

David Genaway  
Library

fk1

TO: FULL SERVICE FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, AND  
STUDENT GOVERNMENT

FROM: VIRGINIA PHILLIPS, SECRETARY, ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1988, 4:00 P.M.  
ARTS AND SCIENCES AUDITORIUM, ROOM 132, DEBARTOLO HALL

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.
2. Approval of the Minutes for June 1, 1988, Senate meeting.
3. Nomination for Chair of the Academic Senate.
4. Nominations for Charter and ByLaws Committee.
5. Charter and ByLaws Committee Report.
6. Senate Executive Committee Report.  
889-1 Picture Directory of YSU personnel.
7. Elections and Balloting Committee Report.
8. Report of Other Senate Committees.  
889-2 Report of Programs Division, Academic Programs  
and Curriculum Committee.
9. Unfinished Business.  
Challenge to Senate actions approving recommendations  
A), B), and C) from the Academic Standards and Events  
Committee, June 1, 1988.  
  
Academic Standards and Events Report 878-23, Items 4)  
and 5) initially on the agenda for the June 1, 1988,  
Senate meeting. (See Agenda for June meeting)
10. New Business.
11. Adjournment.

TO: ALL SENATORS FROM: DUANE ROST, CHAIR, 1987-8

The organizational meeting of the Academic Senate each fall is important as it sets the tempo for the rest of the year. This year in addition to the nominations for Chair of the Senate and Charter and Bylaws Committee, we have several very important items of business. I most strongly urge all Senators to attend and participate in the actions of the Academic Senate in 1988-1989.

COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Date June 3, 1988 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report Executive Committee

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

Elected Chartered

Names of Committee members: Baldino, Blue, Campbell, Granito, Khan,  
Granito, Naberezny, Robinson, Rost (Chair), Sutton

Please write a brief summary of the report which the Committee is submitting to the  
Senate: (attach complete report)

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? \_\_\_\_\_

If so, state the motion: The Senate request a picture directory of  
YSU personnel be created.

If there are substantive changes made from the floor in your committee recommendation,  
would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further  
consideration? NO

Other relevant data: \_\_\_\_\_

*Duncan F. Rost*  
Chair

COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE .

Date May 19, 1988

Report Number (For Senate Use Only)

Name of Committee Submitting Report Programs Division, Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

Elected Chartered

Names of Committee members: D. Brown, K. Foutz, R. Kramer, R. Hoover, A. Owens, G. Sutton, M. Vendemia, R. Nischwitz (student).

Please write a brief summary of the report which the Committee is submitting to the Senate: (attach complete report)

The Programs Division has examined and processed the attached proposal for the BET Court and Conference Reporting program.

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? \_\_\_\_\_

If so, state the motion: No

If there are substantive changes made from the floor in your committee recommendation, would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further consideration? \_\_\_\_\_

Other relevant data: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman (please initial)

**APPENDIX B**

1988-1989

BUSINESS EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY

SECRETARIAL STUDIES PROGRAM

**Court/Conference Reporting Major**

A.A.B. DEGREE

COMMUNICATIONS

550 Basic Composition 1      4 \_\_\_\_\_  
 551 Basic Composition 2      4 \_\_\_\_\_

POLITICAL SCIENCE ELECTIVE

\_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_

HEALTH & PHYSICAL EDUCATION

590 Health Education          3 \_\_\_\_\_

SOCIAL STUDIES ELECTIVE

\_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_

SCIENCE/MATH ELECTIVE

\_\_\_\_\_ 4-5 \_\_\_\_\_

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS

BET 510	Office Procedures	4	_____
BET 522	Typewriting 3	2	_____
BET 535	Machine Shorthand 1	4	_____
BET 536	Machine Shorthand 2	4	_____
BET 537	Machine Shorthand 3	4	_____
BET 538	Machine Shorthand 4	4	_____
BET 620	Typewriting 4	2	_____
BET 635	Machine Shorthand 5	4	_____
BET 636	Machine Shorthand 6	4	_____
BET 637	Machine Shorthand 7	4	_____
BET 638	Machine Shorthand 8	4	_____
BET 690	Court Reporting Experience	4	_____
BET 704	Business Communications	4	_____
CJ 720	Legal Term. & Research	4	_____

