

TO: MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

FROM: Virginia Phillips, Vice Chair, Senate



Dr. Scanlon
Provost

DATE: April 9, 1993

SUBJECT: SENATE BUSINESS

Attached are the minutes for the April meeting. In some cases, the comments are verbatim; in others, the comments are shortened or abstracted. It was impossible to transcribe sections of the tape--there were two voices at once, the individual was too far from the microphone, or some reason I could not detect.

Appended to the Minutes are the attendance figures which should have been sent to you in March. You will note March statistics are missing. My copy of the minutes did not have an attendance roster and I did not have time to track one down.

Please read the minutes carefully. I learned only when I called the Media Center on another matter Thursday that the Media Center expected to deliver the tape to me. Obviously, transcribing the minutes was not built into my schedule. Terry, at the Media Center, was most helpful in moving the tape contents to three different tapes. This enabled three students from my Office Simulation class to make a first attempt at transcribing the contents last night. Given my schedule for the weekend and next week, there was no choice except to finish the minutes today. If there are significant points left out, please communicate with me and I will add your comments to the May Agenda.

Future minutes will contain abstracted comments unless a written or disk copy of verbatim remarks you want included is given to me at the Senate meeting.

Duane Rost has graciously agreed to act as my backup for the last two meetings of the Academic year. He has my gratitude for agreeing to do this on very short notice.

A student secretary has been hired. She will be at the May Senate meeting. Please cooperate by using the microphone and identifying yourself.

Thanks to Marlene in the Provost's office, Mike in the Print Shop, my lab assistant, and several other individuals on our staff at YSU, the committee selection packet should be in your mail boxes next Thursday. Please fill in the preference sheet and return it immediately so that the Senate Executive Committee can begin work before the end of April in making committee assignments.

One last note: All committees should report to the Senate at least once during the Academic year. If you are a chair of a committee and have not reported, please submit a form for the May meeting. Also, I need copies of all minutes from all committee chairs to ensure that the Senate has a complete record for the Academic year.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

APRIL 7, 1993

CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Baldino, Chair, announced a quorum and called the meeting to order.

MINUTES OF MARCH 3, 1993

Motion to Approve Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the Minutes as distributed. Motion approved.

ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE

No report.

CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

No report.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chair noted that there was a very brief report from the Senate Executive Committee. The SEC met on Monday, April 5, and there are only two items to report. The third one is that I am conducting my last meeting of the Academic Senate. I am resigning effective at the end of this meeting and will no longer chair this Senate. I will have a statement to make regarding this at the end of the meeting. Other items on the agenda for that April 5 meeting were the concerns regarding items on the agenda. We had, as you know, a late addition on the agenda regarding a matter presented by the Academic Programs Committee; and the Physics Department wanted an opportunity to speak to that committee report. And I also would, of course, want to give a chance for the Committee and/or Professor Bakos to have some time. And I am going to do this under very strict time limitations; that is to say that you will have a certain amount of time extended to the Committee Chair and/or Dr. Bakos to present a position statement. The same amount of time will be given to a member of the Physics Department to then respond. Some limited discussion will then take place. The final vote on the matter will be taken at the May meeting of the Academic Senate. I was also reminded that the paper work for Senate Committee appointments will have to begin very quickly; in fact, it is overdue. Playing the role of Department Chairperson, President of the Senate, and Secretary of the Senate has got to be impossible. I apologize for the lateness of those matters; that is to say the selection of committee assignments. Things of that kind will be forthcoming and would not be my responsibility. I would like now to turn to the other Agenda items.

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM DIVISION COMMITTEE REPORT

Dr. Haggerty, the Chair, was called out of town on an emergency. The courses attached to the Agenda have been circulated according to established procedures and are presented for your information.

INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chair noted that the next item on the Agenda was a report from the Integrated Technologies Committee. Mr. Hogue, I recognize you for whatever time you need.

R. Hogue reported.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to make just a few very brief remarks on the background concerning this report. The Integrated Technologies Committee was formed by Senate action last December. At that time, the Computer Services Committee was disbanded and the Integrated Technologies Committee was formed. At the same time, most of those who were appointed to the Computer Services Committee continued on to serve on the Integrated Technologies Committee. The report that is presented here and attached to the Agenda contains many recommendations. Some of these could be implemented in a fairly short time period; others would take quite a bit longer, but we feel that this is the time to bring these recommendations forward for Senate consideration. So, although I cannot make a formal motion relating to this report because I am not a senator, I will express my hope that the Senate will consider and then adopt this report. Thank you.

Chair--Thank you Mr. Hogue. May I have the motion to adopt the report.

Motion to Adopt Report From Integrated Technologies Committee

V. Phillips moved and F. Owens seconded that the report be adopted.

Chair--Bob, would you care to make any other comments of any kind. I want to applaud the Committee and the Chairman of that Committee for a rather extensive amount of work on this report. I think it is rather well developed and far reaching--I might say a far-sighted report regarding the issue of technology, the use of computer technology, and the future for this campus. I got a number of complimentary remarks made to me verbally and in writing; and I will pass them on to you, Bob, but I'll give you the opportunity now if you wish to make any comments whatsoever.

