

March 27, 1969

TO: SENATE MEMBERS

FROM: VERA JENKINS
Secretary of the Senate

SENATE MEETING: Friday, April 4, 1969 - 4:00 p.m. IN THE ENGINEERING
SCIENCE AUDITORIUM (Room 273).

AGENDA FOR MEETING:

- 1) Approval of minutes of previous meeting (Friday, March 7, 1969)
- 2) Report of Athletic Council (Dr. Clyde Vanaman)
- 3) Report of Academic Affairs Committee (Dr. David Behen)
- 4) Report of Senate Council and Other Committees:
 - a) Report of Senate Council (Dr. Philip J. Hahn)
 - b) Report of Curriculum Committee (Dr. Thelma Miner)
- 5) Report of Student Academic Guidance and Registration Committee
(Clyde A. Painter)
- 6) Report by Dr. Clyde Vanaman on Proposed Ohio Faculty Senate
- 7) Old Business
- 8) New Business
- 9) Remarks by President Albert L. Pugsley

SENATE MINUTES
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
Friday, April 4, 1969

PRESENT: Mrs. Niemi, Mrs. Bridgham, Mr. Gay, Miss Pfau, Mrs. Miner, Mrs. Dykema, Mr. Hurd, Mr. Mavrigian, Mr. Grim, Mr. Fortunato, Mr. Boland, Mr. Evans, Mr. Miller, Mr. Young, Mr. Harris, Jr., Mr. Slavin, Miss Sterenberg, Mr. Roberts, Mrs. Turner, Mr. Paraska, Mr. Reilly, Mrs. Painter, Mr. Painter, Mr. D'Isa, Mrs. Cunningham, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Foster, Mr. Esterly, Mr. Rosenberg, Miss Boyer, Mr. Kiriazis, Mrs. Botty, Mr. Gillespie, Mr. Solomon, Jr., Mr. Cernica, Mr. Hare, Mr. Vanaman, Mr. Hahn, Mr. Dykema, Mr. Miner, Mr. Baker, Mr. Ives, Mr. Greenman, Mr. Tarantine, Mr. Pejack, Mr. Siman, Mr. Sorokach, Mr. Richley, Mr. Hotchkiss, Mr. Beckman, Mr. Letchworth, Mr. Naberezny, Mr. Jonas, Mr. Livosky, Mr. Carson, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Spiegel, Mr. Van Zandt, Mr. Mahadeviah, Mr. Kelley, Mr. Luginbill, Mr. Blue, Mr. Byo, Mr. Yozwiak, Mrs. Dehnbostel, Mr. Ahmed, Mr. Crisp, Mr. Earnhart, Mr. Foldvary, Mr. von Ostwalden, Mr. Rand, Mr. Behen, Mr. Elser, Miss Jenkins, Vice President Coffield and President Pugsley.

PRESIDING: PRESIDENT ALBERT L. PUGSLEY TIME: 4:00 p.m. (ES AUDIT.)

The President called for approval of the minutes of the previous Senate meeting (Friday, March 7, 1969). The Secretary called attention to a typographical error on page #11 of the minutes: In the paragraph starting with Summer Quarter - the word should be 'expectation' instead of 'exception'. Also, under COMMENTS on Page #3: Number 1: delete 'and changing it to six'. There being no further additions or corrections the minutes were then declared approved. The changes have been made in the minutes.

The Secretary, Vera Jenkins, reported the results of the voting on Motion I and Motion II (to amend the Constitution of the Faculty):

MOTION I: That the Constitution of the Faculty be amended by the substitution of the term "Executive Committee of the Senate" at all points where the term "Senate Council" or "Council" appears in the Constitution.

YES: 73. NO: 17. (A total of 90 ballots cast).
MOTION PASSED.

MOTION II: That the Constitution of the Faculty be amended so that Article III, Section 4, paragraph "a" shall read: "The Senate Council shall consist of nine members. The Senators of each of the Undergraduate Colleges and Schools of the University shall elect one of themselves as a Council member, and the Senate shall elect any additional members, as Council members-at-large. The

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.:

MOTION II CONT'D.: The Council members normally shall have terms of three years with three members to be selected annually at staggered intervals, in accordance with Bylaws."

YES: 88. NO: 2. (A total of 90 ballots cast).
MOTION PASSED.

Tellers for the election: James W. Kiriazis and Frank A. Fortunato, in presence of the Secretary. Miss Jenkins expressed her appreciation and thanks to the tellers for counting the ballots in this election.

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE:

Dr. David Behen, Chairman stated the Committee was working on several items, but had nothing specific to report at this time.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL:

Dr. Philip J. Hahn, Chairman made this report.

Dr. Hahn reminded Senate members of the election to be held in April. The Secretary stated the ballots would be out in a few days. The new Senate takes office at the May 2, 1969 meeting.

Before the May 2 Senate meeting the Senators of each of the following Schools: (School of Education, School of Engineering, and Technical and Community College) shall elect one of themselves as a Senate Executive Committee member.

Dr. Hahn reported the Senate Executive Committee is working on Committee appointments (for the coming school year), which they hope to have completed within a month. If members would like to serve on Committees it should be made known to the Senate Executive Committee. Committee forms have been distributed and many have been returned. If interested, please contact Mrs. Esther Niemi, for the forms.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:

This report was made by the Chairman, Dr. David Behen. The Academic Affairs Committee at their meeting moved unanimously to recommend to the Senate that it adopt the following policy statement:

MOTION: Dr. David Behen moved on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee that the Senate approve the following policy statement: IT IS UNIVERSITY POLICY THAT ALL OF A STUDENT'S GRADED WRITTEN WORK (INCLUDING FINAL EXAMINATION) OF ANY COURSE IS AVAILABLE TO HIM FOR INSPECTION.
Seconded. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

- COMMENTS:
- 1) Available for how long, Dr. Behen?
The above motion is just that it is available for him to inspect. The second motion will specify time.
 - 2) What about the maximum time?
The Committee took no action on this.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)
REPORT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CONT'D.:

COMMENTS CONT'D.:

3) The Economics Department has given Departmental examinations during this school year. It was their thought to possibly repeat the examination when using similar material. What would the thought be on this?

Dr. Behen stated the student's paper would be open for him to inspect. He might come to the office of his Instructor for this purpose.

Possibly some point in giving the same examination (Departmental examinations) at least within one year to check results.

Dr. Pugsley mentioned that any faculty member or department that uses the same questions more than once encourages certain practices which we could do without. Maybe final examination questions should be filed in the Library for resource material.

4) On Departmental test: one commented that students did not get any better grades the second time around; could not remember the questions when they got out of class.

5) In Foreign Languages one comment: Use standardized test at the end of the sequence (French), for example. Student could take same test several times but not improve. Student may come in and see what he did on his test and then the papers are burned.

MOTION: Dr. David Behen moved on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee that the Senate adopt the following statements concerning implementation of the previous Motion which passed unanimously:

(A) All members of the faculty, including Limited Service members, are under an obligation to implement this policy by retaining, for at least thirty (30) days after the close of the course, all such graded written work which has not previously been returned to the student.

(B) This policy is to be further implemented by including the Policy Statement in the YSU Bulletin (Catalog), by including statement (A) above in the YSU Faculty Handbook, and by effective action on the part of all Department Chairmen. Seconded. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMENTS: 1) One faculty member suggested Department Chairmen could turn the papers over to the Secretary of the Department.

2) Another thought it was too burdensome to give them to the Secretaries. The papers should be with the Instructor for consultation with the student, if necessary.

3) Make the tests available for inspection - have faculty members retain the papers in their offices.

4) Thirty (30) days isn't too long to keep the papers.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)

REPORT OF CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:

This report was given by the Chairman, Dr. Thelma Miner.

MOTION: Dr. Thelma Miner moved that the Senate approve a new course; Elementary Education 890 - Elementary Education Workshop - 3 q.h. This had already been approved by the Curriculum Committee. Seconded. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dr. Thelma Miner stated the rest of her report would be regarding certain basic curriculum requirements. She stated what is recommended by the University Curriculum Committee is to require all Youngstown State University students working for the B.A., B.S., B.S. in Ed., B.S. in B.A., B.E., Mus. B., degrees to take 58 quarter hours within Science and Mathematics, Social Studies, and Humanities (including Communication) but giving our students considerable freedom to choose among the offerings within the various disciplines. We are concerned with man's need to know.

(SEE ATTACHED SHEETS IN MINUTE BOOK FOR DETAILS OF REQUIREMENTS)

Dr. Miner stated an open hearing was held on Wednesday, April 2 at 4:00 p.m. in the ES Auditorium on this subject. She further stated the University was criticized by the North Central Accrediting team last year for the confusion in our basic curriculum requirements. We, ourselves, had already recognized the need for certain changes which were being debated by the Ad Hoc Committee at the time the Accrediting team made its criticisms.

The rationale behind this is to ask all students to take a certain number of hours in three (3) broad divisions. This will help the student to understand that he has a freedom of choice. It is hoped he will have a certain interest since he will have made his own choices. The variety of choices should help him find the major and minor he will do well in.

There was a strong plea from some at the open hearing that a sequence of courses in one of the Social Sciences be taken by the student rather than giving him the freedom that the proposal makes. There were good arguments on both sides.

Dr. Miner further stated: The Curriculum Committee, after the open hearing, discussed ways of presenting these recommendations to the Senate. It was unanimous (with one exception - as one member was out-of-town) that the Curriculum Committee ask the Senate to approve the following procedure: After full discussion, if the Senate does not vote to accept the recommendations in toto that the report then be returned to the Committee to give the Committee a chance to consider the comments made at the open hearing, comments at the Senate meeting today (if not passed), and those comments which will be made at further open hearings. This is proposed because attempting to amend these recommendations from the floor without time to consider the balance of one problem against another is unwise. The Curriculum Committee hopes the Senate will accept this particular set of recommendations. The Committee wants a full and open discussion and

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE) -

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)

REPORT OF CURRICULUM COMMITTEE CONT'D.:

in no sense a forced agreement.

MOTION: Dr. Thelma Miner moved that the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee, regarding the basic curriculum requirements, when presented at today's Senate meeting, be accepted by the Senate in toto after full discussion, or if a majority of Senate members are unable to approve these recommendations, that they be returned to the Committee for further study and open hearings.

Seconded. AYES HAVE IT. (TO FOLLOW THE PROCEDURE)

Dr. Pugsley commended the Curriculum Committee on this procedure. He also asked when this would become effective, if passed. Mrs. Miner said the Fall of 1970, if passed.

