

Vice President  
Academic Affairs

MINUTES  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
May 7, 1980

RECEIVED  
MAY 30 1980  
ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT

ATTENDANCE (See attached roster)

CALL TO ORDER

After establishing that there was a quorum present, Dr. Jean Kely, Chairperson of the Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:10. She requested a show of hands of those who had 5:00 p.m. classes, to determine whether a quorum would remain after that time. The results were unclear.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of April 2, 1980 were approved as circulated.

REPORT OF THE CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE--none

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dr. Feitler reported. He referred the attention of the Senate to the Resolution attached to the agenda for this meeting and offered some background. Last October, Jean Kely addressed a memo to President Coffelt, outlining her concern that the proposed charge to the Planning Task Force, a part of the Long-range Academic Planning Process, essentially omitted the Academic Senate. Vice President Edgar responded by noting that there would be a faculty member appointed to the Task Force, recommended by the Senate Executive Committee.

The Senate Executive Committee became concerned about this apparent lack of faculty input in the critical decision making areas of the process and appointed an ad hoc committee to study the situation and make recommendations to the Executive Committee.

There were several issues identified: (1.) The Planning Task Force should be well represented by faculty selected by the Senate Executive Committee; (2.) There should be a procedure added to the planning process that would establish goals; (3.) These goals should be the basis of a priority list; (4.) There should be opportunity for broad representation and general faculty reaction to goals and priorities; (5.) These matters should be brought to the Senate for discussion; and (6.) There should be a mechanism established to insure communication regarding the academic plan--from decision-makers to the faculty and vice versa.

The Executive Committee had intended to ask the Senate to vote last month on a resolution that addressed these issues. President Coffelt and Dr. Rand had expressed some concerns about the intent and wording of the Resolution at that time. Since these concerns appeared to be reasonable, the Executive Committee complied with the

administration's request to postpone action until this meeting. The Resolution attached to the agenda for this meeting meets with the approval of both the Senate Executive Committee and the administration.

Dr. Feitler therefore moved acceptance of the Resolution circulated with the agenda. The motion was seconded, and there was no discussion. The Resolution was accepted.

Dr. Feitler continued his report. In other business, the Senate Executive Committee has been busy selecting committee members for 1980-81. These appointments will be attached to the minutes for this meeting, and each person appointed will be notified in tomorrow's mail.

In other action, the Senate Executive Committee has recommended appointments to the President for administrative boards and advisory committees and selected individuals to serve on the planning committees called for by the Resolution.

Dr. Feitler called on the University representative to the Chancellor's Faculty Advisory Committee, Ed Largent, for a report from Columbus and pending legislation that may affect us all.

Dr. Largent reported that the most recent meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee was held on April 29, 1980. Among items that were discussed was the House Bill 629, which is the bill that deals with the administration picking up the faculty's contribution to STRS; that issue is still in limbo. It was brought to the House for a vote and was defeated. The person who authored the bill resubmitted it and it was passed with an amendment that this picking up of the 8½% contribution to STRS could be done only if the IRS rules that this is not taxable. When Dr. Largent left Columbus, no one was certain whether this would be sent to the Senate Finance Committee or to the Senate Education Committee.

There was a bill entered last year requesting that all colleges and universities submit federal grant proposals to the controlling board. The bill is still alive, but the participation of colleges and universities in this, if it passes, has been stricken.

Another bill that was submitted just before the legislature adjourned, House Bill 1153, proposes that the Board of Regents be required to provide up to 50% of the fee costs of any student graduating in the top 11% of his class, who wishes to attend any school in the state of Ohio. This has some interesting ramifications, since a student who graduates from a private school in the state of Ohio, in the top 11% of his class, could then theoretically gain up to 50% of his fee costs to go to a private school in the state of Ohio. This is an issue that the Chancellor and the Board of Regents will be dealing with.

Senate Bill 76, passed and signed by the governor, provides for the indemnification of defense counsel for employees of the state of Ohio for civil actions against them and also permits the purchase of insurance. The ramifications of this are not clear: who pays for legal counsel? Unfortunately, this is not spelled out in the bill.

