

FILE

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Yours Truly
James K. 100.10

The January 26, 1988 meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Chairman Buterbaugh at 3:25 p.m. in McVitty Auditorium, Sprowls Hall.

On a motion by Senator Chamberlin, seconded by Senator Carey, the Minutes of the December 8, 1987 meeting were approved as published, with one correction: Senators absent--H. Cunningham.

The current agenda items and order were approved by consensus.

The following Senators were excused from the meeting, CULP, BLACKSMITH, CIGNETTI, MILLER, GRAU, ZONI, STASZKIEWICZ, BRIGHT, LIPSKY and DUTKIEWICZ-ZETTERBERG. Also absent were Senators Fox, Knowlton, Dakak, Hyder, Halapin, Jones, Russell, Washington, Cvejanovich, Tobin, Dudt, Aghar, and Jackson. The student senators who were absent from the meeting were not submitted to the secretary and therefore are not listed in these minutes.

President Welty's report to the Senate is shown as Attachment A.

Chairman Buterbaugh reported to the Senate on the following matters:

1. Doug Ross represents the Senate on matters dealing with facilities, Diane Duntley is the Senate representative on the Admissions Committee, and the Chair represents the Senate in matters dealing with programs and curriculum.
2. The Associate Vice President for Computing, Gary Bozylinsky, has asked the Senate Chair to appoint three senators to serve on the RFP Review Committee. Anyone interested in doing this should contact Gary Buterbaugh.
3. Gary Buterbaugh will serve on the Liberal Studies Committee for the next year.
4. Senators Duntley and Buterbaugh serve on the President's University Community Council and are soliciting ideas for treating students and their families as consumers of our educational market. The idea is that we need to treat one another more like people--we are losing too much people contact.
5. Reminded senators that the issue of the Constitutional revision comes up at the February meeting--this is a controversial issue--urges Senators to remember that there are people involved in this issue.
6. Suggested that the Rules Committee consider changing the March 15 meeting to March 22 and the April 19 meeting to April 26. Rules Committee will report at the February meeting.

The Rules Committee listed the following for information:

1. University Senate meeting dates: February 16, 1988
March 15, 1988 - may be 22nd April 19, 1988 - may be 26th
2. Agenda items are to be submitted to Senator Nastase (Weyandt 10, ext. 2993). Due dates for agenda items: February 5 for February 16th meeting. Dates will be published in February for the March and April meetings.
3. All meetings of the Senate during Spring 1988 are scheduled in McVitty Auditorium.

The Curriculum Committee, chaired by Senator Juliette, submitted the following for information:

1. Course number change: CH 355/Biochemistry and Nutrition to CH 255/Biochemistry and Nutrition.
2. Course title change: PH 405/Human Rights: Their Basics and Boundaries to PH 405/Justice and Human Rights.
3. Course number change: BE 364/Office Procedures to BE 264/Office Procedures
4. Course title change: AD 413/Word Processing Concepts to AD 413/Information Processing Technology.
5. Course prefix changes: The following music department courses will change from the MU prefix to the MH (music history) prefix:

MU 102	Music for the Non Major	to MH 102
MU 103	Perspectives in Jazz	to MH 103
MU 301	Music History I	to MH 301
MU 302	Music History II	to MH 302

MU 303	Music History III	to MH 303
MU 320	Music of the Ancient World	to MH 320
MU 321	Music of the Middle Ages	to MH 321
MU 322	Renaissance Music	to MH 322
MU 323	The Baroque Era	to MH 323
MU 324	Eighteenth-Century Music	to MH 324
MU 325	The Early Romantic Period	to MH 325
MU 326	The Late Romantic Period	to MH 326
MU 420	Contemporary Music	to MH 420
MU 421	American Music	to MH 421

As moved by the Curriculum Committee, the following new course was approved:

HP 430 - The American Woman and Sport - 3 credits - Prerequisite: none.

This course is a comprehensive, multidisciplinary analysis of the problems, patterns, and processes associated with the sport involvement of girls and women in our culture. An historical perspective will be presented with an emphasis on physiological, psychological, and socio-cultural influences. See Attachment B for course content outline.

