



Academic Senate
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44555



ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

June 7, 2000

Please submit agenda items and cover sheets for the September 13 Senate meeting to Bege Bowers, English Department, by noon on Friday, September 1. Provide a hard copy and a disk copy of your report and cover sheet in Word 6/95 or rich text format. A downloadable cover sheet is available at the Academic Senate web site:

<http://www.ysu.edu/acad-senate/index.html>

Click on the links in the table to go directly to a specific section of the minutes.

Actions	Previous Minutes	OFC Report	Overview	New Business
Academic Events Committee	Academic Planning Committee	Academic Programs Committee	Academic Research Committee	Academic Standards Committee
Charter & Bylaws Committee	Elections & Balloting Committee	General Education Committee	Honors Committee	Integrated Technologies Committee
Library Committee	Senate Executive Committee	Student Academic Affairs Committee	Student Academic Grievance Comm.	University Curriculum Committee
Sign-in Sheet	Resolution for Duane Rost Resolution for Brandon Schneider	University Outreach Committee	Unfinished Business	Return to Senate Homepage

[Print or Download a Rich Text File of June 7 Minutes](#)[Instructions for Printing Web Minutes in
Black](#)[Top of Page](#)

Overview of meeting:

Topics presented/discussed: representation of all colleges on [Senate standing committees](#); giving faculty the [option of adding pluses and minuses](#) to students' grades; [procedures](#) for approving course proposals and certifying courses for general education.

[Top of Page](#)

Actions:

- **The following [motion](#) carried:** a motion in the form of a resolution of gratitude to retiring faculty member Duane Rost.
- **The following [motion](#) carried:** a motion to table the Academic Standards Committee's motion concerning making pluses and minuses an option in the grading scale.
- **The following [motion](#) carried:** a motion in the form of a resolution of gratitude to graduating student senator Brandon Schneider.

[Top of Page](#)

Call to Order:

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:14 p.m.

[Top of Page](#)

Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

Minutes of the 3 May 2000 meeting were approved as posted.

To view the May minutes, click [here](#); click your "Back" button as necessary to return to the June

minutes.)

[Top of Page](#)

Senate Executive Committee / Report from the Chair: Jim Morrison reported that the Senate Executive Committee has made faculty appointments to standing committees for 2000-2001.

The committee followed the rule (Senate Bylaw 6.1.c) of not assigning any faculty member to more than one standing committee (except as a liaison member). Therefore, some committees have vacancies (click [here](#) to download the list of committee assignments in Appendix A). **If you are not assigned to a committee but are willing to represent your college on one of the committees shown as having a vacancy for someone in your college, contact the Senate Executive Committee representative from your college; we would like a full complement of committee members by fall.**

[Top of Page](#)

Ohio Faculty Council Report: Jim Morrison reported that the OFC met on May 19 and discussed reorganizing as a council, with new members coming aboard in the fall. A temporary chair has been appointed for summer. Council members are making plans to communicate via e-mail, to develop their own agenda items pertaining to items of concern to faculty, and to respond to ideas the chancellor proposes. Some faculty across the state have expressed concern about Senate Bill 286, which involves intellectual property rights and would give boards of trustees the right to set policy on those rights. Morrison noted that YSU has already passed a policy as follow-up to the collective bargaining agreement. The OFC has continued to discuss the role of distance education and faculty's role in it.

Morrison, noting that the Senate Executive Committee had one more item of business, recognized Tom Shipka.

Shipka: As a member of the Senate Executive Committee, I offer a motion in the form of a resolution of gratitude to Duane Rost:

WHEREAS, Dr. Duane F. Rost, Professor of Electrical Engineering, has performed continuous and meritorious service as a faculty member at Youngstown State University since 1970, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Rost has served with distinction, propriety, and civility for multiple terms as Chair of the Academic Senate, wherein among many of his contributions he promoted across-the-University communication and interaction through the creation of the YSU Faculty/Staff Photo Directory, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Rost has served tirelessly on many Senate committees, most recently having been appointed to the University Outreach and Library committees, and elected to the Charter & Bylaws Committee and elected to serve as his College's representative to the Senate Executive Committee, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Rost served for a number of years as YSU's Presidential appointee to the Chancellor's Advisory Committee and has served as our first elected member of its successor, the Ohio Faculty Council, and in both capacities has provided strong and professional representation of Youngstown State University, as well as complete and objective reports to the Academic Senate of Ohio Faculty Council meetings, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Rost will retire from the faculty of Youngstown State University in June 2000,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate of Youngstown State University hereby expresses its appreciation to Dr. Rost for his years of dedicated service at the University, including the activities described above, and that he and Kim be commended to a peaceful and leisurely life along Spirit Lake, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution shall be entered into the minutes of the Academic Senate, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution shall be provided to Dr. Rost, along with the best wishes of those in the Youngstown State University community, this day, Wednesday, June 7, 2000.

The motion was seconded and carried (followed by applause).

Charter and Bylaws Committee: No report.

Elections and Balloting Committee: No report. Louise Aurilio was unable to attend the June 7 meeting. She will submit an end-of-the-year report to Bege Bowers.

Academic Standards Committee: Louise Pavia, chair of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC), recognized members of the committee for their hard work this past year (their names are in the agenda).

She then made the following motion:

The Academic Standards Committee moves that instructors may use plus and minus modifications of the grades. A plus may be added to grades of B, C, and D. A minus may be added to A, B, and C. A plus or minus is recorded and used in the calculation of the point average. A plus increases the points awarded by 0.33. A minus decreases the points awarded by 0.33. This change will be used to calculate students' grade points beginning with the 2001-2002 academic year.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed:

Matthew Vansuch, A&S student representative who will chair the Academic Affairs Committee of Student Government next year: We should postpone discussion of this substantive change until next year to allow time for ample discussion.

Dave Porter, Political Science: I understood that this matter was discussed by Student Government.

Vansuch: It was brought to Student Government in April but with the understanding that it would not be acted upon this year. I believe Student Government has written a letter requesting the Senate to postpone discussion of it.

Charles Singler, Geology: I would like to second Vansuch's thoughts. I was surprised to see the motion on the Senate agenda. When this matter was discussed a few weeks ago, I thought we

would not be acting on it this year. Other people also were not aware that it would be discussed in Senate this year. There are matters I don't understand in the proposed motion. For instance, if the catalog says the grading policy is A, B, C, D, F, but somewhere else it says we *may* put a plus or minus into the system, what does that mean? What does the student receive on the transcript if some instructors follow the policy and others do not? It sounds like there's an unevenness that creates some real problems. Why isn't an A+ or a D- possible? I think the motion is premature and should not be acted upon at this meeting. If it *is* acted upon at this meeting, I hope it is defeated.

Barbara Brothers, dean, College of Arts and Sciences: We looked at this issue at the A&S department chairs' meeting, and it was the unanimous feeling that the University needs more time to study and consider the matter.

Daryl Mincey, Chemistry: I would like to echo what has been said. We have word descriptions for the grades we have now ("very good, excellent, poor, fair, etc."); are there words that would go along with the pluses and minuses? Also, the quantitative part of me worries about what we do with a grade that's halfway between numbers on the point scale. Maybe we should bite the bullet and go to a numeric 10-point scale. I have a real question about distinguishing between a B+ and an A-. Can we grade that critically? If so, let's use a numeric scale such as 1-10.

Vansuch: I move to table the motion.

The motion to table was seconded and carried.

[Top of Page](#)

Academic Programs Committee: No report.

[Top of Page](#)

University Curriculum Committee: Patricia Hoyson, chair of the committee, thanked members of the committee for their hard work and dedication during Q2S. She apologized for omitting Teresa Riley's name from the list of names on the agenda. For the courses that have recently been approved, see [Appendix B](#).

Hoyson referred to handouts at the back of the room, one of which summarized the changes proposed in the documents she had attached to the agenda (the other handouts were the documents attached to the agenda, plus a flow chart showing the proposed progression of course proposals through the approval process). She then invited questions:

Singler: Item B on the proposed course approval form asks for a course description of 50 words or less. Is the word limit a recommendation, or is it mandated?