One item that is much closer to home immediately is the fact that the Board of Regents is now doing something that they call "program review" which involves looking at the degrees, the majors and the minors, on every campus of the state institutions in Ohio. We will eventually be asked to look at everything that we offer with the

goal of deciding which programs, if any, need to be cut. This will blend very neatly with the Resolution we have just passed.

REPORT FROM ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING: none

REPORTS FROM OTHER SENATE COMMITTEES:

Academic Affairs: Dr. Hill reported. The Academic Affairs Committee had three items to bring before the Senate. The committee did not take action on the School of Business Administration proposal, as had been anticipated.

The Department of Secondary Education is proposing a series of new courses and course revisions for two purposes: to meet new state of Ohio certification requirements, for which a program must be in place by July 1, 1980; and to train teachers to work with handicapped students in accordance with Public Law 94-142. All institutions training teachers in Ohio have a mandate to develop a new program by July 1, 1980 to meet the new certification requirements. These requirements are in addition to existing certification requirements, which remain intact. The new requirements do not specify a particular increase in credit hours; they do, however, mandate that an additional 300 clock hours of what are called clinical and field experiences must be completed as of the equivalent of approximately one additional quarter of study. The Secondary Education proposal is primarily designed to provide experiences to accommodate these clock hours in the 40 undergraduate categories in which the department certifies teachers. One two hour course is designed to provide training to work with the handicapped student. The motion about to be made is not for approval of courses, but to approve the proposal. Dr. Hill moved approval of Secondary Education's proposal.

The motion was seconded, and Dr. Kelty called for discussion.

Dr. Byo expressed opposition to the curriculum package proposed by the School of Education on the grounds that it is needlessly inflationary--an increase in 10 quarter hours; that it does not consider the subject matter area, either in development of the package or in the specifics of the courses in question; and that the very philosophy of redesign has been distorted to cover declining enrollments and to bolster student credit hour productivity. He supported the concept of redesign, but asserted that this must begin with a philosophy, not a set of courses, and no such philosophy had been a part of any of the meetings he had attended. He quoted Robert Bowers, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, as saying, "Perhaps the most overlooked aspect of the standards is that which deals with the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values that are believed essential for a particular certificate. These must be spelled out, together with the sequence and continuity of development. This is the most difficult job colleges face in complying with the new standards." Byo remarked that we are now at the eleventh hour, with a July 1 deadline and questionable course changes without any overriding philosophy: redesign has been effected here, he claimed, without adequate preparation and breadth of input. He noted that Superintendent Bowers responded to other questions submitted to him in advance as follows: "If you interpret

the standards as calling for additional courses, you are making an incorrect interpretation. This is where redesign has its greatest significance. What is called for is not a mandate approach but a complete re-thinking. How many courses now offered should be offered? How can those being offered be done better? It is not an additive process." In response to still another question, Byo noted, Bowers said, "I hope that the concerns expressed will be woven into existing courses. I hope that we will have courses established under the new standards in lieu of, not in addition to, those which exist. We are looking," he said, "for evidence as to where the standards are being met, and this will be a test of the adequacy of compliance with the standards." These extra hours are partly to cover the increase in field based and clinical experiences, yet Bowers said, "I see the overwhelming majority of these experiences taking place within the subject matter area." In addition, the National Association of Schools of Music, the accreditation agency for the School of Music, in article GD2 in its standards, says that institutions should encourage teaching experiences prior to admission to the teacher education program, but these activities, as well as continuing laboratory experiences, must be supervised by qualified music personnel from the institution and the co-operating school. Despite all of these stated and recognized means for sharing, Byo asserted, the proposal presents a set of courses that reflects none of this. With reference to the reading course, Byo noted that Bowers was asked what the clause "as it pertains to the subject matter" really means. The standards call for all to be able to teach reading "as it pertains to the subject area." Bowers answered, "I honestly believe that for music education a major component of the expectation in this requirement applies to the reading of notation. The reading of music scores is a legitimate exercise under the expectation of this particular standard, although I would hope it could extend also to the reading of verbiage." To further support his contention of lack of input from the subject matter area, Dr. Byo read from a May 27, 1979 document entitled "Proposed Curriculum" which was sent to Dean Moore and others by Secondary Education: "This need not go to Academic Affairs, since it does not affect courses or programs outside of Education." The same document also said, "The university committee structure will resist any proposal that diminishes the role of other departments and colleges." What that same department labelled Action #25 says that the basic field experience required for all secondary education students consists of the revised Education 501, Education 704, Education 706, and Education 844; again, the subject matter area was absolutely excluded. Byo said that he has spoken to every music executive and co-ordinator of music education in the state. He cited a few examples of how other schools are dealing with the altered certification requirements: Kent State has increased the load from 30 to 31 quarter hours; Miami has no change; Akron has no change; Wright State has increased from 32 to 35 quarter hours, but the increase is in the subject area; Bowling Green State University's School of Education **attempted to add courses, but all were incorporated into other courses** after discussion was completed. Byo concluded that redesign does not mandate course or credit increases. Such a suggestion could have been avoided if the educational activities of the subject areas had been considered prior to the presentation of a complete package.

