

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

February 5, 1986

**RECEIVED**

FEB 14 1986

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

CALL TO ORDER

D. Rost, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 15, 1986

The last paragraph on page 2 was corrected to read Appendix B. (Secretary's Note--The third paragraph on page 3 should be corrected to read Appendix A). The minutes were approved as corrected.

REPORT OF CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

W. Jenkins reported.

At the December meeting, D. Robinson raised the question of whether or not the power to review courses meeting General University Requirements belonged to the University Curriculum Committee or to the Academic Standards Committee.

Dr. Robinson requested the Charter and ByLaws Committee to review the decision made by the parliamentarian and Chairman of the Senate that the Charter assigned these powers to the Academic Standards Committee.

The Charter and ByLaws Committee has decided the following by a 5 to 1 majority:

The language in the Charter is not exacting; however, based on past interpretations and practices that have been instituted and followed--

1. The power to decide which courses fit under the appropriate areas does belong to Academic Standards and Events
2. It is also our opinion the system requires the Academic Standards and Events to use the present circulation system that is used for other curriculum matters
3. The University Curriculum Committee must circulate the courses through the regular distribution process
4. If there are objections, the Academic Standards and Events Committee should make the decision, but objections should come to the Senate for a final decision.

There will be an effort to tighten up the language of the Charter.

## REPORT OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

There are two changes in the Academic Senate Membership: David Nuss is the new Student Senator from Engineering and Lisa Gardner is the new Student Senator from Education.

Changes in University Committee Membership: Professor Eugene Sekeres, Marketing, has been nominated to replace Dr. Carol Gay on the University Marketing and Public Relations Committee.

The University is starting to prepare for the accreditation visit by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This effort will need support from all areas. We particularly encourage the Senators and all faculty members to help in this major undertaking.

Meshel Hall was dedicated last Friday and promises to be a major addition to the University. It can have a significant impact in every academic discipline.

Since the previous Senate meeting, there has been some public criticism of material and texts used in some University classes. I have been kept apprised of the situation as academic freedom is a very important part of the University. With academic freedom comes academic responsibility. It is my understanding that both are being carefully considered at this time.

### Other Announcements:

The May Senate meeting is the deadline for curricular actions by the Senate for course changes or additions for 1986-1987.

The March Senate meeting will be March 5, 1986, at 4:00 in DeBartolo Hall.

Items for the March Senate meeting are due Friday, February 24, 1986, 12:00, to Dr. Duane Rost, Chairman of the Senate, or to the Electrical Engineering Secretary.

Dr. Ikram Khawaja, Vice-Chairman of the Senate and the University representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Chancellor has no report at this time. The next meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee is February 12, 1986. There will be a report at the March Senate meeting.

## REPORT OF ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE

No Report.

## REPORT OF CURRICULUM DIVISION, ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND CURRICULUM

L. Hugenberg reported.

Courses are appended to the Agenda for your information. No action is required.

## REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND EVENTS

### Motion to Reconsider 856-2--see pages 4 and 5 of the Agenda

At the January Senate meeting, L. Satre indicated he wished to call up the motion to reconsider at this time. The discussion centers on the motion to reconsider. It must be passed by a majority vote. The discussion can delve into the merits of the main motion but the Chairman would like to center the discussion on the motion to reconsider.

B. Yozwiak--The danger is that the entire package will be put forth as it was before. Contrary to what appear to be minor changes, there are philosophical changes. I would prefer to see discussion on five or six separate issues:

1. Should current requirements be changed?
2. Should courses in student's major count toward General University Requirements?
3. Should there be a requirement for a courses that includes multicultural knowledge and experience?
4. Should only 500- and 600-level courses be allowed to count?
5. Is 12, 12, and 12, the appropriate distribution?
6. Should specific courses or descriptions be specified?
7. Should courses that are to be approved be selected by department involved or by this committee?
8. Do we agree on criteria that the committee selected?

To bring the entire motion back eliminates this discussion unless each point is brought up separately. I am opposed to bringing back the package as originally presented.

