

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
November 6, 2001

Chairperson Nowell called the November 6, 2001 meeting of the University Senate to order at p.m. in the Alumni Auditorium of the Eberly College of Business.

The following Senators were **excused** from the meeting: O. Agozino, M. Anthony, K. Barton, J. Buriok, A. Creany, G. Dicicco, C. Dugan, J. Eck, J. Fisher, E. Goldsmith, L. Hall, M. Hood, L. Kingamana, S. Krevel, L. Pettit, M. Piwinsky, J. Rivera, K. Rourke, D. Sadler, L. Savova, A. Yang, C. Zoni.

The following Senators (students) were **excused** from the meeting: K. Stillwell, A. Thomas.

The following Senators were **absent** from the meeting: R. Camp, J. Ellerbach, W. Forbes, D. Jenette, K. Patrick, K. Polansky, M. Redvay, E. Ruffner.

In addition, the following Senators (students) were **absent** from the meeting: M. Beasecker, A. Berol, C. Dziadox, T. Ellis, V. Holder, R. Howard, A. Joynes, R.S. Lee, M. Petrowski, J. Roth, B. Surmacz, J. Walsh, L. Zack.

The minutes of the October 2, 2001 meeting were **ACCEPTED**.

Agenda items for the November 6, 2001 meeting were **ACCEPTED**.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Dr. Pettit)

In his absence, President Pettit sent the following report/comments that were emailed to all senators prior to the meeting:

October 29, 2001

Fellow Senators:

Because the Nov. 6 Senate meeting is so important in terms of the issues it will address, I am especially disappointed to have to be absent from the state that day, and I want all of you to know in advance of the necessity of my absence and my deep regret that it must be this way.

I will be in Baltimore and Washington soliciting major private gifts to the University, and also solidifying support for federally funded projects for IUP. When we schedule meetings with persons from whom we are asking substantial gifts -- \$500,000 and up --we generally have to meet at their convenience, not mine, and it is necessary that I spend an increasing share of my time doing this. I regret that this critical responsibility will take me away from campus more frequently, but it is simply

one of the new realities - one of the many changes that we have to deal with - and all of us must change our expectations accordingly.

Thank you for your understanding and patience. Meanwhile, Provost Staszkiwicz will be able to speak for me at Senate in most instances. You have my best wishes for a good, honest, unifying meeting.

PROVOST'S REPORT (Dr. Staszkiwicz)

Senator Staszkiwicz had no report and answered various questions from Senators.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT (Dr. Nowell)

Since our last meeting, I have continued to pursue the issues we have been discussing related to shared governance. In addition to meeting with the President, I have consulted with the Rules Committee and APSCUF. At our last meeting, the President requested my appointment of a committee to work on streamlining shared governance that we might move on decisions critical to the university in this time of financial pressures. I have been working on the composition of that committee and it should be ready to begin its work in the very near future.

As for the Senate's action at our last meeting requesting information from the administration regarding the decision-making process for closing the University School, the Rules Committee has received input from the Provost and requested additional information. I am very concerned about the Provost's response, given it is, in my eyes, incomplete and elusively vague.

One aspect of this process is the seeking of legal counsel. At the Student Congress' open forum a couple of weeks ago, the President, in response to my statement that I believed the administration was violating the Senate's constitution and Act 188, stressed that there was only one legal opinion as to whether his action was proper. This statement seems to be based upon what the Provost has told him and the Senate. The Provost's response reads,

I am not sure what to share with the Senate in response to this item. When the Senate Rules Committee suggested we had violated the Senate Constitution and Act 188, we sought the opinion of our legal [sic]. We received a communication from the System's Chief Legal Counsel, Mr. Robert Mulle, in which he confirmed that our actions were proper and consistent with our authority under Act 188. Act 188, specifically, Section 20-2010-A, (3), authorizes the institution president "To develop and implement policies and procedures for the administration of the institution."