R. Hogue--About a year ago--at the May meeting last year--the Senate heard what I think and what a number of people feel was a very compelling report from the Computer Services Committee presented by Virginia Phillips which I think really put on the table--perhaps for the first time--the state of computing technology at YSU. Recognizing the expanded role of the Integrated Technologies Committee to look not only at computing equipment but computing equipment, of course, being a part of instructional technology, there was a feeling expressed several times at some of our meetings that the report last year from the Computer Services Committee should serve as a foundation--I think one member used the word "manifesto"--and to add to that the dimensions of instructional technology which are not specifically related to computing; in other words to broaden the scope of the report. Thus we met once in December, three times in January, and at least twice in February; and in the process of submitting

several drafts of this report to the various members and receiving their input--which was very valuable and very constructive--we came up with this report for the Senate which I hope presents not only our concerns but our belief that instructional technology can be and should be an extremely important part of what we do--whether it's in the classroom or simply dealing with one another on a day-to-day basis. If you ever had to sit down and write a memo to someone, figure out the mailing list, write it out, type it, spell check it, correct it, copy it, stuff in the envelopes, hope that you got everybody, hope that it gets there, and hope that people aren't on vacation, you know it's a fairly frustrating experience. With electronic mail, for those who are on any accessible computer system on this campus, the process is almost delightfully easy once you get used to it. That simply is one example of what could be considered instructional technology outside the classroom. The examples inside the classroom are many more than that. I firmly hope that we can do this at this University. The intent is not only to use computing equipment more, which happens to be my own special interest area, but also in a broader sense instructional technology. Simply teaching with chalk and a chalkboard with the same notes that were used 20 or 25 years ago quite frankly, I think, does not serve the students of this University very well. There are many things that can be done to incorporate new technologies into instruction. I hope that we have touched on a number of those. I don't think that we hit them all, but we did deal with a number of them in this report. We are, pardon the cliche (I don't know how many times I have heard this in the past six or nine months), at a crossroads here at this University. I think we are in a very advantageous position to make a commitment toward improving instructional technology and toward integrating that to the classroom and toward communicating with each other and among ourselves better and more effectively; and I hope in the future that we'll do that. Thank you.

P. Munro--Can I just ask a question? On page 8 of the report, under item 4, it states "If neither #3 nor #4 can be implemented...". Is that a mistake?

R. Hogue--Yes it is. Item 4 should read "If neither #1 nor #3...". That's the type of mistake a spell checker does not find.

Motion passes.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE REPORT

Chair--I don't see Daryl Mincey here.

D. Mincey--Thank you. I'm Daryl Mincey and I'm here as Chair of the Academic Programs Committee. I think our first agenda item this year was a rather challenging matter. It might set a record on the amount of information that you get on one single action that has, I think, a one sentence motion with it. Let me make the motion and we can go from there. Civil Engineering has requested changing its name from Civil Engineering to Civil and Environmental Engineering.

Motion to Change the Name of Civil Engineering to Civil and Environmental Engineering.

D. Mincey moved and G. Sutton seconded that the name change be approved.

D. Mincey--If I may discuss the actual motion, I don't think there is much of an argument at all.

We have tried very hard on this campus to investigate the whole area of environmental studies which goes way beyond environmental engineering and environmental sciences. I don't think there is any argument that the environmental field is very important. There is a problem of implementation. There are only so many hours a student can take and when you revise programs and start to look at courses and wonder what can be dropped and what can't, this is where the problem comes in. I do not particularly want to take much of the time. I'd much rather have the people who are more involved in this be the ones to talk. As far as the committee is concerned, we thought it boiled down to a question of what exactly did a student need in this new program of Civil and Environmental Engineering and probably who was best able to judge that. As the Programs Committee, we more or less said that the Civil Engineering Department was probably the best department to figure out what that would be. I think you had enough information in your packet to know what all else is going on. If there are any questions, I would be happy to answer any questions; but I think I'd rather turn it over to some of the other people.

Chair--The change deals only with the option for a Civil Engineering Environmental option. Let's make that clear. I think some people are confused in thinking that the change involves all engineering programs. Jack, do you have any comments you wish to make?

