


MUDRAK, ANGELA K.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

January 9, 1985

CALL TO ORDER

Larry Esterly noted a quorum and called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 5, 1984

The minutes of the December 5, 1984, meeting were approved as distributed.

REPORT OF CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

W. Jenkins, Chairman, reported for the committee.

1. There is a question relative to the selection procedure for the Vice-chairman of the Senate. The present process is not spoken to directly in the Charter and ByLaws--The committee will be taking a look at ByLaw 4, Section 1.

2. A question about the secrecy of Senate Elections was raised. The committee determined the Charter provisions were specific and comprehensive and encouraged the Elections and Ballotting Committee to follow the provisions of the Charter.

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

L. Esterly reported. The complete transcript is attached. Highlights of the report follow: The next Senate meeting will be Wednesday, February 6, Room 132, DeBartolo Hall. Committee chairpersons are reminded to have reports submitted to L. Esterly no later than 2:00 p.m., Friday, January 25.

Assignments have been made to the Ad Hoc Committee on Undetermined Majors: J. Morrison, Chairperson. Committee members: J. Conser, F. Owens, G. Murphy, R. Mirth, J. Granito, V. Richley, J. Scriven, T. Beronja, G. Mann, and D. Taraszewski. Appointments still must be made for one student member and the School of Education representative.

Four task forces have been established to enable the Senate to participate in the campus review of the N.I.E. Report: Increasing Student Involvement, Realizing High Expectations, Assessment and Providing Feedback, and Implications of the Conditions of Excellence.

A resolution (passed by Student Council/Government) has been forwarded to the Academic Standards and Events Committee for consideration regarding "Individual student recognition for all graduates at Youngstown State University Commencement Ceremonies."

REPORT OF ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE

NO REPORT

INFORMATIONAL REPORT OF COMPUTER SERVICES COMMITTEE

J. LaLumia, Chairperson, reported. Four areas the committee is presently addressing are:

1. They are trying to assess the positions of other universities regarding the proceeds received from software developed by faculty. The University community will be informed when information is received.

2. They are working in conjunction with the computer center on the implementation of an inventory process for microcomputers (part of the policy passed last spring).

3. They are keeping abreast of the microcomputer acquisition policy passed last spring. The Fall, 1984, issue of ONLINE requested ongoing input from individual faculty members; the committee is also interested in faculty input.

4. The long-range plan for computer services has undergone a critique by an outside consultant. The committee is presently reviewing that critique.

There were no questions regarding the report raised from the floor.

OPEN DISCUSSION, INFORMATIONAL REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND EVENTS COMMITTEE

L. Esterly - Announced that there would be an open discussion on the report but no formal motions or resolutions would be entertained. This discussion is to provide an opportunity to share views with Academic Standards and Events Committee and direct to that committee signals and assist the committee in its work. At this point the podium was turned over to B. Brothers, Chairperson of the committee.

J. LaLumia - A reference was made to page 5 of the agenda regarding the lack of any statement of purposes and objectives of YSU's University General Requirements and a question raised about item 3 on page 4 of the agenda, noting that the catalog refers to history or appreciation courses in the Music Department rather than in Fine Arts.

B. Brothers - There is no rationale in the catalog, only a statement that courses must be taken in three general areas. There is some confusion about what constitutes a humanities course; there are only references in course descriptions. Even 800-level courses presently meet General University Requirements.

G. Sutton - A previous committee failed to reach a consensus and it was impossible to satisfy the faculty and administration on this issue. Engineering students have to interface with people other than engineers and need social science courses; the accreditation requirements also include humanities to ensure that men enjoy the fruits of man's labors in leisure time. There is an argument for upper-division courses to provide depth of understanding. A common freshman year to develop a comprehension of society might be the answer. The question is: Is the University the servant of or the conscience of society?

B. Brothers - The N.I.E. Report states that not all courses should be introductory courses.

STUDENT - You can't please everybody, but there is a need to be able to interact with other areas. There is a need to consider many areas when satisfying general university requirements.

F. Barger - There is agreement with the probability of the difficulty of attaining consensus. There needs to be a linkage between general requirements and admission requirements. It is appropriate to have the committee address the question of how should we link these two. It is now possible to complete all the humanity requirements and not qualify for English 540. Math and Science requirements can be completed without completing deficiencies in elementary ninth grade Algebra. Departments should review courses to institute appropriate prerequisites. The major field is the core of one's education and general requirements should be supplemental. Ideally, general requirements should counterbalance the major courses. Objectives cannot be accomplished by prescribing the same requirements for everyone.