NOTE: Copies of the proposed recommendations regarding basic curriculum requirements were distributed to Senate members for consideration several days before this meeting, Friday, April 4, 1969.

MOTION: Dr. Thelma Miner moved that the Senate adopt the recommendations of the University Curriculum Committee regarding basic curriculum requirements in toto.

AYES: 41. NO'S: 27.

MOTION PASSED.

NOTE: (A lengthy discussion followed the presentation of the Motion by Dr. Thelma Miner - a summary of some of the comments are listed below and on the next page - after the results of the vote on the Motion above.)
(This was done to show result of vote without repeating the Motion.)

Summary of a few of the comments on basic curriculum requirements recommended by the University Curriculum Committee (as passed at today's Senate meeting):

1) After the open hearing meeting many faculty members were impressed with the commendable action at YSU and agreed that the curriculum needed overhauling. The Ad Hoc Committee has done its work well and they put many hours into their work. When faculty as a group tries to change something it ends up as a hodge-podge. Accept this one way or another. At the open hearing many spoke out in objection to certain features of the recommendations. Let us not destroy the findings of the open hearing or the Ad Hoc Committee. Defeat this Motion so it will go back to the Curriculum Committee for further study.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)

REPORT OF CURRICULUM COMMITTEE CONT'D.:

COMMENTS CONT'D.:

2) About 15 years ago, one Professor stated, he was on a Committee which attempted to revise the requirements in Science and General Education, etc. Much time was spent by many people working on this. What happened? It came before one Committee, before Faculty and then died a slow death. He spoke in support of today's procedure.

3) Highly unsatisfactory. Treatment of Humanities satisfies a group of people. As bad as it is we should adopt it.

4) Certain details of this document might be unsatisfactory to certain departments. What improvement could be achieved by sending it back to the Committee?

5) Many on faculty who felt that a number of hours in Social Science, Economics, (student may take 2 or 3 courses); gets a "D" in one, then perhaps he would take a course in Psychology or one in History; thought that perhaps an "x" number of hours was fine if it provided for lumping. There must be some guidance. Some favored the elective system. Some liked the present system.

6) One Department Chairman mentioned he thought there was a tremendous increase in the numbers of hours of Science for his Department as compared to other areas of study.

7) All that has been said here today was said in the Ad Hoc Committee meetings and the Curriculum Committee meetings. Came to this compromise solution.

8) Mrs. Miner stated new courses can be designed but they must go through the proper channels; Curriculum Committee welcomes them.

9) Going to lose considerable number of business students in the Social Science courses. An accounting major takes considerable hours in Economics. He will not have to take all the History courses or some of the others now.

10) School of Business Administration students take Economics courses now, but they can still take Economics courses in addition to those required, if desired. It varies in the degrees; can be additional requirements. No necessity to spell it out. The Departments may design courses of the survey type or appreciation type if they wish.

11) Another comment: Sociology course had to serve 2 objectives: (1) What was the course all about; and, (2) if one took Sociology might learn something about it and decide he wanted to major in it.

Appreciates the flexibility of the kind of curriculum revision we have been talking about at this meeting. An opportunity for the student to test himself in areas and find out what his interests are. It turns out (for example) he likes Economics, but he also has many more hours left to take and might drift over into some other field.

12) One Dean mentioned he was willing to go along with the proposal. Only asking for 58 hours; freedom of choice a good thing.

It is necessary for us to adapt to the Quarter System philosophy.

13) The 58 hours of general requirements is only 33% of the total hours. The National average is about 37%. Some Committee members wanted it higher. The average is already so shamefully low this 33% will make it lower. The faculty member thought it should be closer to 90 quarter hours or 50%.

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)

REPORT OF CURRICULUM COMMITTEE CONT'D.:

COMMENTS CONT'D.:

14) A great advantage to many of us. A Department might want their majors to have (for example) 9 hours in one Department.

15) We are talking about a proposal. We have heard it argued today that we should accept it for many reasons. Thinks it should go back to the Committee and then to the next Senate meeting.

16) We should try something we can change. Nothing in this proposal that forbids future change.

NOTE: (Refer to middle of page #5 of minutes for passage of Motion).

On page #3 of the recommendations of the University Curriculum Committee was one regarding Health and Physical Education. It is to reduce the required Quarter Hours in Health and Physical Education activities from 6 quarter hours to 3 quarter hours, to go into effect in the Fall of 1969.

Mrs. Miner moved for approval of the above recommendation. (It was included with the rest of the recommendations but many did not notice it since it was at the top of the last page by itself).

Seconded. AYES HAVE IT.

REPORT OF ATHLETIC COUNCIL:

This report was made by Dr. Clyde Vanaman, Chairman. The Athletic Council Actions and Recommendations are not subject to Motion but presented merely as recommendations.

1. "It was agreed by the council that there be continuous planning for additional intercollegiate sports programs and that a recommendation be made that the administration explore the possibilities of enlarging the intercollegiate sports program as facilities and funding become available.

2. It is further recommended that two (2) Alumni representatives, excluding faculty, staff, and administration, be appointed to the Athletic Council by the President from a list of ten (10) Alumni to be submitted to the President by the Athletic Council.

3. The Athletic Council is appreciative of the greatly improved housing situation for athletes and commends the University Administration for this improvement. The Council has received many favorable comments on the action of the Administration on this.

4. It is recommended that a Sports Information Director be employed by the University.

5. That a study be undertaken by the Director of Institutional Research for the purpose of devising an NCAA approved institutional table to determine entrance requirements for athletes to be granted aid.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)
REPORT OF ATHLETIC COUNCIL CONT'D.:

6. It is recommended that a study to determine the possibility of the formation of an organization to support the Athletic Program of the University at the Alumni and Community level be undertaken by appropriate University Staff members."

REPORT OF STUDENT ACADEMIC GUIDANCE AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE:

This report was made by the Chairman, Clyde A. Painter.

"The Student Guidance and Registration Committee submits the following to be considered by the Senate:

RE: Change of registration procedure and of Registration Forms. Page 48, 1968-69 Catalog: to delete contradictions. There is an inconsistency between the University catalog description for Change of Registration and the Application for Change of Registration Form; "to alter schedule" is interpreted as any change, either adding or dropping a class.

RECOMMENDATION: that the term "teacher or teachers concerned" be deleted from paragraph one, CHANGE OF REGISTRATION, page 48, of the 1968-69 catalog.

RECOMMENDATION: that a copy of CHANGE OF REGISTRATION be sent to the pertinent Department Chairman for distribution to the Instructor.

RE: GENERAL REGULATIONS

SCHEDULING OF COURSES: ADVISEMENT, page 46, 1968-69 Catalog.

The Committee feels that there should be a revision of general regulations to arrive at some recommended terminology to separate the two functions of advisement and scheduling.

RECOMMENDATION: that "and advisement" be deleted from paragraph two, Scheduling of Courses: Advisement, page 46, 1968-69 Catalog.

RECOMMENDATION: that the functions of scheduling and advisement be physically separated.

RE: CANDIDACY FOR A DEGREE: ADMISSION TO THE UPPER DIVISION, page 49, 1968-69 Catalog.

Since instructions as given are not adhered to, it seems advisable to either delete or to clarify this information.

RECOMMENDATION: That some action be taken to delete or to clarify requirements for application to Upper Division as outlined on page 49, 1968-69 Catalog. The Committee prefers deletion.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)

REPORT OF STUDENT ACADEMIC GUIDANCE & REGISTRATION COMMITTEE CONT'D.:

RE: Charge to the Student Academic Guidance and Registration Committee.

RECOMMENDATION: revision of charge to this Committee to read as follows:

"To determine policies and advise on procedures for the academic advisement and registration of students." (This merely deletes the term "academic guidance" that formerly preceded the terminology "academic advisement".)

NOTE: If this recommendation is accepted, the title for this Committee will, of necessity, need to be changed.

This Committee would like to present these "general points" from Dr. George E. Letchworth, Director of YSU Counseling Center, concerning academic advisement:

RESOLVED: That each academic Dean will be responsible for developing a program of advisement, for the entire Quarter, appropriate to his School. (There is a distinction drawn here between advisement and registration).

- (A) We feel that it is important for each student to be assigned a specific advisor who would be responsible for maintaining the student's records and signing all appropriate forms. If possible, one advisor should assist the student throughout his College career.
- (B) Although students should be encouraged to select a major as early as possible, the student should not be pressured to make this decision prematurely. To this end, each School, with the possible exception of Music and Graduate School, should have general academic advisors. These advisors would adhere to the same principles as in paragraph (A). It is hoped that the student will be able to choose his major by the last Quarter of his Sophomore year.
- (C) Some guidelines should be established for the maximum number of advisees assigned to each advisor.
- (D) Some attention should be given to innovative programs which increase the amount of personal contact between the student and his advisor.
- (E) All seniors should be advised by Department Chairmen."

No action on any of the above needed as these were presented as Resolutions from the Student Academic Guidance and Registration Committee.

Many asked for a copy of Mr. Painter's Report. It is incorporated in the Minutes of today's meeting and will be distributed.

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)

REPORT ON PROPOSED OHIO FACULTY SENATE:

This report was given by Dr. Clyde Vanaman (School of Education). Dr. Vanaman was appointed to represent Youngstown State University at a meeting on March 8, 1969 as a member of a Steering Committee for a proposed Inter-University Senate. A Sub-Committee of the Steering Committee will draft a Constitution to be submitted to the Senate of each State School prior to any commitment for membership in an Inter-University Senate.

"Dr. Vanaman reported the initial meeting of the proposed Ohio Faculty Senate, was Saturday, February 1, 1969 at Bowling Green State University. Good representation at Bowling Green from the Universities.

Purpose of this meeting: Called for purpose of forming an Inter-University Faculty Senate for the State of Ohio.

Discussed at this meeting were:

- 1) Immediate issues.
- 2) Basic purposes and long-range goals to be achieved by a State-wide assembly of faculty.
- 3) Structure and organization of a Senate.

Two (2) Committees were formed as a result of this meeting:

- 1) A Steering Committee composed of one (1) person from each School whose responsibility it would be to further the idea of the Senate.
- 2) A Constitution-writing Committee to work closely with the Schools and the Steering Committee.

A second meeting of the Ohio Faculty Senate Steering Committee was held on Saturday, March 8, 1969 at Clark County Technical Institute in Springfield, Ohio.