I would think that legal opinion is only as good as the question counsel is asked. This response seems to indicate that Mr. Mulle was asked if the administration has the authority to close the University School. Of course, that is not, and has never been, the issue. The Senate has always recognized that the administration has this authority.

It does not seem that Mr. Mulle was asked whether the real concern, the provision below in Section 20-2010 of Act 188, Item #2, was violated. This provision, under Powers and Duties of Institution Presidents, states:

(2) To make and implement specific campus policies pertaining to instructional programs, research programs, and public service programs and academic standards in accordance with policies of the Board FOLLOWING CONSULTATION WITH COUNCIL, FACULTY, AND STUDENTS" (emphasis added).

In fact, I have yet to see anything except a statement from the Provost that he consulted with Mr. Mulle. For a legal opinion to hold any water, it should clearly spell out the focus of the ruling and the basis for the opinion, and should be in writing.

This specific issue is representative of a general concern I have in the debate that we are continuing with the administration. I am concerned when we receive partial information and half-truths instead of a forthright representation of the facts. It is like we are involved in some chess match in which the Provost seeks to out-manuever the Senate verbally until we, in a daze, concede the game. I feel like I should say, a la Sergeant Friday, "Just the facts, sir."

We are currently in a situation that is analogous to our national situation. Whereas, we Americans want to safety and security from terrorism, we do not want to give up the basic civil liberties upon which our country is founded. We faculty and students want strong leadership in a time of fiscal hardship, but we don't want to give up shared governance. I ask our administration to stop telling us how serious our situation is and work with us to share the hard decisions that need to be made. Otherwise we may survive, but the damage done may last for many years.

So how do we move on? I would like to hear from the administration that they see our point of view, that we have a good argument as to why we are concerned. I want the insults that we are reacting emotionally rather than rationally to stop. They don't have to say they were wrong -- OK, it would help a lot, if they did, but I don't think they will. But we have to find a way to repair the damage and move on.

Forthrightness is one characteristic that can help. The other, frankly, is backbone. Wouldn't it be nice once for the Provost to say to the coordinator of a non-approved doctoral program, "If you want to continue as coordinator, the proposal should be in my hands next week," instead of, "when you get to it," which, in this case, was a year later. Wouldn't it be nice for the Provost to send out a notice to all deans and chairs, saying, "The rule says 'three times for a special topics course,' period." You've had plenty of time to prepare a course proposal, so I'm not approving any more exceptions." When Senate committees, after extended consideration, vote to uphold rules passed by the Senate and approved by the Council of Trustees, wouldn't it be nice if our Provost didn't say, "Oh, I'll make an exception in this case -- again."

We can survive this current struggle, but only if both sides are willing to move on. But, if the administration throws up defensive walls at every turn and is unwilling to admit when they make mistakes, or if the faculty and students decide they will be anti-administration no matter what, we will chew on each other while the Board of Governors smirks at the decline of IUP. Let's not let that happen.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT (Senator Coulson)

My report today will consist of two parts, the first being the Student Congress report the second will be about the current morale problem that exists here at IUP.

Student Congress' past 4 meetings have dealt with the following issues:

- Student Congress hosted 'Speak Up, IUP' in which many administration, faculty, and students were present. We were extremely happy with the turnout and the discussion that went on during the meeting. Some members expressed concern about the faculty and the administration arguing with one another. However, in its entirety it was a success. President Cramer and PR Chair Kelli Stillwell did an excellent job running and planning the event.
- Student Congress passed a motion to work with IUP Senior Staff to create a lasting memorial in front of Stapleton Library. This memorial will replace the current temporary memorial from the September 11th attacks. There are two foreseen reasons for creating this memorial: First, to serve as a remembrance of those victims who died on that day. Second, to recognize the 5,000 people who participated in the day of mourning in the Oak Grove.
- * Student Congress passed a motion to sponsor Wahr Hall Residence Council, Wahr Hall Community Service Floor, and Alpha Phi Omega service fraternity to donate \$50 of its budget to each of these organizations. These funds will help each organization donate food, clothes, toys, etc. to people who are less fortunate during the holiday season.
- * Student Congress is co-sponsoring an event for students to meet State Senator Don White and Representative Sarah Steelman. They will be coming to speak to IUP students about their jobs as state legislators and issues being talked about in the Legislature.
- * Student Congress has been concerned about its objectives for the year. We have seen ourselves stray off track. We want to turn that around before it is too late. We discussed our new course of action at the past meeting and are implementing new plans immediately. Instead of working on numerous issues at once, we have decided to work on 3 major objectives for the rest of the semester, the Sept. 11th memorial, a new mascot, and having Student Congress work with other organizations, instead of being perceived as exclusive.

Part 2-The Morale of IUP

I know I do not speak up very much in the Senate, other than to report the usual Student Congress business report. However, today I plan to speak about the appearance and perception of our University. Retention is still a dominant topic this year as well as in years past. Over the past two weeks I have had the privilege to visit 4 other universities in our geographical area. The colleges were Penn State University, University of Pittsburgh, Westminster and Slippery Rock. When I went to Penn St. and Pitt I had the feeling of being a part of something special, something that I believe does not exist at this university. I thought it was simply the national recognition these colleges are bestowed throughout the country. I have a feeling when I am here, and I do not think I am alone on this, that we are neglected employees in a perceived business. This business has nothing to boost our morale. Sure we are here to receive an education, but there is no college environment under which to find a deep-rooted pride in our universities purpose and values. I was really caught off guard when I arrived at Slippery Rock. Their fitness facility was image were hung everywhere. It gave me the impression that the school was there for the students. They wanted them to feel as if they were an integral part of it. I think making this

school look and feel like a college is of great importance. I think something should be implemented immediately. We should not pursue the usual stance of forming a committee to work on the circumstance that goes nowhere. Rather, we need to look at our sister school Slippery Rock and take their ideas and make them a reality here. The closest thing we have to a college atmosphere is Wayne Ave. McDonald's and Ruby Tuesday's. These establishments have more IUP Pictures and memorabilia than this entire school has visible throughout the campus. covered in school colors. Signs boosting the schools spirit and

It is imperative that our University makes a more concerted effort to make its students feel at home here. There are numerous ways to make this happen. The first is to bolster school pride through enhanced promotion of our image and values. Secondly, it is to include students more in the issues that often times most impact their lives.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to discuss.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

RULES COMMITTEE (Chairperson Radell)

See Appendix A, page 9, for this committee report.

AWARDS COMMITTEE (Chairperson Jackson)

Now is the time to submit nominations for this year's awards. These are due on DECEMBER 10, 2001! A publicity week is planned for the week after the Thanksgiving holiday. Information is posted on the senate web site (www.iup.edu/senate and click on "awards" on the home page). Winners will be recognized at Honor's Day and at the May commencement. .

UNIVERSITY-WIDE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (Chairpersons Sechrist and Numan)

See Appendix B, page 11, for this committee report.

GRADUATE COMMITTEE (Chairpersons Kondo and Chambers)

See Appendix C, page 12, for this committee report.

LIBRARY AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE (Chairperson Pagnucci)

This committee will meet on the 13th and 27th of November in the Stabley Library.

NONCREDIT COMMITTEE (Chairperson Barton)

The next meeting will be on November 13, 2001 in Keith Hall, Room 100.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE (Chairperson Guth)

See Appendix D, page 14, for the three grants, which were awarded at the October 9, 2001 meeting.

The next USRC meeting will be Tuesday, November 13, 2001 at 3:15 p.m. in Clark Hall.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Chairperson Hall)

The Student Affairs committee met on October 16 and 30, 2001. The committee plans to re-visit the solicitation policy and examine the image of IUP. The next meeting is scheduled for November 27, 2001 at 3:30 p.m. in the Oak Room West.

