

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The March 10, 1987 meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Chairman Gary Buterbaugh at 3:25 p.m. in Pratt Auditorium.

The following Senators were excused from the meeting: Dakak, Curey, Knowlton, Concannon, DeCoster, Cahalan, Kolb, Auger, Barker and Hall. Also absent were Senators Stacy, Abrams, Altimus, Fuget, Andrew, Austin, Blacksmith, Cvejanovich, Halapin, Hyder, Jones, Pavloski, Russell, Tobin, Viggiano, Spewock, Wilson, Craig, Dietrich, Dudt, Freeman, Forbes, Frank, Jackson, Wegener and Welker.

Students present at the meeting were Burg, Diehl, Heckman, DelGrosso, Kerr, Morneweck, Osman, Reigler, Carey, Brown, Lauer, Gabriel, Perzia, L. Brown, Kuhn, Fulton and Loeff.

See Attachment A for President Welty's report to the Senate.

The following corrections were made to the minutes of the February 17, 1987 meeting:

--Under Chairman's report to the Senate, #4 should read: "The Rules Committee will be asked to look at the Constitution to see whose responsibility it should be to appoint a Task Force on Assessment of University Outcomes."

On a motion by Senator Como, seconded by Senator Kerr, the minutes of the February meeting were approved as corrected.

Chairman Buterbaugh's report to the Senate included:

1. Two appointments to the Task Force on University Outcomes has been made: Senators Wilkie and Elliott. One person will be appointed in the future from the Curriculum Committee.
2. Has expressed concern over the fact that the University Senate is not included in the University-wide computing plan.
3. Expressed his concern and feeling that this is a crucial time for the Senate--both in aspects of its integrity and in concern for its future. Though the current administration and the Senate are working well together and within the University as a whole, the Senate is still not always a respected body.
4. Again urged attendance at committee meetings; Rules Committee continues to have difficulty getting a quorum.

Senator Kerr gave the Vice Chairman's report in the absence of Senator Concannon, as follows:

1. There are 18 student vacancies on the Senate to be filled this spring.
2. The Liberal Studies Program was a topic of discussion at a recent meeting of the Student Senate.
3. There has been some discussion of a university-wide committee being set up to look into the issue of student leader compensation, stipends, etc.

Approval was given to rearrange the Agenda items to allow action on the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on General Education prior to the regular committee reports, and to move the report of the Development and Finance Committee from Item F to Item A.

Because the Senate Chairman, Gary Buterbaugh, is also Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the General Education Program, Senator DeFurio was appointed Chairman Pro Tem for discussion of the report.

The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on General Education recommended to the Senate that the Ad Hoc Committee be dissolved and that the President's proposal for a Liberal Studies Program be sent to the Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, which is the body legally constituted by the Senate Constitution and recognized by APSCUF for dealing with curricular matters.

Senator Kerr moved that the Curriculum Committee be required to set up a time-line and submit it to the Senate at its April 14, 1987 meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Morneweck and passed by the Senate. Following discussion on the original motion, which was to dissolve the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on General Education and turn it over to the Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the motion was passed by the Senate with abstentions.

The Development and Finance Committee listed the 1988-89 capital budget priority list by year for Senate information. See Attachment B.

Approval was granted by the Senate for Fred Sehring to speak on the floor of the Senate concerning the report of the Task Force on Assignment of Classroom Space. The original report was submitted to the Senate in December; committee reactions were included in the current agenda. After lengthy discussion of the item, Senator Duntley moved to close debate, and that motion was approved.

The Final Report of the Task Force on Assignment of Classroom Space, along with the reactions of the Committee, were then accepted by the Senate. See Attachment C.

The Curriculum Committee submitted the following for Senate Information:

1. Proposal Schedule - see Attachment D
2. Committee Roster - see Attachment E
3. Course number changes:
 - a. CR 499 - Independent Study - to CR 482
 - b. CR 482 - Criminal Justice Personnel and Supervision - to CR 486
4. Course name change: CS 213 from Home Equipment and Consumer Electronics to Residential Appliances and Consumer Electronics
5. Foreign language options for BS Chemistry majors broadened to include German, French, Spanish, Russian and Japanese.(could be used at IUP only if taken in a formal, structured classroom setting)

On the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee, chaired by Senator Sommer, the following new courses were approved:

CO 355 - Computer Graphics - 2 c/l'd/3 sh

Prerequisites: CO 310 and Junior Status

The use of computer graphics hardware and software. An overview of current applications and experience with representative software will introduce current practice. Foundations in primitives, geometry and algorithms of passive computer graphics are the principal focus of the course. A brief introduction to interactive computer graphics will be included.