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

BET 615	Info. Proc. Machines	3	_____
BET 706	Business Law	4	_____
BT 500	Survey of American Bus.	4	_____
CJ 602	American Criminal Courts	4	_____
CJ 621	Evidence	4	_____
MA 501	Medical Terminology	4	_____

TOTAL HOURS: 98-99

**NOTE:** Student must have a 3.00 in major and a 2.50 overall grade point average to meet graduation requirements.  
 Student must be able to complete three ten-minute typing tests with three or fewer errors (minimum typing speed 75 wpm).  
 Student must transcribe a five-minute dictation at 225 wpm with 97% accuracy.

BET 505, Transcription Skills, is required if ACT English score is less than 16.  
 Students with no previous knowledge of typewriting should take BET 520 & 521.

PLEASE SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR HIGH SCHOOL REQUIREMENTS.

COVER SHEET TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Date 5-19-88 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) 878-23

Name of Committee Submitting Report Academic Standards & Events

Committee Status: (elected chartered, appointed chartered, ad hoc, etc.) appointed  
charted

Names of Committee members: R. Burden, C. Campbell, H. Corve, J. Gill-Wigal,  
B. Gonda, K. Hankins, L. Harris, L. Hicken, W. Jenkins (chair),  
H. Lee, M. Murphy, J. Scriven

Please write a brief summary of the report which the Committee is submitting to the Senate: (attach complete report) This committee is recommending changes in  
the discipline and grievance procedures, including such items as  
the assignment of discipline cases to the Student Academic Grievance  
Subcommittee, the empowerment of that committee to make grade  
changes in certain limited cases, the structure of the committee, etc.

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? Yes

If so, state the motion: 1) To approve the proposal on academic dishonesty  
2) To approve the proposal regarding other cases in which SAGS may mandate  
a grade change 3) To approve the proposal regarding the structure of SAGS  
4) To approve the proposal regarding the assignment of grades 5) To  
approve the proposal regarding intent

If there are substantive changes made from the floor in your committee recommendation, would the committee prefer that the matter be sent back to committee for further consideration? No

Other relevant data: \_\_\_\_\_

William D Jenkins  
Chairman

## PROPOSALS FROM THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND EVENTS COMMITTEE

### A. Proposal on academic dishonesty

1. The Student Academic Grievance Subcommittee shall replace the Student Discipline Board as the body to hear and determine cases involving academic dishonesty.
2. The Subcommittee shall hold hearings that follow due process procedures, which will be developed by the Vice President - Student Services and approved by the Academic Senate.
3. The Subcommittee shall have the power to issue disciplinary sanctions, including warning, probation, suspension, expulsion or other sanctions.
4. In cases involving academic dishonesty, the Student Academic Grievance Subcommittee shall have the power to mandate a grade change after holding a due process hearing and after consulting with the affected department.
5. In any disciplinary case exonerating the student, the record will be removed from the student's discipline file.

### B. Cases in which the Student Academic Grievance Subcommittee may mandate a grade change in a grievance case.

The Subcommittee shall have the power to mandate a grade change when the instructor materially deviates from the grading scale or weight distribution indicated on the course syllabus to the detriment of an individual student or the entire class.

C. Proposal regarding the structure of the Student Academic Grievance Subcommittee

1. The Vice-President of Student Services or designee will chair the Subcommittee, maintain all records, and only vote in case of a tie.
2. No members of the Subcommittee will hear a case directly affecting them. The appropriate body will appoint a temporary substitute for that case.
3. If an instructor refuses to or cannot participate in the formal grievance or discipline procedure, the appropriate department will provide a substitute who will exercise all the rights and responsibilities of the instructor.
4. The student must file a grievance prior to the last day of the final examinations during the subsequent quarter.

D. Proposal regarding the assignment of grades.

Except for cases in which the Student Academic Grievance Subcommittee has the power to mandate a grade change, the teacher of record shall have the power to assign a final grade.