J. Bakos--There is a strong market demand for Environmental Engineers. We have 197 hours of curriculum with no electives. We have to be careful what we cut to introduce this environmental option. We need to show students who come into the program that indeed this is an environmental program and we had to make sure it was a quality program. We wanted to make sure that students who took the environmental program, five or ten years down the line, did not get displaced if they had to change jobs as it probably will be with so many people jumping on the bandwagon. These individuals could fall back to a basic Civil Engineering degree which is what we wanted to do. We want to make sure that they can pass the registration examination. To come up with a quality environmental option, we had to make some cuts and we made a couple of cuts to the Civil Engineering required courses. We had to decide whether to drop foundation courses or other courses. We had a debate and, of course, we realized cuts had to be made. When we looked at other areas to cut, the one course that stood out was Physics II which was not a prerequisite to anything else in our curriculum. Now, why did we choose Physics? Well, in environmental engineering, as you might well guess, it deals specifically with chemistry, biology, and geology. And we thought to ourselves, what would be better--one of our environmental graduates going out who was trained in analytical chemistry interpreting results or interpreting results of biological testing to look at what impact a pollutant would have on the ground soil. We thought biology, chemistry, and geology courses were much more suitable than additional physics classes. Our accrediting agency, ABET, requires that 24 hours of basic science be required in any engineering curriculum and one full year is required in one discipline. For our students in the environment option, the requirement will be one full year of chemistry and geology. They will take additional courses in biology and chemistry for a total of 28 hours. In fact, our basic science requirement went from 24 to 28 hours. All of engineering is an applied science; and in the case of Civil Engineering, applied science means geology, biology, chemistry, and physics. Now for our structural people, physics is excellent and we're requiring additional physics; we have no problem with it; but for our environmental people, we think that the option we chose is satisfactory. We are in sync with our basic requirements and we are in the best position to see what our students should take. We look to the Physics Department to provide service courses. We don't need Physics to dictate to us what our students should take. They don't tell us what our policy is. We are in the best position to determine what our students should take. We've gone through many accreditation visits. We are experienced. We know what our students should take and, therefore, we made that recommendation. We'll have to stand the test of accreditation and not Physics. Other engineering departments take a lot more physics and we have no argument with that; but you have to remember that

those engineering departments are electrical, mechanical, and materials science and they should be taking more physics. Can you imagine an electrical taking geology and biology? Can you imagine a mechanical taking geology and biology? It does not make any sense; but for civil it does make sense. Traditionally, engineering is very slow to change. For years, even back when I was a student, the only basic sciences engineers considered were chemistry and physics; but this is a new time. Most of the programs are changing their names to Civil and Environmental Engineering and we're jumping on the bandwagon first. We beat Arkon; we beat Cleveland; and we beat Case Western Reserve. They are on the bandwagon and they are going to change their curriculum. That is what we did. We are just saying we are in the position to decide what is best for our students.

Chair--Under the established rules that we set forth, Greg, if you wish, or Dr. Young, if you would rather have Greg speak, you have 13 minutes and you can take all of them if you wish. Dr. Sturris.

G. Sturris--The motion was the name change; I'm not discussing the name change at all. I'll wait until we are discussing the curriculum change.

---You are focusing only on the name change. You indicate there was an approved course change. Well, how can you change a name without changing the program?

---I didn't know what the motion was. So technically I think programs is just a name change. Why did the motion on the cover sheet which reads "change name from Civil Engineering to Civil and Environmental Engineering with approved course changes" differ from the motion that is on the floor? I think some action is required from the Curriculum Division. Course changes should have been approved there before the program change went to the Academic Programs Division.

Chair--The Chair will rule that the established procedure agreed upon between the three parties will be followed. The Physics Department will get a chance to make a set of remarks in response to the Chair of the Committee or the Chair of the Department. I am going to maintain that position; that is, unless you wish to challenge the decision; you may do so.

G. Sturris--I would like to present some of the reasons for the objections we have. We think our objections are based on arguments that are quite compelling and these were presented at the programs committee level. We think they were largely ignored. Let me give you some of the reasons. First, I would like to say that we support the change. The increased emphasis in environmental engineering, we think, is a good idea. We think it will attract students and we hope it is very successful. We don't support dropping half the physics that they take. We can't believe that this is beneficial to the students. Some of the information I have in on the two-page handout I gave you. These handouts are at the back of the room. This transparency shows some statistics and a bar chart. What I'm showing is the cumulative number of programs in the state of Ohio with bachelor degree programs in engineering. There are four programs in the state that require ten hours or less in physics. Close to 80 percent require between 14 and 15 quarter hours or more in physics. So far as I'm concerned that is the standard for engineering programs. The YSU Civil Engineering program, as you can see, is at eight quarter hours. That is currently the lowest in the state including all the civil engineering programs in the state. They are now proposing to move it for the environmental emphasis to only four quarter hours. We believe this represents a very different thought than the general thought in the engineering community. I'm not trying to say physicists believe this; I'm saying this is what engineers are doing right now. If you look at the requirements in the programs, this kind of move at least needs to be justified strongly. I don't think you will find data anywhere to support the idea that reducing the number of hours in physics is going to be

beneficial. If you look carefully at the problems on the test and in the review booklets, you will find material on the tests that is related to the content of Physics 610. Another thing you will find out is that testing level is much the same as the level in Physics 610. A topic we think essential to all engineers, especially civil engineers, is the fundamentals of equilibrium, static dynamics and stress. All of these things are covered in Physics 610. Probably the most relevant topic in 610 for environmental engineers is the study of waves. If you have an environmental engineer who knows nothing about sound and sound levels, I guess you don't have an environmental engineer. One other comment that I want to make is about why we believe it's important to have this course is found in the proposal itself. If you look at pages 1 and 2 of the proposal, there is a description there of the current status of engineers which are educated in the environmental field. If I can summarize what it says, it mentions that a person who has a civil engineering degree has a broad based background and can move into other engineering fields from environmental engineering. However, it is unlikely for an environmental engineer to move back. Other engineers are required to take the Physics 610 course; it's part of the broad background they get.

