



Academic Senate
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44555



ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

April 5, 2000

Notes

Please submit agenda items for the May 3 Senate meeting to Bege Bowers, English Department, by noon on Friday, April 21. Provide a hard copy and a disk copy of your report and cover sheet in Word 6/95 or rich text format. A downloadable cover sheet is available at the Academic Senate web site:

[<http://www.ysu.edu/acad-senate/index.html>](http://www.ysu.edu/acad-senate/index.html)

Many thanks to Joan Bevan for taking minutes at the April 5 meeting while I was away at a conference.

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

Actions	Previous Minutes	OFC Report	Overview	New Business
Academic Events Committee	Academic Planning Committee	Academic Programs Committee	Academic Research Committee	Academic Standards Committee
Charter & Bylaws Committee	Elections & Balloting Committee	General Education Committee	Honors Committee	Integrated Technologies Committee
Library Committee	Senate Executive Committee	Student Academic Affairs Committee	Student Academic Grievance Comm.	University Curriculum Committee
Sign-in Sheet	Advising Motion	University Outreach Committee	Unfinished Business	Return to Senate Homepage
Print or Download a Rich Text File of April 5 Minutes			Instructions for Printing Web Minutes in Black	

[Top of Page](#)

Overview of meeting:

Topics presented/discussed: Discussion of request to ask University counsel to research individual faculty liability because of the lack of resources appropriate for fall advisement; discussion of number of hours to be required for minors as well as whether a student may have an ICP minor; discussion of language concerning adoption of high school units and high school preparation; acceptance of the Maag Library budget; update of Q2S conversion of programs; update from University Curriculum Committee; presentation of General Education Committee report.

Actions:

- **The following motion carried:** that the Senate formally request that the University counsel research the individual liability that faculty will incur because we don't have the resources to advise appropriately for the fall semester.
- **The following motion carried:** motion outlining requirements for minors as stated in [Appendix B](#).
- **The following motion failed:** a motion to amend the motion on minors by substituting "15 hours" for "18 hours." (See [Appendix C](#).)
- **The following motion failed:** a motion to amend the motion on minors by striking the paragraph on ICP minors (paragraph 4 of the ASC statement on minors).
- **The following motion carried:** a motion to delete from the ASC's proposed statement on high school preparation the sentence concerning students who graduated before September 1985. (See [Appendix D](#).)
- **The following amended motion carried:** motion outlining language for the *Undergraduate Bulletin* concerning high school units and high school preparation as stated in [Appendix D](#).
- **The following motion carried:** a motion requesting acceptance of the Maag Library budget as presented in [Appendix E](#).

Call to Order:

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

Minutes of the 2 February 2000 and 1 March 2000 meetings were approved. (Minutes of the February meeting had not been approved at the March meeting due to the absence of a quorum. To view the February minutes, [click here](#); to view the March minutes, [click here](#); click your "Back" button as necessary to return to the April minutes.)

Resumption of Business from the February 2 Senate Meeting:

The following motion had been made and seconded before the February meeting adjourned because of the loss of a quorum:

Motion: that the Senate formally request that the University counsel research the individual liability that faculty will incur because we don't have the resources to advise appropriately for the fall semester.

Discussion of and Vote on the Motion

David Porter, Political Science: I have encountered two basic reactions to this motion.

First, some thought it was crazy to think one could incur legal liability for giving bad advice even if the advisor did not have the necessary documents at hand.

Second, some, including some academic advisors, indicated concern because they recognize that this is a legal question of your personal financial liability.

Bob Hogue sent a quote from *Academic Leadership: A Practical Guide to Chairing the Department*, by ~~Daryl Lemming~~ **Deryl R. Leaming [corrected 4/24/00]**, which stated, in part, "... advisement questions do make it to court quite often. If the information provided a student is in fact wrong, the legal system may decide responsibility and assess damages. Courts often apply contract theory in the situations." I am pleased to share the information with those interested and have the address for a web site that can be investigated.

Some have suggested a vote of no confidence against the current administration or passing petitions, etc. It should be made clear to the current and incoming administrations that the type of laxity that occurs at the top levels of administration is not individual and not the fault of one person. At the time of the motion, I read from a memo from Nancy White, and she took some offense. I apologize to Nancy for any attack that may have been interpreted.

Asking faculty to change the general education requirements, to change from quarters to semesters, and not have accurate and reliable documents available opens them to personal financial liability. I have financial protection from my union, so I am not worried, but the current administrative process is not effective. Some of the information is on the web, and I have downloaded the *Academic Advising Handbook* dated Fall 1999 and noted that it does not coincide with the latest information on GER on the GER web page, so I have already amended my documents. I have a number of memos, only a couple of which pertain to only my department, most of which pertain to the College of Arts and Sciences or to the University, which contain material not contained on the GER web site. Switching between manuals, web sites, and screens on Model 204 to find the required information is not effective.

Finally, the catalog currently on the web site is not the catalog that is published, and the final copy for the *Undergraduate Bulletin* was just this week reviewed and approved. That means that the information I am currently using is not the most current edition and is not the edition that has been approved and adopted by the board. My information is a draft, and I feel uncomfortable going into a court and saying that based on this draft I gave bad advice, and the student is going to have to stay at YSU for another semester or two incurring additional expense. I know the student's attorney would ask why Dr. Porter didn't know the information he was using was a draft and not make the effort to get the latest factual information.

I doubt that University counsel would ever give an opinion on this legal-liability question, but it is important to use this motion as a tool to send a message to the outgoing and incoming administrations that all documents used by advisors and students during the advisement and registration process should be current and accurate.

I would be glad to answer any questions concerning this issue.

Bill Jenkins, Chair, General Education Committee: I understand Dr. Porter's concerns regarding advisement but think it is an overstatement to say that we don't have the resources to appropriately advise for the fall semester. Within the last month, the *General Education Advisory Handbook* was sent out to all department chairs, and in light of the paper problem, chairs were asked to make the *Handbook* available to faculty for advisement. Also, the *Handbook* is available to be downloaded and printed from the web site. Students have the latest on general education in the *Schedule of Classes* booklet. Also, several workshops were offered for chairs and faculty.

I did not receive a call from Dr. Porter, nor has he attended a general education workshop, where questions could have been addressed. I would not suggest there are not areas where improvement could be made, but I do not agree that the resources do not exist. I have no problem with asking the University counsel to conduct research to find out what faculty liability might exist in regard to advising, but I believe the motion is an inappropriate one because the motion asks that research be conducted because we don't have the resources to advise appropriately for the fall semester. I don't think that is accurate.

A vote was taken, and the motion carried. Morrison will direct the action of the Senate to the president of YSU.

