appendix A includes a copy of the questionnaire, the cover letter, and a tally of the responses received.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPOINTMENT OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN:

Because of the significant variation in size and complexity of academic departments at Youngstown State University, the Committee does not propose establishing a single policy for faculty input in the appointment of all chairmen. Rather, it recommends that each department establish a procedure to recommend to the Dean, **Academic Vice President** and President the appointment of a chairman. This procedure would be tailored to the particular needs of the department and would permit and encourage full faculty participation in the selection process. The procedure adopted by a department would be submitted to the administration for review and comment and any discrepancies in view points would have to be reconciled before the procedure could become operative. Moreover, a department could change its procedure for recommending a chairman, as deemed warranted, but subject to review, comment and agreement with the administration.

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN:

The Committee recommends the establishment of a maximum three year contract period for newly appointment department chairmen at Youngstown State University, Any of these contracts could be renewed by the President provided the relevant chairman wished to serve another term provided he has not been recalled by his faculty as discussed below.

The Committee further recommends that there be established the following procedure for faculty evaluation of the performance of department chairmen. A written petition **signed** by 30% or more of the full service faculty of the department, but in no case less than two members, could be submitted to the Dean of the School calling for a vote of confidence in the chairman, Following verification of signatures and discussion with the signers and the chairman, the Dean

will hold a confidence vote of the department's full service faculty no later than one month following receipt of the petition, The result of this vote would be forwarded to each eligible voter in the department and the chairman. If a simple majority voted no confidence, the Dean would confer with department members and the chairman to seek a reconciliation **of** views. Within two quarters of the no confidence vote, the Dean would hold a recall vote among the **full** service faculty of the department and report the results to the eligible voters and the chairman. If a simple majority voted **for recall**, the position of chairman would be declared vacant by the Dean of the school and the department's procedure to recommend a new chairman immediately would become operative. In the period necessary **to select** a new chairman, the department's full service faculty **would** be required to recommend an acting chairman to the administration. **While** our Committee was not asked to review the method used **to** establish salaries of department chairmen, this issue is very relevant to the problem of obtaining qualified persons to serve and to the determining of the service to be rendered by the chairman. Consequently, the remuneration for the position is intimately related to the appointment process and to the willingness of chairmen to serve over a specified time period, Thus, the Committee felt that a recommendation on the remuneration of Department Chairmen was of value and this has been included in Appendix B.

APPENDIX A



YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44803

May 21, 1971

TO: ACADEMIC DEANS, ASSISTANT DEANS, DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN, ALL
FULL SERVICE FACULTY

FROM: AD HOC SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT AND TENURE OF DEPART-
MENT CHAIRMEN

SUBJECT: QUESTIONNAIRE ON APPOINTMENT AND LENGTH OF SERVICE OF
DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN- AT YSU

As you may have heard, the Executive Committee of the YSU Senate has appointed an ad hoc committee to recommend any changes considered desirable regarding the method of selection of department chairmen or the procedures used to determine their stay in office. To assist the committee in this charge, please complete the enclosed questionnaire. You may find it useful to read the questionnaire first before responding in order to minimize the time to reply and to evaluate the alternative policies outlined.

In order to minimize your response time and ease the burden of tabulating replies, please answer using the IBM form (#511) enclosed with this questionnaire. Use only number 2 pencil and make only one mark per question. Do not fold or spindle your answer sheet. Questions 39 and 40 should be returned with the IBM answer sheet. We welcome your comments, but please do not write any comments on the IBM answer sheet.

Since there is only limited information on how other universities handle the appointment and stay in office of department chairmen, your help is important if the committee is to make substantial progress.

Please return your response by June 4, if possible, to:

Anthony H. Stocks
Chairman of Ad Hoc Committee
c/o Vera Jenkins
Secretary of the Senate
Mailroom Box #457
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

AHS:VJ

P.S. THERE IS NO NEED TO PUT YOUR NAME ON YOUR RESPONSE:
ALL REPLIES WILL BE KEPT IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE.