If you look at the transparency, I have what is currently listed in the catalog on the left side and what is proposed on the right side. If you look, you will see single and double arrows. The double arrows indicate courses which are specifically environmentally related that the civil engineering students already have available to them. There are 20 such quarter hours of course work; there may be more. Now the single arrows represent changes that they want to make. Presumably if they had all the courses and electives that were environmentally related, that would increase the emphasis by 16 quarter hours over the present 20, a 60 percent increase which I maintain is a substantial increase.

Finally, if you look in your addendum to the Senate Agenda, on the last page, there is a memo that responds to a memo. It is a memo from Dr. Bakos to Mr. Mincey which responds to a memo from Dr. Young to Dr. Mincey and since it makes some points, you will be able to read it between now and the next Senate meeting when we vote. I should make a comment, at least on item one, since it is related to part of our objection. If you look in the comment, Dr. Bakos states that he doesn't believe the material cited there is for specific problems found in our Physics 610 text. We believe that these problems and the text that accompanies it shows they are based on the course material from 610. Dr. Bakos states that he doesn't believe that the materials is in 610 and his confusion on that matter is probably some of the reason why they decided to drop the course. It is easy to clarify whether the material is in 610--all you need to do is get a copy of the course syllabus or you could ask someone who teaches the course. I teach the course and can tell you that the stuff is in the course.

J. Bakos--All I am asking you to do is look at what the statistics and bar graphs are stating. We are concerned with ABET. They are the law, they are the rules. Now, don't get me wrong. We have 28 hours of basic science. What he said about waves is true. That is what mechanicals cover right now. It would be great if we could add more classes. We are trying to be reasonable about this. Somewhere you have to make some adjustments. What we propose may not be a perfect program, but it is the best we can put together based on our years of experience.

Chair--Thank you, Dr. Bakos. The floor is now open for any debate on the matter.

G. Sutton--My previous employer prior to coming to Youngstown State was the National Counsel of Engineering Examiners, now the National Counsel of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors. Part of my responsibility was the fundamentals exam along with twelve areas of professional exams and two levels of land surveying plus the nuclear reinforced concrete inspection engineer qualifications. Prior to that time, I was also an ABET visitor, first for mechanical and then for environmental engineering. Jack

and I are both registered professional engineers in the state of Ohio. I am president of the state society. Neither of us are very comfortable about having our professional judgment challenged in this matter. I would like to say that we are the ones at risk. If we are putting our students at risk, then we are both wrong; but, I believe that it is our best judgment that what we have done is what is right for the program.

W. Young--We looked at approximately 400 students who had taken Physics 510 and 610 and Engineering 601 in various combinations-- 510, 610, 601; 510, 601, 610; 610, 510, 610. The over 200 students who took the 510, 610, 601 sequence had the best grades in 601. Is it something else that helps or is it 610 that helps students in 601? I don't know. It would be excellent if you would respond to this. It is a serious question. A second question goes back to something Greg mentioned. You mentioned in your introductory remarks that a lot of students who go into Environmental Engineering may have to fall back into some other areas of engineering. If you fall back into other areas, then it would seem that you need a broader base and that you would not want them to be as focused as the program appears to be. That's what I don't understand.

J. Bakos--The world is not perfect. If a student misses one class, is that going to affect performance? I guess that my question to you in looking at Greg's chart is: are these extreme programs? Why should all engineering students have the same basic science courses? We have a much stronger basic background than Ohio State. Most of the programs on Greg's chart are not Civil Engineering programs. As I said before, engineering schools are slow to change. A lot of those engineering programs have courses that are prerequisites. Just because math is on a CPA exam does not mean that accounting students need more math. I don't think the mathematics department goes to the school of business and says you need more math.

G. Sturris--I would like to agree with the statement about the slowness of the engineering schools to change. In fact, the test questions that are on reserve in the library for studying for the exam are 13 years old. It is still the same physics. It is still on the test and they are still studying it.

G. Sturris--There is a point I think that they may have missed. When you change the name of the department to include environmental or anything similarly named, you fall into another category of rules. According to the ABET requirements right now, the program is not meeting those rules as far as we understand them. I called the ABET people and there may be a problem with accreditation. I can get copies of this for anyone who wants one.

W. Young--The problem the Physics Department has is that we feel what is happening here is that they are strengthening the roof but they are weakening the foundation of the program and that is why we are concerned with the welfare of the students.

