

**ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA**  
**Wednesday, 6 December 2000, 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 for free at the following link:

<<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 4 October 2000 and 1 November 2000.
3. Senate Executive Committee Report; report from the Chair; correspondence received (**Attachment 1**, Student Government Resolution); Ohio Faculty Council report.
4. Report of the Charter and Bylaws Committee—see **Attachment 2**.
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 3**.
  - D. Academic Planning—see **Attachment 4**.
  - E. General Education—see **Attachment 5**.
  - F. Integrated Technologies
  - G. University Outreach
  - H. Library
  - 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: Student Government Resolution

### Resolution Concerning the Course Proposal Process Policy in the University Curriculum Committee and Course Certification Procedures in the General Education Committee of the Academic Senate

Submitted by the Academic Affairs Committee: Rep. Matthew Vansuch, A&S, Chair; Rep. Henry Gomez, A&S; Rep. Matt Knight, At-Large; Rep. Susan Devaney, Graduate Studies; and Rep. Tom Pasquarella, Business

The Student Government of Youngstown State University,

*Recognizing* that the success of Youngstown State University is heavily dependent on continued support and cooperation between its faculty and student body,

*Realizing* that a current dispute among members of the Youngstown State University Academic Senate greatly diminishes the ability of the faculty and student body to achieve this success,

*Understanding* that this dispute deals with the approval and certification of courses through the General Education and University Curriculum Committees, which are essential to the education of Youngstown State University's students,

*Recognizing* the Academic Senate and its constituent bodies as public bodies, for they are decision-making bodies of a state institution, Youngstown State University,

*Supporting* an interpretation of the laws of the State of Ohio that require all business of public bodies, including state universities such as Youngstown State University, be open to the public,

*Defining* a sub-committee as a public body within a public body, thus making the General Education and University Curriculum Committees public bodies that are subject to—and not above—the law,

*Agreeing* that the continued arguments among members of the Academic Senate greatly delay the body in serving its duty to develop policies concerning the academic functions and activities of the University, and the body must take immediate action in one direction or another,

Calls upon the Academic Senate and its subcommittees to quickly come to a decision regarding the issue of open deliberations,

Requests that the Academic Senate fully respect the laws of the State of Ohio and not loose interpretations of it,

Reminds the Academic Senate that the proceedings of all its meetings and deliberations directly affect the student body of Youngstown State University, and continued quarrelling produces no benefits to tuition-paying students and state taxpayers,

Encourages the Academic Senate to realize that there is no precedent in current Ohio case law regarding this matter, and the actions taken by this body will set an enormous precedent to other state institutions,

Strongly urges the Academic Senate to keep all portions of all its meetings open to the public, as is consistent with the law of the State of Ohio as it pertains to public institutions, such as Youngstown State University and its decision-making public bodies, and

Further urges the members of the Academic Senate to defeat the General Education Committee's motion to accept their recommendation concerning the course certification procedures and the University Curriculum Committee's motion to accept their recommendation concerning the course proposal process policy, as well as any further proposal that closes the door on deliberations within those and its other constituent bodies.

**Attachment 2: Charter and Bylaws Committee Report**

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

Date November 20, 2000 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report Charter and Bylaws Committee

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

**Elected Chartered**\_\_\_\_\_

Names of Committee Members Kathlynn Feld, Dale Harrison (chair), Ikram Khawaja, Tom Maraffa, John Murphy, Nancy White.

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

**The Committee met Nov. 15 and completed its work regarding the question of closing portions of the General Education and Curriculum Committee meetings. The Charter and Bylaws Committee unanimously passed the motion stated below. There was one abstention.**

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

If so, state the motion:

**To amend Bylaw 11, Section 3, to read "All meetings of the Senate, its committees and subcommittees shall be open in accordance with State of Ohio Open Meetings Laws and the exemptions specified therein."**

**(The current language reads "All meetings of the Senate shall be open meetings unless otherwise decided by a vote of the Senate.")**

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: Rationale attached.\_\_\_\_\_

**Dale Harrison  
Chair**

\*\*\*\*\*

## RATIONALE FOR MOTION TO AMEND BYLAWS

**1. The Open Meetings Laws of the State of Ohio clearly apply** to state universities and its “decision-making” bodies, as specified in Section 121.22 (B) (1a) of the Ohio Revised Code, which includes the Academic Senate.

