

## MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The September 11, 1990 meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Chairman Ron Juliette at 3:15 p.m. in Pratt Auditorium.

The following Senators were excused from the meeting: Brown-McGowan, Cahalan, Cignetti, Costa, H. Cunningham, Doerr, Fontaine, Gilbert, Hiestand, Kroah, LeBlanc, Micco, Norberg, Raze, Storm, and Wilkie.

The following Senators were absent from the meeting: Baker, Benco, Bianco, Bird, Biswas, Blouch, Bowser, Camp, Cherne, Cox, Domico, Fillipi, T. Frisina, Garris, Henry, Jones, Knowlton, Mason, Moten, Pinno, Prezioso, Robinson, Russell, Seibert, Spano, and Walters.

Chairman Juliette made the following correction in the May 1, 1990 minutes: On page 10, the last line under item #5 should read "\*The option of substituting EP 616 or GR 516 was approved previously." A Peterson-Tackett motion to approve the May 1, 1990 minutes as amended was APPROVED.

A motion was made by Senator Scroxton and seconded by Senator Butzow to amend the Agenda Items and Order of Business to include, under the Rules Committee Report, the election of a new Vice-Chair of the Senate. The motion was APPROVED.

Dr. Welty's report is shown as Attachment A.

Chairman Juliette made the following announcements:

- 1.) Senator Maureen McHugh will be serving as the Senate's Parliamentarian.
- 2.) Senators were reminded that the index card attached to their Senate Agenda package is used to prepare Senate attendance records. Senators are asked to sign and turn in their cards when they attend Senate meetings. Those who need to be excused from a Senate meeting should please contact Senator Asamoah at extension 2641/2640, or by electronic mail.
- 3.) Senate Committee Chairs were asked to convene their first Committee meeting for AY 1990-91 for the purpose of electing a new Chair. As part of their Committee Report, each Chair was asked to announce the date, time, and location of their first committee meeting, and also to present a brief description of the Committee's functions.
- 4.) The following were appointed to serve on University Committees:

Academic Advising Committee: William Forbes

Admissions Committee: Charles Kanyarusoke and Theresa McDevitt\*

Athletic Policy Committee: George Walz

Classroom Scheduling Committee: Helen Cunningham

Education Services Fee Subcommittee of the Budget Cttee: Thomas Cunningham

Foundation Distinguished Achiever Scholarship Committee:

Nelson Bormann, Imogene Moyer, Adam Tobin, and Julie Cherne

University Community Council: Ron Juliette as Senate Chair, and Diane Duntley

Ad-Hoc Committee on University Parking: Kay Stratton

\* Theresa McDevitt was subsequently replaced by Robert Stonebraker.

Other Committees to which representatives are yet to be assigned:  
Ad-Hoc Committee on Textbook and Course Policy Fee  
Ad-Hoc Senate Advisory Committee

A motion was made and seconded for the University Senate to adopt a resolution of appreciation to be presented to former Senate Chairman Gary Buterbaugh. The motion was APPROVED. (See Attachment B)

Chairman Juliette's opening remarks to the Senate is shown as Attachment C.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

### RULES COMMITTEE

Chairperson Tackett: The Rules Committee's responsibilities include acting as the adjudicating body in the event of a dispute between two Committees, and conducting Senate elections. The elections include those for Faculty-at-large Senators that are held every Spring, and elections to Senate committees and offices.

### ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

Chairperson Duntley: The Academic Procedures Committee deals with a range of policies and procedures as well as Elections to Grade Appeals Level II, Emeritus Status Nominations, and Honorary Degree Nominations. Last year the Committee originated a Policy on Night Exams, a Policy on Implementing Testing Placement, and a Course Syllabus Policy. Under the Committee's initiative the Senate approved revisions to the Course D/F Repeat Policy and the Cancelled Semester Policy. Items on the docket for this year include Class Attendance Policy; Graduate Honors (second degree); Academic Dishonesty (definitions, consequences, policy review, and information strategy); Missing Grades (procedures); Withdrawal Default (Administrative Withdrawal and Placement Testing as basis for exemptions; and a comprehensive analysis of all aspects of class attendance policies.

### CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Co-Chairperson Richards: The Curriculum Committee reviews all undergraduate curricular matters that come before the Senate. All new programs, program revisions, course additions or deletions, and changes in course title or course number, among other proposals, come before the Committee. It also monitors the undergraduate catalog to make sure that all courses listed in the catalog have been approved by the Curriculum Committee. To this end, Mr. Richard Chamberlin is doing an exhaustive historical tracking of courses listed in the catalog to determine when each entry appeared or disappeared, to identify those that have been changed, and the origins of such changes, i.e. whether changes were made with the approval of the Curriculum Committee. (Mr. Chamberlin is also doing a similar review of the graduate catalog). The Curriculum Committee also makes recommendations to the Academic Procedures Committee on curricular items that appear in the undergraduate catalog.

#### **GRADUATE COMMITTEE**

Chairperson Nastase: The basic role of the Graduate Committee is to help departments prepare and present their cause before the Senate. The committee helps revise and review the material so that it is ready to be presented before the Senate.

#### **LIBRARY AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Chairperson Lamberski: No report.

#### **RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

Acting Chairperson Ginger Brown: One of the primary functions of the Research Committee is to make awards with respect to the internal grant programs that are housed in the Graduate School. The Research Committee has also been asked to review the findings of the Copyright Committee which should be available at the conclusion of the Fall semester.

#### **STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Chairperson Barker: The Student Affairs Committee is a large committee of about 25 individuals. It addresses all aspects of student life that occurs outside the classroom. It reviews matters pertaining to residence life, judicial matters, admissions, student activities and organizations, the IUP Nickname, etc. Policy matters are referred to the Committee by the Office of the Vice President of Student Affairs or the Office of Student Activities and Organizations.

#### **UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Chairperson Ray: The function of this Committee is helping with University Planning and Development, the supervision of buildings and grounds including security, and the general improvement of the campus.

#### **AWARDS COMMITTEE**

Chairperson Woolcock: Our Committee recommends to the President those that will receive the Distinguished Faculty Awards handed out during Commencement exercises at the end of Spring semester. The development of awards for other groups will be reviewed by our Committee this year.

#### **NON-CREDIT COMMITTEE**

Chairperson Caraway: In the past year the Committee has looked at the Office of Conferences and provided information to the Senate, developed an evaluation instrument dealing with non-credit courses, and reviewed and made a recommendation to the Senate about the Culinary Arts School.

Election Results: Chairman Juliette announced the following results of the Vice-Chair election: Adam Goldstein 68, Jim Olson 41, Kimberly Copper 1, and 3 abstentions.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Chairman Juliette opened the Senate floor for Senators to state any concerns that they would like to see the Ad-Hoc Senate Advisory Committee address. Among the concerns expressed are the following:

IUP as a Community

Why Administrators do not speak up at Senate meetings

Leadership and Role models within the IUP Community

The Purpose of the Senate

Making IUP a better place for learning

The need to introduce important issues (which may require more careful deliberation) reasonably early during senate meetings, rather than rushing them through in the last five minutes.

The provision of gynecological services, contraceptive information, and consultation options.

Identifying those areas in which the Senate can make policy.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. as moved by Senators Tackett and Asamoah.

Respectfully submitted,

Yaw A. Asamoah, Secretary,  
University Senate

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE  
September 11, 1990

It is a pleasure to welcome the members of the university Senate back to the campus for the 1990-91 academic year. I believe we have had a very good opening of the year and I thank the many members of the staff and faculty. You have worked extremely hard to get the fall semester underway.

