

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

March 7, 2001, 4:00 p.m.

Room 132, DeBartolo Hall

PDF Version

Note 1: Please submit agenda items and cover sheets for the April 4 Senate meeting to Bege Bowers, English Department, by noon on Friday, March 23. Provide both a hard copy and a disk copy of your report and cover sheet in Word or rich text format. A downloadable cover sheet is available at the Academic Senate web site:

<http://cc.yosu.edu/acad-senate/index.html>

Note 2: If you want to read or print the pdf version of these minutes 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>

To save paper, use the Acrobat Reader menus or toolbar to print the file, not the menus or toolbar in your web browser.

OVERVIEW:

Major topics presented/discussed: Need for committee volunteers for next year; change in oral communication-intensive general education requirement; changes in policy concerning CR/NC courses taken as student option; endorsement of the general education policy/procedures presented at the February Senate meeting; changes in Academic Standing Policy.

POLICY/PROCEDURES CHANGES:

- A reduction of the oral communication-intensive requirement of the General Education Model to one course beyond the required oral communications course. (Changes in catalog language appear in Attachment 2 to the agenda for the March 7 Senate meeting.)
- A reduction, from 30 semester hours to 15 semester hours, in the number of hours that must be completed before taking a Credit/No Credit course (taken as student option). (Substitute 15 for 30 in paragraph 2 on page 32 of the current *Undergraduate Bulletin*, and replace the final sentence of paragraph 5 on page 32 with the following: Students are restricted to taking one CR/NC course per fall and spring semester and one CR/NC course per non-overlapping summer term).
- Changes in the Academic Standing Policy. (The policies presented in Attachment 2 to the agenda for the March 7 Senate meeting will replace the language on page 34 of the current *Undergraduate Bulletin*).

ACTIONS:

The following motion carried: With Senate approval, the Charter and Bylaws Committee will draft language to change the composition of the Academic Standards Committee to include a representative of the colleges' professional advising staff.

The following motion carried: That the oral communication-intensive requirement of the General Education Model be reduced to one course beyond the required oral communications course.

The following amended motion carried: 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 and spring semester and one Credit/No Credit course per non-overlapping summer term.

The following motion carried: 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 standards 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.

The following motion carried: As soon as possible, but no later than summer 2001, the new Academic Standing Policy presented in Attachment 2 to the agenda for the March 7 Senate meeting will replace the current language in the catalog.

CALL TO ORDER:

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

Minutes of the 7 February 2001 meeting were approved as posted. They are available at the Senate web site.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (SEC)/REPORT FROM THE CHAIR: Jim Morrison made the following announcements:

- The SEC has met twice since the last Senate meeting and will soon solicit faculty volunteers to serve on next year's standing Senate committees and administrative committees. Because of the semester calendar, the committee-assignment process must begin a month earlier than in the past. Volunteer, and encourage others in your department to volunteer. Each standing committee needs a representative from every undergraduate college; we follow the *Bylaws* policy that no faculty member may serve on more than one standing committee unless serving as an *ex officio*, or liaison, member.
- The SEC will soon take up issues related to questions raised in President Sweet's address at the last Senate meeting, which is posted on the web with the February minutes. These issues include promoting respect for others in our discourse on campus; policy suggestions concerning academic dishonesty; etc.

- The SEC has received correspondence from Student Government; it will be read when the Academic Standards Committee reports.

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL REPORT: Tom Shipka, our elected representative to the OFC, presented the report that appeared in Attachment 1 of the agenda for the March 7 Senate meeting.

In reference to item 5 in the report, he thanked Bob Hogue and Virginia Phillips for helping him prepare for a future meeting concerning information-technology skills that Ohio college graduates need. In reference to item 6, he noted that "Success Express," an outreach program to attract more high school students to colleges in Ohio, is important for YSU, and information about it is available on the Ohio Board of Regents' web site (<<http://www.regents.state.oh.us>>); see the following link: <http://www.ohiosuccessexpress.com/flash_index.html>.

The next OFC meeting is March 9. Shipka has been meeting with President Sweet to make sure the President, Shipka, and Jim Morrison are coordinated in positions they take at Board of Regents sessions in Columbus.

Discussion followed:

J-C. Smith, Philosophy and Religious Studies: Has the Ohio Faculty Council considered the possibility that there is a dedicated strategy, on the part of some state administrators, to keep subsidies low to encourage the development of side ventures, such as separate faculty-university corporations, as an additional source of funding? This is being called "academic capitalism" and is being pursued at other campuses.

Shipka: That specific issue has not come up. I don't think it's a secret, however, that a number of university presidents are skeptical about the budget proposal that came out of the Chancellor's office, because it diverted significant amounts of money from subsidy formula to other purposes, including "technology." So far, the "family squabble has been kept inside the house," but I suspect that in the next year or so, if the current Chancellor stays in office, there will be some strong public disagreements between and among certain presidents, at a minimum, and the Chancellor.


CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE: No report.


ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE: Louise Aurilio, chair of the committee, was ill and could not attend the March 7 Senate meeting. Reporting for her, Jim Morrison noted that the various colleges are beginning their spring elections (presumably for at-large positions first, then department senators). We would like to have the names of next year's student senators by mid May if possible, or as soon as possible after the new Student Government forms.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE: Martha Pallante, chair of the committee, commended members of her committee for their hard work during the past four weeks. She made the following motions:

 **Motion 1: With Senate approval, the Charter and Bylaws Committee will draft language to**

change the composition of the Academic Standards Committee to include a representative of the colleges' professional advising staff. The motion was seconded and carried.

 **Motion 2: That the oral communication-intensive requirement of the General Education Model be reduced to one course beyond the required oral communications course.** Changes in catalog language appear in Attachment 2 to the agenda for the March 7 Senate meeting. **The motion was seconded and carried.**

 **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 semester. The motion was seconded** and discussion followed.

Matthew Vansuch, Chair, Student Government Academic Affairs Committee, read from the students' correspondence to Jim Morrison (mentioned earlier):


At Monday's regular meeting of Student Government, the body passed the following motion:

We move to convey to the Academic Senate that Student Government does not support Motion 3 of the Academic Standards Committee in regard to the Credit/No Credit option.

We do not object to decreasing the hours necessary to take a Credit/No Credit course from 30 semester hours to 15 semester hours, but limiting students to one Credit/No Credit course during the summer inhibits the students' abilities to take the courses necessary to complete their academic careers. We strongly believe that this would simply be another obstacle placed in the students' path toward graduation, since students can now take two Credit/No Credit courses in the two, non-overlapping summer sessions.

The motion itself provided no justification . . . (if one is provided today, we feel we should be given ample time to discuss this issue with Student Government representatives). Currently, rules outline the procedures and regulations for taking Credit/No Credit courses, and we overwhelmingly feel that there is no justifiable reason for taking this action.

Motion to Amend the Main Motion

 **David Porter, Political Science: I move to amend Motion 3 to incorporate Student Government's concerns—basically to say students may take one Credit/No Credit course per non-overlapping summer term. The motion to amend was seconded,** and discussion followed.

Charles Singler, Geology: The language currently reads that there should be one CR/NC course in the fall and one in the spring, and it's a bit more liberal for the summer. I feel we should treat summer the same as fall and spring; we should have consistency across the terms. In that sense, one course per summer is consistent with one course per fall semester and one course per spring semester.

Porter: The truth is, though, that we don't treat summer the same. It has two sessions. It doesn't run for the same 15-week period. In addition, in the summer a number of students serve internships—one area where CR/NC plays a particularly important role. Since most students take courses either one half or the other, we should permit them to take one CR/NC course each session.

☞ **A vote was taken, and the motion to amend the main motion carried.**

Return to Discussion on the Main Motion as Amended

Singler: For clarification: The second paragraph on page 32 of the current *Undergraduate Bulletin* says that to take a course CR/NC, students must "have a grade point average of 2.00 or better." In the material attached to the agenda (page 6 of the pdf version), you have three dots there. Do the three dots stand for what's in the current *Bulletin*?

Pallante: Yes; the dots are just ellipsis to show that we didn't restate the whole paragraph.

☞ **A vote was taken, and Motion 3 carried as amended: 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 and spring semester and one Credit/No Credit course per non-overlapping summer term.**

☞ **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 standards developed by the General Education Committee, particularly 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.**

The motion was seconded, and a vote was taken; the motion carried.

☞ **Motion 5: As soon as possible, but no later than summer 2001, the new Academic Standing Policy presented in Attachment 2 to the agenda for the March 7 Senate meeting will replace the current language in the catalog. The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.**

Singler: I have several questions. First, why was the language changed to say good standing requires a 1.75 at 1-31 hours? The current language in the catalog specifies that students who have a minimum of 1.75 but not as high as a 2.0 would be on warning but would not be suspended. Why are we putting them into good standing at 1.75?

Pallante: I think that's a "freshman forgiveness clause." This was the recommendation of the academic advisors.

Singler: Does this also mean that if students do not have the 1.75, they can be suspended after one term on warning at 1-31 hours?

Pallante: No, I believe it's at the conclusion of the second term.

Singler: In the paragraphs that follow that, there is reference to new language on probation and suspension. May I suggest that you include references to how long that suspension will last? The current language says "will be suspended for one academic term before reinstatement on warning."

Pallante: That should stay the same; that was our intention.

Singler: Why is a student with a 2.0 for a term permitted to stay on warning or probation? If students got a 2.0 forever, they would still have a GPA below 2.0 if they started below 2.0. They would never graduate.

Pallante: We believed that suspending students who had reached the minimum of 2.0 was punitive. We understood that a student permanently receiving a 2.0 would never average above a 2.0. Students in such serious academic trouble should, with the help of their advisors, be taking those courses they've already failed and having their grades recalculated.

