Note: The ASC's draft GER summary and copies of written amendments and motions distributed (but not considered) at the February 25 meeting are attached to these minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
February 25, 1998

OVERVIEW:

Major topics presented/discussed: Academic Standards Committee's clarifications of and proposed amendments to the GER model report. Some additional proposed amendments to the model were also discussed.

Actions:
1. The following GER amendment proposed by the Academic Standards Committee carried: Amendment II (g, d of these minutes; ways of fulfilling Societies and Institutions category).
2. The following amendment proposed by the ASC failed: Proposed Amendment I (p. 2 of these minutes; statistics course).
3. The following amendments proposed by motion after that the ASC failed: Department of Mathematics and Statistics' proposed change to Goal 5 (page 5 of February 25 agenda); Department of Sociology & Anthropology and Department of Political Science's proposed amendment regarding section D, Societies and Institutions (proposed Amendment I on page 4 of the February 25 Senate agenda); Department of Sociology & Anthropology and Department of Political Science's proposed amendment regarding note at bottom of section D, Societies and Institutions (proposed Amendment 2 on page 4 of the February 25 Senate agenda).

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:

Minutes of the 4 February 1998 meeting were approved, with the following correction to Appendix B, p. 12 (Charles Singler's report to the Senate): replace the word "change" in the last sentence of the second paragraph with "charge." The corrected sentence reads "The Academic Standards Committee has attempted to focus on this charge with all due speed and diligence."

CHARTER & BYLAWS COMMITTEE: No report.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: No report.

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR: Duane Rost read the report attached to these minutes, noting that Chancellor Cha wants to replace the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) with a group composed of Senate presidents/chairs. (See Appendix A.) Jim Morrison will attend the March 3 meeting of Senate chairs and, among other things, express our opinion that Duane has represented YSU and the academic sector to the chancellor extremely well.

At this point, Morrison called on Charles Singler to continue the Academic Standards Committee's report on the general education requirements. Morrison reminded the audience of the procedure established at the February 2 Senate meeting: the Senate will consider proposed amendments from the Academic Standards Committee one at a time. Anyone can speak. Only Senate members may make a motion or vote. Speakers must come to the microphone, state their name, and limit their remarks to three to four minutes; they may speak again for three minutes after everyone has had a chance to speak about the motion or amendment under discussion. The only deviations from that procedure will be recognized points of order or points of information. If we get through the amendments proposed by Academic Standards, we will consider any written amendments attached to the agenda or distributed at the meeting.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE: Chair Charles Singler began by calling attention to the three-page draft "General Education Model: A Summary" on the table at back of room. (See Appendix B.) The summary was written as a working document and will evolve as we continue discussions of GER. Changes made at the February 4 Senate meeting were incorporated in the draft. Item 2 (Speaking) is marked with an asterisk because it is not yet settled.

Presentation of proposed amendments and clarifications followed:

I. Singler noted that item 3, proposed Amendment 6, is the one currently on the floor; the February 4 meeting adjourned during discussion of the proposed amendment. The proposed change, with additions underlined, reads as follows:

Students must take one course that teaches mathematical and statistical skills needed to function as a numerically literate citizen. This course must also address one of the first three goals. A student may satisfy goal 5 by passing such a course, by passing a mathematics placement examination, or by passing a higher-level mathematics course, such as calculus, or passing a statistics course.

Discussion of proposed Amendment 6 resumed. Morrison asked John Buser to restate what he had been saying when the February 4 meeting adjourned.

Buser: I had objected to the wording on "statistics." The Department of Mathematics and Statistics feels it violates the intent of Goal 5. Statistics as taught in many departments on campus—which include Mathematics and Statistics, Economics, Psychology, Criminal Justice, Geography, Sociology, Political Science, etc., etc., etc.—would not satisfy Goal 5. The Department of Math and Statistics believes that everyone on campus should take a college-level math course. Very few colleges within the University don't already require a math course.

