

## **ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

**APRIL 3, 1991**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Jenkins called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

### **MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 1991**

The minutes of the March 6, 1991, meeting were corrected as follows: On Page 2, under Academic Planning Committee, change A. Betts to A. Betz. On Page 9, paragraph 2, change "date uncertain" to "date certain."

#### **Motion to Approve Minutes**

J. White moved the Minutes be approved as corrected. Motion seconded by F. Barger. Motion carried.

The Senate Attendance Record appended to the March Minutes should be corrected to read that S. Sexton, Music, attended all Senate meetings.

### **ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE**

No report.

### **CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE REPORT**

No report.

### **SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Chair Jenkins reported.

Committee Assignment sheets are out. It is important for faculty members to consider carefully what committee they want to participate on in the coming Academic year. April 19, 1991, is the deadline date for returning the sheets. Preference sheets should be returned to Richard Jones, Engineering.

Those who have served three years on a committee are considered to be at the end of their term. Those individuals who have served one or two years on a committee will be given preference for appointment to the committee if they indicate a desire to continue to serve on their preference sheet. Assignments will be made in May.

The Secretary has asked that all Senators check the Attendance Record appended to the March Minutes. If there are any discrepancies, they should be reported to the Secretary who will then make a correction statement in the April Minutes, if necessary.

#### Report of Faculty Advisory Committee

D. Rost reported. During the morning session of the March 6 meeting, there was a general discussion of the "Evolution of teaching." See Appendix A for a summary of the discussion.

During the afternoon session, Chair Hairston discussed the condition of funding. A summary is included as Appendix A; however, there have been changes since the March 6 report was made. Chair Hairston reminded us that we should not lose sight of future goals in spite of short term pressures.

The complete Faculty Advisory Report is found in Appendix A.

The Senate Executive Committee is functioning as a interview committee in the selection process for a new President. Six final candidates will be interviewed some time in May.

Ohio University Faculty Senate communicated with the Senate Executive Committee relative to the State Budget. The State Budget is not reflecting the needs of higher education in the State of Ohio. The Senate Executive Committee is communicating with them in regard to any actions they will be taking. There is a concern we may need to lobby our state legislators.

The next Senate meeting is May 1, 1991. Committee Chairs should have reports to V. Phillips by Noon, April 18, 1991.

L. Harris--When will faculty receive notification of the final list of candidates?

Chair--I do not know when that information will be released. I assume at some point it will become public information.

#### REPORT FROM OTHER SENATE COMMITTEES

Chair--At the last meeting we had a hectic ending and some misunderstanding. In reviewing the entire area under debate when the person called for determination of a quorum, we looked at the number of votes cast for the last motion (the motion relative to the Computer Services Committee report) and found that the number of votes cast did not constitute a quorum.

In view of the new recommendations coming forward from the Computer Services Committee, I am ruling the motions found on Pages 7 and 8 of the March Senate Minutes "Out of Order" because there was not a voting quorum present.

Motion to Request to Move Unfinished Business in Front of Other Senate Committee Reports

To facilitate the business of that committee and the Minority Access/Success Committee, I ask for a motion from the Senate to move and approve Unfinished Business items from their present location on the Agenda and place them in front of the Other Senate Committee reports. Motion was made and seconded from the Senate floor. Motion required a 2/3 majority to pass. Motion carried with one dissenting vote.

REPORT FROM COMPUTER SERVICES COMMITTEE

B. Jones served as temporary Senate Secretary so that V. Phillips, Committee Chair, could present the report.

We are presenting a modified package of what was presented at the March Senate meeting based on the ruling of the Parliamentarian and advice from the Chair.

Each recommendation has been numbered and we will move each recommendation separately asking the Senate to vote to support the recommendation and or amend and support. Obviously the Senate can also vote not to support a recommendation.

After carefully studying each recommendation at a meeting held after the last Senate meeting, the consensus of those members who attended the meeting was that the Committee would send the same set of recommendations to the Senate even if there were no Strategic Planning Process.

