

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
Wednesday, 4 April 2001, 4:00 P.M.
Room 132 DeBartolo Hall
(PDF Version)

Note: If you want to print or view the PDF file and you don't have *Adobe Acrobat Reader*, you may download the program at the following link:

[<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>](http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html)

Use the Acrobat Reader menus or toolbar, not the menus or toolbar in your web browser, to print the file.

1. Call to Order.
2. Approval of Minutes for 7 March 2001.
3. Senate Executive Committee Report; report from the Chair; Ohio Faculty Council report (see **Attachment 1**).
4. Report of the Charter and Bylaws Committee.
5. Report of the Elections and Balloting Committee.
6. Reports from Other Senate Committees.
 - A. Academic Standards Committee
 - B. Academic Programs Committee
 - C. Curriculum Committee—see **Attachment 5**.^{added 3/30/01}
 - D. Academic Planning—see **Attachment 2**.
 - E. General Education—see **Attachment 3**.
 - F. Integrated Technologies
 - G. University Outreach
 - H. Library—see **Attachment 4**.
 - I. Academic Research
 - J. Student Academic Affairs
 - K. Student Academic Grievance
 - L. Honors
 - M. Academic Events
7. Unfinished Business.
8. New Business.
9. Adjournment.

Attachment 1: Ohio Faculty Council Report
Report to the YSU Academic Senate on the Ohio Faculty Council
April 4, 2001, by Tom Shipka

The Ohio Faculty Council met at the offices of the Ohio Board of Regents on Friday, March 9, 2001, from 12:30 p.m. until 3:15 p.m.

Much of the meeting was taken up with a presentation by Robert Sheehan, Associate Vice Chancellor for Performance Reporting and Analysis, on the Performance Report on Ohio's state-supported colleges and universities, which was released on December 13, 2000, as well as OBOR reports on class size and part-time faculty.

The Performance Report was prepared by OBOR at the request of Governor Taft. An assessment document, the Performance Report covers a wide variety of topics, including cost, diversity, retention rates, bar exam passage rates, time to degree, employment success of graduates, the extent and success of remediation, numbers of degrees and certificates awarded, the extent of transferring and the academic performance of transfer students compared to non-transfer students, credentials of faculty, the percentage of first-year student credit hours taught by faculty with academic rank, research funding, and more. OBOR expects to update and expand the report and publish it annually. Future editions are expected to provide information which was not included in the first one, such as distance learning, classroom and laboratory space utilization, the level of satisfaction of students and alumni with their college experience, the ratio of available computers on a campus to the enrollment, and success on licensure exams. The second Performance Report is scheduled for release on November 1, 2001. The full report is accessible on the OBOR web site: <http://www.regents.state.oh.us/>. (The YSU Academic Senate web site also has a link to the OBOR web site.)

On January 10, 2001, after complaints by various campuses, including YSU, OBOR issued a "revision" of the Performance Report on time to degree. The Performance Report originally gave an average. In the revision, OBOR switched to a median. As a result, YSU's time to degree for an associate degree changed from an average of 8.3 years to a median of 4.8 years and YSU's time to degree for a baccalaureate degree changed from an average of 7.3 years to a median of 5.3 years.

OBOR has also released data on class size in the public colleges and universities which it compiled recently. Mr. Sheehan explained to the OFC that compiling information about class size was complicated when it was discovered that at least one campus initially failed to report sections of courses which convened in large lecture halls. Instead, this campus reported only the discussion or recitation sections of such courses. I have circulated a hard copy of the OBOR class size report to you today. [The report will be distributed at the April 4 Senate meeting.] As you study it, you will find that it reports class size information from fall 1999 for all undergraduate classes and for general studies classes. Generally, class sizes are smaller in both categories at branch campuses and two-year institutions than at the main campuses of the public universities. For instance, 41% of students on university main campuses were in classes of 40 or more students, while only 4% of the students in state community colleges were in classes of 40 or more students.

Speaking of general studies, a surprisingly high percentage of students taking general studies courses at the public universities find themselves in sections with "more than 99 students." (Note the category – "More than 99 students." Isn't this a fascinating label? OBOR apparently finds "more than 99 students" preferable to "100 or more students.") Here, YSU compares favorably. Seventeen percent of our students

and those at the University of Toledo taking general studies courses sit in sections with more than 99 students compared to 36% at Ohio University, 32% at The Ohio State University and Wright State University, 30% at Miami University and the University of Cincinnati, 28% at Bowling Green and Cleveland State, 27% at Kent State, and so on. Only the University of Akron (14%), Shawnee State (5%), and Central State (0%) fare better than YSU in this category. No information is provided as to the number or percentage of these large sections which are linked to smaller discussion or recitation sections on a given campus.

On the other hand, YSU is second among the 13 public universities behind Toledo in the category of percentage of students enrolled in general studies sections in the range of 50 to 99 students (19%).

