

SCANLON, JAMES J.

PROVOST

## **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

**MARCH 2, 1994**

**RECEIVED**

MAR - 9 1994

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Virginia Phillips announced a quorum and called the meeting to order at 4:02. She further announced that Bill Jenkins would serve temporarily as parliamentarian due to the unavoidable absence of the regular parliamentarian. She asked that student Senators check the roll to insure that their college affiliations are correct and further she announced that the March minutes would include this year's attendance record. Finally she called for a motion to change the agenda to allow President Cochran to make some remarks to the Senate before any further business.

The motion was made by Larry Hugenberg and seconded by Harold Yiannaki and passed without opposition.

### **REMARKS BY PRESIDENT COCHRAN**

Thank you for allowing me to be here. I have spoken with Virginia Phillips about my interest in doing so and am pleased that the opportunity has presented itself. I want to make a few remarks and will then be happy to accept questions.

I have discussed with the Provost and the Senate Executive Committee the environment of transition we have underway at YSU and the opportunity this presents for the Senate to define its role for the next several years. The Senate is clearly an important part of the governance of the institution, along with college based decision making, the collective bargaining process, and the administration. I have asked the Executive Committee to think about the Senate's role with a focus on the question of academic integrity, or as Provost Scanlon prefers, academic quality. It is important to define the role of the Senate for the future and to chart its primary responsibility for the academic integrity of the institution. This, of course, needs to be accomplished within the context of the other components of the governance system.

In the past the issues related to academic integrity have been addressed in essentially two ways. Through the Senate's committee structure and through the process by which the curriculum is reviewed. But, the agenda becomes longer if we look at the overall academic integrity of the University and choose to venture into other areas of consideration with the Senate ensuring the overall institutional consistency of the academic integrity of the University. Examples of what might be considered:

There is currently no University standard for experiential learning even though we have a large

number of non-traditional students, many of whom are adults with broad experience in their areas of interest. We have no generally accepted way to validate or give credit for those experiences. There is nothing to preclude individual departments from giving credit but we should have institutional guidelines to insure fair treatment of students while maintaining the academic integrity of the University. The Senate can take a lead role in establishing those guidelines, while allowing departments and colleges to make their appropriate decisions.

Cyndy Anderson is charged with the task of leading the development of an outcomes assessment program which is needed to meet upcoming accreditation requirements. There will likely be different plans and programs in the departments and colleges. While these are independent of each other, they need to fit within and meet University guidelines. The Senate could involve itself in helping to set those guidelines.

The Senate might also find other areas which affect academic programs where it is important to establish university wide parameters or standards.

In addition to the overriding academic issues there are several, more specific, issues the Senate might consider in the years ahead. These could be defined as the goals and objectives of the Senate for the next five years. Some other topics that might be addressed by the Senate include:

1. Are there certain outcomes or competencies that graduates of our undergraduate programs should obtain as a result of their general education experiences?
2. Do we need to change the requirements for graduating with honors, possibly upgrading the standards?

3. Should we establish a procedure whereby the faculty (Academic Senate) could recommend individuals to be the recipients of honorary degrees?
4. Do we need or want a writing outcomes assessment program?
5. Do we need to change our admission standards and how do we want to define the academic profile of the students we try to recruit?

The Senate could choose to deal with one or two of these issues each year and make a major contribution to the continuing growth and improvement of the University. An attempt to do more than that in any one year may be too much to ask of senators given other demands on their time. It may also exceed the willingness of the campus to accept major academic change.

Now, to a different issue altogether. On Tuesday of this week a draft copy of a document regarding space utilization plan for YSU was completed and distributed. We are embarking on a program in space utilization that parallels year's academic reorganization. The goal is to ensure we have a rational reason why offices are located where they are rather than a sometimes chaotic distribution of offices and functions. A primary issue in space allocation will be ensuring reasonable proximity of related functions to facilitate their more effective operation and increase the convenience to those who use them. In drafting the utilization plan four principles were used as guidelines:

1. There is clear need for more College based computer labs, decentralizing away from Meshel Hall which leads to the secondary question of what to do with the first and second floors of Meshel.
2. There needs to be a high profile area for "one-stop-shopping" for students to avoid the need to run all over campus and back and forth between offices when they are registering or engaging in other business with the University.