CH 340 - Physical Chemistry for the Biological Sciences - 3 c/0 1/3 sh

Prerequisites: MA 122, 124 or 128 and PY 112 or 132; CH 232

One semester course for Biochemistry and Biology majors. Chemical Thermodynamics, Equilibria, Kinetics; Quantum Mechanics; and Spectroscopy especially as applied to biochemical systems.

The recommendation of the Curriculum Committee to approve SP 353 - Spanish Phonetics and Phonemics; 3 credits; was returned to the Committee for further input from the College of Education Curriculum Committee. This was accomplished through a motion by Senator Chamberlin, seconded by Senator Eisen, and passed by the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The March agenda will be completed by the April 14 meeting of the Senate.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony J. Nastase
Secretary
University Senate

President Welty's Report to the Senate:

As you know Governor Casey released his proposed 1987-88 budget on March 3, 1987. I would like to review a few of the highlights of that budget as it affects the State System of Higher Education and IUP. Governor Casey has recommended a 5% increase in the general operations budget for the State System of Higher Education. This is the same increase which is proposed for the state-related universities in Pennsylvania. However, it needs to be pointed out that this 5% increase means a 2.7% increase in the total revenue available to the SSHE. You may recall that the Board of Governors approved a budget request in the amount of 10.45% from the General Assembly. This is the amount needed in order to meet expenditures for the coming year and to assure that there would not be a tuition increase. Further, the budget does not continue special line items which we have had for the past two years for deferred maintenance in the amount of \$2.5 million for the System and instructional equipment in the amount of \$4.1 million and \$250,000 for the McKeever Center which was funded last year. Specifically, the implications of these items not being included in the budget mean \$335,000 less in repair and deferred maintenance funds and \$645,000 in instructional equipment monies for IUP. The net effect of the proposed budget is a 3.94% increase for the SSHE which translates into just over a 2% increase in the total operating budget for the State System. This is because almost one-half of the total budget is derived from student fees and other sources of revenue.

The Casey budget also places priority on teacher education and economic development. While there are not specific dollars allocated in the teacher education area, it does suggest the opportunity to press for funding to support the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching and other efforts. Obviously, it is critical that we continue to work toward achievement of the 10.45% increase in the budget as approved by the Board of Governors of the SSHE. I urge all members of the University Senate and members of the University community to communicate with legislators to indicate the importance of support for public higher education in the coming year. It is clear that the case for providing quality higher education at a reasonable cost to the citizens of the Commonwealth must be made over and over again if we are to obtain sufficient funding to carry out our programs.

Governor Casey's budget also includes a proposed Capital Budget in the amount of \$12,066,000 for the SSHE which represents 19 projects. Of these 19 projects IUP has one project in the amount of \$594,000 to install automatic heat-smoke sensor fire alarm systems in all on-campus residence halls which is required by the fall, 1989 as a result of legislation passed two years ago. This proposed amount in the Capital Budget represents 4.8% of the total amount of the request submitted by the State System of Higher Education. Increasingly capital facilities are becoming a major problem for all universities and particularly IUP. We must press forward to make our case to attract capital funds to carry out these projects.

As information on the budget continues to develop in the coming months I will make it available to you.

I am pleased to report to you that the Middle States Association has notified Cheyney University that the show cause order which had been issued against the University which threatened to remove their accreditation has been lifted and accreditation of the university reinstated. The Association expects Cheyney to file a follow-up report by October 1, 1988 on progress made in areas of concern which were identified by the visiting team. Further, a small team will visit the campus to review this follow-up report after that date. The Cheyney University community is to be congratulated for the efforts which they have undertaken to address serious issues which were identified by the Middle States Association in recent months.

I would call your attention once again to the request for comments on the proposed computing plan which are due by March 16, 1987 to Vice President Ed Norberg and Dr. Mark Staszkievicz. It is very important that you submit your comments to them so that they can be considered as part of the on-going development of the computing plan.

Also, as I have indicated before, the Middle States Association team will visit the campus on March 29-31, 1987 to review our report on doctoral programs. I assume that by this time the complete copy of the report has been received by members of the University community. Additional copies are available in Dr. Staszkievicz's office if you have not received your copy.

Concerning today's fire in the ground floor of Whitmyre Hall, it appears that damage is moderate. There is smoke damage on the first, second and third floors, with approximately 60 students being affected. The cleaning crew is there cleaning up and hopefully those students will be able to return to their rooms later this evening. The State Fire Marshall has been there and states that the fire is "suspicious" in origin and he will be continuing his investigation.

