

Richard Owen  
Maag Library

MINUTES  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
April 1, 1981

ATTENDANCE (See attached roster)

CALL TO ORDER

After establishing that a quorum was present, Dr. Jean Kelty called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

CORRECTIONS TO MINUTES OF MARCH 4, 1981

Page 2 read "... and (2) the curriculum should develop. . ."; it should read, "... and (2) the University Curriculum Committee should develop. . . ."

Also on page 2 the minutes read, "... 1980-81 Bulletin dealing with graduate honors." This should read "... 1980-81 Bulletin dealing with graduation honors."

On page 4 appeared, "The report was accepted as submitted." However, there was no report, so this should be deleted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes for the meeting of March 4, 1981 were approved as amended.

REPORT FROM CHARTER & BYLAWS COMMITTEE

Dr. Murphy first noted that copies of corrections to the proposed revision of Charter and ByLaws, which had been circulated, were available. Those corrections were as follows:

p. 8 - final sentence of (1) should read "... to the parent Academic Programs/ Auxiliary Services Coordination Committee."

p. 9 - final sentence of (1) should read "... to the parent Academic Programs/ Auxiliary Services Coordination Committee."

pp. 5, 8, 11, 12 - insert (2) preceding paragraph describing charge of committee.

Dr. Murphy stated that before a motion, she would like to summarize and give a brief history of the proposal, and have Professor Esterly explain the procedure and principles that lay behind the proposal. In the Fall of 1979 the Senate Executive Committee forwarded to Charter and ByLaws a request for an examination of the Senate chartered committees and, in return, were asked to make recommendations for possible reorganization and consolidation of the twelve (12) committees. During winter quarter a year ago, the Charter and ByLaws Committee established an ad hoc subcommittee to undertake this task. The committee was composed of 9 faculty members and student representation, and included three members of the Charter and ByLaws committee; Prof. Esterly, Dr. Abram, and Dr. Murphy. Dr. Murphy then spoke for all the subcommittee members to thank Dr. Agnes Smith, who served as secretary, and in particular, Prof. Esterly, who chaired the committee, for the hard work, the immense amount of patience, and organization and leadership he displayed.

She continued to say that the ad hoc subcommittee met through the spring and summer of 1980, working for a goal of the end of the fall quarter 1980. The proposal was presented to Charter and ByLaws in early December, 1980 and was accepted by that committee on Jan. 7, 1981. The proposal was then presented to SEC, and that committee voted its support of it on Jan. 16, 1981. Copies of that proposal were circulated to faculty and to administration and student representation and its presentation was

scheduled for the agenda of the February meeting of the Senate.

In late Jan. Central Administration requested that there be a delay in presentation of the proposal in order to allow time for the resolution of some language problems and some difficulties which they saw in the proposal. Suggestions were received in writing from Central Administration in mid February. On Feb. 17, Charter and ByLaws, after reviewing the suggestions, voted to return the proposal to the ad hoc subcommittee and to postpone discussion of the proposal until a later meeting of Senate. The subcommittee met, together with members of the Charter and ByLaws Committee during late February and early March. The revised proposal which had since been circulated to members in anticipation of this meeting was approved by the Charter and ByLaws committee and by the SEC at its March 13 meeting.

If there were substantive changes to the proposal, it should be sent back to committee. The committee tried to bring various committees to function as a coherent whole. They felt that the revisions hung together well now and any substantive changes should send the revision back to the committee.

Dr. Esterly reported that the ad hoc subcommittee had met on some 20 occasions with the first meeting on February 20, 1981 through March 30, 1981 in 2-2½ hour sessions. Smaller work groups in the subcommittee had also met with the chairmen of presently established committees and task chairmen. In the summer of 1980, the acting Academic Vice President and the Academic Deans were invited to meet with Dr. Rand (acting Academic Vice President), Deans Moore, Paraska, & Yozwiak accepted the invitation. They added valuable insight and suggestions. Subsequently the subcommittee met with Dr. Gillis (Academic Vice President). The proposal had gone through several revisions, one major revision coming in February to meet the concerns of Central Administration.