Actions at this meeting:

- 1) Constitution and Bylaws to be distributed between March 29 and April 5 for representative discussion.
- 2) A State Constitutional Committee of the whole to meet Friday, May 2, 1969 in Columbus. Delegations to that Committee to be chosen in accordance with the "Formula for Membership" described in the draft Bylaws. Youngstown State University to be entitled to three (3) representatives by this formula.
- 3) Members of the Steering Committee were requested to promote in every possible way the School's acceptance of the Ohio Faculty Senate."

(CONT'D. NEXT PAGE)

SENATE MINUTES CONT'D.: (Friday, April 4, 1969)
REPORT ON PROPOSED OHIO FACULTY SENATE CONT'D.:

COMMENTS:

- 1) Dr. Vanaman mentioned he had just received two (2) copies of the Constitution and Bylaws for Proposed Ohio Faculty Senate. It is a document which is rather extensive.
- 2) If this should take place, who would make the appointments? Dr. Philip J. Hahn stated the Executive Council could make the appointments. Depends upon the acceptance of the final Constitution, which will be some time in May. This may not take place this year.
- 3) What should be distributed prior to the May 2, 1969 Senate meeting?
The Preamble is important. The rest is a framework for representation.

The Secretary will distribute copies of the Preamble with the Minutes of this meeting.

OLD BUSINESS: NONE.

NEW BUSINESS: NONE.

President Albert L. Pugsley did not make any remarks due to the lateness of the hour.

Respectfully submitted,

Vera Jenkins
SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
SENATE MEETING

Friday, April 4, 1969

IN ATTENDANCE:

Esther Niemis
Catherine W. Bridgman
Thomas Gray
Margaret D. Ryan
Helma S. Miner
Christine R. Lykema
Raymond W. Kurl
Gus Mavrigian
John S. Drum
Frank J. Jantsch
John R. Beland
E. Hugh Evans
Warren Young
C. Earl Harris Jr.
M. Slavin
E. Sterenberg
S. L. Roberts
Mae Turner
N. Praska
E. T. Reilly

Earl Painter
Clyde A. Painter
Frank A. W. Ba
W. Coffield
J. Cunningham
Thad Dillon
Jack D. Foster
L. E. Esterly
Fred Rosenberg
Iris Baker
James W. Kiriazis
P. E. Batty
John P. Gillespie
Guy R. Sloman
John H. Currier
Robert H. Hare
Clyde Vanaman
K. W. Dykema
Ward Z. Miner
William C. Balay
David S. Ives

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

SENATE MEETING

Friday, April 4, 1969

IN ATTENDANCE CONT'D.:

M.H. Greenman
 Frank Tarantini
 Edwin R. Pejack
 Matthew Siman
 R.J. Sorokach
 V.A. Richley
 S.N. Hotchkiss
 Paul Beckman
 George E. Lethbride
 Jon Nabungay
 Ronald Jones
 Wm. Linsky
 Wm. Larson
 R. Kramer
 L.B. Spiegel
 Van Zandt
 Inally Mahadevigh
 George W. Kelley
 Paul E. Luginbill
 Fred Blue
 G. J. [unclear]
 B. J. Gyzwiak

Melva G. Dehnbastel
 J. Ahmed
 Mawin Chrisp
 Hyl J. Sankh
 Elmer Foldvary
 P. von Istwahlen
 Land
 Behan
 R. Donald Clery
 Vera Jenkins

MAR 25 1969

*Copy of Ballot
r.j.*

BALLOT FOR MOTION NUMBER I - TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

MOTION I

_____ YES
_____ NO

That the Constitution of the Faculty be amended by the substitution of the term "Executive Committee of the Senate" at all points where the term "Senate Council" or "Council" appears in the Constitution.

MOTION II

_____ YES
_____ NO

That the Constitution of the Faculty be amended so that Article III, Section 4, Paragraph "a" shall read: "The Senate Council shall consist of nine members. The Senators of each of the Undergraduate Colleges and Schools of the University shall elect one of themselves as a Council member, and the Senate shall elect any additional members, as Council members-at-large. The Council members normally shall have terms of three years with three members to be selected annually at staggered intervals, in accordance with Bylaws.

NOTE: This ballot is to be returned in the envelope enclosed (SEALED) with your name written on the slip that is taped to the envelope.

Please return this to Miss Jenkins, Secretary of the Senate, Mailroom Box #457 - by WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2 at 4:00 p.m.

NO BALLOTS WILL BE COUNTED IF RECEIVED AFTER THAT TIME.

April 4, 1969

TO MEMBERS OF SENATE:

The University Curriculum Committee will hold an open hearing Wednesday, April 2 at 4:00 p.m. in the Engineering Science Auditorium, Room 273, to answer any questions you may have concerning the following recommendations. These recommendations will then be presented for approval at the Senate meeting, April 4, 1969. Anyone who is unable to attend the open hearing or the Senate meeting is welcome to write his comments to the Chairman of the University Curriculum Committee before April 4 or to discuss these proposals with any member of the committee.

There was a recognition at the time Youngstown University became Youngstown State University that certain changes should be made in basic curriculum requirements. During 1967-68 the ad hoc Curriculum Revision Study Committee worked on the problem and presented their recommendations to the University Curriculum Committee October 16, 1968. We agree with their principle that general education requirements should permit a considerable degree of choice on the part of the student. And in continuing the study we have made ourselves familiar with the problems of curriculum presented in Paul Woodring, The Higher Learning in America: A Reassessment, 1968; Paul L. Dressel and Frances H. DeLisle, Undergraduate Curriculum Trends, American Council on Education, 1969 (a study of curriculum changes during the decade 1957-67 in 322 institutions); Daniel Bell, The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia College Experience in Its National Setting, 1966; Liberal Learning for the Engineer, The American Society for Engineering Education, 1968; Michael Shugrue, English in a Decade of Change, 1968. We have studied the present basic curriculum requirements at the University of Akron, Bowling Green State University, the University of Cincinnati, Cleveland State University, Kent State University, Miami University, Ohio State University, Ohio University, Temple University, Wayne State University. We have talked with chairmen of departments at Youngstown State University. We are acutely aware that there is no perfect pattern--there are many good ones--and the variations depend upon such matters as the objectives of any particular institution, the selectivity of the student body. We have made out trial schedules; we have individually written out and re-written various possible and impossible patterns. We have informally polled our own students and have had the advantage of the opinions of the student members of the committee who also report other student opinions. We have argued loud and long and we have now come to agreement.

What we recommend is to require all Youngstown State University students working for the B.A., B.S., B.S. in Ed., B.S. in B.A., B.E., Mus.B. degrees to take 58 q.h. within Science and Mathematics, Social Studies, and Humanities (including Communication) but giving our students considerable freedom to choose among the offerings within the various disciplines. We are concerned with man's need to know.

NOTE: April 4, 1969 Senate meeting. The Senate adopted the ² recommendations of the University curriculum committee regarding basic curriculum requirements in toto.

AYES: 41. NO'S, 27. MOTION PASSED.

V. Jenkins Secy

Specifically we recommend:

16 q.h. Science (Astronomy, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Physics) and Mathematics to be taken in a minimum of two departments. This requirement can be fulfilled by taking any 4 of the new* science courses, or by any 3 of the new science courses plus a Mathematics course, or by a pattern of the traditional science sequences and/or Mathematics courses.

*Each of the science departments (Astronomy, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Physics) has agreed to set up a new 4 q.h. course designed for the non-science major, using new presentations in order to give the student some knowledge of the vitally important developments in the sciences and an introduction to the scientist's apprehension of and approaches to our environment.

20 q.h. Social Studies (Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology) to be taken in a minimum of two departments.

22 { 12 q.h. Communication 4+4+4 with the use of proficiency tests and/or an example of the student's writing which, with proven capability, will exempt him from one or more of the communication courses.
10 q.h. Humanities (Literature courses in English or in a foreign language, Philosophy and Religion, history and/or appreciation courses in Art, Music, Speeah and Drama, Humanities courses.)

58 q.h. total

We recommend that these 58 q.h. basic curriculum requirements go into effect September 1970 after having been published in the 1970-71 catalog. For comparison with the above recommendations, our present basic curriculum requirements are:

B.A. 60 q.h.
B.S. 50 q.h.
B.S. in Ed. 58 q.h.
B.S. in B.A. 58 q.h.
B.E. 56 q.h.
Mus. B. 54 q.h.

Certain degrees have additional requirements. For example, the B.S. in Ed. will continue to require certain specific courses to meet state certification requirements and the B.A. and B.S. degree will continue to include the language requirements.

NOTE: April 4, 1969 Senate meeting. The Senate adopted the recommendations of the University curriculum committee regarding basic curriculum requirements in toto.
AYES: 41. NO'S: 27. MOTION PASSED.

v. Jenkins Secy.

One further recommendation the University Curriculum Committee makes is to reduce the required quarter hours in Health and Physical Education activities from 6 q.h. to 3 q.h. to go into effect in the fall of 1969.

And, finally, the University Curriculum Committee has approved one new course: Elementary Education 890 Elementary Education Workshop 3 q.h.

Prerequisites: Junior or Senior standing.

Description: A workshop which provides intensive study and related activity in one of the following elementary curricular areas: arithmetic, science, reading, social studies, or language arts.

Reasons for Proposal: Makes it possible for the University to use lecturers, specialized materials and funds available from Federal Government for workshop purposes only; provides a means of inservice training for public school teachers.

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Thelma Miner (Chairman) | Jane Maloney |
| David Ammons | Matthew Siman |
| Paul E. Beckman | John F. Walter |
| E. Mark Evans | Pete Wilms |
| Sister Agnes J. Lavin | Bernard J. Yozwiak |
| Emily P. Mackall | |
| Inally Mahadeviah | |

University Curriculum Committee

C & R
Committee

From the Ad Hoc Committee on Drafting
A Constitution and Rules of the I-IFS

Adopted by the Steering Committee
On an I-IFS -- 3/8/69

PREAMBLE
to the
Constitution and Bylaws
of the
Ohio Faculty Senate
(ENABLING RESOLUTION)

- Whereas, Faculties of the state colleges and universities of Ohio are concerned with the promotion of excellence in higher education in Ohio; and
- Whereas, Faculties of the state colleges and universities of Ohio are enjoined and responsible to participate in the adequate governance of institutions of higher education in Ohio; and
- Whereas, Faculties of the state colleges and universities of Ohio are enjoined and responsible to promote and protect the most efficient and effective use of facilities and resources of higher education in Ohio; and
- Whereas, Faculties of the state colleges and universities of Ohio are enjoined and responsible to advise and respond to solicitations and judgments of the Board of Regents of the state system of higher education in Ohio; and
- Whereas, Faculties of the state colleges and universities of Ohio are desirous of having awareness of and responses to their collective opinions, judgments, needs, and insights disseminated as widely and effectively as possible in the State of Ohio;
- Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that the faculties of the state colleges and universities of the State of Ohio, acting through such representative bodies as they deem expedient, establish, support, and promote a state-wide representative body to act deliberately in their behalf to assist the causes related in the separate paragraphs of this resolution and that it be structured and empowered as specified in the official documents hereinafter referred to as the Constitution and Bylaws of the Ohio Faculty Senate.

rmb

PROPOSAL
From the Ad Hoc Committee
To Draft a Constitution
For an Inter-Institutional
Faculty Senate of Ohio
3/8/69

Reviewed, Amended and Approved
By the Steering Committee
On an I-IFS -- 3/8/69

(Proposed)

CONSTITUTION
of the
OHIO FACULTY SENATE

ARTICLE I
NAME

The name of the organization created by this constitution and its bylaws shall be known as THE OHIO FACULTY SENATE also designated by the acronym OFS.