[Top of Page](#)

Senate Executive Committee / Report from the Chair: Jim Morrison reported that the Senate Executive Committee met and has two concerns:

1. The Committee will soon start the annual process of asking for volunteers to serve on standing committees of the Senate. Information and preference forms will be mailed next week. Morrison encouraged faculty and faculty chairs to return the forms. In the past, some colleges have had difficulty getting adequate numbers of faculty to serve on Senate committees. The *Charter and Bylaws* are worded to guarantee that every college has representation on all standing committees. If colleges do not express interest, the Charter and Bylaws Committee may ask to change the *Charter*.
2. To get all of their work done, the Academic Programs Committee, the University Curriculum Committee, and the General Education Committee have been operating this last year under temporary procedures. Procedures for those committees need to be codified on a more permanent basis. The Executive Committee is asking the three committees to review their present procedures, make suggestions for any changes, and then refer those suggestions to the Charter and Bylaws Committee for review of proper language so that changes can be brought to the Senate and, hopefully, passed before the end of the year. People will then know exactly how those committees are to operate to avoid the type of confusion and conflicts that have arisen in the past year.

[Top of Page](#)

Ohio Faculty Council Report: Duane Rost submitted a report on the OFC March 10 meeting. (See [Appendix A](#), below.) He noted that the report from the Higher Education Information System is available on the web (<http://www.regents.state.oh.us>), and the chancellor is working with the governor on his Business and Industry Taskforce and expecting good results. He quoted the chancellor as saying, "I look to you [the Ohio Faculty Council] for things that you think are missing, and I welcome your input." Jim Morrison or Duane Rost will take comments to the Regents and chancellor.

Charter and Bylaws Committee: No report

Elections and Balloting Committee: No report.

Academic Standards Committee: Louise Pavia, chair of the committee, reminded Senate members that the ASC is a standards committee. She referred to Motion 1 on minors as attached to the Senate agenda. She stated that the minors issue was brought to the ASC in 1997 before Q2S and GER. She stressed that currently the minor sometimes is declared half way through the student's degree, sometimes at the end of completing a four-year degree. Also, the minor is not designated on a transcript, and the committee addressed that issue. She noted that the first paragraph of the committee's statement on minors defines minors as a standard.

Pavia moved acceptance of Motion 1 as distributed. The motion was seconded. (See [Appendix B](#), below.) Discussion followed.

Bob Hogue's Proposed Amendment to the Main Motion

Bob Hogue, Computer Science and Information Systems, proposed that we amend the ASC's motion on minors:

"I move that the clause 'A minor consists of at least 18 hours' be amended to read, 'A minor consists of at least 15 hours.'" (See [Appendix C](#).)

Discussion of and Vote on Proposed Hogue Amendment to the Main Motion

Hogue: Please note that the handout (see Appendix C) contains justification for this amendment. I am concerned that the proposed 18-hour minor would coincide with semester conversion as well as with the initiation of general education in the fall. Some here have had one or more programs go through curriculum committees, sometimes taking all year. I'm very concerned that if the motion passes with the 18-hour minimum, then all those programs will have to be redone and sent back through committees. Second, I did find a couple of examples of colleges elsewhere with a 15-hour minimum. While those examples are not conclusive, I think they indicate that there are other places where a 15-hour minor is in effect. In fact, the two that I found were not only 15 hours, but they were optional and not necessary as part of the degree.

Pavia: This matter was discussed in committee. The ASC discussed 15 hours but considered that number too low, though we do realize that the increase in hours comes at a bad time. However, the issue is what is considered a minor and what standard we want to set.

An unidentified person spoke against the motion to amend: It is true that some schools have 15-hour minors; however, a great many more have 18-hour minors, and we even found many with 24-hour minors. I think the ASC looked at this as a golden opportunity to add something to the minor at YSU that has never existed before here: some depth, coherence, and legitimacy. An 18-hour minor is not excessive; it is middle ground if anything, so I would urge

voting against this amendment.

Joyce Feist-Willis, Teacher Education: Because of the lack of a quorum at last month's meeting, we couldn't vote, but please note that we on the ASC checked minors at other universities, especially in Ohio, and that information is on page 4 of last month's minutes. Kent State University has 18-24 hours for minors, John Carroll has 18-21 hours, Ohio University has 16-22 hours, the University of Toledo has 20-24 hours, Bowling Green has no fewer than 20 hours, Dayton has 12 upper-division hours plus any prerequisites, so who knows how many they might have. Case Western has no fewer than 15, no more than 18, and that was just a sampling.

Barbara Brothers, Dean, Arts and Sciences: I, too, support the 18 hours for reasons mentioned about academic integrity, because we haven't had that before in the minor. I don't understand those individuals who are concerned. We have programs that are pushed, but they are interdisciplinary, and they don't require a minor. That's perfectly appropriate for them because they have defined themselves in an engineering school or in some of the sciences as having to have a number of support courses from outside. I don't understand how in the traditional sense—especially in the College of Arts and Sciences, where you have a major and the number of hours that a major is supposed to take, which is at present only about 30 hours, and then you add to that general education—how there isn't plenty of time for not just one minor, but possibly two with 18 hours. I think that is doing our students a service. The only ones who would have difficulty are people who have far too many hours in a single discipline in the major, and that is not what employers are looking for.

The amendment to strike from the main motion “18 hours” and replace it with “15 hours” was seconded and failed.

Daryl Mincey's Proposed Amendment to the Main Motion

Daryl Mincey: I would like to move that we strike the following paragraph:

An individualized minor may be developed and approved through the ICP process. Transfer students may also use the ICP process for approval of a minor course of study.

I believe that paragraph dilutes the entire intent of making the minor a deeper experience, and concerning “process,” it opens a situation that perhaps should not be addressed.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Discussion of and Vote on Proposed Mincey Amendment to the Main Motion

Brandon Schneider, Student Representative: I would like to speak against this motion. The ICP process here is one of the most rigorous processes for developing curriculum. I know several students who have designed majors, and the process is one of lengthy review and sometimes more thorough justification than for some of the other programs.

Matthew Vansuch, Student Representative: I, too, question this motion because I wonder how this affects minors such as Peace and Conflict Studies that are part of Political Science but incorporate different types of programs. How will this affect that minor; does this mean that we will have to recertify all the minors in the process? I agree that if you have to provide some justification to get an ICP, then you have to follow a process similar to the one for approving a minor, and I don't see anything wrong with that.

Feist-Willis: The original intent for having this ICP language in the motion is because we don't always know exactly what students have in mind for their college education when they come. They may have specific ideas as to what they want to put together as a minor that is not on paper at the University, and yet it is a good, justifiable collection of courses that will serve their individual purposes and career goals very well. We know that at this point the ICP

process is rigorous, and because of that, we did not think that including this paragraph in the statement on minors would indicate that a student the day before graduation could declare a minor and then choose classes and tell the ICP people, "This was my minor." That was not the intent; the ICP minor has to be on record and approved before the student begins or early in the process.

Len Schaiper, Teacher Education: I would like to ditto the comments of Joyce Feist-Willis and the student representatives. The ICP process is rigorous, but, more importantly from my perspective, it offers greater flexibility. Many times students are able to create superb minors, and that flexibility needs to be retained.

