

Earl Edgar
Vice President, Academic
Affairs

RECEIVED

NOV 20 1979

DR. EARL E. EDGAR
ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT

MINUTES
ACADEMIC SENATE
November 7, 1979

ATTENDANCE (See attached roster.)

CALL TO ORDER

After establishing that there was a quorum present, Dr. Jean Kelty, chairperson of the Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:07.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the May 30, 1979 meeting were approved as distributed.

REPORT OF CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

Dr. Abrams made an informational report to the Senate in which he indicated that the carried-over members from last year (Gratia Murphy, himself, Dan O'Neill) and the newly elected members (Larry Esterly, Don Hovey, Ralph Crum) have met several times. He drew the Senate's attention to the fact that Larry Esterly is Secretary for Charter and ByLaws and requested that members of the Senate feel free to call or contact any member of the committee.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dr. Feitler reported on the business that the Executive Committee has dealt with so far this quarter. (1.) Work generated for the Charter and ByLaws Committee: (a.) The Executive Committee has asked Charter and ByLaws to examine the composition of the Executive Committee in relation to the term of office which does not coincide with being a member of the Senate; (b.) Charter and ByLaws has also been asked to examine the issue of proxy voting for the Senate meetings; (c.) Charter and ByLaws has been asked to make a comprehensive review of the committee structure-- the new Senate has been in existence for three years now, and some committees have been overworked, while others have had difficulty finding work to do. Dr. Feitler encouraged members of the Senate, and anyone else in the schools, to communicate their views regarding committees to the representatives on Charter and ByLaws. (2.) Professor Tokar was recommended to President Coffelt by the Executive Committee to replace Professor Pascale from the School of Education on the Computer Advisory Committee. That appointment has been made. (3.) Through Jean Kelty, the

Senate Executive Committee has asked that the Review Committee, which was asked to convene a year from the appointment of the joint Computer Committee, now begin the process of its review.

REPORT OF ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE-- none

REPORT OF OTHER COMMITTEES

Curriculum Committee

Dr. Kelty noted that there was nothing that demanded action from the Curriculum Committee, only the attachment of the courses to the Agenda.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Early Quarter System

Dr. Guido Dobbert made an interim report on the work of the committee. Since its appointment in March of 1979, the committee has met during the Spring Quarter and again during this Fall Quarter to study the merits of the early quarter system. At this time the committee has roughly arrived at a description of the calendar that it believes would be most acceptable to the university community.

Under this system we would start, like most elementary and high schools, immediately after Labor Day. Fall Quarter would end the weekend before Thanksgiving and the Winter Quarter would begin the week after Thanksgiving and last until the middle of February. Spring Quarter would begin the second half of February and end the middle of May. Summer school dates would not be changed. The net effect would be to redistribute the present block of time over Christmas break more evenly over the entire three-quarter sequence. Thus Christmas break would be shortened to the one week intervening between Christmas and New Year. In return there would be a spring break of roughly one week at Easter. Another effect would be that the three to four weeks available between the end of summer school in August and the beginning of Fall Quarter in September would be shifted backwards to be included between the end of Spring Quarter in May and the beginning of summer school in June.

During the next week a stratified sample of day and night class students, including their faculty, will be polled to determine whether they favor a change from the present system to the early quarter system. The procedure is as follows: A random sample has been drawn from all classes in session 10-11 a.m. This includes lab and 2 hour classes beginning at 9 and ending at 11 a.m. The same procedure has been applied to all classes meeting at any time between 5 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. The sample has already been drawn, and there are 19 in the day class sample and 11 in the night class sample. Among the faculty polled, both full and limited service are included. The opinionnaire will be administered by graduate assistants of the School of Education, and as soon as they have results, the committee will make further recommendations to the Senate.

Dr. Kelty asked if there were questions.

Dr. Hotchkiss stated that she was thoroughly in favor of polling faculty and students on an issue which is going to affect the entire university community. She was baffled, however, by the procedure which had been presented as a possibility, since a mechanism for polling a random sample from the student directory, without getting into the matter of when faculty and students happen to have classes, already exists and has been used satisfactorily on several issues. She suggested that it would seem reasonable to poll 100% of the full-service faculty and asked whether a motion was in order.

