

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

**JANUARY 15, 2014  
(Continuation of the December 4, 2013 Meeting)**

**PRESENT:** Berlin Ray, Delatte, Dixit, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Genovese, Goodell, Goodman, Gross, R. Henry, Hoffman, D. Jackson, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Kalafatis, Karem, Kent, Kosteas, Krebs, Lehfeldt, J. Lieske, Liggett, Little, Majette, Marino, C. C. May, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Resnick, Rickett, Sridhar, Steinberg, Visocky-O'Grady, M. Walton, Welfel, J. G. Wilson, Witmer-Rich, L. Wolf.

Bond, C. Brown, Dumski, J. Ford, Mageean, McHenry, Sadlek, Thornton, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

**ABSENT:** Boboc, Delgado, Gorla, S. Kaufman, Margolius, Meier, Rashidi, Talu, Vogelsang-Coombs.

Artbauer, Berkman, Boise, Boychuk, Halasah, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, Novy, Parry, Sawicki, Spademan, Stoll, Triplett, B. White.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M. She welcomed everyone to this extraordinary meeting of the Senate today to finish the unfinished business from the December 4, 2013 meeting and to deal with some new business that has come through the University Curriculum Committee and the Admissions and Standards Committee relative to the 4 to 3 conversion.

**I. Approval of the Agenda for the January 15, 2014 Meeting**

Dr. Goodell stated that the Steering Committee has proposed the Agenda for today. She asked if there was any discussion about the Agenda for today.

Dr. James Marino commented that since this is not an ordinary meeting to clear up Old Business, could we dispense with the usual reports, items II, III, and IV.

Dr. Goodell noted that Dr. Marino was proposing a motion to dispense with items II, III, and IV of today's Agenda,

The motion was seconded. Dr. Goodell then asked Senators to vote. The motion to dispense with Items II, III, and IV was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell noted that Senate needs to approve the remainder of the Agenda as amended with one modification from Dr. Bill Kosteas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee.

Professor Bill Kosteas stated that if everyone looks at the list of items from the University Curriculum Committee, the list actually relates to Health Sciences programs under A. 1. x. which is the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences. The Honors and Scholars Program was also submitted. Moreover, added to that list is the Post Bac for NEOMED students and the Urban Health Concentration. Dr. Kosteas noted that what happened was the UCC did not approve the Speech and Hearing programs but everything else that was in the Senate meeting packet was approved and UCC had resubmission of the Speech and Hearing program.

Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Kosteas, for clarification, which items he had referred to. She stated that we have the addition of three items – A. 1. x. addition of Honors and Scholars Program, A. 1. ab. the Post Bac NEOMED and A.1.ac. the Urban Health Concentration.

Dr. Goodell then asked Senators to approve the Agenda as amended. The motion to approve the Agenda as twice amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**II. Report of the Faculty Senate President**

Deleted from the Agenda.

**III. Report of the President of the University**

Deleted from the Agenda.

**IV. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer**

Deleted from the Agenda.

**V. Old Business**

Dr. Goodell stated that first up is the old business from the University Faculty Affairs Committee, i.e., the Student Evaluation Instrument. She noted that Dr. Karem will give Senate an update on changes that have been made as a result of the feedback that he received from the last go around. Dr. Goodell reminded everyone that the purpose of the meeting here is not to discuss the individual items in the assessment but

rather to take a look at the instrument and any other issues that faculty might have. She added that this will probably not be the end of the discussion.

**A. University Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Student Evaluation Instrument (Report No. 33, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Jeff Karem commented that he hoped everyone had a copy of the most recent SEI instrument. If not, he did bring extra copies.

Dr. Karem stated that he wanted to give everyone a quick update on the process of the review and the revisions UFAC has gone through because he knows this is a proposal that is challenging for a lot of folks. He wanted to make clear UFAC really tried to solicit and incorporate as much feedback as possible. He added that this is a little less than a year in the making.