However, in view of the strong sentiment relative to the recommendation that members of this Committee make a presentation of the Board of Trustees, we are withdrawing it at this time to await the completion of the Strategic Planning Document. When that document is completed and approved by the Senate, the Committee plans to review the recommendation and perhaps revise and resubmit it to the Senate.

The Committee feels strongly about the need to put emphasis on maintaining more up-to-date computing, information services, and data communication facilities for several reasons:

1. Youngstown State is the only State University in the State of Ohio that does not have a high-speed backbone in place. We also lag many of the two-year schools in the networking area.
2. Youngstown State classroom facilities for computer instruction are significantly inferior to a number of two- and four-year institutions.
3. Our high-technology building is showcasing technology that is 8-10 years old and woefully inadequate to support student versions of current software.

4. Potential students who tour our facilities will be turned off to Youngstown State when they see hardware/software that is inferior to that in home schools.
5. Local industry will hardly see Youngstown State as a potential leader when they tour facilities and/or send employees to Continuing Education classes and they see computers in use that are obsolete by three generations.
6. Academic departments will find it increasingly difficult to attract top candidates because of inferior computing capability, classroom facilities, and networking capability. Faculty in Engineering, Business, Art, and many other areas expect facilities that will support current computer-based pedagogical methods being used in respective disciplines.

I have asked several Committee members and L. Anschuetz from the Computer Center to attend today's meeting to help answer questions you might have on the recommendations.

Motions to Approve Recommendations Found on Pages 7 - 11 of the Senate Agenda.

V. Phillips moved Recommendation 1 found on Page 7 of the Agenda. Motion seconded by M. Horvath.

After a moment of silence, the Senate Chair requested that V. Phillips offer a motion to approve Recommendation 1 through 13 found on pages 7 - 11 of the Senate Agenda.

V. Phillips moved that Recommendations 1 through 13 be approved. Motion Seconded by M. Horvath.

Substitute Motion

G. Sutton stated that he felt we are opening a kettle of worms. He was a nonvoting member of the Computer Services Committee and did not have an opportunity to vote against the recommendations. There are some recommendations that he can agree with and some things that he does not agree with. We are not in a position to judge what is good and bad until all the changes are presented as part of the overall Strategic Planning Document. We should not deal with these recommendations until the Strategic Planning Document is brought before the Senate.

G. Sutton then moved that the Senate receive the report and refer it to the Academic Planning Committee. Motion seconded by S. Hotchkiss.

Chair--We would view this as a simple motion to refer to Committee.

F. Barger--The Academic Planning Committee deserves to have some additional input from this body as to the sense with which the body generally supports the proposals? The Academic Planning Committee is facing a difficult job and it seems they could benefit by having some discussion about particular recommendations. I see sending this to committee without trying to get some intuitive sense of the members of the Senate as simply giving the Academic Planning Committee the job of having to come up with a proposal to vote up or down. It is an extremely difficult job. Anything we can do to make it easier should be done. I oppose the motion.



A. Betz--Any discussion from the Senate would be helpful. We discussed this area at our last meeting and tabled discussion pending what happened at the Senate meeting today.

S. Hotchkiss--I believe the motion was not to make the Academic Planning Committee's or anybody else's task more difficult; but it seems premature to indicate endorsement by the Senate of one piece of what will be a very large jigsaw puzzle. I believe the motion should be to receive rather than to endorse the report.

D. Hovey--As I look over the report, most everything looks very attractive to me. I would be very much interested in finding out what people object to or disagree with.

D. Robinson--Are we addressing the substitute motion?

Chair--Yes.

The question was called on the Substitute Motion. Nays have it. Substitute Motion to Refer to Committee is defeated.

Discussion returned to the original motion.

D. Robinson--I would like some clarification of the quotation marks surrounding the recommendations. Do they have any significance? Do they represent direct quotes from somebody? Regarding the proposed network, I am not familiar with TCP/IP protocol. Could someone explain the significance? Recommendation 10 has no verb.

V. Phillips--In response to your first question, the quotation marks have no significance other than they were not deleted when the material was moved from the Computer Service Committee Minutes to the Senate report. They should be deleted. Please make this an editorial change.

Regarding the network backbone, I would like to ask L. Anschuetz to respond.