Charles Singler, Geology: I support the amendment to delete the ICP section. One, the ICP was originally designed to provide flexibility with respect to a major and how students could be satisfied with their particular goals. The possibility of an ICP minor brings a very different element to that, and I think the ICP program offers flexibility that if needed within the context of the major is still there. Students still have the option to do all of the things that they might choose to do and move in the directions they need to move. We should keep in mind that the paragraph that precedes this paragraph does provide for a considerable amount of flexibility with the 18 hours; that is, a minor can be defined within a specific program and individual courses out of that, or it can be interdisciplinary through a variety of programs. I'm sure that where there is a need for more than one particular type of minor for one student, if it's something that needs a broader aspect to it, it can be brought in through an interdisciplinary minor, which is still part of this framework. When this issue was raised last month, I spoke with Jim Mike, and his comment was, "Oh, no, they're not doing that, are they?" I think there is plenty of flexibility in the ICP program, and I think the paragraph in question will bring a considerable amount of confusion and workload and could produce 18 hours of considerable variety with perhaps a very minimalized direction. I ask you to delete this paragraph.

Schneider: I respectfully disagree with the previous two speakers. ICP minors may cause a little increase in workload; however, if students are going to take the initiative, they are obviously interested in combining and making something for themselves and getting the best education they can get. The ICP, according to the *Undergraduate Bulletin*, is for students who are interested in a major that is not specified in the catalog as such. I think the same criteria could easily apply to the minor since it is such an important part of students' education.

Jim Mike, ICP Director: Having gone through a couple of university ICP majors, I think it's really difficult for many people to understand how much effort has to go into the development of a major and the amount of time that has to be spent in terms of one discipline versus another discipline versus another discipline, and the major ends up being something like 70 quarter hours or maybe 48 semester hours. To do that in a small span of 18 hours is, I think, inadvisable, and I don't think it's workable. I'm not sure there are many curricula that you could compile together to fit with 18 hours and stay within the one-third of hours being upper-division courses and get a workable minor. My biggest fear is that there will be this huge rush of people who come at the end of their curriculum and say they forgot to declare a minor, and they have all these courses, at which point it becomes a nightmare. We have probably 10-15 people a year who try to do that with an ICP major, and I can imagine the number would go up significantly for the minor, so I would support not putting this into the statement on minors.

Pavia: I would like a clarification concerning Jim Mike's comments. Is there no deadline by which you have to declare an individualized program? [Jim Mike responded that it must be done before the senior year.] So actually that statement works against why we're (ASC) proposing the minor standards. Should we look at standards regarding the ICP if we're allowing students to go almost through their program and then develop an ICP major?

Mincey: I think most programs have 18 hours of electives, and when it gets right down to it, any student could take any 18 hours, and if he or she writes a proper introductory letter for employment or to apply to other schools, he or she could say, "I took this packet of 18 hours," and so the only difference would be that it wouldn't show up on the transcript as a minor. Certainly, with electives, students have all the freedom they possibly could in such a short number of courses.

Pavia: Now that I understand that the ICP process can wait until the last minute, it actually violates the intent of the whole minor proposal, because if you read the other statements, the minor has to be approved in advance, which means it's on the books before the student chooses the minor. This statement, then, should be eliminated because of how we now do ICPs.

Rost: I'm confused. Does this paragraph say that the ICP student may not develop a minor? My question concerns the first sentence of the second paragraph, "The department offering the minor will develop the specific pattern or sequence of courses to comprise the minor." Does this say in the fourth paragraph that the ICP student will take a minor as specified by the department? What is the intent? Is it to prevent the ICP student from taking some other form of minor, or is the intent to allow others to have an ICP minor? I would appreciate a clarification.

Pavia: The intent was to allow a student to develop an individualized minor just as a major develops an individualized major.

Rost: The ICP has that available now, correct? You (the student) put together the package that you would like; your committee approves it, and you have an individualized program. If those programs are not acceptable to the body of the academy, then we'll say we have to make changes. The concept of the ICP says we can do whatever is needed for that student without restrictions.

David Porter: I think we're missing the boat. I agree with the student representatives completely. There needs to be a safety valve of some type. I guarantee you that a student is going to come up with a very rational, very well conceived and developed minor that doesn't show up anywhere on the books, and we're going to have to develop the minor for them or have an ICP.

I currently chair an ICP committee and have chaired several since I've been here, and there is no way that that process is going to work for 18 hours. You have to start off by putting together three professors from three different departments. To begin with, the 18 hours will have to be split among three departments if you follow the current requirements for the major. It's a very complicated process, and for those students who leave it to their senior year, I think Jim Mike would agree they are unlikely to be successful in making those ICPs work. I think trying to take the process and make it fit minors as well as majors is going to destroy the process.

However, not permitting any student to come up with any way to have an individualized minor is going to work to our disadvantage in the long run. In Political Science, we individualize minors all the time; I did it today. I had a business major in my office who wanted to know what Political Science courses would succeed in achieving his goals in business. We sat down and laid it out and made an individualized minor. Under this proposal, I will not be able to do that. The minor is going to have to be in the books first. I do see a need to have some mechanism, but taking what was designed for the major, which is almost always 70+ credit hours, and adapting it to an 18-hour requirement is not going to function administratively.

I call upon the ASC to continue to look at this issue and come up with a different process of permitting individualized minors that would not be overly burdensome to the students or to the faculty and that would simultaneously adhere to very high standards so that we would get only those highly motivated students and those cases where an individualized minor is truly justified and opposed to last minute desperate situations.

Tom Maraffa: The current policy is 24 quarter hours, and the major is 31 hours. This changes in that it does not address interdisciplinary minors. Would it be any combination of 28 hours submitted? One way around this is for the hours to be higher than 18.

The motion to amend the main motion by deleting the ICP paragraph from the ASC's Motion 1 was defeated.

Discussion of and Vote on the Main Motion (ASC Motion 1)

There was a motion to move the previous question. The motion to move the previous question was seconded and carried.

A vote on was taken on the ASC's Motion 1 (unamended). The motion carried.

[Top of Page](#)

Pavia moved acceptance of Motion 2: "High School Preparation." (See [Appendix D.](#)) She noted that the committee attempted to bring language together to talk about proficiencies rather than deficiencies as currently stated in the *Undergraduate Bulletin*. Enrollment Services and the Deans' Council helped prepare the language for the new catalog. The language would reflect high school units and high school preparation. The motion was seconded.

Discussion of and Vote on the Main Motion (ASC Motion 2)

Janice Elias, Assistant Provost: Moved an amendment to delete the [last sentence](#) in the first paragraph concerning students who graduated from high school prior to September 1985. The motion was seconded.