B. Gillis - The objective is to expose students to broad fields. Students should develop flexibility to be able to adapt to changing circumstances. How do you create a proper balance between exposure to broad areas and depth in a particular area? It is difficult to determine the best fit of what the student body requires.

V. Richley - Reference was made to a report by a previous Academic Affairs Committee. The concept to establish a committee to formulate a statement to consider general requirements led to the Gould Committee recommendations. The report then landed in Academic Standards Committee. We have gone through the background and the rationale. The present mix seems appropriate. Questions to be answered are: What is science, a social science, and a humanities course? The humanities area is particularly difficult. There have been changes in the courses that satisfy this requirement, but there is no comprehensive single list of courses that are humanity courses. We have gone the philosophical route--we need to get to the nuts and bolts.

B. Brothers - We need to answer the question of what we want students to acquire--do we want them to study Western culture or American culture? What kinds of knowledge do we want them to have? Is it more valuable to have a laboratory science course? The University community needs to decide what its objectives are.

L. Haims - We are trying to provide a simple answer to a complex question, but a broad standard general education background is endorsed.

D. Robinson - At the next Senate meeting, we are presumably to come up with a significant statement. The committee should give the Senate guidance as to the form the Senate input and insights should take. We need specificity as to what the questions are.

J. Conser - The committee is not asking for specific directions because the University has not addressed the issues. There is turf building; i.e. What would happen if the committee abolished 700- or 800-level courses as meeting University requirements? Why can a student take 14 hours in the major department to satisfy general University requirements?

J. Scriven - The committee had no preconceptions. It is looking for guidance from the Senate and will then develop a statement to bring back to the Senate. The questions presented are good. The committee needs answers.

B. Brothers - Do we want students who write well? speak well? think well? who can work with computers?

D. Robinson - The Senate is not constituted to give that kind of answer. The role of the committees is to give alternatives. The committee is asking us to determine alternatives. The discussion could go on forever without reaching resolution. There is a concern that we will work on a level of abstraction and never answer any questions.

C. Psenicka - Every functional area has a set of requirements. The committee could seek to find the common thread that runs through the requirements of all functional areas as a beginning point.

G. Murphy - N.I.E. guidelines state that general requirements should synthesize what students have learned rather than fragment. All we have done is fragment. The committee might want to consider some method of integrating courses or general university requirements.

M. Shutes - A few courses now labeled interdisciplinary lead to more fragmentation.

G. Leck - If we could ascertain what the high schools are trying to do with their requirements, we could examine what it is that colleges are doing differently. Students should be culturally literate in the dominate culture, but have access to other cultures. We need to talk about the components of literacy. It is difficult to read journals in other areas. There needs to be a definition of cultural literacy. Perhaps the committee could come before us with a more abstract concept. What does it mean for a student to be literate given the changing nature of culture and the increasing media technology?

T. Alderman - It may be impossible to answer the question given the uniqueness of the University and the fragmentation and explosion of knowledge. We could formulate a brief principle; a proposal about what the Senate believes in principle might be the best approach. We are talking about two different statistics when we talk about 46 hours of general requirements and a four-year degree. Sometimes the course taken is a function of what is available Spring quarter at 9:00 a.m. It is important to define coherently and implement sensibly. Perhaps the Senate could develop a statement of 200-300 words that says, in principle, this is what we want to do; then this body is responsible to carry through with the implementation of the principle.

B. Yozwiak - There are two principles involved. Debate over requirements tends to deteriorate and an educational goal is fine as long as it does not interfere with a departmental program. We have had excellent recommendations from committees in the past. Now that we have addressed admission requirements, we need to address general requirements. They must be in tune with admission requirements. Why should we ask high schools to do what we do not do? We have to take a realistic approach. What do we mean when we talk about a broad background? cultural education? Do students need analytical

many of these courses are upper-division courses requiring prerequisites. A weakness is that we permit the use of courses that satisfy major requirements. If we try to get complete agreement on what constitutes general requirements, debate could go on forever.

I. Khawaja - There is a lack of a statement about the philosophy of general University requirements in the catalog, but in the mind of the framers, there was probably a philosophy that got lost in transition. The committee might look at what are core requirements as opposed to distribution requirements. Do we want to move away from distribution requirements to core requirements?