Professor Karem stated that in the fall of 2012, a joint task force of faculty and administrators, in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, reviewed promotion and tenure procedures. The task force issued a series of recommendations. One of the recommendations was to develop a unified student evaluation of instruction instrument and following that, to consider significant issues of data calculation as well as access to the data and statistics generated from the data. Last January, UFAC was charged by the Provost and the Senate Steering Committee to develop a unified instrument. UFAC did so after completing the Greenbook revision. After comparing and assessing the various college instruments, UFAC presented an initial draft to Senate last spring. Then at Senate's request, UFAC revised the draft in September and submitted it to college FACs and Senators for feedback. UFAC incorporated that feedback into a draft presented at the last Senate meeting on December 4, 2013. Further suggestions from the floor were taken and this initiated another round of feedback. He noted that UFAC also solicited feedback from a professor of Psychology who specializes in psychometrics and UFAC revised the instrument in light of his suggestions.

Dr. Karem noted that specifically in the direction of making questions less prone to bias and more performance based they also conducted educational literature reviews and looked at the resources of other universities to assess past practices. Dartmouth College in particular has a very useful web site on student evaluation procedures and much of our instrument actually aligns closely with theirs so he hopes that we can start charging commensurate tuition if we pass this.

Professor Karem reported that UFAC also met with the Student Government Association and he thanked Jon Fedor, Allie Dumski and Emily Halasah for very useful feedback. He noted that he spoke with Dr. Teresa LaGrange from Institutional Research who has given UFAC a very good sense of what her office plays with this and UFAC has spoken with Sharon Smith and Iris Zana of Testing Services which is the intake point for all student evaluations. UFAC has revised the instrument twice. Since the December 4, 2013 Senate meeting, the committee has been very attentive to working on this

instrument over the break. He is just mentioning all of this to let everyone know that UFAC is really trying to incorporate the feedback.

Dr. Karem said that he is asking for Senate's approval of this core instrument today because this is the first step towards approving the entire process. Following our discussion. He will report to Senate on several crucial policy considerations that need to be considered to move forward. Dr. Karem highlighted briefly some changes in this document since the last Senate meeting. UFAC is adding a "not applicable" option and made clear that these answers won't be tabulated. In other words, if the question doesn't apply, you are not forced into answering in a way that forces a statistical problem. UFAC added a "Neither agree nor disagree" option and scaled that with number 3 within the one to five scale. They rescaled final assessment questions away from an "excellent-unacceptable" continuum to "excellent-poor." That was a more applicable statistical model to use. UFAC adopted the "positive" listing order suggested by Faculty Senate, but preserved the old numbering system so as not to sow further confusion. They don't want to create a situation where we are getting a five under the new system so it means you are at the end of the spectrum. Questions were added about course expectations and whether the course met with those expectations. Questions were added about courtesy and respect, learning environment, and feedback about student's performance in the course. UFAC's question about student engagement produced the most confusion. He noted that quite honestly, no one liked it perhaps because it meant such different things to different disciplines. Consequently, UFAC suggested that each college custom-craft a question appropriate for their fields. Some colleges' engagement may be hands on or some colleges might do community work. Almost everyone who wrote to him about it (about twenty responses from faculty just during the summer alone) said, "I like engagement, but what do you mean? In my college it means this; in your college it means that. If we do move this forward, we might suggest that the colleges consider if they want to custom-craft an engagement question. Dr. Karem noted that on the last subject of custom-crafting, UFAC put in an explicit reminder at the bottom of the instrument that colleges can add other disciplines to specific questions regarding technology, engagement, and student self-assessment. UFAC wanted to make extra clear that this instrument is a common starting point, and colleges can add to it but not subtract from it. At that point, Dr. Karem asked if there were any questions.

Senator Michael Kalafatis commented that he sent Dr. Karem a memo on the 25<sup>th</sup> that says that "neither agree nor disagree" is going to fill the mean. So, if you want a number, that's fine. But for your number to be compared to the whole college and university, that's not going to happen.

