

Bernard Gillis
Provost

RECEIVED

MAY 14 1992

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

MAY 6, 1992

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jenkins announced a quorum and called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

MINUTES OF APRIL 1, 1992

P. Baldino asked that the last paragraph of his comments found on Page 4 of the Minutes be corrected to show the quotation marks at the end of the paragraph rather than after fired. The last paragraph should read"These liberals say to me, last hired, first fired. Be real, get with it." S. Hotchkiss moved the Minutes of April 1, 1992, be approved as corrected. Motion seconded by S. Smith. Motion approved.

ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE

No report.

CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

No report.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Our financial problems continue. The most recent report from Columbus is still gloomy and still set at the 15% level. It is evident that the state has only two options if our situation is to improve. Either the economy must improve, as well as state revenues, or there must be new taxes. In an election year, it does not seem likely that politicians will tempt fate by passing a tax bill, even if it is labeled a revenue enhancement. Nonetheless, politicians have been known to respond to public outcry.

In the past month, in an effort to create a public outcry, the Senate Executive Committee has forwarded letters to our state representatives and to local organizations. In addition, we have supported, attended and participated in rallies in Columbus and on campus and a student government sponsored luncheon and press conference with the state representatives. I would note that our representatives are very concerned about our situation; they do not need to be convinced of our needs. However, it is important that we continue to write them, as well as the Governor, Senate President Stanley Aronoff and Speaker of the House Vern Riffe. Vernon Haynes of YSU-OEA has drafted a sample letter that could be used as a model. Scott Smith of Student Government has a list of names and addresses, as well as a compilation of concerns.

Scott Smith--we have a list of all government officials and a sample letter that can be picked up in the Student Government offices.

Even though some might question what good it does, the Senate Executive Committee encourages you to take the time to write individualized letters. Our state representatives have indicated to us that the volume of such letters is important. They do count the number that they receive and vote accordingly.

The Senate Executive Committee is also appointing faculty to Senate and administrative committees. The announcement of those appointments will occur at the June meeting.

REPORT FROM CURRICULUM DIVISION COMMITTEE

The Chair noted that this is an informational report. The courses appended have cleared the approved procedure.

A number of courses will be appended to the June meeting Agenda which were overlooked. They will be included in the catalog and the course inventory.

REPORT FROM ACADEMIC PROGRAMS DIVISION COMMITTEE

Chair--Because of the budget crunch, we cut back on the materials circulated for the Academic Programs Division. The Senate takes no action on these materials; it simply receives the report. If you have an interest or concern, you can contact W. Jenkins or V. Phillips to examine the materials.

REPORT FROM ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND EVENTS COMMITTEE

R. McEwing reported.

The motions we are presenting are found on Page 19 of the Agenda with supporting materials found on Pages 20-21 of the Agenda.

Motion to Verify That Only 3 Hours of HPE Activities Can Be Applied to Degree Requirements

R. McEwing moved "To add the statements found on Page 20 of the Agenda to change the University Bulletin to verify that only 3 q.h. or HPE activity credits may be applied to degree requirements." Motion seconded by G. Sutton.

G. Mapley--I wish to speak to both parts of the motion. Let me clarify R.O.T.C. I wish to remove the reference to R.O.T.C. It is still alive and reasonably well at Y.S.U. There are still two courses taught by YSU faculty rather than R.O.T.C. personnel.

The second issue is more problematic. A number of years ago, I encountered a problem that needed fixing. I recommended fixing it, but perhaps in the wrong way.

Since the dawn of time, students have only been allowed to count a limited number of hours in HPE courses toward graduation. Students would come to me who had completed 186 hours but had six hours of activities courses. They would need to take another course which would delay graduation. I concluded that a statement should be placed in the catalog.

The Committee is presenting the motion to fix the problem. However, as I thought more about it, I decided I had made the wrong decision. The proposed statement is found in the 1966 version of the catalog. Twenty-five years ago, HPE courses were taught at the Y. The statement hasn't been in the catalog since 1969. The footnote got lost over twenty years ago. HPE courses have changed in the interim.