The subcommittee worked on the basis of four (4) principles:

(1) Senate committees should be concerned with policy and not with actual implementation of policy.

(2) Linkage of the Senate committees with Academic Senate should be strengthened.

(3) Senate committee charges should be precise without being overly rigid and, thereby, confining.

(4) Committee composition should result in a working community of faculty, student and administrative members.

The proposal being presented, he noted, was an integrated package. If adopted, it would result in a committee system of 6 major committees and 5 permanent subcommittees. Within this framework would be committee (subcommittee) membership for 83 faculty members, 31 student members, and 23 administrators, plus a certain number of ex officio members drawn from administration and faculty. Comparable figures for the existing committee system of 12 major committees were given as follows: 94 faculty members, 31 student members, and a variable number of administrators.

The proposal in both the first and second drafts had passed the ad hoc subcommittee unanimously; Charter & ByLaws had passed the proposal on two occasions unanimously; the Senate Executive Committee also had passed it unanimously.

Dr. Murphy moved the adoption of the proposed revision of ByLaw 6, sections 1 and 2 of the ByLaws of the Charter of the Academic Senate. Motion seconded.

Dr. Kelty noted that the chair felt that the Senate should respect the wishes of the committee in the matter, and if there were to be substantive changes, the proposal would be sent back to committee for further consideration. The chair would ask the committee chairmen if any proposed changes were substantive. If they were considered substantive changes, they would be voted upon and if amended, the entire package would go back to committee.

Dr. Gillis moved for division of the issues to subsections in order to demonstrate that the administration was not opposed to the document in totality, but only to specific parts. He commended the efforts of the committee members to the development of the proposal. However, he felt it was lacking precision in a few subsections.

Motion seconded.

Motion defeated 25-30.

A question was raised: Why are there no more than two faculty from any one college?

Dr. Esterly replied that it had been given considerable consideration and that the ad hoc subcommittee added that it was mandated that there would be representation from each school or college for every committee or standing subcommittee. He stated that it should be a matter of appointment and that appointment rests with the SEC. This is more of a matter of the SEC appointment than something to be dealt with in the charter. He noted that it seemed to be a question of degree: just how much to you write into a charter or into bylaws; it was the consensus of the committee not to go beyond a certain point.

As a member of SEC, Dr. Murphy added that they welcomed any suggestions.

Dr. Largent asked what the committee saw as Auxiliary Services as mentioned on page 7.

Dr. Murphy replied that one of the guiding principles was that of collegiality. This should extend to the university environment in which the faculty works. Among the auxiliary services are parking, security, physical plant, book store, and areas such as those, which are part of the Academic community, as they coordinate with academic programs.

Dr. Cohen stated that he was troubled with the committee on planning. He noted that planning had been done in traditional ways and he didn't see anything wrong with having a report from the university committee as a whole, but this committee isn't connected with the planning of department level and so on up. He felt this was not a well-defined committee.

Dr. Khawaja replied that there had been considerable concern by the SEC that the academic community should have some input into academic long-range planning. It was felt that this should be a standing committee to take care of community concerns; there was a need for an organized body to look at the long-range plans. In this way, there would be no need to establish an ad hoc committee because there would already be a standing committee to handle these concerns. This type of committee is not unique to YSU; OSU also has such a committee.

Dr. Gillis expressed the President's opposition to the inclusion of the Committee on Academic Programs/Auxiliary Services' Coordination. The intent to span the auxiliary services, such as bookstore, goes beyond the scope of the Charter of the Senate. It was felt that to form a standing committee in Senate beyond the scope of the existing charter of the Senate would be an obtuse way to approach the problem. He noted that the deletion of such a committee would probably be a substantive change.