Discussion of and Vote on Proposed Elias Amendment to the Main Motion

Elias: My rationale is that if we're talking about proficiencies rather than deficiencies, it won't have any meaning in the future. In the past, students who graduated before September 1985 had to make up different classes than students who graduated later. If we are not using that model anymore, the sentence is not useful, and if we are saying what it is best for students to have in order to be successful, it really doesn't matter when they graduated.

Pavia: Can we say nothing in the catalog?

A vote was taken on the proposed amendment to excise the last sentence in the first paragraph concerning students who graduated prior to September 1985. The motion carried.

Discussion of and Vote on the Main Motion (ASC Motion 2) as Amended

Singler: I'm asking for a clarification under the baccalaureate degree with the listing of the several subject areas. Can I get a clarification on foreign language? Should it be understood to be any two units of different languages, or would they need to be in the same language?

Pavia: When the committee looked at high school preparation requirements in the state, it did not designate that it had to be in one language. I think that we are going forward in the University with some guidelines regarding foreign language and foreign language preparation. That further defines this for the University, but we were looking at the state guidelines regarding high school preparation and used that language.

Robert Campbell, Human Ecology: I chaired the committee that developed the original laundry list of courses for entrance to YSU in approximately 1983. At that time, we had to provide a four-year timeline for students. State law required a four-year notification to high schools before we changed admission requirements. I'm not sure if that is still the law, but freshman, sophomore, and junior high school students who are taking courses geared on old requirements need adequate time to prepare for new requirements.

Pavia: Actually, these aren't new requirements; they reflect present requirements. New requirements will come into play in 2001 and 2002, and we will be looking at further language, but in terms of the need for the catalog and regulations, this is what is required right now.

Schaiper: That assumes a fairly standardized high school curriculum across all types of high school systems, i.e., urban, rural, and suburban. I'm not sure that exists. What about late bloomers or drop out students? Not everyone proceeds through life in that sequential standardized way.

Bassam Deeb, Enrollment Services: For purposes of admissions, these things are primarily used for advisement and not for admission. The testing process, whether writing, reading, math, foreign language, etc., makes the review of these units probably not necessary, but the intent is for us to send the message to the school guidance counselors that students must follow some process in order to be successful at the university. Non-traditional, GED students, and home-schooled students will be dealt with as needed. Those students may not be coming here with units. We are not evaluating credits from high school for purposes of admission.

A vote was taken on the ASC's Motion 2 as amended. The motion, as amended, carried.

[Top of Page](#)

Jim Morrison requested consent of the Senate to move the order of the agenda to consider the Library Committee's proposal since they require action on this business.

Library Committee: **Duane Rost moved that we approve the proposed library budget as attached.** (See [Appendix E.](#)) The motion was seconded.

Rost: One side of the handout shows the budget, and the total budgets at the bottom of each column are \$1,500,000. On the other side is the reality, and it's labeled "2001 Library Materials Budget." This reflects the realization that we may not be able to have available all that is budgeted. However, it is our intent to maintain the concept and intention that the budget is as presented.

A vote was taken, and the motion to accept the proposed library budget carried.

[Top of Page](#)

Academic Programs Committee: Kathylynn Feld, chair of Academic Programs Committee, stated the Q2S conversion of programs is complete with the exception of the Adolescent Licensure Program from the Department of Teacher Education. The committee encourages departments to submit any program changes or additional new programs now or in early fall. The committee is not meeting this summer to work on them. The Adolescent Licensure Program has an unresolved objection that has been returned to the Program Committee. The Program Committee recommends that the Senate approve the program as originally circulated.

Discussion followed:

Feld: The objection to the program was that a course was taken out by the department, and we as a committee had sent it back to them saying that justification and rationale were needed for putting it back into the program. At the time, the committee did not have a dean's signature, and the committee only accepts program changes with deans' signatures, so they are following the established procedure. The original program submitted had significantly more than 124-127 hours but followed somewhat the two-thirds rule. The addition of that course would have increased the

hours, and the committee could not accept that without justification, which was not forthcoming. The committee suggested that the course not be put back in and that the department review it and make a program change for next year but suggested the program be submitted now as originally circulated. Copies of the Adolescent Licensure Program are available in the deans' offices. The committee suggests this be acted upon at the May meeting, so it is available for everyone to review before discussing it. It is approximately 50 pages and contains the curriculum proposals, justifications, and course proposals.

Jim Morrison: A summary of that will be attached to the agenda for the May meeting.

[Top of Page](#)

University Curriculum Committee: Pat Hoyson, chair of the Curriculum Committee, made the following report:

With the last joint Program/Curriculum Committee distribution that completed circulation just prior to spring break, the Curriculum Committee has completed all the quarter-to-semester curriculum reviews. A list of approved courses is appended in [Appendix F](#).

The committee is currently reviewing courses recently submitted with some minor changes. A couple of courses had objections raised to them in the most recent distribution, and the committee is awaiting resolution on those courses. Also, at the next meeting, the committee is going to look at revising the new Change of Course forms to include some information that Jane Caputo needs with regard to workload, CIP codes, etc. The Curriculum Committee will be working with the General Education Committee members to streamline the process of submitting proposals to the University Curriculum Committee and to the General Education Committee. Hoyson thanked the entire committee for its hard work over this past year.

Feld: The addition is that as of today, in circulation to the deans' offices is a new program, Public Management from the Political Science department, and a revision to an accepted one from Environmental Studies, and those should be available today or tomorrow. There will be a ten-day circulation, so please look at those.

[Top of Page](#)

Academic Planning Committee: No report.

[Top of Page](#)

General Education Committee: Bill Jenkins, chair of the General Education Committee, shared his comments concerning the makeup and operation of the General Education Committee. (See [Appendix G](#).)

Jim Morrison called for questions. There were no questions, so he called for other committee reports.

[Top of Page](#)

Integrated Technologies, University Outreach, Academic Research, Student Academic Affairs, Student Academic

Grievance, Honors, and Academic Events Committees: No reports.

[Top of Page](#)

Unfinished business: None.

[Top of Page](#)

New business: Because of the loss of a quorum, Jim Morrison will ask the Executive Committee to place Brandon Schneider's proposed amendment, which is listed on the agenda under New Business, higher on the list so that it will be addressed at the May meeting. Also, he referred to a resolution from the Ohio Faculty Council concerning extending benefits to domestic partners, but since it was not posted on the April agenda, it will be discussed at the May meeting.