If we count other skill courses as electives, why not count HPE courses? If you can take painting, ceramics, trumpet, etc., then why not take basketball, volleyball, etc.? Instead of fixing the catalog, maybe we should change the concept and allow physical education courses to count as electives.

Motion to Divide the Question

G. Mapley moved to divide the question between the R.O.T.C. and Physical Education Components. Motion seconded by F. Barger. Motion Carried.

Vote on Motion Regarding Reference to R.O.T.C.

Motion regarding R.O.T.C. passes.

Vote on Motion Regarding Physical Education Courses Component

J. Neville--I have several pages of notes. I support what Dean Mapley said. I am concerned about the practice of controlling electives in other departments.

B. Wright--I want to speak against the motion. There has been no written policy stating that only three courses would count since we moved into Beegley and hired eight new faculty. We would be stating that only a certain number of courses could count as electives. Why are physical education courses singled out? Physical Education courses require as much skill as other courses. It seems to me that the statement this Committee is making is that physical education courses are nonacademic. Is this the intent? If this is so, how can we offer Academic Programs in Physical Education on this campus and at other universities. It seems odd that this Committee wants to limit the number of physical education courses when there is an increasing emphasis on wellness in our society. I think there are many benefits of activities courses to wellness.

J. Philipp--I speak in opposition to the motion. I suspect that it has been since the dawn of time and the only activities were calisthenics taught by Y personnel since the practice to allow only three HPE electives has been followed. We have hired qualified people and have changed the program. The program is now comparable to and perhaps better than other physical education programs throughout the country. What is the rationale for giving some students credit and not giving credit to others? It is discriminatory and denigrating to students. Why should physical education courses be considered differently? Motor skills are only one component of physical activity courses. Physical education courses are just that--education courses. There is a cognitive component as well as a motor component. Written tests are given and students are evaluated. We do need to encourage people to adhere to a regular exercise program. We are all concerned about improving the lives of the students. If we limit the number of courses that can count as electives, the message is that physical education activities are not important.

R. McEwing--I feel a need to respond to the thinking on the Committee. The Committee spent almost a year discussing this and decided that the best move was to bring it to the Senate. This is a

statement of fact. This is how the administration has been operating. There are physical education courses that are activities. Some courses are not activity courses. Three hours out of 186 hours are now designated as required courses. No additional physical education courses can be counted toward graduation requirements.

F. Barger--I object to a policy that is not written down. I find it offensive to enforce a policy that is not written down. I don't want to insult anyone who has a commitment to oral tradition, but damn it, write things down. Something unwritten has no status at all.

G. Mapley--What happened, as Floyd suggests, is that as I said, we have been doing this for 20 years. If we are going to continue to do it, let's write it down. Had I known what I now know, we would be changing the policy and not making an attempt to change the catalog.

A. Pierce--What is the policy?

Answer--There is no policy.

The Chair reread the motion.

-----If this isn't going to be put into the catalog, will something be put in to say that HPE courses can be counted toward graduation requirements to ensure the practice will not continue?

Chair--Defeat of this motion should ensure that activities courses will count toward degree requirements.

G. Mapley--It would be no more logical to say a student can take as many HPE courses as desired than it would be to say a student can take as many ceramic courses as desired. The message needs to get to the Deans' offices.

P. Baldino--With due respect, what is the status of these courses on other campuses such as Kent and Akron? We seem to reinvent the wheel. It would be helpful to know what is done on sister campuses around the state.

R. McEwing--It is mixed. The issue gets bigger. Some people suggest we consider the liability that results from activities courses. The question should be, "What does YSU want to do?"

G. Sutton--As long as we don't go too far in the other direction, I have no objection. Just don't mandate that we must accept these courses.

S. Smith--Call the question.

Motion Defeated.

Motion to Adopt Requirements for Pre-Business Admission and Upper-Division Standing in the W.S.B.A.

R. McEwing moved to adopt the requirements for Pre-Business admission and Upper-Division standing in the W.S.B.A. found on Page 21 of the Agenda. Motion received a second.

P. Baldino--Is the G.P.A. requirement found on Page 21 different from the G.P.A. requirement currently in place?

R. McEwing--The G.P.A. is not changed. What is different is that the School of Business will start advising pre-Business majors.