Professor Karem responded that UFAC spoke with a number of individuals to try to figure out what the right phrasing should be.

Professor Kalafatis stated that you have to take it out and that should be "Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree." He noted that this yield you a mean.

Dr. Karem replied that UFAC made that proposal at Senate actually last time and there was broad consensus that there needed to be an option in there for “Neither Agreeing nor Disagreeing.”

Professor Kalafatis commented that there has to be a box underneath that doesn't come with the numbers. These numbers may be thrown because that's a physical problem.

Dr. Karem responded that he does think that “Not Applicable” is distinct from “Neither Agree nor Disagree” and UFAC kept that in there for that reasoning.

Senator Robert Krebs stated that he shares a similar misunderstanding because he thought that at the last Senate meeting Senate, we were close to agreeing on a four-level scale where that basically “Disagree” was what was equivalent to “Not Applicable”. He reported that the College of Science caucus met and talked about this for another hour yesterday. It is not that they have a problem with the questions or even actually these answers as long as there was an expectation that no one is going to try to calculate a mean on the first twelve. If it is just the distribution, they are okay with it but the idea of trying to calculate a mean with that series is what concerns the College of Sciences.

Dr. Karem noted that Dr. Krebs raised a really good question. He stated that what we would calculate statistically has not been determined yet. So that is the next step and UFAC did not want to over burden the document with prescription in advance – i.e., of how means could be calculated or whether there needs to be means. UFAC has consulted with a number of web resources and there is a range of different methods. Dr. Karem stated that in terms of our reports at present, the mean scores would be received on the equivalent of questions 13 and 19. He thinks that would be a legitimate argument to move forward to say, when we are calculating comparative data with respect to other colleges, maybe those questions wouldn't be in the mix. But that is not a question that UFAC has decided to answer right now. Currently, UFAC is proposing the instrument itself, not how things can be statistically calculated for exactly the reasons that people are raising. He noted that he has been studying as much statistics as an English professor can handle, looking at distribution charts and things like that, and there are a lot of useful practices out there. To be frank, most data out there that he has seen spends a lot less time on looking at comparisons on what colleges and faculty spend more about comparisons within the scores and how they are distributed in a course. Dr. Karem noted that these are things we can work on.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray expressed grave concern. First of all, we don't know how over the years this is going to end up being used. She doesn't think we can make an assumption that because we don't think it's going to be used in a certain way in the future that will in fact be the case. We have seen over the years that things end getting used in ways that we never could have anticipated. She added that we need to be cautious here. The other thing, is statistically, the mean is not an appropriate measure when you have this kind of scale. So, a way to take care of that, and she doesn't think that we can separate out the items from measure, is you just cut out the “Neither Agree nor

Disagree”. Instead you have “Not Applicable” as another response but it is out of the calculations. You can’t separate that from the scale that we have here. Statistically, it just gives you meaningless results. Dr. Berlin Ray went on to say that it is not a problem in the sense that you just take out “Neither Agree nor Disagree” and have four items with “Applicable” out of there. She feels that it is very dangerous to say we’ll accept this and then we will worry about the statistics later.

Senator Kalafatis commented that cannot be done now and ten years from now someone will say, “Who did this and why did they do this?” We lose something that we used. This thing is not going to give you means. The instrument will yield totally worthless numbers. So, “Strongly Agree or Disagree” has to go. Maybe you put in another mean or you take it out. The difference between “Agree or Disagree” or “Not Applicable.” is all semantics. He suggested that there should be four options – that’s it.

Dr. Karem commented that just as a reminder, he presented four options to Senate the last time and actually didn’t have neither “Agree nor Disagree” so that actually has been inserted because there was feedback to that effect. He added that he doesn’t have a problem with entertaining an amendment if the Senate wills it to delete that option – that’s within the power of this body. He originally did not propose that so he is not disagreeing with Dr. Kalafatis. UFAC inserted that in the instrument in response to feedback.