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

1. Meeting schedule: The committee will meet each Thursday from 3:15 to 5 p.m. in 218 Sutton.
2. The response of the Committee on behalf of the Senate to the Report of the Task Force on Outcomes Assessment is presented for information as Attachment C.

On a motion by Senator Nastase, seconded by Senator Brown, the Response of the Senate Academic Committee to the Report of the Task Force on Outcomes Assessment was accepted as the Report of the entire University Senate.

The Academic Committee moved the awarding of emeritus status to the following individuals, effective on Commencement Day, May 14, 1988, or the effective date of the individual's retirement if still in service on May 14, 1988:

CANDIDATES FOR EMERITUS STATUS - 1988

NAME	DEPARTMENT	YEARS OF SERVICE
Ida Z. Arms	Mathematics	28
Gary L. Buckwalter	Physics	21
Ronald L. Marks	Chemistry	27
Patrick J. McNamara	Physics	21
Robert N. Moore	Biology	25
Marian Murray	Nursing	20
Eugene F. Scanlon	Special Education/Clinical Services	22
Frederick W. Seinfeld	English	26
James C. Wilson	Counselor Education	26

(NOTE: The Committee specifically voted to recognize the status of Dr. Marian Murray as qualifying as effectively retiring from higher education although technically resigning from IUP to continue state employment benefit in a relationship with the State Board of Nursing.

Motion to award emeritus status to those listed above was approved by the Senate.

Senator Jeff Miller, Chair of the University-wide Awards Committee, announced that nomination forms have been sent out and must be returned, along with supporting material, to the Committee by Friday, January 29. Instruction are on the forms.

As moved by the University-wide Awards Committee, the policy for a University Professorship was approved by the Senate, along with the recommendation that one of the University Professorship Committee members be from the Senate Awards Committee. (Note: This representative would, as the proposal states, hold the rank of full professor.) See Attachment D for the University Professorship Policy.

A two-thirds vote of the Senate permitted Senator Goodrich to bring up an item of New Business, as follows:

MOTION: That the undergraduate student senators consider the problem of registration for undergraduates and decide what body might present changes in the registration procedure to the administration, and report to the Senate by the end of the current semester.

The motion was seconded by Senator Ali. Discussion on this item revealed that the SSA and the SGA had been discussing the matter, that the Academic Committee and the Provost's Office have been looking into it, etc. A motion by Senator Curey, seconded by Senator DeFurio, to close debate passed; the original motion then passed.

On a motion by Senator Brown, seconded by Senator McCloskey, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "a J Nastase".

Anthony J. Nastase
Secretary, University Senate

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
January 26, 1988

It is a pleasure to welcome back members of our University community to Spring Semester, 1988. I hope everyone had a restful and relaxing vacation and is excited about this semester. There are a number of items that I would like to report upon.

I am pleased to report that the work to prepare a Request for Proposal for a new computer mainframe has been completed. The work which was completed under the leadership of Mr. Garry Bozylinsky, Associate Vice President for Computing, and the RFP task force has been extensive and complex. Based upon feedback provided concerning the RFP from the two computing advisory committees, the Senate Library and Educational Services Committee, and other interested members of the University community, the Request For Proposal requires that each vendor bidding on the mainframe submit three separate computer hardware and software bids in the following areas:

1. Academic computing on a separate system;
2. Administrative computing on a separate system; and
3. Both academic and administrative computing on one, single system.

In this manner we will have the flexibility to select the best system or combination of systems that will meet our central computing needs.

As an interim step to meet central computing requirements for the next 12-18 months we have continued negotiations with Honeywell. If our negotiations are successful, an expansion of the present mainframe will be completed to meet our central computing needs until we have converted to the system or systems we select through the RFP process.

On December 11, 1987, Judge John Pratt dismissed the Adams versus Bennett case. This case was initiated in 1970 against then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Richardson to compel him to enact Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The court found that Pennsylvania and several other states were operating desegregated systems of higher education. The dismissal was determined on a rather complex legal issue in which the judge ruled that the plaintiffs in the case no longer had standing to continue the case. A complete copy of the judge's ruling is available in the library if anyone wishes to review it in detail. The effect of the dismissal removes the court from supervising the five-year Equal Opportunity Plan. However, it is clear that the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education continues to have responsibility for assuring that the five-year plan is achieved.