**2. Because the Open Meetings Laws apply to the Academic Senate, these laws apply to “Any committee or subcommittee” of the Academic Senate,** as specified in Section 121.22 (B) (1b) of the Ohio Revised Code.

A “decision-making” body is one that proposes and passes motions, as is the case with the Senate and its committees. “Advisory” bodies usually contain the word “advisory” in the title and *do not* propose and pass motions. The intent of the law is clear here, which is why Section 121.22 (B) (1b) of the Ohio Revised Code exists—to specify committees and subcommittees.

While no Ohio precedent exists on point here, there are other state Supreme Court decisions that have exempted bodies such as “Dean’s Advisory Councils” because they do not propose or pass motions.

**3. There *does* exist case law in the state of Ohio on point—beyond point**—which has “liberally construed” Ohio’s Open Meetings Laws. Section 121.22 (A) of the Ohio Revised Code states: “This section shall be liberally construed to require public officials to take official action and to conduct all deliberations upon official business only in open meetings unless the subject matter is specifically exempted by law.”

A. The business of the General Education and Curriculum Committees is not exempted by law. According to Section 121.22 (G) of the Ohio Revised Code, those exemptions are:

1. “To consider the appointment, employment, dismissal, discipline, promotion, demotion, or compensation of a public employee or official ...”
2. “To consider the purchase of property for public purposes, or for the sale of property at competitive bidding ...”
3. “Conferences with an attorney for the public body concerning disputes involving the public body that are the subject of pending or imminent court action” (the attorney-client privilege).
4. “Preparing for, conducting, or reviewing negotiations or bargaining sessions with public employees ...” (contract negotiations).
5. “Matters required to be kept confidential by federal law or regulations or state statutes.”

6. “Specialized details of security arrangements if disclosure of the matters discussed might reveal information that could be used for the purpose of committing, or avoiding prosecution for, a violation of the law.”

7. “In the case of a county hospital . . . trade secrets.”

B. The case law on point is *State ex rel. Toledo Blade Co. v. Univ. of Toledo Found.* (1992), 65 Ohio St.3d 258, 602 N.E.2d 1159, in which the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio held that The University of Toledo Foundation—a private, nonprofit organization—is a public body for the purposes of Open Records and Meetings Laws. The Court believed that the work of the Foundation affected the university’s public affairs, and, therefore, it was a public body for the purposes of the Ohio Revised Code.

There is no doubt that the work of the Academic Senate and its committees and subcommittees affects the university’s public affairs. Deciding which courses do and do not meet General Education requirements determines how the university’s public resources (state of Ohio taxpayer money, etc.) will and will not be used.

**4. The Senate and its committees and subcommittees need not make any changes to how they conduct business** to fully comply with the Open Meetings Laws. For example, Section 121.22 (F) of the Ohio Revised Code, states: “Every public body, by rule, shall establish a *reasonable method* whereby *any person may determine* the time and place of all regularly scheduled meetings and the time, place, and purpose of all special meetings . . . The rule shall provide that any person, upon request and payment of a reasonable fee, may obtain reasonable advance notification of all meetings at which any specific type of public business is to be discussed . . .”

Web site announcements of meetings are sufficient for these purposes. (In the unlikely event that an interested individual without access to the Web site requests advance agendas, that individual must pay any costs associated with receiving notification). What the law says is that this information must be available by a “reasonable method.” It places the responsibility on the interested party to contact the Senate, or its committees and subcommittees, to receive advance notification. A call to the chair of any committee or subcommittee to determine the next meeting is a “reasonable method.” The Senate could simply post contact info for chairs on its Web site.