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE (Chairperson Domaracki)

This committee will meet on Tuesday, November 13, 2001, 2001 in 257 Davis at 3:15 p.m.

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE (Chairperson Andrew)

See Appendix E, page 15, for the information which was provided by the committee to the Senate.

NEW BUSINESS

Speaking on behalf of the Student Congress, Kelly Jean Norris asked to address the Senate and stated the following:

Good Afternoon Senate members, Faculty, Administration, and Students,

I am here to speak on behalf of the Student Congress, the voice of students campus wide, about the re-evaluations of courses and majors currently underway.

First of all, we want to acknowledge that the Congress is aware of the financial needs the university may have within the next three years. As stated in both Dr. Nowell and Dr. Staszkievicz's reports of September 4, because we will not receive the promised increase of funds from our former governor and because of University spending, we may soon be lacking several million dollars if steps are not taken immediately to alleviate some of our expenditures. As citizens of this University, we desire that this strain would not be added and, therefore, fully support the idea of making adjustments to the budget.

However, we are deeply concerned about the curriculum evaluations being made, with the assumption that some programs and departments may be lost.

First and foremost, we think the questions being asked when evaluating the programs need to be adjusted. At the October 2 Senate meeting, Dr. Staszkievicz listed a series of questions with which all low-enrollment programs are being examined. Included on that list were the questions: "What are the costs of the program and potential savings if the program were reduced or eliminated?" and "What are the costs associated with increasing enrollments to an acceptable level?"

Although we are quite aware that financial questions need to be asked in this time of want, curriculum issues should not be addressed in a purely financial light. The statement was made in the Provost's Report of September 4 that the financial adjustments "don't define who we are or what we do, but unless we address them, we won't be given the opportunity to do the other things." Validating our programs solely on these economic questions, however, will indeed make our University defined by what programs bring in money.

The departments that seem to be most at risk, judging from the recent closing of the University School, are the noncredit programs including the American Language Institute. It has been said that these types of programs are not central to the mission of IUP by their very nature. We strongly disagree with that thinking. The ALI brings in countless numbers of international students from around the globe to our hometown of Indiana. University Students have the marvelous opportunity to get to know these international students through classes as well as the Conversation Partner Program. I participated in Conversation Partners for three semesters and each time made a friend who expanded the way I see the world and understand daily life. Also, I grew as a teacher and mentor as I helped my international friend to experience our culture. A financial measuring stick simply cannot measure programs like these, which are a benefit to other schools globally and are an aid to our own University by their very nature of making classes more diverse. Already IUP is known for primarily collecting students from white, middle class, rural families; to eliminate the small multicultural reach we do have would be a disgrace.

In addition, another program, which is being evaluated is Philosophy. Yes, it is true traditionally philosophy is a poorly enrolled department. But yet, as one of the pillars of a liberal studies education, it is a necessary, vital part of our University. It was in my first philosophy class that I learned the technique of point, counterpoint when making an argument. And it is in philosophy class that many of us learn to read critically for the first time. In order to continue to attract the high level of professionals we have in this department currently, we cannot go to a curriculum that will only offer the basic philosophy courses. After all, what professor will stay at a university where he or she can only teach non-major courses? Teaching college students how to think must be one of our first priorities, and the Philosophy Department is central to the mission of this University in that respect.

With due credit, however, the question: "Is the program a System designated 'high need' area?" is being asked. Though I have not seen that list, many of the majors that are on the re-evaluation list are most likely also high need courses. For instance, our physics education program is being evaluated. As many of you are aware, there is an incredible shortage for physics teachers as well as several other secondary education majors in the United States. Yes, this program does have low enrollment, as do most physics programs around the nation. However, our societal need for teachers stands greater than the financial burden this program lays on the institution.