Dr. Kelty indicated that a motion could be made to instruct the committee to poll 100% of the faculty, if Dr. Hotchkiss wished to do so.

Motion: That the poll be made of all full service faculty members and of a random sample from the student directory, of every nth, every 25th, whatever the committee considers appropriate, of the student population.

Seconded: G. Murphy

Discussion: Dr. Dobbert stated that the committee had expressed readiness to proceed with the polling of faculty in whatever fashion the Senate indicated. He also expressed that, while the objections to student polling were unclear to him, the committee would respond to Senate dissatisfaction in that area.

Dr. Hotchkiss observed that there could be some unidentifiable, nevertheless salient, differences depending upon the hours during which a student happens to be in class. She stated that she would prefer the poll to be a more randomized procedure, done by taking every nth name from the total list of currently enrolled students.

Dean Sutton suggested that the problem with a survey of that kind is simply that the rate of return is not very good. The expectation, under the proposed polling procedure, was that a graduate student from Education would administer the opinionnaire in each classroom, which should assure a fairly high return of the sample. Under this system, the random selection would be on the four digit number identifying the class section.

When asked whether he was addressing himself exclusively to the sampling of student opinion, Dean Sutton explained that the committee had agreed that it would take faculty opinion in whatever way the faculty wanted.

Dr. Hotchkiss asked whether there was any mechanism built into the proposed procedure which would prevent the student who happens to have an 11:00 class and a 12:00 class and a 2:00 class from being polled several times.

Dean Sutton explained that the only sample would be drawn from the 10:00-11:00 class and the evening class. If a student happened to have a 10:00 class and an evening class, he might be polled twice.

Dr. Shuster expressed concern about the stratification among schools, noting that the School of Business, for example, has a very high student population.

Dr. Slawewski inquired about the role of the information gained by the proposed poll in any final decision about adopting an early quarter system. He understood that this information was only to provide faculty with insight about how students and faculty respond to the idea, and that the official decision was to be made by the entire faculty.

Dr. Dobbert explained that there were two polls involved--that of the faculty, and that of the students. The committee has suggested that the method for polling faculty be left up to the Senate: if the Senate wishes to instruct the committee to poll the entire faculty, the committee will do so. Since the motion also includes the direction that a different method should be used to poll the students, the following explanation of the committee's proposed method was offered: most students are on campus between 10:00 and 11:00 a.m. and again a large section of students is on campus in the evening between 5:00 and 7:30 p.m. The committee felt that this sample would give them enough of an idea with only minimal error. In polling the entire student population generally, or certain samples of the student population, the return is so bad that essentially you really get less of a reflection of student opinion than if you select randomly.

Dr. Kelty requested that the issue be simplified. She asked Dr. Hotchkiss to make a portion of the original motion.

Moved: That the entire full-service faculty be polled.

Seconded.

No discussion--Motion carried.

Dr. Kelty requested that the Senate next return to the second portion of the original motion. Dr. Hotchkiss made the motion.

Moved: That the student body be polled in the form of an opinionnaire sent to every nth student.

Seconded.

Discussion: Dr. Dobbert, while acknowledging that this suggestion was probably the most statistically accurate one, saw practical difficulties. Either the committee would have to make the sample so small, in order to insure adequate returns, that it would not be representative, or the committee would be engaged in a sampling too large to handle effectively. Without volunteering the committee in any way, he suggested that a 25% sampling might work, but it would probably not improve the results.

Dr. Hotchkiss noted that the distribution, collection and evaluation of the parking questionnaire which was distributed last spring was successful and not extremely difficult.

Dr. Russo suggested that there was nothing to prevent the committee from trying both systems, or trying first one and then the other.

Dr. DelBene observed that this might result in a student being polled several times, thus skewing the results of the poll.

