

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
October 2, 2001

Chairperson Nowell called the October 2, 2001 meeting of the University Senate to order at 3:22 p.m. in the Alumni Auditorium of the Eberly College of Business.

The following Senators were **excused** from the meeting: M. Anthony, H. Boda, C. Carranza, B. Carter, D. Hulings, S. Krevel, F. Nee, W. Nunn., H. Powers, M. Sadler, R. Soni, G. Torges-Hoffman, V. Watson.

The following Senators (students) were **excused** from the meeting: C. Munn, M. Savidge, A. Thomas.

The following Senators were **absent** from the meeting: O. Agozino, M. Ashamalla, R. Camp, D. Ellermeyer, W. Forbes, D. Luo, R. Martin, C. Orchard, E. Ruffner, S. Shiring, M. Vella, A. Wutsch.

In addition, the following Senators (students) were **absent** from the meeting: M. Beasecker, A. Berol, C. Dziados, T. Ellis, R.S. Lee, A. Nixon, M. Petrowski, N. Rank, J. Roth, J. Walsh, L. Zack.

The minutes of the September 4, 2001 meeting were **ACCEPTED**.

Agenda items for the October 2, 2001 meeting were **ACCEPTED**.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Dr. Pettit)

It is healthy that as a nation we do not dwell on the events of September 11, but today I wish to reflect with you on how the impact of such tragedy, and the national despair that it triggers, might affect each of us and in turn impact our relationships and our collective decision making.

Those of us who are old enough, and perhaps unfortunate enough, to have experienced life-changing traumas such as the death of loved ones, the loss of a job, the breakup of a marriage or other relationship, know that the ensuing period of anxiety or depression, even if not clinically noteworthy, is damaging to the soul, and we know that in such circumstances our behavior changes along with our brain chemistry. It is frightening as well as dysfunctional. It is probable that having experienced such events in our own lives, we are more vulnerable to the impact of the national tragedy, and that again our behavior may be tinted by the gripping influence of despair. Those too young or too fortunate to have had such an experience may now, or perhaps within the next several months will, be experiencing an inexplicable feeling of mild depression or anxiety resulting from the attacks of last month.

The danger is that most of us will become more self protective, less affable, and less able to work healthily in team efforts. We may become edgier and less tolerant of opposing views, and we may become alarmist in the face of incidents that normally we would take in stride. I think that all of us need to be more attentive to the possible effects of the national trauma on us personally and on us as a university community, and that we must strive to understand each other better and to accommodate contrary views.

This might be a good time for us to examine how we plan and how we make decisions as a university. When I began my presidency here in August of 1992, the university was faced with a \$35 million debt at the cogeneration plant, and that particular debt was predicted to grow to \$225 million by the end of the contract period with the utility company. In addition, the Financial Vice President notified me that, irrespective of the cogeneration debt, the university was headed toward a deficit of \$10 million in the next fiscal year. At that time the university's planning process had been suspended for about three years. I immediately put together a committee to refocus the university, charging it with producing suggestions to address the immediate fiscal crisis, but also to recommend a new strategic planning process.

Like all university bodies, this one was VERY deliberate, and it moved slowly. After about the first year or two of its work, the committee was disbanded because APSCUF withdrew on the grounds that they did not have a majority of the membership. So... I reappointed a successor, called "Refocus II," and gave APSCUF a majority of the membership. We solved the multimillion-dollar short-term problems without the committee's input. We had to. The committee did recommend a new strategic planning committee, and somewhat of a process. That committee worked well for us, and as a result we have a revised mission statement and a set of strategic objectives to guide our decisions.

Within the past few years, however, a storm of System initiatives in planning, restructuring, centralization and control, fiscal management, and performance funding, along with the imposition of common goals, has swept over us in a chaotic fashion, causing us to have to change our planning model substantially, and to respond continually to false starts as well as to authentic commands. Our new chancellor recognized at once the problems inherent in this approach, and she will reduce the chaos. But the radically changed format of planning will persist, and the university must change the way we plan, and the way we make decisions, in order to meet the needs of the System, and, just as importantly, in order to score well on the various System scales of performance.

I am not comforted by the fact that we have had to make so many decisions so quickly, and often at times of the year when the only persons around are those of us whose work is not interrupted by such niceties as holidays, semester break and summertime. But this is only part of the new reality that all universities face in one way or another. The external environment, in all its many facets, is substantially more demanding than ever before, and only those universities that can plan and make decisions swiftly will compete successfully. Government at all levels, business, our own System administration, will not wait for us to respond to society's needs and will not give us forever to open our windows of opportunity. They will simply move on to those institutions that have modern response capability.