1988/89 CAPITAL BUDGET SUBMISSION PRIORITY LIST BY YEAR

Projects 1988/89

1. Asbestos Abatement/Fireproofing/Renovations/Weyandt Hall
2. College of Business Classroom Building
3. Renovate Waller Hall
4. Renovate McElhaney Hall
5. Renovate Uhler Hall
6. Renovate Clark Hall
7. Renovate Breezedale
8. Renovate Stabley Library
9. Renovate Eicher Hall
10. Renovation/Additions - Ackerman Hall
11. Construction of New Parking Lot Facilities

Projects 1989/90

12. Memorial Hall Renovation/Expansion
13. Cogswell Hall Renovation/Expansion

Projects 1990/91

14. Energy Conservation Package
15. Renovation of Keith Hall
16. Renovation of Leonard Hall

Projects 1991/92

17. Behavioral Science Classroom Building
18. Library - Phase II

Projects 1992/93

19. Renovation of Fisher Auditorium
20. Renovation of Wilson Hall

Prepared by:

Campus Physical Planning
February 23, 1987

TASK FORCE ON ASSIGNMENT OF CLASSROOM SPACE

FINAL REPORT

In May, 1986 President Welty created a Task Force on Assignment of Classroom Space (TFACS). The Task Force was chaired by Dr. Mark Staszkiwicz and consisted of Dr. Tom Goodrich, Dr. Rob Mutchnick, Mr. Fred Sehring, and Dr. Joanne Steiner. The TFACS was given the following charge:

1. Review the current classroom space utilization on campus to determine the degree of usage throughout the day and evening.
2. Review the major problems identified by colleges and departments in classroom utilization. In particular, review data provided as part of the space study analysis concerning classroom utilization.
3. Recommend a procedure for general use classroom space allocation which seeks to meet the following criteria:
 - a. Allows the central allocation of classroom space to maximize accessibility to all departments and insures full utilization of space throughout the day. Such a plan should try to develop a rotation system to assure that space is allocated on an equitable basis over a period of time.

---COMMITTEE REACTION: Strongly endorses a procedure "to assure that space is allocated on an equitable basis over a period of time" and believes that the administration is already sincerely striving toward this goal.
 - b. Allows for the identification of special-use classrooms for those departments which absolutely must have them.

---COMMITTEE REACTION: The "special use classroom," meaning a classroom that has a particular design, location, equipment and the like, is more the rule than the exception it used to be. The administration is cautioned not to commence an examination of teaching stations with old-fashioned definitions, like thinking only in terms of laboratories or kitchens.
 - c. Assures, as much as possible, that faculty teaching assignments are as close to the location of the classroom as possible.

---COMMITTEE REACTION: Is sympathetic with the Task Force's desire to provide proximity of a teaching station to a faculty office. However, the location of professors in departments with heavy enrollment and/or without captured classrooms appears to the Committee to be in the same area of the campus where the academic plant is now most efficiently utilized. If classroom proximity is a high-priority goal then some faculty offices may have to be moved to buildings where classrooms are available.

This report contains the TFACS's findings and recommendations.

Some departments have no departmentally-controlled classrooms while others have a relatively large number of such rooms. Departments with no classrooms must compete for available space while departments with a large number of classrooms have much more control over their schedules. One of the first concerns of the Task Force was to assess whether inequities in the allocation of departmentally-controlled classrooms were the result of an inappropriate allocation system, a shortage of classroom space on campus, or an inefficient utilization of existing facilities.

The conclusion of the Task Force was that the most significant problem with the assignment of classroom space stems from an inefficient utilization of current classrooms. Two factors contribute to this inefficient utilization. First, far too many classes are scheduled during a small range of times. That is, most classes are scheduled between 9:15 and 11:45 a.m. or at 1:00 p.m. on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and between 9:45 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday and Thursday. Secondly, there is great variety in the starting times for classes. For example, during the Spring semester, 1986, Monday classes began at 8:00, 8:30, 9:00, 9:15, 10:00, 10:30, 11:15, 1:00, 1:15, 1:30, 2:15, and so on. This inconsistency means that some classrooms may overlap traditional starting times and, therefore, eliminate a classroom for two major periods.

In addition to the problems cited above, the TFACS also discovered that most of the large classrooms and auditoria were under-utilized. Room-by-room reviews showed that these classrooms are traditionally under-utilized in both the number of hours used and the total number of students taught.