W. Cochran--I really hesitate to get into this, but there have been a couple of points that I have been involved in. I helped develop some of these statistics. First of all, Dean Sutton, you said that the engineering program is at risk if this program is approved. It is not the engineering program that is at risk; it is the engineering students. I have talked to the head of ABET and he verifies what Greg has just told you. There is a serious question of accrediting this program with a name change to Civil and Environmental Engineering. I think maybe there is a point that should be cleared up. What has been proposed here is an environmental emphasis in Civil Engineering. The students will graduate from this program with a degree in Civil Engineering. They can go out and build a bridge just as well as anybody else who has a structural emphasis in Civil Engineering. We are concerned about the academic integrity of YSU. There is no Civil Engineering program in the state and I doubt that there is one in the country

which has a physics requirement of four quarter hours. I have talked to engineers from New York to California; from Case to Cincinnati; and not one has greeted this with anything but derision.

---We called to make sure. If you change part of the name to include environmental, then you have to abide by the rules set down for environmental programs. The rules that are not followed currently are included in this part of the ABET guidelines. There is a reference to laboratory work that has to be included in any science course. Right now, at least in the physics department, the civil engineers don't take any labs. The name change was not something we are against. A new emphasis in the program is a good idea. It is the dropping of physics that is going to be the problem for accreditation. The point we brought up is we don't think they have looked closely enough at the accreditation guidelines in terms of the name change.

I can't be so certain that if Physics 610 is dropped, there will be no ABET backlash. That is not the indication I get when we talk to people from ABET. This is not a standard way to go in the engineering community. I am only a physicist, but engineers don't generally do this.

D. Mincey--Not that I think we are going to get sympathy as a committee, but I think that this has been a fairly clear indication of what the committee has gone through. As far as the discussion of this goes, if it was a single event, I would probably just be very quiet about it right now. But I think that I see this happening all over campus. I am not sure the Programs Division is in the best position to handle these types of problems. We had hoped very much that this could be handled by some negotiation through the departments. A little bit of history--this program change was actually designated by the President. We had a little bit of a problem going against the President. We do worry about prerequisites, but this should be handled by the Curriculum Division. We rely on other committees and as I have said before, we have to rely on the departments that are bringing this to us and their review agencies. It's not a good situation and it's not one that we had a very good time trying to resolve. Judging by the faces I see looking at me now, I don't think it is really one I think you would want to try to resolve either.

Chair--For whatever it is worth I sympathize with you.

J. Bakos--We decided to go with an environmental emphasis rather than with a program because there is an entire different set of criteria.

---We called ABET on this and the head of ABET told us the environmental requirement applies to any program that has the environmental modifier in the title. I got it from him--I didn't make it up.

G. Sutton--The maximum accreditation time is six years and we have been accredited for six years on our last accreditation visits. If anybody is worried about the quality of our students, we are certainly worried. That is the first thing we look to. What would be our motivation to change the program except to benefit the students?

W. Cochran--Well, again, I don't like to comment, but those are my remarks and notes. I also talked to the head of ABET. You see the word "Brazil" in quotation marks. There is a sentence underlined with the words chemical, physical, and biological sciences. I asked the head of ABET if physical sciences means physics or if it could be interpreted as geology. He said, under normal circumstances, he would read it to mean physics. If there were unusual circumstances like training students to go down to Brazil to deal with some special topological problem, then perhaps substitution of a geology course for a physics course could be justified. I think that, at best, this is a question the Civil

Engineering people would want to discuss with ABET and the physics department before they try to steam roller this thing through, but we are not getting that kind of cooperation from the engineers.

G. Sutton--One quick comment. I happen to have served at four institutions that dropped the sophomore physics sequence finding it totally unsatisfying and, in no case, was their accreditation lost.

W. Cochran--I asked that question of the head of ABET. What does he say? He says there has been a move or there was a move to teach physics within the engineering school rather than have them take physics from the physics department. He says the only way that can be done is if the engineering school has people qualified and trained in physics. You have a proposal here that is far removed from a normal program offered by a civil engineering department, with or without an environmental emphasis. It seems to me that if someone offers a program that is so far removed from what is normally done, there is a chance they may be on the right track. There is also a chance they are out of line. Obviously, it is your job to find out.

J. Bakos--I will repeat what I said earlier to emphasize it. We talked to ABET officials. ABET has an overall criteria that comes from ABET, but if you talk to an individual from a specific area, you wouldn't necessarily hear the same thing. The American Society of Civil Engineers would decide how this basic science component should be met. You are intelligent people. A civil engineer should know geology as a basic science. We have been called sanitary engineers since everyone jumped on the bandwagon for environmental. We have been treating water and waste water from time beginning; just lately the word "environmental" comes into play. So you cannot sit there and believe that a civil engineer or environmental engineers shouldn't have a background in biology, microbiology, and geology to do the kind of work that we have. If we don't know anything about geology, we are in big trouble.