ARTICLE II
PURPOSES

The Ohio Faculty Senate shall strive in all reasonable and deliberate ways to achieve the following purposes:

1. Concerted action in appropriate settings to achieve excellence in all facets of higher education in Ohio;
2. Promotion of faculty welfare in the public institutions of higher education in Ohio;
3. Promotion of student welfare in the public institutions of higher education in Ohio;
4. Consensus regarding the dominant opinions, intentions, and/or interests of the faculties of the public institutions of higher education in Ohio;
5. General and effective dissemination and use of advice from the faculties of the public institutions of higher education in Ohio;
6. Collation and study of facts relating to higher education in Ohio;
7. Widespread dissemination of information about the needs, opportunities, responsibilities, and plans of higher education in Ohio;
8. Review of any and all matters deemed important to the faculties of the public institutions of higher education in Ohio;

9. Representation to, liaison, and cooperation with the several agents, agencies, and/or bodies concerned with and responsible for matters of higher education in Ohio and elsewhere.

ARTICLE III
MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Classes of Institutions Eligible

The Ohio Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members of public universities, colleges, community and/or technical colleges offering higher education in the State of Ohio and reporting to the Board of Regents.

Section 2. Number of Voting Members

Voting membership in the Ohio Faculty Senate shall at no time be less than forty (40) nor larger than one hundred (100), unless specifically provided for by amendment to this constitution and its bylaws.

Section 3. Voting Membership

Voting membership in the OFS shall consist of representative faculty members duly elected by their institutional faculties, senate, or councils in accord with proportional figures (see BYLAWS, Article III) of FTE student members within the institution represented and its branches plus an irreducible membership of one per institution and/or branch.

Section 4. Formulas for Membership

Specific designation of the numbers of members in the OFS shall be by constant formulas established by the Senate. The formula for designation of membership shall be reviewed periodically by the Senate and, if necessary, revised in the appropriate article of the BYLAWS. The ~~Executive~~ Committee of the OFS may initiate proposals for reapportionment.

Proposed CONSTITUTION of the OFS -- 3/8/59

Section 5. Enlargement or Reapportionment of Membership

Membership in the Ohio Faculty Senate shall be enlarged or reapportioned in an appropriate and fair manner at the discretion of the Senate by the process of specific amendment. At no time shall an institution represented in the Senate be disenfranchised, unless by reclassification of institutions. Petitions for membership shall be filed with the secretary of the OFS subsequent to ratification of this constitution and bylaws by charter members.



YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44503

March 24, 1969

Memo to: All Members of the Senate

Dear Colleagues:

At the Faculty Senate meeting of Friday, March 7, I promised to you that I would send a copy of the Chancellor's presentation of testimony relating to the faculty work week bill. This is enclosed. When one relates the figures shown for the Youngstown State University to those for other institutions one should remember the following differences:

1. The inclusion of the services of limited service teaching faculty members in this University is computed on a basis of 15 credit hours per FTE faculty member and as a result increases the average teaching load recorded.
2. The comparisons include graduate work if present in the institution. The impact of doctoral programs and master's programs is substantial in some schools. Our figures include no master's level work since the data are for the fall of 1967.
3. The 1967 figures do not recognize the large number of positions added since that time with consequent reduction in loads.
4. Our class sizes are smaller than most.

A final factor which should be taken into account is the general distribution of time which reveals only 14½% of faculty services at this institution devoted to advising, departmental research, public service and administration. When these services are not rendered to the same degree as in other institutions, proportional higher faculty loads may be expected because more time is available for the teaching function.

Cordially,


A. L. Pugsley

ALP/slh

Enclosure

FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY

A report prepared by the
Ohio Board of Regents
February, 1969

FOREWORD

During the current fiscal year, Ohio's state universities, taken together, have budgeted expenditures of more than \$280 million for their instructional programs and for the general operation of their campuses. This does not include those functions such as dormitories, dining halls and student unions which are designed to be self-supporting. Neither does it include research projects which are supported by special grants and contracts of governmental or private sponsors.

It does include the operation of the academic plants and the various offices involved with student affairs, such as the Registrar's Office, the Admissions Office and the several Deans of Students. It also includes the operation of libraries and of the various administrative offices such as those of the President, the Vice-Presidents, and the Business Office. But the largest single commitment in these \$280 million spending plans is to the various instructional departments. More than 60 percent of all spending will take place in the instructional departments, and at some universities this percentage may run as high as 70 percent.

Clearly, if the Board of Regents, the Governor and the General Assembly are to understand the financial operations of the state universities, they must understand a good deal about the costs of the instructional departments. Data available to the Board of Regents show that spending requirements within various instructional departments will be very different depending upon the nature of the instruction which is organized there. However, if all departments are taken together, about 20 percent of spending will support the salaries of administrative and clerical persons who support the regular instructional staff, and about 15 percent will go toward equipment and general supply items. Clearly the major expenditures, about 65 percent of all departmental spending, will be for faculty salaries.

The amount of money which must be spent on faculty salaries is determined by two factors; the level of salary payments which a university establishes and the number of faculty persons required to carry out a given academic program. The first of these, the level of salary payments made, is determined essentially by the supply and demand market within which faculty persons move, and by the ability of a university to support a given salary structure. The second factor, the number of faculty persons required to carry out a given academic program, depends upon the productivity of those faculty persons engaged in carrying out the program.

All of the various factors which determine the costs of operating a university and its instructional departments properly fall within the scrutiny of the Legislature and of appropriate governmental officials who deal with the budgetary process. The Board of Regents is systematically studying these various factors in its Uniform Information System, which encompasses all state colleges and universities. One of the most difficult of these factors to come to grips with is the matter of faculty productivity, and the report which follows will concentrate upon that one factor.

Faculty productivity is a complex matter, both because the missions of universities are complex and because the professional character of the educational enterprise has not given rise to productivity standards which are easily quantified. Indeed, many aspects of excellence in professional

performance may be incapable of quantification or may even be at odds with "production" in its popular sense. But universities are enterprises for which operational plans must be made, and for which budgets must be built if appropriate funding is to be made available. It is fitting, therefore, that as clear an understanding as possible be developed concerning the productivity of the most expensive single resource utilized in the university enterprise - the professional faculty member. This paper sets out to develop such an understanding.

FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY

The individual faculty member is the production element through which universities seek to reach their goals. To consider the productivity of these persons necessarily requires a recognition of just what those goals are.

University Goals

Universities describe their goals as three-fold; and their organizations, financing, and assignment of staff resources very clearly reflect those goals:

1. The preservation of man's accumulated wisdom and the communication of knowledge to new generations.
2. The extension and continual reevaluation of knowledge.
3. The provision of public services which are closely related to a university's store of knowledge.

The first of these goals is fundamental to the instructional programs which universities organize, and which may in the public view sometimes appear to be the single function of a university.

The second goal is expressed in the research programs which the universities support; both the personal research of individual faculty members and the very complex programs of research centers employing hundreds of persons.

The public service goal is expressed not simply through the value of educated persons moving out into the society, but through the results of research which has economic value to the nation's public and private enterprises, the provision of expert consultative services in virtually every area of man's activities, the conduct of professional practice by various university faculty members, and the provision of cultural experiences and entertainment activities which grow out of a university's total program.

University leaders assert that these three goals do not represent a simple selection of several desirable programs from among a larger list of functions which an institution might set out to perform. Rather, the three have evolved as functions which are fundamental to the educative process which universities have sought to sustain, and are mutually supportive. No one of these goals can be fully realized except as a university also gives attention to the others.

The Personal Character of University Organization

All of a university's major services would appear in the last analysis to be based upon wisdom and understanding in some field or another of human concern, and wisdom and understanding are individualized characteristics of men's minds. While selected stores of factual knowledge can be retained in libraries for the benefit of students, the wisdom and understanding which inspires learning, which makes possible the extension of knowledge, and which makes knowledge valuable in its application to society's problems can only exist

within a man's mind. This fact is critical to an understanding of faculty productivity, because it explains why so many of a university's varied functions call upon the personal services of the same individual faculty persons. Where in many private and public enterprises specialists can be assigned to concentrate on one or another division of the organization's work, this has been much less feasible in university management. It has not been possible to organize instruction, research, and public service functions as clearly separate from each other.

Not only do the various major functions of a university frequently require the services of the same individual faculty persons, but the updating of professional skills and the scholarly expertise of a faculty person requires involvement in the various functions of the university. Teachers can remain current in their fields only by continuous contact with the scholarship of that field and frequently through personal involvement in professional practice or research. Faculty members engaged in public service functions such as consultation and professional practice can frequently remain of value only to the extent they are closely attuned to research which is going on in their fields. Research itself is frequently stimulated by the experience of confronting students in the classroom or by confrontation with society's problems or a profession's practice in various public service activities. This is not to suggest, of course, that every faculty person must be involved in all functions of the university, or that all will be uniformly inspired to the same level of professional or scholarly achievement. It does suggest, however, that a study of faculty productivity must recognize the diversity of legitimate demands which are involved in any particular faculty person's assignment.

Diversity of Masters

It is important to establish also, that a measurement of faculty productivity should recognize the several masters which need to be served in scheduling faculty activities. Certainly the faculty person has a primary responsibility to effectively serve the university with which he contracts to work. This responsibility must be discharged through carrying out all duties agreed upon in his contract.

The faculty person also feels a strong responsibility to the profession in which he holds membership. These responsibilities are not essentially different from the professional obligations felt by physicians or lawyers to their professions, and which demand a certain participation beyond the confines of day to day employment or professional practice..