**5. Closing the “deliberations” portions of these meetings is simply *too risky*** for the Senate to do. Given the record of Ohio’s Court’s “liberally constru(ing)” these laws, it is quite likely that a legal challenge would fall on the side of openness. In fact, it is the *deliberative process*—which is what is being proposed to close—that this law is explicit about in addition to official action. Again:

“This section shall be liberally construed to require public officials to take official action and to *conduct all deliberations upon official business* only in open meetings unless the subject matter is specifically excepted by law.”

The outcome would be that all business that was the result of closed deliberations would be declared null and void. Section 121.22 (H) of the Ohio Revised Code, states

“A resolution, rule, or formal action of any kind is invalid unless adopted in an open meeting of the public body. A resolution, rule, or formal action adopted in an open meeting *that results from deliberations in a meeting not open to the public is invalid* unless the deliberations were for a purpose specifically (exempted) ...”

**6. The simple existence of the proposal to close portions of these meetings is already enough to trigger a lawsuit:** The Ohio Legislature saw the simple “threat” to close a meeting—the mere existence of this proposal—as enough to trigger the statute. The Senate is *already* in a vulnerable legal position. Section 121.22 (I) (1) of the Ohio Revised Code states:

“Any person may bring an action to enforce this section. An action under division (I)(1) of this section shall be brought within two years after the date of the alleged violation *or threatened violation*. Upon proof of a violation or threatened violation of this section in an action brought by any person, the court of common pleas shall issue an injunction to compel the members of the public body to comply with its provisions.”

This makes good legal sense. Requiring that a violation actually occur before the statute is triggered could result in a lot of public business being declared null and void.

### **In Conclusion**

The Senate needs to remove the motion to close portions of the committee meetings off the table immediately to avoid a lawsuit being filed against it. As a body in an institution of higher learning, the Senate should set an example of openness for its business and respect for the laws of the state of Ohio.

The concern that open meetings may result in the intimidation of members of the General Education and Curriculum committees is not in question. These are legitimate concerns. However, the business of these committees is no more sensitive than the business—and potential business—of other Senate committees. Such a proposal sets a dangerous precedent for the Senate.

The State Legislature was not naïve in writing this law and understood that conducting business in public may result in various forms of political pressure. The Legislature established these laws with an understanding that such pressures are invariably the price we must pay for conducting business in the democratic and participatory environment of openness.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Attachment 3: University Curriculum Committee Report**

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

Date November 22, 2000 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Committee Status: Appointed Chartered

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

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

**We are amending the course process proposal, "University Curriculum Committee Course Proposal Progression," under the HEARING section. We are removing the former #9 and changing the former #10 to #9. This will result in eliminating the section which read, "At the close of the open hearing, the objector, department representative and all observers will be excused so that the UCC members can conduct their deliberations." (For the former version of the proposal, see the agenda for the November Senate meeting.)**

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

If so, state the motion: **The new course process proposal be adopted in conjunction with the General Education Committee's course proposal process, which has also been amended in the same fashion as the UCC's 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?  
Yes

Other relevant data: The course proposal process presented was the result of the joint efforts of the University Curriculum Committee and the General Education Committee.

**Tammy A. King**  
**Chair**

\*\*\*\*\*

**UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE  
COURSE PROPOSAL PROGRESSION**

1. Course proposals are forwarded by the Undergraduate College or School Curriculum Committee to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) Chair.

- If the course is a new or changed course and is to be submitted for General Education certification, both UCC and GEC forms must be completed and submitted.
- If the course is an existing course and is to be submitted for General Education certification with no changes, the UCC form need not be completed. If during the certification process changes to the course are made, the course must be submitted to the UCC for approval.
- If the course is not to be submitted for General Education certification, only the UCC form needs to be completed.