L. Anschuetz--TCP/IP is a network developed over the last 15 years. It is an industry standard that will be supplanting ISO/OSI. ISO/OSI uses TCP/IP as a medium so no changes in hardware and wiring will be needed. TCP/IP can be handled over any multitude of media. We are the only campus still running on coaxial cable. The campus already has an EtherNet protocol running on a coaxial cable which is communicating at 10 megabytes per second. The effect of going to a high speed backbone is that this speed jumps to 100 megabytes per second. Changing would increase delivery time by a factor of 10. The fiber cable should be able to go even higher than that. Ohio State University is running on T1 at approximately 1.44 mbps. It will jump to T3 running at approximately 4 mbps. T3 is expected soon on some links. OARNET is planning to run at 1 gbps. Most schools have routers that can be upgraded to T1 or T3, but Youngstown State University is limited to 56 kbps. We will be slow when libraries come on line and share the line with other computer users. This is expected in 1991-92.

The local telephone system has gone fiber. They will expect to connect to campus with a fiber cable. Fiber is not the only medium we have, but it is the best and at the present time, is no more expensive than copper wire. Connecting cable all over the campus does require manpower that is expensive and we know that. We need to advance to where everybody else is. We are trying to stay within mandated standards.

B. Yozwiak--In Recommendation 11 regarding the network there is a parenthetical expression regarding telephone service. If this is not implemented, does this affect the recommendation?

V. Phillips--No. It means that the telephone system might not be compatible.

L. Anschuetz--If the telephone system does not report to the Computer Center, it does not have anything to do with the data capability. We wanted to avoid the duplication of installing parallel cables. We want to insure that they only install the cable once.

V. Phillips--In response to Dr. Robinson's questions about Recommendation 10 lacking a verb, he is correct. The deficiency can be corrected by making the following adjustments in the wording of the recommendation. Recommendation 10 should read: Computer classrooms should be equipped with drop-down, electric whiteboards; adequate lighting, including lighting above chalkboards and whiteboards and task lighting when appropriate; projection system connected to hard drive computer with installed software, including presentation management software; ergonomically designed desks and tables that include 'pocket-type' backs to store power strips and other wiring; adequate student work space for group interaction; suspended or built-in television monitors equipped with telecommunications capabilities; and interactive workstations that allow the classroom facilitator to receive feedback electronically and to coordinate discussions electronically; auditoriums should be equipped with multimedia equipment and software designed with telecommunications capabilities; lounge areas should be equipped with suspended television screens with educational programming; facilities should be made available for laser disk based hypermedia instruction to allow for open entry, provide open exit training at users' levels; Windows should be designed to avoid glare; Rooms should be carpeted with nonstatic carpeting in appropriate colors; Telephone system should include a dedicated line to allow for security and utilization of technical support in all lab areas; Ventilation systems should be designed with attention given to emissions from laser printers; Safety features should be provided for handicapped students such as the hearing impaired; and room design should give appropriate attention to noise levels.

Chair--Does the seconder of the motion agree with the changed wording?

M. Horvath--I have no objection to the change.

B. Gillis--Recommendation 4 provides for students to purchase computers at University prices. Last year, this Committee presented a report that said the University was paying prices for computers that exceeded prices paid by individuals.

V. Phillips--The Provost is correct. The University last year paid prices in excess of that paid for computers purchased by individuals. However, the University does have a provision for individual purchase at University rates that is not well publicized. It took me three telephone calls to find out who to contact and the procedure to follow to purchase computers at University rates. Also, the recommendation asks that the bookstore stock software, possibly student versions, for faculty and student purchase.

G. Sutton--I am dissatisfied with the proposals in the sense that if this body sends this forward, we are recommending that the University commit a quantity of resources that it is in no position to do.

One proposal disturbs me. The recommendation that the Electronic Maintenance Service be placed under the Computer Center should not be approved. We have had no problems operating that service.

V. Phillips--There is no recommendation that the Electronic Maintenance Service be moved. The Committee felt that restructuring was related only to the Strategic Plan Document. We would not make a recommendation for restructuring if there were no Strategic Plan. On last month's report to the Senate, we did provide a courtesy copy to the Senate of the recommendation we forwarded to the Academic Planning Committee relative to restructuring.

