MINUTES
ACADEMIC SENATE
May 5, 1978

ATTENDANCE: (See attached attendance roster.)

The meeting was called to order at 4:20 by Dr. Jean Kelty, chairperson of the Senate.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 7, 1978 SENATE MEETING

All minutes of the April 7 meeting were not distributed. They will be approved at the May 19, 1978 meeting.

REPORTS OF SENATE COMMITTEES

Charter and ByLaws Committee - Dr. Agnes Smith reported in place of the chairman, Dr. Cox.

The essence of the decision of the Charter and ByLaws Committee regarding elections is as follows: The Elections and Balloting Committee is an integral part of the Senate; in absence of other procedures Roberts Rules of Order shall be followed; and it is the judgment of the committee that the matter is concerned with a procedural dispute rather than a balloting dispute.

Executive Committee - Dr. Kelty reported.

Scanner problems have made it impossible to run through the computer requests for committee appointments. The Executive Committee plans to make the committee appointments next week and will report at the next meeting.

Room 1080 in CAST is the office of the Academic Senate. Anyone who has Senate records in relation to Senate committees should contact Dr. Kelty and she will make arrangements for you to transfer those records to the official office of the Academic Senate.

Elections and Balloting Committee - Dr. Secrist reported. They are presently conducting elections for the new Senate. Elections are completed for the At-Large Senate elections and the Elections and Balloting Committee.

AT-LARGE FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS
Edward Largent
Donald Byo
Darla Funk
Elaine Juhasz
Daniel O'Neill
Louis Zona

AT-LARGE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
James Steele
Glorianne Leck
Robert DiGiulio

AT-LARGE CAST
William Barsch
Margaret Horvath
Dorothy Kennedy
Victor Richley

AT-LARGE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
Samuel Skarote
Jack Bakos

AT-LARGE ARTS AND SCIENCES

Jean Kelty
Esther Niemi
George Beelen
Gratia Murphy
Everett Abram
Sidney Roberts
Frederick Blue
Janet Del Bene
Irwin Cohen
Warren Young
Sally Hotchkiss
Ikram Khawaja

AT-LARGE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Ranger Curran
Terry Deiderick
Donald Hovey
Mervin Kohn
William Petrych

ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE

Sara Throop - Education
Mervin Kohn - Business
To be elected - Arts and Sciences

Dr. Secrist reported on the action the committee has taken in response to the April 7 Senate meeting regarding elections.

He then read a memo that he sent to Dr. Kelty (attached) and a memo in response to Charter and ByLaws action (attached).

Dr. Kelty noted that Article 4, Section 2 B(3) specifies that the Charter and ByLaws should make interpretations and those interpretations should be brought to the floor of the Senate. If the Senate wishes to overrule, it must be by majority vote which would call for the Charter and ByLaws Committee to submit a Charter and ByLaws revision which would clarify the issue.

Motion to overrule Charter and ByLaws — Died for want of a second

Gary Pilcher moved to overrule the decision of Charter and ByLaws. Died for want of a second.

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE SENATE - Dr. Roberts recognized the services of Dr. David Behen (text attached).

Motion to recognize services of Dr. Behen — Carried

Dr. Roberts moved to recognize Dr. Behen's service to the university and grant him honorary membership in the YSU Senate. Second by Dr. Brothers. Motion carried.

He then recognized the services of Professor Dykema (text attached).

Motion to recognize services of Professor Dykema — Carried

Dr. Roberts moved to recognize Professor Dykema's service to the university and grant her honorary membership in the YSU Senate. Motion received a second. Motion carried.

MOTION TO CHANGE AGENDA ITEM 8 TO ITEM 7 — Carried

Dr. Del Bene moved to place item 8 before item 7 on the agenda. Second by Dean Brown. Motion carried.

Computer Committee - Dr. Dandipani reported.

Motion to rescind Senate motion 1 of Computer Committee report - May 20, 1977 — Carried

Dean Brown moved to rescind Senate motion 1 of the May 20, 1977 meeting. Second by Dr. Krishnan. Discussion followed.

Dr. Kelty then read motion 1 (attached).

Q. Why are we rescinding?

A. They want to introduce the motion appended to the agenda as a replacement.

Q. Why are they moving form 60% usage to a more general motion?

A. Because there were problems in implementing the previous motion.

Dr. Edgar - Last fall there were concerns expressed about the motion. He met with the Charter and ByLaws Committee and the Computer Committee to find a substitute solution. This motion is a step toward solution of the problem. This will lead to getting more faculty participation in discussing matters dealing with the Data Services Committee.