2. Upon receipt of proposals, the UCC Chair distributes the course proposals to all UCC members for review and a UCC meeting is conducted to approve the course proposals. If the course is also seeking General Education certification, the UCC Chair will forward the course proposal to the GEC for pre-certification prior to distribution for UCC review.

3. Upon approval by the UCC, copies of the course proposals are distributed to the Provost, Associate Provost, Deans of all Schools and Colleges, and Department Chairs for distribution to all faculty. The course proposals circulate for an examination period of ten working days.

4. During the examination period, an objection to a course proposal may be filed by the Provost, Associate Provost, Deans, Chairs, or any individual faculty member (see **OBJECTION**).

5. If no objection is filed, a listing of the approved course proposals is appended to the Senate Agenda for informational purposes. Presentation of the UCC report to the Academic Senate serves as final approval of the appended course proposals.

6. The Chair of the Academic Senate will sign the original course proposals and forward them for addition to the University course inventory.

**OBJECTION**

1. A memo must be forwarded to the UCC Chair by the objector prior to the circulation deadline. The memo must include a detailed explanation of the objection. (Objections to courses as General Education Courses are to be submitted to the General Education Committee—see General Education and University Curriculum Proposal Flow Form).

2. The UCC Chair will notify in writing the Department proposing the course that an objection has issued. A copy of the objection will be attached to the memo. The UCC Chair will request that the objector and the Department proposing the course resolve the objection.

3. If the objection is resolved, the UCC Chair must be notified in writing of the resolution. The proposed course is then returned to the UCC for continuing action.



4. If those involved are unable to resolve the objection, the UCC will seek reconciliation. If the differences still cannot be resolved, the UCC will then conduct a hearing regarding the objection. (See **HEARING**)

## **HEARING**

In order to insure a just and orderly hearing of the objection, the following procedures must be observed by all parties:

1. Prior to the day of the hearing, a precise written statement of the objection(s) will be distributed to all parties.
2. All concerned persons are permitted in the room during the open hearing.
3. The UCC Chair will call the meeting to order and clarify any procedural questions.
4. Any objectors may be present. Each will be heard. The objections will be presented in a reasonable and concise manner.
5. The representative for the course proposal will present the department's position in a reasonable and concise manner.
6. The objector may present a rebuttal in a reasonable and concise manner.
7. The department representative for the course proposal may present a rebuttal in a reasonable and concise manner.
8. UCC members will then have the opportunity to ask questions of both the objector and the department representative.
9. The UCC members will then discuss the issues in their deliberations and report the Committee's decision, in writing, to the objector and department proposing the course within five working days.

The UCC must reach one of the following decisions and forward the course proposal to the Senate:

1. Reaffirm its approval of the course proposal.
2. Withdraw its approval of the course proposal.
3. Forward the course proposal to the Senate with no recommendation.

The UCC then will undertake one of the following actions at the next Academic Senate meeting:

1. Move to approve the course proposal.
2. Move to withdraw the course proposal.
3. Present the course proposal without a recommendation. The Senate may then take appropriate action.

Flow Chart for New Course Approval Process [Tammy King will bring copies to the Senate meeting.]

**Attachment 4: Academic Planning Committee Report**

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

Date November 27, 2000 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report Academic Planning Committee

Committee Status: Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members: \_\_\_\_\_  
**Brothers, Burger, Elias, Gergits, Kasuganti (acting chair), Kasvinsky, McEwing, Martin, Ruffer, Russo (student), Shayesteh**

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

**Guidelines for summer scheduling (semesters) beginning Summer 2001—The APC recommends adopting the attached summer scheduling guidelines, beginning 2001. They have been circulated to department chairs and deans.**

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?