Singler: This seems to be the wrong message to send—that we are asking only a 2.0 when these students are at-risk to begin with, especially when the first paragraph of the policy says, "These are intended to signify a student's progress toward graduation." Maintaining a 2.0 after you've been on warning or probation doesn't get you to graduation. Why not say a 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, or whatever?

Pallante: That's the minimum that we require students to maintain. I would be glad to hear an alternative or a suggestion. A student who had a disastrous quarter and has been recovering from it ought to be rewarded for maintaining at least a 2.0.

Singler: I agree that we should not suspend someone who is making progress. I don't know that achieving a 2.0 in any one term is making progress. My last question concerns the final paragraph of your statement. The current language says that transfer students are admitted "according to their status at the university from which they are transferring." Are we dropping that language?

Pallante: We felt students should be held to the standards at YSU. For instance, a 1.8 could be the cut-off for good standing at another university.

Singler: Students who have been suspended or on warning at another university won't come here with the same status they had there?

Pallante: No. Their status here will be based on the grade point averages specified at YSU.

Patricia Sarro, Art: My question also concerns how long someone can be at 2.0 and get anywhere. Will the student continue indefinitely, or just be given another one or two semesters? Was that matter considered?

Pallante: It was considered but did not go into the final language.

Barbara Brothers, Arts and Sciences: One thing that makes this difficult is that we keep getting motions that are really four or five motions together. Motions used to come to us separately, so we could consider a motion, not catalog language. For example, if you want to change the fact that a 2.0 is necessary to stay on good standing, that is an issue to be looked at. It was looked at a

few years ago. One reason for the 2.0 was to help students. If you don't have some way to identify that they aren't in good standing, the students register in the middle of the term and there's no way to stop them from taking the courses. Presently, at the end of the term, students not in good standing come to the departments, and if they are registered inappropriately, they get advised before they dig the hole deeper.

I think this issue needs to be looked at by itself, and a rationale developed for it. This came up at a chairs' meeting in my college: when students had been on warning and done poorly but grade changes hadn't had a chance to go through, the students got a letter saying they were suspended. All we needed was a little more time. What started out to solve a problem is introducing others. I urge that we send this back to committee so the different issues get separated, and we can be clear about the changes we are passing and why those changes are needed—particularly because of the change of grade point average, which means we are less able to intervene early and get students into the right courses, to tell them to repeat courses, etc.

Pallante: We are making no recommendations about students on "hold."

Melissa Amorn, student senator, Health and Human Services: You used the term "freshman forgiveness." I know that at other universities, the term is used to apply to freshmen who have fallen below a certain GPA, but who are also allowed to retain their scholarships for a year or a year and a half. Do you know what effect the proposed policy will have on keeping scholarships if a student falls below a certain GPA?

Pallante: To my knowledge, the policy will do nothing to affect scholarships. But I would suggest that a student below 1.75 who is on scholarship should be looking for help elsewhere.

Marge Collins, College of Business: Students with 31 hours or less have to be advised already. Students with a 2.0 for the semester will have to be advised because they will be on probation. They will have the intervention they need.

Pallante: Collins was with the group of advisors that helped create this policy, and her point is a good one.

Tom Shipka, Philosophy and Religious Studies: I call the question.



A vote was taken, and the motion to accept the new Academic Standing Policy presented in Attachment 2 to the agenda for the March 7 Senate meeting carried.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE: Kathylynn Feld, chair of the committee, was away from campus. Jim Morrison read her report, which appears in Attachment 1 to these minutes.

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE: No report.

ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: No report.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE: Bill Jenkins, chair of the General Education Committee (GEC), reported:

The GEC's recommendation that the oral communication-intensive requirement be reduced from two

courses to one has just been passed as a motion from the Academic Standards Committee. Encourage departments to send submissions for intensive courses as soon as they can. This coming fall, students who are freshmen now will begin to need intensive courses. Some of the committees that have been advising the GEC about intensive courses will contact departments to offer help.

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Attachment 1: Academic Programs Committee Report

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

Date March 7, 2001 Report Number (For Senate Use Only) _____

Name of Committee Submitting Report Academic Programs Committee

Committee Status: Appointed Chartered

Names of Committee Members: _____

Kathlynn Feld (chair), Beverly Gray, Patricia Hoyson, Shakir Husain, Jane Shanabarger, David Stephens, Nancy Sweeney, Ray Shaffer, Janice Elias, Tenika Holden (student), Tammy King (ex officio).

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

The committee has approved the Political Science minor; it was circulated to the department chairs and deans for the ten-day period. There were no objections. It has been forward to Jim Morrison for his signature.

The Medical Coding Certificate Program (new program) and Respiratory Care Program (changed) were approved by the committee and are in circulation to the department chairs and deans. Other programs have been reviewed and referred back to the departments.

The following minors have been approved by the committee and are in circulation to the department chairs and deans: Economics, Theater, Developmental Psychology, General Psychology, General Sociology, History.

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?

Other relevant data: _____

**Kathylynn Feld, Committee Chair
Department of Health Professions**

Attachment 2: Attendance Sheet for March 7, 2001 (Scanned Image), is in a separate pdf file.