

**ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA**  
**Wednesday, 7 March 2001, 4:00 P.M.**  
**Room 132 DeBartolo Hall**  
**(PDF Version)**

**Note:** If you want to print or view the PDF file and you don't have *Adobe Acrobat Reader*, you may download the program at the following link:

[<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>](http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html)

*Use the Acrobat Reader menus or toolbar, not the menus or toolbar in your web browser, to print the file.*

1. Call to Order.
2. Approval of Minutes for 7 February 2001.
3. Senate Executive Committee Report; report from the Chair; Ohio Faculty Council report (see **Attachment 1**).
4. Report of the Charter and Bylaws Committee.
5. Report of the Elections and Balloting Committee.
6. Reports from Other Senate Committees.
  - A. Academic Standards Committee—see **Attachment 2**.
  - B. Academic Programs Committee
  - C. Curriculum Committee
  - D. Academic Planning.
  - E. General Education—see **Attachment 3**.
  - F. Integrated Technologies
  - G. University Outreach
  - H. Library
  - I. Academic Research
  - J. Student Academic Affairs
  - K. Student Academic Grievance
  - L. Honors
  - M. Academic Events
7. Unfinished Business.
8. New Business.
9. Adjournment.

### **Attachment 1: Ohio Faculty Council Report**

#### *Report to the YSU Academic Senate, March 7, 2001, on the Ohio Faculty Council*

The Ohio Faculty Council, which consists of two faculty representatives from each of Ohio's public four-year universities, met at the Ohio Board of Regents office in the Rhodes Tower in Columbus on Friday, February 9, from noon until 3:00 p.m.

1. Mr. Michael Brown from the Chancellor's staff briefed the OFC on the fate of the OBOR budget proposal. Based on Mr. Brown's presentation and an extended question and answer period, I reached the following conclusions. The mood in the Chancellor's office is one of disappointment and frustration following submission by the Governor of his budget recommendations. The OBOR budget proposal sought to elevate spending for Ohio's public colleges and universities dramatically to raise the percentage of Ohioans attending and graduating from college, to make Ohio more competitive in the information-age economy by expanding the college-educated labor pool, and to raise per capita income. The Chancellor had drafted the ambitious higher education budget with three assumptions—the Governor would be receptive, if not enthusiastic; the economy would remain strong; and many constituencies in Ohio, including the media, would understand and applaud the laudable goals behind the budget proposal. All three assumptions turned out to be unfounded, with the result that K-12 garnered far more of the Governor's attention and support than did higher education. The Chancellor's staff is now working in the Ohio General Assembly to win support for restoring portions of the OBOR budget proposal that the Governor cut, but the prospects for a turnaround in the legislature are not bright.

2. Members of the OFC raised objections to the tuition caps or other restraints established in previous budgets and reflected in the Governor's budget proposal. Several members observed that the State of Ohio provides less than half the operating support for their institutions and that Ohio public universities are really "state-assisted" rather than "public" universities. They said that it is hypocritical of the State to fund at the comparatively modest level which it does but then turn around and impose restraints on the legal right of universities to generate the resources that they need. Representatives from two universities gave examples in which belt tightening on their campuses made it impossible to retain some of their best faculty who had accepted far more attractive salaries, teaching loads, and research support budgets at out-of-state universities.

3. In response to the apparent failure of the Chancellor to garner support in the Governor's office, OFC members suggested to the Chancellor's representative that more should be done to educate business and professional members of Boards of Trustees at public universities and to enlist them individually for help in the political arena.

4. The OFC is compiling information about terms and conditions of employment of part-time faculty at the public universities. The Ohio AAUP is also conducting a study of Ohio part-time faculty that it has agreed to make available to the OFC. Information from both organizations will be studied and discussed at a future meeting.

5. The Chancellor's office requested help from the OFC in defining the skills that Ohio college graduates should have in information technology, and the OFC agreed to provide a statement to the Chancellor in the next month.