3. All of the University's business and administrative functions need to be located in one area making it easier for faculty and administrators to have their needs met.
4. Finally, we recognize to do this once and do it well so that it doesn't have to be redone in the foreseeable future. To do so would be both a waste of the resources and effort put into the creating more effective space utilization while at the same time disturbing those who are directly affected by space reallocation unnecessarily.

That is all that I have prepared. I would be happy to take any questions on these issues or others that might be of interest to you.

Question from D. Hovey - What are your thoughts on workload requirements?

The Board of Regents has approved a policy that is much better than the original proposal. The DAC's will have to address the issue for their Colleges and the Trustees will need to approve a YSU policy by June. Under the Regents policy YSU will fare well and some departments may see an improvement in their workload.

Dr. Scanlon indicated that the Regents approved the final draft of the policy on February, 18 with the final text due for distribution shortly and that the final draft is not significantly different from the December draft already distributed.

Question from A. Fowler - What is the work week that the teaching percentage requirements are judged against?

The national self reported workload for faculty per week is 52 hours. The nice part of the new guidelines is that the issue needs to be defined by each institution. There is no overall standard for everyone. There is tremendous flexibility and opportunity to address the differences across campus.

Dr. Scanlon said that each department need not be the same nor each faculty member in the department. We still have to meet student demands but can be flexible as long as we maintain our

accountability.

Dr. Cochran indicated that there can be flexibility within the departments but that each department needs to meet the overall standard. He further stated that the policy being developed in Ohio is much more flexible than in many other states where workload requirements are mandated by law rather than being left to individuals in the academy.

Question from the floor - With the decentralization of computer services what will be the basis for technical support?

First, it will be the responsibility of the Integrated Technologies Committee to determine what we want in computer availability and what we need in terms of support for computing. We have committed \$1.8 million over the next two years from capital funds to connect all buildings on campus with fiber optic cable and will commit a similar amount over the following two years to connect every office, classroom, and dorm room on campus with fiber. That then raises the question of how to maintain and keep current those facilities. It is felt that the annual cost will be about \$500, 000 which may result in a two tier computer usage fee of \$35 per course having intensive computer use and \$25 for computer assisted courses. Some way needs to be determined to charge the casual lab user who only wants to do data/word processing -- perhaps a purchased card through the bookstore. Another question that will need to be resolved is how to insure student access to computer facilities while maintaining their security and denying access to those not authorized to use them. As we move through this deliberative process the specific responses to your questions can be delineated. Hopefully, these specifics will become more clear over the next six or eight months.

Thank you again. I am looking forward to meeting with you at least on a quarterly basis.

**MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 2, 1994**

**Motion to Approve Minutes**

No corrections were offered. Derek Gyongois moved acceptance. The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.

**ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE REPORT**

none.

**CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE REPORT**

none.

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Recommendations for Administrative Committee assignments have been completed and names forwarded to area officers. A list of all confirmed appointments will be appended to the minutes of today's meeting in Appendix A.

Please look at the list carefully. In some cases, the committees were already meeting using last year's appointees or members appointed by the administrator. In several cases we were asked to delay the effective date of the appointment until Fall, 1994 to avoid disrupting committee activities. Consequently, some committee assignments become effective with the Spring, 1994 quarter and others with the Fall, 1994 quarter. In all cases the appointment is effective through the Spring, 1995 quarter. The Chair will try to follow through in the Fall quarter to ensure that individuals whose appointments become effective Fall, 1994 are notified.

The SEC is currently working on a Mission and Goals and Objectives statement for the Academic Senate. We are also examining the charge to all Senate committees and referencing the input from the committees as we do so. It is expected that a request for changes in charges to some committees will be forwarded to the Charter and Bylaws Committee and that possibly some committees will be recommended for deletion and others recommended for addition to the list of Chartered Senate Committees. It is intended that a byproduct of this process will be a Guide Sheet to be given to newly elected Chairs of the Committees each year to ensure that Senate work is conducted in a consistent manner.

**Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor Report**

No oral report; a written report is appended in Appendix B.

## **ACADEMIC PROGRAM COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Proposed changes were appended to the agenda. The reports were for information only; no Senate action is necessary. In addition Julia Gergits reported that the committee has approved two proposals from Health and Human Services and will present them to the Senate next month. The course proposals have to complete the circulation process before the Program change can be appended to the Agenda.

## **INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE REPORT**

Richard Goldthwait reporting.

I appreciate the opportunity to report to you on some of this year's activities of the ITC. The ITC will be presenting a written report, possibly at the next Senate meeting with policy recommendations for Senate approval. This is essentially an informational report that I am presenting today.