The Task Force is also concerned that there is no clear definition of, nor policy for, establishing special-use classrooms on campus. A problem exists when a department labels a classroom as a special-use classroom because, in effect, it removes that room from general use by the University. Certainly, rooms which contain laboratory equipment or computers may appropriately be labeled special-use classrooms. However, it appears that some departments have created "seminar rooms," "student lounges," "curriculum laboratories," "computer labs," "libraries," "offices," and other special use facilities from existing classroom space. While the Task Force does not question the need for such facilities, it is concerned that there are no clear policies for modifying existing classroom space for such purposes. In fact, the TFACS is concerned that no definition exists for what constitutes a special-use facility.

The Task Force also discovered that there is no complete and accurate inventory of current classroom facilities on campus. While some effort is made to obtain such information, the current inventory was not very useful to the TFACS because not all rooms are included, the history of room changes is not maintained, the inventory is not updated in a timely manner, and a number of important data are simply not collected.

Finally, the Task Force discovered that there is no established policy by which departments are assigned departmentally-controlled classroom space. This lack of clear procedures and guidelines have led to an inequitable allocation to some departments.

To summarize, the Task Force identified the following problems with current classroom space allocation and utilization procedures:

1. Classes are unevenly distributed throughout the day.
2. There is too much variety in starting times for classes.
3. There are no clear definitions of special-use classrooms and no policies for their creation or reclassification.
4. There is an under-utilization of large classrooms.
 ---COMMITTEE REACTION: The Committee has seen the data on this point and clearly it is true. However, it is not so clear to the Committee that this is so much a result of the captured nature of large classrooms as it is the tradition at IUP of providing instruction in classes of moderate size. On occasion, a department is forced into a large area because a small or moderate-size area is not available.
5. There is no accurate and complete inventory of classrooms.
6. There are no policies or procedures for assigning "captured" classrooms to departments.
 ---COMMITTEE REACTION: Feels there should be policies and procedures for assigning all academic space and not only teaching space (e.g. office space and storage space).

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to address these problems the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

1. In order to provide for more efficient use of existing facilities, course offerings should be more evenly distributed throughout the day. Distributing courses more evenly would also benefit students by providing them with fewer scheduling conflicts. In order to accomplish this, the Task Force recommends that:
 - a. No more than 60 percent of a department's course offerings may be on a MONDAY-WEDNESDAY-FRIDAY sequence or on a TUESDAY-THURSDAY sequence.
 - b. On any given Monday, Wednesday or Friday, no more than 17 percent of the department's courses may be in any single period for that day.
 - c. On any given Tuesday or Thursday, no more than 20 percent of the department's courses may be in any single period for that day.
 --- COMMITTEE REACTION: Understands and agrees with the purpose of the formulae but has some feeling that too strict an application of any formula might be both difficult and impractical to implement. In short, the Committee feels these won't work in practice. The Committee feels that the Scheduling Office needs some leeway of action and would not consider modest deviations as violations of procedure. Some scheduling considerations must be given to students employed in the afternoon.
 The Committee raises the following points for further consideration:
 1. Do we really want to spread out the day equally?
 2. A separate formula should be developed for large size groups.
 3. There is the possibility that the formulae could provide departments in total with more rooms than the university can supply. Then what?

2. The University should establish fewer standard starting times for courses. An Ad Hoc Committee should be formed to develop a proposal for review by the University community.

---COMMITTEE REACTION: The Committee feels that evening classes have not been dealt with adequately.

3. Each department should have "captured" classrooms. The allocation of these classrooms should be based on a formula which would be fair to all departments. Based on the assumption that courses will be more evenly distributed by implementing recommendations 1 and 2, the TFACS believes that a sufficient number of classrooms exist and that the following formula is equitable. For each department the total number of hours per week of regularly scheduled instruction will be computed for each of the last two fall semesters, and the larger of the two semesters will be used for each department. For purposes of the formula, a course with three hours of instruction per week in a classroom and one hour per week in a laboratory will generate three weekly hours of classroom use. The total classroom hours (TCH) calculated will then be used in the following formula to determine the number of classrooms each department should be allocated:

$$\text{TCH}/3 \times 60\% \times 17\% = \text{CAPTURED CLASSROOM ENTITLEMENT}$$

The TFACS believes that if each department were allocated this number of classrooms and distributed their classes more evenly throughout the day, the department would be able to teach virtually all courses in its own classrooms.

4. Unallocated classrooms and unscheduled departmentally-controlled classrooms would be placed in a pool and scheduled by the Scheduling Center.

---COMMITTEE REACTION: The Committee understood this is what happened under the present system.