It is not clear at this time whether the case will be appealed or what other subsequent direct impact it will have upon us. Regardless of the court ruling I believe we must continue to move forward in our Affirmative Action efforts both in student recruitment and retention, and faculty and staff recruitment. The State System of Higher Education has already begun work on the development of a comprehensive Affirmative Action Plan for the next five years. As soon as that plan is adopted by the Board of Governors, it is my intention that we will begin work with a University group to develop our own affirmative action plan for the

next five years. We have made excellent progress thanks to the work of so many. I believe we must continue to build upon the successes of the past.

Several comments have been received concerning the initial report of the Task Force on Student Outcomes Assessment. The task force will be reviewing those comments in more detail. In addition, they will be scheduling open meetings during this semester to engage the University community in further discussion and dialogue. The task force has prepared a series of readings and bibliographies on the topic which have been distributed to all department chairs, deans and constituency leadership. In addition, a copy of this material is in the University library for those who wish to read further. I would urge everyone interested in this topic to review those materials and participate in the open hearings as they are scheduled during the semester.

I will be writing to all faculty and administrators along with student leadership this week to advise them of my intention to appoint a special Commission on the Education of Teachers at IUP. This sixteen-member commission will be appointed in consultation with the President of APSCUF, the chair of the University Senate, and Provost Hilda Richards. I will be asking the commission to consider several critical questions with regard to the education of teachers including the following questions:

1. Do we have enough faculty for each specialty and program to provide for increased emphasis on instruction and content in teacher preparation?
2. Should we continue to house secondary education faculty in academic departments or should we consider other alternatives, such as a Department of Secondary Education in the College of Education? Are there other alternatives?
3. Should we expand our initial teacher certification program model to include a variety of approaches such as the fifth year or a MAT degree?
4. How can we achieve the necessary commitment to upgrade our approach to improve the supervision of pre-student teaching, student teaching, and advanced internships for teacher education for both undergraduate and graduate students?
5. What steps must be taken to support emerging urban field experiences which require faculty to supervise students at greater distances from campus?
6. How can we provide for the recommended academic content specialties in the Humanities and Sciences which are needed to strengthen our elementary education program?
7. What types of partnerships with elementary and secondary schools need to be developed in order to contribute to the on-going inservice development of teachers in elementary and secondary schools and at the university level? What resources are required?

8. Are there directions our University School should take in order to support some of the necessary directions in teacher preparation? What are the priorities that should be established for the University School in order to support this overall thrust? What steps should be taken to address these priorities?
9. What other issues need to be addressed in the revitalization of our teacher preparation program?

I have asked the commission to complete an initial report for distribution to the University community by the end of Spring Semester, 1988. My intention is that this report can then be discussed in depth during the early part of Fall Semester, 1988, and the commission will be in a position to submit final recommendations prior to the end of Fall Semester, 1988. I believe this will allow us to begin to address this most critical issue which is an issue that must be of concern to all of us on campus and not simply just the College of Education. I have asked Dr. John Butzow to co-chair the commission along with a faculty member who will be appointed after consultation with constituency leadership.

I would like to update you on the status of our cogeneration project. As I had indicated in our December meeting, final testing was undertaken during December. Just as we were prepared to bring the entire plant on line it was discovered that installation of certain piping had been done incorrectly as a result of an error by the design professional. As of Friday, January 22, we have placed the first engine on line. The second engine went on line January 24. We are now generating over ten megawatts of power which is enough to meet the campus demands of 4.6 megawatts and allows for the remainder to be sold. The subsequent two engines will be placed on line shortly and that power will be transmitted to the Pennsylvania Electric Company. As you know, we have completed drilling four gas wells on the campus. They will be connected with the cogeneration facility in a few weeks. The dedication for the cogeneration plant is scheduled for March 18, 1988.