Today I wish to begin the process of streamlining the manner in which we plan and the way in which we make decisions. First, I propose to replace the old strategic planning committee with a new University Planning Council which the president of the university will chair. Unlike its predecessors, the planning council will integrate budget and planning and will provide a mechanism for informing the campus community about the university's planning efforts as they relate to the System's business plan. This also will be a mechanism for sharing budget information, and for advising the president and his senior staff on planning and budget issues. The membership will be broadly representative, as before, only this time we will not forget the student congress. I will be consulting with constituent groups in

the designation of their members. Staff support for the council will be provided by the executive director for planning and analysis, who reports directly to the president.

Second, I ask the Senate to appoint a special committee to work with me and my senior staff in analyzing and recommending changes in the way in which the university makes decisions. The aim, however, is not to disperse power and slow down the process. The aim is to figure out how we can move faster and still preserve shared governance. Perhaps we have to re-define shared governance so that it fits contemporary circumstances. Perhaps we have to think of this hallowed academic concept as something that must serve the best interests of the university as a whole, rather than the best interests of the university's constituent parts. In any event, we need to determine how we can "fast track" certain decisions in certain circumstances without weakening the legitimacy of the decision once it is made. We need to bring into balance process and outcomes. Process is important, but universities have a habit of enshrining process to the point of ignoring the outcome. I have seen too many examples of where a university group congratulates itself for having dotted all the "i"s and crossed all the "t"s, and is impervious to the mediocrity of the result. I wish to preserve community, I wish to honor process, but I want only the best results for this university. I hope that we will have a committee of persons willing to take on this task. It could be one of the most important contributions anyone has made to IUP in several years.

Thank you.

PROVOST'S REPORT (Dr. Staszkiwicz)

At the last Senate meeting I reported that as part of the State System's Performance and Outcome Planning process, IUP will need to review all low enrolled programs and courses. In response to a question from Senator Rafoth, I indicated that this process would involve faculty. The review will have to take place this fall semester and the analysis and decisions will need to be concluded by the end of the spring semester. Working with the Council of Deans, we have developed a series of questions that deans will work with faculty to answer. These include:

Low Enrolled Majors

1. What are the enrollment levels in required courses in the major? In major specific electives?
2. Are there related majors in the department and/or other departments? What are their enrollment levels? What consolidation or overlap is possible?
3. How central is the program to the mission of the University, college or department? Is it a vital part of an Area of Special Competency and Distinction?
4. What is the impact of accreditation and/or regulatory agencies? Provide specific documentation.
5. Is the program a System designated "high need" area?
6. Do special programmatic needs or faculty competencies impact the number of majors that can be served?
7. Is availability of qualified/specialized faculty an issue?
8. What are the costs (including complement) of the program and potential savings if the program were reduced or eliminated?
9. What are the costs associated with increasing enrollments to an acceptable level?

Low Enrolled Courses

1. How many sections are offered? How often? What is their enrollment?
2. Are there locationl issues or special audiences to serve?
3. How many majors require the course?
4. What are available alternatives? (e.g., other liberal studies or electives)
5. Are there physical or equipment constraints?
6. Are there accreditation and/or regulatory constraints?
7. How central is the course to specific majors?
8. What are the costs and potential savings?
9. What are the costs associated with increasing enrollments?

At this point, we are still early in the process and have begun to identify the type of information that will be needed. I want to emphasize that NO decision has been made about any program or set of courses. We expect that deans and faculty will work together to provide appropriate information so that informed decisions can be made.

We all recognize that the recent decision on the University School has left many concerned about the process used in making such decisions and I hope that the process in reviewing the credit-bearing programs will be accepted. Certainly, it will feed nicely into the planning council model President Pettit has just announced.

I assume there may still be questions concerning the University School and I will try to answer them now or, if you prefer, to wait until “new business” on today’s agenda.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT (Dr. Nowell)

Needless to say, much has happened since we last met. The tragedies in New York and Washington, D.C., seem somehow to make our business and concerns insignificant in the overall scheme of the world. On the other hand, the freedoms we struggle to preserve in our country are reflected in the daily struggles we have in the universities of America to preserve academic freedom and the democratic ideals of shared governance. A major decision was made recently by the President and the Council of Trustees that brings into question their dedication to the concept of shared governance.