[Top of Page](#)

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

[Top of Page](#)

Appendix A: Ohio Faculty Council Report

Ohio Faculty Council Report for Meeting of March 10, 2000 (Submitted by Duane Rost)

(Next Meeting: April 14, 2000.) (Ohio Board of Regents web site is: <<http://www.regents.state.oh.us>>)

1) Robert Sheehan (Cleveland State University faculty member working with the Regents on statistical analysis now) met with us to discuss several topics:

a) Governor Taft's Annual Performance Report on the Schools. Sheehan indicated the Governor was concerned about the graduation rates of the college students and that the IUC presidents were also interested in the retention rates. The Legislature put four times as much money in the budget for the Success Challenges as was asked for by the Regents, with one facet being "timely degree completion." These moneys will not be part of the base budget but are expected to continue in strong and related lines. They are interested in how to measure the benefits and thus how much to fund the new initiatives.

b) The Survey of Full-Time Faculty is completed and has been "quite well received by OBOR." This survey of full-time faculty is intended to be made on alternate years with a similar survey of part-time faculty in the other years. There is an intent to "do no harm with this report," though Sheehan said, "there will be winners and losers."

Sheehan said they were aware of the local time required for each new aspect of HEI and are trying to hold down that demand. He was appreciative of the input and support the faculty members had shown in developing the survey instrument and follow ups.

There is a training meeting for liaison representatives from the institutions on Thursday, March 23, at Central Ohio Technical College. The first Annual HEI Users Conference will be held on Friday, March 24, also at Ohio Technical College.

Additional information about the Higher Education Information System and the results that are available at this time can be found from the Regents home web page under HEI. Additional investigations are possible from the raw data available. Faculty are encouraged to “go and play” through querying the data.

c) The HEI is providing tracking data to follow students throughout the Ohio state-assisted colleges and universities. The initial results show a significant movement among the institutions, but details are yet to be finished.

Sheehan did express a willingness and desire to talk with interested individuals around the state. Contact him to ask further questions (e-mail: rsheehan@regents.state.oh.us) or to arrange formal meetings. They will “travel for food.”

2) Chancellor Chu met with the Ohio Faculty Council next. Though there was not a set agenda of topics that he or the OFC wanted to address, an extensive, lively discussion followed. Some items were broad, such as “what’s a baccalaureate degree mean, what should be in a core curriculum, what should be included in the knowledge and skills” developed in the institutions, and who should determine what is expected of the student?

The Chancellor indicated the Regents were a coordinating board, not a controlling board as is the case in some other states, such as New York.

The Chancellor is on the Governor’s “Workforce Policy Board,” where the main topic is to “advance the economy of Ohio.” They are working on the details to jumpstart the economy in Ohio. One goal is to become smarter at creating the product. Business and higher education need to be working together on this. “What kind of knowledge and skill are you (business) looking for?” Business: “I need life-long learners with degrees. I can’t find someone to work. In the past I’d go elsewhere, but today there is no one available.” A dichotomy exists in the interface to business: CEOs say they need people with board interests and backgrounds and their Human Resources people are trying to fill specific jobs with highly specific criteria and credentials. This leads to the need for a three-way dialog between the CEO, the HR director, and the academic community. Chancellor Chu cited work at Sinclair Community College as examples of successful interactions.

Chancellor Chu shifted the focus to the Baldrige methods in education. He indicated strong support in the K-12 sector and felt it could be applied to higher education also. He said the essence of the approach was to empower the faculty, teachers, employees, and students. There is a commitment to (1) no social promotions and (2) “no student left behind.” This would mean everybody was at grade level and every child will learn. He indicated “the student is responsible for his/her own learning rubrics.” Is there a one-page description of the Baldrige method? No, but a 61-page set of Criteria does exist. A short video is available to give some insights on what would be featured. At the April meeting, the Board of Regents will go through the Baldrige training.

The Chancellor was asked about the domestic partner issue again, and he reiterated that it was a local issue but he had brought it to the Regents and to IUC.

There is a brighter future for high tech developments if Ohio is a part of a larger group and so is joining with other Great Lakes states to increase their clout. They are looking for “clusters” of strengths, both in localities and in topics. The prediction of the direction of the next wave of progress is difficult.

This led to discussions of doctoral programs and size limitations by the Regents. Chancellor Chu indicated that you don't get quality from a large quantity of mediocre graduate students. There is a need to up the quality of research on the campuses. The focus is on getting to critical state needs. "They" will fund to get answers.

Chancellor Chu stated there are any number of things we (Chancellor and the Ohio Faculty Council) can work on. We need to get our priorities set and get under way. The Mission and Vision items are good places to start. Chancellor Chu: "I look for your input. I look for things that are missing and I welcome your input."

After Chancellor Chu left, Bob Faaborg reported on the governance structure at the University of Cincinnati.

Continue to check the Ohio Board of Regents web site for new actions and more details.

[Top of Page](#)

Appendix B: Academic Standards Committee Motion 1

MOTION 1: MINORS

A minor is an intellectual venture that broadens and deepens the student's intellectual growth. An intellectual framework and coherence are evident in the scope and sequence of the minor course of study. A minor is intended to contrast with or deepen the major or General Education and is to be taken in a discipline other than that of the major.

The department offering the minor will develop the specific pattern or sequence of courses to comprise the minor. The department in which the student receives the major will be responsible for certifying that a student has completed a minor. Such certification will be guided by the description of minors published in the undergraduate bulletin. Departments may offer more than one minor.

Prior to offering a minor, the minor program of study is approved through the program approval process. An interdisciplinary minor is likewise developed and approved through the same process. Once approved, departmental requirements and specific courses for the minor are published in the undergraduate bulletin.

An individualized minor may be developed and approved through the ICP process. Transfer students may also use the ICP process for approval of a minor course of study.

A minor consists of at least 18 hours of a specific sequence of courses with grades of C or better. Upper division courses must comprise at least 1/3 of the credit hours in the minor.

Certain degree programs require a minor. Please check with an academic advisor for specific information.

A minor is designated on the student's transcript.

[Top of Page](#)

Appendix C: Hogue Proposal to Amend the Motion on Minors

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 5, 2000
From: Bob Hogue, Computer Science & Information Systems
To: Members of the Academic Senate
Subject: Proposed Amendment to Academic Standards Recommendation on Minors

At today's meeting, I would like to introduce the following amendment to the motion on minors from the Academic Standards Committee:

I move that the clause "A minor consists of at least 18 hours" be amended to read, "A minor consists of at least 15 hours."

Justification:

1. We will already be implementing a semester calendar and a new set of General Education requirements at the same time this fall. I feel that it is in the best interests of students, faculty, and advisors to allow these changes to settle in before making any more university-wide modifications of graduation requirements.
2. Although there is indeed evidence that 18 or more hours are required at some universities, there is also evidence of lower limits at other universities. Some examples:

From the College of Arts & Sciences at Lehigh University: "A minor consists of at least 15 credit hours; the specific content is determined by the department, division, or program concerned. A minor is optional and, if successfully completed, will be shown on the university transcript in the same manner as the major field of concentration."
 (Source: <<http://www.lucs.lehigh.edu/~incat/section3/cas.html>>, document date: August 5, 1999)

From the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts at the University of Michigan: "An academic minor will require no less than 15 credits of course work, will show structure and coherence, and will contain some upper-level courses." The same document also specifies that a minor is an option, not a requirement.
 (Source: <<http://www.lsa.umich.edu/saa/publications/bulletin/chapter3/minor.html>>, document date: February 2, 2000)

[Top of Page](#)

Appendix D: Academic Standards Committee Motion 2

HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION

Students admitted to the university may have their high school records evaluated by the college in which they are enrolled. Specific course work, in addition to what is listed below, may be required in order to be accepted into a specific program or major. Since such course work may vary depending on the college and degree requirements, students should check with advisors as to the academic expectations that need to be met. Students who graduated from high school prior to September 1985 should consult with the dean of the college in which they are enrolled for a list of pre-college courses. **[Note: The**

previous sentence, on students who graduated before September 1985, was deleted by an amendment at the April 5 Senate meeting.]