Hoyson: It was set up for Q2S. We are putting this on the form as a general guideline. Certainly, longer descriptions have been approved.

Singler: Is any course proposal limited to 50 words or less?

Hoyson: No; this statement is a guideline only.

Singler: I suggest that the wording be changed.

Brothers: Why not say “approximately 50 words”?

Hoyson: That would be fine.

An unidentified speaker referred to note 4 at the bottom of the back of the curriculum form, which says that 50 or fewer words are “preferred” and suggested that this wording be moved to the front of the form. Hoyson agreed to do so.

Singler: I have a question pertaining to item 6, which says “This distribution would allow faculty to review courses for both UCC approval and GEC certification.” This would mean that the GEC would be acting on courses that were not yet courses.

Hoyson: We thought the General Education Committee (GEC) should look at a course proposal first and be sure that it contains the material that applies to general education certification—but courses will be circulated for UCC approval and GEC certification at the same time. The kind of changes the UCC makes tend to be minor ones, such as changes in descriptions for the sake of clarity.

Singler: The statement at the top of the back side of the curriculum form says, “If at any step in the process revisions are made . . . , the course must begin the approval process again. . . .” The GEC would then be looking at a proposal twice.

Hoyson: The two committees communicate about minor changes.

Singler: But there may be more than minor editorial changes.

Hoyson: Most of the substantive changes normally occur at the GEC. Going to the GEC first should streamline the process.

Bill Jenkins, general education coordinator: Either way, we will potentially have some difficulties. We have simply agreed as committees to have a proposal come to the GEC first since the most change will probably occur there. We are recognizing that the GEC is certifying and not approving new courses. The proposed process is the least fraught with back-and-forth problems.

Dora Bailey, College of Education, UCC member: The problems we had in the past resulted when the UCC approved a course and then the GEC changed it to meet general education needs; the course would have to come back to us for re-approval. We were trying to create a process that, while it may not be totally clear of confusion, creates less confusion than what we experienced this past year.

Dave Porter: I would like to see the confusion cleared up. To be honest, I don't think we have done so. Look at numbers 4, 5, and 6 at the top of the back of the curriculum form and then at statement II.a of the General Education and University Curriculum Proposal Flow Form that was part of the agenda. The documents seem to contradict each other.

Jenkins: During the GEC report, I will be changing the general education motion to say that a proposal for a new course comes to the GEC first.

Porter: I was very frustrated by the procedures you're talking about. We would get proposals back to say a course had to meet UCC criteria and then also to meet GEC criteria. This was confusing and sometimes contradictory. I don't see why we can't have a sequential process now that some of the Q2S pressure is off.

Brothers: It was my understanding that the guidelines passed by the Senate for general education specified that the GEC could consider only courses that were already courses when they came to the GEC. I would like to echo Dave. With the pressure of Q2S and the new general education, we faced unusual circumstances this past year, with everyone being very pushed. I thought the GEC was to *proactively* help departments design courses and give feedback *before* proposals were sent to the committee. There should not be a problem unless a department has not consulted the GEC first.

Mincey: A course can stand on its own with UCC approval, but it can't stand on its own with GEC approval. It seems like one has to exist before the other.

Jenkins: Our concern was a department submitting a course proposal to the UCC first and then the course coming to the GEC, which may or may not be able to work with it. We have taken a proactive approach in the past year. But we thought departments would not want to submit some courses as new courses if these courses were not going to be approved for general education.

Brothers: Didn't the general education model that we approved say that the GEC could consider only an already-approved course?

Jenkins: That wasn't my understanding.

Brothers: I think that should be checked.

Singler: I see an outline of what is being requested by the UCC: a title, description, etc. It doesn't include a request for a syllabus, though that would be desirable. The GEC will be looking at something much more developed than a title and a course description. It has to determine whether a course meets the general education goals. It strikes me that these two committees have two very different functions.

Duane Rost, Electrical Engineering: Would the chair tell me what the motion on the floor is?

Morrison: There is none. This is an informal discussion of a committee report.