W. Cochran--While I said a moment ago that there are no environmental engineering programs in Ohio, there are programs in Ohio and elsewhere that offer an environmental emphasis within Civil Engineering. How are those programs formulated? Those programs, and I think it would be true in anyone else's department sitting here, offer a specialization area by offering specialization courses in the upper division. You don't cut out basic science. It would be equivalent to the Physics Department offering a specialization in nuclear physics by eliminating the second course in basic calculus. The change for an emphasis, and this is done in Civil Engineering programs, is made in the upper division--not by cutting out your basic courses. Thank you.

Chair--I think we have had as much debate as we have time for. Daryl, do you have any other comments to make? We have an understanding that this matter will come before the Senate for a vote. I ask you with all due regard to study the transcript of the meeting this afternoon and be ready for a vote at the next meeting.

Question--Are we going to vote?

Chair--This will go before the Senate for a vote next month. The intent was to discuss the issue today and vote at the next Senate meeting. I would rather do this informally at this time.

Motion to Table

It was moved and seconded that the motion be tabled. The Parliamentarian ruled that no discussion could take place. Motion to Table until the May meeting passes.

REMARKS FROM DR. SCANLON, PROVOST

Clearly, reasonable people will differ on significant issues. The tribute here is that a significant issue was not glossed over. I just have a few things to keep you at this late hour. Most of you know, I think, that within the University we are looking at draft statements of missions and goals. How important this is, I couldn't overemphasize. I couldn't even overemphasize it if we are acting alone and nobody else cared, but the fact of the matter is that how crucial it is becomes increasingly clear as you pay attention to the kind of statements coming from Columbus and the Board of Regents about what they see for the future of public education in Ohio. In fact, what we are leading ourselves toward by the development of mission and goals and ultimately objective statements for colleges and departments is a revisiting of the University mission statement and a requirement from the Board of Regents that we provide them with what we believe our mission statement to be, what our mission is. In January, 1994, this becomes increasingly significant as the Board of Regents and others in this state will shape what they will do for Youngstown State and other universities in terms in what we say we are all about. That will be true in terms of the creation of new programs. That will be true in the maintenance of existing programs. This is a crucial enterprise that we are involved in now. Please take it seriously.

Better news, maybe. A letter went out today from me together with a survey instrument, a very short survey instrument, that can be completed very quickly, the design of which is to spend \$250,000 on computers for faculty--computers for faculty in their offices. When you read--I read with great interest the report from the Integrated Technologies Committee--this is not a pre-emption of what they suggest; in fact, I hope this is a facilitator of what they suggest. That memo went out today. You should be receiving copies of it. Please pay attention to it, at least if you want a computer; and I don't kid myself into thinking that the \$250,000 will do everything that needs to be done for faculty, but the design of this is for you, as individuals, to ask you what you have, what you think you need, and even if you have a computer if you think you need something what that is, and then to make a start, a good start, to make sure that faculty members as individuals have the kind of capacity that they need. In my view, at least, and I am not a "techie", this is fundamental to the integration of that kind of technology into instruction. If faculty members don't have adequate computers, we'll never get where the Integrated Technologies Committee believes we need to go.

Beyond this \$250,000, we have \$1.06 million provided in a special appropriation from Columbus for instructional equipment which we will spend in the fall. Some of that, of course, can be spend on computers, but there are lots of other demands for instructional equipment beyond computers.

Finally, you will receive from me, once we have completed the process in the Academic Affairs Division, a report of the priorities for new money in Fiscal Year 1994 that will be sent forward to the University budget development process from the Academic Affairs Division. As I am sure many of you know and I hope all of you know, departments and colleges have developed requests in the personnel area and in the operations area for new funds, funds beyond the base that is available this year. I expect that we will have substantial new funds, exactly how much I don't know. The case you put together, the priorities for the colleges, were forwarded to the University level, to the Provost's Advisory Committee which consists of the deans, the Director of the Library, a representative from each of the college advisory committees, which is in the process of developing the priorities for the Division. I expect that certainly within the next week we will be finished with that. University level discussions will begin at the end of April and continue into early May after which I'm sure we will have some determination of what funds

we have. Thanks for the opportunity to make some comments.

REMARKS FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT

Chair--Is a representative from Student Government here?

John Woodall--I am a student representative and I am also on Student Government. Mr. Burley was unable to join us once again and he apologizes profusely. We will be getting out to all the members as soon as we possibly can.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair--Any other matters before the House?