The ITC has met at regular intervals with the active participation of all of its faculty and administrative members. Topics and discussion have been lively and varied, treating subjects which range from fiber optic networks and multi-media electronic technology to the specific gripes of faculty and students in regard to obsolete computing equipment, shortages of modern P.C.s and software, as well as a number of other immediate concerns. In addition to discussing technology issues, our committee has taken several specific actions this year which I will attempt to briefly summarize here.

Our first major action was to submit a memorandum last November to the Provost concerning the appropriation of the 1.06 million dollars received from the state legislature for computers and other forms of instructional technology. The recommendations in this memo were based largely on those in the ITC report submitted to and accepted by the Senate last year.

A second major activity of the ITC involved holding a special session at which we met with members of the peer review team which visited YSU in December. Initiated by the Computer Center and with top level support of the administration, a team of outside experts in the area of computing and network services reviewed the status of computing and network technology on the YSU campus, interviewing a large number of faculty, staff, and administrators. The peer review team, functioning under the auspices of the Association for Computing Machinery, submitted recommendations to the administration. The Computer Center, at the request of the administration, prepared a "companion" report to the peer group's report and both reports have been the subject of ITC discussions.

The next major activity of the ITC will be to meet with Dr. Mapley, Dr. Mears, and Mr. Miller on March 9 to discuss:

- (i) The administration's reaction to the recommendations in the peer review team's report and to the Computer Center's companion report, and
- (ii) The future role of the ITC with regard to planning and participation in technology at YSU.

To help you appreciate the importance of the March 9 meeting, I will provide some very brief background. It is widely acknowledged by faculty and administration alike that YSU does not yet have a comprehensive plan for distributive computing networking, multimedia, teleconferencing, and personal computer labs. Some of the most significant recommendations of the peer review team concerning

academic computing include (but are not limited to):

1. Formation of a Network Services Organization to pull together computing, telecommunications, electronic service maintenance, and other groups which currently function more or less independently from each other,
2. Creation of an advisory Computing and Communications Technology Committee (CCTC) to help in creating a five year plan and to advise in budget decisions concerning academic computing, and
3. Development of a 5 year plan to provide a blueprint for installing many of the critical technological improvements which are needed at YSU, including installation of a fiber optic backbone.

The "companion" report from the computer center essentially supports these recommendations. A major concern of the ITC is the recommendation to form another academic computing committee. This issue will be further explored at the March 9 meeting.

I think that it is fair to say that YSU is poised to take some significant steps forward in the area of electronic technology. The President has already spoken of YSU becoming an electronic campus. In personal conversations with certain members of the administration, I have sensed a genuine commitment to technology. However, some major challenges lie ahead, one of which is the timely development of a comprehensive plan. Finances are another big challenge, but I have been told that the administration is considering various strategies for raising additional capital, a significant portion of which would be used for technology.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

none.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Genevra Kornbluth requested an opportunity to report to the Senate regarding the honors program. A motion to accept the report was made by Jennifer Campbell and seconded. The motion was approved.

See appendix C for the report.

Dr. Barger asked if the criteria listed in the report would be a part of the motion to follow. When the response was no, he questioned several of the criteria by which the HICP would judge honors courses, specifically number 3, 4, and 6.

With no further questions after Dr. Barger's Dr. Kornbluth moved as follows: The Honors Program and Individualized Curriculum Program Committee shall have authority to approve Honors sections of any course currently listed in the YSU Bulletin. Such approval shall not be subject to further approval by the University Curriculum Committee. The motion was seconded by Dean Sutton.

Dr. Hovey asked if there is an existing procedure for approving honors courses.



Dr. Kornbluth answered that there is none outside of the normal course approval channel which can be very time consuming and that the proposed motion concerned only honors sections of existing courses not entirely new courses which will still go through the standard approval process.

The Chair indicated that if the motion is passed it will be sent to the Charter and Bylaws Committee for review and to recommend a change in the Bylaws to amend the charge of the committee.

Dr. Barger asked if there is a review process for the committee's decisions regarding honors section approvals.

Dr. Kornbluth indicated that there was not one specifically but that a negative action by the committee could be referred to the Curriculum Committee for reconsideration.