Floyd Bagge made two points:

(1) Most students are exempted from taking a GER course to fulfill this requirement; they are exempted by taking a mathematics course that they would take to the normal course of things anyway. The amendment would add a statistics course to the list, placing statistics courses in a unique category; such courses wouldn't have to meet any "math monies," any math criteria. A department couldn't withhold any statistics course from the list.

(2) GER Goal 5 says students are to "reason mathematically in both abstract and applied contexts." It doesn't say "in abstract or applied contexts." These courses in applied statistics were represented for years as being applied courses in their disciplines; they don't have mathematics prerequisites. If the ASC wants Goal 5 to say "quantitative, period," it should say this.

A vote was taken, and the motion to accept proposed Amendment 6 failed.

****

II. Singler noted that the ASC is not currently bringing forward proposed Amendment 7—regarding explanation of the National Science goals, section B on page 9 of the February 4 Senate agenda/page 6 of the GER report, and the note at the bottom of page 6 of Senate agenda/page 3 of the GER report. Discussion has recently arisen about interpretation of this part of the model relative to semester conversion. The ASC has agreed to consider this amendment further and will not bring it forward at this time.

****

III. Additional Editorial Changes and Clarifications—Singler, referring to the three-page draft summary mentioned earlier, noted two additional editorial changes/clarifications:

(1) Under Section C, Artistic and Literary Perspectives (page 9 of the February 4 Senate agenda/page 6 of the GER report): With reference to satisfying goal 8 with goal 10, it is interpreted that courses on European history, culture, societies, etc., or non-European history, culture, societies, etc., without specific inclusion of the relationships to western societies would satisfy the intent of general education goals.

Section C, with the clarification underlined, would then be understood as follows:

C. Artistic and Literary Perspectives
GOAL 8 — Grasp and appreciate artistic expression in multiple forms and contexts

A minimum of 2 and no more than 3 (9[2-4]) courses from a list of courses that meet goal 8, and, in addition, goal 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, or 13.* With reference to satisfying goal 8 with goal 10, courses on European history, culture, societies, etc., or non-European history, culture, societies, etc., without specific inclusion of the relationships to western societies would satisfy the intent of general education goals.

* The number of courses in B, C, and D must total a minimum of 8 (9[2-19])

(2) The second clarification pertains to section D, Societies and Institutions, Goal 11 (page 10 of the February 4 Senate agenda/page 7 of the GER report). The passage, with the clarification underlined, would be understood as follows:

Goal 11 — Evaluate the impact of theories, events and institutions on the social, economic, legal and political aspects of society

(It is not expected that courses meeting Goal 11 have to cover all of the areas mentioned. The intent of goal 11 is not confined to the context of the contemporary world or contemporary societies.)

Historical contexts or other avenues of meeting Goal 11 would be allowable.

****

(Bob Levin raised a point of information: I don't understand the impact of these statements you've added about intent. Whose intent are you referring to, and what are we being asked to do with the information you've given?

Singler : In explaining what was meant by Goal 11, the GER Task Force noted that "Students develop their knowledge about the markets, social organizations, legal systems, and levels of government that comprise society. They understand, through study of theories, how these institutions function, interact with one another, and evolve in our society and others." The point was made in the ASC that Goal 11 would seem to be unduly focused on modern societies. The ASC felt it would be beneficial to consider organizations, institutions, and events that weren't necessarily from today. A student could derive much from looking at some of these other elements.

Levin: If it's not an amendment, what would you like for us to do with the information?

Singler: I would like you to understand that we in the Academic Standards Committee aren't seeing this goal as pertaining only to the stated modern, Western examples.

Levin: You're speaking to the Senate. Is it understood, when you present such information to the Senate, that the General Education Task Force is supposed to listen to you, take you seriously, and consider what you're saying? I'm not certain what it means that this information is being discussed in the Senate and appears in the Senate minutes.