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair--If I may make a concluding statement. One reason that I wanted to remain at Youngstown State University was because of many people and groups of this kind--the Senate. I feel very much pride at being chosen as Chair of this body. I find it necessary to say at this time that it is with regret that I step down as Chair. Two of the things I want to remark, to make a remark about, is that two instances in this body always serve to me as a focal point in my tenure here. One was to ask, in my first year here, that students be allowed to vote and have full rights as members of this body. Also, I had an opportunity to serve as Chair of this body when certain individuals thought it best to disregard the faculty in a matter having to do with presidency of this University. It was very, very fitting that this body voted without a dissenting vote to censure the board, to remove, to ask that an individual be removed, and ask that a bona fide search be instituted and a President be elected in what resembles or what happens to closely represent an honest search. And I think that Dr. Cochran and now the Provost, Dr. Scanlon, have brought, I think, ability encompassing caring to this institution which would not have been possible otherwise. I made that comment only in the sense that people tend to have short memories. I now know, I know of no one, I know of no one, who opposed the Senate on the matter having to do with the election or the selection of an individual as the President of this University. Wonderful. Now that we have Dr. Cochran and Dr. Scanlon on board, we rewrite history. I paid a price for my stand and I paid it in many ways since. I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to a person who is not here, at least I don't see him here, Bill Jenkins. Bill Jenkins and I served in the positions of Chair and Vice Chair for two years. It was a relation that was deeply respected. I don't know of anyone in the Chair of the Senate that I can say more good things about than Bill Jenkins. He was and will always be a colleague in the best sense of the word and I want that to be understood. I hope, referring back to the remarks I made back on that rather interesting day in 1991, I think as Matthew Arnold once indicated, I still feel that we are still at a point like a man caught between two worlds, one dead and the other too powerless to be born. I think, in many ways, we take two steps forward and take a step and one-half back. I don't think this University stands a ghost of chance as a bona fide institution of higher learning unless we make a bona fide true attempt to recruit women and people of color in the very highest offices of this University. To

do less than that would make a mockery of what we stand for at this University. For that and for so many other reasons I would like to say "goodbye" to you today, but I want it understood that at no time in all the years I have been here and in the Senate did I ever wish to take personally any, let's say, my comments were not to be taken personally, I always had to make comments to some of my colleagues, but there was never an attempt on my part to make it an argument, I was talking about an issue. Very early in my training, it was Baldino is the argument, not the person. So if I offended anyone in this room, at any time, it was not my purpose, and to each and everyone of you, thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

ATTENDANCE SHEET

Academic Senate, 1992-1993

DATE: April 7, 1993

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

At-Large

William Barsch
 Maria Delost
 Steven Gardner
 Anthony Messuri
 Virginia Phillips

WB
MD
SG
APM
VK
VP

Departmental

*Kathylynn Feld, A. H.
 **Robert Campbell, B.E.T.
 **C. Allen Pierce, Crim. Justice
 *Donald Slanina, Eng. Technology
 *Janice Elias, Home Economics
 **Marsha Kuite, Nursing

KF
RC
CAP
DS
JE
MK

ARTS AND SCIENCES

At-Large

Samuel Floyd Barger
 Fred Blue
 Paul Dalbec
 Hugh Earnhart
 William Jenkins/Linda Tessier
 Friedrich Koknat
 Lowell Sare
 Sandy Stephan
 Ronald Tabak
 John White

SFB
FB
PD
HE
WJ
FK
LS
SS
RT
JW

Departmental

*John Usis, Biology
 **James Mike, Chemistry
 *Taghi Kermani, Economics
 **Bege Bowers, English
 *Mary Loud, Foreign Languages
 *Thomas Maraffa, Geography
 **Ikram Khawaja, Geology
 *Richard Walker, Health & Physical Educ.
 **Martin Berger, History
 *Stephen Rodabaugh, Math and Comp. Sci.
 **Stanley Browne, Philosophy & Religion
 *William Sturrus, Physics and Astronomy
 **David Porter, Political Science
 *Nancy White, Psychology
 **Beverly Gartland, Sociology, Anthrpology

JU
JM
TK
MB
ML
TM
IK
RW
MB
SR
WS
DP
NW

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

At-Large

Daniel Borgia
 James Daly
 Rammohan Kasuganti
 Jane Reid
 Eugene Sekeres
 Homer Warren

DB
JD
RK
JR
ES
HW

Departmental

*Inez Heal, Accounting
 *Clement Psenicka, Management
 **David Burns, Marketing

IH
CP
DB

EDUCATION

At-Large

Peter Baldino
 Susan deBlois

Departmental

*Janet Beary, Elementary Education
 **Ed Tokar, Foundations
 **Sherry Martinek, Guidance & Counseling
 **M. Dean Hoops, Special Education
 *Donna McNierney, Secondary Education

JB
ET
SM
MH
DM

+Effective:

September 30, 1992

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

ENGINEERING

At-Large

Martin Cala
Duane Rost

MR

Departmental

**Soon-Sik Lim, Chemical Engineering
**Shakir Husain, Civil Engineering
*Phil Munro, Electrical Engineering
*Hojjat Mehri, Industrial Engineering
*Les Smith, Mechanical Engineering

A.L.C.
SH
PH
LWS

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

At-Large

Michael Crist
Joe Edwards
Daria Funk
Les Hicken
Larry Hugenberg
Tedrow Perkins
Bill Slocum