I am pleased to report that our annual fund-raising campaigns have established new records once again. The Alumni Phonathon has resulted in pledges from over 10,500 alumni who have pledged just over \$250,000, which represents an 8 percent increase over last year; our Parents Phonathon has resulted in pledges from just over 2,700 parents who have pledged \$42,000, which is a 31 percent increase over last year's pledge total; the University Retirees Campaign has resulted in pledges of \$12,230, which is 22 percent over last year; and the University Family Campaign has resulted in pledges of \$27,000, which exceeds the established goal by 8 percent. All totaled, more than \$331,000 has been pledged as part of these four annual campaigns. In addition, our President's Council Campaign has exceeded its goal. As you know, the President's Council is that group of donors that contributes \$1,000 or more annually to the Foundation. At this date we have 256 members for 1988 which is an increase of 24 members over last year's total. I am very pleased by this continuing growth in private support for the University. In particular these increases are noteworthy since it does not include any of the funds pledged as part of our Capital Campaign effort. Thus, we have succeeded in a major increase in commitments for private giving for the University.

That concludes my report.

JDW18/sd

HP 430 COURSE CONTENT

THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND SPORT
Carolyn A. Thompson
222 Zink Hall
Phone - 357-2403

COURSE CONTENT:

- I. Historical Survey
 - A. Factors Affecting Participation
 - 1. Victorian Ideals
 - 2. Medical Issues
 - 3. Social Changes
 - B. Aspects of Women's Sport
 - 1. Early Physical Recreation
 - 2. Women as Sports Spectators
 - 3. Women's Athletic Clubs
 - 4. Sports Costumes
 - C. Sponsorship and Promotion
 - 1. Amateur Athletic Union
 - 2. Industrial Sport
 - 3. National Sports Organizations
 - 4. Coaches and Other Personnel
- II. Collegiate Sport
 - A. Sport in the Curriculum
 - 1. Early Physical Ed. Programs
 - 2. 20th Century Phys. Ed. Programs
 - B. Forms of Competition
 - 1. Intramural
 - 2. Extramural Forms
 - C. Concepts of "Appropriate" Competition
 - 1. Early Era- "disapproval"--Victorian
 - 2. Formal Philosophy--appropriate defined
 - 3. New Era-- values of intercollegiate--D.G.W.S.
 - D. Collegiate Sport Organizations
 - 1. W.A.A./W.R.A.
 - 2. National Amateur Athletic Federation
 - 3. D.G.W.S.
 - 4. A.I.A.W.
 - 5. N.C.A.A.
- III. Olympic Competition
- IV. Psychological Dimensions of Female Participation
 - A. Psychological Determinants of Sport
 - 1. Aggression: hormones vs social learning
 - 2. Personality traits
 - 3. Achievement-related motives
 - B. Psychological Consequences of Sport Involvement
 - 1. Fitness, Body Image, Self-Concept
 - 2. Role Learning and Trait Acquisition
 - 3. Role Conflict

4. Attributions for Success

V. Shaping the Female Athlete

- A. Impact of Family
 - 1. Gender Role Socialization as Sex Typing
 - 2. Sex Typing in Toys and Play
 - 3. Roles of Mother and Father
 - 4. Differences in Structure of Boys & Girls games
- B. School Influences--Elem., H.S., College

VI. Influence of Mass Media

- A. Extent of Coverage
- B. Type of Coverage
- C. Style of Coverage
- D. The Production of Media

VII. Physiological Parameters

- A. Differences between the Sexes
 - 1. Physical-- size, muscle strength, fat, etc.
 - 2. Physiological-- function-- VO2 capacity, etc.
 - 3. Performance-- potential, training, etc.
- B. Exercise and Menstruation-- amenorrhea
- C. Exercise and Pregnancy
- D. Exercise and Menopause
- E. Adaptation to Training
- F. Nutritional Needs