If the education proposal were to pass, it would affect many more segments of the university than the School of Music; those 10 increased hours must come from somewhere, and the impact would probably fall on a variety of electives that would no longer be taken, crossing all subject matter areas. Dr. Byo urged defeat of the motion.

Dr. Kelty asked for further discussion.

Dr. Douglass addressed the objections raised by Dr. Byo. The proposal did pass the Academic Affairs Committee and the Curriculum Committee without a dissenting vote. The existing program is based upon regulations published by the State Department of Education in 1972 which mandate a minimum of 32 hours in professional education course sequence. The redesign issue is based upon a new set of state standards which go into effect July 1, 1980. These standards spell out five to six major areas of competence that teachers are now supposed to have, including the area of teaching reading. They also spell out the requirement that teachers have the equivalent of one additional quarter of field experience above and beyond that which was called for in the old standards. The new standards leave the old standards in effect. Education took all of its existing courses and had the individuals working with those courses prepare very detailed outlines of those courses in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. They put those outlines into a taxonomic framework around major ideas concerning teacher education and compared those with the new state standards. As a result of that, they modified some courses, completely revised one course, created a new course in field experiences, but did not simply add courses. The question of whether or not redesign mandates additional courses is not dealt with directly by the new standards. According to information from the State Deans of Education, most universities across the state appear to be considering, or are in the process of implementing, a 6 to 8 hour increase in response to redesign. Douglass asked whether Byo's quotations from Bowers referred to a speech Bowers had made to music educators four or five years ago, when, according to Douglass, Bowers' position was different from his present position. Douglass drew the attention of the Senate to a recent Associated Press release out of Columbus, published in the Vindicator, in which the reporter quoted Bowers, giving the impression that additional course work would indeed be necessary under the new state certification standards. Douglass said that last April there was sent out to the School of Music, as well as to other schools and departments where there are people cross-appointed with the department of education, a proposal for a new curriculum. Following that circulation there were two meetings, and there was a representative from the School of Music there. The School of Music representative did lodge some objections to some of the aspects of the proposal, and there was one significant modification made on that basis. This October a revision was again circulated and there was an opportunity for the School of Music to respond to that. Douglass suggested that there had indeed been input. With reference to the issue of inflation, Dr. Douglass said that he could understand concern over the total number of hours students would be required to take, particularly

music students. Here at Youngstown State, the following are the total number of hours that students have to take in various academic fields so that they may then be certified as secondary teachers: Art, 53; Biology, 53; Chemistry, 49; Literature, 45; History, 52; Comprehensive Social Studies, 90; Music, 132-134. The state requirement for training in music for music educators is 75 hours. Perhaps the problem lies in the very large program that students coming through the School of Music must take. Douglass repeated that the proposal had been approved by both Academic Affairs and the undergraduate Curriculum Committee without a dissenting vote. He urged approval of the proposal.

Dwayne Sample, who is cross-appointed with Music and Education, spoke about the issue of redesign. He has been disturbed by redesign meetings and opposed the proposal in November, at which time he sent a memo, registering his objection, to Douglass. No further involvement was asked; no meetings were called to discuss his opposition. Dr. Sample said that he did not feel that Music had had the input needed, and he stated opposition to this approach to redesign. (In the state of Ohio, music schools which are of the same type as Dana are well over the 180 quarter hours required for most bachelor's programs.)

