

Earl Edgar
Vice President, Academic

RECEIVED

NOV 13 1978

DR. EARL E. EDGAR
VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

7 MINUTES
ACADEMIC SENATE
October 6, 1978

ATTENDANCE: (See attached roster)

Jean Kelty called the meeting to order at 4:00 o'clock after having established that there was a quorum present.

CONFIRMATION OF SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN AND SENATE SECRETARY

Motion to confirm L. Esterly as parliamentarian and V. Phillips as secretary Carried

Chairman Kelty announced that the charter specifies that the chairman of the senate will appoint a secretary and a parliamentarian who will be confirmed by the senate. Larry Esterly has agreed to serve as parliamentarian and Virginia Phillips has agreed to serve as senate secretary. It was moved that Larry Esterly be confirmed as parliamentarian and Virginia Phillips be confirmed as secretary. Motion received a second. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 26, 1978 AND JUNE 2, 1978 MEETINGS

May 26, 1978 Minutes
June 2, 1978 Minutes

Deferred
Approved

Approval of the May 26, 1978 minutes was delayed until the next senate meeting to give the curriculum committee an opportunity to determine which of the courses that were appended to the minutes of the meeting should, in fact, not have been appended. There was a question about the page notation of the minutes of June 2. It was determined that the minutes, as circulated, had incorrect page numbers. Page 3 should be page 2, and page 2 should be page 3. It was then determined that the minutes with correctly numbered pages accurately reflected the events of the June 2, 1978 meeting. It was moved that the minutes of the June 2, 1978 meeting be approved as corrected.

REPORTS OF SENATE COMMITTEES

Charter and ByLaws Committee - No report.

Executive Committee - Dr. Feitler reported. (A copy of his remarks to the senate is attached to the minutes.)

Chester Routh, Biological Sciences, has been appointed to fill a vacant position on the Educational Media Committee. The other major item discussed was the President's challenge to the senate action on Labor Studies Program.

Motion to Reconsider

Carried

Dr. Feitler moved that the Academic Senate reconsider the June 2 action to accept, as amended, the Labor Studies Program. Seconded by Dr. Largent. A question was raised as to whether it was necessary to revoke. The answer was in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Motion to Return to Academic Affairs

Carried

Dr. Feitler moved that the reconsidered action of June 2, 1978, to accept the labor studies program, as amended, be returned to the Academic Affairs Committee. Dr. Largent seconded the motion. Motion carried.

ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE

No report.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Dr. Paraska reported for the committee. He noted that because of the delay of time in getting this proposal to the senate floor, adjustments in the dates, as circulated, are necessary. The proposed time line for implementation of the system is changed to Fall, 1981. January, 1979 should be changed to March, 1979; March, 1979 should be changed to May, 1979; September, 1979 should be changed to May, 1980. January, 1980 should be changed to December, 1980, and February, 1980 should be changed to February, 1981.

Motion to Approve Early Semester System

Defeated

Dean Paraska moved that Youngstown State University change from the present quarter calendar to an early semester calendar no earlier than Fall, 1981. Motion received a second. A lengthy discussion about the early semester system followed.

Points of discussion included:

1. It is geared to the faculty and administration rather than students.
2. The survey results are questionable; an informal survey by one department showed sentiment 11 to 1 against change.
3. Was any consideration given to an early fall quarter system? This is an alternative to the early semester system.

4. Most students who work will have difficulty in adjusting to the semester system. This may result in extending a student's educational program. At this point, Dr. Kelty asked Dr. Van Norman to read into the minutes a statement by the Youngstown State University Chapter of the OEA relating to its positions on the subject (see attached).

5. This is an academic decision, and we should consider the matter from an academic viewpoint. The faculty should make up its mind after proper debate on the subject on its academic merits. The administration will then look at the decision made by the senate. If adopted, an agreement would have to be worked out between Youngstown State University and the Youngstown State University OEA. The Youngstown State University OEA has not discussed the merits of the program and has taken no position on quarter versus semesters.

6. Q. What is the latest date that action could be taken without changing the milestone dates for implementation?

A. The answer to this question is that dates would have to be changed on a month-by-month basis. There is not that much give in the timetable. Departments need adequate time to convert courses.

Q. Could the senate delay action for another month and still meet the fall, 1981 date?

A. Probably. However, the committee recommends we should not procrastinate. Dean Scriven noted that a one-month delay would not cause any problems in meeting the proposed timetable.

7. While much discussion has taken place, it was noted that the Senate has not yet debated the question.

8. There is a serious question about the poll. There is a question about the academic superiority of the semester system over the quarter system. The question is really whether we are more comfortable with a quarter system or with a semester system.