Senator Deborah Geier stated that she thinks this is particularly important because right now, every faculty member is given the college mean and how we compare to the college mean. If we are going to adopt a new form and then say we are no longer going to give you college means along with the individual faculty mean, it’s going to be very difficult to see how to compare with your colleagues. She went on to say that the fact that there was no “Neither Agree nor Disagree” last time, and people want something to encompass “Not Applicable”, if she remembers correctly, previously there was no “Not Applicable.” So adding both is what we are all focusing on here and it is the wrong way to go. We need a “Not Applicable” or we need a “Neither Agree nor Disagree” with a star both of which or whichever we choose is outside of the statistical analysis.

Dr. Goodell inquired if someone wanted to propose an amendment.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltdt moved that we remove 3) “Neither Agree nor Disagree” and it will default to a four-point scale as a consequence. Dr. Kalafatis seconded the motion. Professor Karem agreed with the motion.

Dr. Goodell then asked Senators to vote. The motion to remove 3) “Neither Agree nor Disagree” from the SEI Instrument was approved with one nay and one abstention

Professor Kalafatis stated that he had one more thing to argue about. He commented that this depends on the college. You cannot compare a freshman class of 200 people with a graduate class of 18 to 25. This is more pertinent at the college level

than at the university level but this should be addressed. He asked Dr. Karem if UFAC could do that – to make sure that we have four categories here and in a large lecture, 200 level, GenEd 200 level, non-GenEd and graduate courses, etc. He added that this should be kept in mind.

Professor Karem replied that once UFAC has dealt with the instrument, actually one of the policy suggestions that has come out of every level of feedback is to build a data-base that allows those kind of comparisons – apples to apples comparisons to be made. In fact, the impetus behind creating a core-unified instrument, is to be able to make those comparisons so that, if you are teaching an English 100 course, you want to have your scores compared probably not to an English 400 course, maybe to a Math 100 course or something of that nature which you can't really do in this current environment. Dr. Karem said that he agreed with Dr. Kalafatis' point one hundred percent.

At this point, Dr. Goodell asked if there was any additional discussion or questions about the instrument.

Dr. Karem indicated that he had one other question. He noted that someone had suggested to him on the way to today's meeting and he just wanted to ask if this was of interest. It's in the continuum of "Not Applicable". He stated that a colleague pointed out to him that we don't have an equivalent answer for number 20) "What Grade do you expect to earn in this course?" He asked, do Senators think it would be wise to add a question and answer that is "Unknown" so if a student doesn't have an expected grade, there is a place for that simply because they don't know.

Senator Kathleen Little added that a student may be auditing or enrolled in a continuing education course.

Professor Karem responded that except for the questions that people raised with him about making sure that there is a place for the answer, that doesn't fit with the others.

Professor Krebs stated that this seems to be the right place for the "Not Applicable" response for audits or Project 60 students.

Dr. Karem noted that it is possible somebody might not know their grade because they haven't discussed the issue with the instructor.

Senator Beth Ekelman commented that this is also applicable to a pass/fail situation.

Dr. Berlin Ray asked about including an "other" line.

Professor Karem stated that if we want to be symmetrical he supposed we could just use "Not Applicable." He said he doesn't want to force us into wordsmithing and opening a can of worms. However, since faculty were tentative to the "Not Applicable" issues elsewhere, then this issue comes up.

Dr. Berlin Ray commented that this is true based on her auditing a course and the answer to the “What grade do you expect to earn in this course?” question is “Not Applicable” – that question is not applicable.

Dr. Marino asked if Senate could amend to unknown support of “Not Applicable.” It could be a catch-all for both of those categories – Project 60 students and any students who have just fundamentally no idea how they are doing.

Professor Hoffman commented that we can’t hear what Jim Marino is saying.