Question called. Motion to rescind carried.

Motion to approve formation of joint Computer Committee — Carried

Dean Brown then moved the substitute motion as listed in the agenda. Motion received a second.

Q. Does this detract from the charge of the Computer Committee?

A. The committees will be frozen, and after one year a review will be conducted to determine whether the Computer Committee will be reactivated or dropped. There are presently two committees: the Charter Committee and the Data Services Committee which determines programming time. The motion is an attempt to achieve more faculty representation.

Q. There will be three committees until a change is made?

A. Dr. Edgar has a concern about this.

Q. When was this sent to Charter and ByLaws?

A. April 12.

Observation: This has not been discussed at recent meetings of the Charter and ByLaws Committee.

By approving this motion we can act in lieu of the Charter and ByLaws Committee to approve the action this motion is suggesting - That the Computer Committee be in limbo for a one year period.

Q. Why the change in the method of student appointments.

Motion to amend to change student appointment process — Approved

An amendment was moved by John Carano to delete president of student government and replace with student council. Second by McBriarty. Question called. Amendment carried.

Question called on the motion as amended. Motion carried.

Motion to clarify committee relationships — Withdrawn

Dean Yozwiak moved that the new joint Computer Committee will assume the duties which supercede the duties of the present Data Services Committee and the present Computer Committee and that the latter be inactive for one year after the joint committee is formed. After one year a review will be conducted by the president of the Senate, president of the University, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Director of the Computer Center and a faculty person designated by the faculty members serving on the joint committee. A report will be made recommending the Computer Committee be reactivated or dropped. Motion received a second.

Dr. Dalbec - Will this violate Charter and ByLaws?

Parliamentarian- You can't simply make a ByLaw or Article inactive by Senate vote. The solution is to have three committees until Charter and ByLaws brings in a motion to suspend actions.

Dean Yozwiak withdrew the motion.

Motion to refer to Charter and ByLaws Committee — Carried

Dr. Singler moved that the matter be referred to Charter and ByLaws. Second by Dr. Dalbec. Question called. Motion carried.

REPORTS OF OTHER SENATE COMMITTEES

Individualized Curriculum Program Committee - No action required.

Academic Affairs Committee - Dr. Richley reported.

Major differences are that the present policy would allow the student with a B, C, D, F grade to repeat a course and utilize recalculation of GPA; The future policy would limit it to C, D, and F grades; it removes some of the abuses of the original policy. The present policy allows for recalculation of point average based on the higher grade when a student repeats one or two times; the future policy allows for recalculation of grade based only on grade for the last course.

Motion to approve circulated GPA change — Quorum lost before vote

Dr. Richley moved for the approval of the motion as listed on the agenda. Motion received a second.

Dean Yozwiak objected. He stated the following reasons:

1) If we allow any recalculation, it should be recalculation for any courses.
2) There is no way we can control when a student takes a course for a third or fourth time.
3) Is it justifiable that once a student takes a course and receives a D, takes it over and gets an F, to remove credit from him?

A lengthy discussion followed. Points raised included: rules should pertain to all students, the original reason for this policy was to permit students to remain in school, the recalculation of point average is a misrepresentation of student ability, GPA means a great deal less when 20% of the graduates have a 3.5 average or better, the proposed change supports mediocrity, there could be a misuse in calculating honors.

Motion to amend by adding a sentence — No vote - lost quorum

Dr. Leck moved to amend the motion to read:

A current undergraduate student may petition the dean of her or his college for a recalculation of grade point average when that student has legitimately repeated a course once and has earned a higher grade. It is noted that such a recalculation will automatically disqualify the student from receiving academic honors recognition from Youngstown State University. Motion received a second.

Motion to amend the amendment — No vote - lost quorum

Dr. Dalbec moved to delete the second sentence in the amendment--"It is noted that such a recalculation will automatically disqualify the student from receiving academic honors recognition from Youngstown State University."

Move to table the motion

Dean Paraska noted the loss of a quorum.

The motions died for loss of a quorum and any future action will have to be introduced by the Academic Affairs Committee for consideration.