D. Robinson - The Senate had a proposal last year--it had flaws; but rather than keep working on it and hammer out a statement, we tabled it and threw it away. Now we are facing the same problem.

L. Esterly - The Academic Standards and Events Committee is applauded for taking this approach and seeking the Senate views so that the committee might have some sense of direction. The committee will find today's meeting to be beneficial.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by the chair at 4:55 p.m.

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 9 January 1985

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be Wednesday, February 6, at 4:00 p.m., in this auditorium. Committee chairpersons are reminded that agenda items for that meeting must be submitted to me at the Political Science Department office no later than 2:00 p.m., Friday, January 25.

Last month I reported that the SEC had established an Ad Hoc Committee on Undetermined Majors. Assignments to that committee have now been completed by the Executive Committee:

Dr. James Morrison of the Psychology Department will serve as chairperson.

Others on the committee:

James Conser	- CAST representative, and liaison with the Academic Affairs Committee
Fred Owens	- FPA Representative, and liaison with Student Academic Affairs Committee
Gratia Murphy	- A/S Representative, and liaison with the Programs Division of Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee
Richard Mirth	- School of Engineering Representative
James Granito	- School of Business Administration Representative
_____	- School of Education Representative
Victor Richley	- Dean, CAST
James Scriven	- Assistant Provost
Terry Beronja	- Administrative Assistant, School of Engineering
Genevra Mann	- Academic Advisor, A/S
David Taraszewski	- Student
_____	- Student

An organizational meeting of this committee will be called later this month by Dr. Morrison. The committee will make a preliminary report to the Senate at the Senate's June meeting.

Initial arrangements have now been made for the participation of the Senate in the review on this campus of the N.I.E. report, "Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education"--a review, and a participation, requested by Dr. Humphrey. Four task forces have been established by the President:

- (1) Increasing student involvement
- (2) Realizing high expectation
- (3) Assessment and providing feedback
- (4) Implications of the conditions of excellence

In the first three instances, the task forces will have representatives of the Academic Senate serving on the task force. Selections have been made so as to draw on the relevant committee assignments of the faculty member. It is my understanding that President Humphrey has now forwarded letters of invitation to faculty members for services on these task forces.

The SEC has forwarded to the Academic Standards and Events Committee, for its consideration, the resolution of Student Council/Government with regard to "individual student recognition for all graduates at Youngstown State University Commencement Ceremonies."

There is, today, no report from Dr. Beelen, YSU representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(FAC)

to

Chancellor of Ohio Board of Regents
(OBOR)

Since our last Senate meeting, FAC met twice; on October 17, and December 4, 1984. At both meetings, much of the discussion centered upon the next biennial budget and the Selective Excellence Program. Chancellor Coulter holds that the latter matter continues to be well received--by university presidents, the Administration, the State Legislature, and the large city newspapers--and the former (as regards higher education) appears to be a high priority for the Celeste Administration. However, it remains to be seen what the Governor will do and what the Legislature will do in the aftermath of the November election. There is some concern about the new make-up of the Senate. That the income tax will be cut is anticipated. The hope is that the cuts will not be large. If they are substantial, we could fall back to the economic chaos of recent memory. Our task is to make the needs of higher education abundantly clear to the legislators and to the public-at-large.

The official FAC minutes for the October 17, meeting are attached; therefore, I will comment further only on the meeting of December 4.

During the morning session, William Napier, Vice-Chancellor for External Relations, met with us briefly to tell us of his duties. In the first place, his duties include "information dispensing" (lobbying). This capacity reflects the new advocacy thrust of the OBOR. He will also meet with, among others, university presidents, editorial boards of newspapers, and State Legislators, to discuss the needs of higher education.

In the afternoon meeting with Chancellor William Coulter, he gave us an update on the budget process, to which I alluded above; the implications of the November election; and the preparation of a Planning Profile for each university. This last item is an attempt of the OBOR to ascertain the uniqueness and strengths of each university, from which true programming and planning can emanate. Finally, we were told that the Governor will be happy to meet with our (FAC) group, probably early in 1985.

The next scheduled FAC meeting is February 4, 1985. Please call me at 3451 if you have questions and/or suggestions.

Respectfully submitted,

George D. Beelen

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO
THE CHANCELLOR OF THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

Minutes of the Meeting of October 17, 1984.

