

Note: Please get agenda items for the January 8 Senate meeting to Bege Bowers, English Department, by noon on Monday, December 16.

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
December 4, 1996**

CALL TO ORDER:

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

Charles Singler moved that minutes of the 6 November 1996 meeting be approved. Motion was seconded, and minutes were approved as distributed, but adjournment time should have been 5:09.

CHARTER & BYLAWS COMMITTEE: No report.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

J. Morrison reported two items from the Senate Executive Committee:

1. The Senate Executive Committee appointed an ad hoc committee to formulate a statement of academic ethics. Cynthia Brincat of the Dale Ethics Center will chair the committee, and the following will serve on it: Denise Da Ros (Education), Patti Dalleske (Health & Human Services), Jan Elias (Assistant Provost), Beverly Gray (Arts & Sciences), Dennis Henneman (Fine & Performing Arts), Jill Schulick (Student Government), Elvin Shields (Engineering), Charles Stevens (Engineering), and Homer Warren (Business). They will prepare a document for ratification by the Senate this spring.
2. The resolution on reciprocal fee remission, which was attached to the agenda, was revised slightly after the agenda was printed. The revised version, distributed at the Senate meeting, asks the administration rather than the Board of Trustees to consider the resolution. The two revised paragraphs are printed below:

Resolved, That the administration is requested to explore all feasible reciprocal agreements with any and all willing state-assisted institutions to provide said tuition or waiver of fees for dependents of all full-time employees of the agreeing institutions, and therefore be it further

Resolved, That the administration report back to the Senate the results of the exploration no later than fall 1997. . . .

J. Morrison moved that we pass the resolution; Tom Shipka seconded the motion.
Discussion followed.

F. Barger: Will the administration report back before or after taking it to the Board of Trustees?

J. Morrison: The administration can take it to the board at any time; we aren't asking that they bring it back to the Senate before taking it to the board. We don't know what may transpire. There could be a two- or three-university agreement or even a statewide agreement. We are simply asking the administration to pursue the matter.

Motion carried.

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR:

Duane Rost delivered the attached report, focusing on Ohio's Master Plan for Higher Education, five "challenges" in the budget requests, and the system for compiling faculty-staff data (see Appendix A).

ELECTIONS & BALLOTING COMMITTEE: No report.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE: No report.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE:

Nancy White reported that Provost Scanlon met with the committee twice after the November Senate meeting to discuss the business proposal.

The first meeting—with the Arts & Sciences science department chairs, chairs from the College of Business, Jim Morrison, White, and others—dealt with the issue of requiring a lab science. That matter has been resolved, with the language reverting to the original language: "1 lab [science] *recommended*."

The second meeting—with chairs from the College of Business and chairs from departments in Arts & Sciences that offer statistics—concerned the statistics issue. The outcome is shown on the second page of the program that was attached to the Senate agenda. The economics statistics courses will still be the required ones, but students may formally request permission to take statistics courses in other departments instead (procedure is outlined in the note at the bottom of page 9 of the agenda; MATH 717 and 815, or PSYCH 616, 617, and 618, are currently approved alternatives).

White noted that the Programs Committee also discussed procedures that colleges and the Programs Committee should follow in submitting/approving program changes, additions, and deletions; a summary of the revised procedures was attached to page 10 of the Senate agenda.

Discussion of White's report followed:

C. Singler: Why was the lab-science *requirement* diverted back to just a *recommendation*? Also, why are there two social studies electives under attachment A (page 8 of agenda) but only one under attachment B (page 9 of agenda)?

N. White: The chairs of the three departments in the College got together and decided that reverting to a recommendation was the best way to solve the problem at this time. The meetings

did not address the social studies matter; White doesn't know why the hours in Attachments A and B differ. Jim Tackett, chair of Accounting and Finance, noted that he, too, doesn't know.

F. Barger: The controversy surrounding this program proposal has been "bizarre," and we weren't given a rationale for the changes noted today. Shifting an item from the body of a program proposal to a footnote (as with the statistics issue) "hardly seems to be a reason for Presidential action." Strong reasons for recommending rather than requiring a laboratory science still haven't been given; we can only speculate about what they were. (If we don't have enough facilities for offering lab sciences, why wasn't that considered in remodeling Ward Beecher?) Similar controversy about other curricular matters could have a "chilling effect" on deliberations about general education requirements. If changes such as these in the College of Business "send people into some kind of tailspin, what will *substantive* changes" under general education do? Barger hopes we will discuss and debate substantive issues related to general ed.

C. Singler: In regard to item 1 of the program-approval process, which stipulates that proposals go directly from the individual college to the chair of the Programs Committee, could the proposals be distributed to each *dean* as well?