ATTENDANCE
UNIVERSITY SENATE
May 5, 1978

AND SCIENCES

George Beelen
Frederick Blue FJB
Barbara Brothers
Dean Brown
Carl Chuey
William Cochran
Irwin Cohen
Paul Dalbec
Janet DelBene
Christine Dykema
Gary Fry
George Haushalter
James Houck
William Jenkins
Jean Kelty
Friedrich Koknat
Renee Linkhorn
Loretta Liptak
Donald Milley
Brendan Minogue
James Morrison
Gratia Murphy
Sidney Roberts
Lowell Satre
Charles Singler
David Stephens
Elizabeth Sterenberg

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Dennis Bensinger
A. Ranger Curran
E. T. Deiderick
William Flad
Inez Gross
Donald Hovey
Mervin Kohn
Donald Mathews
Jane Simmons

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Margaret Braden
David Cliness
Robert DiGiulio
Louis Hill
Glorianne Leck
Ron[illegible]d Richards
Juanita Roderick
Charles Smith

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Donald Arnett
Paul Bellini
Robert Foulkes
John Kearns
John Petrek
John Ritter
Samuel Skarote
Leslie Szirmay

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Donald Byo
Ronald Gould
Elaine Juhasz
Edward Largent
Jon Naberezny
Daniel O'Neill
David Robinson
Arthur Spiro
Louis Zona

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

James Conser
Janis Cramer
Barbara Erickson
Kathylynn Feld
Bari Lateef
Gary Pilcher
Victor Richley
Mary Sebestyen
Daniel Suchora

ADMINISTRATIVE

Taylor Alderman
Earl Edgar
Michael Householder
Rama Krishnan
Charles McBriarty
William McGraw
Robert Miller
Arnold Moore
Jon Naberezny
Nicholas Paraska
Edmund Salata
James Scriven
George Sutton
Bernard Yozwiak
Leon Rand

STUDENT MEMBERS

Sam Barbera
John Carano
Jackie Caventer
Richard Curry
George Glaros
Laura Grohovsky
Jeff Gwin
Tony Koury
Mary Miller
Genna Pavel
Albert Pesa
Linda Schajatovic
Jon Steen
Dave Stroud
William Yeaton

MEMO TO DR. KELTY:

I regret that you seem to have interpreted my explanatory memo of April 11 as defiance of the Senate.

On the contrary, the Elections and Balloting Committee firmly believes that it is simply performing its duties and exercising its responsibilities and authority under the Charter and ByLaws.

I agree that the Senate's action involved "questioning the proper conduct of nominating procedures." However, since I as well as the chairman of the Charter and ByLaws Committee maintain that the procedures were indeed proper. The result is ipso facto nothing more or less than a balloting dispute. The Charter, ByLaw 2, Section 3 expressly and unequivocally states that "all balloting disputes shall be resolved by the Elections and Balloting Committee and their determination shall be final."

Accordingly, as I previously explained, the Elections and Balloting Committee were consulted and they unanimously supported my view that the procedures involved in the election in question were in fact proper as well as customary and unexceptionable and that the election did proceed as planned.

Since the Elections and Balloting Committee is not a creature of the Senate but rather elected by and responsible to all faculty of the respective schools and colleges, the Charter and ByLaws Committee under which it was established and under which it derives its authority supersedes and nullifies any action of the Senate that might conflict with it.

Just as the Congress must deal with the superior authority of the Constitution, the University Senate must operate under the Charter and ByLaws which delimits its authority and jurisdiction.

I fully support as does the Elections and Balloting Committee the other action of April 7 which calls for an examination and specification of election procedures. But unless and until such action is incorporated into the Charter by amendment and ratification the present document is in effect and it cannot be denied that the present document under which we operate is absolute and final jurisdiction over all balloting disputes which this obviously and indubitably is, to the Elections and Balloting Committee rather than to the Senate.

I respectifully submit, therefore, that we are acting not in defiance of the Senate but rather within the jurisdiction and with the authority granted us by the Charter and ByLaws. If it can be demonstrated otherwise we will be happy to reconsider our decision in this matter.

RESPONSE TO CHARTER AND BYLAWS

The conclusions drawn about the Elections and Balloting procedures after a meeting of April 21 leave much to be desired as to both accuracy and logic as follows: (numbers correspond with Charter and ByLaws memo)

I and III While the Elections and Balloting Committee is obviously connected with the Senate, it is even more obviously in a special even unique position since it is the only committee to be nominated and elected by the entire full-service faculty of each school and college. Thus it is a creature not of the Senate but of the Charter itself and there is nothing in the Charter and ByLaws that appears to give the Senate any direct authority or control over the Elections and Balloting Committee.