With no further discussion the Chair called the question and the motion passed.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

ACADEMIC SENATE, 1993-1994

ENGINEERING

At-Large

William Barsch  
William Wood

WB  
WW

Departmental

\*Richard Jones, Chemical Engineering  
\*Javed Alam, Civil and Environmental  
\*\*Phil Munro, Electrical Engineering  
\*\*Donald Slanina, Eng. Tech.  
\*\*Hojjat Mehri, Industrial & Systems  
\*\*Les Smith, Mechanical Engineering

JA  
PM  
DS  
HMA

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

At-Large

Michael Crist  
Darla Funk  
Larry Hugenberg  
David Robinson  
Bill Slocum  
Phil Chan

MC  
DF  
LH  
DR  
BS  
PC

Departmental

\*\*Susan Russo, Art  
\*\*Steve Ausmann, School of Music  
\*J. LaLumia, Communication and Theater

SR  
SA

STUDENTS

At-Large

Jennifer Campbell  
Dennis Gartland  
Derek Gyongos  
Erica Hall  
Jackie Kestner  
Don Craig

JC  
DG  
DG  
EH  
JK  
DC

School/College

Adele Economos, Education  
Brian Vanik, Performing Arts  
Maureen Dellapenna, Business  
Shannon Womer, HHS  
Megan Matthews, Arts and Sciences  
Pam Rudolph, Engineering  
Elizabeth Glasgow, Graduate School

AE  
BV  
MD  
SW  
MM  
PR  
EG

Ex-Officio

Scott Schulick, Pres., Stu. Gov.  
Dave Hall, V. President, Stu. Govt.

SS  
DH

ADMINISTRATION

Barbara Brothers  
James Cicarelli  
Richard McEwing  
James Scanlon  
George E. Sutton  
David Sweetkind  
John J. Yemma

BB  
JC  
RM  
JS  
GS  
DS  
JY

Cynthia A. Anderson  
Shirley A. Carpenter  
Raymond E. Dye  
David C. Genaway  
Peter J. Kasvinsky  
Gordon E. Mapley  
Alfred W. Owens II  
Harold Yiannaki

CA  
SC  
RD  
DG  
PK  
GM  
AW  
HY

\*First year of two-year term  
\*\*Second year of two-year term

senrost.934/Senate9394  
revised 10/04/93  
revised 10/25/93

# ATTENDANCE SHEET

Academic Senate, 1993-1994

DATE: March 2, 1994

## HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

At-Large

Patricia McCarthy  
Diane McDougal  
Joseph Mistovich  
John E. Neville

*DMC*  
DM  
DM  
DM

Departmental

\*\*Kathlynn Feld, Allied Health  
\*Richard Billak, Criminal Justice  
\*Marion Scott, Health Sciences  
\*\*Janice Elias, Human Ecology  
\*Jennie Wood, Nursing  
\*\*Richard Walker, Human Per & Exer

*RJB*  
RB  
RB  
RB  
RB

## ARTS AND SCIENCES

At-Large

Samuel Floyd Barger  
Frederick Blue  
Bege Bowers  
Paul Dalbec  
Hugh Earnhart  
Ikram Khawaja  
Sandy Stephan  
Ronald Tabak  
Linda Tessier

*SFB*  
FB  
BB  
PD  
HE  
IK  
SS  
RT  
LT

Departmental

\*\*John Usis, Biology  
\*Allen Hunter, Chemistry  
\*Ted Chrobak, Computer & Info Sys  
\*\*Taghi Kermani, Economics  
\*James Schramer, English  
\*\*Mary Loud, Foreign Languages & Lit.  
\*\*Thomas Maraffa, Geography  
\*Charles Singler, Geology  
\*William Jenkins, History  
\*\*Stephen Rodabaugh, Mathematics  
\*Gabriel Palmer-Fernandez, Phil. & Relig  
\*\*William Sturuss, Physics and Astronomy  
\*Paul Sracic, Political & Social Science  
\*\*Nancy White, Psychology  
\*Mark Shutes, Sociology & Anthropology  
\*Joan DiGiulio, Social Work

*JU*  
JU  
CH  
TC  
TK  
JS  
ML  
TM  
CS  
WJ  
WR  
SM  
GF  
WS  
PS  
MS  
JD  
J

## BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

At-Large

William Vendemia  
James Daly  
Donald Hovey  
Virginia Phillips  
Jane Reid  
Eugene Sekeres

*WV*  
WD  
DH  
VP  
JR  
ES

Departmental

\*\*Inez Heal, Accounting  
\*Glenda Kunar, Business Info Sys  
\*\*Clement Psenicka, Management  
\*Terry Deiderick, Marketing