And, of course, the faculty person's assignment must satisfy the legitimate interests of the university's sponsors. In this respect the State of Ohio looms large as a sponsor and the social purposes which have caused the university to be created and supported must be effectively served. But the universities have other sponsors as well, such as the federal government and private donors who support research through grants and gifts, and the various sponsors of public services functions. These sponsors also make legitimate demands which require dedication of faculty time. No single sponsor can reasonably require that complete attention be given to his particular interests, to the exclusion of the interests of other sponsors.

Measures of Faculty Performance

All of the Ohio public colleges and universities seek in various ways to measure and to regulate for budgetary planning purposes the services expected of faculty members. Some institutions have adopted formal policy statements concerning institution-wide standards, but more have found standards useful only within individual instructional departments where the characteristics of a particular field of study can be reflected.

Various accrediting bodies also have been concerned with the development of standards of faculty performance and load within particular fields of study, and these standards are utilized in the judgments of quality made by visitation teams from time to time. The judgments of such accrediting bodies are, of course, important to a university not only in determining its reputation among universities but its ability to attract financial support from sponsors of research or special programs who seek to support institutions of high quality.

The Board of Regents has devoted a considerable amount of time and effort during the past three years to gathering information concerning faculty productivity in Ohio's state-assisted colleges and universities. Careful attention has been given as well to reflecting reasonable expectations in the budget proposals made to the Governor and the General Assembly. Recommendations made to the General Assembly for operating appropriations to higher education during the 1967-1969 biennium were based upon a new concept in budgeting. Several model budgets were presented, each representing total expenditure requirements for serving students at a particular level of instruction. Model budgets were presented for Lower Division (freshman and sophomore) instruction, for Upper Division (junior and senior) instruction, for Masters level instruction, for Doctoral level instruction, and so forth. Expenditure requirements of all universities were related directly to these model budgets, depending upon the number of students which each university would plan to serve at each level of teaching. This same approach to recommending state appropriations for the universities is being used again by the Board of Regents for the 1969-1971 biennium, and proposed budget models for that period are included in the Appendix to this report.

A key component of each of these model budgets is a student-faculty ratio required for that particular level of study. The anticipated requirements for staffing are different for each level of instruction, and represent the Board of Regents' best judgment of needs during the budget period. Ratios used for the 1969-1971 budget proposals are as follows:

<u>Level of Instruction</u>	<u>Student-Faculty Ratio</u>
Lower Division	24/1
Technical Education	16/1
Baccalaureate-Professional and Upper Division	16/1
Masters and Graduate-Professional	12/1
Doctoral	10/1
Medical Professions	6/1

These student-faculty ratios have been established to reflect assumed levels of faculty productivity during the period of the budgets. Feeling that many variations from such norms within individual institutions and departments are essential in actually administering a program of instruction, the Board of Regents has not recommended that these ratios be applied as limitations in any particular case. The ratios do, however, determine the amount of appropriation support which a university will receive from the state. The Board has felt that the establishment of norms in determining financial support is the best possible way of assuring a reasonable overall level of productivity without unduly hampering the administration of instructional programs.

In order to establish student faculty ratios for purposes of budgetary recommendations, the Board of Regents has included within its broadly based Uniform Information System a number of data collections dealing with faculty productivity. The first step in the Board's study of productivity has been to separate faculty time spent on sponsored research and public service functions from time spent on the instructional program of a college or university. This has been done because the research and public service functions which are sponsored by donors other than the State of Ohio generally involve specific agreements or contracts which set up measures of expected results and performance of their own. These expected results are apart from whatever else a faculty person involved in such a contract might do for the university. While the faculty person's contract with the University will take into account his commitment to a specially funded project, the time which he spends on that project clearly is not available to the instructional program of the university and should not be included in a productivity study which deals primarily with the instructional program.

Instructional Service Analysis

Individual reports have been received by the Board of Regents concerning the services of all faculty persons within Ohio's system of state-assisted higher education. These data do not identify individual persons, but are sufficiently detailed as to make possible a rather comprehensive statistical review of how faculty time is spent throughout the system. For each faculty person, the universities have been asked to report the percentage of total working time spent on various formal assignments which the faculty member is expected to carry out. These dedications of time are to several standard activities defined within the data gathering procedure:

- Instruction
- Student Advising
- Departmental Research
- Public Service
- Administration

The Instruction category includes all activities related to organized class instruction or to the supervision of students engaged in individual study or research; including, preparation for classes, grading papers, student conferences connected with courses, laboratory set-up, supervision of teaching and non-teaching assistants, and that research which is necessarily a part of

preparation for classes and for good teaching. Within this category each person's time is apportioned among various levels of teaching depending upon the level of courses being taught.

The Student Advising category includes time spent in advising and counseling students apart from that advising which is associated with individual classes being taught.

The Departmental Research category includes faculty research which is supported by the instructional department's budget, either through money grants or released time, and does not include that research which is separately budgeted outside of the department and responsive to a sponsoring agency.

The Public Service category includes activities generally of a public service nature, such as extension services or non-degree credit instruction, which are supported within the instructional department's budget. This would not include time spent on separately budgeted public service enterprises of the university which are organized apart from the instructional departments.

The Administration category includes formal assignments to administrative duties such as departmental chairmen, placement services, policy and curriculum committees, faculty council participation, etc. General activities associated with supervising and carrying out assigned courses would not be included as administration assignments.

Detailed data concerning Instructional Service breakdowns for individual institutions and in various fields of instruction are included in the Appendix to this report. The overall conclusion of this part of the Board of Regents' study is that faculty time is actually devoted to various activities as follows:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Time</u>
Instruction	74%
Student Advising	3
Departmental Research	7
Public Services	3
Administration	3
	<u>100%</u>

These percentages, drawn from the detailed reports of eleven of Ohio's state universities, indicate that nearly three quarters of all faculty time which is supported by instructional budgets is related directly to classroom teaching assignments. The remaining one quarter is devoted to other services which are expected of the faculty persons within the terms of their contracts; equal amounts going to assigned duties in Student Advising, Departmental Research, and Administration, and 3% to approved public services.

Faculty Load Analysis

In addition to studies of the ways in which faculty services are apportioned among various activities, the information gathered by the Board of

Regents is also designed to deal with the specific loads and teaching productivity involved within the Instruction activity. Study has gone into determining norms or averages within the 74% of total time devoted to Instruction in the analysis reported above.

Little general agreement exists concerning just what measures of instructional productivity are useful in this type of study. Three particular measures have been used by the Board of Regents in order to gain a reasonably balanced insight into instructional productivity; Course Credit Hours Assigned, Weekly Contact hours, and Student Credit Hours taught.

In this context, Course Credit Hours Assigned means the total course credit value of all instructional classes for which a faculty member is responsible, excluding credit hours for thesis supervision and individual study courses. This particular measure is probably the most widely used for representing faculty load, and is frequently used by the universities themselves in discussion of general expectations regarding faculty contracts. It is a measure which has several weaknesses, however, especially in measuring loads involved with individual tutorial work and in courses which involve substantial amounts of non-credit laboratory instruction in addition to lecture sections. In both cases, this particular measure may grossly distort the actual load carried by a faculty person.

Weekly Contact Hours means the number of hours each week during which a faculty person actually meets students in regularly scheduled instructional sessions. This measure treats more equitably the problems involved with individual instruction and laboratory instruction, because contact with students is recorded whether or not the system of assigning degree credits happens to award credit for a particular regularly scheduled meeting. This measure, however, does not recognize special preparation which may be required in offering instruction to especially large groups such as television lectures and demonstrations, or the number of "preparations" for different courses involved in a faculty person's load. Neither Weekly Contact Hours nor Course Credit Hours Assigned gives any recognition to the size of classes taught.

Student Credit Hours taught reflects the sizes of different classes for which a faculty person is responsible, in that it records the total of all credits earned by students in a given class. Using this measure of productivity, a three credit hour lecture course attended by 100 students would be counted as 300 student credit hours taught. If a faculty person taught three such courses his productivity would be recorded as 900 student credit hours.

Detailed data concerning Faculty Load breakdowns for individual institutions and in various fields of study are included in the Appendix to this report. The overall conclusion of this part of the Board of Regents' study is that faculty loads may be very broadly characterized as follows:

<u>Measure of Load</u>	<u>Average Load</u>
Course Credit Hours Assigned	11 Hrs.
Weekly Contact Hours	13 Hrs.
Student Credit Hours Taught	330 Hrs.

These averages, drawn from the detailed reports of eleven of Ohio's state universities, indicate that the average faculty load is eleven hours of courses taught, that the average number of hours of weekly contact with students is thirteen, and that the average productivity in terms of student credit hours taught is 330. No one of these measures is sufficient in itself to explain faculty load or performance, nor does any one of the measures describe the obligations of a faculty person falling outside of his specific Instruction assignment.

It is important to point out, also, that neither the very brief summary of Instructional Service Analysis data and Faculty Load Analysis data presented above, nor the more detailed reports included in the Appendix, reflect service and load variations among different levels of instruction or various ranks of faculty persons. Data bearing on these differences are also collected as a part of the Board of Regents' study but have not been presented as a part of this particular report. Very significant variations must be expected to exist between those faculty persons who devote most of their attention to teaching freshman and sophomore courses and those faculty members who are assigned primarily to the instruction of Masters and Doctoral level graduate students. Not only will the latter group be expected to meet students in smaller classes or in individual tutorial settings, but they may be expected to spend larger amounts of their time on scholarship and research, be more active in the policy affairs of their departments, and carry lighter teaching loads. It may be entirely to a university's advantage that the "production" of the most valuable faculty persons be rather low as that production is measured by the procedures described here. The great value of a particular faculty person's service may lie as much in the quality of his scholarship and research and in his stimulation to the level of performance of his whole department, as in his service to the students he meets.

A Composite Assignment

For purposes of generalization, however, it is possible to merge the conclusions of study done to date by the Board of Regents, and to describe a typical or composite performance. This composite is useful primarily for gaining a general insight into just what a representative instructional faculty assignment might entail.

Of a typical week (set at 40 hours for purposes of illustration), this assignment would include these components:

Instructional Activity	30 hours
Student Advising	3 hours
Departmental Research	3 hours
Public Services	1 hour
Administration	3 hours
	<u>40</u> hours

During the 30 hours devoted to instructional activities, this "typical" faculty person would teach 11 hours of course credit classes, would spend 13 hours in direct classroom contact with students, and the students enrolled in his classes would earn 330 hours of degree credits. In order to support his

13 weekly hours of direct classroom contact with students, the faculty member would spend 17 additional hours in preparation for classes, grading papers, conducting student conferences directly related to classroom work, laboratory set-ups, supervision of teaching and non-teaching assistants, and that research needed to directly support classroom teaching.