J.E.
JE
DF
LH
LH
TP

Departmental

*Susan Russo, Art
*Steve Ausmann, Music
**Frank Castronovo, Speech and Theater

SR
SA

STUDENTS

At-Large

Julie Allshouse
John Durkin
Megan Matthews
John Woodall
Jaida Brady

JW

School/College

Mary Durbin, Education
Sharon Texter, Performing Arts
Brend Dorazio, Business
Jerry Barnett, CAST
Sharyn Campbell, Arts and Sciences
Jason Fleming, Engineering
Mike Graham, Graduate School

MD

Ex-Officio

Bill Burley, Pres., Stu. Gov.
Pat Billett, V. Pres., Stu. Govt.
Dave Hall, Second V. President

X

ADMINISTRATION

James Cicarelli
Sally M. Hotchkiss
Gordon E. Mapley
David P. Ruggles
George E. Sutton
David Sweetkind
John J. Yemma

J.C.
Sally Hotchkiss
GEM
DR
GS
DS

Shirley A. Carpenter
Robert Beebe
David C. Genaway
John R. Loch
Charles A. McBriarty
Richard A. McEwing
Alfred W. Owens II
Harold Yiannaki

CM
RM
AW

senrost.923/dallas

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

ATTENDANCE SHEET

Academic Senate, 1992-1993

DATE: 1992-93 Attendance Record

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

At-Large

William Barsch
 Maria Delost
 Steven Gardner
 Anthony Messuri
 Virginia Phillips

O N D F M A
 N I
 o
 A I
 T I
 E
 N
 O
 A
 N
 C
 E
 R I
 E
 C
 O
 R I
 D I

Departmental

*Kathlynn Feld, A. H.
 **Robert Campbell, B.E.T.
 **C. Allen Pierce, Crim. Justice
 *Donald Slanina, Eng. Technology
 *Janice Elias, Home Economics
 **Marsha Kuite, Nursing

1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |

ARTS AND SCIENCES

At-Large

Samuel Floyd Barger
 Fred Blue
 Paul Dalbec
 Hugh Earnhart
 William Jenkins/Linda Tessier
 Friedrich Koknat
 Lowell Satre
 Sandy Stephan
 Ronald Tabak
 John White

Departmental

*John Usis, Biology
 **James Mike, Chemistry
 *Taghi Kermani, Economics
 **Bege Bowers, English
 *Mary Loud, Foreign Languages
 *Thomas Maraffa, Geography
 **Ikram Khawaja, Geology
 *Richard Walker, Health & Physical Educ.
 **Martin Berger, History
 *Stephen Rodabaugh, Math and Comp. Sci.
 **Stanley Browne, Philosophy & Religion
 *William Sturrus, Physics and Astronomy
 **David Porter, Political Science
 *Nancy White, Psychology
 **Beverly Gartland, Sociology, Anthrpology

1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

At-Large

Daniel Borgia
 James Daly
 Rammohan Kasuganti
 Jane Reid
 Eugene Sekeres
 Homer Warren

Departmental

*Inez Heal, Accounting
 *Clement Psenicka, Management
 **David Burns, Marketing

1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |

EDUCATION

At-Large

Peter Baldino
 Susan deBlois

Departmental

*Janet Beary, Elementary Education
 **Ed Tokar, Foundations
 **Sherry Martinek, Guidance & Counseling
 **Louis Hill, Administration
 **M. Dean Hoops, Special Education
 *Donna McNierney, Secondary Education

1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |
 1 / 1 / 1 |

+Effective:

September 30, 1992

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

ENGINEERING

At-Large

Martin Cala
Duane Rost

/ /
/ /

Departmental

**Soon-Sik Lim, Chemical Engineering
**Shakir Husain, Civil Engineering
*Phil Munro, Electrical Engineering
*Hojjat Mehri, Industrial Engineering
*Les Smith, Mechanical Engineering

/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

At-Large

Michael Crist
Joe Edwards
Darla Funk
Les Hicken
Larry Hugenberg
Tedrow Perkins
Bill Slocum

/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /

Departmental

*Susan Russo, Art
*Steve Ausmann, Music
**Frank Castronovo, Speech and Theater

/ /
/ /
/ /

STUDENTS

At-Large

Julie Allshouse
John Durkin
Megan Matthews
John Woodall
Jaida Brady

/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /

School/College

Mary Durbin, Education
Sharon Texter, Performing Arts
Brend Dorazio, Business
Jerry Barnett, CAST
Sharyn Campbell, Arts and Sciences
Jason Fleming, Engineering
Mike Graham, Graduate School

/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /

Ex-Officio

Bill Burley, Pres., Stu. Gov.
Pat Billett, V. Pres., Stu. Govt.
Dave Hall, Second V. President

/ /
/ /
/ /

ADMINISTRATION

James Cicarelli
Sally M. Hotchkiss
Gordon E. Mapley
David P. Ruggles
George E. Sutton
David Sweetkind
John J. Yemma

/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /

Shirley A. Carpenter
Robert Beebe
David C. Genaway
John R. Loch
Charles A. McBriarty
Richard A. McEwing
Alfred W. Owens II
Harold Yiannaki

/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /

senrost.923/dallas

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