*IH*  
IK  
CP  
TD

## EDUCATION

At-Large

Lawrence J. Haims  
Phil Ginnetti

*LJH*  
PG

Departmental

\*Janet Gill-Wigal, Counseling  
\*\*Janet Beary, Early & Middle  
\*Robert Pegues, Ed. Administration  
\*Edward Tokar, Foundations  
\*Nancy Sweeney, Special Education  
\*\*Donna McNierney, Secondary Education

*JGW*  
JB  
RP  
ET  
DN

Effective:  
Revised

September 30, 1993  
February 28, 1994

\* First year of two-year term  
\*\* Second year of two-year term

# ATTENDANCE SHEET : NOTE - NO DEC. 93 MEETING

Academic Senate, 1993-1994

DATE: Attendance Record

## HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

At-Large

Patricia McCarthy	_ _ _ _	4
Diane McDougal	_ _ _ _	5
Joseph Mistovich	_ _ _ _	4
John E. Neville	_ _ _ _	5

Departmental

**Kathlynn Feld, Allied Health	_ _	2
*Richard Billak, Criminal Justice	_ _	2
*Marion Scott, Health Sciences	_ _ _ _	5
**Janice Elias, Human Ecology	_ _ _ _	5
*Jennie Wood, Nursing	_ _ _ _	5
**Richard Walker, Human Per & Exer	_ _ _ _	5

## ARTS AND SCIENCES

At-Large

Samuel Floyd Barger	_ _ _	3
Frederick Blue	_ _ _	4
Bege Bowers	_ _ _ _	5
Paul Dalbec	_ _ _ _	5
Hugh Earnhart	_ _ _	3
Ikram Khawaja	_ _	1
Sandy Stephan	_ _ _ _	5
Ronald Tabak	_ _ _ _	4
Linda Tessier	_ _ _ _	5

Departmental

**John Usis, Biology	_ _ _	3
*Allen Hunter, Chemistry	_ _ _ _	4
*Ted Chrobak, Computer & Info Sys	_ _ _ _	5
**Taghi Kermani, Economics	_ _ _ _	5
*James Schramer, English	_ _ _ _	5
**Mary Loud, Foreign Languages & Lit.	_ _ _	4
**Thomas Maraffa, Geography	_ _ _ _	5
*Charles Singler, Geology	_ _ _	4
*William Jenkins, History	_ _	3
**Stephen Rodabaugh, Mathematics	_ _ _	3
*Gabriel Palmer-Fernandez, Phil. & Relig	_ _ _ _	4
**William Sturuss, Physics and Astronomy	_ _ _ _	1
*Paul Sracic, Political & Social Science	_ _ _ _	5
**Nancy White, Psychology	_ _ _	3
*Mark Shutes, Sociology & Anthropology	_ _ _ _	5
*Joan DiGiulio, Social Work	_ _ _ _	5

## BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

At-Large

William Vendemia <i>[not seated before 3-94]</i>	_ _	1
James Daly	_ _ _ _	4
Donald Hovey	_ _ _ _	4
Virginia Phillips	_ _ _ _	5
Jane Reid	_ _ _ _	5
Eugene Sekeres	_ _ _	3

Departmental

**Inez Heal, Accounting	_ _	1
*Glenda Kunar, Business Info Sys	_ _ _	3
**Clement Psenicka, Management	_ _ _ _	4
*Terry Deiderick, Marketing	_ _	2

## EDUCATION

At-Large

Lawrence J. Haims	_ _ _ _	5
Phil Ginnetti	_ _ _ _	4

Departmental

*Janet Gill-Wigal, Counseling	_ _ _	3
**Janet Beary, Early & Middle	_ _	2
*Robert Pegues, Ed. Administration	_ _ _ _	4
*Edward Tokar, Foundations	_ _ _	3
*Nancy Sweeney, Special Education	_ _ _ _	4
**Donna McNierney, Secondary Education	_ _ _ _	4

+Effective: September 30, 1993  
Revised February 2, 1994

\* First year of two-year term  
\*\* Second year of two-year term

ACADEMIC SENATE, 1993-1994

ENGINEERING

At-Large

William Barsch  
William Wood

O N T F M

1 1 1 1 5  
1 1 1 1 5

Departmental

\*Richard Jones, Chemical Engineering  
\*Javed Alam, Civil and Environmental  
\*\*Phil Munro, Electrical Engineering  
\*\*Donald Slanina, Eng. Tech.  
\*\*Hojjat Mehri, Industrial & Systems  
\*\*Les Smith, Mechanical Engineering