Assuming a typical student to be one enrolled for 15 credit hours of instruction, this represents an average student faculty ratio of 22/1.

Work being done to continually validate the budget models through which the Board of Regents describes expenditure needs of higher education follows this pattern of study. As was pointed out earlier, however, budget models have been devised separately for various levels of instruction and for broad groupings of instructional programs, in order that a more accurate portrayal of needs might be made.

Summary

The full-time member of the instructional staff of a state-assisted college or university assumes an obligation of responsible service to the institution which contracts with him for his professional activity and to the profession which he has undertaken. These two obligations are not conflicting but are mutually supportive. The college or university faculty member indeed has membership in two professions: the academic profession comprised of all who serve higher educational institutions and the individual profession of the field of knowledge or of the field of professional practice in which he has achieved his personal competence.

The full-time member of the instructional staff of a state-assisted college or university has several duties to perform which are implied or which are explicitly stated by the contract of service annually entered into by the instructor and the institution. These duties include classroom, laboratory, and tutorial instruction; student advising or consultation; research; public service or professional continuing education, and participation in university administration. It is generally assumed that the fulfillment of these varied activities, as with any professional person, will require not less than forty hours per week during the period of contract service, which is usually a period of nine months.

In general the prevailing classroom and laboratory instructional load of a full-time member of the instructional staff is about twelve credit hours of formal instruction per week. This entails twelve to fifteen hours per week in the classroom and laboratory. Tutorial instruction is usually handled on a similar or equivalent basis of credit hour registration. The customary expectation is that about two hours per week are required for preparation, student evaluation, and student consultation for each hour of classroom and laboratory activity. The remainder of the work week will be spent in such university activities as administration (departmental meetings, college meetings, faculty meetings, and committee meetings), continuing education, and research. Ordinarily, the professional work week of the college or university instructor, like the work week of professional practitioners generally in the United States, exceeds 40 hours and is likely to run to 60 hours or more.

There are two additional aspects of the professional contract arrangements with full-time faculty which require special consideration. One of these is the matter of research activity. The other is the matter of employment outside the college or university. On both of these certain general standards of practice should prevail.

Insofar as research activity is concerned, it is expected that instructional staff members may desire from time to time to have concentrated periods of time available for this work with reduced instructional and other time obligations. This interest on the part of instructional staff may be accommodated in several ways. When a faculty member obtains special financial support for his research activity, his instructional obligation may be reduced with the research fund assuming a proper proportion of the contract compensation. He may devote all of one or more quarters of an academic year to research with the entire compensation drawn from special research funds. And a college or university may find resources from its general funds or outside sources to permit designated staff members from time to time to devote more

time to research and creative activity. Such activity is a proper effort of members of the instructional staff.

Many faculty members find themselves in demand for activity beyond that to which they are obligated by terms of their professional contract. They may be asked to perform part-time instructional service in another college or university. They may be asked to perform in-service training activity for others in their same profession. They may be asked to perform consulting service for other colleges and universities, for business firms, for government, for voluntary groups.

In general, such outside activity by a full-time member of the instructional staff is advantageous both to the individual and to the institution. It brings the faculty member into intimate contact with the practical problems of his professional field of specialization. It enlarges the effective scope of effort undertaken by the institution. It may advance the reputation of the staff member and the institution, and may enlarge the placement opportunity for students. All of these advantages arise, of course, only when the outside activity is directly related to the professional competence of the faculty member.

The prevailing limitation upon such outside activity by a full-time member of the instructional staff is that not more than one full day out of each work week may be devoted to such outside activity. The enforcement of this limitation rests first upon the ethical responsibility of a professional faculty member, together with such periodic review as may seem appropriate to department chairmen and other officers of academic administration within the college or university.

So far as control over such matters as faculty contract and productivity are concerned, it would appear that the State's financial interests can be adequately served through the budgetary process, without unduly hampering the direct administration of instructional programs. The budgetary procedures now in effect, through use of expenditure models based upon specific productivity assumptions, present a direct method of asserting the State's concerns with matters of productivity. Research now being done under the auspices of the Board of Regents promises to develop increasingly meaningful data concerning all aspects of higher educational cost, and should more and more become the basis for financial decisions concerning the State's support of higher education.

Appendix A

Instructional Service Analysis
 Percentage of Time Spent by Ranked Faculty on Various Assignments
 Fall Term, 1967

	<u>UA</u>	<u>BGSU</u>	<u>UC</u>	<u>CLEVE</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>MU</u>	<u>OSU</u>	<u>OU</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>YSU</u>
Humanities											
Instruction	69.8	38.1	79.2	87.9	67.6	81.0	72.5	70.9	70.9	76.3	88.7
Advising	6.5	2.1	9.7	3.6	9.9	6.8	3.8	10.5	3.8	10.6	5.0
Departmental Research	9.1	2.5	4.3	.5	9.2	2.1	11.5	7.8	12.5	7.6	.8
Public Service	7.1	2.9	2.2		3.7	2.6	4.4	1.9	1.1	2.3	1.9
Administration	7.5	4.4	4.7	8.0	9.6	7.5	7.7	8.9	11.7	3.1	3.6
Sciences											
Instruction	79.1	87.9	61.8	86.6	56.5	71.5	61.4	64.4	67.8	62.8	88.1
Advising	4.6	2.2	12.3	2.8	8.7	8.0	7.8	9.8	2.2	7.8	5.5
Departmental Research	8.9	5.7	15.7		19.2	9.1	14.6	15.7	20.2	21.5	1.3
Public Service	3.0	.4	1.8	.2	3.1	2.8	4.7	.8	1.2	2.7	.8
Administration	4.3	3.8	8.4	10.4	12.5	8.6	11.5	9.2	8.6	5.3	4.3
Social Sciences											
Instruction	81.4	86.3	68.6	82.1	65.9	69.5	60.9	68.2	77.1	66.9	86.5
Advising	8.8	2.6	15.6	6.1	11.6	11.6	9.7	10.7	3.3	18.2	8.6
Departmental Research	3.9	8.4	6.3	.3	9.9	7.2	12.1	10.3	9.4	9.8	.2
Public Service	2.9	.1	2.4		3.6	1.7	4.9	1.5	3.5	1.0	.4
Administration	2.9	2.6	7.2	11.5	9.0	10.0	12.4	9.2	6.8	4.0	4.4
Education											
Instruction	68.0	87.5	68.4	74.4	56.7	75.7	38.6	69.6	66.2	66.2	69.1
Advising	15.5	2.9	13.6	8.9	10.4	11.3	11.2	11.6	8.7	12.5	21.9
Departmental Research	2.0	1.0	1.8		3.7	1.8	7.1	6.4	10.9	6.4	1.0
Public Service	7.0	3.3	12.4	1.0	15.7	2.7	18.3	2.2	3.6	5.4	2.1
Administration	7.6	5.3	3.8	15.7	12.5	8.4	24.9	10.2	10.6	9.5	5.9

	<u>UA</u>	<u>BGSU</u>	<u>UC</u>	<u>CLEVE</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>MU</u>	<u>OSU</u>	<u>OU</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>YSU</u>
Engineering											
Instruction	75.7		66.3	86.9		80.9	65.5	70.3	71.2	84.0	77.4
Advising	7.0		11.8	5.3		7.4	6.5	11.4	10.6	2.7	13.8
Departmental Research	8.1		11.7			.2	5.4	4.6	6.5	3.2	1.2
Public Service	2.5		2.2			4.5	7.7	2.3	3.4		.6
Administration	6.7		8.0	7.8		7.0	14.8	11.5	8.4	10.1	7.0
Natural Resources											
Instruction	97.5	97.2	84.6		82.0	78.7	50.6	75.7			74.2
Advising	1.8	1.6	12.4		9.8	12.7	11.6	12.5			18.7
Departmental Research		.8			.8		8.3				
Public Service	.8				4.1	3.5	12.8	2.6			4.5
Administration		.4	3.0		3.3	5.2	16.6	9.3			2.6
Health Professions											
Instruction	25.8	93.7	67.0	37.0	87.0	64.2	69.0	81.9	45.1	30.0	82.3
Advising	7.2	2.2	14.1	4.5		13.5	5.7	7.9	4.5	5.0	4.8
Departmental Research	22.3		2.7		3.3	2.7	4.2	1.2	11.8	30.0	
Public Service	33.7	2.1	8.2			1.3	5.6	.7	3.8		1.2
Administration	11.1	2.0	8.1	58.5	9.7	18.3	15.5	8.3	34.7	35.0	11.7
Medicine and Dentistry											
Instruction			35.3				60.8				
Advising			10.3				7.4				
Departmental Research			15.7				8.4				
Public Service			24.7				6.0				
Administration			14.0				17.4				
General Education											
Instruction	86.3							84.7			11.8
Advising	5.1							5.9			.3
Departmental Research	1.5							.5			.2
Public Service	4.9							.6			.2
Administration	2.2							8.3			87.5

Page 3
Appendix A

	<u>UA</u>	<u>BGSU</u>	<u>UC</u>	<u>CLEVE</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>MU</u>	<u>OSU</u>	<u>OU</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>YSU</u>
Other Studies											
Instruction	55.2	100.0	75.7		75.2	85.2	67.2	85.0	67.1	100.0	75.7
Advising	5.0		8.9		10.2	2.9	4.4	7.5	3.1		
Departmental Research	17.7		5.1		4.4	2.4	14.1		16.0		
Public Service	4.1		2.8		4.5	.5	6.8	5.0	2.7		
Administration	18.0		7.5		5.7	9.0	7.6	2.5	11.0		24.3
All Faculty											
Instruction	75.2	88.5	64.9	84.3	65.8	75.5	62.5	69.8	70.8	69.6	85.5
Advising	6.9	2.3	11.7	4.4	9.4	8.9	7.2	10.5	5.1	11.4	7.6
Departmental Research	7.0	3.8	8.6	.2	9.3	4.3	9.7	8.7	10.5	11.6	.6
Public Service	5.4	1.7	6.9	.1	5.3	2.4	6.8	1.7	2.3	2.4	1.1
Administration	2.2	3.6	7.8	11.0	10.2	8.9	13.8	9.3	11.3	5.0	5.1

