

MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING - OCTOBER 3, 1972

The meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Chairman, Lorrie Bright, at 3:30 PM Tuesday, October 3, 1972 in McVitty Auditorium. A quorum was present.

A committee was appointed as requested by Dr. Hassler and the Board of Trustees to do a study and make broad policy recommendations concerning the University judicial system. The committee is composed of three students and three faculty members, as follows:

Thomas Murray
Joseph Cimino
Karen Polaski
Dorothy Luckner
Edward E. Platt
Beverly Lucas, Temporary Chairman

The Chairman made the following report of the July meeting of the Board of Trustees: A number of promotions to full professor were reserved by the administration to fill vacancies and attract able people. Nine were awarded during the summer to eight faculty members and one administrator, in line with the recommendations made by Committee C, with the exception of one case.

A discussion followed concerning a series of curriculum proposals which were approved by Committee B, the Senate and the Board. Some of the proposals which were approved are being held in abeyance now because of funding problems at Harrisburg, resulting in a dictate that no new programs be instituted which might entail the hiring of new staff. One proposal was the offering of a major in journalism in the English Department, but the Chairman of the English Department is hopeful this program might be instituted.

Senator DeMark remarked that phase one of the implementation of the Journalism major can be realized without additional equipment, plant or faculty. She questioned that the process could be stopped by administrative fiat.

Chairman Bright replied that this is a matter of concern to the Senate, particularly if proposals which have passed up the ladder can be suspended by administrative fiat.

Senator Hazley requested that this discussion be included in the minutes of this meeting so that the Board of Trustees are aware of it.

Senator DeMark remarked that Dean Gillis, Academic Vice President, should have been present at the April 21 meeting of Committee B, of which he is a member, in order to register his complaints and objections at that time.

Senator Berry stated the minutes should also show a different point of view. This campus has a lot of problems because there has been unrestrained growth in departments which have good ideas and it is essential to the future of good education that there be a process where the income and outgo be balanced in order to preserve class size and all the other things that are precious to us. He was very pleased that we finally had a decision not to implement a curriculum simply because it had merit. There are many suggestions that have merit and are good things to do. Somewhere in the process someone with more background and knowledge than we bring to the Senate must have a chance to bring some input into the system. The future of the University is better for those decisions. Had there been a sudden release of funds from Harrisburg the programs might have been started. Where the first new program will be introduced is not known, but will certainly be out of those approved by the Senate. This body should not become alarmed at actions which work for betterment of all the departments by maintaining some degree of prudence in the fiscal management of the institution.

Senator Ferris said the point they are trying to make is whether this is going to be an effective body; if the administration wants to work with this body, they should work through it. Dean Gillis had two chances of stopping the proposal, both in Committee B and on the Senate floor. The administration should try to stop it up through the ladder rather than to wait until it is ready to be implemented.

Senator Smith then reported that the position of APSCUF on Committee C as written in the contract is that there may be no student members on the tenure committee and this fact invalidates Committee C of the Senate. It is possible that some kind of recommending procedure can be worked out through the Senate. The final tenure committee must be complete faculty as described in the contract.

Chairman Bright stated, for student information, that the contract does provide an avenue for student evaluation of faculty and students will be involved, though not necessarily through the Senate.

Senator Smith said this does not invalidate student participation on the departmental level. Final decision is with APSCUF, elected by complete faculty.

Chairman Bright stated that the question is whether to eliminate Committee C or if there any compelling reason to retain Committee C with duties which they did not initially have.

Senator Eisen asked if the committee remain in the Senate if its action would not be subject to Senate approval.

Chairman Bright replied that the whole Senate votes on Committee C and students could not vote for APSCUF tenure committee.

Senator Saylor stated that there does seem to be a principle involved. APSCUF does legally have a contractual responsibility, but the Senate has a moral responsibility to monitor personnel matters. If committees can be eliminated without Senate approval, then by June of next year there may not be a Senate. A study of advantages and disadvantages should be made and the appropriate action should be decided by the Senate.

Senator Tompkins asked if there is going to be a recommendation from Committee A about what should be done about Committee C.

Senator Marks stated that Committee A has forwarded a request to the chairman of Committee C to meet with its own membership and with members of APSCUF to make a recommendation back to Committee A on its own existence. The same should hold for Committee A.

The committee has not met. Chairman Bright requested that the committees report later to the Senate on the matter.