EST ON APPOINTMENT LENGTH OF SERVICE OF DEPARTME
CHAIRMEN AT YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

1. Please indicate your current academic rank,

a. instructor	c. associate professor
b. assistant professor	d. full professor

2. Please indicate your administrative position, if any,

a. department chairman	c. dean
b. assistant dean	d. no administrative post

3. How many years have you been at YSU?

a. 1-3 years	d. 11-15 years
b. 4-6 years	e. over 15 years
c. 7-10 years	

4. Please indicate the highest academic degree you hold.

a. B.A. or equivalent	
b. M.A., M.S. or equivalent	
c. Ph D. or equivalent	

5. Approximately how many full time faculty members are in your department?

a. less than 5	d. 21-40
b. 6-10	e. over 40
c. 11-20	

6. Are you a tenured faculty member?

a. yes	b. no
--------	-------

AFFOINIMENI OF DEPARIMENI CHAIRMEN

7. Should the members of a department seeking a chairman vote to determine if the appointment will be made from within their ranks or from outside?

a. yes	b. no
--------	-------

The next six (6) questions refer to possible methods for the selection of department chairmen. Rate each method in terms of its desirability on the following basis: (a) most desirable, (b) highly desirable, (c) desirable, (d) undesirable, (e) unacceptable.

8. The president appoints chairmen upon recommendation of, and consultation with, appropriate dean or deans without faculty participation,

a. most desirable	d. undesirable
b. highly desirable	e. unacceptable
c. desirable	

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

9. The president appoints chairmen upon recommendation of, and consultation with, appropriate dean or deans with faculty participation limited to the suggestion of candidates.
- a. most desirable
 - b. highly desirable
 - c. desirable
 - d. undesirable
 - e. unacceptable
10. The president appoints search committee composed of faculty in the department which is seeking a new chairman plus two or more members of related department. Committee recommends one or more candidates it considers appropriate to the dean and the president.
- a. most desirable
 - b. highly desirable
 - c. desirable
 - d. undesirable
 - e. unacceptable
11. The president appoints search committee exclusively composed of faculty in the department which is seeking a chairman. Committee recommends one or more candidates it considers appropriate to the dean and the president,
- a. most desirable
 - b. highly desirable
 - c. desirable
 - d. undesirable
 - e. unacceptable
12. The faculty of the department which is seeking a department chairman elect a search committee which recommends one or more candidates it considers appropriate to the dean and the president.
- a. most desirable
 - b. highly desirable
 - c. desirable
 - d. undesirable
 - e. unacceptable
13. The university establishes the principle of a rotating chairman for each department in which case the position typically would be filled from within the department,
- a. most desirable
 - b. highly desirable
 - c. desirable
 - d. undesirable
 - e. unacceptable

If your first preference is the search committee approaches, please answer the following: If not, go on to question 17.

14. Should the search committee rank its preferences for department chairmen from the acceptable candidates and specify the reasons for the ranking?
- a. yes
 - b. no
35. If the president or appropriate dean prefers someone other than the first ranked candidate of the search committee, should the president or dean specify the reasons for his choice to the search committee?
- a. yes
 - b. no

(CONT' D. NEXT PAGE)

- 24, The Senate establishes a Committee on Department Chairman Performance, representative of the University Community, to hear compliments or complaints from any individual or group of individuals regarding any department chairman.
- a, most desirable
 - b. highly desirable
 - c. desirable
 - d. undesirable
 - e. unacceptable
25. The dean of each college or school **should** be required to establish a Committee on Department Chairman Performance, representative of the college or school, to hear compliments or complaints from any individual or group of individuals regarding any department chairman in the college or school.
- a. **most** desirable
 - b. highly desirable
 - c. desirable
 - d. undesirable
 - e. unacceptable
- 26, Periodically, a vote of confidence shall be taken by the faculty of each department to determine whether or not they desire the **retention** of their department chairman.
- a. most desirable
 - b. highly desirable
 - c. desirable
 - d. undesirable
 - e. unacceptable

If your first preference is the Department Chairman Performance Committee Approach, please answer the following questions: If not, proceed to question 31.