Mrs. Dykema stated that certain auxiliary services are closely connected with the faculty. On occasion, the faculty felt that they would like to have some problems thrashed out and this committee might permit this. This was not a committee to go out and decide things, but to make helpful suggestions about relevant issues.

Dr. Cohen commented that of the 88 faculty members, a total of 72 were assigned from various colleges, one from each. There are also twelve (12) committee members and 16 others selected by interest, etc. The Arts & Sciences membership in Academic Senate is 31; the total of all other colleges is 38. The Arts & Sciences members number three times the total of members from any schools. The faculty does want to participate in activities, yet the numbers discriminate against Arts & Sciences; only a small portion would be allowed to participate. He suggested that Arts & Sciences should have three members representative of the college on each committee.

Dr. Esterly noted that the ad hoc subcommittee's compromise on this issue was seen in the proposal.

There was a question concerning the Student Academic Affairs Committee; specifically, what would be included under the area of student academic disciplinary policy?

Dr. Esterly indicated that concern would be with things such as plagiarism.

Dean Paraska pointed out that Section 2, paragraph e, subparagraph 2, under Academic Standards and Events Committee, would, as it was worded, create an intrusion on the prerogatives of the school or college. He stated he didn't think it was meant to be worded in that way. They might establish overall requirements, but as worded it infringes on the schools or colleges. He hoped that it would be deleted in order to be corrected.

He also noted regarding Section 2-f-2, that it was not logical to establish admission requirements to each program or department. He felt that it should establish a general university requirement; each program should have a say. This statement also needed correction.

Dr. Khawaja said that it was not meant as an infringement on the rights of the school. The degrees as established go through Academic Affairs and the proposal for a new degree comes through the school. There may be a need to clean up the language. Regarding the second point, Dr. Khawaja stated that they were more concerned about the admission policy overall in the university rather than in the schools.

Dr. Murphy noted that perhaps the language needed to be more specific. Charter and ByLaws were talking about general admission policy and not admission to a particular program. This could be considered an editorial change.

Tony Koury inquired what committee would handle the actual student grievances.

Dr. Esterly stated that he thought this had been cleared up with the present Student Academic Grievance Committee. This concern would rest with the Student Academic Grievance subcommittee. The subcommittee procedure would be subject to Senate approval. The subcommittee would check with the parent committee, but the subcommittee would have access to the Senate floor.

Tony Koury then inquired if it was guaranteed that the parent committee would not overturn the decision.

Dr. Esterly stated that the subcommittee consults with the parent committee because there are overlapping concerns. But the policy and procedure lies entirely with the Student Academic Grievance subcommittee.

Dr. Alderman noted that Dr. Khawaja had made the point that if the language of the charge of the committee was not precise, minor problems could be worked out when the committee was convened and then brought back recommendations regarding its procedures to carry out its charge. He felt that this was putting the cart before the horse. He felt that if there were language problems they should be addressed at that time. Secondly, he didn't know what to make of either a lack of parallelism or variations of language used in the charges of the committees. Some charges mention the "policy of" and other committees don't speak of policy at all. Dr. Alderman thought that it would be more logical if the language of the various committees were more precise.

Dr. Esterly stated this was a result of the compromises that had to be made, particularly with Central Administration.

Dr. Gillis commented that the lack of precision in the language would lead to difficulty.

Dean Sutton noted that he was concerned with the intent of this matter. Members would vote in terms of how they evaluated the intent of the committee, and the language doesn't pinpoint intent anywhere. It seemed to him that the Senate might be establishing grounds for eternal debate about intent.

Dr. Esterly stated that in the past when there were problems in language of the charge of a committee, that committee would refer to Charter and ByLaws for interpretation of the charge. If the proposal is adopted, this policy would continue to be the practice.