As Chair of one of the departments of the College of Education and Educational Technology, I was visited by my Associate Dean on the day that the Indiana Gazette broke the story that a proposal was to be made to close the University School. This was the “notified by word of mouth” that the Provost suggested to you at the last Senate meeting had occurred. If the administration felt that it was unnecessary to consult with the chairs of the college, why did they go through this charade and then mislead you by suggesting some worthwhile consultation had been done. Not only were the chairs not informed, but the Provost has also stated that the Dean of the College was not informed that the proposal was to be made until the decision had been made. This is, of course, in direct opposition to the proclaimed decentralization of the budgeting process.

Our Rules Committee has examined the process that was followed – or not followed – by the administration, and they came to the conclusion that the Senate Constitution has been violated. Therefore, I sent the following message to the President and the Provost:

Drs. Pettit and Staszkiwicz:

As Chair of the IUP Senate, I am informing you that the Rules Committee of the Senate voted at its recent meeting that, in regards to your recent presentation to the Council of Trustees of a motion to close the University School, you have violated the constitution of the Senate. The Constitution requires you to consult with the Senate regarding decisions related to policies and academic programs at the University, except under certain circumstances. Let me quote from the constitution

"Purpose:

The purpose of the University Senate is to provide a formal means through which the student body, faculty, staff, and the administration, working as a unified group, shall have a representative share in the governance of the University. In order to further a sense of University community on all issues of governance, the Senate shall have a consultative role to the President and Council of Trustees that is designed to empower the Senate with a significant voice in the governance of the University. The University Senate shall approve all curricular matters before they are implemented.....

.....The Senate can study any issue of university governance and make recommendations to the President and Council of Trustees. The President and the Council of Trustees, (when possible), shall provide the University Senate an opportunity to review all policies and make recommendations prior to their implementation.

As a matter of expediency, occasionally it may be necessary for administrative personnel, during the normal exercise of their duties, to initiate or modify policies when there is insufficient time to present such matters to the University Senate for consultation. The initiators of such policies shall immediately give notification of their action to the senate Chair and the Chair of the Rules Committee. If it applies, notification shall also be given to the Chair of the Senate Committee within whose purview subject policy matters ordinarily fall. Such policies will automatically be included as New Business on the agenda of the Senate meeting immediately following such enactment."

Neither the chair of the Rules Committee nor myself received any notification from you indicating that there was any "matter of expediency" in the decision about the University School, nor were we notified following the decision. The Rules Committee has requested that the other provision [be followed]-- placing the decision on the agenda as New Business will be done at the coming Senate meeting. Please be prepared to present the circumstances that led to this decision requiring expediency on the part of the administration and why myself and Dr. Radell were not notified.

Furthermore, Dr. Radell and I are of the opinion that you have violated the state law governing the institutions of the State System of Higher Education. In "Act 188 - Section 20-2010-A.

Power and Duties of Institution Presidents," item #2 states, .. (2) To make and implement specific campus policies pertaining to instructional programs, research programs, and public service programs and academic standards in accordance with policies of the Board FOLLOWING CONSULTATION WITH COUNCIL, FACULTY, AND STUDENTS" (emphasis added). The law clearly states that consultation is required, and there is no evidence that you made any attempt to consult with the Senate or other faculty and student groups prior to the motion presented to the Council.

Given the major violation of the curriculum process last year, I am afraid that this is a continuing pattern of violations of this law and our constitution, and I urge you to cease and desist your disregard for the Senate in your governance of the University. We will all look forward to discussing this matter at the coming Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Nowell, Chair
IUP University Senate

A correction of my letter is that the Rules Committee concluded that the issue of the University School must be put on our agenda for New Business, given the guidelines in the Constitution.

Today you (have heard and) will hear the administration's opinion that there is no binding wording in the Constitution and the state law that required them to consult with the Senate before making this decision. Even if they are correct (and I don't believe they are), I believe that if this administration wants to work with us in a collaborative way, it only makes sense to involve the Senate in hard decisions such as the closing of the University School. The farce that was acted out with the Council of Trustees to pretend to have meaningful dialogue was disgraceful and insulting. At the end of the Finance Committee meeting there was the reading of a statement meant to seem to come from within the trustees. Given that the trustee assigned to read it couldn't make sense out of the written word, it was obvious that it was the administration that had authored the statement and that this was another example of the meaninglessness of having a Council of Trustees that (with the death of Pat Stapleton) simply rubber stamps anything the administration wants.