I regret very much that State System of Higher Education has not resolved contract negotiations with our faculty union. The two negotiating teams met on Thursday, September 6, but did not make any significant progress. The State System of Higher Education negotiators and the Chancellor have indicated a willingness to return to the table as soon as possible to move toward resolution of the contract. I will be preparing a letter to the university community which summarizes the status of negotiations and the proposals that have been made by the State System. Copies of this letter to the university community will be available tomorrow.

As I have indicated earlier, I plan to appoint a special Ad Hoc committee on parking, to look at the recommendation received from the university Senate last year, as well as recommendations which came forward from the Parking Review Board and the impact of the new bus service schedule, which is being provided for I-card holders. In addition, the location of the College of Business building will have an impact on parking in the future as well. As soon as I receive recommendations for membership from the constituency groups of the campus, I will officially appoint the committee and ask them to begin work and request that a complete report be available during the spring semester, 1991 for our review.

I am pleased to announce that a response has been received from the external reviewers of our Periodic Review Report to the Middle States Association. According to the reviewers "The Periodic Review Report provides solid documentation of the institutions progress in addressing. . . (graduate education, the quality of teaching, computer utilization and institutional self-study). It highlights significant changes since 1984 and discusses plans for continued improvement over the next five years. Most important the institution has carefully considered the Commission's recommendations and has made significant progress in responding effectively." The External Reviewers Report further states that the institution is fully aware of concerns requiring further attention and has appropriately developed a revised strategic planning document that identifies needed actions. This month, the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association will review the External Reviewers' Report and our response to it and will then take final action. A full copy of the reviewers report and our response is available in the library.

I wish to thank the faculty administrators, trustees, and students whose outstanding efforts resulted in this positive report. We have achieved this rating together and there is reason to be proud. Congratulations and thank you.

The State System of Higher Education Planning Commission has transmitted its final report to the Chancellor. The Chancellor has made the report available to the Board of Governors and they will be reviewing it this fall. I anticipate

that the Board may take action on the planning commission report at it's October, 1990 meeting.

I have written to the Alumni Association, University Senate and the Student Congress asking for representatives to serve on a committee which I will appoint shortly to look at the issue of the differing positions which have been taken in regard to the university's nickname. This committee will be asked to review all of the information provided as well as the recommendations of the various constituency groups and make a recommendation to me. The charge to the committee will be as follows:

1. Review the recommendations of the Student Congress, the University Senate, and the Alumni Association concerning the university's nickname and mascot. After careful study, the committee is asked to make a recommendation to the president regarding the continuation or discontinuation of the nickname with a rationale for their conclusion.
2. If the committee recommends that the use of the nickname be continued, please recommend how the nickname and symbols can be used so as to not have them stereotyped or reflect insensitivity to a group of people.
3. If discontinuation of the nickname is recommended, please indicate if a new nickname should be selected. If it is recommended that a new nickname should be chosen, please recommend a process to be followed in choosing a nickname and a projected timeline.

I am pleased to report to you that yesterday Money Magazine released its report on America's best college buys. The report identifies the top 200 colleges and universities in terms of value as measured by seventeen criteria, including quality of students, faculty and cost. The report identifies the top 100 public schools and the top 100 private schools. IUP ranked number twenty-two in the country in the top public schools and it was identified as the top public school in Pennsylvania. This is a continued affirmation of the quality of the University in which we are consistently identified in the reports as an outstanding public institution. This is an achievement of which the entire University community should be very proud.

I would like to wish everyone a very good fall semester and I look forward to continuing to work with you during this current year.

SPCH3/san  
9/13/90

I N    A P P R E C I A T I O N


WHEREAS: Gary Buterbaugh has served Indiana University of Pennsylvania for two terms as Chairperson of the University Senate in a manner that has been characterized by selflessness, impartiality, and dedication; and

WHEREAS: Gary Buterbaugh has given primary commitment to the constructive leadership of the University Senate, even though carrying substantial personal, academic and other responsibilities; and

WHEREAS: Gary Buterbaugh has effectively represented the University Senate to the Council of Trustees and to other forums such as the University Community Council, where he has fostered a greater sense of community by initiating and implementing the Picnics-in-the-Oak-Grove; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED: That the body of the University Senate this day expresses its appreciation for the service of Gary Buterbaugh as chairperson, acknowledging his history of leadership as a senator and anticipating his further contributions as a member of the University Senate.