Hoyson: I move that the Senate approve the curriculum form—Youngstown State University Curriculum Proposal for Curriculum Committees of Academic Programs and Curriculum Division—with the insertion in section B of “50 words is preferred” and the deletion of “ ≤ 50 words.” [I can't reproduce the “less than or equal to” sign with my web fonts. *BKB*]

The motion was seconded.

Rost: That includes the back of the form, too?

Hoyson: Yes.

Rost: We have been using the word “chair” instead of “chairperson,” and the front of the form uses “chair.” The back of the form uses “chairperson.” Can we use “chair” instead?

Hoyson: Yes, and we will fix typos such as “quarter” for “semester.”

Bob Hogue, Computer Science and Information Systems: I have a quantitative suggestion. Item no. 6 at the bottom on the back of the form says, in effect, that 1 s.h. is the equivalent of 50 minutes of classroom instruction. I suggest we change the wording either to “15 occurrences of 50-minute classroom sessions” or to “a total of 750 minutes of classroom instruction.”

Hoyson accepted the change.

Mincey: I move that we amend the order of the numbered items at the top of the back of the curriculum form, so that the information in no. 4 would come after the information in no. 6 and the rest of the items would be renumbered.

The motion to amend was seconded, and discussion on the proposed amendment followed.

Shipka: I appreciate the observations of those who have expressed misgivings, but this document represents an honest attempt to clarify and streamline the procedures. I speak against this motion to amend and hope we get back to the main motion.

Dave Porter: I disagree with my colleague. I don't consider the flow of paper and approval to be superfluous. I think the flow should go from most general to most specific. The basic concept of a course should be approved by the UCC first. Requirements for general education are different, and a proposal for general education needs to be more developed. The amendment before us would order the process from general to specific.

Jan Elias, assistant provost: I speak against the amendment. (1) This procedure has been worked out by two committees who have much more experience with the process than the rest of us; and (2) certification by the GEC can't go into effect until the course is approved by the UCC; certification becomes effective only after a course is approved.

Brandon Schneider, student senator: I speak in favor of the amendment. I don't think the GEC should look at proposals for courses that aren't yet courses. If there's no course, we can't certify it.

Mincey: On the front of the form, there's no line for the signature of the GEC chair.

Hoyson: This is purely a UCC form. The only reason the approval process was put on the back of the form is that most faculty don't go to the Appendix of the Senate *Charter and Bylaws* to read the progression policy. Most look at the instructions on the back of the form. The information about the approval process was meant to clarify the procedure for individuals who are submitting courses.

Jenkins: No matter how we organize this, there will be some problems with how a proposal flows and where it gets held up. These two committees have spent a lot of time looking at the process—and engaged in the process—and have proposed what seems to us to present the least problem overall. If the procedure is amended, the amendment will create problems. Any time two committees work with similar matters, such problems will occur. The two committees overwhelmingly believe our proposed procedures will present the fewest difficulties and problems.

J-C. Smith, Philosophy and Religious Studies: I think Bill Jenkins is right in saying that there will be problems to be addressed, whichever way the paperwork flows. It's roughly "six of one, a half dozen of the other."

Also, I would like to ask for two points of clarification on the University Curriculum Division Course Proposal Progression form (the UCC's Appendix A) (click [here](#) to see it; then click your

“Back” button to return to these minutes):

(1) The middle bulleted item under no. 1 states that if an existing course “is to be submitted for General Education certification with no changes, the UCD form need not be completed.” Does this mean that a department submitting such a course does not have to submit it to the college curriculum committee, as indicated in the flowchart?

(2) Also, in the flowchart there is a distinction between the college and university curriculum committees, but the general education committee is not labeled in this way. Some colleges have general education committees, so I would like to know whether they are being included in this form or it is only the university GEC that proposals must be sent to.

Hoyson: I’ll let Bill address the bulk of what you ask. But I can say, yes, if it is an existing course, then there is no change in your course, and it doesn’t come to the UCC. If during the certification process substantive changes are made to the course, it must be submitted to the UCC, starting with the department, the college curriculum committee, the dean, etc.

Smith: But if there is no such change and only general education approval is sought, then the proposal need not go to the college curriculum committee?