All of this has filled me with great sadness, on top of that I feel from our national calamity. I have been in a quandary as to what to do. In my worst moments, I have even considered suggesting we dissolve the Senate and let the administration do whatever they want, if they are going to do that anyway. But this is not their university. It belongs to all of us, faculty, students, staff, as well as administration. I cannot accept capitulation.

We have heard that these are desperate times financially for the university and that such times require drastic action. I do not question the right of the administration to make this kind of a decision. But I do question their doing so without input from the various groups that comprise this university. If we are to continue to face such difficult decisions, we need to face them together.

I support the President's proposal to establish a committee that will work with the administration to facilitate shared governance. I would hope that such a committee would refer issues to appropriate

Senate Committees as seen appropriate. Membership should include faculty, students, and staff, as well as administrators. I hope that this will be a positive step in moving away from unilateral decisions and toward shared governance.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT (Senator Coulson)

Student Congress has been working on the following activities this month:

- President Cramer and I met with Dr. Pettit in order to form an AD-HOC committee to find possible alternatives to the current mascot. Student Congress plans to set up polling places to survey the student population in residence halls and the dining facilities. Once the survey is completed, SC plans on taking the most popular alternative from the survey results, and then eventually presenting them to the Board of Trustees in the spring.
- Student Congress plans on participating in the Homecoming Parade this Saturday.
- In a continuing effort to make the student body more knowledgeable, Student Congress is posting reminder signs for students to meet with their advisors to schedule their classes for the spring semester.
- Pat Brooks, the new director of the food service, came for a question and answer session during the past Student Congress meeting. Complaints and suggestions for the operations of Aramark were aired, resulting in minor changes to the food service already. An SC member, (Aron Honick,) was hired by Mr. Brooks as an intern after speaking with him after the SC meeting. He plans on working with Mr. Brooks to continuously improve problems that the food service is having.

Thank you, and I hope you all have a good week!

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to discuss.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

RULES COMMITTEE (Chairperson Radell)

See Appendix A, page for this committee report.

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE (Chairperson Andrew)

This is the time of the year that nominations for Professor Emeritus status must be made. Those who would like to make nominations must do so by November 1, 2001 to the appropriate Dean of the specific college.

AWARDS COMMITTEE (Chairperson Jackson)

The awards committee met on Tuesday, September 25, 2001 and the calendar for the year will be posted on the senate web site (www.iup.edu/senate and click on “awards” on the home page). Winners will be recognized at Honor’s Day and at the May commencement, and the dates/timeline reflects this change.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (Chairperson Sechrist and Numan)

See Appendix B, page for this committee report.

GRADUATE COMMITTEE (Chairpersons Kondo and Chambers)

The Graduate Curriculum Handbook has been revised. It has been placed on the web and is located at: <http://www.iup.edu/graduate/admit/handbook/>

LIBRARY AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE (Chairperson Pagnucci)

The next committee meeting will be on October 9, 2001 in Stably, 101. The chair noted that with the conversion completed from the Dewey to the Library of Congress system that there is much more cross-reference capabilities with the Library of Congress. Additionally, the chair recognized the staff of the library for completing the conversion well *ahead* of schedule! Congratulations and thank you to all library staff members.

NONCREDIT COMMITTEE (Chairperson Barton)

The next meeting will be on October 30, 2001 in Keith Hall, Room 100.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE (Chairperson Numan)

The committee met on September 11, 2001 and reviewed proposals which included:

1. Dr. Patricia Villalobos Escheverria received \$1500 to construct and present a new work of art at the Prague Print Triennial.
2. Dr. Laurence Kruckman received \$1500 to complete a documentary video “Ceramic Technology of La Chamba.”
3. Dr. Helen Sitler received \$252 to fund research assessing the use of innovative teaching methods in ENGL 202 Research Writing.

The committee encourages proposal submissions for the monthly research awards and senate fellowship competitions.

The next USRC meeting will be Tuesday, October 9, 2001 at 3:15 p.m. in Clark Hall.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Chairperson Hall)

The Student Affairs committee met on September 18th. Routine business was set aside in order to discuss the recent national tragedy and its impact on the university community. The next meeting is scheduled for October 16, 2001 at 3:30 p.m. in the Oak Room West.

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE (Chairperson Domaracki)

This committee will meet on Tuesday, October 9, 2001 in 257 Davis at 3:15 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS-University School Closing

An extensive discussion was held regarding the recent decision to close the University School. Dr. Hechtman, Director of the University School addressed the Senate regarding the time line of being told of the potential closure through the actual decision by the Council of Trustees. Numerous questions were asked and Senators Pettit and Staszkiwicz responded, particularly questions as to what must and must not come to the senate.