O N T F M

0  
3  
4  
2  
1  
3

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

At-Large

Michael Crist  
Darla Funk  
Larry Hugenberg  
David Robinson  
Bill Slocum  
Phil Chan

1 1 1 3  
1 1 1 3  
1 1 1 1 5  
1 1 1 4  
1 1 1 3  
1 1 1 1 5

Departmental

\*\*Susan Russo, Art  
\*\*Steve Ausmann, School of Music  
\*J. LaLumia, Communication and Theater

4  
1  
4

STUDENTS

At-Large

Jennifer Campbell  
Dennis Gartland  
Derek Gyongois  
Erica Hall  
Jackie Kestner  
Don Craig

1 1 1 1 5  
1 1 1 1 4  
1 1 1 1 4  
1 1 1  
1 1 1  
1 1 1

School/College

Adele Economos, Education  
Brian Vanik, Performing Arts  
Maureen Dellapenna, Business  
Shannon Womer, HHS  
Megan Matthews, Arts and Sciences  
Pam Rudolph, Engineering  
Elizabeth Glasgow, Graduate School

0  
1  
3  
3  
1  
4  
3  
0

Ex-Officio

Scott Schulick, Pres., Stu. Gov.  
Dave Hall, V. President, Stu. Govt.

1 1 1 1 4  
0

ADMINISTRATION

Barbara Brothers  
James Cicarelli  
Richard McEwing  
James Scanlon  
George E. Sutton  
David Sweetkind  
John J. Yemma

1 1 1 3  
1 1 1 1 5  
1 1 1 1 5  
1 1 1 3  
1 1 1 1 4  
1 1 1 2  
1 1 1 2

Cynthia A. Anderson  
Shirley A. Carpenter  
Raymond E. Dye  
David C. Genaway  
Peter J. Kasvinsky  
Gordon E. Mapley  
Alfred W. Owens II  
Harold Yiannaki

5  
3  
4  
5  
4  
2  
3  
5

1st year of two-year term  
--Second year of two-year term

senrost.934/Senate9394  
revised 10/04/93  
revised 10/25/93

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
FACULTY APPOINTMENT LIST  
ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISORY BOARDS/COMMITTEES**

Affirmative Action (Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Sandra Stephan, English  
James Conser, Criminal Justice

Intercollegiate Athletic (Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Ralph Crum, School of Engineering Technology  
Kathleen Garbe, Health Sciences

Global Awareness (Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Theresa Riley, Economics  
Pearl Zehr, Allied Health  
Patricia Hoyson, Nursing  
David Stephens, Geography  
Frank Castronovo, Communications and Speech  
William Slocum, Music  
Stanley Guzell, Jr., Management  
Thakol Nunthirapakorn, Accounting and Finance  
Javed Alam, Civil and Environmental Engineering  
Anthony Messuri, School of Technology  
Nancie Shillington, Early and Middle Childhood  
Robert Levin, Education

Kilcawley Board

A new appointment was made Summer, 1993 and one replacement will be nominated Spring, 1994 to replace Soon Sik Lim whose appointment period ends Spring, 1994.

Fees and Appeals Board (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Donald Slanina, School of Technology  
Jerome Small, Psychology  
John Neville, Human Performance and Exercise Science

Committee on Aids (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Carolyn Mikanowicz  
Marueen Vendemia  
Madelyn Janosik

Student Affairs Advisory Committee (Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Sherry Linkon, English  
David Porter, Political and Social Sciences

Student Discipline Board (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Stephen Ausmann, Dana School of Music  
Steve Gardner, School of Technology  
Allen Hunter, Chemistry  
Diane Mc Dougal, Nursing

Student Publications (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Julia Gergits, English  
Patricia Kelvin, English

Student Retention (Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

John Turk, Dana School of Music  
Martha Pallante, History  
William Wood, School of Technology

Animal Care and Use

Appointments made by Graduate Dean.

Human Subjects Research

Appointments made by Graduate Dean.