Dr. Kelty asked if there were further comments.

Dr. Byo addressed the comments of Dr. Douglass. Byo would not lend much credence to the Vindicator article's representation of Bowers' views, since Bowers is not directly quoted in that article, which seems to consist of the reporter's interpretations of his interview with Bowers. Furthermore, though many schools are adding hours, the variation occurs within the subject area, and is dependent upon what is already being done in each area.

Dr. Kelty asked for further discussion.

Dr. Largent observed that the program in Dana is not out of line with any comparable program in the country. Ohio State has redesigned its music program with no inflation. He urged defeat of the proposal.

Dr. Cohen expressed confusion about the proposal: what is the relationship between the courses appended and the proposal, and are there 9 or 10 increased hours?

Dr. Hill responded. The proposal is basically a series of courses. The Academic Affairs Committee does not deal with courses per se; it deals with programs, degrees, majors, standards, and also with any individual course which affects more than one department, which clearly applies in this case. What is primarily involved, on that basis, is a motion only to approve the program proposal. There are not 10 additional hours involved; there are 7 involved in redesign and 2 in the training to work with the handicapped.

Dr. Byo commented that this further corroborated his observation that there was an absence of any governing philosophy in this proposal.

The proposal went to the Curriculum Committee, obviously fitting into their responsibility to deal with courses; at that time Byo lodged his complaint and was unsuccessful in having it resolved. At that point he lodged a complaint with Academic Affairs on the grounds that this proposal did involve more than one department. His complaint appeared before the Academic Affairs Committee and that committee did come forth with a motion, unanimously passed with one abstention, that carried with it a request that the hours in field experience and clinical studies in the various areas be considered. The proposal was referred back to the Curriculum Committee, and he was not sure why it was coming from Academic Affairs at this point.

Dr. Douglass responded. Field experiences in other areas are being taken into consideration. Clearly, no agreement has been reached with the School of Music. Of the proposed 10 hours, one of those hours was a change of course, and that went through without an objection. So the Senate has before it a total of 9 hours of increase. With reference to the number of hours required by the Music School, Douglass stated that Bowling Green requires 100 hours in its music education program; Kent State has 120 hours; University of Akron has 96: it does appear, he noted, that the requirements at Youngstown State are very high, although there are some other institutions that are close. This, he observed, was indicative of a good program; he said that the proposal was seen by the School of Education as also being indicative of a good program.

Dr. Satre asked what, in total, had to be submitted in order to conform with the state law by July 1, 1980.

Douglass answered: the courses must be made available. In addition to that, the state must be supplied with a description that identifies the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are incorporated in the courses.

Dr. Satre suggested that the Senate was being asked at the last minute to resolve a dispute, and he was unsure what should be done.

Dr. Baldino noted that objections were being raised by only one department. He asserted that he trusted the judgement of the members of the Academic Affairs and Curriculum committees, and that Byo's argument was a distortion of fact. The fundamental point in this issue, Baldino claimed, was the decision about who is to judge. Academic Affairs has said that the School of Education should have that responsibility. He urged adoption of the proposal.

Dr. Hovey requested that a list of those in attendance on the day this proposal was unanimously passed be read, and that the motion itself be read.

Dr. Hill read the names of those attending the committee meeting on April 8, 1980: Dr. Baldino, Dr. Hahn, Dr. Hill, Dr. Khawaja, Dr. Kougl, Dr. Munro, Dr. Richley, Dr. Scriven.

Dr. Hovey noted that he was not at the committee meeting.

Dr. Baldino offered to read the motion: "Motion: that the committee positively recommend the Secondary Education proposal with the provision that Secondary Education take existing clinical-field experiences into consideration as appropriate."

Dr. Kelty asked if there was further discussion.

The question was raised whether, once the proposal was passed, the method of fulfilling requirements would be negotiable; Dr. Hill said that it would be negotiable.

Dr. Rand observed that ordinarily the Senate does not act on programs for certification by the state; he asked whether the Senate was just looking at the courses or at a program.