It was moved by Senator Radell and seconded by Senator Bransford to request Senators Pettit and Staszkiwicz to bring to the senate at the next meeting documents and evidence as to how and when the decision was made to close the University School, and the legal justification/legal counsel's rationale for not bringing the decision to the University Senate. Senator Duntley added a friendly amendment, which was seconded and passed, that the information provided by Drs. Pettit, and Staszkiwicz should be sent directly to the Rules Committee. The motion passed.

During this discussion, motions were made to extend the meeting first to 5:10 p.m. and then 5:25 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan B. Smith, Ed.D.

APPENDIX A
Rules Committee
Chairperson Radell

Rules Committee Report

Response to request of the Senate Chair to rule on the constitutionality of the process of a decision:

The committee rules [that] the manner in which the decision to close the University School was made is in violation of the University Senate Constitution. [adopted by majority vote of the Rules Committee on September 25, 2001].

Excerpts from supporting documents:

IUP SENATE CONSTITUTION
 Revised 10/2000

PURPOSE

The purpose of the University Senate is to provide a formal means through which the student body, faculty, staff, and the administration, working as a unified group, shall have a representative share in the governance of the University. In order to further a sense of University community on all issues of governance, the Senate shall have a consultative role to the President and Council of Trustees that is designed to empower the Senate with a significant voice in the governance of the University. The University Senate shall approve all curricular matters before they are implemented...

The Senate can study any issue of university governance and make recommendations to the President and Council of Trustees. The President and the Council of Trustees, (when possible), shall provide the University Senate an opportunity to review all policies and make recommendations prior to their implementation.

As a matter of expediency, occasionally it may be necessary for administrative personnel, during the normal exercise of their duties, to initiate or modify policies when there is insufficient time to present such matters to the University Senate for consultation. The initiators of such policies shall immediately give notification of their action to the senate Chair and the Chair of the Rules Committee. If it applies, notification shall also be given to the Chair of the Senate Committee within whose purview subject policy matters ordinarily fall. Such policies will automatically be included as New Business on the agenda of the Senate meeting immediately following such enactment....

Nothing relating to the organization and administration of the University Senate shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Council of Trustees or the President of the University with respect to the administration of the University as prescribed by law.

Pennsylvania ACT 188: Powers and Duties of Presidents

...(2) To make and implement specific campus policies pertaining to instructional programs, research programs, and public service programs and academic standards in accordance with policies of the Board following consultation with council, faculty, and students....

2001-2002 Undergraduate Catalog
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15705

...The University School provides a program of instruction for students in kindergarten through sixth grade. In addition, the school offers a rich variety of experimental and research activities for IUP faculty and students. Faculty members from disciplines as varied as music, physical education, Spanish, elementary education, and special education have ongoing programs which are carried out at the university School. Each year, hundreds of teacher education students participate in activities such as observations, lesson presentations, and student teaching. Graduate students utilize the University School to conduct research on teaching and learning. Research and experimental activities are scheduled with the director of the University School.

APPENDIX B
University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Co-Chairpersons Sechrist and Numan

FOR INFORMATION

1. Liberal Studies Committee Report:

Approved title change for LBST 499 Constructing Appalachia. New title: Appalachian Culture.

Approved Dr. James Cahalan, English Dept., as faculty for LBST 499 Appalachian Culture.

Approved LBST 499 Men and Masculinities, Dr. Robert Heasley, Sociology Dept.

2. Honors College Committee Report:

The following courses were approved for /H/ credit:

ENGL 480 Seminar for Distinction in English

PHIL 400 Honors Ethics and Public Policy

EDSP 102 Educational Psychology

FOR ACTION

1. The Department of Biology -- New Course

PASSED

BIOL 477 Neurobiology

3c-0l-3sh

Prerequisites: BIOL 111 or 105, or 151, or PSYC 350 or permission of instructor.

This course presents the underlying mechanisms through which the nervous system mediates behavior, from the molecular to the organismal level. This course emphasizes two major themes: 1) the roles of synapses and neuronal excitability in shaping the input/output functions of neurons and neuronal networks and 2) the role of neuronal development and neuronal experience upon resultant neuronal organization.

Rationale: This course is designed to satisfy two needs within the College: (1) to provide a course for the undergraduate pre-physical therapy program in Natural Science, and (2) to serve as a biology elective for Biology and Pre-Medicine majors. This course is also designed to be an elective for the eventual cognitive science minor.