Appendix B

Faculty Load Analysis
Load Averages of Ranked Faculty
Fall Term, 1967

	<u>UA</u>	<u>BGSU</u>	<u>UC</u>	<u>CLEVE</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>MU</u>	<u>OSU</u>	<u>OU</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>YSU</u>
Humanities											
Credit Hours Assigned	12.0	16.7	12.5	11.4	12.7	11.6	8.7	9.7	10.8	10.7	12.8
Weekly Contact Hours	13.9	12.3	12.8	11.5	14.0	12.2	9.1	12.0	10.6	11.3	14.4
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	253	264	500	322	318	273	300	278	305	238	418
Sciences											
Credit Hours Assigned	9.6	15.4	10.0	9.3	12.0	10.2	5.8	8.6	8.6	5.0	12.6
Weekly Contact Hours	12.6	10.7	9.0	10.5	12.4	12.4	6.3	10.6	9.7	9.0	13.8
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	307	332	447	243	414	352	535	338	316	218	368
Social Sciences											
Credit Hours Assigned	10.3	11.5	10.3	11.2	11.0	10.8	8.4	8.8	10.0	9.1	12.8
Weekly Contact Hours	10.2	9.1	10.2	11.4	10.6	9.8	8.4	9.2	10.1	9.3	13.1
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	462	359	462	409	516	401	324	470	740	312	351
Education											
Credit Hours Assigned	10.9	17.2	9.6	9.4	13.3	11.9	9.4	8.6	10.9	9.3	12.1
Weekly Contact Hours	11.2	10.6	11.3	11.7	15.4	14.1	10.0	11.1	10.0	11.2	12.1
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	329	274	328	170	219	285	214	191	182	290	351
Engineering											
Credit Hours Assigned	9.0		8.4	8.8		12.0	6.7	8.9	8.3	6.4	10.5
Weekly Contact Hours	12.0		10.4	11.3		14.6	9.2	11.9	10.9	10.2	14.6
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	206		223	174		229	133	166	181	169	224
Natural Resources											
Credit Hours Assigned	11.5	10.1	9.8		13.2	12.9	7.9	11.7			10.1
Weekly Contact Hours	16.5	12.4	12.8		15.1	15.6	12.4	14.2			12.4
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	296	257	270		457	272	187	310			221

Page 2
Appendix B

	<u>UA</u>	<u>BGSU</u>	<u>UC</u>	<u>CLEVE</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>MU</u>	<u>OSU</u>	<u>OU</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>YSU</u>
Health Professions											
Credit Hours Assigned	6.0	8.0	6.3	4.8	8.0	7.5	3.8	8.0	9.8	6.7	12.1
Weekly Contact Hours	8.5	15.0	14.8	9.7	11.7	12.4	9.1	14.1	13.8	6.7	14.7
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	209	318	109	243	228	214	92	250	230	108	334
Medicine-Dentistry											
Credit Hours Assigned			5.7				6.2				
Weekly Contact Hours			12.3				10.8				
Student Credit Hrs. Taught			181				151				
General Education											
Credit Hours Assigned	10.9								11.6		28.6
Weekly Contact Hours	11.8								11.5		30.0
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	491								453		1000
Other Studies											
Credit Hours Assigned	6.2	25.2	8.2		8.5	10.9	5.8	15.5	8.2	12.0	10.0
Weekly Contact Hours	6.2	25.3	14.0		13.5	14.0	5.8	18.5	8.9	12.0	14.5
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	239	302	229		175	202	292	111	215	318	288
All Faculty											
Credit Hours Assigned	10.5	14.6	10.1	10.3	11.8	11.0	7.2	9.2	10.0	8.7	12.6
Weekly Contact Hours	12.3	11.4	11.6	11.2	13.1	12.1	8.9	11.4	10.6	10.2	13.8
Student Credit Hrs. Taught	341	301	387	297	350	309	248	304	385	252	368

F

MINUTES OF MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF YOUNGSTOWN STATE
UNIVERSITY SENATE HELD WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1969

The Executive Committee of the Youngstown State University Senate met on Wednesday, March 12, 1969, at 3 P.M. in Room 292 of the Engineering Science Building with Chairman Philip Hahn presiding. In the absence of the Secretary, Thaddeus Dillon was asked to serve as Acting Secretary for the meeting.

Dr. Hahn reported on the Student Code. It is to be considered by Student Council later this month. It was recommended that the next Senate meeting be held at the regular time, April 4, 1969. It may be necessary to have a special meeting later to consider the Student Code.

Dr. Cohen reported on a meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee in Columbus. Faculty loads were discussed at this meeting.

Dr. Cohen moved that the Executive Committee arrange a meeting (preferably a luncheon meeting on Saturday, March 29, 1969) of the Executive Committee, local legislators, and the President and Vice Presidents of the University to discuss matters of common interest, and to initiate a continuing exchange of views between the University and legislators in the interest of maintaining quality in higher education. Motion was seconded.

A discussion on the motion followed regarding expenses for the meeting. Chairman Hahn will investigate ways to finance the proposed luncheon and will set the exact time and place for the meeting. Motion carried with five votes in favor of the motion and two abstentions.

Dr. Hahn reported to the Committee on suggestions of the Ad Hoc Constitution and Bylaws Committee for the proposed Inter-University Senate concerning the manner in which the Constitution and Bylaws of the Ohio Faculty Senate is to be ratified.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

Submitted by:



Thaddeus Dillon, Acting Secretary

F

MINUTES OF MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF YOUNGSTOWN STATE
UNIVERSITY SENATE HELD MARCH 26, 1969

The Executive Committee of the Senate met on Wednesday, March 26, 1969, at 3 P.M. in Room 292 of the Engineering Science Building with Chairman Philip Hahn presiding. Members present were: Irwin Cohen, Edward Reilly, Marilyn Solak, Frank Tarantine, Thaddeus Dillon, Philip Hahn, and Esther Niemi. Members absent were: Margaret Pfau and Donald Byo.

The minutes of the meetings of March 5, 1969, and March 12, 1969, were approved as presented.

Dr. Hahn reported that Student Council is now considering the proposed Student Code.

The Secretary distributed committee preference sheets received from the faculty to various members of the Executive Committee for analysis.

It was moved by Dr. Cohen, seconded by Mr. Reilly, that the Executive Committee request Dr. Clyde Vanaman to report to the University Senate on April 4, 1969, on matters connected with the proposed Ohio Faculty Senate to date. Motion carried.

The following reports were made on liaison assignments:

<u>Member reporting:</u>	<u>Committees:</u>	<u>Remarks on Committee activities:</u>
Dr. Cohen	Research Council	Continues to be active, and has made research grants.
	Computer Center	Has been working on an expanded proposal for a computer science curriculum, department, and staff. Also working on a proposal for change in structure and membership of computer center committee.

The following agenda was agreed upon for the Senate meeting to be held on April 4, 1969:

1. Approval of minutes of previous meeting.
2. Report of Constitution and Bylaws Committee (by David Behen)
3. Report of Executive Committee of Senate and other committees:
 - a. Report of Executive Committee (by Philip Hahn)
 - b. Report of Athletic Council (by Clyde Vanaman)
 - c. Report of Academic Affairs Committee (by David Behen)
 - d. Report of Student Academic Guidance and Registration Committee (by Clyde Painter)
4. Unfinished business
5. New business
 - a. Report on proposed Ohio Faculty Senate (by Clyde Vanaman)
6. Remarks by President Pugsley

It was moved by Dr. Cohen, seconded by Mr. Reilly, that the matter of University policy on faculty dismissals as described by the memorandum of March 18, 1969, from David M. Behen, Chairman of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, be submitted to the Faculty Affairs Committee, along with the recommendations of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Submitted by:

Esther Niemi

Secretary

April 10, 1969

SENATE BALLOT
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
FOR TECHNICAL AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

(VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2)

_____ MARY ANKELES

_____ ROBERTA MILLER

_____ VIOLET BOGCESS

_____ VIRGINIA PHILLIPS

_____ PAUL CRESS

_____ ANNE SCHEETZ

_____ JAMES W. DeGARMO

_____ MARY SEBESTYEN

_____ BARBARA ENGELHARDT

_____ HELEN SHIELDS

_____ CYNTHIA GOARD

_____ JOHN TERLECKI

_____ ALICE GORTON

_____ MARTHA WALTON

_____ DOROTHY HILLE

NOTE: This ballot is to be placed in the envelope provided, (SEALED), with the name of the voter on the outside and returned to Vera Jenkins, Secretary of the Senate, Mailroom Box #457, by Friday, April 18, 1969 at 4:00 p.m.

BALLOTS RECEIVED AFTER 4:00 p.m. ON THAT DAY WILL NOT BE COUNTED.

April 10, 1969

SENATE BALLOT
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
FOR SCHOOL OF MUSIC

(VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2)

_____ JOHN E. ALLEMAN	_____ WALTER S. MAYHALL
_____ SAMUEL S. BADAL, JR.	_____ ESOTTO PELLEGRINI
_____ WILLIAM G. CONABLE	_____ C. WADE RARIDON
_____ PATRICIA J. CONNOR	_____ FRED ROSENBERG
_____ JOHN L. DAVIS	_____ CHARLES RULLMAN
_____ ROBERT E. FLEMING	_____ DUANE SAMPLE
_____ RONALD L. GOULD	_____ ARTHUR G. SPIRO
_____ LOIS HOPKINS	_____ DONALD E. VOGEL
_____ ROBERT E. HOPKINS	_____ MARK F. WALKER
_____ VERN KAGARICE	_____ MYRON J. WISLER
_____ SISTER AGNES JEAN LAVIN	

NOTE: This ballot is to be placed in the envelope provided, (SEALED), with the name of the voter on the outside and returned to Vera Jenkins, Secretary of the Senate, Mailroom Box #457, by Friday, April 18, 1969 at 4:00 p.m.

BALLOTS RECEIVED AFTER 4:00 p.m. ON THAT DAY WILL NOT BE COUNTED.

April 10, 1969

SENATE BALLOT
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
FOR SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
(VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3)

_____ DONALD ARNETT

_____ EDWIN R. PEJACK

_____ PAUL X. BELLINI

_____ JOHN E. PETREK

_____ HALIL ERZURUM

_____ VICTOR A. RICHLEY

_____ GEORGE JURI FILATOV

_____ JOHN F. RITTER

_____ MEHDA GHAFFARZADEH

_____ HENRY P. SHENG

_____ JOSEPH F. GONCZ

_____ MATTHEW SIMAN

_____ PASTOR R. GONZALEZ

_____ SAMUEL J. SKAROTE

_____ RUSSELL HIBBELER

_____ GERHARD STEIN

_____ MICHAEL K. HOUSEHOLDER

_____ JOHN S. STEVENS

_____ HAROLD N. JOHNSON

_____ FRANK J. TARANTINE

_____ RICHARD W. JONES

_____ GILBERT R. WILLIAMSON

_____ CHARLES M. LOVAS

NOTE: This ballot is to be placed in the envelope provided, (SEALED), with the name of the voter on the outside and returned to Vera Jenkins, Secretary of the Senate, Mailroom Box #457, by Friday, April 18, 1969 at 4:00 p.m.