Dr. Jenkins sought to clarify the issue: in the minds of the members of the Curriculum Committee, the question being raised about the courses came out of the Academic Affairs Committee, since it involved two or more departments. The question is whether this program can go ahead and add the hours that affect more than one department. The courses themselves are still to be acted upon. The Curriculum Committee simply approved the courses as meeting all other requirements. The question, then, is whether this program legitimately impacts on more than one department.

Dr. Cohen stated that he still did not understand what the proposal was, since it had never been stated.

Dr. Hill recognized that Dr. Rand was correct in observing that this was the first time such a matter had come before the Senate. There seems, he noted, to be no category in which it fits. He restated the situation producing the proposal: the university is required to meet new certification standards and the proposal, including new courses and course changes, is an attempt to do that.

Dr. Kelty asked for further discussion.

Dr. Beaubien observed that it was difficult to determine exactly what the proposal was: would addition of the courses constitute the program? Would there be any changes?

Dr. Hill said that the courses are an extension of an already existing certification requirement. Changes would occur as Dr. Douglass had indicated.

Dr. Beaubien said that in that case we did not have a program.

Dr. Douglass said that the Senate would not be approving a program but a series of courses that have been considered by the Academic Affairs Committee because of the impact of those courses.



Dr. Alderman asked what the motion was.

Dr. Hill said that the term "proposal" or "program" was being used to refer to the series of courses. The Academic Affairs Committee does not deal with courses per se, so this terminology is being used.

Dr. Alderman than asked what the specific motion was.

Dr. Hill indicated that the motion was to approve the Secondary Education proposal which includes those courses listed.

Dr. Jenkins proposed to move to reject the rejection of the School of Music, but Dr. Kelty indicated that the motion on the floor was to approve the proposal and a negative motion would be out of place.

Dr. Baldino pointed out that what the Senate was considering was a committee report.

Dr. Phillips enquired whether, if the proposal is accepted by the Senate, everyone must meet all of the requirements as stated by the School of Education, or substitutions of equivalent work could be made within separate departments.

Dr. Hill indicated that substitution of equivalent work would be possible.

Dr. Rand attempted to clarify: the State Department of Education looks to one person at Youngstown State University to certify graduates as being appropriately educated to teach in certain areas. That person is the Dean of the College of Education. The proposal is to indicate that through the redesign process nine additional hours would be required to gain certification. This would be true in any area of certification, including music. Dr. Rand asked Dean Moore if this was correct.

Dean Moore indicated that this was correct. The Senate is not dealing at this time, he said, with the issue of unequal numbers of required units in programs. The issue at hand is a professional education program which is the domain of teacher education. He stated that there had been adequate opportunity for involvement in this proposal and recommended that the Senate endorse the action of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Dr. Byo observed that this process had begun some ten years ago, and those involved had five years to do something about it. Now they are saying that after the proposal is approved they will begin to negotiate with the subject matter areas. That negotiation should have been going on for the past five years. He said that he does support redesign and would like to be able to support this proposal but has not been equipped to do so. If the Senate wishes to relinquish its responsibility to the School of Education or to any one person, it is creating a dangerous situation. He urged defeat of the proposal.

Dr. Kelty asked for further discussion.

Dr. Alderman suggested that the Senate was faced with a parliamentary problem: the Senate as a body was being asked to formally approve a proposal which the Senate as a body had not seen. That assumption being correct, he urged the defeat of the proposal.

Dr. Khawaja noted that the charge of Academic Affairs does not deal simply with programs but also with new standards. We should look at this as an issue of a new standard of certification and hence the proper concern of Academic Affairs. The proposal is simply to enlarge our certification program by adding courses, as stated in the agenda.

Dr. McGraw stated that he has never been convinced that sufficient consultation did exist, despite what some members of the Senate have said. He therefore urged defeat of the proposal.

Dr. Alderman stated that the problem seemed to be that there was a document but the members of the Senate as a whole had not seen it.

Dr. Kelty asked if Dr. Alderman wished to move to table the issue for further consideration. Dr. Alderman said he did not.

Dr. Hovey asked for an opinion from the Senate Parliamentarian on Dr. Alderman's comment.