It is not fitting to discuss the details of all of the programs on the list, however, we think the point is made that the viability of courses is based on more than the questions the Provost is asking when re-evaluating majors.

Therefore, the Student Congress wants to make it quite clear that we do not approve of curriculum adjustments based solely on financial need. Instead we are calling the Senate and Administration, first,

to have a private audit done, which will look for unnecessary expenditures in departments and in the administration. We feel as a Congress that there are many places the budget can be tightened without eliminating or lessening the rigor of programs.

Second, we want to continue the theme of shared governance Dr. Petit began at the October 2 Senate meeting. We agree that sometimes changes need to be made quickly, but this does not mean decisions should be made in haste without proper consideration or thorough input. We stand behind the idea that a commission should be formed to handle the questions the University is facing today. And we want to remind that body of people that the right questions need to be asked when re-evaluating the curriculum.

Lastly, the Student Congress as a whole believes that the adjustments are moving the University in the wrong direction. If our goal is to increase marketability to students, fewer courses and programs will not accomplish our objective. It has been proven that most students change their major several times while at college, and therefore, students look for schools which cover a wide variety of interests, and they stay at schools which offer what they are looking for. We feel this statement must be made to the Board of Governors, who mandated the reviews of all low enrollment programs.

Also, we want strong statements to be sent to our state government, which decided to not put more money into public universities. As discussed before, there is a need throughout our nation for graduates from several of our low-enrollment majors. More students need to be recruited into these areas; cutting programs is not the answer to reaching this current need.

The Student Congress has collected signatures of support from students across different disciplines as well as several letters of support for making budget adjustments in areas other than our programs. Included in these letters are well thought out arguments for both specific majors and general programming. Although I could not include all of my peers' ideas into this brief address, their opinions are all worth reading.

It is clear that the students are taking initiative to stand for what we believe is best for our University, and I trust that our statements will be taken seriously as the course and major evaluations continue.

Senator Ray made a motion that an American flag be present in the Eberly Auditorium during senate meetings made a motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan B. Smith, Ed.D.
Secretary-IUP Senate

**APPENDIX A
Rules Committee
Chairperson Radell**

Rules Committee Report for the November 6, 2001 Senate Meeting.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Rules Committee will be Tuesday November 27, at 3:15 pm in McElhaney 203.

As of October 30, 2001, the Rules Committee has not received the information requested from the Administration (Senate Meeting, October 2, 2001). The Administration has indicated that it is preparing the requested information.

This presentation is the first reading of a proposed amendment to the Senate Bylaws initiated by the Awards Committee. The Rules Committee discussed and passed the proposed amendment on October 30, 2001. The proposed amendment will be decided by a vote in the Senate on December 4, 2001. The Rules Committee proposes the following amendment to the Senate Bylaws (**in bold italics**):

Current Wording:

a. Administration:

- 1. One Dean elected by and from the membership of the Senate.*
- 2. Two additional Administrative members elected by and from the Senate.*

.....
Recommended Wording:

a. Administration:

- 1. One Dean elected by and from the membership of the Senate.**
- 2. One Administrative member elected by and from the Senate.**
- 3. One Administrative member appointed by the President.**

.....
Rationale for Change (from the Awards Committee):

The Senate Awards Committee must work closely with the Office of the President to facilitate the awards process. Some examples of this include: informing the award recipients, generating the small stipend for winners, deciding on when/where recipients will be recognized, and creating the biographical sketches of the winners that are printed in University publications. Currently Ruth Riesenman, Executive Assistant to the President, serves on the Awards Committee. However, the current Senate Bylaws do not guarantee that she, or someone from the President’s Office, be on the

Committee. The members of the Committee met on 9/25/01 and voted unanimously in the form of a motion to make this change. It should be noted that this change does not expand the number of individuals that serve on the Committee. In addition, it does not expand the representation of administrative members on the Committee at the expense of other designated members (i.e., faculty or students).

