

Academic Senate Minutes
May 3, 1995

Call to Order:

A quorum was announced and the meeting was called to order at 4:10.

Minutes of Previous Meeting:

The chair called for corrections to the April minutes. There were none and the chair announced they would stand as published.

Senate Executive Committee Report:

The chair indicated that he and the other senate chairs from Ohio Universities had met with Michael Fox, Chair of the House Education Committee. As a result of the meeting the Chairs felt that there is a need for better communications between faculty and the legislature. In addition the Chairs expressed to Representative Fox the belief that OBOR is unnecessary and is not the proper mechanism for dealing with faculty interests in Ohio.

The Chair then announced that requests for senate committee assignment preferences would be out soon and that the SEC expects to be able to announce next year's assignments in the near future. He further announced that agenda items for the next meeting should be submitted by Friday, May 26, and that Bege Bowers would be assuming the duties of secretary for the rest of this year.

Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor Report - Duane Rost reporting - see Appendix A.

GER Committee Report - Bill Jenkins reporting - see report in Agenda. In brief explanatory remarks Dr. Jenkins indicated what the committee has accomplished this year and expects to do next year. He indicated that the committee has decided to avoid use of either a strict core model or a completely distributive model for the GER. Instead there will be a mixed model with a limited number of common courses and some flexibility for differing student needs.

Floyd Barger congratulated the committee for its efforts but expressed some concern that the wording of the report suggests that students prefer short term convenience rather than quality. Dr. Jenkins responded that he disagreed that the report made such a suggestion.

Senate Committee Reports:

Charter and Bylaws - Duane Rost reporting - Dr. Rost began his remarks by indicating how the Charter and Bylaws are amended and stated that proper procedures have been followed in making the current recommendation. He then moved that the Charter and Bylaws be amended to change the terms of office of the Chair and Vice Chair as published in the agenda. The motion was seconded and discussion began.

A question was asked regarding the timing of the next Chair election. Dr. Rost said that the election format used in the past would be continued with the new Chair to be elected early in the Fall in order to provide a reasonable transition period for the new Chair to take over the office in January.

Another question was raised concerning how the change would affect Senate activity in the Fall given

the recent tendency for the Senate to actually do very little in its first couple of sessions. Dr. Rost indicated that the C&B Committee discussed that issue and felt that the continuity provided by the change would serve to help the Senate be more active earlier in the academic year and to provide a more effective transition from one Chair to the next.

A question was asked regarding the possible need for special language to allow continuity of a Chair who was not reelected to the Senate. Dr. Rost indicated that a thorough reading of the Charter and Bylaws does not prohibit such continuity since the election of a Senator to the Chair position can be interpreted as automatically extending the term of office of that Senator for the duration of the Chair's term of office regardless of other considerations.

A question was raised about what would happen if both the Chair and Vice Chair were to leave the University before completing their term of office. Dr. Rost said that in such an event the next highest vote getter in the previous Chair election would be asked to fill the position or lacking such a person a special election would be held.

Dean Brothers asked if consideration had been given to holding the Chair election in the Spring after the Senate election. Dr. Rost said that such had been considered but that the Committee believes that it would be less effective in insuring continuity and would not allow the following year's student Senators to participate. A related question was asked regarding the possibility of opening the Chair election to all faculty and the answer to it was that the Chair of the Senate should be a Senator.

Dean Brothers expressed the opinion that the committee's reasoning in rejecting the Spring election was not sufficient to reject it. Dr. Rost restated that the Committee feels that the Fall election and January to December term of office are better.

Not further questions were raised. The question was called and the motion passed.

A motion was then made to have the current Chair and Vice Chair continued in office until next December. It was seconded and passed without opposition.

Academic Standards - Larry Hugenberg reporting - Dr. Hugenberg announced that the motion passed last month to allow students to take more than one Cr/NC course in the summer was being implemented on an ad hoc manner for this summer and that the Committee was recommending without formally moving that Departments make a list of courses appropriate for a minor in their disciplines for publication to assist students and advisors in scheduling and course selection.

x Library Committee - Dan Suchora reporting - The report consisted of a brief discussion of a budget proposal for the Library. A motion was made to accept the budget. It was seconded and passed without opposition. A copy of the budget is attached as Appendix B.

Academic Research - Martha Pallante reporting - Dr. Pallante referred to the report attached to the agenda and indicated that the report was informational in nature in regards to a conflict of interest policy being presented to the Trustees for consideration in order to meet Federal regulations covering the awarding of grants.