2. The Robert E. Cook Honors College

PASSED

A. New Course

HNRC 202 Honors Core: Sciences

4c-0l-4sh

Prerequisites: HNRC 101, HNRC 102, sophomore standing, admission to Honors College
 HNRC 202 is concerned with science as a way of knowing about the world. It focuses on what scientists have learned about what it means to be human, how humans have been shaped by and, in turn, have influenced their environment, and on what use might be made of scientific knowledge. These themes will be explored from disciplines in the natural and social sciences.

Rationale: HNRC 202 is intended to fulfill some Liberal Studies equivalents for students enrolled in the Honors College. This course will add a fourth semester to the Honors Core Sequence, and will satisfy the requirements of one non-lab science and one social science course for the majority of the students who enroll. It is also expected that the majority of students who take the psychology unit will opt to use it as an equivalent for PSYC 101 except for Psychology Majors who will still be required to complete PSYC 101. There may be instances in which a student will take both units as a non-lab science, or both units to equal two social science courses, but this will only be permitted in unusual circumstances by permission of the instructors and the Director of the Honors College. The new course will be modeled on existing core courses in format and will make the core curriculum more representative of the Liberal Studies program by including natural and social sciences.

The course will be interdisciplinary in nature. Four faculty will simultaneously teach each unit of the course, viz., two from the social sciences and two from the natural sciences. For the first time the course is offered, two faculty from Biology and one each from Anthropology and Psychology will teach the course, with students taking half the course from a biology professor and half from one of the social science faculty. In future years, other departments may develop proposals for approval and thus subsequent offerings of HNRC 202 may be staffed from different natural and social sciences, though the topical questions that focus the course will remain the same, and there will be a balance with two faculty from the natural sciences and two from the social sciences.

If all three initial departments retain the full complement of faculty, and with the cooperation and support of the Deans of Natural Sciences and Mathematics and Humanities and Social Sciences, the participating departments should be able to staff the new course on an annual basis.

B. New Course

HNRC 499 Honors Senior Synthesis

PASSED

var3-6sh

Prerequisite: 3.25 QPA, Honors College good standing or permission of instructor, 73 or more semester hours earned

Concluding crossdisciplinary Honors College experience, focused on the question "What are the obligations of the educated citizen?" The course helps students understand and handle complex intellectual issues from multiple perspectives. A selection of topics is announced and described in the undergraduate course schedule. Substitutes for LBST 499 Senior Synthesis.

Rationale: This proposal fulfills a charge given by the IUP Senate when it adopted the original *Plan for an IUP Honors College* in December 1992. Speaking about the Senior Synthesis course, the *Plan* said, "Because Honors College students will have experienced interdisciplinary, synthetic thinking in their earlier courses, it makes sense to think about this course differently for them. The course should draw out, synthesize, and reflect on what the Honors College has done for these students. It should also provide closure to the four years of honors work."

As the first graduating class reached its senior year in 1999-2000, the Honors College Committee and the Liberal Studies Committee designated certain LBST 499 sections as honors sections, and professors teaching those sections made some adjustments in expectations, content, and pedagogy for the different audience. These were very good courses, but we think we can do even better.

At the mundane level, a discrete course number will solve certain administrative difficulties. The existence of non-honors and honors sections of the same course number created enough confusion that students did not always enroll in an appropriate section. Some non-Honors College students enrolled in an honors section when they did not really want one. In addition, it was apparently difficult for Honors College students not to see the entire list of intriguing synthesis sections as open to them and fulfilling their requirement.

More importantly, a discrete honors version of LBST 499 has pedagogical implications mentioned in the educational vision laid out by the Senate-approved *Plan*. We are proposing a course that incorporates all of the objectives and criteria for the regular LBST 499 Senior Synthesis yet goes beyond this to provide what the 1992 *Plan* envisioned--"closure to four years of honors work." Having a different course number will make it more likely that faculty and students will think about this course in a different way and take full advantage of the learning opportunities. HNRC 499 does this in intentional ways such as by the prefix "HNRC" linking the course to earlier honors courses.

Like the honors core courses, there will be an overarching question--"What are the Obligations of the Educated Citizen"--to focus the new course and to link it to earlier honors pedagogy. This also achieves the *Plan*'s hope for a concluding course that moves students "from thinking 'what have I accomplished' to 'what can this mean for others.'" This does not mean that sections of HNRC 499 will all be identical; each will still have its own topic just as all current synthesis sections do. The overarching question will encourage students and faculty to draw out the implications of whatever they are studying in a way that is consistent with the existing synthesis course goals and their earlier honors course work. During the academic year, HNRC 499 will only be offered as a 3sh course; however, it may be offered as a 6sh course during the summer if offered as an intensive study abroad course of a duration that normally receives 6sh of IUP credit.