Chemical Hygiene (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Richard Ulrich, Art  
Stan Ziger, Chemical Engineering  
David Ash, Biology  
Leonard Spiegel, Chemistry

Computer Review (Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

James Umble, Dana School of Music  
Karen Duda, Business Information Systems  
Pietro Pascale, Foundations of Education  
Paul Mullins, Computer and Information Sciences  
Salvatore Attardo, English  
Hyun Kim, Mechanical Engineering

Bookstore Advisory (Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Margaret Horvath, Human Ecology  
Robert Levin, Foundations of Education

Minority Student Affairs (Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Soon-Sik Lim, Chemical Engineering  
Servio Becerra, Foreign Languages  
Carolyn Martindale, English

Housing Contract Review Board (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Christine Cobb, Human Performance and Exercise Science  
Gary Stanek, Mathematics

Health Enhancement Advisory (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Richard Walker, Human Performance and Exercise Science  
Joan Di Guilio, Social Work  
Francis Krygowski, School of Technology

Student Enrichment Center (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Linda Strom, English  
Laurie Harig, Allied Health  
John Murphy, Communication and Theater

Student Health Services (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Kathleen Akpom, Health Sciences

Residence Classification Board (Fall, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Lee Slivinke  
Robert Nicholsburg

Recruitment and Outreach Advisory Committee, Spring, 1994 - Summer, 1995)

Appointee will be identified next month

APPENDIX B

**Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents**

**Duane F. Rost**

The last meeting was February 9, 1994. The Chair of the FAC underwent heart bypass surgery recently so I am, as Vice Chair, functioning as the Chair. In the morning meeting Dr. Randy Smith, Faculty member on the Regents' Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload Standards & Guidelines and Dr. Howard Gauthier, Assistant to Chancellor Hairston reviewed at length and in detail the work effort discussions as presented in the "Report of the Regents' Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload Standards & Guidelines". This report was to go to the Regents for action on Feb. 18, 1994. You will have read some comments in the newspapers on this Report.

There were no new developments, though the discussions did reinforce the understanding we have had that: 1) 10% is a number so that there was a number for the legislators to have a number, 2) 10% was not magic, 3) 10% came from the Chancellor, Regents, as a number in a pre-emptive strike to keep the legislature from coming up with a higher one, 4) 10% came from faculty self-reported data during 1980s, 5) Faculty self-reported data is not hard data on which to make policy decisions, 6) Comparisons in the future, even with hard data, to the past self-reported data will not produce conclusive evidence of anything, 7) Departments must propose their work effort statements as they feel are correct for their department, 8) Universities will combine the departmental results into their University statements, 9) The Regents, Chancellor Hairston, Dr. Gauthier, and the Advisory Committee consider the 10% a "Wake-up call to the Universities" not a tight, hard number to be precisely met, 10) They consider those who have been diligently committed to undergraduate education will NOT be making changes. (If dedicated before, this will have no impact.), 11) The results of the "Wake-up call" will show enough recommitment to undergraduate education to satisfy the legislators, 12) NOT an effort to INCREASE faculty workload, but to REFOCUS in on undergraduate teaching

The Advisory Committee is now considering rewards for teaching as a second general topic. Their work now includes such as: rewards, emphasis, and barriers.

In the afternoon, we met with Chancellor Hairston who discussed the General Assembly and legislation interface with OBOR and plans at this time. The General Assembly is excited about "Technology", and it seems to be the buzz word there now. How Higher Education will work with technology to improve the delivery of the educational experience is a major question in the air now.

She also discussed the second phase of the Workload Committee's activities, proposals "to reward faculty for undergraduate activity". Several requests for inputs were along the lines of: incentives to trigger improvements in the classrooms, "casting a net of creativity, creative outcomes, constructive faculty rewarded, and how do to break old paradigms that impede improvements."

Restructuring was addressed, specifically: internal to an institution, where institutions meet/border/hit against each other, (used Northeast Ohio in an example), faculty involvement in graduate programs at other institutions.

She is requesting inputs from Faculty Advisory Committee on line items for the budget including: strategies, ideas, specific areas of investment of funds to produce special results (Selective Excellence, Primary Care, Student financial Aid).

OBOR and the Chancellor are looking for ways to attract new moneys to specific projects, and what should those projects be? Any and all ideas and suggestions are solicited. Please contact me.



The last meeting was February 9, 1994. The Chair of the FAC underwent heart bypass surgery recently so I am, as Vice Chair, functioning as the Chair. In the morning meeting Dr. Randy Smith, Faculty member on the Regents' Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload Standards & Guidelines and Dr. Howard Gauthier, Assistant to Chancellor Hairston reviewed at length and in detail the work effort discussions as presented in the "Report of the Regents' Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload Standards & Guidelines". This report was to go to the Regents for action on Feb. 18, 1994. You will have read some comments in the newspapers on this Report.