Baccalaureate Degree

High School graduates desiring to pursue a baccalaureate degree should have completed the following college preparatory units:

English	4 units
Mathematics	3 units
Science	3 units
Social Studies	3 units
Foreign Language	2 units
The Arts	1 unit

It is recommended that course work reflect preparation in the following areas:

English Composition
Algebra 1, 2, and Geometry
Laboratory Science
US History and Government

Associate Degree

Students wishing to pursue an associate degree should have completed the following college preparatory units:

English	4 units
Mathematics	2 units
Science	2 units
Social Studies	2 units
Other subjects	6 units

[Top of Page](#)

Appendix E: Proposed Library Budget

Colleges	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-2001
Arts & Sciences	\$707,000	678,495	678,495
Business	125,000	120,872	120,872
Education	86,000	81,812	81,812
Engineering/Tech	91,500	91,024	91,024
Fine & Performing Arts	89,000	82,237	82,237

Health & Human Services	141,500	136,952	136,952
LIBRARY			
General Works	76,000	76,000	76,000
Reference	59,000	59,000	59,000
Replacements	8,000	8,000	8,000
Binding	70,000	70,000	70,000
Electronic Journals	25,000	25,000	25,000
OhioLINK Databases	22,000	22,000	22,000
Yankee Book Peddler	0	48,608	48,608
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000

[Top of Page](#)

Appendix F
University Curriculum Division - Approved Courses - 1999-2000
February-March-April 2000

The following courses have been approved by the committee and have completed the circulation process.

UCC #	Dept	Course Code	Title	New (N) Revised (R) Deleted (D)
1	CLTEC	2687L	Microbiology for Health Professions Laboratory	N
5	ALTH	1500	Applied Physiology 1	N
6	ALTH	1501	Applied Physiology 2	N

8	CRJUS	3777 A,B,C	OPOT- Law Enforcement, OPOT -Corrections, or OPOT-Loss Prevention	N
9	CRJUS	4800	Senior Seminar	N
10	EMTEC	1503	Patient Assessment and Airway Management	N
11	EMTEC	2602	Emergency Medicine Special Certification	N
12	EMTEC	1506	Emergency Department Clinical 1	N
13	EMTEC	1502	General Pathophysiology for the EMT - Paramedic	N
68	A&S	1599	Medical Professions Seminar	N
69	CHEM	1505R	Recitation for Allied Health Chemistry 1	N
70	CHEM	1506R	Recitation for Allied Health Chemistry 2	N
71	CHEM	1515R	Recitation for General Chemistry 1	N
72	CHEM	1516R	Recitation for General Chemistry 2	N
73	CHEM	3719R	Organic Chemistry Recitation 1	N
74	CHEM	3720R	Organic Chemistry Recitation 2	N
75	CHEM	4850	Introduction to Research	N
76	CHEM	4861	Polymer Science 1: Polymer Chemistry and Plastics	N
77	CHEM	4862	Polymer Science 2: Polymer Rheology, Processing, and Composites	N
78	CHEM	4876	Enzyme Analysis	R
79	CHEM	5821	Intermediate Organic Chemistry	R
80	CHEM	5831	Inorganic Chemistry Laboratory	R
81	CHEM	5832	Solid State Structural Methods	R
82	CHEM	5836	Chemical Bonding and Structure	R
83	HPES	1506	Performance and Analysis of Track and Field	R
84	HPES	1567	Performance and Analysis of Team Sports 1	R
85	HPES	1574	Performance and Analysis of Lifetime Sports	R
86	HPES	1589	Scientific Basis of Fitness	R

87	HPES	1595	Introduction and Concepts of Physical Education and Exercise Science	R
88	HPES	2605	Sports First Aid and Injury Prevention	N
89	HPES	2610	Introduction to Outdoor Pursuits	R
90	HPES	2624	Physical Education for Children in Early Childhood Settings	N
91	HPES	2625	Pedagogical Aspects of Exercise Science	R
92	HPES	2628	Movement for Early Childhood	R
93	HPES	2661	Games Analysis	R
94	HPES	3700	Exercise Leader Practicum	R
95	HPES	3710	Physiology of Exercise	R
96	HPES	3710L	Physiology of Exercise Laboratory	R
97	HPES	3720	Kinesiology and Applied Anatomy	R
98	HPES	3730	Health/Fitness Instructor Practicum	R
99	HPES	3740	Exercise Program Administration	N
100	HPES	3760	Strength Training and Conditioning	R
101	HPES	3765	Athletic Training I	R
102	HPES	3767	Teacher Behavior in P-12 Physical Education	R
103	HPES	4808	Assessment Instruments and Strategies for Physical Education	N
104	HPES	4810	Clinical Exercise Practicum	R
105	HPES	4820	Research Design and Statistics in Exercise Science	N
106	HPES	4850	Exercise Testing & Prescription for the Health Professional	R
107	HPES	4870	Exercise and Aging for Health Professions	R
108	HPES	4880	Internship	R
109	HPES	4890	Undergraduate Research	N
110	HPES	4899	Physiology of Exercise for Physical Education	N
111	HPES	4899L	Physiology of Exercise for Physical Education Laboratory	N

112	TERG	3703	Assessment and Instruction in Reading Internship, Pre K-9	R
113	TERG	3704	Assessment and Instruction in Reading, Internship	N
114	TERG	3705	Advanced Literature Studies	R
115	TERG	3706	Reading Practicum	R
118	TEMC	3703	Thematic Instruction and Assessment Methods in Social Studies	N
119	TEMC	3704	Teaching Mathematics in the Middle School	N
120	TEMC	3705	Teaching Science in the Middle School	N
121	TEMC	3706	Teaching Language Arts in the Middle School	R
122	TEMC	3707	Science/Technology/Society	N
123	TEMC	4801	Middle School Learning Community	N
124	TEMC	4802	Student Teaching in Middle Childhood Education	N
125	TEMC	4803	Senior Capstone Inquiry Experience	N
126	SPED	4857	Applied Technology in the Education of Children and Youth with Disabilities	N
127	SPED	4869	Student Teaching Seminar for Special Education	N
142	BIOL	1505	Biology and the Modern World	R
143	BIOL	1545	Allied Health Anatomy/Physiology	N
144	BIOL	1551	Anatomy & Physiology 1	R
145	BIOL	1552	Anatomy & Physiology 2	R
146	BIOL	2610	Cell Biology: Fine Structure	N
147	BIOL	3702	Microbiology	R
148	BIOL	3703	Clinical Immunology	R
149	BIOL	3705	Introduction to Human Gross Anatomy	R
150	BIOL	3718	Women, Science, and Technology	N
151	BIOL	3790	Molecular Genetics	R
152	BIOL	4801	Environmental Microbiology	R