BALLOTS RECEIVED AFTER 4:00 p.m. ON THAT DAY WILL NOT BE COUNTED.

April 10, 1969

SENATE BALLOT--YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
FOR COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

(VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 39)

___ EVERETTE ABRAM	___ FRANK J. COSTA	___ HENRY FUKUI
___ DOMENICO ALIBERTI	___ HAROLD CRITES	___ ALFONSO L. GARCIA
___ ROBERT A. AMEDURI	___ KATHERINE CRITES	___ BEVERLY GARTLAND
___ JOSEPH BABISCH	___ JANE CUNNINGHAM	___ CAROL GAY
___ LORRAYNE BAIRD	___ MARK CURRAN	___ THOMAS GAY
___ WILLIAM C. BAKER	___ SONIA CURRAN	___ CHARLES GEBELEIN
___ HOWARD BANILOWER	___ PAUL DALBEC	___ EMILY GOLDSTEIN
___ LUBA BARNA-GULANICH	___ CHARLES W. DARLING	___ STEPHEN GRCEVICH
___ EUGENE BARRET	___ DONALD P. DEGLI	___ MARY GUTERBA
___ PAUL BECKMAN	___ THEODOSIUS DEMEN	___ PHILIP J. HAHN
___ RICHARD H. BEE	___ THADDEUS DILLON	___ CHARLES HALLER
___ DWIGHT BEEDE	___ THOMAS N. DOBBELSTEIN	___ CLYDE HANKEY
___ DAVID M. BEHEN	___ GUIDO A. DOBBERT	___ STEPHEN HANZELY
___ MARILYN BILES	___ MARY ANN DOBRICH	___ MARY V. HARE
___ FREDERICK BLUE	___ LESLIE S. DOMONKOS	___ ROBERT R. HARE
___ PAULINE BOTTY	___ GEORGE M. DURITSA	___ ANN HARRIS
___ JOHN BRENNAN	___ CHRISTINE DYKEMA	___ GEO. HAUSHALTER
___ ALFRED BRIGHT	___ C. WM. EICHENBERGER	___ MARTIN HELLING
___ MARY ALICE BUDGE	___ LOUISE EINSTEIN	___ JOEL HENKEL
___ DORIS CANNON	___ EARL E. EMINHIZER	___ SALLY HOTCHKISS
___ STEVEN R. CARTER	___ LARRY E. ESTERLY	___ JOHN HUDZIK
___ CARL F. CHUEY	___ DALE FISHBECK	___ DAVID HUNT
___ FRANK CIOTOLA	___ MASON FISHER	___ WILLIAM H. HUNT
___ JOHN CLEARY	___ JOHN FLASHER	___ RAYMOND W. HURD
___ IRWIN COHEN	___ ELMER FOLDVARY	___ DAVID S. IVES
___ MARGARET J. CONNELLY	___ J. DONALD FOSTER	___ HENRI JAKOBS
___ SISTER MARY CONROY	___ JAMES E. FOUNTAINE	___ RALPH L. JOHNSON

___ ELAINE JUHASZ	___ EDNA K. McDONALD	___ LaVERNE D. REILLY
___ ANTHONY JULIUS, JR.	___ KEITH McKEAN	___ MARY P. RIGO
___ JEAN KELTY	___ JAMES R. McKEE	___ BRUCE T. RILEY
___ TAGHI T. KERMANI	___ DONALD McLENNAN	___ LEWIS RINGER
___ IKRAM U. KHAWAJA	___ MAY McMILLAN	___ SIDNEY I. ROBERTS
___ JANET KNAPP	___ JAGDISH C. MEHRA	___ RALPH ROBINETTE
___ MARILYN A. KOCINSKI	___ HOWARD D. METTEE	___ STAMAN RODFONG
___ JOSEPH J. KOSS	___ MARGUERITA M. METZGER	___ HASSAN A. RONAGHY
___ HARRY KRYNICKY	___ THELMA MINER	___ LEWIS ROSENTHAL
___ JOSEPHINE KRISHNAPA	___ WARD MINER	___ DOMINIC ROSSELLI
___ BERTINA A. LaBORDE	___ RICHARD MITCHELL	___ ANNA MAE ROWE
___ LEON LAITMAN	___ MARGARET MOORE	___ RONALD ROWE
___ BARI LATEEF	___ WILLIAM MOORHEAD	___ CHESTER E. RUFH
___ JAMES LEPORE	___ ALBERT F. MORITZ	___ EUGENE SANTOS
___ RENEE LINKHORN	___ NICHOLAS MORTELLARO	___ LOWELL SATRE
___ LORETTA M. LIPTAK	___ GRATIA MURPHY	___ ANN SCHAFFER
___ YIH-WU LIU	___ ESTHER P. NIEMI	___ LAUREN SCHROEDER
___ JAMES LUCAS	___ HENRY J. OLES	___ WERNER SCHULTZ
___ JOSEPH LUCAS	___ DANIEL O'NEILL	___ LEONARD SCRIBNER
___ MARVIN LUKIN	___ PAUL C. PETERSON	___ AURORA SEBASTIANI
___ DAVID B. MacLEAN	___ RICHARD C. PHILLIPS	___ ROBERT SECRIST
___ RUSSELL MADDICK	___ BHAGWATI PODDAR	___ VIRGINIA SHALE
___ INALLY MAHADEVIAH	___ WILLIAM PODOLL	___ A.W. SKARDON, JR.
___ FRANK MALAK	___ JAMES P. POGGIONE	___ MORRIS SLAVIN
___ JOHN MANTON	___ FRANK POLITE	___ THOMAS P. SMATHERS
___ CLEMENT S. MASLOFF	___ DAVID QUINBY	___ AGNES SMITH
___ ALBERT MATZYE	___ JOYCELYN RAMSEY	___ FRANK W. SMITH
___ GUS MAVRIGIAN	___ JAMES REEDER	___ ROBERT K. SMITH
___ JOSEPH MAY	___ CHARLES L. REID	___ VIRGIL SMITH

April 10, 1969

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES SENATE BALLOT CONT'D. -- Page 3

ANTHONY E. SOBOTA
JOSEPH SOLIMINE
LEONARD B. SPIEGEL
SISTER ELIZABETH STAUDT
ELIZABETH STERENBERG
KARL-HEINZ STOLL
NICHOLAS STURM
BALAKRISHNAN SUBRAMANIAN
CHRISTOPHER SWEENEY
ROBERT THOMPSON
JAMES R. TOEPFER
JANE TUREK
HELEN VAN GORDER
PAUL VAN ZANDT
MARIE VECCIA
JAMES VECHIARELLA
PETER W. von OSTWALDEN
KENNETH WALLACE
MICHAEL WALUSIS
WILLARD L. WEBSTER
LIBBY WERBNER
NELL WHIPKEY
INGA S. WORLEY
RALPH E. YINGST
WARREN YOUNG
BETTY A. ZBORAY
ALAN ZOELLNER

NOTE: This ballot is to be placed in the envelope provided, (SEALED), with the name of the voter on the outside and returned to Vera Jenkins, Secretary of the Senate - Mailroom Box #457 by FRIDAY, April 18, 1969 at 4:00 p.m.
BALLOTS RECEIVED AFTER 4:00 p.m. ON THAT DAY
WILL NOT BE COUNTED.

April 10, 1969

SENATE BALLOT
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
FOR THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
(VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3)

<u> </u> J. LEONARD AZNEER	<u> </u> WILLIAM NICHOLS
<u> </u> ANNA MARGARET BATTIN	<u> </u> GEORGE OVERBY
<u> </u> MARGARET BRADEN	<u> </u> GEORGE SCHOENHARD
<u> </u> LAWRENCE A. DIRUSSO	<u> </u> CHARLES SMITH
<u> </u> WILBERT HAMMACK	<u> </u> MARILYN SOLAK
<u> </u> DOROTHY HEYM	<u> </u> CLYDE VANAMAN
<u> </u> HOWARD MILLER	<u> </u> JOHN WALTER

NOTE: This ballot is to be placed in the envelope provided, (SEALED), with the name of the voter on the outside and returned to Vera Jenkins, Secretary of the Senate, Mailroom Box #457, by Friday, April 18, 1969 at 4:00 p.m.

BALLOTS RECEIVED AFTER 4:00 p.m. ON THAT DAY WILL NOT BE COUNTED.

April 10, 1969

SENATE BALLOT
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
FOR SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
(VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 7)

_____ JOHN R. BOLAND	_____ MELVIN P. MAMULA
_____ FRANK M. BRADEN	_____ DONALD H. MATHEWS
_____ RALPH S. BURKHOLDER	_____ RAYMOND E. MEINERS
_____ PHILIP F. CHUEY	_____ CASPER J. MOORE, JR.
_____ ANTHONY F. DASTOLI	_____ CLYDE A. PAINTER
_____ LAWRENCE A. DAVIS	_____ WILLIAM PETRYCH
_____ SYLVAN H. D. EINSTEIN	_____ DAVID S. PROVANCE
_____ ERWIN MARK EVANS	_____ EDWARD T. REILLY
_____ ROBERT F. FERRO	_____ EUGENE E. SCHNEIDER
_____ FRANK A. FORTUNATO	_____ BETTY H. SEIFERT
_____ JOHN L. GRIM	_____ EUGENE A. SEKERES
_____ WILLIAM J. GUTKNECHT, JR.	_____ MICHAEL E. STEVENS
_____ WILLIAM W. HANKS	_____ WILLIAM E. WALSH
_____ VERA JENKINS	_____ ROBERT J. WOLANIN
_____ JOSEPH H. KOORNICK	_____ RICHARD T. ZENO
_____ ROBERT P. LACICH	_____ JEROME E. ZETTS
_____ PAUL E. LIBER	

NOTE: This ballot is to be placed in the envelope provided, (SEALED), with the name of the voter on the outside and returned to Vera Jenkins, Secretary of the Senate - Mailroom Box #457 by FRIDAY, April 18, 1969 at 4:00 p.m.

BALLOTS RECEIVED AFTER 4:00 p.m. ON THAT DAY WILL NOT BE COUNTED