Yes

Other relevant data: \_\_\_\_\_

**Ram Kasuganti**  
**Chair**

\*\*\*\*\*

**GUIDELINES FOR SUMMER SCHEDULING**

Time frame for summer semesters—6 weeks (starting 2001)

**CALENDAR** — Summer I begins 5/21 and ends 6/30/2001  
 Summer II begins 7/2 and ends 8/11/2001  
 Interim term begins 6/18 and ends 7/28/2001  
 Full term begins 5/21 and ends 8/11/2001

The purpose of these guidelines is to facilitate the building of student’s schedules by **reducing** the conflicts caused by overlapping scheduling of courses.

Following the guidelines is important. Department chairpersons or persons assuming responsibility for scheduling of classes need to consult with others about courses affecting several departments. Where advisable, exceptions to the standard pattern can be made through approval from the appropriate Dean.

**Avoid/minimize breaking across schedule blocks.**

**SUMMER SEMESTER (6 wks) SCHEDULING GUIDELINES:**

<b>3 s.h. classes</b>	<b>3 days/wk—MWF</b>	<b>2 days/wk—T Th</b>
	8 - 10	8 - 11
	10:15 - 12:15	11:15 - 14:15
	12:30 - 14:30	14:30 - 17:30
	14:45 - 16:45	18:00 - 21:00
	<i>M W 18:00 - 21:00</i>	

<b>4 s.h. classes *</b>	<b>3 days/wk—MWF</b>	<b>2 days/wk—T Th</b>
	<b>2 hrs 45 mts/day</b>	<b>4 hrs 30 mts/day</b>

**5 s.h. classes \***      **3 days/wk,**  
                                  **3 hrs 30 mts/day**

**\* For 4 s.h. (MWF) and 5 s.h. classes, please observe starting times for 3 s.h. 3 days/wk classes.**

**For 4 s.h. T Th classes, please observe starting times for 3 s.h. 2 days/wk classes.**

**FULL SUMMER SESSION—12 WEEKS:**

***3 s.h classes—Do not cross time blocks set up for the 6-week sessions.***

There are many possibilities.

Examples:

One day a week—T 8-11 or Th 8-11

Two days a week—MW 8-9:30 or 10:15-11:45

T Th 8-9:30, 11:15-12:45

Three days a week—MWF 8-9 or MWF 9-10 or MWF 10:15-11:15

***4 s.h classes—Minimize crossing time blocks set up for the 6-week sessions.***

Examples: One day a week—T or Th 4 hrs 30 mts—8-12:30

Two days a week—T Th 2 hrs 15 mts—8-10:15 or 11:15-13:30

Three days a week—MWF 1 hr 30 mts—8-9:30, 11:15-12:45

***5 s.h. classes - Minimize crossing time blocks set up for the 6-week sessions.***

Examples: Two days a week—T Th 2 hrs 40 mts—8-10:40 or 11:15-13:55

Three days a week—MWF 1 hr 45 mts—8-9:45, 11:15-13:00

\*\*\*\*\*

**Attachment 5: General Education Committee Report**

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

Date November 20, 2000 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 have modified the formal motion made at the Senate meeting in September, and intend to make a new motion. The section providing for closed deliberations during the hearing process has been deleted.**

**We are also introducing a new policy for 2001-2002 regarding students at different stages in their careers and the choice of old or new general education requirements. The GEC is only asking for feedback on the initial draft at this meeting.**

**In addition, we are attaching a list of recently certified general education courses.**

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

If so, state the motion:

**That the Academic Senate approve the GEC Course Approval Process.**

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: \_\_\_\_\_

**William D. Jenkins  
Chair**

\*\*\*\*\*

## GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

The following courses have been certified by the General Education Committee and have been circulated. All have passed the objection stage. They are being appended to the Senate agenda as information. For a complete list of certified courses, see the General Education Website linked to the YSU homepage.