9. Both systems have academic merits. It is a matter of personal taste and change is miserable.

10. If we change from the quarter system to the semester system in the manner that Akron University did, it could wreck havoc with our curriculum.

11. A student member agreed with some of the previous statements. He indicated students do not know the proposal is before the senate. Before a decision is made, student feedback should be solicited.

12. An ad-hoc committee member noted that over two years of work have gone into this proposal. There was a previous committee which

studied this question. Both committees attempted to poll students' opinions. If the senate holds this up for more information, we may as well forget it. It is too difficult to get students to respond to this type of poll. You cannot get a large enough section to respond. Both committees found that a majority of faculty favored the switch.

13. It was noted that this issue was covered in the Jambar last year. Students tend to favor what system they are on. Senate is being asked to decide on academic merits. Faculty members have problems in textbooks not arriving on time. Winter driving can cause some winter classes to be canceled. A semester system would mean that you would be waiting for textbooks only twice a year, fewer days would be missed, and students would have a longer exposure to academic material. Students would have more time to absorb the material, and there would be a greater opportunity for teacher diagnosis versus a reduced opportunity for students to retake classes that they had failed.

14. The report does not emphasize an important issue: how many classes would a student take per semester and how many days would a student attend class; and how many classes would a faculty member teach. Students would take more classes per semester; faculty members would be teaching four rather than three classes.

15. The point was raised again that it is a matter of preference. Both systems produce quality programs. In recruiting faculty, seldom is the question raised as to what system the University is following. Research data will not support one system over the other on academic merits.

16. The semester would give the opportunity for three, rather than two, tests. Students could be asked to read books, write term papers, etc. There are courses that could benefit from an extended time period.

At this point, Dr. Paraska noted that President Coffelt had been invited to attend one of the meetings of the Ad-Hoc Committee. The President stressed the fact that deliberation and decisions should be made on the academic merits rather than personal preference of the University community body.

In discussion with Dan O'Neill, it is felt that the OEA feelings are that the faculty should address the issue from an academic standpoint. It is true that the faculty would be teaching four versus three classes. However, the number of class sessions per week would remain the same.

17. We are dealing with two arbitrary periods of time--ten weeks is not a coherent time period, nor is fifteen weeks. The more things change, the more they remain the same. Unless we have perceived problems with the quarter system, we should stay where we are.

18. We should determine if there is a monetary saving and if there is a work saving that can be accomplished by changing to the semester system.

19. The semester system is academically sound. Students do not have time to internalize subject matter. There would be more time for individual attention.

20. The primary difference is that with the quarter system you have a feverish pace of activity. No one is happy about changing, but the result of a change to a semester system could result in a better atmosphere.

21. A student raised a point asking whether or not it would be possible to set aside one class day for students to discuss this issue after being presented with information on the proposal.

22. Is it implicit that the time suggested be adopted if the proposal is adopted? Is it necessary to have an extended time period between semesters? The proposed time schedule would wipe out Christmas job and summer job opportunities for many students.

23. The proposed dates are only suggested dates.

24. This discussion is pertinent to the second motion which will be considered if the first motion is approved.

25. There is a lack of flexibility in the semester system. Students will have fewer opportunities to take some courses.

The question was called, the vote taken, a hand count was requested, it was determined that the motion was defeated by a 35 to 31 margin.

The Ad Hoc Committee was thanked for the work and effort that had gone into presenting this proposal to the senate.

Motion to consider an early quarter system.

Carried

Dr. Steele moved that a committee be appointed to study the feasibility of an early quarter system. Seconded by Largent. Motion carried.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

PRESIDENTS CHALLENGE - Because of the earlier Senate Executive action taken under executive committee report, item 8 on the agenda is mooted.

ADJOURNMENT - Dr. Hovey moved that the meeting be adjourned. Seconded by Dr. Largent. Meeting adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted


Virginia Phillips, Secretary

ATTENDANCE
UNIVERSITY SENATE

ARTS AND SCIENCES

Everett Abram E. Abram
 George Beelen George D. Beelen
 Frederick Blue _____
 Dean Brown Dean Brown
 Irwin Cohen Irwin Cohen
 Janet DeBene Janet DeBene
 Gary Fry Gary Fry
 George Haushalter George Haushalter
 Sally Hotchkiss Sally M. Hotchkiss
 James Houck James Houck
 William Jenkins William Jenkins
 Jean Kelly Jean Kelly
 Ikram Khawaja Ikram Khawaja
 Friedrich Koknat _____
 Leon Laitman _____
 Brendan Minogue Brendan Minogue
 Gratia Murphy Gratia Murphy
 Esther Niemi Esther Niemi
 Joan Phillip Joan Phillip
 Sidney Roberts Sidney Roberts
 William Shipman William Shipman
 Ann Harris Ann Harris
 Elizabeth Staudt Elizabeth Staudt
 Christopher Sweeney Christopher Sweeney
 Ronald Tabak Ronald Tabak
 Allen Viehmeyer Allen Viehmeyer
 Warren Young Warren Young
 John D. Van Norman John D. Van Norman