HP 430 Agenda
The Am. Woman and Sport
Monday Evening 6:00-9:00

- JANUARY: 26 Intro. Class, objectives, philosophy, requirements "Woman in Sport"
Video by Michner
- FEBRUARY: 2 History of Participation and development survey (Chapter 1 pg. 1 - 47).
9 Collegiate Sport - Chapter 2 - (pg. 48 - 85).
Sport in Society - Chapter 3 (College women athletes events)
16 Social View - Chapters 5, 6, 7 - Sociological Influences
*23 Pennsylvania History of H.S. Sports development (H.S. coaches-guest panelist)
- MARCH: 2 Olympic Competition Film: Women in Sport
9 The Woman Athlete Chapt. 8, 9, 10, 11 - (Psychological Aspects)
Dr. Maureen McHugh, Psyc. Dept. - Sexuality
- SPRING BREAK
23 Biophysical Perspectives (Chapters 12, 13, 14, 15)
30 Presentations of Autobiographies - Autobiographies
Guest - Peg Hoffman: 1928 & 1932 Olympic Swimmer
- APRIL 6 Media Influence: Analyze Newspaper National (USA Today)
Bookstores & Magazine Stands Regional (Pgh Press or Pgh Post-Gazette)
Local (Indiana Gazette)
Campus (PENN)
- 13 The Law; Title IX; Feminist Movement
20/21 Work on final projects (no class meeting) and class presentations
27 Presentations of Projects
- MAY 4 Final Exam questions distributed

SENATE ACADEMIC COMMITTEE
on behalf of the
UNIVERSITY SENATE

a response to

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

The attempt by the Task Force on Student Outcomes Assessment to examine the dimensions associated with the various national expressions of the outcomes assessment movements is to be commended for the comprehensiveness. It is difficult to disagree with the value of any one of the approaches in isolation.

However, the most significant limitation of the report is that it is too general, even for an initial report. Nothing is eliminated or set at lower priority. The establishment of priorities, especially in light of limited resources, will be critical to decision-making about the feasibility of undertaking an outcomes assessment project.

Especially missing is a clear definition of 'assessment'. There is need for clarification of goals with specific goals targeted to appropriate levels: University-wide outcomes, Departmental outcomes, Student-specific outcomes, and another category of student-developmental outcomes. Perhaps first consideration should be given to defining and then assessing proficiencies in areas such as writing, speaking, and "cultural literacy".

The question of resources is perhaps the most critical. To see the scope that assessment includes or should include to be well done, and to have the initial charge include the concept of

"no significant new resources" represents a mismatch. There is need for strong leadership, for sophisticated research design, and for appropriate psychometrics if a proper job of assessment is to be done.

The resource needs are far more than financial. All participants ultimately must see this as a unifying construct for institutional direction; as an example, Long Range Planning is one such construct already in place. At this time, implementation of the new Liberal Studies Program presents a similar unifying construct for curriculum review. The addition of outcomes assessment may seriously detract from the energy, sustained commitment and resources needed for strong accomplishments in the others.

The recommendation that the purpose of assessment at IUP be primarily for internal purposes is developed in language that makes assessment seem essentially an administrative tool for University-wide and departmental outcomes. If student participation is not required and feedback provided, then there seems to be question in the statement "An important benefit of assessing student outcomes is the potential it creates for involving students in directing their own cognitive and affective growth and development."

The purposes and ultimate uses of outcomes assessment must be clear to all constituents. Faculty must be reassured that there will be no relationship with individual faculty evaluation as provided by the CBA. Students must understand that as part of outcomes assessment there will be no additional competency

specifications for continuation in a major or for graduation.

A series of questions were raised concerning the larger setting for this report. What is the impetus for a thrust in the assessment area at IUP at this time? What is the balance among (a) national focus, (b) accrediting agency interest, (c) SSHE concerns both programmatic and budgetary, and (d) public relations potential. In short, what is the REAL agenda?

Timing of an outcomes assessment project is another crucial issue. If the purpose of the initial assessment is to provide benchmark data, then the project must be undertaken with appropriate sampling, etc., constructed so that comparisons can be made. Unless establishing benchmarks is the immediate need/purpose, outcomes assessment may be deferred until 1992-93 as a target for the assessment of the impact of full Liberal Studies implementation. Because students admitted in 1988 will be under general education requirements, even well into 1989-90 or 1990-91 the substantial body of students will be "general education" products. In short, there is time to plan assessment carefully, cautiously, marshalling all the desired resources and leadership to approach the task with the wisdom and professional expertise a project of this significance and magnitude demands and deserves.