Motion Carried.

REPORT FROM COMPUTER SERVICES COMMITTEE

When discussion on the motion appended to the Agenda took place, it was our understanding that the lab fee would not necessarily be assessed on computer courses or other courses for that matter; and that if a fee was assessed, it would be possible that many students using the facilities might pay no fee and some students assessed the fee might never use the facilities (some of our students have access to home and/or business computers).

Even so, we were reluctant to bring this proposal today because of the additional economic burden it would place on our students. We felt it is not the appropriate time to introduce yet another fee (possibly the straw that would break the camel's back) to be paid by our students, many of whom pay for a significant part of their education expense themselves. It is, however, the right time to think about how we can do some strategic planning to ensure that YSU students do not have to continue to work with outdated and inoperable computing facilities.

In fact, YSU's Computer Services Committee is, for a change, attempting to position Youngstown State University with other schools in the computing arena. Cleveland State is presently conducting a survey to determine what fees other universities are charging; the University of Cincinnati charges up to \$100 per quarter depending on the college and the department (funds are dedicated to upgrade facilities); Wright State assesses a \$25-50 fee which is part of the general fee (this was recommended, we understand, by the Student Government) which is earmarked for upgrading student computing facilities; Bowling Green rents PCs out at approximately \$170 per quarter; and Akron is currently looking at a course fee to support computing facilities upgrades.

Since submitting the proposal, much confusion has been generated over the proposed laboratory fee and how the laboratory fee will be accessed. The list I have access to shows over 300 courses identified as being approved by SMH on 4/9/92 for a lab fee, but on the list is only one course in Williamson, two courses in CITEC, and no courses in BET and Computer Sciences -- all who are heavy users of computing facilities. Discussion with the Acting Provost, Dr. Hotchkiss, indicated that there is a list of computer-related courses being compiled that will also be assessed the laboratory fee. Students may end up paying \$60 in laboratory fees if they take three computer-related courses. Because of the confusion that has been generated, we are withdrawing our motion, but will make our annual report. If the confusion abates, we may have a motion to present at the June Senate meeting.

Informational Report -- Computer Services Committee

This year, our committee identified three areas that needed attention and each area was assigned to a subcommittee. One group worked to create dialogue between Computer Sciences, Computer Information Systems, and Williamson to determine if an interdisciplinary internship program in Model 204 similar to a program developed by Westchester University was possible. Some discussion has taken place that has involved participants from all areas.

Another group worked to develop a systematic tracking system for maintenance repairs -- this continues to be a problem -- not because we do not have a competent and hard working EMS, but because that area is underfunded and understaffed.

The third group began work in January to develop a funding plan that would attempt to provide YSU students with access to modern computing facilities that would enable them to compete effectively with students from other universities. We were told that tapping into the general fee assessed students was virtually impossible, so we began to think in terms of a restricted fee that would be used exclusively for computing facilities upgrades and a method to provide equity in its assessment. Just when we were ready to report back to the full committee, we learned that the deans were considering a lab fee assessment, but really never learned how or who would determine what classes to assess, how or who would determine what students had access to what facilities, and how or who would determine how the generated funds would be used. We still don't have complete answers to these questions. The committee did meet to discuss the work of the subcommittee and that meeting resulted in the motion that was withdrawn today.

Our committee also asked Lou Anschuetz to write an article on Viruses for the Jambar which he did. Thank you, Lou.

The State of Computing at YSU

In listening to comments made around campus and at various meetings, it is my perception that many members of the university community are unaware of the present state of computing on the YSU campus and the reality of the job market that many of our students face. Faculty members on our committee are very much aware of the deteriorating state of computing facilities in Meshel Hall (and quite possibly other sites) and the computing skills expected by many employers. They have worked hard to identify problems, research what is being done elsewhere, and attended meetings regularly. I wish to thank them publicly at this time and acknowledge their efforts.

