Bernard Gillis
Provost

TO: FULL SERVICE FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, AND STUDENT GOVERNMENT

FROM: VIRGINIA PHILLIPS, SECRETARY, ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1992, 4:00 P.M.
ARTS AND SCIENCES AUDITORIUM, ROOM 132, DEBARTOLO HALL

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.

2. Approval of Minutes for February 5, 1992, meeting.

3. Elections and Balloting Committee Report.

4. Charter and Bylaws Committee Report.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report.

6. Reports From Other Senate Committees.
    912-10 ICP/Honors Program Committee Report .
    912-11 Ad Hoc Committee on the Computer Services Committee Report.

7. Unfinished Business.

8. New Business.

9. Adjournment.

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

Date __Feb. 18, 1992__   Report Number (For Senate Use Only) ___912-10___

Name of Committee Submitting Report __ICP/Honors Programs__

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

____Appointed chartered_____

Names of Committee members: __Genevra Kornbluth (chair); William Barsch, Theodore Chrobak,__
__Wilda Ferris, David Porter, Melissa Smith, Judy Wilkinson; George Sutton and Gordon__
__Mapley (ex officio); Jason Bryan and Cindy Olenik (student government)__

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

Senate: __(attach complete report) The Individualized Curriculum Program grows in__

__popularity each year. Enrollment has been limited to 100 since the program was__

__instituted in the early 1970's. To accommodate student demand, we recommend that__

__the enrollment limit be changed to 200.__

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

If so, state the motion: __We move that the enrollment limit for the Individualized__

__Curriculum Program be changed from 100 to 200.__

If there are substantive changes made from the floor in your committee recommendation,

would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further

consideration? __yes__

Other relevant data: _____

_____

_____
Chair:

2

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

Date ___2-20-92___   Report Number (For Senate Use Only) ~~912-11~~

Name of Committee Submitting Report ___Ad Hoc Committee to Review Computer Services___
          Committee
Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, <u>ad hoc</u>, etc.) _____

_____

Names of Committee members: <u>Richard Gaydos, Daniel O'Neill, Philip Munro, Virginia</u>
<u>Phillips, Sidney Roberts, Howard Pullman, Samuel Skarote, Sheila Routh, David</u>
<u>Genaway, Thomas Doctor, Floyd Jackson, Louis Anschuetz, Jeffrey Glasnapp,</u>
<u>Linda Kadilark, David Decker (chair)</u>

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

Senate: __(attach complete report) See attached report._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

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

If so, state the motion: __That the Academic Senate approve the recommendations__

__of the report._____(If passed) that the Senate Executive Committee forward__

__the approved recommendations to the Charter & Bylaws Committee in order to__

__incorporate the changes into the Charter & Bylaws._____

If there are substantive changes made from the floor in your committee recommendation,

would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further

consideration? ___yes_____

Other relevant data: _____

_____

David Decker
(Chair) (*WDg 2-24-92*)

3

TO: Academic Senate Charter and Bylaws Committee
            Academic Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Ad Hoc Committee on the Computer Services Committee

DATE: February 21. 1992

SUBJECT: Final Report and Recommendations

I. Recommendations

The Ad Hoc Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Computer Services Committee and the Library and Media Services Committee be dissolved.

2. That two new committees be created: the Library Acquisitions Budget Committee and the Integrated Technologies Committee.

3. That the charge for the Library Acquisitions Budget Committee be as follows:

> "The committee shall be responsible for making recommendations to the Academic Senate concerning the allocation of budgeted resources for the acquisition of instructional and research materials by Maag Library."

4. That the composition of the Library Acquisitions Budget Committee be as follows:

> Voting members shall be one faculty member from each school or college of the university and two students.

> Nonvoting members shall be two academic deans and the Director of the Library.

5. That the charge for the Integrated Technologies Committee be as follows:

> "The committee shall be responsible for making policy recommendations to the Academic Senate concerning faculty and student use of. acquisition of. and accessiblity to instructional and research technologies. This shall include computing and networking hardware and software; video. audio, and text materials; access to and distribution of electronically stored and transmitted data: support. maintenance, and training: and classroom and laboratory design.

> "This responsibility shall include a review of program and course proposals where such technologies are involved."

4

6. That the composiiton of the Integrated Technologies Committee be as follows:

> Voting members shall be one faculty member from each school or college of the university and two students.

> Nonvoting members shall be two academic deans, the Director of the Library, the Director of the Computer Center, the Director of the Media Center, and two members to represent areas such as: Fine and Performing Arts Materials Center, Foreign Language Lab, Education Curriculum Resource Center, Telephone, Electronic Maintenance Service, and Mail Room.

II. Rationale for Recommendations

The committee recognized that major changes have occurred in instructional and research technologies in recent years. If the Academic Senate is to fulfill its proper role in policy formulation and academic leadership, these changes must be reflected in the charges of the committees responsible for these matters. Among the most prominent of these technological changes are the following:

- The dissemination of microcomputers into virtually every academic and administrative department of the university.

- A significant improvement in the sophistication and capability of communications networks linking electronic devices throughout YSU's campus.

- A dramatic increase in the type and amount of electronically stored material.

- Significant improvements in the ability to deliver audio and visual information into classrooms and laboratories.

The committee further recognized that lack of coordination among the many university departments and entities using these technologies causes problems which are expensive and avoidable. It was felt that current charge of the Computer Services Committee was too narrow in its scope given today's technical environment.

The committee identified twelve policy areas related to instructional and research technologies which appeared to be of legitimate interest to the Academic Senate:

1. Faculty and student use of computers for research.
2. Instructional use of computers, including physical settings.
3. Hardware acquisition.
4. Hardware support, training, and maintenance.
5. Software acquisition.
6. Software support and training.
7. Network management, both internal and external.
8. Data distribution and electronic data interface.
9. Community use of YSU computing facilities.
10. Strategic planning for information systems.
11. Student administrative information services.
12. Access to electronically stored or transmitted library materials.

The committee then debated whether these policy areas should be divided and allocated to different committees of the Academic Senate, or whether a single committee should assume responsibility for all of them. Our conclusion was that a single committee would provide the required level of coordination in dealing with these interrelated topics. We also noted that the current charge of the Library and Media Services Committee covers some of these topics, that the current charge of the Computer Services Committee covers others, and that several are not covered by any existing committee.

The above analysis led us to the recommendations we offer, which were agreed to unanimously by the Ad Hoc Committee on February 10.

Finally, the committee observed that the last formal, written strategic plan for information systems at YSU was issued in 1983 and covered a five-year period. The committee believes that YSU should have a written strategic plan for its information systems activities, and believes that the Academic Senate should play a leading role in the development of such a plan.