Mr. Wilson indicated that APSCUF was discussing the matter. Since this is part of the President's report, no action is needed. Those who have any feelings about the continued existence of Committee C were asked to report to Mr. Bright or APSCUF representatives or Committee C.

Senator Green, Chairman of Committee B, moved the adoption of the following:

- A. Delete third paragraph of Section 6213 of the Administrative Manual; and make the following revision of paragraph one of Section 6213:

"The Final week (formerly the final examination period) is a part of the regular academic program and must be incorporated into the instructor's course plan for the semester. The University recognizes that final examinations are not the only legitimate type of terminating activity and, therefore, allows the instructor the autonomy to determine the most suitable form of terminating activity, within the bounds of departmental, teaching team or course objectives. However, the terminating activity shall take place only during the time scheduled for his class during the special schedule provided for Final Week by the Scheduling Center. Exceptions to this policy must have prior approval of the dean of the school in which the course is taught."

The intent of this item is to recognize that there are ways by which a course can be terminated other than by a final examination. The intent is to provide some flexibility to the instructor. The terminating activity must be held during the final exam period.

Motion seconded by Senator Yenchko.

A question was asked: Does this in practice mean that there would be a short final examination schedule or that the last meeting of a class could serve as the final examination period?

Senator Eisen replied that one cannot give the final examination during the last class hour and eliminate the period scheduled as the final examination period because the schedule as now written does not count the examination period as part of the 82 1/2 hours instruction time mandated by the state. The proposal would allow an instructor to eliminate the final exam but it would not be consistent with policy to give the terminating activity before that week.

The motion for adoption passed.

Senator Green then moved the adoption of the following:

"The University recognizes that on some occasions an instructor may require more time for an exam or other activity than is provided in the normal class hour. Therefore, the Scheduling Center is directed to provide three blocks of time of two hours each per week during which no undergraduate classes are scheduled. Instructors wishing to conduct exams or other activities requiring more than the normal class time may use these block periods upon approval from their department chairmen. Instructors must, however, release one class period from regularly scheduled class hours for each block of time used, the purpose of this policy being not to increase the number of class hours, but to provide a longer period of consecutive time or to provide opportunity for mass meetings of multiple sections. Instructors should use only these block times for irregularly scheduled activities in order not to conflict with other regularly scheduled courses. Students should have full opportunity to make up exams which are given at irregularly scheduled times, and should be given ample advance notice of irregularly scheduled activities."

The intent is to provide three blocks of two hour periods during each week of the regular semester which may be used for holding examinations etc. outside the regular hour; this would structure a block of time for activity which may extend beyond fifty minutes.

Motion seconded by Senator Truxell.

Senator Murray said three blocks will be two hours each, while instructors are to release one class period. This does not equal out.

Senator DeMark said that this is done now and the way it works out is to the benefit of the student taking a test because the student has more time to finish a test.

Senator Eisen stated that the primary intent of this motion is that examinations will not conflict with other classes.

Senator Warren said under the current schedule there are approximately 35% of the exams meeting between 5 and 8 o'clock in the evening. If this were adopted to free a student, it would entail exams being held from 8 to 10 p.m.

Senator Eisen replied that Dale Marchand, a member of the subcommittee, had assured the committee it would be possible to work around that two hours, and that exams would not have to go until 10 p.m.

Senator Holt asked if anybody has made an investigation about how this plan would affect commuters.

Senator Eisen said students would have full opportunity to make up examinations which are given at irregularly scheduled times. No student should be bound to take an examination at the hours the course is not scheduled.

Senator Johnson said students appear to be intimidated when they have to face make-up exams which they feel may be more difficult than the regular exam.

Senator Fuget stated this will not remove the hint of a more difficult make-up exam.

Senator Eisen says it insures that the examination will not be scheduled with other regularly scheduled classes.

Senator Murray said most of the students have four or five courses. If a professor has the authority to have a two hour exam, that could add five extra hours per week. If Committee B wishes to put this through, revise it to two blocks per week. Release students for a similar period of time.

Senator Brode indicated that already many students are finding that schedules are running until late because of irregularly scheduled tests.

Senator H. Smith said the intent of the committee was to prevent what Brode is talking about. Intent is not to provide extra work for the students, but to prevent the "wildcat" tests and to have a regularly scheduled time these examinations can be given.

Senator Innes asked if we aren't making something legal that has been illegal. This schedule will not prevent many cuts happening when late tests are scheduled.

Senator Ferris moved to cut off debate. Seconded by Senator DeMark. Passed.

Then Bright called the original motion for the adoption of Section B: 32 ayes, 49 nays. Proposal defeated.