B. Gartland--The changes are far reaching. Some comments from the hearings were not addressed in this proposal.

H. Mettee--The Senate is an embodiment of a continual evaluation. The demands of the market place change. We need to have a device to make continual changes. Whether we recommend a change now or later, it will come back to haunt us. Enough time has gone into the process.

L. Satre--What the committee was doing was valuable. At the December meeting we did not address all the issues. There is too much effort that has gone into the package. I do not want to see it die. I agree that we need to debate the issues raised by Dean Yozwiak. There are two important things that the committee is recommending:

1. There is a design to reduce the number of courses that count for General University Requirements. There is a need to weed out courses.
2. The proposal does require some writing in most General Area Requirements courses. We are still in a crisis relative to the writing ability of students. The entire burden cannot be assumed by the composition faculty. The new matriculation requirements mandate more English composition and it is hoped that writing skills will improve. However, writing must be required during the first two years of college.

V. Richley--Every year or two, the requirements need to be revised. Last year the issue was that there was not enough time to revise. We have all had the Summer and Fall terms to study the proposal. There were six open hearings. There was discussion. However, the proposal presented is the same that was proposed last Spring. I oppose the return of discussion to that proposal, but in some way those issues raised by Dean Yozwiak should be discussed to give the committee guidance and direction.

B. Brothers--Some of this is disturbing. The proposal is not the same word for word. The committee did review the discussion. The implementation procedure was changed. The writing requirements were changed. CAST requested that 800-level courses be considered. The University Curriculum Committee has taken the stand that courses must have appropriate prerequisites; therefore, 800-level courses were not included. There is more emphasis on breadth and opportunity for some depth. I am not arguing for passage, but am disturbed that the comment is made that we did not respond. The committee has no where to go except to work at it piecemeal and present it to the Senate one piece at a time.

T. Alderman--I am speaking in support of reconsideration. I also left the December meeting feeling frustrated. The discussion centered on mechanics; five or six revisions, each with some degree of merit, were presented. What was missing from the December discussion was the merits of changing General University Requirements. We need to address the merits of the general concept of revision. We need to reconsider to achieve this goal.

-----I am speaking against reconsideration. At one point, the committee observes the need for breadth and at another point, they observe we have some 820 course options. This indicates we have breadth.

B. Gillis--Offering 820 courses does not give breadth. The proposal is designed to make certain that a student get breadth in his/her selection of courses to meet General University Requirements.

P. Baldino--I support the motion to reconsider.

Call for question. Motion carried.

Ruling by Chairman to Delete Last Paragraph Under Implementation on Page 5

The Chairman ruled that the Charter and ByLaws Committee interpretation of the Charter required that the last paragraph under Implementation be deleted from the motion.

Comment by the Chairman

Items A and B have been amended as presented on page 6 of the Agenda. To change the amendments would require a motion to reconsider. Any motion that was decided would require a motion to

reconsider. The floor is open to debate on the main motion as amended.

F. Barger--In the spirit of past comments, Item 3 under restrictions should be deleted. I am not arguing the merits. This is implementable at any time and it is not central to the proposal.

Motion to Delete Item 3 from the Restrictions (see page 4)

F. Barger moved to delete Item 3 from the Restrictions as found on page 4 of the Agenda. Motion was seconded by D. Robinson.

B. Brothers--There are a number of things General University Requirements should address.

----- We need to implement what we can implement readily and make other changes later. The most readily available courses would meet this criteria. The restriction may be redundant.

D. Robinson--I support deletion because I do not know what I am being asked to approve. The committee did not tell us what they meant by international and/or multicultural knowledge and experience. Vague statements should not be passed.

H. Mettee--I support the deletion. Most of the courses offered by the science departments have no international or political emphasis. Science knows no national boundaries. Science courses are multicultural and have an international component, but not explicitly.

I. Khawaja--It is ironic that we are discussing whether there should be an emphasis on international and or multicultural course content at this point in time.

B. Brothers--the committee did not think about sciences. They were thinking specifically about History or Economic courses. The conception was that a department might choose to develop a course that did meet this objective.