153	BIOL	4861	Senior Biology Capstone Experience	N
154	BIOL	4899	Internships in Biological Sciences	N
155	BIOL	5804	Aquatic Biology	R
156	BIOL	5806	Field Ecology	R
157	BIOL	5809	Concepts of Developmental Biology	R
158	BIOL	5811	Ornithology	R
159	BIOL	5834	Advanced Systems Physiology 1	R
160	BIOL	5835	Advanced Systems Physiology 2	R
161	BIOL	5836	Cell Biology: Molecular Mechanisms	R
162	BIOL	5840	Advanced Microbiology	R
174	OIS	1520	Beginning Keyboarding	R
175	OIS	1575	Document Preparation	R
176	OIS	2676	Multimedia Technology	N
177	CIS	2613	RPG and Midrange Computing	R
178	CSIS	2617	Data Structures and Objects	R
179	CSIS	3723	Networking Concepts and Administration	R
180	CSIS	3740	Computer Organization	R
181	CSIS	4840	Business Systems Analysis and Design	R
182	CIS	2640	Business Programming	R
183	WMST	2601	Introduction to Women's Studies	N
184	WMST	4850	Senior Research Project	N
185	FNLG	2605	Topics in Foreign Drama	R
186	COUNS	1587	Mental Health and Wellness in Contemporary Society	N
187	ECON	2632	Principles 3: International Economics	N
188	EET	2650	Personal Computer Hardware	N
189	EET	2651	Digital Communication Systems 1	N

190	EET	2652	Digital Communication Systems 2	N
191	EET	2653	Fiber Optics	N
192	EET	2670	Process Instrumentation	N
193	EET	2671	Computer Instrumentation and Control	N
194	MGT	4840	Work in America	N
195	HPES	2620	Exercise Equipment Management	R
196	HPES	4803	Issues & Trends in Exercise Science	R
197	SCWK	4826	Integrated Field Work Seminar	R
198	SCWK	4827	Integrated Capstone Course	N
199	ECON	1501	Economics in Action	N
201	ECON	1503	Rich and Poor: Diversity and Disparity in the US Workforce	N
200	ECON	1502	Panic and Prosperity, US Economic Policy Since the Great Depression	N
202	ECON	1500D	Sports and Entertainment Economics	N
203	SCWK	3730	Social Services and the Aged	R
204	SCWK	3731	Social Services and the Disabled	R

Senate #3 -3/00
 Hoyson 1999-2000

[Top of Page](#)

Appendix G: General Education Report

General Education Report to the Academic Senate 4-5-2000

The General Education Committee is a new committee of the Academic Senate. As such, it is composed of a cross-sectional representation of the faculty with at least one representative from each college and a student appointment from Student Government. As Coordinator of General Education I chair that committee, which must follow the Charter and Bylaws of the Academic Senate, and Roberts Rules of Order. The General Education Committee is thereby a democratic committee that follows procedures and keeps minutes to record its actions. Its deliberations constitute an honest and representative effort to interpret the GER model with some degree of compromise and flexibility.

The General Education Committee has been in operation for 1-½ years now. During that period it has functioned as a generator of criteria for courses seeking to be part of the general education offerings and as a certifier of course proposals based on the ability of a department or its faculty to demonstrate that the course has satisfied both the goals and the criteria for specific areas. In January of 1999 the General Education Committee fulfilled the first function by recommending the criteria for basic skill courses, domain courses, and intensive courses, based on the work of a number of subcommittees. The Academic Senate approved those criteria on March 5, 1999. The General Education Committee then created course proposal forms with appendices that included a statement of the goals and the specific criteria for each area. Faculty and department chairs have access to this information through the General Education Website at <<http://www.ysu.edu/ger/>>, which is linked to the YSU homepage. Also included on the Website are the original goal statements, the general education model, a list of committee members, and a list of those courses that have achieved certification.

Since spring a year ago the General Education Committee has been fulfilling its second function, the certification of courses. Committee members view themselves as interpreters of the rules and guidelines passed by the Academic Senate and available in the appendices to the various course proposals. One example of the use of this interpretive function occurred in regard to prerequisites. Some departments proposed courses that had prerequisites that were not general education courses. Since the Academic Senate had passed, as part of the Criteria, a statement that general education courses must be designed for the general student body, the General Education Committee interpreted that guideline to mean that only those courses without a prerequisite or with a general education prerequisite could be certified as general education courses. A prerequisite outside of general education obviously restricts the access of the general student body to that course.

As each proposal has come forward, the committee has examined the course title, course description, narrative and criteria responses, and the syllabi as evidence regarding the relevance of the course to a particular area. It is important that departments not only justify a proposal, but also demonstrate that it meets the appropriate criteria. When the committee has had questions or reservations regarding the proposals, it has followed an informal process of notifying the department of its concerns and inviting a meeting with the Coordinator or with the entire committee. It has keyed its comments to the above items and explained why those items are not satisfactory. The General Education Committee recognizes that it has no power to mandate a change regarding any of these items, and that final authority regarding the title, course description, prerequisites, and acceptance as a university course rests with the University Curriculum Committee. It has only taken these items into consideration insofar as they reflect upon the certifiability of the course as a general education course.

If the department resubmits the proposal, the committee will vote on whether to certify or not, and notify the department of the results. After certification, it is then circulated through the deans' offices to departments for an objection stage lasting ten working days. As a result of an objection by any department, dean, or faculty member an informal meeting occurs between the proposing department and the objector to seek resolution. If an agreement is reached, and the objection is withdrawn, then the course is examined at another committee meeting and appended to the Senate Agenda as an indication of its certification. Were no agreement to be reached, the General Education Committee holds a formal hearing with both parties in attendance. The General Education Committee will then vote regarding possible certification and report the results to the Academic Senate. It will present a motion regarding its action, so that the two parties involved may debate the issue on the Senate floor. The vote of the Academic Senate is final. As a result of this process, the overwhelming majority of 1500- or 2600-level proposals have received certification.

Finally, I would like to make some comments on the issue of breadth in general education. Since the times of Thomas Jefferson, it has been a premise of our democratic society that we need an educated citizenry. For many years the college curriculum was broadly based, but in the twentieth century preparation for a specific career has taken over larger and larger segments of the curriculum. Hence the drive in the last twenty years to preserve general education as a central part of the college experience. The benefits to the society are immeasurable; its most educated citizens possess awareness of what constitutes the best thinking in the areas of the humanities, the arts, social studies, politics, and the sciences. This awareness can only enhance the life of the individual and of the society. There is no problem in justifying a general education as a base for each college student, but there is a disagreement over just how broad that education should be.