Dean Yozwiack spoke in favor of the greater, and thus more representative, return from direct polling in classes. He urged the defeat of the motion.

Dean Sutton agreed with Dean Yozwiack.

Dr. Kelty asked for further discussion or question.

Question called.

Motion failed.

Dr. Hovey inquired whether there had been any provision made to poll the limited service faculty.

Dr. Dobbert indicated that limited service faculty would be among those polled during the specified hours.

Dr. Kelty noted that the motion had changed the procedure to that of polling the entire full service faculty.

Dr. Dobbert explained that the questionnaire is set up in such a fashion that it obtains response from both students and the faculty teaching those students--that faculty will be both full and limited service.

Dr. Kelty asked Dr. Dobbert to clarify the apparently confused issue of whether the committee intended to follow its originally proposed polling procedure in addition to polling the full service faculty, as instructed by the Senate.

Dr. Dobbert recognized that the Senate had directed the committee to make a poll of full time faculty, but he pointed out that in the procedure which the committee initiated, all faculty teaching the classes to be polled will also be polled, and among those will be some limited service faculty.

Dr. Hovey observed that the proposed procedure would mean that the committee would get double responses from some full time faculty.

Dr. Dobbert explained that the committee would present the information to the Senate, separating full service from limited service responses.

Dean Yozwiack noted that it seemed that Dr. Dobbert was still espousing the original intention of the committee, which had been changed by the motion which called for separate polling of the faculty. He assumed that the committee would reconsider their action of including the faculty in the polling of classes.

Dr. Dobbert suggested that the committee could then take out all of the questionnaires that were from full-service faculty, noting that that would be a matter of internal procedure for the committee.

Dean Rand asked whether the committee would get the opinion of the Senate on the details of this matter before it took the poll.

Dr. Dobbert said that the poll was scheduled to proceed next week, and that this presentation to the Senate had only been for the purpose of information. If the committee brought the results of this poll to the Senate, and the Senate found some objection, would the committee take a revised poll, he was asked. Dr. Dobbert indicated that if the Senate wished such a thing, the committee would have to do so.

Dean Yozwiack expressed some concern over the procedure of approval for the proposed early quarter system. If the faculty were to express unanimous approval of the early quarter system, yet the Senate rejected it, what then? Is the Senate or the faculty poll the final authority?

Dr. Dobbert asserted that the Senate is the final authority. The committee's job is to supply the Senate with the sound facts upon which to base a wise decision.

Dr. Shuster inquired about the process of selection for polling classes.

Dr. Dobbert informed the Senate that the member of the committee who has taken on the responsibility of conducting the poll has gone to the table of random numbers and selected a sample from among all the classes in the morning; he used the same procedure for night classes. There is very little chance that students will be polled twice, except for those who are polled at 10:00 and also at night.

Concern was expressed that the sample might be too small, but Dr. Dobbert doubted that that would happen. If it should happen, the committee could increase the sample.

Dr. Alderman expressed curiosity about the advantages of the early quarter system.

Dr. Dobbert explained that it would synchronize us with other educational institutions in the state.

Dr. Kelty asked for further questions or motions.

Perry Cooper inquired about the respective weights to be given to faculty and student responses to the poll. Would the students be represented effectively, and would the results of the poll be skewed toward faculty response?

Dr. Dobbert responded by observing that, although the school is becoming more egalitarian, he assumed that faculty is one group and students another, that they have different interests.

Dr. Kelty asked if Mr. Cooper wished to make a motion; he did not wish to do so at that time. She then asked Dr. Hovey if he had a motion.

Dr. Hovey noted that the committee's poll would reach about 10 limited service faculty, and that in order for it to be representative, it would have to poll 50. He therefore made the following motion.

Moved: That the committee consider polling a minimum of 50, and possibly all, of the limited service faculty.

Seconded.

Discussion: Dr. Slawewski spoke against restricting the prerogatives of the committee. Dr. Hotchkiss could not see that the limited service person's investment in this issue is in any way equivalent to that of the student or the full service faculty.