E. Proposal regarding intent.

1. The term "cheating" shall mean using or attempting to use, providing or attempting to provide unauthorized materials or information in or for any class assignment or examination.

2. The Subcommittee may consider intent in making its determinations.



TO: FULL SERVICE FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, AND  
STUDENT GOVERNMENT

FROM: VIRGINIA PHILLIPS, SECRETARY, ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1988, 4:00 P.M.  
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING BUILDING, SCHWEBEL AUDITORIUM

IMPORTANT: PLEASE NOTE!!!!!!

The meeting place for the Senate Meeting scheduled for  
October 5, 1988, has been changed to Schwebel Auditorium,  
School of Engineering Building.

DAVID C. GENAWAY  
Librarian

f.c.

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: Members of the Y.S.U. Academic Senate

FROM: Ronald G. Tabak  
Senator-at-Large, Arts & Sciences

DATE: September 14, 1988

SUBJECT: The challenge to the Senate action of June 1988 on  
modifying the grade change policy [PLEASE READ BEFORE THE  
OCTOBER 5 MEETING OF THE SENATE!]

Dear Colleague:

We need your support! On October 5, 1988 the Y.S.U. Academic Senate will consider whether or not to uphold the challenge initiated by Steve Hanzely to the Senate action of June 1, 1988 that established a new grade change policy (see details below). In brief, the Senate action that we are challenging would permit the Student Academic Grievance Subcommittee (SAGS), which is composed of a minority of non-elected faculty, to change final grades in certain specific instances. Please vote to uphold the challenge! In order to vote intelligently in this matter, it is essential to read this document, discuss it with your colleagues, read the minutes of the June 1 meeting where the new policy was adopted and the minutes of the special meeting of January 13, 1988, where the grade change issue was first discussed. Please become informed. The chairman of the Senate has told me that if he picked a handful of Y.S.U. faculty at random, NONE of them would fully understand the issues. Let's prove him wrong!

The following is a reprint of our position concerning the challenge that was published in The Advocate in July 1988. We wrote it as concerned faculty members and not as officers (past or present) of the YSU-OEA. [Dr. William Jenkins, the chairperson of the Academic Standards and Events Committee, has informed me that he will write a rebuttal in an upcoming issue of the same newsletter.] After this article, I will discuss why I believe the Senate passed such a flawed policy in the first place and what will happen if the challenge is upheld.

---

CHALLENGE OF SENATE ACTION ON GRADE CHANGES

Stephen Hanzely and Ronald G. Tabak  
[from The Advocate, July 1988]

Article 13.37 of the Agreement assigns to individual faculty members "the authority to make the final determination of the grade to be awarded to each student". This authority is deemed absolute unless the Academic Senate adopts a policy "which provides for a system of changes in grades awarded".

On June 1, 1988, the Academic Senate considered a five-part proposal dealing with academic dishonesty and grade changes. Three of these were adopted; action on the remaining two was postponed due to the lack of a quorum. Specifically, the Senate voted to

(a) empower the existing Student Academic Grievance Subcommittee (SAGS) "to hear and determine cases involving academic dishonesty";

(b) empower the SAGS to mandate a grade change in cases involving academic dishonesty "after holding a due process hearing and after consulting the affected department";

(c) approve the following policy statement: "The subcommittee shall have the power to mandate a grade change when the instructor materially deviates from the grading scale or weight distribution indicated on the course syllabus to the detriment of an individual student or the entire class."

Article V of the Charter of the Academic Senate permits either the President of the University or a member of the faculty to challenge a Senate action. In accordance with the procedures prescribed therein, a challenge petition bearing the signatures of 46 faculty members was delivered to Dr. Duane Rost, Chairman of the Senate Executive Committee, on June 7, 1988. Effectively, the challenge puts the actions at issue "on hold" until the next Senate meeting, which is scheduled for October 5. At that meeting, the Senate may either uphold the challenge - if it is supported by a majority of the Senate members present - or not. If it does, then the Senate action of June 1, 1988 is null and void. On the other hand, "If the challenge is not upheld by a majority but is supported by a minority, one-third plus one of the Senate members present, then the challenge, under the direction of the Executive Committee, shall go to the entire faculty for vote. By a majority of those voting the Faculty may support the challenge in which case the action is null and void provided this majority represents more than one-third of the Faculty [emphasis added]."