In respect to the financial crunch, the feeling of this Committee is that we have not been setting high enough priorities on computer resources. We would like to see a movement in the direction of implementing these recommendations as our resources permit.

D. Genaway--Regarding Recommendation 13 regarding a change in the name of the Computer Services Committee to Information Services Committee, changing the name implies a new direction and a new scope. It redefines the role of the Computer Center. There are Libraries of Information Science all over the country. Computer Centers manipulate data and provide information. The reference to research implies that all research would fall under that area.

LIBRARY IS TYPICALLY THE PROVIDER OF INFO. NOT MERELY DATA MANIPULATOR

V. Phillips--We had intended to move the recommendations one at a time. When the motion to approve Recommendation 13 was made, we intended to add to the recommendation a statement to refer this recommendation to the Charter and Bylaws Committee for study by that Committee. I would like to make an editorial change in the motion at this time to include a referral of Recommendation 13 to the Charter and Bylaws Committee for further study. Also, please delete "Administrative members should be voting members" from the recommendation. The question of voting is part or a larger question being considered by the Senate Executive Committee.

G. Sutton--Does that also apply to Recommendation 12?

V. Phillips--Recommendation 12 is worded properly. It is intended that Recommendations 12 and 13 be referred to the Charter and Bylaw Committee for further study.

F. Barger--Is it the intent that the Charter and Bylaws Committee review this issue or is this a directive?

V. Phillips--It is intended that they will review the recommendations to determine if they have merit.

G. Kornbluth--It has already been stated that the recommendations are on the order of motherhood and apple pie. My question is on priorities. Since we don't have an overall plan for the University, can we say that we are endorsing the recommendations over other things that might have a claim on resources? Might it be appropriate to say if we approve the motion, we and would like to have the recommendations made part of the overall plan?

Chair--What is the desire of the Academic Planning Committee?

A. Betz--We have other information related to this area that we have received. We would study this with all other material we have received. As we are planning to bring everything back to the Senate, I think this will come back again.

Chair--So it will not be given priority over all others.

A. Betz--No, it would be considered with all other issues.

A. Sobota--What is the value of the motion then?

Chair--Its approval by the Senate would be important in the sense that the Senate thinks these are important items. The Academic Planning Committee has a host of other things that they will review and eventually the entire document will require Senate approval. Approval of the motion does indicate Senate approval. It would not be in the overall nature of Dean Sutton's motion to refer to committee which takes no stance at all.

D. Genaway--What about Recommendation 13? Will it be referred to Committee?

M. Horvath--It has already been so stated when we agreed to refer Recommendations 12 and 13 to Charter and ByLaws Committee.

Chair--Recommendations 12 and 13 are still part of the original motion. Approval of the motion would indicate Recommendations 12 and 13 be referred to the Charter and Bylaws Committee for further study.

#### Motion to Substitute "Receive" for "Approve"

S. Hotchkiss moved to replace "Approve" with "Receive" in the original motion. I am hoping to clarify by replacing "approve" with "receive."

Chair--The ruling of the parliamentarian would be that the motion at this point is out of order. The motion is to accept and voting should be Aye or Nay.

#### Appeal From Chair's Decision

G. Sutton--I appeal to the Chair. An amendment is appropriate at any time. That amendment would take precedence over any motion.

Chair--Will the parliamentarian please comment on the ruling.

Parliamentarian--The body can receive a report at any time without a motion. A body cannot amend to receive a report when a motion has been made to adopt it.

F. Barger--Receiving a report does have a technical point. It means that you cannot subsequently amend the motion. You must vote Aye or Nay. It is used as a technique to prevent a superficial watering down of proposals. To receive a report means that you give it a special status. It is



the same situation we were in at the last Senate meeting when we moved to receive the report. I would ask that if you mean something other than that, then use a different term that would not have that technical impact.

Chair--The motion is to support the chair's ruling. If you vote Aye, you support the Chair; if your vote Nay, you vote against the Chair.

Motion to uphold the chair carried.