It was suggested that the motion be amended to recommend that the committee be assigned one full time secretary and one data entry clerk. No second offered.

Question called on the main motion--that the committee poll at least 50, and possibly the entire, limited service faculty.

Motion failed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS--none

NEW BUSINESS

Dean Edgar announced that copies of the revised Senate Charter and ByLaws would be out for the faculty by about the end of the week.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned.
Adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

ATTENDANCE
UNIVERSITY SENATE

ARTS AND SCIENCES

Everette Abram E. Abram
Christopher Bache C. Bache
George Beelen G. Beelen
Barbara Brothers B. Brothers
Dean Brown D. Brown
Irwin Cohen _____
Janet DelBene Janet DelBene
Thomas Dobbelstein T. Dobbelstein
Leslie Domonkos _____
Larry Esterly LEE
Sally Hotchkiss Sally De Hotchkiss
Jean Kelty Jean M. Kelty
Ikram Khawaja Ikram Khawaja
Friedrich Koknat F. Koknat
Leon Laitman _____
Margaret Moore MC Moore
Gratia Murphy Gratia Murphy
Joan Phillip J. Phillip
Sidney Roberts _____
Lowell Satre Lowell Satre
Gary Salvner Gary Salvner
William Shipman _____
Agnes Smith Agnes Smith
Elizabeth Staudt Elizabeth Staudt
Christopher Sweeney _____
Ronald Tabak Ronald Tabak
Alan Viehmeyer _____

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Howard Cox Howard Cox
James Daley J. Daley
Larry Davis L.A. Davis
Terry Deiderick T. Deiderick
Inez Gross Inez Gross
Donald Hovey D. Hovey
Mervin Kohn _____
R.J. Shuster R. Shuster
Jane Simmons Jane Simmons

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Robert Ameduri _____
Peter Baldino _____
Edgar Cobett Ed Cobett
Jack Dunsing Jack Dunsing
Fred Feitler F. Feitler
Louis Hill L. Hill
Glorianne Leck _____
George Levitsky George Levitsky

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Jack Bakos J. Bakos
Prakash Damshala _____
Wade Driscoll Wade Driscoll
Richard Mirth R. Mirth
Floyd Morris _____
Philip Munro P. Munro
Samuel Skarote _____
Tedeusz Slawecki T. Slawecki

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Donald Byo _____
Darla Funk Darla Funk
Elaine Juhasz Elaine Juhasz
Joseph Lapinski Joseph Lapinski
Daniel O'Neill _____
David Robinson D. Robinson
Virginia Shale V. Shale
Michael Walusis _____

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

William Barsch William Barsch
Mary Beaubien _____
Ronald Ciminero Ron Ciminero
Alfreda Harris Alfreda Harris
Gail Hedrick _____
Bari Lateef B. Lateef
Victor Richley Victor Richley
Mary Sebestyen Mary Sebestyen
Hilary Soller _____
James Zupanic _____

ADMINISTRATIVE

Taylor Alderman T. Alderman
William Binning W. Binning
David Cliness _____
Lawrence Cummings _____
Earl Edgar Earl Edgar
Charles McBriarty Charles McBriarty
William McGraw _____
Arnold Moore Arnold Moore
Nicholas Paraska _____
Leon Rand _____
Edmund Salata _____
James Scriven _____
George Sutton George Sutton
Bernard Yozwiak BY
Dean of S.B.A. _____

STUDENT MEMBERS

Michael Anderson M. Anderson
Diane Bogan D. Bogan
Joe Castrodale J. Castrodale
W. Perry Cooper W. Perry Cooper
Tony Koury T. Koury
Lori Kovach L. Kovach
Mario Massaro _____
James Melfi _____
Ralph Minto R. Minto
Kerry Paulin Kerry Paulin
Steven Shelton _____
Karen Snyder _____
George Stokes _____
Robert Wade Robert Wade
Bob Wasko Bob Wasko
Ed Mengoldi Ed Mengoldi

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL:

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

UCC # 79-265	DATE REC'D: 5-23-79	IR CODE:
-----------------	------------------------	----------

----- DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE-----

The following change in curriculum is hereby proposed:

College of Applied Science and Technology (Department)

DELETION of _____ (Complete A and C) Paraska MAY 18 1979
 (Chairperson's Sig./Date)

ADDITION of L.S. 502 (Complete B and C)

CHANGE of _____ (Complete A, B, and C)

Paraska MAY 23 1979
 (Dean's Signature/Date)

Approved Disapprove

SECTION A:

If you propose to DELETE or CHANGE an existing course, use the blank space to the right to paste in a clear photocopy of the course description, as it appears in the current YSU catalog.

SECTION B:

If you propose to ADD or CHANGE a course, provide the course description below, precisely as you would expect it to appear in the next issue of the YSU catalog.

L.S. 502 - History of the Labor Movement. Historical review of the Labor Movement. Origin of crafts and guilds, rise of industrial unionism, struggle for political effectiveness and labor's civic responsibilities. Cross-listed and indential with History 502. 4 q.h.

SECTION C:

Provide below your justification for the curriculum proposal you have offered, using additional sheets if necessary. If the proposal is for a new course, list faculty qualified to offer the course. If you propose a new or changed course which will require special library and/or physical plant facilities, give assurances that these support services are or will be available.

This course is part of an associate degree program in Labor Studies being developed to meet needs of labor organizations.

APPROVALS:

<u>James N. Harris</u> (School/College CC)	<u>William D. Jenkins</u> (UCC, if appropriate)	<u>Earl M. Peety</u> (Academic Senate)
<u>May 23, 1979</u> (Date)	<u>10-10-79</u> (Date)	<u>11-19-79</u> (Date)

Returned
Circulated
Objected to
Senate minutes 11/20/79

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL:
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

UCC # 79-264	DATE REC'D: 5-23-79	IR CODE:
-----------------	------------------------	----------

----- DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE-----

The following change in curriculum is hereby proposed:

College of Applied Science and Technology (Department)

DELETION of _____ (Complete A and C) Paraska MAY 19 1979
(Chairperson's Sig./Date)

ADDITION of _____ (Complete B and C)

CHANGE of L.S. 501 (Complete A, B, and C) Paraska MAY 23 1979
(Dean's Signature/Date)

Approved Disapproved

SECTION A:

If you propose to DELETE or CHANGE an existing course, use the blank space to the right to paste in a clear photocopy of the course description, as it appears in the current YSU catalog.

501. Introduction to Organized Labor. An overview of the Labor Studies program designed to introduce the student to the many facets of the labor movement; growth of the working class the industrial revolution, the development of unions.

SECTION B:

If you propose to ADD or CHANGE a course, provide the course description below, precisely as you would expect it to appear in the next issue of the YSU catalog.

L.S. 501 - Introduction to Organized Labor. An overview of the Labor Studies ^{Program} designed to introduce the student to the many facets of the labor movement. ~~This course will survey the phases of labor studies to be studied in depth in follow up courses~~ 4 q.h.

SECTION C:

Provide below your justification for the curriculum proposal you have offered, using additional sheets if necessary. If the proposal is for a new course, list faculty qualified to offer the course. If you propose a new or changed course which will require special library and/or physical plant facilities, give assurances that these support services are or will be available.

This course is part of an associate degree program in Labor Studies being developed to meet needs of labor organizations. The coordinator of the Labor Studies program and other qualified faculty will be assigned to teach this course.

APPROVALS:

James D. Harris (School/College CC) William D. Jenkins (UCC, if appropriate) Stan M. Feety (Academic Senate)

May 23, 1979 (Date) 10-10-79 (Date) 11-19-79 (Date)

Circulated to Objected to Senate minutes 11/20/79

UCC # 79-257	DATE REC'D: 5-1-79	IR CODE:
-----------------	-----------------------	----------

11. Returned

----- DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE-----

The following change in curriculum is hereby proposed:

Economics	(Department)
DELETION of _____	(Complete A and C) <u>Emily P. Marshall</u> 4/18/79 (Chairperson's Sig./Date)
ADDITION of <u>Econ 845</u>	(Complete B and C)
CHANGE of _____	(Complete A, B, and C)
	<u>B. J. Upzwick</u> 4/27/79 (Dean's signature/Date) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved

SECTION A:

If you propose to DELETE or CHANGE an existing course, use the blank space to the right to paste in a clear photocopy of the course description, as it appears in the current YSU catalog.