- 27, Should the hearings of the committee be?
- a. open hearings
 - b. closed hearings
28. Should the findings of the committee be reported to:
- a. only the dean of the relevant college or school
 - b. the president and dean of the relevant college or school
 - c. the president, dean and faculty of the relevant department
 - d. the entire university community
 - e. everyone
29. If the president or appropriate dean does not agree with the findings of the committee, should he be required to specify the reasons for his position to the **committee**?
- a. yes
 - b. no
30. Should the president or appropriate dean have the prerogative to retain any department chairman which a majority of the committee believe should be **replaced**?
- a. yes
 - b. no

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

If you prefer the vote of confidence approach, please answer the following questions:

31. A vote of confidence should be held-
 - a. every 3 months
 - b. every 6 months
 - c. once a year
 - d. once every 2 years
32. The appropriate date(s) for a vote of confidence should be determined by:
 - a. the president
 - b. the Senate
 - c. the appropriate dean of each college or school
 - d. the appropriate department chairman
 - e. majority vote of the faculty of each department
33. Those eligible to vote shall be restricted to:
 - a. full professors
 - b. associate and full professors
 - c. assistant, associate and full professors
 - d. all full service faculty members
 - e. all full service and limited service faculty members
34. A no confidence vote shall be established when the plurality failing to support a chairman is:
 - a. 75 percent
 - b. 66 2/3 percent
 - c. 60 percent
 - d. 51 percent
35. Responsibility for the conduct of votes of confidence should rest with?
 - a. the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
 - b. the dean of each college or school
 - c. a committee within each department
36. Results from each vote of confidence shall be presented to:
 - a. the president only
 - b. the president and appropriate dean of each college or school
 - c. the president, appropriate dean of each college and school, and to the faculty of the relevant department
 - d. everyone
37. If any department chairman receives a no confidence vote, then:
 - a. its up to the president to decide on what action is to be taken
 - b. the appropriate dean discusses the matter with the chairman and gives him a second chance to pass the next confidence vote
 - c. the appropriate dean replaces the department chairman
38. If you choose alternative three (c) in question #37, then the dean should replace the department chairman:
 - a. within two months after the no confidence vote
 - b. within four months after the no confidence vote
 - c. within six months after the no confidence vote
 - d. at the end of the academic year

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE
ON APPOINTMENT AND TENURE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

277 Questionnaires were used.

<u>QUESTIONS</u>	<u>ANSWERS</u>				
	<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
1.	35	128	75	35	
2.	26		8	226	
3.	129	49	35	35	25
4.	5	90	182		
5.	17	73	98	65	16
6.	121	153			
7.	220	50			
8.	13	4	16	80	159
9.	21	7	51	105	91
10.	22	30	71	79	72
11.	21	44	93	61	56
12.	94	44	63	40	34
13.	52	30	42	83	66
14.	171	13			
15.	174	10			
16.	22	156			
17.	8	24	42	9	10
18.	1	35	37	30	
19.	48	56			
20.	3	6	84		
21.	89	8			
22.	43	2	13	19	14
23.	41	13	40	83	92
24.	19	19	81	81	67
25.	27	48	71	64	53
26.	105	28	56	46	31
27.	32	61			
28.	7	21	55	7	3
29.	86	4			
30.	32	60			
31.	3	6	85	66	
32.	11	19	46	5	84
33.	2	4	26	121	16
34.	19	52	43	53	
35.	29	71	68		
36.	4	31	119	14	
37.	21	73	57		
38.	13	3	3	41	

APPENDIX B

1 THE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

In order to interest well-qualified persons in the job of department chairman and reward them for effective leadership, the Committee recommends that three elements be used to establish the salary of any chairman:

- 1) the wage which the person would be paid if on nine month teaching assignment at the university,
- 2) a one-twelfth stipend per course to cover any summer term teaching obligation of the chairman, and
- 3) a specific bonus to reward the chairman for his efforts and sacrifices in the position, said bonus to be negotiated between the President and each chairman.