Dr. Marino stated that he would make a motion that we amend not only adding the “Not Applicable” category but amend the phrasing to “Unknown or Not Applicable” to cover both the students who are not expecting a grade, students who are getting a pass/fail grade and students who are just in the state of fundamental confusion about their progress.

Dr. Goodell asked for a second to Dr. Marino’s motion. The motion was seconded. Dr. Goodell then asked for discussion. There being no discussion, Dr. Goodell asked Senators to vote. The motion to amend the phrasing to “Unknown or Not Applicable” was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell stated that we have two amendments to UFAC’s SEI Instrument.

Senator Joel Lieske asked, “What is the rationale for reversing the order of the responses?” He noted that we had the order from low to high before – “Strongly Disagree, Strongly Agree” and we had from “Poor to Excellent” and from “F to A.”

Dr. Karem replied that at the last Senate meeting and in consultations with statisticians it suggested to UFAC that in terms of psychometric profiling you may create a bias towards the negative if you use that.

Professor Lieske commented, “Or create a bias towards the positive – grade inflation.” A differential of zero to 100 is also used in psychometric research. He said that, in national surveys conducted by political scientists, generally you go from low to high.

Professor Karem replied that he made this amendment in response to what people suggested at Senate and several psychometricians UFAC talked to. He said that it seems that we are still preserving the continuity of responses.

Senator Barbara Hoffman stated that she feels that we have actually arrived at a fairly good compromise here because if you notice, if this is not looked at in terms of a semantic range, but in terms of the numbers, the first number is a lower category so number 1) is poor, 2) is below average, etc., up to 5) so you’ve got the semantic tendency



going in one direction and then the numerical tendency going in another direction which seems to her to be about as close as you can get to balancing out those two tendencies.

Professor Berlin Ray asked Dr. Karem how many faculty he heard from who teach on-line classes.

Dr. Karem replied that he heard from between five to seven people in the most recent round and one individual said “This looked a lot better than the initial draft when it didn’t seem to respond to on-line instruction.” He noted that the instrument was also circulated to the E-Learning Committee.

Professor Berlin Ray said that she wonders if we approved this today, if there could be a caveat in there stipulating that after using the instrument maybe once or twice that we just revisit with the on-line folks to see how it works. She doesn’t teach on line, but she can just imagine that some of these questions may end up not working as well, or there may be other things that should be on the instrument that people who teach on line when they actually use it will find helpful. So she would like Senate to be able to revisit it for that.

Dr. Karem stated that our caveat should be that we need to revisit our evaluation procedures recurrently and historically we haven’t done that. So he agrees with Dr. Berlin Ray one hundred percent. He added that it needs to be extended beyond that. He said that he would go on record in the Senate Minutes saying, “I believe that UFAC needs to revisit this periodically in order to check it’s accuracy for all forms of instruction.”

Professor Berlin Ray commented that it makes her nervous because some things end up getting codified in ways that to revisit them becomes very difficult.

Dr. Karem responded that Senate has oversight over this process; this has been guaranteed to us by the Greenbook and our Bylaws so if we don’t feel comfortable with what’s been happening, we are empowered to change it, and we should.

Dr. Goodell pointed out that years ago, Senate tried to come to some sort of agreement on this issue. She noted that it must have been initiated by the Senate but she was not sure but discussions never got as far as the floor of Senate she doesn’t believe. So in the past this issue was addressed.

Professor Berlin Ray thanked Dr. Karem and said that UFAC had really done a very good job on something that all of us need and she appreciates that.

Dr. Karem replied that he takes that excellent feedback from everyone as a kind of holiday present. He was thankful that people would write in to UFAC during the holidays and to talk about student evaluations when they were with family.

Dr. Goodell stated that UFAC is proposing a modified SEI Instrument with the amendments as proposed to eliminate “Neither Agree nor Disagree” and to add an option “Unknown or Not Applicable” to the expected grade and that this unified instrument would be used as a poll across all colleges.