September 11, 1990

  
Chair of University Senate 1990-92

  
Secretary of University Senate 1990-92

Opening Remarks to the University Senate  
by  
Ron Juliette, Chairperson  
September 11, 1990

I thought I would take a few minutes today to introduce myself and to tell you a little bit about what I envision for the Senate in the next two years. I go back a fairly long way at IUP. I was a student at the Armstrong Campus in 1965 when Indiana State Teachers College became IUP. I taught junior high school history for three years before IUP hired me away to be its first public relations photographer and part-time teacher of audiovisual education. Today, I am a member of the Department of Communications Media where I am a photographer. I have been a Senator for ten years, and a member of the Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee during all that time.

For the past several years, however, I have grown increasingly uncomfortable with the Senate. After two incidents in particular that occurred last year, I resolved that it was either time for me to get out of the Senate altogether, as many other disillusioned senators have, or try to do something to change it. As you can see, I chose the latter.

The two incidents to which I refer involved the development of a course syllabus policy and the issue of parking (not a small issue on this campus).

The Academic Policy Committee of the Senate thought it had a good idea when it developed a policy that required each faculty member to issue a syllabus to students at the beginning of each course. Further, the syllabus was to have several required components, such as a listing of office hours and an explanation of grading procedures. It seemed reasonable, and also seemed to enjoy wide support among Senators, until APSCUF raised a hand and warned that requiring faculty to do anything was considered a "term of employment" and, as such, something in which they should have a say.

The Senate Agreed. As a result, APSCUF and the Academic Policy Committee sat down and compromised on a course syllabus policy that had absolutely no teeth. The Senate was told that this was the best we could hope for because APSCUF would never agree to a policy that required a faculty member to have a syllabus.



The senate was wrong to accede to APSCUF on this issue. True, requiring a course syllabus is a working condition, but is it the function of the Senate to represent only those interests of the faculty when faculty are only one constituency of the Senate? I think not. It is my impression that the Senate is supposed to act in the best interests of the University -- and a tough course syllabus policy is in the best interests of the University.

If APSCUF disagrees with Senate policy, it certainly has a right to review it with the administration, but it does not have the right to insist that the Senate compromise the integrity of its mission on their behalf.

Please don't misconstrue my remarks to think that I am anti-APSCUF. I am not. I am a strong union member, and the APSCUF president and I will have monthly meetings during my tenure as Senate chair, but I will make it clear to him that the Senate is not an arm of APSCUF and that the University will benefit most from a strong and independent Senate.

The second incident involves what is, perhaps, the single most important issue on campus -- parking. The Senate passed a parking policy last spring after two spirited meetings on the topic and countless behind-the-scenes hours by the Finance and Development Committee who formulated the policy for Senate consideration.

I noted during the debate that, as is always the case, the administrative segment of the Senate was rather quiet. You would think that when the Senate took administrators' reserved parking places away from them, some of them would have been "steamed", but they remained remarkably reserved. Even a few faculty stood to defend a Dean's right to a free parking space, but nothing was said by the Deans themselves.

This fall, one of my first duties as Senate chair was to appoint Senate representatives to several university committees. One such committee was an Ad Hoc Committee to study parking -- a committee which is going to consider the senate policy of last spring along with recommendations from the Parking Review Board and others. But why? I am not sure I fully understand why we need to continually study over and over again problems such as registration and parking.

Both of these issues, course syllabus policy and parking, illustrate just what is wrong with the Senate and how weak it has become. On the one hand, we have APSCUF telling us what we can and cannot discuss and the extent to which we can discuss issues, and on the other hand we have an administration that takes our decisions "under advisement." Apparently, we no longer make policy, we give advice.