SECTION B:

If you propose to ADD or CHANGE a course, provide the course description below, precisely as you would expect it to appear in the next issue of the YSU catalog.

Econ 845. Theory, Operation, and Problems of Labor Organizations. Contemporary economic theory and operation of labor organizations in maintaining and expanding the economic rights and benefits of the American workers in a dynamic economy.

Prerequisite: Econ. 831 or Econ. 833 or Econ. 835 or Mgmt 750 4 q.h.

SECTION C:

Provide below your justification for the curriculum proposal you have offered, using additional sheets if necessary. If the proposal is for a new course, list faculty qualified to offer the course. If you propose a new or changed course which will require special library and/or physical plant facilities, give assurances that these support services are or will be available.

This is a new course to meet the needs of students in the labor economics area and related business management fields. Existing faculty in the Department of Economics, Dr. Kermani, Dr. Shipman, Dr. Smythe, and Mr. Koss, are qualified to teach this course. The specialized library sources and data required are already available in the Maag Library and no specialized physical plant facilities are required.

APPROVALS:

<u>William R. Colman</u> (School/College CC)	<u>William D. Jenkins</u> (UCC, if appropriate)	<u>Paul M. Selty</u> (Academic Senate)
<u>4/26/79</u> (Date)	<u>10-10-79</u> (Date)	<u>11-19-79</u> (Date)

Circulated
Objected to
Senate minutes 11/20/79

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL:
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

UCC # 79-258	DATE REC'D: 5-1-79	IR CODE:
-----------------	-----------------------	----------

12/ Returned

----- DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE-----

The following change in curriculum is hereby proposed:

Economics (Department)

DELETION of _____ (Complete A and C) Emmy P. Mestral 4/18/79
 (Chairperson's Sig./Date)

ADDITION of Econ 849 (Complete B and C)

CHANGE of _____ (Complete A, B, and C)

B. Jozwiak 4/27/79
 (Dean's Signature/Date)

Approved

SECTION A:

If you propose to DELETE or CHANGE an existing course, use the blank space to the right to paste in a clear photocopy of the course description, as it appears in the current YSU catalog.

SECTION B:

If you propose to ADD or CHANGE a course, provide the course description below, precisely as you would expect it to appear in the next issue of the YSU catalog.

Econ 849. Seminar/Workshop in Labor Relations. An analysis of selected issues such as union interests in the investment of funds accumulated through private and public pension plans; the effect of multi-national corporations on traditional union tactics and strategies; the effect of wage-price guidelines and controls, etc.

Prerequisite: Econ. 831 or Econ. 833 or Econ. 835 or Mgmt 750 4 q.h.

SECTION C:

Provide below your justification for the curriculum proposal you have offered, using additional sheets if necessary. If the proposal is for a new course, list faculty qualified to offer the course. If you propose a new or changed course which will require special library and/or physical plant facilities, give assurances that these support services are or will be available.

This is a new course to meet the needs of students in the labor economics area and related business management fields. Existing faculty in the Department of Economics, Dr. Kermani, Dr. Shipman, Dr. Smythe, and Mr. Koss, are qualified to teach this course. The specialized library sources and data required are already available in the Maag Library and no specialized physical plant facilities are required.

APPROVALS:

<u>William R. Cochran</u> (School/College CC)	<u>William D. Jenkins</u> (UCC, if appropriate)	<u>Stan M. Kesty</u> (Academic Senate)
<u>4/26/79</u> (Date)	<u>10-10-79</u> (Date)	<u>11-19-79</u> (Date)

Circulated
Objected to
Senate minutes 11/20/79