Dr. Kelty asked again if Dr. Alderman would care to move to table so that the whole proposal could be brought before the Senate. Dr. Alderman stated that he would prefer a more creative approach to keep the main question on the floor.

A question was raised concerning the relationships of Academic Affairs and the Curriculum Committee to this proposal. It seems that Academic Affairs was called in as a consultant to the Curriculum Committee, and might refer the proposal back to the Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Kelty noted that the motion on the floor was to approve this proposal from Academic Affairs, there being no motion to table.

The response was that we should then defeat this motion and get it back to the Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Kelty asked whether such a motion was made.

After some consultation, Dr. Kelty announced that Dr. Hill had advised the chair that Charter and ByLaws had been asked for a ruling in this matter and had ruled that the issue was appropriate for Academic Affairs.

Dr. Abram indicated the bases upon which Charter and ByLaws had made that ruling.

Dr. Kelty said that if the members of the Senate felt that there was not enough substance presented, it would be proper to table; if they felt there was enough substance, they should consider the proposal as

stated.

Dr. Feitler suggested that the Senate was simply voting to affirm or not affirm the actions of the Academic Affairs Committee, which was why the complete proposal was not included. He felt that the Senate was making too much of the parliamentary issue and should simply vote to approve or disapprove of the request of Academic Affairs.

Dean Paraska read the charge of the Academic Affairs Committee, to indicate that procedures had been in line with the Charter and ByLaws.

Dr. Baldino said that while we must have faith in committees, they should not be immune to criticism. The issue, he asserted, was whether or not we place faith in the School of Education and the Dean of Education in the matter of teacher certification.

Dr. Phillips asked for a point of clarification: if the Senate approves this proposal, is it saying that it accepts the certification program as proposed?

Dr. Hill indicated that that was his judgement.

Dean Rand asserted that it was inappropriate for this body to consider that question. The only individual who is in a position to determine whether a particular group of courses meets state certification requirements is the Dean of the School of Education.

There was a general murmur of dissent.

Dr. Kelty asked if the Senate was ready for the motion; the vote was taken:

In Favor: 19  
 Opposed: 25  
Motion failed

Dr. Hill left for 5:00 class, turning the business of Academic Affairs over to Dr. Khawaja.

At that point it was necessary to take a count to determine whether the Senate retained a quorum: there was no longer a quorum.

Dr. Kelty thanked members of the Senate for their co-operation, patience, and diligence, and expressed appreciation for the work of Larry Esterly and Susan Mason.

The meeting dispersed at 5:05 p.m.

May 7, 1980

ATTENDANCE  
UNIVERSITY SENATE

ARTS AND SCIENCES

Everette Abram E. Abram  
 Christopher Bache Chris Bache  
 Richard Bee \_\_\_\_\_  
 George Beelen George Beelen  
 Barbara Brothers \_\_\_\_\_  
 Dean Brown \_\_\_\_\_  
 Irwin Cohen Irwin Cohen  
 Janet DelBene Janet DelBene  
 Thomas Dobbelstein \_\_\_\_\_  
 Leslie Domonkos \_\_\_\_\_  
 Larry Esterly L. Esterly  
 Sally Hotchkiss Sally Hotchkiss  
 Jean Kelty \_\_\_\_\_  
 Ikram Khawaja Ikram Khawaja  
 Freidrich Koknat F. Koknat  
 Leon Laitman \_\_\_\_\_  
 Margaret Moore Margaret Moore  
 Gratia Murphy Gratia Murphy  
 Joan Phillip Joan Phillip  
 Sidney Roberts \_\_\_\_\_  
 Lowell Satre Lowell Satre  
 Gary Salvner Gary Salvner  
 Agnes Smith Agnes Smith  
 Elizabeth Staudt \_\_\_\_\_  
 Christopher Sweeney \_\_\_\_\_  
 Ronald Tabak \_\_\_\_\_  
 Allan Viehmeyer Allan Viehmeyer

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Howard Cox Howard Cox  
 James Daley James Daley  
 Larry Davis \_\_\_\_\_  
 Terry Deiderick \_\_\_\_\_  
 Inez Gross \_\_\_\_\_  
 Donald Hovey Donald Hovey  
 Mervin Kohn \_\_\_\_\_  
 R.J. Shuster \_\_\_\_\_  
 Jane Simmons \_\_\_\_\_