F. Blue--Some impetus came from the Black Studies Report. Students need to become more aware of third world areas.

B. Yozwiak--The question is the difficulty of implementation. Does the committee foresee identifying which courses will meet the criteria.

B. Brothers--Each department is responsible for self identifying courses that meet the requirements and sending them to the committee. Perhaps the language could be better--we see no problem with implementation.

P. Humbertson--I would recommend that we not include Item 3 because there will be difficulties in interpretation. It may create something not intended by the committee. Items 1 and 2 are broadening; Item 3 does not fit in; it is specific.

B. Gillis--Implementation poses a problem. We should look at both extremes. What if no course is approved? What if all courses are approved? We should be leery of a proposal that has no set of courses that meet the requirements.

F. Barger--The committee is not aware of implementation problems. Look at Black Studies II--what is it? What requirements does it meet?

G. Sutton--The main problem is logistical. There is already a problem getting students into required courses. This adds another dimension to the problem of student registration. Why have specific requirements?

P. Bladino--If implementation is a problem, we cannot give a formula. The committee is giving an opportunity for faculty input.

#### Motion to Close Debate

H. Mettee moved to close debate. Motion seconded by T. Alderman.  
Motion Carried.

#### Vote on Main Motion

A division was called on the vote on the main motion to amend the proposal by deleting Item 3 from Restrictions. The vote was 35 for the motion; 26 against the motion. Motion to Amend Carried.

#### Motion to Amend by Deleting Item 1 under Restrictions

H. Mettee moved to amend the Proposal by deleting Item 1 under Restrictions. F. Barger seconded the motion.

H. Mettee--The problem that surfaces is that Chemistry majors could not count Chemistry courses; they would have to take a course in Physics or Astronomy. The idea of Chemistry courses not counting seems absurd. It is illogical to have that restriction.

B. Brothers--Chemistry is not an adequate introduction to all the sciences. Some Arts and Sciences graduates look as specialized as those graduating from the professional schools.

D. Robinson--We should look at this in terms of what we are trying to do when we implement General Area Requirements. It is like leading students through a buffet supper. This is a serious question--what are we looking for when we impose General University Requirements?

F. Barger--We already have restrictions under A, B, and C of the Proposal. Students must take courses from three different areas in Humanities, Social Studies, and Science/Mathematics. A student's major is somewhat ambiguous. Is a required Mathematics course less part of a major than a Physics course? Where do we draw the line? I don't like to have this requirement imposed on students.

H. Mettee--Most sensible majors require that courses be taken outside of the major. Most majors require similar ancillary courses. It is an insult that courses in a student's major do not count.

Student Senator--I am somewhat confused as to the number of restrictions that will be placed on students. When you take away the student's freedom to select, you are taking away the fun of education.

Call for question.

Call for Division

The vote was 25 for the amendment; 26 against. Motion Defeated to delete Item 1 from Restrictions.

Motion to Amend Item 2 Under Restrictions

L. Harris moved to amend Item 2 under 'Restrictions to read: "Only 500-, 600-, and 700-level courses count toward the fulfillment of the basic 12 hours required in each area." Motion seconded by G. Sutton.

L. Harris--The concern is for ICP students enrolled in CAST courses. Students have at least 105-110 hours when they complete a two-year degree because they have to meet many accreditation requirements. To go back to take 500- and 600-level courses seems illogical when there are 700-level courses that can be taken.

P. Humbertson--Presumably 700-level courses would require pre-requisites. This could mean that students will violate prerequisites. If these students have 100+ hours why have they not taken courses to meet the requirements.

L. Harris--The requirements to meet accreditation standards are rigid.

H. Earnhart--ICP's are limited to 100 students. There is a lot of flexibility in ICP's. Some requirements can be waived. We should not amend for 100 students.

Student Senator--A basic criticism is that it takes more than four years to get out of Youngstown State University. These restrictions will force students into five-year programs.

F. Barger--If prerequisite structure is such that students will meet General University Requirements by taking a 700-level course and if the 700-level course is accessible despite whether or not it meets the ideal set by the Curriculum Committee and if the course is otherwise acceptable, why should we object to it?