Dr. Brothers commented that she didn't understand why they couldn't look at specific problems and objections. Why couldn't they proceed by clarifying, then agree on the changes? This way everyone could agree on the document and its general principles. She didn't feel it was wise to pass something with unclear language. Consequently, she wanted to refer back to 2-f-2, concerning the general university requirements.

Dr. Kelty stated that the committee was willing to make editorial changes but they had specified that substantive changes would be sent back to committee. There was nothing keeping members from referring changes back to committee, but they want the changes referred back so that they may consider it before a complete package is put together, so that they may again bring it back on the floor.

One person questioned what the committee felt was an editorial change and what was a substantive change.

Dr. Murphy clarified that in reference to specific questions such as f-2 on page 12, the addition of the word "general" university requirements would be considered an editorial change rather than a substantive one.

Dr. Brothers questioned whether they should be voting on that.

Dr. Murphy stated that the Senate might vote on it, and it would be an amendment which would not force it back to the committee.

Dr. Kelty stated that if it were an editorial change and everyone agreed, the committee might simply make such changes rather than sending them back to committee.

Dean Paraska moved to refer this back to committee for further study and clarification of some wording. Motion seconded.

Dr. Cohen agreed that it should be sent back, but added that this motion should be held off until more matters that were questioned had been brought up.

The question was called. Motion defeated 17-23.

Dr. Cohen felt that the purposes of the Honors Program and the Individualized Curriculum Program were very different and shouldn't be put together. He noted that even though this is not a major issue, it should be addressed. Secondly, he noted that the Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee were two committees, yet everything presented must go through both committees. Also some matters must also go through Academic Standards and Events Committee. Dr. Cohen felt that this seemed to be cumbersome and that matters should be put in simple categories so that an issue need really only go through one committee, and could then be reported to Senate without going through other groups.

Dr. Jenkins noted that both committees do have to, to some degree, work together. The purpose is to integrate or coordinate these committees where they can work together in a large degree to facilitate program matters. Really there is separateness with unity.

One person noted that the charge of Academic Planning was so general that no one would know where to go. She questioned whether it would be possible to expand the charge to have a little more explanation of what is considered concerning the Academic Planning.

Dr. Esterly stated that the first proposal circulated had a much more detailed charge and certain objections had been registered. As a result, this was the outcome.

Dr. Largent moved the previous question. Motion seconded. Motion passed.

Dr. Kelty informed Senate that they were voting now on the main motion, Revision of ByLaw 6, sections 1 and 2, with the following editorial changes:

Typing Corrections

1. On pg. 2, section (d), "be" changed to "by"
2. On pg. 12, section (f), (1) "... representation from each college/school of the university; the Associate Vice President. . . ." (Same correction on pg. 13)

Editorial Change

1. On pg. 12, "This responsibility shall include the making of recommendations concerned with general university admission policy. . . ."

Motion seconded. Motion passed 28-24.

Dr. Murphy stated that because this motion had passed, it would be necessary to make a revision to Article 4, section 1 of the Charter of Academic Senate. This is to align the Charter with the ByLaws.

Dr. Murphy moved to approve Article 4, section 1. Motion seconded. Motion passed 38-9.

REPORT FROM CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Course proposals were submitted.

Dr. Rodfong stated that Computer Technology 600 course had been objected to by the Math Department. The Curriculum Committee had a meeting and a motion was made to approve this course and the motion was defeated 5-4.

Dr. Rodfong moved in Senate to approve the action of the Curriculum Committee which was to disapprove this course. Motion seconded.

Dr. Largent asked for a brief history of the problem.

Dr. Rodfong replied that the Math Department felt that there were not enough terminals. The Curriculum Committee voted against the course on that basis because in part C of the course 600, it states that resources and plant facilities will be available. The question involved the use of terminals.

Dean Sutton felt that the committee was out of the Academic realm in this matter. The question should have been whether the course was academically sound and appropriate. If it was sound, they should have approved it and allowed administration to work out a priority system for time and usage.