Called for a quorum count: 95 members present; there a few seats which have not been filled; hence there was a quorum.

Senator Eisen said the Senate voted two years ago to reject a motion to restrict all examinations to a legal single hour. What is the will of the Senate?

Senator Chamberlain suggested that people send their recommendations to the committee in writing.

Senator Green presented item C as a matter of information:

C. Ms. Mamie Anderzohn and Mr. Ralph Reynolds be recommended for Emeritus Status.

Senator Green then moved the adoption of the following new courses:

A. BM 480, The Practices and Processes of Collective Bargaining, 3 credits. This course will include the role, function, and authority of negotiation committees, techniques of negotiation, the negotiation agreement, the mediation process, and the arbitration process through mainly a case study approach.

B. Chem. 113-114, Concepts in Chemistry, 8 credits (4/course) (For Majors Only). (Chem. 111-112 to be retained as a non-majors course)

C. Art 418, Practicum in Slide Room Procedures, 1 credit. This short course will be devoted to the study of slide room practices and techniques; organization, cataloguing, filing, mounting, and labeling of slides.

D. Art 419, Museum Internship, 2-6 credits. The student will work at a cooperating museum under the supervision of the museum director learning the techniques and practices of such activities as: planning displays, preparing and setting up shows and exhibits, and catalogue write-ups. The student will present to the instructor a daily diary or an in-depth paper dealing with the work-learning experience.

Seconded by Senator Yenchko.

Senator Murray spoke in favor of the proposed Chemistry 113-114. Said there is not enough discrepancy in course numbers, and courses are not separated into non-majors and majors.

Senator Perry questioned the lack of funds for the courses.

Senator Green answered, that as with all the courses recommended by Committee B to the Senate, the committee have asked whether the course can be handled with current staff; no new staff will be necessary.

Motion for the adoption of A, B, C, D passed.

Senator Green called for the adoption of the following as a result of the May 19 meeting of Committee B:

A. A resolution: "Whereas, all course offerings of this University should be considered academically sound and proper, and whereas, all courses in all schools should be open to all regularly enrolled students, and Whereas, student course restrictions should be made only for the most practical and academically justifiable reasons, Therefore, be it resolved that each school accept courses for credit toward the 124 hour minimum from any other school, as long as the student has satisfied his general education requirements and the requirements of his major department."

(Committee B recommends that this resolution become operational in the semester immediately following the approval by the Senate and the Board of Trustees).

Seconded by Senator Riddle.

Senator McGovern questioned the wording of this recommendation. There is no reference to transfer credit acceptance policy. There is no recognition of the distinction between a student's ability to enroll and the applicability of the course to a degree the student is pursuing. There are problems along the staffing line, a problem which will increase. There are pragmatic and necessary reasons limitations have been put upon courses. This wording, even with the qualifying phrases that are used, would not face up to this problem. There is a kind of thrust here that students may assume the widespread availability of courses not possible to all students. If the thrust of this recommendation is toward the liberalization of the curriculum, then rather than a piecemeal approach or an attempt on a specific phrase, a much more direct frontal approach should be taken for curriculum revision rather than adoption of this recommendation.

Senator Shearer asked what is the procedure to take a course in a school other than the one in which the student is enrolled.

Senator McGovern said there is a procedure. There is nothing that prevents a student from taking over 124 hours. The student is asked to present to his advisor the reason for wanting to take a course. If the advisor rejects his plea, he can go to the department chairman. If the advisor or chairman do not make a decision, he can refer the matter to the dean.

Senator Burke supported Dr. McGovern's recommendation.

Senator Bormann asked if this restricts prerequisites for advanced courses and if the departments may save some spaces for the incoming freshmen.

Senator Smith replied both are questions that were considered by the subcommittee.

Senator Chu asked if every school has been consulted.

Senator Green replied that every school was consulted.

Senator Smith said there was not a unanimous response.

Senator Tompkins noted that this resolution says apparently nothing to the problem of schools closing courses to students of another school.

Senator Patterson pointed out that faculty and equipment often dictate class size.

Senator Green replied that for justifiable, practical reasons, it would still be possible to restrict class size.

Senator Fuget said he would like to urge a no vote since it would only-weaken exercising selectivity.

Senator Merryman wanted to know who would be the person responsible for determining reasons for exclusion.

Chairman Bright replied that the advisor, department chairman, and the dean would.