Motion to Divide the Question--Remove 12 and 13 From the List

D. Robinson--I move we split the motion into two parts, separating Recommendations 12 and 13 from the rest of the recommendations included in the motion and refer those two to the Charter and Bylaws Committee. Motion seconded by J. Neville. Motion Carried.

Motion to Refer Recommendations 1 - 11 to the Academic Planning Committee

D. Robinson moved to refer Recommendations 1 - 11 to the Academic Planning Committee.

F. Barger--Is it a different motion this time?

Chair--We did rule that this was out of order.

Call for Question. On the motion to adopt the eleven recommendations, the ayes have it.  
Motion carried.

We have split off Recommendations 12 and 13. I will assume that this was the intent of the original motion.

### REPORT FROM MINORITY ACCESS/SUCCESS COMMITTEE

A. Budge reported.

The Committee Chair requested that members of the Committee come to the front of the auditorium to help answer questions. Committee members are: A. Bright, A. Budge, P. Dalbec, I. Del Pozo, M. A. Echols, R. Kasuganti, J. Kraynak, I. Khawaja, J. Pusch, J. Ritter, R. Varma, and R. A. Baker. The report is a collaborative/cooperative effort.

Two people are distributing a page that appeared on the original report which was appended to the March Agenda for reference.

The charge given to the Committee was to: 1) Review the report from the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor and 2) Review the work of previous Youngstown State University Committees, and 3) Develop recommendations for defining, enlarging and increasing the effectiveness of the faculty in enhancing the success of minority students. The Committee also examined relevant Youngstown State university information on admissions and retention. Based on this work, a set of recommendations was developed. A summary appeared in the full Committee report that was appended

to the March Agenda. In endorsing the motion, the Committee would like the Senate to support the specific implementation procedures found in the report. Recommendation 10 should be revised to read that Student Enrollment and Retention statistics should be reported to the Senate once a year.

Motion to Approve Recommendations Found on Pages 9 and 10 of the Committee Report found on Pages 60 and 61 of the March Agenda

A. Budge moved the recommendations found on pages 9 and 10 of the Committee report that was appended to the March Agenda. Motion received a second.

QUORUM DETERMINATION

G. Dobbert asked for a determination of quorum. A count showed that a quorum was not present. The Chair indicated discussion could continue but no action could be taken.

F. Barger--I have an issue which relates to this although it is not strictly a minority student issue. It concerns students on financial aid. Students must carry a certain level load or lose their aid. This means that poor students are the only ones who get F grades because they must stay rather than drop the course. A conservative advising of these students would take this into account.

It might be advisable to have a flexible scheduling procedure which would allow for other methods of addressing this particular issue.

A second issue relates not only to minority students but also to commuting students which represent a sizable number of the Youngstown State University population. This issue is family ties. It might be useful to examine the value of a certain amount of family orientation as part of this issue. Many times, family demands on students vary widely from the beginning of the quarter until the end of the quarter. Performance can be adversely affected by these changes.

I would hope that subsequent reports would include these concerns.

A. Budge--Administrative and Student Services personnel have served on the Committee. We also have a new member from Student Minority Services who is here to answer questions.

--Is there a procedure by which the remainder of the Senate can vote to accept?

Chair--I have heard of a rump parliament -- but we don't want to make asses of ourselves.

Parliamentarian--The answer is no.

A. Budge--The most sturdy members are still here.

Chair--This will have to come to the next meeting for a vote. We can only discuss.

P. Baldino--I would like to have any memo to be consider for the debate circulated before the meeting.

A. Budge--You have received it. It was included with the complete report circulated with the March Agenda. The copy was distributed for reference.

P. Baldino--The Committee has been here a long time. We have reduced this body to a club that meets until 4:45 p.m. Can we consider changing the time to permit the Senate to be a Senate. The present time format limits the time to deliberate.

W. Barsch--Some faculty have classes that begin at 4:50 p.m.

Chair--There are indeed time conflicts.

G. Murphy--Can we put this in the front of the Agenda for the next meeting?

Chair--I will attempt to move it to the front at the next meeting.

-----The Senate could also have another meeting before the regularly scheduled meeting. To do this might encourage faculty to stay until the business is finished.