George McCloud: It might be considered as a form of "full disclosure." At some point, we'll vote on a final package. The information is merely "the committee's effort to help you understand what it intends," so that when we do vote, everyone fully understands the proposal and is interpreting things in the same way.)

****

IV. Proposed Amendment II—regarding explanation of the Societies and Institutions goals, section D on page 10 of the February 4 Senate agenda/page 7 of the GER report:

Charles Singler moved that we replace "A minimum of 2 and no more than 3 (9[2-4]) courses from a list of courses that meet a combination of two goals from 10, 11, or 12." with "A minimum of 2 and no more than 3 courses that meet Goal 11, and in addition, Goal 10 or 12."

The revised passage, with additions underlined and deletions marked out, would be:

D. Societies and Institutions

Goal 10 — Understand the development of cultures and organization of human societies throughout the world and their changing relationships with western society

Goal 11 — Evaluate the impact of theories, events and institutions on the social, economic, legal and political aspects of society

(It is not expected that courses meeting Goal 11 have to cover all of the areas mentioned. The intent of goal 11 is not confined to the context of the contemporary world or contemporary societies.)

Goal 12 — Comprehend and appreciate the development of diversity in America in all its forms

A minimum of 2 and no more than 3 (9[2-4]) courses from a list of courses that meet Goal 11, and in addition, Goal 10 or 12a combination of two goals from 10, 11, or 12."

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed:

Rochelle Raffer: If you look at Groups B and C, each has a defining goal. We are just asking for consistency with these two groups.

Tom Malaffo: Was the intent of the ASC to limit courses to those that meet past pairs of goals? It is not possible under this for a course to meet Goal 11, 10, and 12, as long as 11 is included?

Singler: The intent is that Goal 11 be central. A course must address Goal 11 plus at least Goal 10 or Goal 12. As long as Goal 11 is met, a course could address all three of the goals or more than three; it could address Goal 11 and either Goal 10 or Goal 12, or address Goal 11 and both Goal 10 and Goal 12.

A vote was taken, and the motion to accept proposed Amendment II carried.

****

(Allen Hunter asked for a point of information or order: In Clarification Number 6 attached to the draft summary [page 17 of these minutes], aren't you changing the intent of Goal 10? I agree that we should broaden the goal to include more than Western society, but doesn't that change the fundamental intent of the goal and require an amendment?

Singler: The ASC felt the language "Understand the development of cultures and organization of human societies throughout the world" was the focus of Goal 10, or at least that it should be the focus of the goal. We wanted to provide opportunities for courses in Chinese history, African history, Brazilian societies, etc. to meet the goal. Any relation to Western societies would be an "add on" in the main focus. We didn't want to change the intent of the goal, just to provide a little different focus.

Hunter: I agree with what you're trying to do, but the Senate had approved the original wording of Goal 10, which addresses Western societies specifically. You are giving the wording a very different meaning. It's a good change, but a major one that should require a vote.

Bill Jenkins: The ASC is trying to define to a greater extent what happens when a goal is in another area. For example, Goal 10 is highlighted as being in "box" D, and that's where the original definition of the goal most apply. But what happens, for example, in regard to the artistic expression goal in box C, which Art might want to meet through an Art History course focusing on a particular segment of the world? A student is still required to reach Goal 10 in group D, but what we've tried to create through the GER system is repetition or other considerations of these goals in other boxes. If someone includes Goal 10 in another box, that's admirable, and they don't have to carry it to an unreasonable extent to be considered as having reached Goal 10. Rarely on, we decided we couldn't have each student reach each goal. We had to "clump" the goals together and have students reach them in specific areas—yet offer the opportunity for meeting the goals in multiple ways and combinations. I think the ASC is saying that a "lesser consideration" of Goal 10 in another box is possible. It's a practical thing.

Paul Sacco: I agree with Allen Hunter that the ASC is changing the fundamental meaning. The ASC's intent may be admirable, but it doesn't meet Goal 10.