Student Academic Affairs - Steve Kent reporting - There are no proposals to make at this time although the Committee is working on revising undergraduate grievance procedures. In conjunction with that effort he requested that recipients of the questionnaire sent by his committee in late March return them.

Other committees were called upon and none had reports to make.

Unfinished Business:

Floyd Barger asked about the status of the second request for nominations for Senators from A&S and was told that the list of nominees has grown from 8 to 20 and that the election would be forthcoming.

New Business:

Aubrey Fowler expressed his appreciation to the Senate for being allowed to serve it for the past two years and gave a brief explanation for his resignation from the position.

Adjournment:

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and passed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:01.

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE SHEET - May 3, 1995

Arts and Sciences

At Large

MB Samuel Floyd Barger
FB Frederick Blue
PEB Paul Dalbec
Tom Tom Dobbstein
AGE Hugh Earnhart
WJ William Jenkins
MM Thomas Maraffa
NR Nathan Richey
CJS Christopher Sweeney

Departmental

JSU John Usis, Biology
Ted Ted Chrobak, C&IS
JS James Schramer, English
DS David Stephens, Geography
IB Martin Berger, History
GP Gabriel Palmer-Fernandez, P&R
PS Paul Sracic, Pol. & Soc. Science
MS Mark Shutes, Soc. & Anth.

Departmental

Allen Allen Hunter, Chemistry
Tod Tod Porter, Economics
HKC Herv'e Corb'e, For. Lang. & Lit.
CS Charles Singler, Geology
JB John Buoni, Mathematics
RT Ron Tabak, Physics & Ast.
JM James Morrison, Psychology
JD Joan DiGiulio, Social Work

Business Administration

At Large

HC Hiyang Chen
RK Rama Krishnan
CPS Clement Psenicka

Departmental

JD James Daly
RK Ram Kasuganti
ES Eugene Sekaras

Departmental

RR Ray Ross, Accounting
TR Tom Rakestraw, Management
TD Terry Deiderick, Marketing

Education

At Large

PG Phil Ginnetti
SR Susan Rippberger

Departmental

JGW Janet Gill-Wigel, Counseling
DR David Ruggles, Ed. Adm.
NS Nancy Sweeney, Spec. Ed.

Departmental

YS Nancie Shillington, E&M
ET Edward Tokar, Foundations
JD James Douglas, Sec. Ed.

Engineering

At Large

SG Steve Gardner
DR Duane Rost

Departmental

RJ Richard Jones, Chem. Eng.
SS Samuel Skarote, Elec. Eng.
MZ Mansour Zenouzi, Eng. Tech.

Departmental

JA Javad Alam, Cicil & Env.
MC Martin Cala, Ind. & Sys.
JR Jeff Ray, Mech. Eng.

Fine and Performing Arts

At Large

NA Nancy Andrew
JM John Murphy
DR David Robinson

At Large

DH Dennis Henneman
SN Steve Nolan
JT John Turk

Departmental

GK Genevra Kornbluth, Art
DF Darla Funk, Music
JL James LaLumia, Comm.

Health and Human Services

At Large

RC Robert Campbell
DM Diane McDougal
JN John Neville
PS Pamela Schuster

Departmental

JB Janet Boehm, Allied Health
MS Marion Scott, Health Sci.
MB Mary Beaubien, Human Ecol.

Departmental

RB Richard Billak, Crim. Jus.
JW Jennie Wood, Nursing
FB Frank Bosso, HPES

Administration

BB Barbara Brothers
DS David Sweetkind
SC Shirley Carpenter
GM Gordon Mapley

DD David Decker
FT Frank Tarantini
RD Raymond Dye
AO Alfred Owens II
CJ Clara Jennings
JY John Yemma
DG David Genaway
HY Harold Yiannaki

JS James Scanlon
CA Cynthia Anderson
PK Peter Kasvinsky

Students

At Large

DG Dennis Gartland
CR Chad Ring
JS John Stilliana
RS Ryan Spencer
JC Jennifer Campbell
CW Cathy Wess

School/College

JN Joseph Nohra, Education
BN Brian O'Neil, Business
TB Todd Beckett, A&S
LH LeeAnn Henry, Grad. School

School/College

LR Leslie Raines, Perf. Arts
DP Don Prue, HHS
ND Nizar Diab, Eng.
Ex-Officio
CH Christopher Heasley, Pres.
SM Sherry Merritt, VP

Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents
Meeting on April 27, 1995

Duane F. Rost

Morning Meeting: Was limited to the doctoral programs, but as the masters programs will be subjected to a similar review, I feel it is appropriate to share with the YSU community. Dr. Gary Walters, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Access Programs, Graduate Programs, reviewed at length the background and current status of the state-wide considerations of the larger doctoral programs. The catalyst for these reviews came from the Managing-for-the-Future Task Force efforts and reports.