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Ranger Curran _____
 Terry Deiderick Terry Deiderick
 William Flad _____
 Inez Gross Inez Gross
 Donald Hovey _____
 Mervin Kohn Mervin Kohn
 Donald Mathews _____
 William Petrych _____
 Raymond Shuster Raymond Shuster

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Lawrence Haims L.H. (new list)
 Robert Ameduri _____
 Robert DiGiulio Robert DiGiulio
 Fred Feitler _____
 Clorienne Leck Clorienne Leck
 Gerald Richards Gerald Richards
 Charles Smith _____
 James Steele James Steele

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Jack Bakos Jack Bakos
 Wade Driscoll Wade Driscoll
 Floyd Morris _____
 Philip Munro Philip Munro
 John Ritter John Ritter
 Samuel Skarote Samuel Skarote
 Leslie Szirmay Leslie Szirmay

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Donald Byo Donald Byo
 Darla Funk Darla Funk
 Elaine Juhas Elaine Juhas
 Joseph Lapinski Joseph Lapinski
 Edward Largent _____
 Daniel O'Neill _____
 David Robinson _____
 Michael Walusis _____
 Louis Zona _____

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

William Barsch William Barsch
 Mary Beaubien _____
 Ronald Ciminero Ronald Ciminero
 James Conser _____
 Gail Hedrick _____
 Margaret Horvath Margaret Horvath
 Dorothy Kennedy _____
 Victor Richley Victor Richley
 Mary Sebestyen Mary Sebestyen
 Hilary Soller Hilary Soller

ADMINISTRATIVE

Taylor Alderman Taylor Alderman
 William Binning William Binning
 David Cliness David Cliness
 Lawrence Cummings _____
 Earl Edgar Earl Edgar
 Charles McBriarty _____
 William McGraw _____
 Robert Miller _____
 Arnold Moore Arnold Moore
 Nicholas Paraska _____
 Leon Rand _____
 Edmund Salata Edmund Salata
 James Scriven James Scriven
 George Sutton _____
 Bernard Yozwiak _____

STUDENT MEMBERS

Diane Bogan Diane Bogan
 John Carano _____
 Carol Colburn _____
 Richard Curry _____
 Mark DeNucci Mark DeNucci
 Toni DiSalvo _____
 Anita Marie Gillies Anita Marie Gillies
 Anthony Koury Anthony Koury
 John Murosko John Murosko
 Abidin Pak _____
 Tim Pysher _____
 Phyllis Schirck Phyllis Schirck
 Jon Steen _____

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

REPORT TO THE SENATE
October 6, 1978

The Senate Executive Committee has met on two occasions thus far this quarter. In addition to routine business, the committee has appointed Chester Ruth, Biological Sciences, to fill a vacant position on the Educational Media Committee.

We have also considered at length the effects of the President's Challenge of the Labor Studies Program. A copy of this challenge was attached to your agendas. After deliberation regarding this issue, we will present two motions to you, one to "Reconsider" the Labor Studies motion passed at the June 2nd Senate meeting; and the second to send the matter back to the Academic Affairs Committee, with the charge that the underlying issues be resolved, and that the issue be returned to the Senate floor as soon as possible, so that this program can be begun at our University.

Before presenting these motions to you, we would like to have you consider a summary of our thinking behind these motions. If the Senate were to over-rule the Challenge to the Labor Studies Motion, the President would then present the motion and his challenge to the Board of Trustees for their adjudication. It is our feeling that the Senate action would not be upheld in that instance. If, on the other hand, we vote to accept the President's Challenge, we have in effect undone our own actions at the request of the President. We believe that such action would, in effect, only exasperate the problem, while weakening the position of the Senate. In either case, the basic issues will not have been resolved and the integrity of the Senate action will have been weakened.

The Senate Executive Committee, therefore, urges all Senators to support the following motion to reconsider the June 2nd Labor Studies action and then to support the second motion which would send the matter back to Committee, where the Academic Community can debate the fundamental, underlying issues and bring back a motion that would be acceptable to both faculty and administration.

1ST MOTION

The following motion is made to you. I move that: The Academic Senate Reconsider the June 2nd action to accept, as amended, the Labor Studies Program.