For years, our students have enjoyed "free" computing facilities. Yes, they were paying an excessive activity fee, but that activity fee did not find itself manifested in updating computing facilities. Never have we accessed a fee for mainframe usage, even though several years ago it was determined that students were being allocated \$100 worth of time (what we would have charged an outsider) and today the average allocated time would be billed at \$400 per quarter. The Meshel Hall facility that includes several microcomputer labs has always been open at all times (7 days a week during times when classes are in session) to all students (we suspect even nonstudents). No account numbers or passwords are required.

Our information sources indicate that many schools make students purchase a computer (\$2000 - \$4000). Some schools charge a rental fee (approximately \$150 - \$180 per quarter), and all other schools charge for all printing (5 - 25 cents per page) in addition to usage fees.

Thanks to the efforts of Harry Meshel, YSU received funding several years ago for a high-tech building. Funding included hardware and software; but admittedly the funding was not adequate to permit purchasing hardware and software recommended by the faculty.

Faculty and students who now use the Meshel facility (our "high-tech" building) constantly are frustrated by equipment failure, inability to use specific packages, slowness of the process and the ensuing mistakes that slowness causes, etc. The School of Business in particular is impacted because at the time Meshel Hall was built, their one and only computer lab was moved to Meshel Hall with the understanding they would have a dedicated lab in the new building. The dedicated lab never materialized. Nor has Meshel Hall been equipped with the type of computing facilities their students need.

YSU has only been able to find funding in the six-year period the building has been operational to replace two rooms of equipment (386 processors), Rooms 102 and 107, used primarily by the Art Department. Room 202 (a computer terminal room) will hopefully be equipped with 486 machines and a new network this summer; but this is "iffy" -- as recently as three months ago, it was projected that three labs could be equipped with more up-to-date hardware and new networking capability.

Identified Student Problems:

- o Printers do not work, are out for repair, will not print properly, etc.)
- o Disks don't read properly even though disks work in another computer in another building; disk drives are wearing out
- o Lack of personnel to answer software-related questions
- o Equipment in several areas that is not totally functional

Identified Faculty Problems:

- o Inability to teach and/or demonstrate the latest software products
- o Need to purchase own computers/software to stay technologically current
- o Need to constantly check equipment before using to avoid major snafus
- o Inordinate amount of time dealing with student problems generated by inoperable hardware/software

Our research also shows:

- Many students work -- work computers are usually 386 or higher
- Many students have personal computers at home -- usually 386
- 67% of YSU computers at student sites are XT or AT -- 1981 - 1983 vintage
- Current software (including Windows and software that runs under Windows) will not run on the XT and AT computers. Most current software requires hard drives for installation and 386 or higher processing capability. Software that we cannot currently use includes:
 - o AutoCad
 - o Language Compilers
 - o Graphics Software
 - o WordPerfect for Windows
 - o DOS 5.0 or DR DOS
 - o PageMaker 4.0
 - o Lotus 3
 - o Windows
 - o OS/2
 - o Statistical Packages
- Newer networks do not support the XT and AT hardware
- We are possibly losing current students and potential students:
 - o students transfer to schools that have current technology
 - o Students select schools that have current technology
 - o Students know that our outdated technology is not job relevant
- Our EMS group does their best, but they do not have funds or staff to provide proper maintenance
 - o Computers are out of service for an entire quarter
 - o Computers have limited access for an entire quarter
- There is little current support (no funding) for students using computers. The lab consultants provide hardware and network support, but there is no central source to field questions on software usage. The students desperately need a hot-line service that will route questions to individuals who could answer them.

Other Important Information

- It would appear that the university budget will be tight for the next few years and that there is little hope of squeezing any money from it to upgrade computing facilities.
- The Strategic Plan Draft recognizes the need to upgrade computing facilities at YSU but underestimates the scope of the problem.
- As mentioned earlier, other universities charge a yearly/quarterly fee or require students to purchase a computer and charge for printing services.

Summary

Our mission statement assures its readers that teaching is a priority at YSU. Does it, then, not really matter what we teach or what type of teaching facilities we use?

Much ado has been made about "Marketing the University." At a time when we are focusing on marketing strategies and ways to obtain positive visibility for YSU, we need to consider what we are marketing in the area of technology. We cannot in good conscience describe ourselves as being at the "leading edge" in academic or administrative computing. Programs cannot grow and respond to changes in society without leadership and commitment to computing facilities and technological growth.