They have developed the Standards of Viability and Characteristics of the Programs including: description of the program; placement of the students graduating from the program; status of faculty research efforts/successes (related/current); service to community/State if directly appropriate. With a RAGGS subcommittee and including some Provosts, they created the process dimension.

The fifteen person (half national, half state) Committee on State Investment in Graduate and Professional Education is addressing the question of the needs of the State, considering how many programs and their make-up. Their charges are to recommend to the OBOR which areas to be first reviewed at the state level and to recommend the State overall level of investment in graduate and professional programs.

Questions to be addressed will be somewhat different in each discipline but include: productivity; number of graduates in Ohio versus national job market; research productivity where measurable; and service to the State

A report in 1994 listed nine areas and packaged them in three groups for scheduling convenience. They compromise 60% of the State's doctoral investment and are:

- History, Psychology, Computer Science, Due June 15, 1995, Action by Nov. 1995.
- English, Chemistry, Educational Administration, Due Sept. 1995, Action by Feb. 1996.
- Physics, Business, and Biological Sciences, Due Oct. 1995, Action by Feb. 1996.

The timing of the reviews is tight, but represented the strong conviction of the committee that there is a need to address the public perceptions as well actual facts and avoid unnecessary delays. The Committee argument was to avoid the public concern that might be exacerbated by a long, leisurely-feeling review. It has "stressed" some campuses.

The OBOR does not want these reviews to be negative only but wants to identify positive aspects and support those programs. (The Computer Science area may get increased and expanded support.)

Process:

- 1) Self study on campus, compare to standards, request to include external reviewers.
- 2) Creation of 9 review panels, 5 persons each with broad representation, focus on experience with public institutions. (Campus will get list of members proposed and objections will be considered.)
- 3) Three meetings with each panel:
 - 1) Orientation, charge, receive self studies and information
 - 2) Compile reports from members and share draft report with campuses

3) Receive feedback from campuses. The panel will meet as necessary with representatives from the campuses. The programs will have their opportunity to make their case and show the values of their efforts during the above process.

4) Reports to Graduate Deans, Provosts, RAGGS, and Committee on State Investment in Graduate and Professional Education, then to the Chancellor and the OBOR.

There will be incentives and disincentives to campuses. OBOR is encouraging collaboration in many and different forms. RAGGS has done well here and will be helpful.

No information at this time on the next wave. The general area of "Education" must be addressed as it is the largest single dollar item at the graduate level, but the plans are not firmed up at this time.

Professional Programs: OBOR did not seek additional authority in these areas but the Legislature gave it anyway.

Law: seems in line, maybe fewer schools than might be indicated, number of graduates is in line, number of practicing lawyers is in line, placement of graduates seems good.

Medicine: cost is enormous, much more difficult to address, not sufficient information, rapidly changing, can not separate Higher Education and Health Care, bad time to try to make decisions as health care is in such a fermentation now, incredible changes, mixed reports.

Doctorate in Engineering: topic on front burner as Wright State has a proposal in and it deserves attention, get it off the table and decide, though not expecting unnecessary duplication here.

Concern expressed, geography and demography: Is this going to be another example of the 3-Cs benefiting to the detriment of the Other Ohio? Is this going to be a political process?

Dr. Gary Walters: "No one has told of a quota number ... believe we want to see a serious process and result ... no preconceived decision I'm aware of ... can't say some will not want to make it a political process ... you will have many opportunities to argue your points in the self study process ..."

Concern expressed, is the review process to be applied to private institutions and what is the status of state subsidy to private institutions:

Dr. Walters: Some discussions though OBOR can only remove subsidy from public institutions, but CWRU does get subsidy in medicine. No information will be given to the review panels about the private institutions.

OBOR is aware of access issues. They approved the Social Work collaborative program by CSU and Akron over the strong objections of CWRU.

Chancellor Hairston (later in the day): Choice Grant provides "\$600 to each Ohio student who attends a private institution. This is about 1/4 of the average tuition at a State supported school."