Prof. Biles stated that there are students now in the process of leaving the university because of computer terminal congestion. There is great frustration when students can't complete their assignments because they can't get in to work on the computers. If there are no facilities, no one will take the course. Secondly, the new terminals that are supposedly coming are involved with CAI instruction lab and therefore usage will increase congestion. Also, she wouldn't bank on the new terminals until they were installed. And thirdly, the Computer Science department has been forced to limit usage by their own students. Until there are more terminals, she insisted, a sound course really cannot be considered.

Dr. Richley stated that attached to the materials handed out was a copy of the objection to the course that had been prepared by Dr. Brown of the Math Dept., and also a list of considerations of the need for the course. The objection was based on the shortage of terminals. He noted how important this course was. Students in Computer Technology have been using terminals. The purpose of this course is to organize that learning process. Steps have been taken to reduce computer usage impact. First, this course is required of all Computer Technology majors in their sophomore year.

It is important because it teaches some skill in computer utilization. Secondly, the department has recommended, the dean has supported, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs may approve a set of enrollment criteria for department enrollment that should reduce incoming Computer Tech majors in the fall from 30 to 40%. Thirdly, there will probably be 10 additional terminals. If these are installed in Cushwa (with the other 14 terminals) there will be a 71% increase in the number of terminals in use. Another point is that in order to make room for these new terminals there is a natural expansion for Cushwa facilities. The Computer Tech Dept. would give up a badly used existing lab in order for efficient usage of computer facilities to be available. Also, there is a proposal which may result in the rewarding of funds to establish a micro-computer lab which can support terminals. He noted it was ironic that the 14 terminals that are presently in use and would not be used if the course were not approved, were purchased from the sale of a 360-480 IBM computer which was once on their inventory. Finally, the Computer Science faculty were aware of what was involved in the structure of this course, yet they felt it was a good one. Yet they would object because of a lack of terminals. He also stated that he has some data which need to be presented concerning utilization of terminals for the fall quarter 1980, strictly for student use:

In fall quarter, 8,800 terminal hours were used; 19,000 terminal hours were available. Proper scheduling can free up any congestion.

In fall quarter, 50% of all terminal hours used were used in the Math/Computer Science Department, 29% by Computer Tech., and 6% by Marketing, Philosophy, and Industrial Engineering.

There are 600 majors in Computer Tech. and they are anxious to get quality education. Also, computer tech students spend 5 hours per quarter on terminals while computer science majors spend 25 hours per quarter. In the winter of 1980, the demand was even higher and was met. In the fall, there were 8,800 hours used and in winter there were 10,200 hours met plus additional time that could have been used. Tom Doctor estimates that about 40% additional hours will be made available by the 10 additional terminals. Consequently, he stated that the point of the problem is proper scheduling and he urged Senate to defeat this motion.

Dr. Zupanic stated that there are many steps that can be taken and will be taken to alleviate congestion. He emphasized that we should not eliminate a class (that teaches how to use a terminal efficiently) because there is not good utilization of facilities. He recommended that Senate vote no and approve this course.

Dr. Brown stated that the problem was seen was access to the terminals for student usage. This problem is significant because computer use this fall over last year had increased by 63%. The increase of winter quarter over fall quarter was about 10%; and usage is getting worse and worse as time goes on. In the computer science department, they have cut down on computer usage. No one in 600 level courses uses computers. Also they are hoping to purchase a special terminal for classroom sessions to eliminate the need for the Cushwa lab. They have also taken one course off the terminal and put the students on micro-processors in an experiment to relieve congestion (this didn't work well).

The ten terminals would be significant and efficient, but it is uncertain if they will be funded. There are also additional demands and these new computers have been earmarked for CAI; with this, usage will increase.