In our opinion, the challenge should be upheld for the

following reasons:

[A] The SAGS is composed of six faculty members appointed by the Senate Executive Committee, six students appointed by Student Government, and one administrator appointed by the President of the University. Faculty will be a minority on this committee! If the SAGS is to operate under the auspices of the Academic Senate and have the power to mandate grade changes, its membership ought to be representative of the parent body, i.e., 70% faculty, 15% administrators, and 15% students. (With few exceptions, Senate committee memberships do reflect the composition of the Senate itself.) We also believe that the faculty members should be elected by their colleagues in the schools and colleges and not appointed by the Executive Committee.

[B] The SAGS's power to change grades is unprofessional in the sense that people without expertise in a given field will be required to critically evaluate students in that same field. Not only would it have the power to, conceivably, change an F to an A, but it may also be called upon to render judgements in more subtle cases, such as the distinction between a B and a C. Although it must consult the department involved, it does not have to abide by the department's advice.

[C] The SAGS's charge excludes intervention in some of the most frequent (and some of the most blatant) cases that affected student grievances in the past. For example, what if a syllabus explicitly states that anyone missing a test for any reason automatically receives an F for the course? What if a course syllabus is never handed out, contrary to the Agreement?

[D] Policies dealing with issues as important and as broad as academic dishonesty and the changing of an assigned grade ought to be voted on by the entire faculty. This is not only a possibility under the challenge procedure of the Academic Senate but is also specifically mentioned in Article 13.37 of the Agreement.

We wish to state unequivocally for the record that we are NOT opposed to a policy that could, subject to the appropriate safeguards, result in changing a grade issued by an instructor. Such a policy is prudent, guards against abuses, and - in cases involving academic dishonesty - is required by recent court decisions. Our position, simply stated, is "If we are going to do it, let's do it right". The Senate's posture on June 1, 1988, on the other hand, seemed to be: "Let's do it now and correct our mistakes along the way".

We hope that you will join us in asking our elected senators to uphold our challenge at the October 5, 1988 meeting of the Senate. Please send us your comments and suggestions.

-----

I have been asked several times why the Senate passed such a flawed policy. There are at least two major reasons: (1) expediency and (2) a desire to demonstrate that the Senate can act on controversial matters. Consider #1 first. At the January 13, 1988 meeting, I stated that the proposed composition of the committee was inappropriate and that "We need a revamping of the committee." My comments were immediately followed by those of Dr. Taylor Alderman, VP-Personnel, who asked us to "Consider Dr. Tabak's point that the present committee is an unacceptable body to recommend a grade change...." and that "We must have individuals who have professional expertise consider the grade change." [Academic Senate Minutes (Special Meeting), Jan. 13, 1988, pp. 3-4] Did Dr. Alderman change his mind between January 13 and June 1, 1988, when he voted FOR the flawed policy? In a conversation he had with me last summer, he admitted that he had not but that the Senate's action would remove one touchy item from next year's negotiations with the faculty association. Expediency! He was not alone.

The second major reason for the adoption of this policy was the need felt by many long-time (and long-suffering) senators to establish once and for all that the Senate was not impotent when it came to handling controversial issues. Any grade-change policy, no matter how bad, was to be preferred over yet another stalemate. In fact, we were told by several such individuals that if our challenge is upheld, the Senate will be effectively destroyed. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE! The Senate's charter, which was originally subjected to the democratic process, permits the challenge of any Senate action. If this challenge is upheld by means of the same democratic process, the Senate will be prodded to produce an academically sound grade-change policy. If its leadership abdicates its responsibility, it has no one to blame but itself! The issue would then be resolved at the bargaining table next spring.

To summarize, we believe that the new policy on grade changes adopted by the Senate on June 1, 1988 is seriously flawed. Please vote to uphold the challenge.