As the Task Force considers responses and works to extend the initial report, the Senate Academic Committee suggests that questions such as the following be considered:

What current evaluation policies might be impacted by the process of Outcomes Assessment?

What modifications to curriculum or evaluation policies

might be necessary or desirable to implement Outcomes Assessment?

What new policies and procedures might be necessary or desirable to implement Outcomes Assessment?

The Senate Academic Committee will be most willing to continue working with each group or office addressing the issues that relate to the policies and procedures involved in developing an effective and appropriate Outcomes Assessment design. By early involvement we will be able to recommend to Senate approval of appropriate outcomes assessment policies.

The Senate Academic Committee has received the first report of the exploration of outcomes assessment for IUP with interest. Because the proper implementation of a comprehensive program is a massive undertaking and the resources to match the undertaking seem unavailable, the movement toward such a process should be set in very clear understanding of the real values that will be accomplished by the process and the real costs (far beyond financial) of such a project. In "real" language the question that must be answered is "What good will come that will be worth the price?" The time line for exploring the dimensions of this must be approached with caution. At this time many other institutions are moving into outcomes assessment programs; IUP may be in a position to learn from the results of these.

Stated in another way, this first report represents a level of divergent "possibility" thinking; a second phase report defining clearer priorities and representing convergent process-based thinking will be reviewed happily by this Committee on behalf of the University Senate.

12/87

Passed by the Professional Development Committee 3/12/87
Passed by the Deans 3/17/87

UNIVERSITY PROFESSORSHIP

PURPOSE: The purpose of the University Professorship is to recognize, reward and encourage IUP faculty who demonstrate outstanding records in teaching, research/scholarly activities, and service.

QUALIFICATIONS: To become a University Professor, a faculty member must be at the rank of full professor, hold a doctorate or other terminal degree, have a record of outstanding teaching, quality research/scholarly activities and university service, and be currently active and demonstrably engaged in research/scholarly activity which advances the faculty member's discipline or the teaching of his/her discipline.

BENEFITS: A faculty member who is awarded the University Professorship will receive:

1. A \$2,500 grant, through Foundation funding, to support his/her research/scholarly activities,
2. a reduced teaching load (three hours release time) for each semester of the year for which the University Professorship is awarded,
3. a six-hour summer contract for professional activity,
4. a reception in honor of the year's University Professor,
5. the opportunity to present current and past research/scholarly activities with a unique approach to teach with the university community through a program sponsored by the Faculty Professional Development Committee,
6. his/her name inscribed upon a plaque honoring all University Professors,
7. a news release announcing the name and activities of the year's University Professor,
8. the life-time title of University Professor.

TIME FRAME: The position of University Professor will be for one calendar year commencing at the beginning of the fall semester. It can be held any number of times, but may not be held for two consecutive years. The University Professor must be in residence during the year for which the award is given (i.e., he/she must not be on sabbatical or other forms of leave).

PROCESS: The process whereby a University Professor is awarded shall consist of four phases: nomination, application, review and award.

A committee on University Professor shall be established and charged with the entire process leading to the awarding of the University Professorships.

Early in the fall semester the committee will solicit nominations for the University Professor from the faculty, administration and students of the University. Each nominee will be invited to apply for the position of University Professor. In addition to the usual application information, the application will consist of a documented record of the qualities listed in the "Qualifications" section, as well as a brief description of the research/scholarly activity to be accomplished during the time period for which the University Professorship is to be held. The committee will then evaluate each applicant with respect to the quality of prior work and that of the work proposed for the time period of the University Professorship. The top candidate will be recommended through the Provost to the President.

Replacement of the faculty member who is awarded release time through the University Professorship will be considered on the basis of need within the department.

THE UNIVERSITY PROFESSORSHIP COMMITTEE: The University Professorship Committee shall consist of three administrators and four faculty members. All faculty members serving on the committee must hold the rank of full professor. The three administrators shall be selected by the administration. The chair of the committee shall be a faculty member selected from and by the Faculty Professional Development Committee. The three remaining faculty members shall be recommended to the President/Provost by APSCUF. No faculty member may serve on the University Professorship Committee during a year in which he/she has applied for the University Professorship.

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE 1/26/88

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

FEB 12 1988

RECEIVED