APPENDIX IIREPORT TO SENATE

By

THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEEPROPOSED CHANGE IN GRADING PRACTICES

FOR

SUPERVISED STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES

The **Academic Affairs Committee** has studied a request by the faculty of the School of Education to abandon the **traditional A,B,C,D grading system** for its Student Teaching and Laboratory courses and to implement instead, a **Credit/No Credit (CR/NC) system**. The new system would result in the **assignment** of one of the following **symbols**:

"CR"--To indicate satisfactory completion
 "NC"--To indicate unsatisfactory completion
 "W"---To be used as currently specified
 "I"---To be used as currently specified

To those students enrolled in the following courses:

Education 704--Professional Laboratory Experiences: High School
Education 70s--Professional Laboratory Experiences: **Elementary**
Education 841--Supervised Student Teaching: **Elementary**
Education 842--Supervised Student Teaching: High School
Education 843--Supervised Student Teaching: Special Field and Special Education
Education 860--Supervised Student Teaching: Educable Mentally **Retarded**

RATIONALE:

The **Academic Affairs Committee** agrees that present practice in **grading** for student teaching amounts to a double jeopardy for the student:

- 1) **it may** affect his future **employment--where** prospective employers **examine** the grade for student teaching;
- 2) **it** simultaneously affects his University grade point average more importantly than **any** other course (student receives **15 hours** of credit),

As supervisors from the University have **the** primary responsibility for assigning grades in student teaching, their burden **is obvious**. **Regardless** of what evaluation instrument the supervisor uses to determine what "**excellent potential**" may be for student teachers, he feels forced to consider the extraneous **criteria** of grade point average and future employment in assigning grades. Verification

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX II TO SENATE MINU CONT'D.: (October 6, 1972)RE: PROPOSED CHANGE IN GRADING PRACTICES CONT'D.:

of this is made **obvious** through the following **data** proved for **1,046** regular Student Teachers for the academic years 1968-69 and 1969-70:

A's	763	72.9%
B's	267	25.5%
C's	15	1.4%
F's	1	.1%
	<u>1046</u>	<u>99.9%</u>

The dilemma for the student also becomes obvious. He feels that too much chance rests upon such an **important matter** for him. Inappropriate placement, the **particular** style and attitude of a given cooperating teacher or university **super-**visor--combined **with** the student teacher's **concern** for grade point average requirements " can provide **far** too many **variables** for him to cope with. Those variables work against the goal he is **trying** to achieve. The purpose of student teaching is in part to provide an extended **practicum** whereby students are encouraged to "apply techniques and methods learned in prerequisite courses to **actual** classroom teaching **situations**", centering on "**process**" rather than "**product**". Within those guidelines the student teacher **needs** to experiment, **make** mistakes, and determine whether he is suited for **teaching**. All of these practices need to occur in an atmosphere free from threat or penalty if **they are** to be achieved. Satisfactory work in student teaching can represent a **wide range** of behaviors, but the present grading system was not built to **reflect** them.

- 1) The faculty of the School of Education **has** had **this** matter under consideration for more **than** one year. In a recent **poll** (32) of (41) faculty voting, **80%**, favored the proposed system.
- 2) Forty-eight (48) undergraduate students working for teacher certification and representing both the **elementary** and secondary areas were **polled** on their preference of one of the following systems:

CREDIT/NO CREDIT
 CREDIT/NO ENTRY
 TRADITIONAL A-B-C SYSTEM

Only 5 students preferred the traditional system.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX II TO SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (October 6, 1972)

RE: PROPOSED CHANGE IN GRADING PRACTICES CONT'D.:

- 3) Twenty-eight (28) graduate students (all of whom were teachers or teaching aides) surveyed during the winter and spring '72 quarters favored Cr system of reporting.
- 4) Only two of the twelve (12) state related universities in Ohio (OU, and YSU) continue to use the traditional **grade** reporting system in student teaching. Others are using P/F or **CR/NC** or variations thereof.
- 5) The National **Association** of Colleges of Teacher Education (accrediting **body**) surveyed 393 schools of teacher education and reported that 52% were using a non-traditional grading **system**.