Chair--The Senate Chair will consider this possibility.

P. Baldino--We are reducing this body to a 45-minute meeting to discuss very important issues. I think that is patently absurd.

M. Horvath--Ohio State University meets on Saturday morning and meets from 9 a.m. until 12 noon.

F. Barger--That meeting time would certainly facilitate Senate elections.

Chair--Any further complaints, questions, or concerns?

D. Hovey--We should stress that we need a much more robust effort to get minority faculty on board on a full-time basis. We need faculty role models.

## ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR,  
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

Report of the meeting, March 6, 1991

Duane F. Rost

The Committee discussed "evaluation of teaching". The following generalizations could be drawn. Increasingly, some form of formal evaluation of teaching is mandated at all institutions. That evaluation typically has two purposes: one is diagnostic, providing information that can be used by the instructor to improve teaching, the other is for evaluation, where administrators use the information for salary and/or promotion and tenure decisions. With regard to the latter, full documentation of the teaching record is expected.

Teaching evaluation often has two components. One focuses on student evaluations, with the use of a form that has been developed within the institution (at either the University or College/Department levels) that has a set of core questions to be completed for all faculty so that institution-wide comparisons can be made, and then a set of optional questions chosen by the instructor for diagnostic purposes; the other is peer evaluation (classroom visits by administrators or department colleagues). Materials development for classroom use is often also considered in the evaluation of teaching.

At all institutions research is an important component of annual evaluations, and given that the reward structure often focuses heavily on research productivity, faculty must confront the dilemma of creating an appropriate balance of time for their research and teaching roles. It was noted that too often the evaluation of teaching is tied to the probationary (pre-tenure) period. Thus while teaching evaluation is an annual event for untenured faculty, it may be more infrequent after tenure is achieved. And, there was expressed the concern that an overemphasis on teaching evaluation can occur, leading to the situation where faculty start "teaching for the evaluation". Most importantly, it is difficult to know how to interpret evaluations of teaching when we do not have an understanding of what actually constitutes good teaching.

Overall however, Committee members stressed that the majority of faculty on their campuses took their teaching roles very seriously. Thus it is unfair to hear public statements from legislators and others that the commitment to teaching at the colleges and universities is not strong.

During the afternoon session, the Committee met with Chancellor Elaine Hairston. Her comments, and questions from the Committee, focused on the next biennial budget. She noted that the Board of Regents' budget, submitted late in 1990, was developed with a long-term view of the needs for higher education in Ohio. In that regard, new access and retention programs were important items within it, along with proposed increases for the instructional subsidy and existing line items such as the Excellence Programs.

She continued to stress that we must not lose sight of the future goals during these near-term pressures.



# ATTENDANCE SHEET

Academic Senate, 1990-1991

DATE: April 3, 1991

## APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

At-Large

Robert Campbell  
 Ralph Crum  
 Karen Duda  
 Margaret Horvath  
 Anthony Messuri

*[Handwritten signatures]*

Departmental

\*Madeleine Haggerty, A. H.  
 \*\*Virginia Phillips, B.E.T.  
 \*\*Joseph Waldron, Crim. Justice  
 \*William Wood, Eng. Technology  
 \*Jim Dishaw, Home Economics  
 \*\*Sharon Phillips, Nursing

*[Handwritten signatures]*

## ARTS AND SCIENCES

At-Large

Samuel Floyd Barger  
 George Beelen  
 Paul Dalbec  
 Larry Esterly  
 William Jenkins  
 Gratia Murphy  
 Lowell Sare  
 Thomas Shipka  
 Ronald Tabak  
 John White

*[Handwritten signatures]*

Departmental

\*Anthony Sobota, Biology  
 \*\*Friedrich Koknat, Chemistry  
 \*Teresa Riley, Economics  
 \*\*Sandra Stephan, English  
 \*John Sarkissian, Foreign Languages  
 \*William Buckler, Geography  
 \*\*C. Earl Harris, Geology  
 \*John Neville, Health & Physical Educ.  
 \*\*George Kulchytsky, History  
 \*Richard Goldthwait, Math and Comp. Sci.  
 \*\*Linda Tessier, Philosophy & Religion  
 \*Edward Mooney, Physics and Astronomy  
 \*\*George Haushalter, Political Science  
 \*James Morrison, Psychology  
 \*\*Guido Dobbert, Sociology, Anthrpology