L. Harris--There are properly accessible 700-level courses for students to take that meet their educational needs. We should avoid detours and runarounds.

G. Sutton--The reason for my second is the logistical problem. Not all courses are properly numbered. Not all 700- and 800-level courses have prerequisites.

Call for question. Motion Defeated to amend Item 2 under Restrictions.

D. Robinson--Point of Information. The Academic Standards and Events Committee has a second proposal on the Agenda. Is action on the second motion critical?

Chairman Rost--If we do not complete action today, it will automatically carry over to the next meeting.

B. Brothers--The proposal was initiated by Dean Richley.

V. Richley--CAST would appreciate quick action on the proposal. Dean Scriven tells me that students have already been admitted for Fall, 1986. It is intended that implementation will take place Fall, 1986.

#### Motion to Adjourn

G. Sutton moved to adjourn. Motion received a second.  
Motion Defeated to adjourn.

#### Call for Question on Motion to Amend Item 2

A voice vote resulted in a call for division.

#### Call for Division

There was a call for division. There were 26 votes for the motion and 27 against the motion. Motion Defeated to amend Item 2.

#### Motion to Amend the Purpose of the Science/Mathematics Requirement

H. Mettee moved to amend by replacing the statement of purpose with the following: "To understand the laws and concepts that describe the natural world, as developed by the scientific method." Motion was seconded.

The rationale is that the phrase "numerical data" in the present description implies a limited statistical approach to science; it should also be noted that mathematics could equally be a part of the social studies area (e.g. Economics); finally "political and social implications" of science are not really the study of science itself.

B. Brothers--What about the question to postpone?

Chairman Rost--A motion is required.

H. Mettee--There are other qualitative and descriptive qualities to be considered.

----- Would the proposed amendment require that Mathematics courses be deleted. Answer--No.

B. Brothers--No one suggested any changes previously. Would it be helpful to include numerical data?

F. Barger--If the intent is to include mathematics, then the statement "understanding numerical data" won't do it. I support Howard's proposal as a bold step forward.



Motion to Postpone Discussion

L. Satre moved to postpone discussion until the next meeting.  
Motion seconded by D. Robinson.

Call for question. Motion Carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Rost adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

ATTENDANCE SHEET+

Academic Senate, 1985-86

Date: 2/5/86

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

At-Large

Violet Bogges

VB

Steve Gardner

SRG

Nancy Mosca

NM

Sharon Shipton

SS

William Vendemia

WB

Departmental

\*\*Louis Harris, Allied Health

La  
cc

\*Cynthia Peterson, Business Ed.

\*James Conser, Criminal Justice

\*\*Ajit Kumar, Engineering Tech.

AK

\*\*Mary Beaubien, Home Economics

MB  
BGC

\*Barbara Engelhardt, Nursing

ARTS AND SCIENCES

At-Large

Frederick Blue

FB

Barbara Brothers

BB

Paul Dalbec

P.D.

Leslie Domonkos

LD

Hugh Earnhart

HE

Everette Abram

EA

William Jenkins

WJ

Gratia Murphy

GM

Sidney Roberts

SR

Lowell Satre

LS

Thomas Shipka

TS

Departmental

\*\*Paul Van Zandt, Biology

\*Howard Mettee, Chemistry

\*\*Richard Bee, Economics

RB  
im

\*John Mason, English

\*\*Renee Linkhorn, Foreign Languages

RL

\*\*Patricia Humbertson, Geography

PH

\*Ikram Khawaja, Geology

IK

\*\*Barbara Wright, Health/Phys. Ed.

BW

\*Martin Berger, History

MB

\*\*S. Floyd Barger, Mathematics

S.F.B.

\*Brendan Minague, Philosophy

\*\*Edwin Bishop, Physics/Astronomy

EB

\*William Eichenberger, Polit. Sci.