There were no new developments, though the discussions did reinforce the understanding we have had that: 1) 10% is a number so that there was a number for the legislators to have a number, 2) 10% was not magic, 3) 10% came from the Chancellor, Regents, as a number in a pre-emptive strike to keep the legislature from coming up with a higher one, 4) 10% came from faculty self-reported data during 1980s, 5) Faculty self-reported data is not hard data on which to make policy decisions, 6) Comparisons in the future, even with hard data, to the past self-reported data will not produce conclusive evidence of anything, 7) Departments must propose their work effort statements as they feel are correct for their department, 8) Universities will combine the departmental results into their University statements, 9) The Regents, Chancellor Hairston, Dr. Gauthier, and the Advisory Committee consider the 10% a "Wake-up call to the Universities" not a tight, hard number to be precisely met, 10) They consider those who have been diligently committed to undergraduate education will NOT be making changes. (If dedicated before, this will have no impact.), 11) The results of the "Wake-up call" will show enough recommitment to undergraduate education to satisfy the legislators, 12) NOT an effort to INCREASE faculty workload, but to REFOCUS in on undergraduate teaching

The Advisory Committee is now considering rewards for teaching as a second general topic. Their work now includes such as: rewards, emphasis, and barriers.

In the afternoon, we met with Chancellor Hairston who discussed the General Assembly and legislation interface with OBOR and plans at this time. The General Assembly is excited about "Technology", and it seems to be the buzz word there now. How Higher Education will work with technology to improve the delivery of the educational experience is a major question in the air now.

She also discussed the second phase of the Workload Committee's activities, proposals "to reward faculty for undergraduate activity". Several requests for inputs were along the lines of: incentives to trigger improvements in the classrooms, "casting a net of creativity, creative outcomes, constructive faculty rewarded, and how do to break old paradigms that impede improvements."

Restructuring was addressed, specifically: internal to an institution, where institutions meet/border/hit against each other, (used Northeast Ohio in an example), faculty involvement in graduate programs at other institutions.

She is requesting inputs from Faculty Advisory Committee on line items for the budget including: strategies, ideas, specific areas of investment of funds to produce special results (Selective Excellence, Primary Care, Student financial Aid).

OBOR and the Chancellor are looking for ways to attract new moneys to specific projects, and what should those projects be? Any and all ideas and suggestions are solicited. Please contact me.

APPENDIX C

Report from the Honors Program and Individualized Curriculum  
Program Committee

Submitted by Genevra Kornbluth (Art), chair

Committee members, faculty: Dora Bailey, Tom Copeland, Bari Lateef, Fred Owens, Wade Raridon, John Sarkissian, Lester Smith, Judy Wilkinson; student members: Corina Klies, Wendy Korb, Michael Schueller, Michelle Wrona; administration: Nate Ritchey, George Sutton, Genevra Mann

Date: March 2, 1994

This committee is charged with "making recommendations... as to policy related to honors courses and programs," among other duties. While we have no wish to usurp the prerogatives of the Curriculum Committee, we recommend a slight change in policy with regard to Honors sections of courses already listed in the YSU Bulletin. At present, proposals for new Honors sections of existing courses are treated as new courses in their own right, needing approval from departmental and college committees, this committee, the university Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Senate. To increase flexibility as the Honors Degree Program is developed, we would like to have the authority to approve any Honors section of an existing course. (This applies only to sections of existing courses, and not to entirely new Honors courses.) If it appears desirable that the Honors section have a description different from the one in the Bulletin for the related regular course, this committee would submit a proposal to Curriculum and the Senate for approval and official listing in the YSU inventory.

In approving Honors sections, this committee will use the following criteria. When compared to a non-honors course, an honors course should

- (1) cover material in greater depth
- (2) encompass more complex concepts, stressing analysis
- (3) give greater emphasis to communication skills
- (4) include discussion of applicable theories in the field
- (5) require of each student more preparation and class participation, including more ambitious papers or projects, as well as a greater share of responsibility for learning
- (6) involve more state-of-the-art technology whenever possible and appropriate.

Our proposal to change the approval procedure for Honors sections in this way, using the criteria listed above, has been circulated to both the Academic Standards and Events Committee and the University Curriculum Committee. Neither committee objects to the change.