I believe in a strong Senate, and I believe that when the Senate was designed and the constitution drafted, the intention was that it be a strong institution. It is the only body on this campus where what is best for the University is, or should be, the primary focus. It is the only place where the constituent interests of students, faculty, or administrators are, or should be, of less importance than the integrity of the University itself.

But the Senate has never fully matured, and it has never lived up to initial expectations because one segment of the Senate has always refused to participate. For them, the Senate has always been a good public relations tool and the place where much of the University's grunt work, like curriculum, is accomplished.

I begin my tenure as Senate chair by calling on that segment of the Senate, the administrative segment, to begin to participate fully in Senate functions. I have worked with a number of administrators on Senate and University committees and I regard you as among the brightest and best administrators that IUP has ever assembled. But when you come to senate meetings, the collective hush that comes over you is deafening.

I am not so arrogant to expect that you will suddenly change simply because I asked you to do so. Instead, I base my appeal on an appeal that you, the administration, have made to all of us, an appeal for unity, an appeal that IUP infuse itself with a "spirit of community". It is a theme that you've been pushing for more than a year.

This concept of community is one that I can fully support and one that I might even get excited about. But my definition of a community is a place where citizens must respect each other, trust each other, and rely on each other. It is a place where solutions are sought that benefit the community as a whole, not segments of the community. It is a place where there is a shared vision about the future and a willingness among all segments of the community to work toward that goal even if it means that their own personal interests may not always be served.

When one segment of the community begins to feel that its vision is superior to all others, or that it doesn't need to abide by community standards, or that it needs to control what goes on in the community, resentment can't help but build among other community members. This resentment may eventually lead to direct confrontation, something that is all too familiar at IUP, or it may reveal itself in more innocuous ways, like taking away one's parking privileges.

We can begin to develop this spirit of community right here in the Senate. We come here as administrators, faculty, and students, but when we are here, we are all Senators, all equal, all participants, and, hopefully, all working toward a common goal.

To this point, I have not said much to or about the student segment of the Senate. I can almost predict that there will be occasions, perhaps monthly, when you will walk out of here dazed and confused, wondering what in the world just took place. Relax. It's happened to all of us, and you aren't officially a Senator until it happens to you. If you take the time to listen to the voices of the Senate, you will find humor, some bitterness, a lot of confusion, but, hopefully, you will be overwhelmed with the impression that a lot of us care very deeply about this University.

Your challenge as student Senators will be to reign us in, to keep us focused, and to be represented fully in all our decisions. Do not let us intimidate you, discourage you, or disillusion you. Your opinions matter and we want to hear them.

I am not interested in confrontations and I am not interested in participating in any aspect of administration bashing, or any other type of bashing, which is what the Senate has sometimes been reduced to. I do not believe that this administration is a sinister force bent on destroying the University through its incompetence any more than I believe that our faculty is the Evil Empire or that our students make the occupants of Animal House look like The Brady Bunch. What I do believe is that the vast majority of us are rational, reasonable citizens of this community who, when given the opportunity, will work together with surprising vigor and enthusiasm.

I am at a point in my personal life where my feelings about the Senate are confused. There is a side of me that has been at IUP for twenty years, a side that has grown increasingly cynical. It's a side that says we will never be able to curb our arrogance and mistrust and work together for the common good of the University.

But there is this other side of me that is still relatively young and full of energy, a side that is, perhaps, still too naive, a side that keeps telling me that we can do this -- that we can put our heads together and make it work -- make this university a true community in every sense of the word, a place where we can rely on each other, trust each other, and respect each other. It is this part of me that made me seek out this position. Somewhere inside of me I truly believe that we can each be a little less suspicious, a little less cynical, and a little less confrontational.

My goal for the next two years is a modest one. I hope to begin to inch the Senate forward on a path of mutual respect and trust, where students, faculty, and especially administrators will come together to seek solutions to our most pressing problems, and where our personal and constituent interests will be less important than the common good of the university.

Thank you for your attention.