Mr. President, for the **Academic Affairs Committee**, I move approval of the following Motion:

MOTION

A **Credit/No Credit (CR/NC)** grading system is to be implemented) for courses:

Education 704 and 705--**Professional Lab Experiences**
and Education 841, 842, 843 and 860--**Student Teaching**.
The student grade card for these courses will show **only** one of the symbols: CR, NC, W or I.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

VICTOR A. RICHLEY - CHAIRMAN

OCTOBER 6, 1972

October 6, 1972

APPENDIX III TO SENATE MINUTES
MECHANICS OF EVALUATING
FIELD EXPERIENCES IN EDUCATION

by Visitor Dr. Wilbert Hammack
Director of Student Teaching in School of Education

If you find this report is somewhat involved in both mechanics and **problems** it is only because both are **genuinely** interrelated.

Student Teachers and Professional Lab Students in **this** University may be assigned into **any** of about 700 schools in **approximately** 70 school districts in the **Youngstown** University **area**.

These schools and school systems reflect the economic advantage level of the communities in which they are located. It is, that they **vary tremendously**. Building adequacy, availability of supplies, extent of teaching media and effectiveness of staff **vary** from the **minimum** requirements of the State upwards -- depending upon available resources and the philosophical base on which these school **systems** may **operate**.

Selectivity is exercised, of course, **among** these schools in the placing of student teachers. The selection of schools has the purpose of providing the field experience student **with the variety** of **instructional programs** and **problems** that **teachers** presently are experiencing and probably will continue to **experience** in type **as** these **students** matriculate into their teaching careers. The **differences** in teaching **problems** in the **inner-city** schools **vis-a-vis** the affluent suburban schools is a matter of **popular** description in the periodicals. The student teacher **that** appears to be successful **with** his assignment in the relatively good academic atmosphere of the future-oriented suburban school **may** not appear to be so **successful** and promising as a student teacher in the **relatively** less academically oriented atmosphere of the now-oriented inner-city school.

These student teachers in the respective school milieus **into** which **they** are assigned, are responsible **to**, and take direction from and are critiqued and evaluated by not less than two (2) supervising persons, a campus appointed supervisor

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX III TO SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.- (October 6, 1972)
MECHANICS OF EVALUATING FIELD EXPERIENCES IN EDUCATION CONT'D.: (Dr. Hammack)

and a cooperating teacher within the school. Many student teachers have two campus supervisors and two or more cooperating teachers. In addition these student teachers may also receive critique from and be evaluated by the building principal and the supervising specialist in the cooperating local school systems,

The extent and variety of supervisory persons with whom the student works during the field experiences (be it student teaching or professional lab experience) is a strong factor tending to complicate the evaluation process. The wide range of types of schools into which students are assigned adds to the difficulty of evaluation. The practices and attitudes precipitated by the differing philosophies of education and learning theories that motivate the various supervisory persons with whom the student teacher may work is also a complicating factor in the valuation process.

The evaluative criteria used to rate a student teacher's level of attainment is so varied and extensive that the great majority of supervisors find they must qualify any letter grade with a descriptive evaluation of the student to interpret that letter grade.

THE STUDENT TEACHING HANDBOOK, Youngstown State University, 1972, pages 33 to 40 lists criteria in four (4) major areas for evaluation, viz.:-

- 1) Personal Qualities - which specifies 13 sub-headings
- 2) Professional Qualities - with 7 sub-headings
- 3) Human Relation Qualities - with 11 sub-headings
- 4) Communication skills embracing 10 sub-areas

These 31 criteria factors must be delineated by precise description to some level of comprehension. The omission of description for any of these factors could be interpreted as a negative evaluation of the student.

The mechanics of evaluating the student teacher or professional lab student in the aforementioned areas must, reasonably well, consider the four domains of educational objectives as **Banj.** Bloom has presented in 'Taxonomy of Education Objectives.' However, the four domains are not necessarily equally weighted. Weighting must be

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX III TO SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (October 6, 1972)

MECHANICS OF EVALUATING FIELD EXPERIENCES IN EDUCATION CONT'D.: (Dr. Hammack)

particularly considered when evaluating the neophyte or fledgling teacher. These are persons in process of development. They are, largely, **experimental**.