*[Handwritten signatures]*

## BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

At-Large

James Daly  
 Inez G. Heal  
 Donald H. Mathews  
 Jane S. Reid  
 Dean Roussos  
 Eugene A. Sekeres

*[Handwritten signatures]*

Departmental

\*Richard Magner, Accounting  
 \*Donald Hovey, Management  
 \*\*Homer Warren, Marketing

*[Handwritten signatures]*

## EDUCATION

At-Large

Dora Bailey  
 Peter Baldino  
 Susan deBlois

*[Handwritten signatures]*

Departmental

\*Phillip Ginnetti, Elementary Education  
 \*\*James Pusch, Foundations  
 \*\*Lawrence DiRusso, Guidance & Counseling  
 \*\*James Douglas, Administration & Sec.  
 \*Len Schaiper, Special Education

*[Handwritten signatures]*

+Effective:

September 30, 1990

\* First year of two-year term \*\* Second year

ACADEMIC SENATE, 1990-1991

ENGINEERING

At-Large

Jack Bakos  
Duane Rost

*JEB*  
*WR*

Departmental

\*\*Dilip Singh, Chemical Engineering  
\*\*Javed Alam, Civil Engineering  
\*Jalal Jalali, Electrical Engineering  
\*Hojjat Mehri, Industrial Engineering  
\*Ganesh Kudav, Mechanical Engineering

*Dilip*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*J. Alam*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

At-Large

Joseph Edwards  
Darla Funk  
Les Hicken  
Larry Hugenberg  
Ted Perkins  
David Robinson  
James Umble

*J. E.*  
*DF*  
*LH*  
*LH*  
*TP*  
*DR*  
*JU*

Departmental

\*Genevra Kornbluth, Art  
\*Susan Sexton, Music  
\*\*Dan O'Neill, Speech and Theater

*G.K.*  
*SS*  
*DO*

STUDENTS

At-Large

Mac Crum  
Michelle Donley  
Babur Lateef  
Christopher Lim  
Karen Melanson  
Anthony Pochiro

*MC*  
*BD*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

School/College

\_\_\_\_\_, Education  
Erin Fogarty, Performing Arts  
\_\_\_\_\_, Business  
Theresa Leslie, CAST  
Najah Hudson, Arts and Sciences  
Kelly Senzarin, Engineering

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Ex-Officio

Brian Fry, Pres., Stu. Gov.  
Dan Haude, V. Pres., Stu. Govt.  
Eric Stephens, Second V. President

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

ADMINISTRATION

Bernard T. Gillis  
Bernard Yozwiak  
John Yemma  
James Cicarelli  
David P. Ruggles  
George E. Sutton  
David Sweetkind

*BTD*  
*BY*  
*JYC*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*GS*  
*DS*

William Barsch  
Shirley Carpenter  
David C. Genaway  
Sally M. Hotchkiss  
Gordon E. Mapley  
Charles A. McBriarty  
Richard A. McEwing  
Harold Yiannaki

*WB*  
*SC*  
*DCG*  
*SMH*  
*GEM*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_, first year of two-year term  
\*\*Second year of two-year term

senrostr.901/senate9091  
revised Decembef 4, 1990



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3675

William F. Maag Library

(216) 742-3675

**TO:** Virginia Phillips, Secretary  
Academic Senate

**FROM:** David C. Genaway *dcg*  
University Librarian

**DATE:** April 19, 1991

**RE:** Academic Senate Minutes, April 3, 1991 -- Correction

My remarks as reported on page 7 paragraph 4 need to be revised. "There are...information." should be revised to read:

"There are schools of Library and Information Science throughout the country. Typically libraries are providers of information and not merely data manipulators."

Having served as secretary to the Computer Review Committee, I can appreciate the difficulties in producing minutes of any meeting.

Thanks for making this change.

For your information a copy of a memo to the Academic Planning Committee and the Charter in Bylaws Committee is also enclosed.

Enc.