

## MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The February 14, 1984 meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Chairman Lorrie Bright at 3:30 p.m. in Pratt Auditorium.

Senators Dakak, Lafranchi, Lynch, Norberg, Park, Rowell, Spence and Tackett were excused from the meeting. Also, Senators Asting, Browe, Burwell, Byrnes, Chekanski, Craig, H. Cunningham, Forbes, H. Johnson, F. Jones, Maderer, Matous, McCue, L. Miller, Mlecko, Moorhead, Moreau, Receski, Reynolds, Russell, Solak, Sommer, Stacy, Storm, Swinker, Taiani, Troxell, Walz, Welker, Barry, DeSantis, Faller, Fiorella, Frye, Gibb, Haley, Heacox, Henderson, Johns, King, Kline, Kosin, Long, Little, McCaffrey, Matthews, Mazzone, L. Miller, M. Miller, Opalisky, Roon, Wagner, Williams, Wolfinger, Hurley and Mulhern were absent.

IUP President Worthen reported on the following:

1. Governor's Budget Message for 1984-85 lists 7% for higher education-- to be allocated between the community college, the State System of Higher Education and the state-related institutions. While this is not a great figure, it is considerably more than many states are able to provide.
2. The Presidents of the 14 institutions in the SSHE have been commissioned to come up with a new formula for the appropriation of funds among the institutions. Progress is being made on this project.
3. It is expected that an announcement of the permanent Chancellor of the SSHE will be made within the next two to four weeks.
4. The University has been given \$100,000 over the next five years by Sam Jack, Indiana resident and member of the Board of Trustees, to establish a Distinguished American Lecture Series. This will enable the University to bring to campus one outstanding lecturer per year. A committee of university and community people will be established to help develop the plans for the series and it is hoped that the first speaker will be scheduled for the fall semester, 1984-85.

Chairman Bright made the following announcements:

1. Noted that the staff calendar for the current semester lists March 16, 1984 as the date for D & F reports to be distributed to freshmen. This policy was changed a few years ago and is no longer a requirement.
2. Has requested the Rules Committee to consider a Constitutional change to reduce the number of senators needed for a quorum for the operation of the Senate.
3. Will shortly be asking for nominations to a "Consultative Committee to Study the Possibility of Revising General Education Requirements".
4. Will be asking the Academic Affairs Committee to increase Senate representation on the Admissions Committee and will be asking for a report from the Senate Representative on the Admissions Committee, Dr. Diane Duntley, to bring the Senate up to date on its activities.
5. Will be asking for nominations to a "Consultative Committee to Restudy the Process for the Evaluation of Administrators". This policy was originally passed in 1976, was carried out once or twice, and should have been looked at in 1979--but this was never done.

- 6. Per information from Mark Staszkiwicz, there will be a series of presentations by the Long-Range Planning Committee during which the unit heads will be presenting their plans for the 1984-89 five-year plans. The purpose of these is to share the goals and objectives of each unit and the resources needed to meet these goals; and to communicate unit needs to Long Range Planning Committee members for the development of the University-wide plan. The first series of presentations will be during the week of February 20 and the second on March 2, 3 or 8. A schedule of times and locations will be published in the Faculty News and Drum Sounds.

On a motion by Senator Chamberlin, seconded by Senator Tompkins, the minutes of the December 6, 1983 meeting were approved as published.

Senator Chamberlin, Rules Committee Chairman, made the following announcements:

- 1. Future Senate meeting dates: March 13, April 10 and May 8, 1984.
- 2. There will be an important meeting of the Rules Committee on Tuesday, February 21, 1984 at 3:15 p.m. in the Library to consider a Constitutional revision.
- 3. The following students have been appointed to committees:  
 Rules Committee: Ed Kellar  
 Student Affairs Committee: Kevin Benz, William Matthews, Mark Opalisky  
 Academic Affairs Committee: Chuck Bove
- 4. Nomination forms for the 22 at-large vacancies on the Senate will be published soon in the Faculty News.
- 5. There has been a proposed Constitutional revision brought to the Rules Committee by the Research Subcommittee of the Committee on Faculty Research, Library and Educational Services. The original agreement was between three groups -- the Senate, the APSCUF union, and the administration. Senator Chamberlin, Chairman of the Rules Committee; Senator Asting, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Research; Senator Radell, Chairman of the Faculty Research, Library, and Educational Services Committee, will be meeting with members of the administration and union in an effort to iron out the problems relating to the ranking of college research proposals.