We can, perhaps, proudly presume that the faculty in the various **campus disciplines** have provided well for the student in the cognitive domain. We believe by-and-large our student teachers are competent in subject matter, But teaching is equally, if not more, related to human interaction than subject **matter**. The student's **expertise** in the affective domain **must** also be **assessed**. The School of Education would like to take credit for helping the student mature here. The psycho-motor skill domain exercised by student **teachers** has in such **areas** as Visual Art, **Performing Arts**, and **Typewriting**, contributed well to the **student's** initial success. **As well as** the **assessment may** be made of student expertise and success in field **experiences** in those three domains **it** remains that evaluation of the student in his conative domain is a major factor, **What** drives, **what** aspirations, longings and **perspectiveness** for the future of the profession does this student teacher demonstrate--even latently--that can be assessed, evaluated and **transmitted** to his record which will become a credential for future employed service in education?

IN SUMMARY: The evaluation of a student teacher on 31 **criteria items** must be made by not less than two (but frequently by four or **more**) supervisory persons **working** out of two different institutions--the University and a **Public/Private** School System. **The** cooperating school systems have extremes of resources, vary across a broad spectrum of educational philosophies, have clients with very diverse cultural. backgrounds representing differing needs and attitudes. The evaluation report of student teachers **is** not a **summative** fact drawn out of **these** variables, but a **communicative** report of a developmental process. To measure extent and accuracy of cognitive **learnings** is relatively uncomplicated as is assessment of psycho-motor skills, but in the affective and conative domains which are constantly evolving in an interaction

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

APPENDIX III TO SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (October 6, 1972)
MECHANICS OF EVALUATING FIELD EXPERIENCES IN EDUCATION CONT'D.: (Dr. Hammack)

process of human development, evaluation is complicated mechanics.

Being privileged to be the co-author of this Proposal before the Senate I would like to say a word about the History of this Proposal which has been a stand in the School of Education for nearly two (2) years and also voted upon last Spring by a great majority and the Proposal of the authors was to use symbols already existing in the computer system to rate Student Teachers and at that time this was CR, W and I

When this Proposal came to the Academic Affairs Committee, as our former Dean insisted it must, they the Committee asked, that we add to this NC (No Credit) in order to relieve what they felt might be some complications on this floor. This was done and again approved, as you heard by our faculty in School of Education (by this 80%majority).

If we refer to the present Youngstown State University Catalog, Page #51 it gives information about what was intended; and this Hill be the final full paragraph in the right-hand column on page #51:

'A grade of CR is recorded in specific courses that have been determined as inappropriate for the regular achievement grades of A, B, C, and D.
 A CR denotes satisfactory completion of the course.'

This is simply what we want to achieve in the School of Education. To have our students receive a credit (CR) in a course in which we as a School of Education feel that a letter grade is not adequate to do the job that needs to be done.

APPENDIX IV
REPORT TO SENATE
BY
THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
PROPOSED CHANGES CONCERNING
REPEATED COURSE GRADE AND CALCULATION OF Q.P.A.

Current University policy regarding repeated **courses** and calculation of the Q.P.A. is:

"If a course is repeated, the repetition is treated merely as another course, along with the first, in calculating the point index."

Upon review of this policy the **Academic** Deans Council requested the Academic Affairs Committee to consider revising the policy so that only the last grade earned in a repeated course would be counted in the calculation of the Q.P.A.

The Academic Affairs **Committee** agrees with **and** supports the **recommended** revision since it deletes a system under which a student who repeats and passes a course is penalized by his poor initial performance in the course, **The** revised policy would provide a more liberal system of grading in keeping with recent trends and in agreement with the **policies** of **several** of our state **assisted** Universities.