5. A standing classroom space committee, chaired by the University Scheduling Officer, the Associate Registrar, should be established. This committee would be responsible for reviewing departments' requests in such areas as:

- a. Departmentally-controlled classrooms (exceptions to the formula)
- b. Special-use rooms (e.g., computer labs, curriculum centers, lounges)
- c. Changes in allocations

---COMMITTEE REACTIONS to #2 and #5: The Committee feels there should be only one committee to monitor space and time concerns as determined by the Task Force Report. The Committee suggests that this new standing committee consist of one representative from each College, a member from the Senate Finance and Development Committee and the University Scheduling Center, the chair to be selected by the membership.

6. The University should purchase (or develop) a computerized room inventory system. Each room in every building should be maintained in the inventory and should be identified by its primary purpose. For rooms identified as classrooms, the following fields should be maintained: seating capacity, storage space, fixed equipment (e.g., water, gas, overhead, etc.), number of electrical outlets, number of chalkboards, types of desks, accessibility, television cable hookup, carpeting, air conditioning, shades or curtains on windows, and primary department. This list is not intended to be exhaustive and is only indicative of the types of data which would be useful for scheduling purposes.

7. Once the room inventory is complete, each room identified as a classroom should not be used for any other purpose without the recommendation of the standing classroom space committee and the approval of the Provost or designee.
8. The effectiveness of the above recommendations, if accepted, should be reviewed by the appropriate Senate Committee two years after implementation.
COMMITTEE REACTION: The Committee feels that the review should commence after one semester and be continuous. The way to insure this would be overlapping membership with the new committee and the Senate committee (see Item 5, page 4). The new committee should report to the Senate committee as the way of having its work receive Senate approval.

If these recommendations are adopted, procedures will be established for their implementation. The TFACS recommends that for the allocation of departmentally-controlled classrooms, each department should be asked to meet with the standing classroom space committee to review initial allocations and the department's use of or need for rooms for other purposes. The committee should make its recommendations to the Provost or designee for final assignment of space.

Accepted by the University Senate
3/10/87

SENATE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE PROPOSALS

No.	Course or Proposal	Cmte. Action	Senate Ac
86-87/1-1	FN 408 Title Change	Approved 11/25/86	Approved
86-87/1-2	HP 261, 262, 265, 266, 267 Course No. Changes	Approved 11/25/86	Approved
86-87/1	Child Development/Family Relations Program Changes	Returned to Dept. 11/18/86	
86-87/2	Modification of Geology Minor	Approved 12/2/86	Approved
86-87/3	CR 499, 482 Course No. Change; CR 299 New Course	CR 499, 482 Change Approved 12/2/86 CR 299 Returned to Dept.	
86-87/4	HP 160 New Course	Approved 11/25/86	Approved
86-87/5	CO 355 New Course	Approved 2/10/87	
86-87/6	CH 340 New Course	Approved 2/10/87	
86-87/7	Foreign Lang. Options for Chemistry Majors	Approved 2/10/87	
86-87/8	SP 353 New Course	Approved 2/26/87	
86-87/9	HE 457 New Course	Returned to Dept. 11/18/86	
86-87/10	Degree-Credit Course Renumbering	Approved 11/25/86	Approved
86-87/11	GE 416/516 New Course	Approved 2/24/87 conditionally	
86-87/12	Course Letter Prefixes Changes	Approved 11/25/86	Approved
86-87/13	LC 090 New Course	Scheduled 3/24/87	
86-87/14	LC 095 New Course	Scheduled 3/24/87	
86-87/15	Course Prefix, Credit, Name, Content Changes	Scheduled 3/24/87	
86-87/16	CS 213 COURSE NAME CHANGE	Approved 2/24/87	

UPDATED 2/26/87

SENATE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM MEMBERS

1986-87

Update: February 26, 1987

Administration

Hilda Richards	2219, Provost, 205 Sutton Hall
Nicholas Kolb	2227, Dean, Continuing Ed., Whitmyre Hall
Donald Eisen	2397, Interim Dean, College of Fine Arts

Faculty

Lorrie Bright	x-2273, English
Joseph Costa	x-2360, Chemistry
Anthony DeFurio	x-2530, Art
Ron Juliette	x-2492, Communications Media (Sabbatical Spring)
Sally Lipsky	x-2729, Learning Center
Imogene Moyer	x-2720, Criminology
Harold Sommer	x-3082, German
Jeanne Steele	x-3091, Nursing

Students

Lora Brown	x-5263, 626 Scranton Hall
Roger Greer	465-9180, 406 Campus Towers
Sean Lauer	x-5352, 303 Lawrence Hall
Lisa Morneweck	349-0638, 757 Locust Street