WE

\*\*Gilbert Atkinson, Psychology

GA

\*Beverly Gartland, Sociology

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

At-Large

E. Terry Deiderick

ED

James Granito

JG

Clement Psenicka

Dennis Bensinger

Thomas Rakestraw

Mervin Kohn

Departmental

\*\*Gerald Smolen, Accounting

\*\*Anne McMahon, Management

\*Jane Simmons, Marketing

AS

EDUCATION

At-Large

Peter Baldino

PB

Randy Hoover

RH

Departmental

\*\*Dorothy Scott, Elementary Ed.

\*Lawrence Haims, Foundations of Ed.

\*Janet Gill-Wigal, Guidance/Couns.

JG

\*\*Louis Hill, Secondary Education

\*M. Dean Hoops, Special Education

+Effective: February 3, 1986

2/5/86

Academic Senate, 1985-86

ENGINEERING

At-Large  
Frank A. D'Isa  
Duane Rost

FR

Departmental

\*Dilip Singh, Chemical Engineering  
\*Scott Martin, Civil Engineering  
\*\*Philip Munro, Electrical Engin.  
\*\*Hojjat Mehri, Industrial Engin.  
\*\*Thomas Elias, Mechanical Engin.

PM  
TIE

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

At-Large  
Frank Castronovo  
Darla Funk  
Joseph Edwards  
Walter Mayhall  
Jon Naberezny  
David Robinson  
Louis Zona

FC  
DF  
JE  
WM  
JN  
DR  
LZ

Departmental

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

RM  
DB  
JL

STUDENT

At-Large  
Marvin Robinson  
Donald Bryant  
Michelle Demetra  
Nick Dubos  
Ben Vaughan  
Gerald Wolfe

MR  
DB  
MD  
ND  
BV  
GW

School/College

CAST, Katherine Kish  
Arts/Sciences, David Curry  
Business, William McRoberts  
Education, Lisa Gardner  
Engineering, David Nuss  
F/P Arts, Mark Passarello  
Graduate, Rob Ingersoll

J.A.C.  
Lisa Gardner  
David Nuss  
Mark Passarello  
Rob Ingersoll

Ex-Officio

John Fetch, Student Government President  
Bill Grafton, Student Council Chairman

JF  
BG

ADMINISTRATION

H. Robert Dodge  
Bernard T. Gillis  
Timothy J. Lyons  
David Ruggles  
Victor A. Richley  
George E. Sutton  
Bernard J. Yozwiak

CR Angle

HRD  
BTG  
TJL  
DR  
VAR  
GES  
BY

Taylor Alderman  
William Barsch  
David Genaway  
Sally Hotchkiss  
Charles McBriarty  
David McBride  
Alfred W. Owens, III  
James A. Scriven

TA  
WB  
D.G.  
SH  
CM  
DM  
AWO  
JS

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

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Chemistry

TO: Senate Members

February 4, 1986

FROM: Howard Mettee, Chemistry

Re: General Area Course Requirements

Please consider supporting the following amendments to proposed course requirements offered by the Academic Standards and Events Committee.

1. That the purpose of the Science/Mathematics requirement be replaced by:

"To understand the laws and concepts that describe the natural world, as developed by the scientific method."

Rationale: The phrase "numerical data" in the present description implies a limited statistical approach to science; it should also be noted that mathematics could equally be a part of the social studies area (eg. economics); finally "political and social implications" of science are not really the study of science itself.

2. "That restriction 1. be deleted."

(1. "No course in a student's major area may count toward any general area requirement.")

Rationale: Courses in a major area nearly always satisfy the broader purpose of exposure to the area, and usually include other courses in disciplines within the area.

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

January 28, 1986

FROM ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND EVENTS COMMITTEE *BB:sthr*

SUBJECT: FEBURARY 5th, SENATE MEETING: RECONSIDERATION MOTION

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND

EVENTS COMMITTEE ON THE GENERAL AREA REQUIREMENT PROPOSAL

**RECEIVED**  
JAN 30 1986  
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

At a number of Academic Senate meetings and additionally scheduled hearings, the Academic Standards and Events Committee has provided comments and rationale for the recommended changes in the General Area University Requirements. However, some individuals are newly elected, and some have requested additional information. The Committee has compiled the following as a "statement of rationale" for the changes.