### **Oral Communication Intensive**

990250 – MGT 3755, Managing Diversity

### **Writing Intensive**

990150 – FOUND 3708, Education & Society

990248 – CSIS 3704, Business Communications

990251 – CRJUS 3712, Criminal Justice Research Methods

990255 – ECEGR 2612, Instrumentation and Computation Lab II

### **Critical Thinking Intensive**

990216 – PHYS 3741, Electromagnetic Field Theory 1

990254 – ECEGR 2632, Basic Circuit Theory I

990258 – PHIL 3711, General Ethics

\*\*\*\*\*

## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE PROPOSAL FLOW FORM

### **I. Proposal of an Already Existing Course**

A. After Dean's review, the department submits the course proposal to the General Education Committee.

B. The General Education Committee reviews the course and undertakes one of the following actions:

1. Certification of the course as proposed. Course is then circulated as part of the objection stage.
2. Return of the course to the department with advice on how to improve the proposal for possible certification. Coordinator will meet with the department if requested. The course may be resubmitted for possible certification.
3. Rejection of the course proposal. The Coordinator will explain the reasons for rejection to the department.

C. A certified course will be circulated for ten working days through the deans' offices and with notification to the chairs. The circulation process may result in the following options:

1. If no objections are forthcoming, the course is certified as a general education course and appended to the Senate agenda. It will also be added to the list of certified general education courses on the General Education Website.

2. If a faculty member, chair, or academic administrator lodges a complaint with a written memo to the Coordinator of General Education within the ten working days, then the Coordinator will notify in writing the department proposing the course that an objection has occurred, and attach the objection to the memo. The Coordinator will request that the objector and the department proposing the course resolve the objection.

3. If the objection is resolved, the Coordinator must be notified in writing of the resolution. The proposed course is then returned to GEC for continuing action, which includes the following:

a) If no changes have occurred, then the course has cleared the objection stage, is certified and appended to the Senate agenda.

b) If changes have occurred, the committee will review the changes and determine whether they are acceptable. If acceptable and the changes do not require further review by the UCC, the course will be appended to the Senate agenda. If a review is needed, then the course proposal will be forwarded to the department for submission as a course change proposal.

4. If those involved are unable to resolve the objection, the GEC will seek reconciliation. If the differences still cannot be resolved, the GEC will then conduct a hearing regarding the objection. (See **HEARING**)

## **II. Proposal of a New Course**

A. A proposing department must submit a completed Undergraduate Curriculum Committee form and a completed General Education Course Proposal form in one package to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The UCC will send the appropriate forms to the GEC.

B. The General Education Committee will review the course and undertake one of the following actions:

1. Pre-certification of the course as proposed. Course is then returned to UCC for its review and circulation as part of the objection stage.

2. Return of the course to the department with advice on how to improve the proposal for possible certification. Coordinator will meet with the department if requested. The course may be resubmitted for possible certification.

3. Rejection of the course proposal. The Coordinator will explain the reasons for rejection to the department.

C. A pre-certified course will be jointly circulated with UCC for ten working days through the deans' offices and with notification to the chairs. A course must clear the objection stage for both committees to be certified as a general education course. The circulation process may result in the following options:

1. If no objections are forthcoming to either committee, the course is certified as a general education course and appended to the Senate agenda. It will also be added to the list of certified general education courses on the General Education Website.

2. If a faculty member, chair, or academic administrator lodges a complaint with a written memo to the Coordinator of General Education within the ten working days, then the Coordinator will notify in writing the department proposing the course that an objection has occurred, and attach the objection to the memo. The Coordinator will request that the objector and the department proposing the course resolve the objection.

3. If the objection is resolved, the Coordinator must be notified in writing of the resolution. The proposed course is then returned to GEC continuing action, which includes the following:

- a) If no changes have occurred, then the course has cleared the objection stage, is certified and appended to the Senate agenda.
- b) If changes have occurred, the committee will review the changes and determine whether they are acceptable. If acceptable and the changes do not require further review by the UCC, the course will be appended to the Senate agenda. If a review is needed, then the course will be forwarded to the UCC with a recommendation that the department submit a new course proposal through appropriate channels.