Senator McGovern said he did not see any accomplishment made by the acceptance of this recommendation. Senator Katzbeck noted that in many science courses students cannot get anything out of it if they have had no prerequisites.

Moved the adoption of the question.

Vote on the resolution: 21 ayes, 57 nays. Motion defeated.

Senator Green moved the adoption of the following proposal regarding the granting of emeritus status;

A. Procedure

The procedure for granting Emeritus Status shall be initiated at the Department level. Recommendations which cite specific and significant contributions by the nominee shall be forwarded to the Dean of the School involved, who in turn submits them through the Academic Vice President's Office, to Committee B of the University Senate, to the University Senate, and finally to the Board of Trustees. Recommendations may be made by any person(s) familiar with the nominee's professional contributions. For persons who do not fall within the usual administrative structure, the procedure should be initiated by the person to whom the nominee is, or was immediately responsible, and then be processed through the normal channels of that office.

B. Criteria

The granting of Emeritus status shall be highly selective. It shall be granted to only those persons who have made outstanding contributions and achievements during a reasonable term of service at Indiana University of Pennsylvania in one or more of the following areas:

- (1) In teaching
- (2) As an administrator, director, coordinator, or any other professional designation
- (3) In scholarship - academic competency, research, publishing, editing, consulting, eminence in a learned society, honors bestowed, etc.
- (4) In humanitarian and service contributions. Distinguished service for the University or at the local, state, national or international level in professionally related or non-related activities

C. Privileges

- (1) All rights and privileges accorded full-time faculty and staff members in regard to University mailings, cultural life programs, sport activities, library privileges, and discreet use of facilities, office space, and secretarial assistance.
- (2) Invited as a non-voting member on select University Senate, School, Department, and other Committees related to the professional background and experience of the individual.
- (3) Standing invitation for the Emeritus person and spouse or guest to attend various University social events and Alumni affairs.

Seconded by Senator Innes.

Motion passed.

Senator Yenchko announced a meeting Friday afternoon, October 6, in the Conference Room, Clark Hall at 1 PM to discuss the final points of the calendar for 1973-74. Any comments should be sent in writing to the committee.

The following was presented as a matter of information:

"Committee B resolves that its chairman be directed, upon receipt of new course proposals, to submit titles and concise course descriptions immediately to Faculty News; that Faculty News be requested to create a special feature called New Course Proposals in which it will publish the information submitted by the Chairman of Committee B; That the feature close with a comment to the effect that any inquiries or comments concerning these proposals should be sent speedily to the chairman of Committee B; That Committee B delay reviewing new courses and programs until one week has passed since the appropriate announcement in Faculty News."

Senator Green moved the adoption of Item C which in effect would destroy Committee B for the time and create two committees:

A Proposal

A. The Committee on Academic Procedures

1. Functions: Determination of academic probation (to include academic grievances); general policies for admissions; scholarships; and recommendations for the awarding of honorary degrees; and emeritus status; and calendar review
2. Membership:
 - a. Appointed: The Vice President of Academic Affairs and one representative from the Council of Deans shall be appointed members by virtue of their offices.
 - b. Elected: The University Senate shall elect eight faculty and four student members.
3. Officers: A Chairman, Vice-chairman, and a Secretary shall be elected by the committee from its members.

B. The Curriculum Committee

1. Functions: All matters relating to undergraduate programs and curricula including degree requirements unless specifically relegated to the charge of another committee.

2. Membership:

- a. Appointed: Two representatives from the Council of Deans shall be appointed members by virtue of their offices. The Vice President of Academic Affairs shall serve as an ex-officio member.
- b. Elected: The University Senate shall elect eight faculty and four student members.

3. Officers: A Chairman, Vice-chairman, and a Secretary shall be elected by the Committee from its members.

C. Committee B respectfully requests that existing Committee B members have first choice as to which new committee they would want to serve on. Elections would be held to fill the vacant seats of the new committees.

Seconded by Senator Smith.

Senator McGovern asked if he may assume that the curriculum committee would be responsible for academic standards. The proposed curriculum committee should be cognizant of this responsibility. He asked if leaving out academic standards was intentional.

Senator Smith said it was intentional in the captioning of the two committees. Academic standards would come under academic procedures.

Motion passed.

Senator Green reported there may be a meeting of the Senate October 17 to elect members to the new committees.

Senator Murdoch said Committee A would like to be notified concerning senator's choices for committee assignments.

Chairman Bright requested Committee A to circulate a list of the openings for the benefit of new student senators and faculty.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.


Cleo McCracken, Secretary