Hoyson: No.

Dennis Henneman, Communication and Theater: It appears that the two committees have gone to hell and back trying to resolve problems as best they could. It’s my inclination to accept their judgment. I propose that we vote against the amendment and get to the motion.

Porter: I’m confused. We’re voting on all three documents at once?

Hoyson: No. The other documents will be submitted also, but we aren’t voting on them now.

Porter: I speak in favor of the amendment. But I would like more time to review all of these documents. There seem to be inconsistencies and typos, and it will take a great deal of time to clarify the documents. I encourage you to vote in favor of the amendment.

Singler: I encourage voting in favor of the amendment. But the process by which we are processing these courses is a very important one, and if we follow the language as originally presented, we are going to abort the idea that the GEC is looking at courses that are not courses. I’m not sure the GEC should be offering changes in course titles and course descriptions. The GEC should be looking at what has been presented and whether the course meets the general education goals.

Shipka: I move the previous question.

Shipka's motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and his motion (closing debate on the proposed amendment) carried.

Brandon Schneider questioned whether we still had a quorum. A show of hands showed that, with only 33 senators still present, we had lost a quorum.

[Top of Page](#)

Resolution Honoring Brandon Schneider: Jim Morrison asked our indulgence so that Bill Jenkins could make a statement:

Jenkins: I would like to make a motion in the form of a resolution of gratitude to Brandon Schneider:

WHEREAS, Brandon Schneider has served as a student representative to the Academic Senate for the past several years; and

WHEREAS, Brandon Schneider has worked on multiple committees of the Academic Senate, including the General Education Committee, the Academic Standards Committee, and the Charter & Bylaws Committee, and faithfully attended the meetings of these committees and of the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, Brandon Schneider has taken a very active role in the work of the Academic Senate, both on the Senate floor and in the committee meetings; and

WHEREAS, Brandon Schneider has served as a model for faculty and students of what it is to be a citizen of Youngstown State University;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate commend Brandon Schneider for his outstanding service to the academic development of this institution and that it wish him well as he pursues a graduate degree at Georgetown University.

The motion was seconded and carried (followed by applause).

Duane Rost asked if the Senate would like to host a forum to continue the discussion on curriculum matters. There was no response, and the meeting adjourned.

[Top of Page](#)

Academic Planning Committee: No opportunity to report.

[Top of Page](#)

General Education Committee: No opportunity to report.

[Top of Page](#)

Integrated Technologies Committee: No opportunity to report.

[Top of Page](#)

University Outreach Committee: No opportunity for an oral report. However, the committee submitted a written report. See [Attachment 1](#).

[Top of Page](#)

Academic Research, Student Academic Affairs, Student Academic Grievance, Honors, and Academic Events Committees: No opportunity to report.

[Top of Page](#)

Unfinished business: None.

[Top of Page](#)

New business: None.

[Top of Page](#)

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

[Top of Page](#)

**Attachment 1: University Outreach Committee
Report for 1999-2000**

Committee Members: B. Angle, L. Hemminger, J. Locke, S. Phillips, MJ Reiff, S. Stephan, C. Stevens, D. Suchora, and W. Vendemia

During the 1999-2000 academic year, the committee revisited the previous year's proposed redefinition of the committee's scope and charge. The charge was put on the Senate agenda last year, but it had not yet been passed. It was identified by this committee that areas needing further consideration are the clarification of the word "recruitment," the scope of the committee regarding on/off campus offerings, and the pay scale for instructors of outreach courses.

The proposed revision

(1) The Committee shall consist of eight faculty members, with representation from each undergraduate college of the University, two undergraduate students, and four representatives from administration, including the Executive Director of Metropolitan College and Director of University Outreach, both of whom are nonvoting ex officio members.

(2) The Committee shall be responsible for making recommendations to the Academic Senate on policy related to the development of and recruitment for Metropolitan College services and programs inclusive of non-credit, off-campus credit, and continuing education credit courses (CEU), including distance learning, work force education, creative retirement programs, and travel/study programs.

It was agreed that the charge be tabled until next year after the change of administration.