N. White: There's a representative from each college on the committee; but the committee will consider the suggestion.

B. Brothers: Procedures for the *Curriculum* Committee allow proposals to be distributed, even though there are representatives from each college on that committee as well. Distributing the proposals facilitates communication. While *everyone* in the University doesn't need to see each program proposal, we shouldn't have to be dependent on any one individual in a college who serves on the Programs Committee. Sending copies to deans would help ensure that appropriate people are aware of changes that would affect someone else.

N. White noted that she will send copies to the deans and will work with the Charter and Bylaws Committee on procedures.

Singler: According to item 4 of the procedures, when the Programs Committee approves a program, the program is forwarded to the Senate and included in the agenda for information purposes only. Is there a better way to distribute information than just reporting it through the Senate agenda?

J. Morrison: The suggested procedures outlined in the agenda for today's meeting are an attempt to clarify the schematic that appears in the Senate bylaws. Morrison will ask the Bylaws Committee to look at these suggested procedures and to clarify misunderstandings with the Programs Committee before bringing any new language to the Senate for incorporation into the bylaws. He thanked Provost Scanlon for helping resolve the business-proposal issues, noting that Scanlon had encouraged rational conversation.

CURRICULUM, ACADEMIC PLANNING, INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGIES, UNIVERSITY OUTREACH, LIBRARY, ACADEMIC RESEARCH, STUDENT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, AND STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE COMMITTEES: No reports.

HONORS COMMITTEE:

Jeremy Mercer reported that the Honors Committee has worked on a proposed two-year (associate's) honors program and forwarded it to the appropriate committee.

ACADEMIC EVENTS COMMITTEE: No report.

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS AD HOC COMMITTEE:

Bill Jenkins reported that the General Education Requirements (GER) Committee has been meeting about once a week since summer to consider feedback the committee received last year from the university at large concerning GER models elsewhere and what faculty, administrators, and students thought were the best directions to take. The members of the committee don't totally agree among themselves about details. The committee hopes by winter to have two or three very specific models to propose.

The committee has, however, reached some preliminary decisions:

- a writing sequence should be retained;
- there should be a quantitative course that prepares students for mathematical, statistical, and numerical skills important in the modern world;
- computer skills, ethics, and critical thinking should be infused into courses, not treated as individual courses (for example, we are now experimenting with ENGL 551 courses that use computers for writing and research);
- there should be a capstone seminar-type course, preferably in the major, involving students in the type of work required in the major (gathering data, writing and presenting a report, etc.)—this would represent the capstone of the sequence of GER courses.

The committee is in the midst of strong discussion about other matters. Members have decided that we need to cluster some of the goals, and they are discussing how to do so. There should be both introductory-level and advanced courses in the GER sequence. The committee still needs to discuss speech (will it be a separate course, or infused?), an orientation course, etc.

The committee needs feedback on the issue of changing to semesters. The state is altering its funding pattern and seems to favor semester schools. The committee believes that if we change to semesters, the change should be linked to the GER change; it shouldn't occur separately.

Jenkins encouraged oral and written feedback on all these matters.

Discussion followed:

T. Maraffa (a member of the GER Committee): The committee is also discussing Writing across the Curriculum (WAC).

B. Jenkins: With ENGL 550 and 551, we have "learning-to-write" courses. WAC implies *using* writing in other courses and reinforcing the writing skills gained in freshman English. Maybe one course in GER and one in the major should be writing-intensive courses.

J. Mercer: Could existing writing-intensive courses in a major meet the requirement?

B. Jenkins: Probably yes, but such courses should meet whatever general goals we establish for WAC courses.

T. Maraffa: Currently, students take freshman English and perhaps don't do additional intensive writing, or there is a gap before they do. Thus, their writing skills aren't reinforced. We need to have a more consistent writing experience across all four levels of a student's education.

B. Brothers: What is done in ENGL 550 and 551 should be called *Introduction* to Academic Writing, *Introduction* to Academic Research. People need to learn to write in their own disciplines; disciplines should accept responsibility for this.

R. Ruffer: Throughout this discussion, people have used the word "freshman." "First-year students" is a more inclusive term. (Update: Jenkins reports that the GER Committee discussed this matter after the Senate meeting; the committee noted that "first-year student" may also not be the best term since so many YSU students are part-time students who take longer than one year to move to "sophomore" level.)

M. Shutes: If we move toward WAC, at what point does the introduction to writing become redundant?

B. Jenkins: We want entering students to take the two introductory English courses during their first year. That would be preparatory for the kind of activities required in GER and other courses.

N. Ritchey: Have there been parallel discussions about technology?

B. Jenkins: Yes, technology would be infused into courses across the curriculum, too.

N. Mosca: Has there been any discussion about having a capstone course in the major?

B. Jenkins: Yes; that is the most appropriate place for the capstone.

The GER Committee will report to the Senate monthly and hopes to make its recommendations by late winter or early spring.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Al Pierce moved that we adjourn. The motion was seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Stay updated on Academic Senate matters via the on-line Academic Senate Newsgroup, which you can reach through Pine.