The course we are dealing with will serve 100 students per year. The computer usage would increase about 24% over the previous fall. Also would be included a 10% increase through all other increases that would come along. He also noted that the congestion figures (as mentioned above) are somewhat distorted. The reason is not day/night hours, but week during the quarter hours. In the 7th week of the quarter, the terminals were used 92%; during the 10th week they were used 97% of the time. This will be a problem for students with long programs to finish before the end of the course.

Dr. Gillis stated that the objection of Computer Science/Math Department presented a problem involving a violation of principles. He had no answers to the problem, but it seemed that it was a principle that went beyond what the normal curriculum committee should be doing: it implied that any department that does not feel it is getting sufficient resources could object to the proper development of the curriculum of any other department.

Dr. Kelty stated that Senate had lost a quorum. She also extended gratitude to Dr. David Robinson, who served as parliamentarian in the absence of Prof. Esterly.

Meeting adjourned. (5:40 p.m.)



# ATTENDANCE UNIVERSITY SENATE

## ARTS AND SCIENCES

Bache, Christopher\*  
Bee, Richard  
Bishop, Edwin V.  
Earnhart, Hugh  
Edwardio, D.  
Esterly, Larry\*  
Khawaja, Ikram\*  
Koknat, Fred\*  
Manton, John W.  
Moore, Margaret\*  
Morrison, James  
Poggione, James P.  
Salvner, Gary\*  
Smith, Agnes\*  
Sturm, Nicholas  
Veccia, Mario

**At-Large :**

Beelen, George  
Blue, Frederick  
Brothers, Barbara  
Cohen, Irwin  
Dalbec, Paul  
Dobbelstein, Thomas

Kelty, Jean  
Mettee, Howard  
Murphy, Gratia  
Roberts, Sidney  
Ronda, James P.  
Satre, Lowell  
Sniderman, Stephen  
Schroeder, Lauren  
Young, Warren

**BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

Bensinger, Dennis  
Davis, Larry\*  
Guzell, Stanley, Jr.  
Simmons, Jane\*

At-Large:

Daly, James  
Diederick, Terry  
Kohn, Mervin  
Petrych, William

## SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Dunsing, Jack\*  
Eshleman, Winston

Hill, Louis

**At-Large:**

Baldino, Peter  
Douglass, James E.  
Leck, Glorianne M.

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Botros, Peter  
Driscoll, Wade  
Mirth, R. A.  
Slawewski, Thad.\*

**At-Large:**

Damshala, Prakash  
Jones, Richard  
Munro, Phillip

## FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Babisch, Joseph  
Largent, Edward\*  
Shale, Virginia

**At-Large:**

Byo, Donald  
Lapinski, Joseph  
Naberezny, Jon  
Owens, Alfred

## APPLIED SCIENCE &amp; TECHNOLOGY

Beaubien, Mary  
Boyd, Joan  
Crum, Ralph

Hedrick, Gail\*  
Sebestyen, Mary\*  
Talton-Harris, A

At-Large:

Barsch, William  
Feld, Kathylynn  
Horvath, Margaret  
Kennedy, Dorothy

## ADMINISTRATION

Alderman, Taylor  
Binning, William  
Cummings, Lawrence  
Dodge, Robert  
Gillis, Bernard  
McBriarty, Charles  
McGraw, William  
Ruggles, David  
Paraska, Nicholas  
Rand, Leon  
Ross, Ray  
Salata, Edmund  
Scriven, James  
Sutton, George  
Yozwiak, Bernard

## STUDENT MEMBERS

Card, Jeff  
Fitzpatrick, Tim  
Hartsoe, Desiree  
Horton, J.  
Hudak, John  
Kangas, Rainer  
Salata, Ed

At-Large:

DePirro, Dean  
Koury, Tony  
Laret, Jeff  
Menaldi, Ed  
Muldoon, Jane  
Nakley, Ray  
Rand, Deborah  
Siegel, Harlan

May 1891 In second year of term

Sail Hedrick  
Mary Chesnut

W. Bauer  
in C. F. H. H. H.  
Veratig Gundy