6. The OFC also learned at our meeting that OBOR has launched a new outreach program to attract more high school graduates to colleges in Ohio. The program is built around a specially equipped bus called "Suc-

cess Express,” which is visiting high schools and other community sites throughout the state. “Success Express,” with a slogan of “higher learning = higher earning,” offers students information about the economic impact of a college education; programs and degrees offered in Ohio colleges and universities, including private institutions; and financial aid. “Success Express” is staffed by OBOR personnel and local volunteers. You can learn more about “Success Express” ([http://www.ohiosuccessexpress.com/flash\\_index.html](http://www.ohiosuccessexpress.com/flash_index.html)) at the Regents web site. The YSU Academic Senate web site has a link to the Regents web site. The Regents web site is [www.regents.state.oh.us](http://www.regents.state.oh.us).

It is important, I think, that YSU personnel learn about “Success Express” and attempt to use it to our advantage. For starters, admissions staff, financial aid staff, and academic advisors should investigate to determine whether the information about YSU in the “Success Express” program is accurate and complete. YSU faculty and staff should also get involved, in conjunction with schools in our service area, in scheduling visits of “Success Express” in our area during which YSU volunteers are present to counsel prospective students.

The next meeting of the OFC is March 9.

Respectfully submitted:

Tom Shipka

cc: President Sweet, Mr. Deeb

**Attachment 2: Academic Standards Committee Report**

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

Date February 28, 2001 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report Academic Standards Committee

Committee Status: Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members: \_\_\_\_\_  
**Beckett, Castronovo, Cobb, Feist-Willis, McCloud, Mosca, Munro, Pallante (chair), Savage, Sculli.**

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:

**The Academic Standards Committee has five recommendations to submit to the Academic Senate for action: expansion of the Academic Standards Committee to include a representative of the Colleges' Advisors; reduction of the Oral Intensive Component of General Education; number of hours completed before student can use the Credit/No Credit option; policies concerning students' status relative to General Education; change in language concerning students on Warning, Probation, and Suspension.**

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

If so, state the motion(s): **See ASC APPENDIX I (next page).**

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

Yes

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

**Martha Pallante  
Chair**

\*\*\*\*\*

**ASC APPENDIX I: ACADEMIC STANDARDS  
COMMITTEE MOTIONS**

**Motion 1:**

The composition of the Academic Standards Committee be changed to include a representative of the colleges' professional advising staff.

**Motion 2:**

The Oral Intensive requirement of the General Education Model be reduced to one course beyond the required Oral Communications course.

Note: Passing the motion would result in the following changes (noted in bold) in the *Undergraduate Bulletin*:

*Page 38, second paragraph of column 2:*

. . . Under the new system students must take a math course, an oral communication course, 2 writing intensive courses, **1** oral communication **course**, and 2 critical thinking intensive courses. . . .

*Page 39, second and third paragraphs under the **Speaking** subheading:*

In addition, students must take **an** oral communication intensive course **that is not a regular speech course**; rather **it includes** a speaking assignment. . . . Students are permitted to take **the course** required as oral communication intensive as an upper division course in the major or minor.

The oral communication-intensive **course** may be satisfied in a foreign language, provided. . . .

*Page 40, final sentence:*

**The** oral communication-intensive **component** may be at the lower or upper division level. **[delete the rest of the sentence.]**

**Motion 3:**

Change the hours necessary to take a Credit/No Credit course from 30 semester hours to 15 semester hours completed. Students may take one Credit/No Credit course per Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters.

Note: Passing the motion would result in the following changes (noted in bold) in the *Undergraduate Bulletin*:

Page 32, second paragraph:

Youngstown State University students who have completed at least **15** semester hours of credit and . . . transfer students admitted unconditionally who have at least **15** semester hours of credit, may elect to take a course for credit/no-credit.

Page 32, final sentence of fifth paragraph:

Students are restricted to taking one CR/NC course in the fall and spring **semesters and one course during the summer.**

**Motion 4:**

The language suggested by the General Education Committee in Appendix I of its attachment to the February 7, 2001, Senate agenda be adopted, with the following provisions:

- It replace language on page 38 of the *Undergraduate Bulletin* and be titled “Old and New General Education Requirements” [delete “Choosing”].
- The Academic Standards Committee reserves the right to review and approve the guidelines developed by the General Education Committee in reference to items 3, 4, 5, and 6.
- The Academic Standards Committee has the responsibility to review and revise the language under “Catalog of Entry” on page 36 of the *Undergraduate Bulletin* to reflect those changes.