Chairman Givens called the meeting to order with the following members present: J. Armstrong, G. Beelen, R. Boyer, J. Coady, P. Falkenstein, E. Fankell-Hauser, H. Federspiel, W. Fleming, R. Gilson, S. Givens, E. Harden, B. Hodgen, P. Jastram, T. Jenkins, R. Johnson, L. Laushey, B. Leidner, S. Maxwell, H. Munro, D. Noble.

MORNING SESSION

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of September 17, 1984, were approved as circulated.

Introduction of New Members

Prior to introducing a number of new members, Chair Givens explained the background of CFAC and how the group was expanded from the senior, four-year institutions to include membership from the two-year institutions. Of the latter, those with over 3000 FTE have permanent membership on CFAC, while four groups of about eleven schools each rotate onto CFAC for a biennium.

Preparation of Afternoon Agenda

A. Chancellors Statement on Excellence--CG began a discussion of the Chancellor's draft statement on the excellence programs distributed at the last meeting. Recognizing the effort in the document to include a "hook" for the humanities and liberal arts, but with some concern that the language not overemphasize professionalism/vocationalism, it was suggested that "individual fulfillment and social well-being" be substituted for "human satisfaction and . . . success." The suggested change was approved by informal consensus. There was also discussion of the "new" emphasis on "needs for economic renewal," with the observation that efforts have long been in place toward this goal; that "good performance" may not adequately convey the higher quality that the word "fine" may perhaps accomplish. There was a discussion of other alternatives from "excellent" to "poor."

B. Budget Status--CG reported that he had received a call from Ann Moore that CC's agenda for the afternoon session will include: 1) selective excellence; 2) capital improvement process; 3) operating budget process; and 4) the planning model. Background for the past and ongoing discussions of several of these issues was provided for the new members. A question was raised about the Ohio "investment fund" and the earlier plan for an international student and scholar exchange. CG was also informed that CC is working on a possible date for a visit to CFAC by Governor Celeste.

Future Meetings

The group repeated its desire to hear from Vice-Chancellor Napier, especially given the earlier discussion of appropriate language and approaches to gaining public and legislative support for ongoing academic research and the new excellence programs.

Information Sharing

G. Beelen asked about how STRS pickup was progressing. Some system-wide confusion over the term "pickup" was reported. YSU has had a "paper pickup" (of individual faculty members' STRS contributions) and was going to "pick up on the pickup" next year, but has received a ruling that the second pickup is not permissible. It was not clear whether YSU has already put into place both "pickups" but, if so, the second may be dropped because it is seen not to be in the faculty's interest. Akron is still studying the plan; KSU expects to implement basic pickup by January. It was agreed to discuss STRS pickup problems at the next meeting. The new early retirement program also is being implemented differently around the State: Miami, OSU and others reported a maximum of three possible years of "buy-up," while UT and OU reported five years; some schools (BGSU, OU) reported that a fixed "window" for application was still open while UT's plan is at present open-ended; greater variation was reported in the mix of options--at OSU one may choose either early retirement or part-time teaching after retirement while at OU a professor may elect (if eligible) up to five years of early retirement plus five years of post-retirement teaching (their old system allowed up to ten years of part-time teaching after retirement). Coady reported that OU was looking at summer compensation formulas and asked for patterns at other institutions; there was a question about internal program review, which is apparently still "alive" though the earlier, OBOR-proposed, statewide discipline-by-discipline plan is "dead;" Boyer asked about the stance of OBOR towards women's study programs.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Response to Statement on Excellence

The proposed change in language in Paragraph 4, was presented to CC. He responded that the suggested revision was in keeping with the substance of what was being sought. A further suggestion that the passage be strengthened by adding the term "humanities" drew the response that such specificity could lead to objections from other groups of disciplines. CC explained that he was trying to find a simple, succinct statement that would be satisfying to the academic community. Other language alternatives were discussed; CC spoke to the multiple considerations involved in the various audiences addressed and their probable reading of these alternatives. He recalled that the media has responded well to the assessment that "we have a good system and want to move toward selective excellence."