Overall, YSU fares well in large sections of general studies courses. If you focus on classes of 50 or more students, you discover that YSU ranks tenth among the thirteen public universities, with 36% of our students taking such sections. The selective (i.e., non-open admissions) institutions have a much higher percentage. For instance, Ohio University is at 48%; Miami, Bowling Green, and Ohio State are at 45%; Kent is at 40%; and Cincinnati is at 39%. One wonders whether parents and students don't care much about class size when making decisions about college or whether they don't know the facts about class size. One also wonders what use, if any, the 50 private colleges in Ohio which belong to the Association of Independent Colleges will make of such data.

Mr. Sheehan also shared with the OFC a new report prepared by OBOR on part-time faculty in Ohio public higher education, but there was no analysis or discussion of this at our meeting.

The last time I checked, the class size data were not accessible on the OBOR web site; however, the part-time faculty report is available at the following address: http://www.regents.state.oh.us/mainpages/Board_PT_Faculty_Survey_Home.html.

After Mr. Sheehan's presentation and a follow-up discussion, Chancellor Roderick Chu met with the OFC for about half an hour. He briefed us on the Governor's budget proposal and his staff's efforts in the Ohio General Assembly to restore funds which OBOR had requested of the Governor unsuccessfully. He characterized the Governor's budget for higher education as "ugly." OBOR had requested a double digit increase but got only 1.3% from the Governor. The Chancellor was not optimistic about the potential for dramatic progress in the legislature. The Chancellor said that sharp increases in utility and insurance costs on the campuses, ranging from 10% to 35%, meant that the Governor's budget amounts to a reduction in net income for the colleges and universities. The Chancellor reaffirmed his claim, with the aid of impressive statistics, that far too few Ohioans attend and complete college, thereby jeopardizing Ohio's prospects in the new economy which relies so heavily on college-educated workers with basic critical thinking and information technology skills. The meeting ended after a brief discussion with a representative of the two-year counterpart of OFC.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 13.

Attachment 2: Academic Planning Committee Report

**COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED
TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Date March 27, 2001 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) _____

Name of Committee Submitting Report Academic Planning Committee

Committee Status: Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members:

R. Kasuganti (chair), A. Burger, J. Gergits, S. Martin, R. McEwing, R. Ruffer, M. Shayesteh, B. Brothers, J. Elias, P. Kasvinsky, R. Russo

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:

As part of a campus-wide dissemination process, the Academic Planning Committee is presenting the Youngstown State University Mission Statement drafted by the Mission Statement Revision Committee. We are presenting the statement for information purposes at the April Senate meeting. The Academic Planning Committee will review the statement during the next month and invites your comments. We will seek Senate approval of the statement at the May Senate meeting. For the full committee report, see Academic Planning Committee Appendix I, (next page).

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? **Not until the May Senate meeting**

If so, state the motion(s):

If substantive changes in your committee recommendation are made from the floor, would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further consideration?

Other relevant data: **The proposed Mission Statement is the result of an open committee process involving representatives of all campus constituencies—including faculty, staff, students, administrators, Board of Trustees, and the Senate’s Academic Planning Committee—as well as off-campus representatives from the Youngstown and Warren communities.**

**Ram Kasuganti
Chair**

ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE APPENDIX I MISSION PROCESS AND PROPOSED STATEMENT

Mission Statement Revision Process:

In January 2001, at the request of the YSU Board of Trustees, President David Sweet appointed a Mission Statement Revision Committee and charged it to “**revise, focus, and shorten**” the existing YSU Mission Statement. He stressed that the purpose of the process was not to redefine YSU’s mission radically but to revise the statement so that it would

- focus on the characteristics that define YSU and distinguish it from other universities,
- speak clearly to internal and external audiences, and
- serve as a guide for a subsequent strategic planning process for the University.

The 22-member committee, chaired by Bege Bowers and facilitated by Suzanne Fleming, included representatives of all campus constituencies—including faculty, staff, students, administrators, Board of Trustees members, and the Senate’s Academic Planning Committee—as well as off-campus representatives from the Youngstown and Warren communities.

During February and March 2001, the Mission Statement Revision Committee met four times to revise the YSU Mission Statement. The meetings were well attended, and the committee thoughtfully considered both the suggestions made by committee members and the suggestions submitted by other members of the University community.

The timeline calls for the proposed statement to be disseminated campus-wide during April. As part of that dissemination process, the Academic Planning Committee is presenting the statement at the April Senate meeting to inform you of the process used to develop the statement and to solicit your constructive comments. (This is not the time for “wordsmithing,” which was the responsibility of the Revision Committee, but we welcome questions and comments about the process and the proposed Mission Statement.)

The Academic Planning Committee will entertain comments at the April Senate meeting and review written comments submitted to Ram Kasuganti (rrkasuga@cc.ysu.edu), Academic Planning Committee chair; to Bege Bowers (bkbowers@cc.ysu.edu), Mission Statement Revision Committee chair; or to your representative on the Academic Planning Committee as soon as possible but no later than April 13.

The Academic Planning Committee will make a formal recommendation concerning the statement at the May Senate meeting, and the statement will go to the Board of Trustees for approval at its June meeting.