Indeed as Dr. Khawaja pointed out at another meeting I attended, it was probably the intent of the framers of the Charter and ByLaws to remove from the direct control of the Senate the machinery for its perpetuation. For this reason, the Elections and Balloting Committee was made electable by and responsible to the faculty itself rather than the Senate.

II, III, IV The foundations on which your main conclusions were erected is totally without substance. Since the sentence you cite, Article III, Section 5, Subsection E clearly and unmistakably applies Roberts Rules of Order to meetings of the Senate not to either the functioning of committees in general or to elections procedures in particular, both of which are taken up in entirely different and later articles. While it is true that ByLaw 9 makes a broader application of these rules, this statement was not referred to as supporting your conclusion. Moreover, when the details of elections procedures were being worked out four years ago in constant consultation with the Charter and ByLaws Committee, no reference to either of these revisions was ever made to my knowledge.

On the contrary, the Elections and Balloting Committee was given the responsibility and the authority to work out these details themselves, so long as they were reasonable, fair, uniform and applied without prejudice in the spirit of the Charter and ByLaws if not necessarily the letter. In this way were developed the procedures that have been followed for the past four years, ever since the new Senate and the Elections and Balloting Committee were established.

V It is difficult to distinguish a "procedural dispute" from a balloting dispute in this instance since the procedure in question involves specifically the composition of a ballot. Moreover, while the resolution of all balloting disputes, procedure or otherwise is specifically and clearly provided for and placed in the jurisdiction of the Elections and Balloting Committee, the term procedural dispute seems to have been manufactured specifically for the purposes of this memo. No authority being cited for it in the Charter and ByLaws. Thus it appears to be without wither legal or logical validity in this case. However, since the Elections and Balloting have always considered the Charter and ByLaws Committee to be something of a Supreme Court as to the interpretation of the Charter and ByLaws, we will bow to your decision and rerun the elections in question with all the nominees on the ballot albeit with great reluctance and under strong protest. We urge however that you act expeditiously on the other Senate action to evaluate the Elections and Balloting procedure with aims to greater specificity and clarification so that such an unfortunate dispute need never occur again.

May 5, 1978

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE SENATE

At the end of this academic year David Behen, Professor of History, is retiring from the faculty after a long, unique, and significant academic career. After teaching at the University of Chicago and Knox College he came to Youngstown College in September of 1954 at the rank of Associate Professor, was appointed a full professor four years later, in 1958; and, served as chairperson of the History Department from 1957 to 1967.

His achievements throughout his career were many. He was named a Distinguished Professor by Youngstown State University in 1963-1964, and subsequently was commissioned a "Kentucky Colonel" by the governor of that state for outstanding achievement as a native son.

Those of us who know Professor Behen know him as a mentor, advisor, scholar, teacher, and gentleman. One of his departmental colleagues describes him as "the best and the wisest man whom I have ever known." Another declares that while he "continues to teach and to guide he also continues to learn and to grow." Still another colleague asserts that Dave Behen is "concerned not only with the discipline of history but with students--as students and as citizens." There are only a few of us who know that Dr. Behen gave his public lecture fees and other gifts to the University requesting that no publicity be given to his donations. All of us who have had any contact whatsoever with Professor Behen know that he identifies with and is fiercely

committed to the development of this University as an institution of higher learning. In a private letter Dave Behen confessed that "all of my satisfactions are bound up with the privilege of sharing in the experience of the University's growth and achievements." In the same revealing letter he acknowledged what we all already know when he wrote "I happen to be one of those people who find the attractions of teaching so great that no other satisfactions ever quite compensate."

While I am privy to other information I'll keep it for a more festive and less formal occasion. But, the University Senate should take special note of his contribution to this very body.

Shortly after his arrival here from Knox College where a faculty Senate existed Professor Behen and two others went twice to see President Howard Jones urging and arguing on behalf of the creation of a faculty Senate here. President Jones at both of these meetings opposed the idea, but shortly thereafter agreed. On October 21, 1959 the very first meeting of the Senate took place, President Jones presided, officers were elected, committees were appointed, and a monthly schedule of meetings in the Audio-Visual Room of the old library was established. It was fitting and just that many years later when the President of the University stepped down as presiding officer of the Senate the first faculty member to be elected chairperson of the Senate was Professor David M. Behen.

In view of all the above, I should like to make the following motion:

WHEREAS David M. Behen has served the Academic Senate as a founder and as an active member; and

WHEREAS David M. Behen has rendered invaluable service to this faculty and University;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate accord to Professor Behen its appreciation for said service and grant to him Honorary Membership in the Youngstown State University Senate.