Concerns go far beyond programs directly related to computer science and mathematics -- every corner of our academic institution is impacted by technology. Our faculty cannot adequately utilize concepts such as computer-based multimedia and hypermedia without adequate facilities, support, and commitment. Students cannot achieve adequate levels of computer literacy when they do not have access to up-to-date hardware, software, and support personnel.

It may be an inappropriate time to seek more student funding, but it is a critical time for establishing YSU's direction toward technological progress.

REPORT FROM FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO CHANCELLOR

The Chair reported for Duane Rost.

Duane Rost was unable to attend the most recent meeting, but has talked with the Chair. The following report is from that discussion.

There are no new items to share on the budget at this time. Concern was, of course, expressed. The Committee participated in the rally on the State House steps at noon.

The Draft Report of the Study Committee on Faculty Workload for the Managing for the Future Task Force was shared. This is a draft report as of April 20, 1992. I (Duane Rost) have a copy and will share with anyone who wishes details. The Report is well done and is 38 pages plus appendices. It was prepared by a widely-based group of capable individuals. It carefully makes the points of the diversity of roles in the general category of higher education faculty. They presented the patterns in two-year programs, the four-year baccalaureate programs, and the extension to the graduate areas. The conclusion was, "Workload should be derived from program mission."

This extensive document pointed out the various aspects of teaching, research, and service that make up the duties of the faculty members.

On Friday, April 24, three of the Committee members met for some 15 minutes with the Task Force. Concern has been expressed about how well the message was imparted. In a few short bits, I will try to convey the sense of the meeting. "What do faculty do? How do you police yourselves? How about motivation, how do you motivate? Isn't tenure counter to motivation? Do we really need 63 state-supported institutions? Are you licensed? (No.) Did you take any education courses? (No.) Does K-12

certification really mean competence?" Thus, there is continued worry that the message of higher education activities has not fully been appreciated.

Additional areas of comment included: mandatory teaching hours, number of hours spent in the undergraduate classroom, various horror stories, accountability, duplication of programs at two or more places particularly at the graduate level, consolidation, possibility of remedial programs at the two-year campuses only, access to education.

The next Faculty Advisory Committee meeting is June 2.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Student Senator--I have a question regarding what Betsy brought up earlier. In some way, we need to make it clear to the advisors, departments, etc., that more than 3 HPE courses can be counted toward graduation requirements.

Chair--We will look to Dean Mapley to take care of this responsibility through the Dean's Council.

ADJOURNMENT

D. Robinson moved that the meeting be adjourned. Motion seconded. Motion Passes. Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

ENGINEERING

At-Large

Robert McCoy
Duane Rost

RAM

Departmental

*Soon-Sik Lim, Chemical Engineering
*Shakir Husain, Civil Engineering
**Jalal Jalali, Electrical Engineering
**Martin Calfa, Industrial Engineering
**Ganesh Kudav, Mechanical Engineering

SL
SH
JJ
MC
GK

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

At-Large

Joseph Edwards
Daria Funk
Les Hicken
Daniel O'Neill
Tedrow Perkins
David Robinson
James Umble

JE
DF
LH
DO
TP
DR
JU

Departmental

**Genevra Kornbluth, Art - alternate
**Susan Sexton, Music
*Frank Castronovo, Speech and Theater

- M.A.T.
SS
FC

STUDENTS

At-Large

Pia Brady
Tisha Brady
Craig Brenner
Amber DeJulio
Mary E. Durbin
Marc Veynovich

MS

School/College

Kevin Griggs, Education
Trisha Garibaldi, Performing Arts
Drew Banks, Business
Amy Bloomingdale, CAST
Mary Kate Barrette, Arts and Sciences
Donna Gardner, Engineering

Ex-Officio

Scott Smith, Pres., Stu. Gov.
Paul Conley, V. Pres., Stu. Govt.
Sharyn Campbell, Second V. President

SS
PC

ADMINISTRATION

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

DR
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
SG
GEM
MB
RM

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