Afternoon Meeting: Chancellor Hairston joined us for lunch and we talked from 12:45 to 2:15. Of course the status of the Budget was the first topic. (There was a budget hearing in the larger conference room with some 70 people.) Summary: Best Higher Education Budget in 5 years. Higher Ed's fortunes are tied to the State economy. When it is good, we will do okay. Legislature is concerned about the Federal actions and the resulting impacts on State moneys.

Concern expressed by Legislators to Chancellor Hairston in hearings:

Faculty in the undergraduate teaching roles, particularly at the freshman and sophomore levels. (But she did not discuss incentives to the Universities to support or encourage more full-service faculty in the earlier courses.) Bill to specify faculty contact hours by law shows a need to more effectively portray what the faculty really do.

The Governor continues to inquire about every 6 months as to the progress by the institutions on meeting the recommendations of the Managing for the Future Task Force.

Near-term activities include the standards and measures and the linking subsidy to these. "We are in new territory here." She again referred to the identification of the common-core, and the identification of the institution-specific items based on the institution's defined mission.

Concern expressed on long-term State support for Higher Education:

Dr. Hairston: "... **no expected increase** ...", She is tracing the percentage of State expenditure on Higher Education from 1953 to date. Probably will see there was a gain in percentage in 1980s but lost all in the early 1990s. She feels only specifically directed support is likely to get any new moneys (Excellence Programs of the 1980s, Eminent Scholars).

Concern expressed on all-term subsidy calculation:

Dr. Hairston: "Soon." Probably 1996, maybe 1997, but on its way. Each institution does not know how it will impact them as they don't know how it will impact other institutions.

Concern around the FAC on Trustees comprehension of what the University is really about and the administrative attempts to isolate the faculty from the Trustees:

Faculty: upset about this, some forbidden by contract to talk to Trustees, some forbidden by policy.

Dr. Hairston: Discussed the general role of the Trustees and the Regents. She continued on to the Governor wanting to appoint the State Board of Education. The positive note is education is front and center and is now seen to be critical to the State. No discussion at this time about faculty membership on the Boards.

Additional Items: The Faculty Advisory Committee delivered the draft report from the workshop to Dr. Hairston. Copies were printed for members to share with their institutions. I have a couple copies and am willing to share.

In the general, who's-doing-what early portion of the meeting, the topic of switching to semesters sparked lively comments. I indicated YSU would not be switching at this time. OSU seems to have this come up every 4 or 5 years. President Gee is strongly supportive of semesters, but the campus seems to be 49-51% each time, with the 49-51 shifting sides occasionally. Too much cost and effort to change was the typical comment. Dr. Buttlerwerth, Cincinnati State Technical and Community College discussed their calendar of five equal sessions each year. "Administration has figured out they get to collect money five times a year." It works for them, but is unusual.

X

LIBRARY COMMITTEE REPORT - 1994-95

The University Library Committee began work this year on the complex and changing problem of what is appropriate material to be purchased by library acquisition funds. In the changing world of the information superhighway and the computer revolution, many complex issues arose and were addressed by the committee. The primary conclusion reached is that it is information which the library must make available not necessarily the medium of transmitting this information. Based on this discussion, the committee reached consensus on appropriate materials to be purchased with library acquisition funds including, among others, CD-rom materials, books which supply software as an attachment, and materials used in Dana collections. Materials thought to be inappropriate were computer hardware and software such as a Word Perfect, Lotus, etc. It has been a busy year.

Based on the acquisitions policies established, requests for a portion of the \$30,000.00 Hold Back Fund from many departments on campus were reviewed. The fund was dispersed by consensus to help satisfy special needs of many departments. During this process a document outlining policies and procedures used in administering the Hold Back Fund was developed to aid future distribution of the Hold Back Fund.

The last major issue addressed by the committee was the allocation of the 1995-96 library acquisitions budget. After considerable discussion, the following recommended distribution of funds was arrived at by consensus:

	<u>APPROVED FOR FY 94-95</u>	<u>RECOMMENDED FOR FY 95-96</u>
COLLEGES		
Arts & Sciences	646,265	696,000
Business	111,345	120,000
Education	60,329	65,000
Engineering/Tech	85,943	92,000
Fine & Performing Arts	76,205	83,000
Health/Human Services	<u>89,013</u>	<u>101,000</u>
	\$1,069,100	\$1,157,000
HOLD BACK	30,000	25,000
LIBRARY		
General Works	71,900	73,000
Reference	63,000	69,000
Replacement	11,000	16,000
Binding	<u>55,000</u>	<u>60,000</u>
	\$200,900	218,000
	<hr/> \$1,300,000	<hr/> \$1,400,000