I so move.

May 5, 1978

Special Report to the Senate

Our Senate Parliamentarian, Professor Christine R. Dykema, is retiring from the faculty at the end of this academic year after forty years of service to this University. She obtained a diploma in French Civilization from the Sorbonne in 1931 and degrees from the Barnard College of Columbia University and Western Reserve University. She joined the Youngstown faculty in September of 1938 and as an Associate Professor of French and was promoted to full Professor in 1970. Since the Spring of 1973 she has been the Chairperson of the Department of Foreign Languages.

Professor Dykema served as faculty advisor to Student Government for twenty-five years. She has been an active member of the Senate both as a faculty member and as our peacemaking Parliamentarian.

In view of Professor Dykema's many years of distinguished contributions to the University, I should like to make the following motion:

WHEREAS Christine Dykema has served the Academic Senate as Parliamentarian since its inception,

AND WHEREAS she has rendered invaluable service to the faculty and to the academic community,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate accord to Christine Dykema its appreciation for that faithful service and grant to her Honorary Membership in the Youngstown State University Academic Senate.

I so move.

COMPUTER COMMITTEE MOTION 1 MAY 20, 1977

That all computer related project proposals shall be reviewed by the Computer Committee of the University Senate. This committee shall recommend allocation of academic programming and analysis hours, not to exceed 60% of the total budgeted, to the University Budget Committee through the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO Dr. Howard Cox **DATE** April 12, 1978

FROM Senate Computer Committee

SUBJECT Creation of Joint Computer Committee.

At our regular meeting on April 6, 1978 the enclosed motion was adopted and will be brought to the Senate for a vote. Passage of this motion involves the future of Senate Computer Committee and Data Services which should be addressed by the Senate Charter and By-Laws committee. We have the following recommendation to you in this regard:

The Senate Computer Committee recommends that the new joint computer committee will assume duties which supercede those of the present Data Services Committee and the present Senate Computer Committee, the latter to be inactive for one year from the time the joint committee is formed. After one year, a review will be conducted by: The President of the Senate, the President of the University, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Director of the Computer Center, and a faculty person designated by the faculty members serving on the joint committee. From this review, a report will be made to the Senate recommending that the Senate Computer Committee be re-activated or dropped from the Charter.

The idea behind the proposed joint committee is a unified approach to matters relating to computer usage and other computer related services at Y.S.U. Hence the need for freezing or dissolving the Computer Committee and Data Services Committee when the new joint committee is formed becomes essential. This topic is bound to arise when we present our proposal to the Senate at its next meeting. Your participation, therefore, will be essential.

I will be glad to provide more information on this subject if needed.

R. Dandapani

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

Ac Senate
discussed at
May 5, 1978 Senate
mtg

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO Vice President Edgar **DATE** May 19, 1978

FROM Bernard J. Yozwiak BY

SUBJECT Recalculation of Grades
College of Arts and Sciences

RECEIVED
MAY 22 1978
DR. EARL E. EDGAR
VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

We have just completed a study of the recalculation forms processed from the Fall quarter, 1977 to the present date. The following observations are to be noted:

1) Recalculation was used on a total of 437 courses. Of these, the following grades were replaced

3	B's
32	C's
195	D's
207	F's

2) There were 12 courses in which the replacing grade was not the last one taken.

3) The point average after the 275 individual recalculations, fell in the following categories

56	below 2.0
112	in the range 2.00 to 2.49
69	in the range 2.50 to 2.99
25	in the range 3.00 to 3.39
5	in the range 3.40 to 3.59
3	in the range 3.60 to 3.79
5	in the range 3.80 to 4.00

4) Of the 13 students who might be concerned with honors (3.40 and above), 10 did not change their "honor" status, 1 went to the 3.4 range (cum laude) and 2 went to the 3.8 range (summa cum laude). However, recalculation was made in these cases on 1 C, 1 D, and 1 F.

The added observations one can make are the following:

4) Continued

If the present proposal (on the Senate floor) were approved

a) only 3 of the 437 recalculations would have been disallowed (see 1)

b) 12 recalculations might not have been presented since the retake resulted in a lower grade (see 2)

c) No one would have qualified for honors or a different honors category by the recalculation process, since no B grades were involved--in fact, only 1 C was involved, the others were below C (see 4).

cc: Academic Deans

no quorum -
meeting held
May 26
(same agenda)