Sandy Stephan presented updates of Metro College activities; no action was needed by this committee.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sharon Phillips Committee Chair

Print or Download a [Rich Text File](#) of June 2000 Minutes

[Sign-in Sheet for June 7 Senate Meeting](#)

[Return to Top of Page](#)

[Return to Senate Homepage](#)

For further information, e-mail [Bege Bowers](#).

Administration

CEA Cynthia E. Anderson
TA Thomas C. Atwood
BB Barbara H. Brothers
Mac Margaret A. Collins

DD Bassam Deeb
JE Janice G. Elias
CM Clara M. Jennings
Peter J. Kasvinsky GLM G. L. Mears

Virginia L. Mears
James J. Scanlon
CA Charles A. Stevens
John J. Yemma

Students

At Large
Paul Brenner
Lauren Hamilton
Donna Lorincz
Chris Morrone
BS Brandon Schneider

MGV School/College
Matthew Vansuch, A&S
Tenika Holden, Ed.
Francine Dillullo, E&T
Ed Ross, FPA
Heather Chandler, HHS
Lumi Strimbu, WCBA

School/College (Cont'd)
[Vacant], Grad. School

Other
Robert Harvey, Pres.
Marla Carano, VP
Tara Mauch 2nd VP

Revised 4/25/00

[Top of Page](#)

[Return to Top of Page](#)

[Return to Top of June 2000 Minutes](#)

[Return to Bottom of June 2000 Minutes](#)

[Return to Senate Homepage](#)

For further information, e-mail [Bege Bowers](#).



Academic Senate
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44555



ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES, APPENDIX B
University Curriculum Division - Approved Courses - 1999-2000
April - May 2000

The following courses have been approved by the University Curriculum Committee and have completed the circulation process.

UCC #	Dept	Course Code	Title	New Revised Deleted
228	GEOG	4826	The Planning Process	N
229	POLIT	3724	Public Budgeting	N
230	ECON	3724	Public Budgeting	N
231	GEOL	4804	Ground Water	R
232	SOCIO	3745	Sociology of Health, Illness, and Healthcare	R
233	NURSG	2643	Health Assessment	R
234	NURSG	3720	Contemporary Nursing for RNs	N
235	NURSG	4846/L	Community Nursing for RNs	N
236	NURSG	4800	Legal Nurse Consulting	N
237	CSIS	2660	Foundations of Electronic Commerce	N
238	CSIS	3760	Electronic Commerce Programming	N
239	CSIS	3761	Electronic Commerce Strategies	N

240	CHFAM	1531	Infants & Toddlers: Integrating Development and Education	R
241	CHFAM	1531L	Infant/Toddler Laboratory	R
242	CHFAM	1532	Early Childhood: Integrating Development and Education	R
243	CHFAM	1532L	Early Childhood Laboratory	R
244	CHFAM	2650	Introduction to the Assessment of Young Children	R
245	CHFAM	2664	Managing Classroom Behavior and Staff Relationships in Early Childhood Settings	R
246	CHFAM	3750	Parent and Professional Relationships	R
247	CHFAM	3790	Supervised Practice in Early Childhood Education	R
248	FNUTR	1551	Normal Nutrition	R
249	FNUTR	1551L	Nutrition Laboratory	R
250	FNUTR	2603L	Diet Therapy Lab	R
251	FNUTR	2609L	Food Systems: Supervised Practice	R
252	FNUTR	2613L	Nutritional Care Clinical Experience	R
253	FNUTR	2628	Practicum in Dietetic Technology	R
254	FNUTR	4858	Food Service Management	R
255	FNUTR	4858L	Food Service Systems Management Laboratory	R
256	FNUTR	4873L	Nutrition and Aging Laboratory	R
257	FNUTR	4885	Practicum in Dietetics	R
FT	SPED	2630	Individuals with Exceptionalities in Society	R

[Top of Page](#)

[Return to Top of Page](#)

[Return to Top of June 2000 Minutes](#)

[Return to Curriculum Committee Portion of June 2000 Minutes](#)

[Return to Senate Homepage](#)

For further information, e-mail [Bege Bowers](#).