Singler: As Bill Jenkins has pointed out, the focus here is Goal 8. We aren't across the board redefining Goal 10; we're only refocusing it in regard to the way Goal 8 is met along with Goal 10, whether through art, or music, or literature. This isn't a redefinition under Societies and Institutions; this is under Artistic and Literary Perspectives.

Hunter: I don't see how you're not changing the meaning of goal 10, and that requires a formal amendment.

Singler: As a parallel situation, look at Goal 11. The GER Task Force report distributed in November included an explanation under Goal 11 that not all of the elements identified in Goal 11 needed to be addressed; addressing all of them in one course might not be possible or preferable. That principle needs to be applied here as well.

Sacco: But then one is not technically meeting Goal 10. Don't we have to amend Goal 10?

Singler: I don't think so. As long as we're restricted to addressing all of the issues under any of these goals, we'll have some very difficult implementations. We're addressing the most important part of Goal 10 here. I think Goal 10 is still being addressed.

R. Levin: I want to be clear on what we're going to be voting on ultimately. I know what the GER report was. I know what the amendments passed by the Senate are. But if we're voting on neither of those, if we're voting on a document that has some parenthetical underwordings in the form of "nonsounds sort of sentences" from the ASC, and I vote on that, what am I voting on? If the ASC has parenthetical, informative statements, I would prefer that the committee provide them in a memo to us and [to the form of advice] to the committee that will implement the model. I prefer that we not be asked to consider these items or to vote on a document that includes these items unless they are formal amendments.

Singler: You might remember the last time we had a picture up on the screen. In that picture and in my opening I indicated that there really are three significant parts to the GER model. First, there is the actual timeline, which we're trying to deal with now. Second, there are the guidelines and criteria that define what all of those categories are about and how they are to be implemented. And third, there is the successor committee that will oversee the whole GER model. The ASC hasn't addressed parts 2 and 3 yet. Right now, the ASC simply wants to clarify its understandings of part 1. We intend for the guidelines and criteria to be addressed later.

Levin: Then we're not voting on the "understandings" in red on the screen today (i.e., the clarifications/intents underlined in this set of Senate minutes)?

Singler: No, you're not being asked to vote on the underwordings in red.

Levin: Then our vote wouldn't say that we endorse the underwordings that are in red?

Singler: You are correct, I believe. We're offering an explanation to the membership and believe this will come forward again.

Heidi Madrinkis: Please clarify how editorial change no. 6 attached to the draft summary does not contradict Goal 10.

Singler: Editorial change 6 addresses category C, Artistic and Literary Perspectives, which is governed by Goal 8. Goal 8 has to be put into a context. That context as defined by the GER Task Force was to be either Goal 4, 7, 9, 10 , 12, or 13. The ASC felt it would be difficult to address certain elements traditional to artistic and literary expression if one had to address them only in the context of Western society. How would one deal with Chinese literature or Chinese music or Chinese art if one had to deal with it only in a context that included its relationship to Western society? Goal 10 still speaks to societies throughout the world. But we don't want to preclude that there are elements of art, music, and literature and other artistic and literary perspectives that would be denied the opportunity to reach the student and reach general education as part of the model.

Madinkis: Under Goal 10, some elements of other societies might have a relationship to Western societies, and others might not?

Singler: A course doesn't have to address the relationship to Western societies under Artistic and Literary Perspectives.

Don Rudolph: How can Goal 10 meet Goal 8 when Goal 10 is more specific than Goal 8? You seem to be making a fundamental change that requires an amendment.

Singler: Category C is defined by Goal 8, which is to address artistic/literary expressions. In what framework does one address the arts or literature? One can't look at art or literature in a vacuum. Goal 10 was one of the frameworks, along with the others identified in the paragraph below Goal 8, in which one might look at art or literature. Students will still choose which courses to take. They could avoid Japanese art if they chose. But restricting the courses mentioned in category C to those that include the relationship to Western society seems too restrictive.