C. New Catalog Description

PASSED

Current Catalog Description:

Course Requirements for Students Admitted as Freshmen

Students admitted as freshmen are required to complete 23 semester hours of honors work including:

- 14 hours: Honors College Core I, II, and III (HNRC 101, 102, and 201) --a three-semester "core" sequence of 14 semester hours which replaces Liberal Studies requirements for ENGL 101 and 121, MUSC (sic. MUHI) 101, THTR 101, ARHI 101, HIST 195, and either RLST 100 or PHIL 120.
- 3 hours: Honors LBST 499 Senior Synthesis
- 6 hours: An additional 6 semester hours of Honors College courses which must fulfill the following requirements:
 - A. At least one advanced honors course (300 level or above) in addition to LBST 499
 - B. At least one honors course in a non-humanities area (the same course might meet requirements A and B)

C. An honors course during every academic year (requirement may be waived for students participating in study abroad or off-campus internships)

Students are also encouraged to complete an undergraduate thesis for graduation from the Honors College with distinction.

Course Requirements for Students Admitted as Sophomores

Sophomore “transfer” students are required to complete 18 semester hours of honors work and must meet the same course requirements as freshmen with the exception of HNRC 101 and 102, from which they are exempted.

Proposed Catalog Description:

Course Requirements for Students Admitted as Freshmen

Students admitted as freshmen are required to complete 24 semester hours of honors work including:

18 hours: Honors Core I, II, III (HNRC 101, 102, 201) and Honors Core: Sciences (HNRC 202). HNRC 101 and 102 is a first-year sequence; HNRC 201 and 202 may be taken in either order during subsequent semesters. HNRC 101, 102, and 201 replace Liberal Studies requirements for College Writing (ENGL 101), three humanities courses (ENGL 121, HIST 195, and either RLST 100 or PHIL 120), and one fine arts course (either ARHI 101, MUHI 101, or THTR 101). HNRC 202 replaces Liberal Studies requirements for either one non-laboratory science and one social science or two non-laboratory sciences or two social sciences, depending on the units selected.

3 hours: HNRC 499 Honors Synthesis (replaces Liberal Studies requirement for LBST 499)

3 hours: additional honors course work

Students are encouraged to complete at least one honors course during every academic year, although it is recognized that this might not be possible for students participating in study abroad or off-campus internships.

Students are also encouraged to complete an undergraduate thesis for graduation from the Honors College with distinction. Students may enroll for thesis credit by completing the necessary approval forms and scheduling HNRC 483 Honors Thesis or, in some departments, by scheduling a departmental honors thesis course.

Course Requirements for Students Admitted as Sophomores

Sophomore “transfer” students are required to complete 17 semester hours of honors work and must meet the same course requirements as freshmen with the exception of HNRC 101 and 102 from which they are exempted.

D. Course Requirements for Students Admitted as Freshmen and Course Requirements for Students Admitted as Sophomores--Program Revisions **PASSED**

<p>CURRENT PROGRAM—23sh Course Requirements for Students Admitted as Freshmen</p>	<p>PROPOSED PROGRAM—24 sh Course Requirements for Students Admitted as Freshmen</p>
<p>14 hours: Honors Core I, II, III (HNRC 101, 102, 201) --a three semester "core" sequence of 14 semester hours which replaces Liberal Studies requirements for ENGL 101 and 121, MUSC [<i>sic.</i> MUHI] 101, THTR 101, ARHI 101, HIST 195, and either RLST 100 or PHIL 120.</p> <p>3 hours: Honors LBST 499 Senior Synthesis</p> <p>6 hours: An additional 6 semester hours of Honors College courses which must fulfill the following requirements:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A: At least one advanced honors course (300 level or above) in addition to LBST 499.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">B. At least one honors course in a non-humanities area (the same course might meet requirements A and B)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">C. An honors course during every academic year (requirement may be waived for students participating in study abroad or off-campus internships)</p>	<p>18 hours: Honors Core I, II, III (HNRC 101, 102, 201) and Honors Core: Sciences (HNRC 202). HNRC 101 and 102 is a first-year sequence; HNRC 201 and 202 may be taken in either order during subsequent semesters. HNRC 101, 102, and 201 replace Liberal Studies requirements for College Writing (ENGL 101), three humanities courses (ENGL 121, HIST 195, and either RLST 100 or PHIL 120), and one fine arts course (either ARHI 101, MUHI 101, or THTR 101). HNRC 202 replaces Liberal Studies requirements for either one non-laboratory science and one social science <u>or</u> two non-laboratory sciences <u>or</u> two social sciences, depending on the units selected.</p> <p>3 hours: HNRC 499 Honors Synthesis (replaces Liberal Studies requirement for LBST 499)</p> <p>3 hours: additional honors course work</p>
<p>Current Program (Students Admitted as Sophomores)</p>	<p>NEW PROGRAM—17sh (Students Admitted as Sophomores)</p>
<p>Sophomore "transfer" students are required to complete 18 semester hours of honors work and must meet the same course requirements as freshmen with the exception of HNRC 101 and</p>	<p>Sophomore "transfer" students are required to complete 17 semester hours of honors work and must meet the same course requirements as freshmen with the exception of HNRC 101 and</p>