On the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee, chaired by Senator Tiger, the following revision of the Earth and Space Science Education major was approved by the Senate:

Earth and Space Science Education Major Requirements:

Science and Mathematics:

Calculus I	4
General Chemistry I & II	8
1-Environmental Biology	4
2-General Physics I & II	8
3-Intro to Computer Science	3
Sub-Total	<u>27</u>
15 hrs. covered Gen. Ed.	-15
	<u>12</u>

Geoscience:

General Geology I & II	8
2 more Geology	6
Solar System & Stellar Astronomy	6
4-Drop Meteorology II	3
5-Drop Oceanography II	3
6-Operation of Planetarium	1
	<u>27</u>

SUMMARY: General Education	52
School of Education	30
Sciences and Mathematics	12
Geoscience	27
	<u>121</u>
Electives	3
TOTAL:	<u>124</u>

The Curriculum Committee also listed the following for Senate information:

Changes in Course Title and/or Number:

- (a) PC 366/566 Human Cognition: Learning ---Change to  
PC 366/566 Human Cognition *memory & thinking*
- (b) FN 204 Hospitality Management Seminar ---Change to  
FN 101 Introduction to Hospitality Management

Delete BI 112, Plant Diversity, 3 credits (Reason: lack of student interest and enrollment)

The Graduate Committee, chaired by Senator Bowker, listed the following for information:

- Course Title Changes: FROM CE 643 - Planning Principles TO  
Planning Human Services
- FROM CE 644 - Organizing Principles TO  
Organizing Human Services
- FROM CE 650 - Supervision of Counselors TO  
Supervision of Human Development Specialists

The Academic Affairs Committee, chaired by Senator Duntley, listed the following for information:

1. Honorary Degrees: Nominations for honorary degrees to be awarded at May 1984 commencement were processed as defined and recommendations were sent to President Worthen on December 1 for selection by the Council of Trustees.
2. The complaint of violation of Senate policy referred by the Rules Committee was investigated, a response has been returned to Senator Bright and the specific matter is considered closed. A specific recommendation of policy has been prepared to clarify the intent.

As recommended by the Academic Affairs Committee, the Senate acted on the following items:

1. Approved Emeritus Status for the following persons, to be awarded at the May, 1984 Commencement:

Dr. Robert H. Saylor	Counselor Education	22 years
Dr. Edwin M. R. Smith	Mathematics	13 1/2 years
Dr. George L. Spinelli	Counselor Education	23 1/2 years

2. The Academic Standards Policy as shown in Attachment A was discussed at length. A motion by Senator Chamberlin, seconded by Senator Wegener, to change Section A.1.C.1. was approved. A motion by Senator Kroll, seconded by Senator Messner, to change the percentage listed at 75% in Section A.1.C. to two-thirds (2/3) was defeated by a vote of 58 No, 28 Yes and 3 Abstentions.

A motion by Senator Kroll, seconded by Senator Messner, to return the policy to the Academic Affairs Committee was defeated.

The Policy as shown in Attachment A was then approved by the Senate.

3. The IUP Student Grade Appeals Policy as shown in Attachment B was discussed at length.

A motion by Senator Duntley, seconded by Senator Popchak, to substitute Page 3 with a page which has not been approved by the Academic Affairs Committee, but which does meet with APSCUF approval, was passed by the Senate, despite some objections because of the fact that it did not come through the Academic Affairs Committee. Attempts to divide the policy and discuss only pages one and two were defeated.

The Grade Appeals Policy as shown in Attachment B was then approved by the Senate.

4. The following academic policy was proposed so that the Curriculum Committee retains control over the content of the General Education Program:

"Any Special Topics course (481) intended as a substitute for a General Education requirement must be reviewed prior to its offering by the Senate Curriculum Committee to insure that the content of the experimental course meets the intent of the original requirement. A favorable review will mean that the 481 offering can be used as a substitute but is not to be construed as course approval. The department must still conform to the existing guidelines for approval as a regular course after two offerings."

The policy was approved by the Senate.

Senator Radell, Chairman of the Faculty Research, Library and Educational Services Committee, made the following announcements:

1. The Committee has passed in principle a policy which would require all faculty, staff and students to return library books to the Library once per semester.
2. A crisis has arisen in regard to the ranking of college research proposals, in that the author of a proposal which was ranked number one in its school has not filed any progress reports on his last grant. Senator Radell urged all those who received grants to bring their reports up to date so that crises such as this can be avoided.

The Student Affairs Committee listed the United Way Campaign as a recognized activity.