**Motion 5:**

As soon as possible, but no later than summer 2001, the new Academic Standing Policy will replace the current language in the catalog:

**ACADEMIC STANDING POLICY**

(Currently labeled **GRADE REQUIREMENTS** on page 34 of the 2000–2001 *Undergraduate Bulletin*)

(First three revised paragraphs are directly from the Bulletin. Revisions in bold.)

**Four** categories of academic standing are established: Good Standing, Warning, **Probation**, and Suspension. These are intended to signify a student’s progress toward graduation or to provide an opportunity for making improvements and achieving academic success.

“Warning” **and “Probation” indicate** that grade standards consistent with graduation requirements are not being met. An advisor’s approval of course load is required prior to continuing studies at the University.

“Suspension” means that a student is separated from the University for a period of time.

*(The following four paragraphs replace the next three paragraphs of the current Bulletin text.)*

Recognizing that the transition from high school to college may be a difficult one, the University has set the minimum levels of academic achievement during the student’s first year below the level required for graduation. Academic standing is based on the total academic hours (TH) completed, including accepted transfer hours. The point averages (PA) required for **good standing** are as follows:

REQUIRED	
TH	PA
1 – 31	1.75
32 +	2.00

A student whose point average falls below the specified average for the number of credit hours achieved will be given a **warning**.

A student who has been on **warning** and who fails to bring the average up to the minimum by the end of the following term will be placed on **probation** for the next term. A probationary student who has failed to bring the average up to the minimum by the end of the probationary term will be **suspended**; however, a student who makes substantial improvement during a probationary term and averages at least 2.00 for that term will be continued on **probation** even though the student’s cumulative average does not reach the desirable minimum.

A second **suspension** will have a duration of at least one full year before reinstatement on **probation**. Students should not expect to be reinstated after two suspensions unless the dean agrees that extraordinary conditions or circumstances have occurred. Additional suspensions will have durations of at least two years.

*(The following paragraphs remain the same as in the current Bulletin.)*

**Reinstatement** after any suspension is determined by the dean of the college from which the student was suspended, or, if the student wishes to change colleges, by the dean of the new college. Exceptions to the suspension policy may be granted by the dean.

Any student receiving a semester GPA of less than 1.0 is required to have advising for the succeeding semester. Registration for the succeeding term will be put “on hold” immediately and not be reactivated until an advisor’s approval for course selection is acquired.

*(This paragraph replaces the final paragraph of Bulletin text.)*

Transfer students admitted in **good standing** or on **probation** must meet those point average requirements indicated for their total hours, including transfer hours accepted by this University.

**Attachment 3: General Education Committee Report**

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

Date February 21, 2001 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Committee Submitting Report General Education Committee

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

Names of Committee Members **Young, Mosca, Kasuganti, Castronovo, Pusch, Munro, Gergits, Lovelace-Cameron, Maraffa, Tessier, Funk, Hannay, Jenkins**

Please write a brief summary of the report the Committee is submitting to the Senate:

**The General Education Committee is also supporting the motion of Academic Standards to reduce the oral communication intensive requirement from two courses to one. (See Appendix GEC I, below.)**

Do you anticipate making a formal motion relative to the report? No

If so, state the motion:

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

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

**William D. Jenkins  
Chair**

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPENDIX GEC I**

**ORAL COMMUNICATION INTENSIVE COURSES**

The General Education Committee has reviewed the requirement that students take two oral communication intensive courses as part of the goal-driven general education model. The Coordinator of General Education, Bill Jenkins, and the Chair of the Communications and Theater Department, Dan O'Neill, have met with department chairs regarding the number, and reported to the committee that a general consensus had formed that there should be one less course required. The particular problem that led to this recommendation was the time that would have to be spent in class on oral presentations. For many faculty there was too much conflict with the coverage of course content. Hence, the General Education Committee is recommending that the Academic Senate reduce the number from two courses to one.