CALCULATION OF QPA WITH REPEATED COURSES

LAST GRADE COUNTED

Ohio **University**
University of Toledo
University of Akron
Bowling Green State University
Wright State University

BOTH GRADES COUNTED

Cleveland State University
University of Cincinnati
Central State University
Ohio State University
Kent State University
Miami University

In formulating a **revised** policy statement for Senate consideration, the Academic Affairs Committee sought to establish that:

- 1) The transcript continue to show the **student's** total performance **recording all** grades earned in **all** courses, repeated or not,
- 2) Only **the** last grade in a repeated course be counted in computing the Q.P.A. (**Quality** Point Average).
- 3) The new policy be established for Fall Quarter 1972 and that **it** be made retroactive for current students regarding past repeated courses.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

RE: PROPOSED GRADE CHANGE CONCERNING REPEATED COURSE GRADE & CALCULATION OF QPA

- 4) A simple automatic method be established for implementing the new policy in the future,

A study of the current registration process shows that the only practical means by which the new policy can be implemented requires that the student "trigger" a corrective mechanism by filing a petition. The **committee has** been assured that the petition is not one which requests permission to have the new policy implemented, but instead, simply "triggers" the mechanism by which the **new** policy is applied. It is necessary that the student petition since he is the only person who knows **that the** course he has just completed is the repeat of a previously completed course,

Mr. President, on behalf of the Academic **Affairs Committee** I move Senate approval of **the** following Motion:

MOTION

Effective **Fall** Quarter, 1972, that **when** a **course** taken for undergraduate credit is repeated, only the last grade recorded be counted in calculation of the **Q.P.A.** Current students **must** petition for the **Q.P.A.** recalculation of previous as **well** as present course-work repeated at Youngstown State University,

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

VICTOR A. RICHLEY, CHAIRMAN

OCTOBER 6, 1972

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

SENATE MEETING

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1972

IN ATTENDANCE:

W. Linsky
 Edwin Pejack
 R. W. Jones
 T. T. Weidrich
 William S. Flad
 Robert R. Ross
 William Otto Barsch
 Dan O'Neill
 James Lucas
 David S. Treas
 R. Steve Morris
 B. G. Gyzwiak
 Robert J. Huber
 Philip A. Snyder
 Paul W. P. Garmode
 J. Roy Sumpter
 Jack O. Foster
 A. J. Muntean
 W. W. Swan
 L. Long
 Louis Hill
 L. R. Meyer
 Baker
 E. P. Mackell
 Jerome E. Parn
 Mary S. Sanders (Mrs.)
 William Paris

Thomas Montgomery
 George Lettich
 V. A. Richey
 Fred Miller
 Frank Tarantini
 Nancy Smith
 Jim Scrimen
 John J. Coffey
 Harold S. Edgar
 George L. Almy
 Raymond W. Hill
 Peter W. von Ostwalden
 Leonard B. Spiegel
 Elmer Foldvary
 Cohen
 Esther Diemio
 Philip John
 Miller
 Sally Hatchkipe
 Gerette Abram
 Carl Harris Jr.
 J. M. Ellis
 Joseph D. Cook
 John C. Walker
 Arthur Greener
 R. Bright
 C. David Butcher

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

SENATE MEETING

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1972

IN ATTENDANCE CONT'D.:

Darrell F. Reibel	Charles A. Forbes
Aili J. Hakojärvi	James Lawrence
M. Dean Hoop	Gilbert F. Roney
Luke N. Zaggaro	Lucrecia Di Rocco
T. K. Slawinski	James Bettes
E. Hankey	Marjorie Cannatta
Helma S. Miner	Larry Smith
Ward S. Miner	R. J. Foster
192 Honey	Karl Hill
Charles R. Reil	Marqueat Toboy
R. C. Ward	Paraska
Thomas A. Shipka	Cliff Hill
Sam Saitman	Stacy Kennedy
Rehan	Fred Blue
Ranger Curran	Delser
Wynne Braden	Vau Zandt
Clyde Vanard	Stotkless
A. H. Baldino Jr.	Winston Eckleman
Charles L. Branstup	W. H. Egan
Steve Gordon	Morris Slavin
Debrahne Meade	Sidney J. Roberts
Stephen Flanzky	Lowell J. Satre
Elizabeth Sternberg	M. J. S. S. S.
M. A. Budget	George Jones
R. L. Gould	Bruce Koff
H. Curran	R. E. Gower
Jon Nabrey	P. Kessler
Christie Lykema	Veronica Jenkins