The University Committee on Athletic Policy submitted its report, as shown in Attachment C.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony J. Nastase  
Secretary, University Senate

## ACADEMIC STANDARDS POLICY

### A. Good Standing

1. To be in good standing each student must meet standards for qualitative progress, as measured by cumulative quality point average (qpa), and quantitative progress, as measured by cumulative credits earned.
  - a. To be in good standing at the end of the first fulltime semester (the semester of matriculation) a student must have earned at least a 1.50 qpa.
    - (1) A part-time student will be reviewed for having the first semester average of 1.50 at the point of six hours registered.
  - b. To be in good standing on a qualitative basis for each subsequent semester, the following scale must be maintained:

0-40 credits earned	1.80 qpa
41 or more credits earned	2.00 qpa

    - (1) "Credits earned" includes IUP credits with grades, IUP credits recorded as P, transfer credits, and credits by exam.
  - c. To be in good standing on a quantitative basis, a student must have earned at least 75% of the cumulative number of registered credits at IUP.
    - (1) "Registered credits" is the number of credits for which a student is enrolled at the end of the Drop/Add period (for a student who was originally registered and charged at full-time status, and who reduced during Drop/Add to part-time status, the registered credits will be calculated as twelve.)
2. To determine academic standing, a student's cumulative qualitative academic record is reviewed at the end of each fall semester, each spring semester, and the end of the summer sessions collectively. All summer sessions constitute a review period in the application of this policy. A quantitative measure of good standing will occur once each academic year between the termination of Post-Summer session and before the beginning of the Fall semester.
3. The application of these policies for students admitted through the Educational Opportunity Program (Act 101) is defined within the approved policies for the operation of that program.
4. Probation
  - a. A student who does not attain either the quantitative or qualitative standards will be placed on probation. The status of a student on

probation will be examined each review period to determine whether probation may be lifted.

- b. A student whose cumulative qualitative academic record falls below the above standards may be continued on probation for the next two review periods (summer and fall or fall and spring or spring and summer).
- c. A student whose cumulative quantitative academic record falls below the above standard may be continued on probation for one academic year (three qualitative review periods).
- d. A student will not remain in good standing beyond these probationary periods unless both quantitative and qualitative standards have been met.

5. Suspension

A student who fails to attain the required level for good standing after the probation period(s) will be suspended from the university.

6. Reinstatement

A student may qualify for reinstatement:

1. By attaining the minimum qpa and credits standards for the student's level by attending IUP summer sessions.
2. By formal appeal through the office of the Dean of the student's college for extension of probation for one review period in exceptional and extenuating circumstances.

## IUP STUDENT GRADE APPEALS

### INTRODUCTION

The Policy Documents and Reports of the American Association of University Professors makes the following recommendation regarding student protection against improper academic evaluation:

"Students should have protection through orderly procedures against prejudiced or capricious academic evaluation. At the same time, they are responsible for maintaining standards of academic performance established for each course in which they are enrolled."

Students are encouraged to seek redress for discrimination or capriciousness but they are cautioned to be responsible and avoid capriciousness in their own charges.

### IUP GRADE REVIEW POLICY

If a student believes an improper grade has been assigned, an appeal may be filed on the following grounds:

1. Discrimination: On the basis of race, religion, national origin, age, political preference, sex, ancestry, handicapped status, or affectional or lifestyle preference.
2. Capricious Evaluation: Significant and unwarranted deviation from grading standards set forth at the beginning of the course (ordinarily during the first week of the semester) or grade assigned arbitrarily on the basis of whim or impulse.

If a student disagrees with the subjective evaluation of his/her work by the instructor, but has no basis for a charge of "discrimination" or "capricious evaluation", the student may discuss the matter directly with the instructor, and if unsatisfied, with the department chairperson, and if still unsatisfied, with the Dean of the College in which the grade was given. In such cases, however, the decision of the instructor is final, and the student cannot appeal if the grade is not changed.

### PROCEDURE OF APPEAL

#### LEVEL I:

The student must first seek a resolution to the disagreement with the instructor. If the student is not satisfied with the results, he/she must speak with the chairperson of the department to which he/she is appealing. If still unsatisfied, he/she must discuss the matter with the Dean of the College in question. A Student Government Association member will accompany or advise the student during this procedure, if requested. Every effort should be made to solve the disagreement at Level I.