102, from which they are exempted.	102, from which they are exempted.
------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Rationale for Change:

The primary academic reason for adding HNRC 202 to the honors program is to strengthen and broaden the core sequence by including the natural and social sciences. The *Plan for an IUP Honors College* (adopted by the Senate in 1992) created a core sequence comprised entirely of humanities and fine arts units. At the time, no one considered this ideal, but all knew that these were the areas of the Liberal Studies program where there were the fewest prescribed choices, and this made them the easiest areas to target in the beginning. Now, extending the core is feasible as well as pedagogically warranted.

Exit interviews with the first class of graduating seniors emphatically urged inclusion of the natural and social sciences in the core sequence. Science majors spoke passionately and persuasively of the need for students to engage scientific knowledge with the same rigor as they now engaged the humanities and fine arts. As one put it succinctly, “You cannot be well educated if you have no idea about science.”

The proposed HNRC 202 follows the model—actually the nationally acclaimed model—now in use for the existing core courses. This model, based on intellectually challenging “core questions,” will encourage students to think of their core classes as an integrated whole and to carry intellectual skills developed in earlier courses into later ones. While an abstract argument might be made for a 5sh or 6sh version of HNRC 202, experience with the 4sh HNRC 201 demonstrates that a 4sh course is academically justifiable and, in any case, sits at the outside limit of what can be fitted into many student schedules.

Following the existing model in which honors core courses replace certain Liberal Studies requirements, this revision proposes that students taking HNRC 202 earn social science and/or non-laboratory science credit according to the formula explained above in the new catalog description. It is clearly understood that some students’ options may be restricted by requirements set by their majors. A few students may not be able to take full advantage of the exchange, but this is currently the case with the existing humanities/fine arts replacements.

In addition to the primary academic reasons for HNRC 202, its creation will solve some other nagging scheduling problems. Student exit interviews were justifiably critical of unpredictable scheduling of courses to meet the 6sh of honors electives. While students often needed to plan well in advance, departments (whose resources were often tight) frequently could not announce honors electives until the last minute. The regular scheduling of HNRC 202 will alleviate much of the unpredictability and pressure both for students and chairs.

The revision also introduces additional flexibility for students with very tight major sequences by allowing HNRC 201 and HNRC 202 to be taken in either order and in any of the last six semesters. For added flexibility, this revision changes the current requirement that students take an honors course each year to an encouragement. In consideration of the university’s limited resources to provide elective honors courses and for further flexibility, this revision deletes the requirement of a 300+ level honors course, which is often simply impractical. While most elective honors courses are numbered above 300,

some highly successful and demanding courses, such as ENGL 208 Art of the Film, are not, and there seems no justification for excluding them on either an academic or practical basis.

A final rationale for the change relates to national credibility and thus to recruiting of superior students. Common shortcomings of honors programs are that they are weak in the sciences and are front-loaded in the first two or three semesters. This revision, which brings the natural and social sciences into the core and extends the program through to the senior synthesis course, will significantly improve the quality, and thus the recognition, of IUP's program.

Requirements for students entering the Honors College as sophomores are being similarly adjusted. The creation of HNRC 202 should significantly strengthen the program for these students by giving them two core experiences rather than one. The total of required credits is being lowered from 18 to 17 so that the number of "additional" hours is a multiple of three, the typical semester hours for an honors elective. The revision thus removes an existing awkwardness since the current requirement is for 11 additional hours.

The new requirements will be effective for students admitted to the Honors College after the program is approved and appears in the catalog. Students enrolled prior to the new program's full approval will have the option of meeting either the old or new requirements.