2ND MOTION

I move that the Reconsidered action of June 2, 1978, to accept the Labor Studies Program, as amended, be returned to the Academic Affairs Committee.

The Youngstown State University Chapter

THE OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

631 WICK AVENUE
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44503

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY VOTE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE on OCT. 4, 1978:

SINCE the Academic Calendar is a negotiable matter under the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between Youngstown State University and the YSU-OEA (see Sect. 13.28 of the Agreement), and

SINCE several provisions of the Agreement would be affected by the adoption of an "Early Semester" calendar (e.g., workload, leaves, summer assignments),

THEREFORE, we shall consider any action of the Academic Senate calling for the adoption of an "Early Semester" calendar to be an advisory action which calls upon both the Administration and the YSU-OEA to incorporate provisions for an "Early Semester" calendar into subsequent bargaining.

FOR THE COMMITTEE:



David J. Robinson
President, YSU-OEA

RECONSIDERATION OF THE EARLY SEMESTER SYSTEM BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY/ANTHROPOLOGY/SOCIAL WORK JOINED BY SOME MEMBERS OF THE POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT.

The committee should be much commended for its diligence. Unfortunately, however, it has failed to look closely at one of the most relevant questions of all: how will the change from the quarter to the early-semester system affect our enrollment? And here the student opinion survey does provide some disconcerting indications, particularly in items 4, 5, and 6.

Let us begin with item 6: "If Y.S.U. changed to an 'early semester' calendar, would you probably transfer to another university or college?". Eleven per cent stated they would probably transfer, and 177 (21%) were not sure. If we add one half of that group to the 11% who said they probably would transfer, this would amount to 21%.

Now let us address ourselves to item 5: "Would a 15 week term make it easier or harder for you to coordinate your work and class schedules?". Out of 841 respondents, 311, or 38%, answered "harder". This by no means should be interpreted that 38% would not enroll because it had become harder for them to adjust their schedules. Yet, on the other hand, the economy in this valley is not precisely booming. Jobs are easier to lose than to get. And the decision to hold on to a job rather than to lose it and go to the university in the hope of finding another one may point to staying with the job rather than going to school. If only half of those act in the presumed manner, we are looking again at a potential loss of 19% in enrollment.

Finally, let us look at item 4: "Your yearly tuition would be paid in 2 parts instead of 3".

According to the Fall schedule for 1978, the full-time resident student with 12 - 16 quarter hours pays an instruction fee of \$210, a general fee of \$36, a vehicle permit fee of \$15, which comes to \$261 three times a year. Under the semester system he will pay \$391.50 two times a year, which means, come registration, he or she will have to come up with \$130.50 additional. We are a credit-oriented society in which substantial portions of income are already spoken for by various installment payments. We don't think that our students are any more prudent and budget-conscious to plan ahead for those \$130 extra dollars when registration fees become due. Furthermore, should a student be forced to drop out for health or job reasons, to lose \$261 versus \$391 is a great deal less painful, even in these inflation-ridden times. And the size of the loss alone may further discourage a student to enroll again.

Now let us briefly dwell on those disadvantages mentioned by the committee which also may have serious bearing on enrollment. The quarter system offers a great deal more flexibility than the semester system, as pointed out by the committee under 5, 7, and 3. Only two Final Exam sessions are given under the semester system. The student is responsible for more subjects and possibly also for covering them in greater depth. This in itself may affect his performance. In addition, his risk of failure and the consequences on his grade point average are potentially more severe. Too, to meet a prerequisite on a semester system becomes more difficult. Desirable sections may be closed, and others may be cancelled. Under the quarter system, the student has two more chances per academic year to get the desirable section, while under the semester system he has only one.

It is indeed strange that the committee has failed to take into consideration how the change will affect our enrollment. Given the declining numbers in the college group nationally, and even more so locally, retrenchment becomes a distinct possibility. Shall we make this possibility even more distinct by experimenting with the early semester system. The majority of our State institutions seem not to be so eager to engage in this type of experimentation and are perhaps the wiser for it.

On the other hand, it might be pointed out that in the change from the quarter to the semester system, the administration might very well profit. Shrinking student enrollment might justify faculty retrenchment. Sums saved in faculty salaries and fringes could be added to administrative savings in temporary manpower, computer time, and paperwork. Thus, from an administrative point of view, the early semester system combined with retrenchment might not be such a bad thing at all.

G. A. Dobbins

A. J. Muntean

John R. White

James W. Kiviazis

Margaret C. Moore

Larry E. Esterly

Wilhelm C. B.

Beverly Hartland

- Day 7 Fry

Joan De Silvio

Syretta Cooper

David S. Tasseer