Selective Excellence

CC said that since the total package (two present + three new programs) has not been approved yet by the Governor, we are still a long way from guidelines; he reviewed the Governor's strategic plan, which has two parts (economic strategy--the creation of jobs, and human resource development) and noted that higher education has a big role in both. Included in human resource development must be a move, once a stable base of support is assured, toward selective excellence in higher education, and then on to job training, along with a state marketing program to heighten awareness that more sophisticated job training and re-training beyond high school is, today, a necessity to complete, today, both individually and as a state. CC agreed that guidelines and a system for critiquing proposals will have to be designed carefully; the process is beginning now in advance of their possible implementation at the beginning of the next biennium. CC said that he sensed "excitement" in the colleges and universities so long as there is a search for harmonies between the traditional values and objectives, and the present state needs for economic renewal. Institutions, he said, not the state, will make the specific determinations of those harmonies. On a related question, CC admitted that the Ohio Investment Fund had "disappeared;" although it seemed like a good idea, there were too many objections by budget people that it competed with the state treasury for investment of inactive funds.

Capital Improvements

CC explained the beginning of an inter-institutional study of the capital improvement process to review the present five categories of projects--renovation of space (\$5B of which exists), upgrade/replace equipment, growth and campus completion, media centers, and research centers. A question about renovation criteria was whether projects involving entire buildings had to be proposed or whether labs and lecture halls could be targetted individually; CC responded that although small projects such as individual labs might not be funded, the criterion was dollar-amount, not the fact of being a part of a building. Another question, about Chris Sales' matching 20 percent formula, drew the response that in those (many) cases where there is no source of partially matching money, the plan was unworkable. With regard to the "good business" proposals (see Sept. minutes), operating budget monies for renovation and equipment replacement would be restricted funds; while they are not top priority, CC felt that since they make good sense (will save capital interest costs), he hoped they would be viewed favorably. On whether ancillary renovation (A/C, power, lighting) to accompany equipment purchase (say, 30 computer terminals) could be funded as part of the equipment, there was a negative response.

Operating Budget

CC said that at the first major hearing with OBM, two representatives from the Governor's office sat in and the OBOR proposals drew a "very warm reception;" CC felt that there is now a substantial opportunity for the state to fund higher education as a major part of the base for re-building the state economy. Passing out reprints of two editorials (Cleveland Plain Dealer, "Investing in Ohio's Future;" Akron Beacon Journal, "Education Budget Realities," 16 Sep. 84), CC related that PD publisher Tom Vail had asked how

he could help (promote the 38% '86-'87 budget increase proposal); a CFAC member asked the same question, to which CC replied: by communicating a positive response to these budget initiatives (assuring a stable base, excellence programs, and the "good business" proposals for building renovation and equipment replacement).

Planning Model

CC expressed the view that previous planning has been somewhat inadequate because it has been based on individual campus needs and enrollments, and based on a principle that institutions doing similar things should get similar amounts of state support. While such an arrangement seems fair, the question today is whether institutions that are "differently disposed" and in different environments (e.g., rural vs. city locales) really have equal needs, even where the surface appearance of some of their programs and their enrollments are equivalent? What all this suggests is that there is a need to explore a possibly sounder planning model, based on the real nature of individual campuses, if this can preserve fairness. Laushey suggested that uniqueness shows up well in private gifts, and that "uniqueness" itself needed to be carefully defined before going forward with any new plan. CC said that the demonstrably unique must be discovered, and that on that will hinge the sense of fairness without which no new plan could stand, politically.

Subsequent Meetings

The next CFAC meeting will be Tuesday, December 4, with the first one for calendar year 1985, being Monday, February 4. It was noted that these dates are contingent on the possibility of working out a meeting date with the Governor.

1/9/85

ENGINEERING

At-Large

Jack Bakos
Salvatore Pansino

J. Bakos
S. Pansino

Departmental

**T. K. Slaweki, Chemical Eng.
**Javed Alam, Civil Engineering
*Philip Munro, Electrical Eng.
*Hojjat Mehri, Industrial Eng.
*Thomas Elias, Mechanical Eng.

T. K. Slaweki
Javed Alam
Philip Munro
T. Elias

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

At-Large

Frank Castronovo
Darla Funk
Joseph Lapinski
Louis Zona

F. Castronovo
D. Funk
J. Lapinski
L. Zona

Departmental

*Richard Mitchell, Art
*Donald W. Byo, Music
**James LaLumia, Speech/Theatre

R. Mitchell
D. W. Byo
J. LaLumia

STUDENT

At-Large

Greg Ball
J. Lisa Hardin
Kathy Jickess
Kristy Organ
Steve Schmidt
Pam Tolliver

G. Ball
J. Lisa Hardin
K. Jickess
K. Organ
S. Schmidt
P. Tolliver

School/College

Dana Sutton, Arts/Sciences
Brock Ferrier, Business Admin.
Francine Palumbo, CAST
Mary Matthews, Education
Brian Evans, Engineering
Dwayne Williams, FPA
Steve Burks, Graduate Programs