Rudolph: Then shouldn't Goal 10 be amended, since it says the courses must tie into Western society? Don't students have to meet Goal 10 in its entirety?

Singler: Under Artistic and Literary Perspectives, the student doesn't have to meet Goal 10 in its entirety. Goal 10 is also identified in category D, Societies and Institutions. If we changed it for one, we'd have to change it for the other.

Sacco : To return to the point of information: When we vote after we finish all these amendments, although we won't be voting on the red [underlined] underwordings, are we endorsing the red parts? Is the commentary part of the goal officially?

Singler: I didn't offer it as an amendment.

Sacco: What is the status of commentaries when we vote at the end?

Singler: We're trying to offer a context under which these categories are to be viewed.
Each goal appears in a context, and we're trying to suggest what the ASC feels the model means. In this particular case, we don't feel artistic and literary expressions have to be confined to those areas that provide relations to Western societies. We feel the broader view is the "better" view. We were working by analogy to Goal 11.

Sacco: That's the understanding only in regard to Goal 8, Artistic and Literary Perspectives?

Brendan Monagan: This seems to be a sensible but substantive change, not an editorial change. Can the chair of the Senate rule as to whether this is an editorial change or a change that should come back as an amendment, so that we can move on?

Morrison: It's obvious that we won't be voting on a complete model today. The ASC noted already that its deliberations aren't complete. At the February 4 meeting, the speech amendment was tabled and the critical thinking amendment was sent back to the ASC. Other proposed amendments are attached to the agenda today. More amendments could be proposed later. All of these need to be dealt with before we vote on a model. If you feel a matter is important enough to have it explicated (to avoid the Oliver Cromwell effect), please do so at the appropriate time.

Jim Blim: Courses that are designed to meet Goal 8 don't have to include Goal 10 at all.
Does that help clarify?

Audience: No.

Frank Krzygowski: I understand that a course that meets category C, Artistic and Literary Perspectives, does not have to meet Goal 10 at all; I understand that it may meet most of Goal 10. If a course doesn't meet all of Goal 10, I assume the student would still have to take a course from category D, Societies and Institutions, where courses that meet Goal 10 have to meet all of Goal 10. It might be appropriate to remove Goal 10 from the Artistic and Literary Perspectives category and leave it only in category D. It's an "or" choice in the amended Societies and Institutions section.

Levin: If it would be in order, I'd like to move that we limit discussion today to proposed amendments, so that we might have an opportunity to vote on those amendments, and that additional information for background purposes be brought to us in a memo, not debated.

Morrison: That's what we're going to do since there are no amendments on the floor at the moment.

Singler: Since we've already voted on proposed Amendment II, which carried, the ASC report for today is finished. The ASC is scheduled to meet before next week's Senate meeting.)

Consideration of amendments not proposed by the Academic Standards Committee:

Morrison: A number of possible amendments were attached to today's agenda. I will entertain the introduction of any of those, preferably those that relate to categories A-D, since the committee hasn't reported on the other categories.

Tom Shipka: Can we deal with the critical-thinking goal now?
Morrison: It was referred back to the committee, and they haven't reported back. We need to wait until they report back.

V. Department of Mathematics and Statistics' proposed amendment regarding Goal 5

John Buser: On page 5 of the February 25 agenda, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics tried to clarify the issue of Goal 5. I move that we replace the paragraph after Goal 5 with the wording attached to the agenda:

Students whose program of studies includes successful completion of one or more baccalaureate (higher-level) mathematics courses, such as calculus, have met Goal 5. Other students must take one course that teaches mathematical and statistical skills needed to function as a numerically literate citizen. This course must also address one of the first three goals.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Giuliana Lock: I have a question about students who take advanced courses in math in high school in an attempt to prepare for college but don't wish to take math at the college level. Are they required to add an additional math course in college simply because we have this goal?

Buser: There are facilities within the University for students to get credit for these courses, and we don't plan to change that. AP programs and other options are viable.