APPENDIX B
University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Co-Chairpersons Sechrist and Numan

FOR INFORMATION

1. Liberal Studies Committee Report:

Approved Type I Professor Commitment Status for Dr. Jennifer Roberts, Criminology Department.
 Approved Dr. Anthony Joseph to teach LBST 499 Feeding the Hungry as requested by
 Dr. Van Dyke the original proposer.

2. Honors College Committee Report:

ENGL 310 Public Speaking has been approved for Honors credit.

FOR ACTION

The Department of Anthropology – Title and Catalog Description Change

PASSED

Current Catalog Description:

ANTH 456 Field Research Methods

3-01-3sh

Prerequisites: 9sh in ANTH

Examination of methods and practice of sociology and anthropology in the areas of qualitative and quantitative methods. Concentrates upon the development of field notes, interviewing techniques, participant observation, etc. Qualitative methods of sampling and analysis will include theoretical sampling and analytic induction. Brief background research into community, organizational, and group structure will also be emphasized.

Proposed Catalog Description:

ANTH 456 Ethnographic Research Methods

3c-01-3sh

Prerequisites: 9sh in ANTH

Course provides a background in qualitative and quantitative techniques used in anthropological research. We will concentrate on the ethics of research with people, the formulation of hypotheses, design and use of appropriate research techniques, and data analysis. Particular emphasis will be placed on development of field notes, interviewing techniques, developing genealogies, and participant observation.

Rationale:

The catalog description has been in existence for many years and it does not reflect current terminology in the field. Additionally the old description was fairly vague and students sometimes confused this course with the Archaeological Field School. In keeping with policies of being more specific about curriculum options, we are using this opportunity to revise the catalog text to make it more descriptive of the topics that will be explored in the course, and the range of skills a student might be expected to acquire.

APPENDIX C
Graduate Committee
Chairpersons Condo and Chambers

FOR ACTION

1. Minor Course Revision:

PASSED

Course Title Change

From

ANTH 556 Field Research Methods

To

ANTH 556 Ethnographic Research Methods

Rationale: To make explicit that the course is one in cultural anthropology, emphasizing qualitative methods for research with contemporary people, in contrast to ANTH 520, "Archeological Field School" which is a course in archaeological methods.

2. New Course

PASSED

PHYS 611 Computational Physics

3sh

This course is an introduction to developments in computational physics. The emphasis will be on physical concepts and applications rather than mathematical proofs, derivations, and code developments. In particular, the course will show how computers can be used to learn about physics concepts and how they can be used as tools in solving physics problems. A familiarity with the concept of programming is assumed. **Prerequisites:** PHYS 473/561, or equivalent, or permission of the instructor

Rationale: The course will become a new elective in the Physics Department.

3. Peer Review Process Proposal:

PASSED

Minor course revisions of graduate courses, involving no new resources, can, upon departmental and the college dean's approval, be submitted directly to the University-Wide Graduate Committee for approval. When such changes are part of a program revision, they should remain packaged with the full proposal. The University-Wide Graduate Committee shall notify the appropriate College Curriculum Committee prior to sending a minor graduate course revision to Senate.

Rationale:

In examining ways to streamline the curriculum approval process, the University-Wide Graduate Committee believes that existing courses – i.e. those that have already had resource and content approval at the department, college and university-wide level – do not need another full review when undergoing minor revisions, as long as no new resources were required. Note: this change would affect only graduate courses. This change was approved by all six College Curriculum Committees.