The mission statement revision process will be followed by a strategic-planning process (which will result in planning and “vision” documents that include much more detail than is desirable in a mission statement).

Proposed Youngstown State University Mission Statement:

Youngstown State University provides open access to quality learning experiences for students from the metropolitan region and beyond.

YSU faculty and staff are dedicated to

- integrating scholarship and service with the University’s primary purpose of teaching;
- offering a broad range of affordable certificate, associate, baccalaureate, and graduate programs;
- fostering student-faculty relationships that enrich learning;
- promoting diversity throughout the University and the communities it serves;
- advancing the intellectual, cultural, and economic life of students and the broader community.

March 27, 2001, Draft

Attachment 3: General Education Committee Report

COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Date March 23, 2001 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) _____

Name of Committee Submitting Report General Education Committee

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.) Elected Appointed

Names of Committee Members **Young, Mosca, Kasuganti, Castronovo, Pusch, Munro, Gergits, Lovelace-Cameron, Maraffa, Tessier, Funk, Hannay, Jenkins**

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:

We are reporting to the Academic Senate on courses that have cleared the objection stage. The list is appended to the Senate agenda for information only and as an indication that the courses are now officially certified. (See Appendix GEC I, next page.)

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? No

If so, state the motion:

If substantive changes in your committee recommendation are made from the floor, would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further consideration?

Other relevant data: _____

William D. Jenkins
Chair

APPENDIX GEC I

COURSE CERTIFICATION

The following courses have passed the General Education Committee and the objection stage. This listing is an indication of their certification as general education courses. For a complete list of certified courses, see the General Education Website linked to the YSU homepage.

Writing Intensive

- 990259 – FNUTR 5872, Maternal and Child Nutrition
- 990268 – PSYCH 3755L, Developmental Psychology I: Child Development Laboratory
- 990273 – PHYS 3704L, Modern Physics Laboratory

Oral Communication Intensive

- 990272 – PHIL 3728, Engineering Ethics

Critical Thinking Intensive

- 990275 – ECON 3710, Intermediate Micro-Economic Theory
- 990214 – ECON 3712, Introductory Macroeconomic Theory

Artistic and Literary Perspectives

- 990271 – HPES 2698, Survey of Dance

Attachment 4: Library Committee Report

COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Date March 23, 2001 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) _____

Name of Committee Submitting Report Library Committee

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.) Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members **Dora Bailey (Teacher Education), Rebecca Barnhouse (English), Dorcas Fitzgerald (Nursing), Jean Hassell (Human Ecology), William Jenkins (Admin), David Kurtanich (Civil Engineering Technology), Betty Jo Licata (Admin), Tedrow Perkins (Dana School of Music), William Guy Vendemia (Management), Gary Walker (Biological Sciences), John Yemma (Admin.), Thomas Atwood (Maag Library)**

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:

Presentation of the FY02 Library Budget (See Appendix LC I, next page.)

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? Yes

If so, state the motion:

The University Library Committee has agreed upon the following budget for Library Materials in FY02 and moves that the Academic Senate approve it at this time.

If substantive changes in your committee recommendation are made from the floor, would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further consideration?

_____ **yes** _____

Other relevant data: _____

**Dora Bailey
Chair**

APPENDIX LC I

LIBRARY MATERIALS BUDGET FY02

Colleges/Other:	Amount
Arts & Sciences	\$ 678,495
Business	\$ 120,872
Education	\$ 81,812
Engineering/Tech	\$ 91,024
Fine & Performing Arts	\$ 82,237
Health & Human Services	\$ 136,952
General Works	\$ 76,000
Reference	\$ 59,000
Replacements	\$ 8,000
Binding	\$ 70,000
Electronic Journals	\$ 25,000
OhioLINK Databases	\$ 22,000
Yankee Book Plan	\$ 48,608
Total	\$1,500,000.00

Attachment 5: University Curriculum Committee Report

COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Date March 30, 2001 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) _____

Name of Committee Submitting Report University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Committee Status: Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members: _____
Martin Cala, E&T; Jeffrey Coldren, A&S; Philip Ginnette, Ed.; Edward L. Largent, FPA; Joseph J. Mistovich, BCHHS; Teresa Riley, A&S; Deena DeVico, Student; Bassam Deeb, Admin. (ex officio); Kathylynn Feld, chair APC (ex officio); WCBA?; Tammy A. King (Chair).

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:

The University Curriculum Committee has approved changes to the following 13 courses:

- | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| MECH 4835 | MECH 4835L | MECH 2606 | MECH 3708 |
| MECH 3725 | MECH 3751 | MGT 3755 | CIS 3714 |
| ENST 3751 | ENST 3751L | CEEGR 3751 | CEEGR 3751L |
| | | | ECEGR 2612 |

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? No

If so, state the motion:

If substantive changes in your committee recommendation are made from the floor, would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further consideration?

Other relevant data: _____

Tammy A. King
Chair