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Robert Ameduri Robert Ameduri  
 Peter Baldino Peter Baldino  
 Edgar Cobett Edgar Cobett  
 Jack Dunsing Jack Dunsing  
 Fred Feitler Fred Feitler  
 Louis Hill \_\_\_\_\_  
 Glorianne Leck \_\_\_\_\_  
 George Levitsky George Levitsky

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Jack Bakos Jack Bakos  
 Prakash Damshala Prakash Damshala  
 Wade Driscoll Wade Driscoll  
 Richard Mirth Richard Mirth  
 Floyd Morris \_\_\_\_\_  
 Philip Munro Philip Munro  
 Samuel Skarote Samuel Skarote  
 Tedeusz Slawecki \_\_\_\_\_

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Donald Byo Donald Byo  
 Darla Funk Darla Funk  
 Elaine Juhasz Elaine Juhasz  
 Joseph Lapinski Joseph Lapinski  
 Daniel O'Neill \_\_\_\_\_  
 David Robinson \_\_\_\_\_  
 Virginia Shale Virginia Shale  
 Michael Walusis \_\_\_\_\_

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

William Barsch \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mary Beaubien Mary Beaubien  
 Ronald Ciminero Ronald Ciminero  
 Alfreda Harris Alfreda Harris  
 Gail Hedrick Gail Hedrick  
 Bari Lateef \_\_\_\_\_  
 Victor Richley \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mary Sebestyen Mary Sebestyen  
 Hilary Soller Hilary Soller  
 James Zupanic James Zupanic

ADMINISTRATIVE

Taylor Alderman Taylor Alderman  
 William Binning William Binning  
 David Cliness \_\_\_\_\_  
 Lawrence Cummings \_\_\_\_\_  
 Earl Edgar \_\_\_\_\_  
 Charles McBriarty Charles McBriarty  
 William McGraw \_\_\_\_\_  
 Arnold Moore Arnold Moore  
 Nicholas Paraska \_\_\_\_\_  
 Leon Rand Leon Rand also 4/2/80  
 Edmund Salata Edmund Salata  
 James Scriven \_\_\_\_\_  
 George Sutton \_\_\_\_\_  
 Bernard Yozwiak \_\_\_\_\_  
 Dean of S.B.A. \_\_\_\_\_

STUDENT MEMBERS

Michael Anderson \_\_\_\_\_  
 Diane Bogan Diane Bogan  
 Joe Castrodale \_\_\_\_\_  
 W. Perry Cooper \_\_\_\_\_  
 Tony Koury Tony Koury  
 Lori Kovach \_\_\_\_\_  
 James Melfi \_\_\_\_\_  
 Ed Menaldi Ed Menaldi  
 Ralph Minto \_\_\_\_\_  
 Kerry Paulin \_\_\_\_\_  
 Steven Shelton \_\_\_\_\_  
 Karen Snyder \_\_\_\_\_  
 George Stokes \_\_\_\_\_  
 Robert Wade Robert Wade  
 Bob Wasko \_\_\_\_\_