D. Sutton
B. Ferrier
F. Palumbo
M. Matthews
B. Evans
D. Williams
S. Burks

Ex-Officio

Jeanne Ann Lasky, Student Council Chairman
Walt Avdey, Student Council President

J. Lasky

W. Avdey

ADMINISTRATION

Taylor Alderman
H. Robert Dodge
David Genaway
Bernard Gillis
Sally Hotchkiss
Charles McBriarty
David McBride
William McGraw

T. Alderman
H. R. Dodge
D. Genaway
B. Gillis
S. Hotchkiss
C. McBriarty
D. McBride
W. McGraw

Victor Richley
David Ruggles
James Scriven
George Sutton
Gloria Tribble
L. Allen Viehmeyer
Bernard Yozwiak

V. Richley
D. Ruggles
J. Scriven
G. Sutton
G. Tribble
L. A. Viehmeyer
B. Yozwiak

Key: *Departmental Senator in first year of two year term.
**Departmental Senator in second year of two year term.

ATTENDANCE SHEET*

Academic Senate, 1984-85

Date: 11/9/85

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

At-Large

Barbara Engelhardt BGE
Maureen Mitchell _____
Nancy Mosca _____
Maureen Vendemia MV

Departmental

*Louis Harris, Allied Health L Harris
**James Kohut, Business Education J Kohut
**Bari Lateef, Criminal Justice B Lateef
*Ajit Kumar, Engineering Tech. _____
*Mary Beaubien, Home Economics MB
**Diane Bateman, Nursing DB

ARTS AND SCIENCES

At-Large

Everette Abram EA
George Beelen GB
Frederick Blue FB
Barbara Brothers B Brothers
Paul Dalbec P Dalbec
Janet Del Bene _____
Leslie Domonkos _____
Hugh Earnhart HE
Larry Esterly LE
Ikram Khawaja Ikram Khawaja
Howard Mettee HM
Gratia Murphy GM
Joan Phillip _____
Sidney Roberts SR
Lowell Satre LS
John White _____

Departmental

*Paul Van Zandt, Biology _____
*Thomas Dobbelstein, Chemistry _____
*Richard Bee, Economics RB
**Thomas Gay, English Thomas Gay
*Renee Linkhorn, Foreign Langs. R Linkhorn
*Patricia Humbertson, Geography P Humbertson
**C. Earl Harris, Geology C Earl Harris
*Barbara Wright, Health/Phys. Ed. Barbara Wright
**William Jenkins, History WJ
*S. Floyd Barger, Mathematics SFB
**Eugene Eminhizer, Philosophy _____
*Edwin Bishop, Physics/Astronomy EB
**William Binning, Political Sci. WB
*Gilbert Atkinson, Psychology GA
**Joan DiGiulio, Sociology JD

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

At-Large

Dennis Bensinger DB
Lawrence Davis LD
E. Terry Deiderick ED
Stanley Guzell SG
Clement Psenicka CP

Departmental

*Gerald Smolen, Accounting/Fin. _____
*Anne McMahon, Management AM
**Phyllis Stoll, Marketing _____

EDUCATION

At-Large

James Douglass _____
Glorianne Leck _____

Departmental

*Dorothy Scott, Elementary Ed. D Scott
**Joseph Kirschner, Foundations _____
**Lawrence DiRusso, Guidance/Coun. _____
*Louis Hill, Secondary Ed. L Hill
**Robert Nickelsburg, Special Ed. R Nickelsburg

* Effective: 11/1/84

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO MEMBERS, THE ACADEMIC SENATE

DATE 7 January 1985

FROM Larry Esterly

L. Esterly

SUBJECT: MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
WEDNESDAY, 9 JANUARY 1985
4 p.m.
ARTS AND SCIENCES AUDITORIUM, DEBARTOLO HALL

RECEIVED

JAN 7 1985

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

The agenda for the January 9th meeting of the Academic Senate will provide an opportunity for an open discussion on the informational report of the Academic Standards and Events Committee delivered by Dr. Barbara Brothers at the December 5th meeting of the Academic Senate. The committee is most interested in securing the "sense of the Senate" before proceeding to an examination of the issues raised in the informational report.

While the informational report is part of the minutes of the December 5th meeting, the report has also been attached to the current agenda for your added convenience.