4. Policy Revision:**TABLED****Policy on Workshops and Special Credits:****Current Policy**

The Graduate Program approved in each specific department constitutes a rationally structured and well-defined body of information and techniques deemed appropriate to the discipline. For that reason, the individual master's degree candidate may submit for credit for his degree no more than six (6) semester hours of workshop and other special-credit offerings approved by the department offering the degree. Doctoral candidates may submit (a further) six (6) semester hours of such work beyond the master's or its equivalent if approved by the degree-granting department. Should the workshop(s) or special credit offering(s) later become a catalog-listed course which is part of the degree program, while the student is still working toward his/her degree, the student may request of the department a retroactive reclassification of credits so earned and upon approval may again submit up to the maximum of such reclassified credits workshop or special-offering credit as initially stipulated above.

Revised Policy

The Graduate Program approved in each specific department constitutes a rationally structured and well-defined body of information and techniques deemed appropriate to the discipline. For that reason, the individual master's degree candidate may submit for credit for his degree no more than six (6) semester hours of workshop and other special-credit offerings approved by the department offering the degree. Doctoral candidates may submit (a further) six (6) semester hours of such work beyond the master's or its equivalent if approved by the degree-granting department. Should the workshop(s) or special credit offering(s) later become a catalog-listed course which is part of the degree program, while the student is still working toward his/her degree, the student may request of the department a retroactive reclassification of credits so earned and upon approval may again submit up to the maximum of such reclassified credits workshop or special-offering credit as initially stipulated above. Special-offering credits are defined as those credits earned through Independent Study, Individualized Instruction, Special Topics, workshops, or any combination therein.

Rationale: The current policy governing workshop and other special-offering credits was passed by the University Senate on May 8, 1979. The proposed revision adds the final sentence to the end of the original policy for clarification.

Appendix D
University Senate Research Committee (USRC) Report
Chairperson Guth

The USRC met on October 9, 2001 and reviewed proposals. The committee awarded \$4,034 in grants to the following individuals:

Dr. Teresa Shellenbarger received \$1,407 for her project, "Understanding and Supporting Family Caregivers."

Dr. Joseph Nolan received \$1,127 for his study, "Reexamining the Link Between Motor Disorders and Learning Disabilities."

Dr. Lynn Botelho received \$1,500 to present her paper "Agents of Their Destinies: Poor, Old Women in Early Modern England" at the European Social Science History Conference in the Netherlands.

The committee also added clarifications to category 4 (international travel) of the USRC guidelines. The updated information is now available on the Grants Office Website.

The next USRC meeting will be on Tuesday, November 13, 2001 at 3:15 p.m. in 317 Clark Hall.

APPENDIX E
Academic Committee
Chairperson Andrew

For Senate Information:

The Academic Committee presents for information this revision of the Cancelled Semester Policy. The purpose of the revision is to clarify the policy.

CANCELLED SEMESTER POLICY

Purpose: The Cancelled Semester Policy provides for cancellation from the cumulative record of the effects of one semester below 2.00 for the purpose of helping a student improve academic standing.

Conditions: The student must have been separated from the university for four consecutive semesters and the intervening summer sessions.

Definitions:

One semester refers to any semester of enrollment, whether full- or part-time, with the summer sessions collectively considered as one semester.

Cancellation removes the mathematical effect of all grades (passing, failing, withdrawals) from the semester, but there is no abridgement of the transcript. All courses and original grades remain visible on the official transcript; credit toward graduation remains for those credits associated with passing grades.

Academic Standards: A student readmitted under this policy must meet current degree requirements and will be reviewed under current academic standards requirements applicable at the time of readmission.

Restrictions:

Single occurrence: This policy may be invoked only once in a student's undergraduate enrollment in the university.

Active enrollment: While readmission may be based on the application of the cancelled semester, the transcript record will reflect this only after the student is enrolled and attending IUP. It is not a tool to qualify for transfer to another institution

Process: The student must apply to the college of which he/she was a member at the time of last enrollment. If a student wishes to enter a major in a college other than the one from which he/she was separated, he/she will apply to the original college, which will forward the application and related records to the new college for action. The college will inform the office of the Registrar if the application is approved. Authorization for registration will come from that office.

Approved: Senate Academic Committee October 16, 2001