Our North Central Association, which accredits this university, defines general education as “that component of a student’s study that ensures breadth.” It further states, based on a 1983 statement that

General education is “general” in several clearly identifiable ways: it is not directly related to a student’s formal technical, vocational, or professional preparation; it is a part of every student’s course of study, regardless of his or her area of emphasis, and it is intended to impart common knowledge, intellectual concepts, and attitudes that every educated person should possess.

Notice that the definition is not that specific.

As the General Education Committee began to discuss the issue of how much breadth was needed, it faced two problems. The first was that some members were satisfied with the fact that the domain and skill requirements forced students to take a variety of courses; that was sufficient breadth for them. Others, however, looked at the domain requirements and were concerned that a student might take only one discipline within a domain. They believed that breadth required a student to take courses from more than one department, and that those departments should not be the one in which the student majors. The second problem was accreditation requirements, especially in the professional programs. Representatives of those programs argued that in certain situations additional breadth requirements would cause their students to take more hours than the minimum required to graduate. They were concerned about the recent demand that students be able to graduate in four years. Because of these differences, the General Education Committee could not reach a consensus on what constituted breadth within domains. The committee also felt limited by the cap on the total number of hours within the general education program. Expanding requirements could provide a solution for breadth, but the gain in one area would only mean the loss of requirements in another.

Instead, the committee has decided that additional requirements in breadth are best decided by the colleges and the major departments. We are suggesting, however, the following guidelines for colleges and departments to consider for their students. They are:

- 1) Departments should avoid using their own courses as a way for their majors to satisfy general education requirements in the domain.
- 2) Advisors should encourage students to take courses from at least two disciplines to fulfill each domain requirement.
- 3) Students should design their general education curriculum so as to address every goal.

[Top of Page](#)

Print or Download a [Rich Text File](#) of April 2000 Minutes

[Attachment 1: Sign-in Sheet for April 5 Senate Meeting](#)

[Top of Page](#)

[Return to Top of Page](#)

[Return to Senate Homepage](#)

For further information, e-mail [Bege Bowers](#).



Academic Senate
 Youngstown State University
 Youngstown, Ohio 44555



ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Attachment 1: Sign-in Sheet (Scanned Image)
April 5, 2000

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE – April 5, 2000

Arts and Sciences

At Large

____ Martin Berger
 CKB Bege K. Bowers
 BH Robert Hogue
 WS William Jenkins
 JM Thomas Maraffa
 DM Daryl Mincey
 JCM James C. Morrison
 NR Nate Ritchey
 TAS Thomas A. Shipka
 CS Charles Singler

Departmental

DKA David Asch, Biology
 RKS Ronald Shaklee, Geography
 SB Servio Becerra, For. Lang.
 _____ Jeffrey Coldren, Psychology
 _____ Julian Madison, History
 RLB Richard Bee, Economics
 JEA James Andrews, Physics & Ast.

Departmental (Cont'd)

TK Robert Kramer, CSIS
 JJ John Jackson, Chemistry
 MI Megan Isaac, English
 JD Jeffrey Dick, Geology
 RGD Richard Goldtwait, Mathematics
 JCS J.-C. Smith, Phil. & Rel.
 DP David Porter, Pol./Soc. Sci.
 RW Robert Weaver, Soc./Anthropology

Business Administration

At Large

____ Dennis Bensinger
 GC Gregory Claypool
 JD James Daly

At Large (Cont'd)

JK James Kohut
 _____ David Law
 _____ Ron Volpe

Departmental

EH Inez Heal, Accounting & Finance
 AK Anthony Kos, Management
 _____ Bart Kittle, Marketing

Education

At Large

____ Dora Bailey
 JB Janet Beary
 DR Denise Da Ros

At Large (Cont'd)

BE Bill Evans
 LS Len Schaiper
 NS Nancie Shillington

Departmental

FE Feist-Willis, Teacher Ed.
 JC JoLynn Carney, Counseling
 _____ No rep for 1999-2000, AR&C

Engineering and Technology

At Large

____ Robert McCoy
 PM Philip C. Munro
 EBS Elvin B. Shields

Departmental

____ Shakir Husain, Civil/Environ.
 and Chemical Engineering
 DR Duane F. Rost, Electrical Engineering
 _____ Ganesh Kudav, Mechanical/Industrial & Systems Engineering

Departmental (Cont'd)

____ James C. Zupanic, Technology

Fine and Performing Arts

At Large

____ Laura Buch
 DJF Darla J. Funk
 DRH Dennis R. Henneman
 _____ Greg Moring

At Large (Cont'd)

____ Allan R. Mosher
 JM John Murphy
 _____ Patricia Sarro

Departmental

____ Richard Krueger, Art
 _____ Ed Largent, Music
 FC Frank Castronovo, Comm. & Th.

Health and Human Services

At Large

____ Kathleen Akpom
 LA Louise Aurilio
 JN John Neville
 LP Louise Pavia

Departmental

KF Kathylynn Feld, Health Prof.
 MC Marcia Matanin, HPES
 RC Robert Campbell, Human Ecol.

Departmental (Cont'd)

EG Elaine Greaves, Crim. Jus.
 MK Marsha Kuite, Nursing
 SK Shirley Keller, Social Work
 CP Cathy Parrott, Physical Therapy

LP Louise Pavia

EM Cathy Farou, Physical Therapy

Administration

CEA Cynthia E. Anderson
TA Thomas C. Atwood
BA Barbara H. Brothers
MA Margaret A. Collins

BD Bassam Deeb
JE Janice G. Elias
CM Clara M. Jennings
PJK Peter J. Kasvinsky
BJL Betty Jo Licata
GE Gordon E. Mapley
GE George E. McCloud
GLM G. L. Mears

VM Virginia L. Mears
JS James J. Scanlon
CS Charles A. Stevens
JJY John J. Yemma

Students

At Large

LB Paul Brenner
LH Lauren Hamilton
DL Donna Lorincz
CM Chris Morrone
BS Brandon Schneider

School/College

MV Matthew Vansuch, A&S
[Vacant], Ed.
Francine Dilullo, E&T
Ed Ross, FPA
Heather Chandler, HHS
LS Lumi Strimbu, WCBA

School/College (Cont'd)

[Vacant], Grad. School

Other

Robert Harvey, Pres.
MC Marla Carano, VP
TM Tara Mauch 2nd VP

Revised 10/13/99

Terrika Holden Education

[Top of Page](#)

[Return to Top of Page](#)

[Return to Top of April 2000 Minutes](#)

[Return to Bottom of April 2000 Minutes](#)

[Return to Senate Homepage](#)

For further information, e-mail [Bege Bowers](#).