## SENATE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS 1980-81

<u>Appointment of</u>		<u>School</u>
<u>Academic Affairs</u>		
1. Peter Baldino	1981	Education
2. Daniel Fantauzzi	1983	Fine and Performing Arts
3. Philip Hahn	1982	Arts and Sciences
4. Ikram Khawaja	1982	Arts and Sciences
5. Carole Kimbrough	1983	CAST
6. Bari Lateef	1983	CAST
7. Philip Munro	1982	Engineering
8. Jane Simmons	1981	Business
<u>Academic Events</u>		
1. George Beelen	1982	Arts and Sciences
2. Robert Campbell	1981	CAST
3. Ed Cobett	1983	Education
4. Joan DiGiulio	1982	Arts and Sciences
5. Robert Fleming	1981	Fine and Performing Arts
6. Margaret Horvath	1981	CA..T
7. Robert Lacich	1983	Business
8. Riza Tokuz	1982	Engineering
<u>Computer Committee</u>		
1. Thomas Baglan	1983	Fine and Performing Arts
2. Peter Botros	1981	Engineering
3. Stephen Graf	1983	Arts and Sciences
4. Peter Pascale	1983	Education
5. Virginia Phillips	1981	CAST
6. Dean Roussos	1981	Business
7. Robert Sorokach	1982	Engineering
8. Joseph Waldron	1982	CAST
<u>Continuing Education</u>		
1. Ronald Ciminero	1983	CAST
2. Larry DiRusso	1982	Education
3. Stanley Guzeli	1983	Business
4. Keith McKean	1981	Arts and Sciences
5. Richard Mirth	1981	Engineering
6. Wendell Orr	1981	Fine and Performing Arts
7. Daniel Suchora	1983	Engineering
8. Clyde Vanaman	1982	Education
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
1. Jack Bakos	1981	Engineering
2. Anthony Dastoli	1982	Business

3. Lois Hopkins	1982	Fine and Performing Arts
4. Audrey Ownes	1982	CAST
5. Staman Rodfong	1983	Arts and Sciences
6. Dorothy Snozek	1982	Education
7. Allen Viehmeyer	1981	Arts and Sciences
8. James Zupanic	1981	CAST

Educational Media

1. Doris Cannon	1983	Arts and Sciences
2. James Conser	1983	CAST
3. Elizabeth Davic	1981	CAST
4. Joseph Lapinski	1981	Fine and Performing Arts
5. Robert McCoy	1983	Engineering
6. William Nichols	1982	Education
7. Eugene Sekeres	1981	Business
8. Richard Shale	1983	Arts and Sciences

Library

1. Ivis Boyer	1982	Arts and Sciences
2. Barbara Engelhardt	1981	CAST
3. Glorianne Leck	1983	Education
4. John Mason	1981	Arts and Sciences
5. Walter Mayhall	1983	Fine and Performing Arts
6. John Petrek	1981	Engineering
7. Phyllis Smith	1983	Business
8. Stanley Zager	1983	Engineering

Research

1. Richard Bee	1981	Arts and Sciences
2. Irfan Khan	1982	Engineering
3. Mark Masaki	1983	Arts and Sciences
4. K.R.M. Rao	1983	Business
5. Ronald Richards	1983	Education
6. Robert Rollin	1981	Fine and Performing Arts
7. Frank Tarantine	1982	Engineering
8. John Yemma	1981	CAST

Student Affairs

1. William Brown, Jr.	1983	CAST
2. James Daly	1982	Business
3. Frank D'Isa	1981	Engineering
4. Louis Hill	1983	Education
5. Sally Hotchkiss	1983	Arts and Sciences
6. Kathy Kougl	1983	Fine and Performing Arts
7. Ineke Marshall	1981	CAST
8. Francis W. Smith	1981	Arts and Sciences

Honors

1. Ralph Burkholder	1981	Business
2. Thomas Copeland	1982	Arts and Sciences
3. Dean Hoops	1981	Education
4. Elaine Juhasz	1981	Fine and Performing Arts
5. George Kelley, Jr.	1983	Arts and Sciences
6. Gratia Murphy	1983	Arts and Sciences
7. Dilip Singh	1982	Engineering
8. Vincent Wino	1981	CAST

ICP

1. Don Brady	1981	Business
2. Paul Dalbec	1983	Arts and Sciences
3. Dorothy Kennedy	1983	CAST
4. Joan Phillip	1981	Arts and Sciences
5. Wade Raridon	1982	Fine and Performing Arts
6. Raymond Shuster	1981	Business
7. Matthew Siman	1982	Engineering
8. Edward Tokar	1983	Education

Student Grievance

1. Robert Ameduri	1982	Education
2. Gilbert Anderson	1982	Arts and Sciences
3. Howard Cox	1981	Business
4. John Ritter	1982	Engineering
5. David Robinson	1983	Fine and Performing Arts
6. Robert Stanko	1981	CAST

Kilcawley Board

1. Paul Bellini	(term expiring in 1981)
2. Larry Esterly	(term expiring in 1982)
3. Victor Richley	(term expiring in 1983)