Morrison: Is the intent of the proposed amendment to replace the language related to fulfilling the requirement through a placement examination?

Buser: Yes, I think so.

Morrison: And would a calculus course fulfill the requirement?

Buser: We say a course "such as" calculus. Calculus is not the only way to fulfill the requirement. We have in mind that students would actually have to take a University-level course that teaches mathematical and statistical skills.

Morrison: So, AP calculus would do it?
Buser: Yes.

Someone: If it's possible to meet Goal 5 by taking AP courses and perhaps a test, will it be possible to meet the other goals by the same mechanisms? Is the math goal less important than the other goals, so that it doesn't require a college course?

Buser: We discussed that issue late time. George McCloud mentioned the AP English test.

Barbara Brothers: To clarify, academic departments or disciplines control the credit given for CLEP exams, AP, etc. The disciplines decide what level of achievement students must meet in order to receive credit for a particular college course that's offered here. Disciplines already have the power to determine what AP courses and test scores to accept.

Rochelle Raffer (to Bunsy): Are you interpreting Goal 5, the part that says "applied contexts," to mean statistical skills? Are you going to create a course that addresses both math and statistics?

Buser: We have several courses on the books that do this already. One is the traditional math for liberal arts majors, which includes both math and statistics. We also teach courses for the College of Education that include both math and statistics. Our calculus course certainly satisfies applied contexts. Our courses for the College of Business meet the applied contexts.

Raffer: Someone who takes a calc course won't have gotten statistical skills per se. But you're saying that if students don't take a calc course, you want them to have both skills. You seem to be interpreting the "applied" to mean both math and statistics for those who don't take a calc course.

Burger: The distinction is whether this is a course that exempts the student from a general ed requirement, or one that exists under GER. There are two ways to meet Goal 5: to be exempted, or to meet it through GER. GER courses are supposed to meet more than one goal. The inclusion of statistics addresses Goal 2 because the statistics in the course will probably be primarily, if not exclusively, descriptive. Inclusion of statistics is to meet Goal 2 as well as Goal 5. "Abstract" and "applied" aren't meant to be in opposition to each other. They're meant to be interactive, to work together.

Nancy Mecca: Can a student who had Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry in high school take algebra to meet GER?

Buser: We begin not. Algebra is here mostly to meet deficiencies, not to meet GER. In the true spirit of GER, we don't want students taking a high school-level course to meet GER. Many school districts require algebra for graduation. Brunsbrau, for instance, requires students to take both Algebra I and Algebra II. We don't want these districts to require a higher level of math than we do.

Mecca: A high school student with no high school deficiencies who comes here for Nursing would have to take calculus?

Buser: No.

Mecca: The student would still have to take another math course?

Buser: We have a course that's offered at probably 75% of the universities across the country. It's called Liberal Arts Mathematics. It does meet the GER requirements. It does have statistics in it. Statistics isn't the only thing in the course, however. We've been teaching it for the last two years.

Mecca: So a Nursing student would have to take that course and a statistics course?

Nate Bitzley: What we didn't like about the old amendment, which was voted down, was the lack of specificity. I believe it's possible to have a statistics course with enough mathematics in it to meet Goal 5. Underlying statistics is mathematics. The statistics course your students take would have to contain enough mathematics to meet the requirements of Goal 5.

Mecca: The course would have to be from your department?

Bitzley: Not necessarily. Whoever offers the course would have to meet certain mathematical standards.

Morrison: Since the phrase "or statistics" has already been voted down, would the effect of the proposed amendment be to eliminate the phrase on passing a placement test as an alternative?

Buser: With the existing mechanisms that Barbara Brothers pointed out (CLEP, AP, testing by exams), we don't feel that we need a placement exam; yes, in effect, this would eliminate a placement exam.

A vote was taken, and the proposed amendment failed.

file:///tp/Faculty%20Senate%20Minutes/Faculty%20Senate%20Minutes/Faculty%20Senate%20Minutes