#### RATIONALE

POINT #1: Several previous Academic Standards and Events Committees, as well as the current one, have concluded that the General Area Requirements lacked both breadth and substantive definition of purpose.

The current committee found:

- a. A lack of stated purpose for the general area requirements.
- b. No definition as to the intended content for each area.
- c. Concern among faculty members for the "hodge-podge" of courses that applied toward the requirements.
- d. Over 820 courses applicable to the general area requirements of Humanities, Science/Math, and Social Studies.
- e. Curriculum sheets were not consistent among the Schools/Colleges and sometimes did not include courses that appeared to be appropriate.
- f. Some courses that count toward certain component areas are not consistent with others that do not apply (e.g., social work courses-- which appear to be applied/professional coursework--count toward social studies credit while similar types of applied/professional courses in the professional schools/colleges do not; statistics courses apply as social studies or as mathematics depending on where they are taken). In other words, some courses count toward the requirements merely because they are offered by certain departments and not because of their content.
- g. In one instance, a 4-hour course can be counted as science or as social studies depending upon which department the student is enrolled in while, in another instance, an interdisciplinary course is excluded from satisfying either requirement.
- h. Students majoring in the arts and sciences are permitted to apply coursework in their major toward the general requirements which even limits the breadth of study of our "liberal arts" majors.

POINT #2: Since October of 1984, three critical reports on the status of higher education in the United States have been published:

- a. October 1984--"Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education," sponsored by the National Institute of Education.
- b. November 1984--"To Reclaim a Legacy," sponsored by the National Endowment of the Humanities.
- c. February 1985--"Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community," sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Each of these reports has criticized, to some degree, the lack of breadth in requirements for the baccalaureate degree.

- a. The NIE study:

"Specialization may be a virtue for some students. But as ever more narrow programs are created, they become isolated from each other, and many students end up with fragmented and limited knowledge. While depth of study in any area has great value, the guidelines laid down by many professional accrediting bodies distort students' expectations and close off their future options. The result is that the college curriculum has become excessively vocational in its orientation, and the bachelor's degree has lost its potential to foster the shared values and knowledge that bind us together as a society." (emphasis ours)

"All bachelor's degree recipients should have at least two full years of liberal education. In most professional fields, this will require extending undergraduate programs beyond the usual four years."

- b. The NEH study found:

A student can get a bachelor's degree from 75 percent of colleges without studying European history and from 72 percent without studying American literature or history.

- c. The A.A.C. report recommended a minimum program for the baccalaureate-degree consisting of:

1. Critical analysis, inquiry, abstract thinking
2. Literacy: reading, writing, speaking
3. Understanding numerical data
4. Historical consciousness
5. Science
6. Values
7. Knowledge and appreciation of fine and performing arts
8. International and multicultural experiences\*
9. Study in depth--majors and minors

\*This was also expressed as a need in the Ad Hoc Black Studies Report referred to Academic Standards and Events.

POINT #3: The Committee accepted the following as basic assumptions and guiding principles:

- a. That the baccalaureate degree should contain/retain a liberal arts component.
- b. That the General Area Requirements are the only courses/areas mandated for every student.
- c. That such requirements should ensure breadth of study, while allowing some in-depth study.
- d. That a departure from the present breakdown of Humanities, Science/Math, and Social Studies was not desirable.
- e. That changes should have a minimum impact on present programs and departments.
- f. That the three areas of study not be strictly identified or defined by department/course titles.
- g. That we address content areas, not methodologies.

POINT #4: The Mission of the University is:

Youngstown State University seeks to enrich and liberate the minds of its students that they may be fully developed men and women, conscientious and productive citizens and responsible and understanding partners with others in life, family, and work. The University seeks to prepare its students for the future, not just to adapt or succumb to it, but to play active roles in shaping the future. To this end the University seeks to combine the best elements of the long tradition of humanistic, liberal education with education in the most significant advancements in science and technology.