4. If those involved are unable to resolve the objection, the GEC will seek reconciliation. If the differences still cannot be resolved, the GEC will then conduct a hearing regarding the objection. (See **HEARING**)

### **III. Hearing**

A. In order to insure a just and orderly hearing of the objection, the following procedures must be observed by all parties:

1. Prior to the day of the hearing, a precise written statement of the objection(s) will be distributed to all parties.
2. All concerned persons are permitted in the room during the hearing.
3. The Coordinator will call the meeting to order and clarify any procedural questions.
4. Any objectors may be present. Each will be heard. The objections will be presented in a reasonable and concise manner.
5. The representative for the course proposal will present the department's position in a reasonable and concise manner.
6. The objector may present a rebuttal in a reasonable and concise manner.
7. The department representative for the course proposal may present a rebuttal in a reasonable and concise manner.
8. GEC members will then have the opportunity to ask questions of both the objectors and the department representative.
9. The GEC members will then discuss the issues and report the Committee's decision, in writing, to the objector and department proposing the course within five working days.

B. The GEC must reach one of the following decisions and forward the course proposal to the Senate:

1. Reaffirm its certification of the course proposal.
2. Withdraw its certification of the course proposal.
3. Make no recommendation.

C. The GEC then will undertake one of the following actions at the next Academic Senate meeting:

1. Move to certify the course proposal.
2. Present the course proposal without a recommendation. The Senate may then take appropriate action.

\*\*\*\*\*



Below you will find a draft of policies to be presented to the Academic Senate after a university-wide review:

### **CHOOSING OLD OR NEW GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS**

#### **1. INCOMING FIRST YEAR STUDENTS SINCE THE FALL OF 2000—**

Such students must take the new general education requirements.

#### **2. TRANSFER STUDENTS WITH A BACHELOR'S DEGREE—**

Students coming from another university with an already completed bachelor's degree shall not have to complete any general education requirements at YSU.

#### **3. TRANSFER STUDENTS WITHOUT A BACHELOR'S DEGREE—**

In general, such transfer students who are admitted to YSU in or after the fall of 2002 must satisfy the new general education requirements. Transfer students admitted prior to that time may choose either the old or new general education requirements. Students who have completed the transfer module at a recognized institution may transfer 36-40 semester hours of general education credit. Such students must check with an advisor to determine which courses must be taken beyond the 36-40 hours to complete the YSU general education requirements. Transfer students will be given credit under either old or new requirements for courses taken at another university which equate to courses offered at YSU for general education credit.

#### **4. STUDENTS ENROLLED CONTINUOUSLY SINCE BEFORE THE FALL OF 2000—**

These students have the option of continuing with the old model or switching to the new general education model. It is easiest for such students to continue with the old program; there will be plenty of courses available to do so.

Those students who choose the new general education program must have an advisor evaluate the courses they have already taken to see if they equate to any of the certified general education courses under the new program. A general education bulletin is available with the list of newly certified general education courses and their equates under the former system. Under the new system students must take a math course, an oral communication course, 2 writing intensive courses, 2 oral communication courses, and 2 critical thinking intensive courses, which were not required by the old system.

#### **5. STUDENTS RE-ENROLLING AFTER THREE OR MORE SEMESTERS OF ABSENCE OR ITS EQUIVALENT; STUDENTS WHO COMBINE RE-ENROLLING AND TRANSFERRING—**

Students who are readmitted will use the catalog in effect at their last readmission or any one subsequent catalog as the guide to general education requirements.

#### **6. STUDENTS WHO SWITCH MAJORS OR DEGREES WHILE AT YSU—**

Students taking the new general education model will finish whatever portion of the new requirements remains. Students taking the old general education model must satisfy the requirements that are part of the degree they are seeking.