## LEVEL II:

The next step of appeal is to file an appeal form with the Provost's Office. This form must be filed within thirty (30) calendar days of the beginning of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was received. Grade appeals will not generally be processed during the summer; therefore, any grade received in the spring or summer sessions will be processed in the fall. In the summer a review will be scheduled only when the student's academic eligibility is jeopardized by the grade in question or if the student is a graduating senior. The Provost's Office will notify the appropriate dean, department chairperson, faculty member, and the SGA president of the student's initiation of the Level II appeal process.

The Senate Academic Affairs Committee or designated sub-committee will review the appeal to determine the existence of the substantive basis for appeal. Appeals based on discrimination will be reviewed according to current standards of non-discriminatory action. Appeals based on capriciousness will be reviewed in light of the faculty member's published evaluation and grading system. Denial of appeal continuance must be by a two-thirds majority of those voting. This committee will inform the Provost's Office of its findings. Within five (5) working or class days of the committee's report, the Provost or designee will notify the student and the faculty member of the findings. If the basis for appeal was determined to be substantive, the Provost or designee will convene the Grade Review Committee within fifteen (15) working or class days.

## LEVEL III:

The Grade Review Committee will consist of seven members. Five will be voting members: an academic dean or associate dean, three faculty members, and a student. Four-fifths of the voting membership will be a quorum. The SGA Academic Affairs Committee chairperson will advise as requested. The Affirmative Action Officer will advise with respect to appeals dealing with discrimination. The committee chairperson will be elected by and from the committee before each review.

The Grade Review Committee membership will serve one year terms and will be established in the spring term for the following academic year. The voting members will be chosen as follows:

- A. The dean will be chosen by the Council of Deans. Two alternates will also be chosen.
- B. Three faculty members will be chosen at random by the Senate Academic Affairs Committee from the full-time faculty. Six alternates also will be chosen.
- C. A student will be chosen by the SGA. Two alternates will also be chosen.

Committee names (members and alternates) will be supplied to all parties involved prior to the review. A committee member may request the Provost or designee to disqualify him/her due to a conflict of interest. Also, the instructor and the student each may eliminate names in proportion to the composition of the committee (one dean, three faculty, one student). Vacancies will be filled from the appropriate pool of alternates, so that the committee will be composed of one dean, three faculty and one student.

---



Both the student and the instructor will have the right to appear before the committee and offer evidence. Each may also bring one observer with whom they may consult, but who may not participate in the review.

After hearing the evidence brought forth, the committee will privately deliberate and recommend action with respect to the evidence before it. The committee will submit a written report of its decision to the Provost, or designee, within five (5) working or class days after the review. If a grade change is to result, the Provost, or designee, will inform the faculty member and direct that the change of grade form be submitted to accomplish the decision of the committee. If the faculty member is unwilling to comply, the department chairperson, dean or provost, each in turn, will implement the committee's decision.

This appeal procedure does not supplant any legal rights afforded by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and/or the Government of the United States.

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE — February 14, 1984

REPORT TO THE SENATE FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETIC POLICY

At the December 7th meeting of the University Committee on Athletic Policy (referred to at the last Senate meeting as the Advisory Committee to the President on Athletic Policy), several questions arose as to what items should appear on the agenda. This problem was alleviated by the passage of a motion stating that members wishing items to be placed on the agenda should inform the chairperson (Robert Letso) in at least ten days advance of the next meeting.

Also, at this meeting coach William Blacksmith presented his view of the condition of wrestling as an IUP intercollegiate sport. Coach Blacksmith restated the ideas that wrestling is both underfunded and underfacilitated. The members of the committee decided to postpone the decision of keeping or eliminating wrestling at IUP until December 15th.

In other business, a motion was passed stating the committee's support of Proposal #36. Proposal #36, which was to be voted on at the NCAA conference, would empower a group of 44 college presidents to advise the NCAA, but not give the group the power to veto rules, or to impose rules of its own.

Finally, the committee looked over NCAA Division II philosophy, and criteria for membership. The committee also looked over the mission statement of the IUP Intercollegiate Athletic Program.

At the December 15th meeting of the University Committee on Athletic Policy, the continuance of the wrestling program at IUP was the only issue discussed. Coach Blacksmith was again present. He described the problems with the wrestling program at IUP, and answered questions. Finally, after some two hours of discussing the pros and cons of the wrestling program, a motion was made that the committee recommend to President Worthen its support for the wrestling program at IUP, and that he attempt, along with the athletic director, to implement and improve the program, and to alleviate the problems that were discussed. The motion to support the wrestling program passed.

The next meeting of the University Committee on Athletic Policy has been tentatively set for sometime in February.