Professor Karem said that he will need to discuss with Testing Services and college offices how quickly this can be implemented. He noted that Testing Services has said that if colleges can approve their expanded forms by mid-March, they could run with this in the fall but he doesn’t know based on all of the other work that is going on, if that’s going to be a realistic target point. When he talks about the policy considerations he has learned a lot from Testing Services. They met with UFAC for two hours and were tremendous in explaining procedures so the answer is that it depends.

Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Karem if he would like Senate to take a vote on the SEI Instrument now and then he can discuss the policy implications in a minute. Dr. Goodell then asked Senators to vote. The UFAC’s proposed unified SEI Instrument as twice amended was approved by voice vote with one abstention.

Dr. Karem stated that this is a preview of coming attractions. It is not quite Oscar worthy, but February is nearly here. Dr. Karem thanked Senate for just giving its approval. UFAC will consult with Testing Services to review the timeline of how we can implement this new instrument. UFAC recommends that each college work with Testing Services to develop forms similar to those used by Engineering and Education, which SGA definitely considers as best practice. It is a format where the questions are all on the same page. The form is user friendly. It’s not in a font from 1999. He noted that there was a clear sense that some more current evaluations seemed to be produced by someone not from almost the era of the ditto machine. He went on to say that each form should begin with a common core of questions and each college may have specific questions. Obviously doing this doesn’t preclude the possibility of the options for writing long-hand responses. Dr. Karem said that as he mentioned to Senator Jones at a separate meeting, Testing Services indicated that they could launch the new instrument in fall 2014 but they would need final word on the format from the colleges by March of 2014. So, UFAC next needs to consult with colleges and Testing Services and return to Senate with a proposed timeline for implementation and approval.

Dr. Karem said a few words about statistics. He noted that it is clear that the current college means have no statistical value. The most current one available is from Joanne Goodell’s College of Education. They redid the computation of their mean in 2003 – the rest of the university dates back to 1999 so we are literally dealing with the means from the past century. In two cases, they refer to a college that no longer exists. Interestingly, this is not a product of any statistical inabilities on the part of Testing Services. He said that colleges simply haven’t gotten around to updating this issue. He noted that we need to update this data and we need to decide what the appropriate standards are for comparison. Testing Services can do quite a bit once there is a good data-base established. Dr. Karem reported that looking at Dartmouth, for example, they offer a course report with the mean and distribution chart to make clear where general

tendencies lie. He noted that country-wide, there is a lot more division on what to do with respect to comparing to your peers – there are some very different ways of deal with that issue. We need to talk about that in the future.

Dr. Karem noted that the good news/bad news is that before we do that, we actually need to make sure that we have a database that allows comparisons. At present, there is not a unified database for collating and comparing evaluation scores. All of the SEI information is accumulating in data-files in Testing Services. Testing Services, with a very small staff (they are working very hard there) is simply running data sheets through scan-tron machines and not assembling results in a digital data base. It is possible to calculate means or comparisons, as Professor Kalafatis suggested, but you in a sense have to put in a research request to Testing Services or Institutional Research to recalibrate the data to look in the files. So if you want anything close to quick access to look at your scores in comparison to your peers or colleagues or departments, you have to draw up a proposal. He added that he doesn't think this is any way to run a database; this was being stated by a humanities professor. Just to be clear, this is not the fault of anyone in Testing Services. They are working with in-house software that was developed in 1999. Fortunately, there is an expert in Computer and Information Sciences on the UFAC committee and he assessed the software and said it could easily be updated in-house to a data-base system. He added that this is something we can do using our own human intellectual capital. We can make it work for us and hopefully that will save some money for some other avenues.

Dr. Karem mentioned that many people have been commenting about the instrument itself; it took a lot of time to express dissatisfaction with the quartile ranking system. He also wanted to report to Senate that in 1999, a statement from UFAC recommended that we do away with the quartile system and somehow that didn't happen. He wanted it known that there has been previous visitations of this issue.

Dr. Karem noted that the last issue is one that is going to be the most interesting down the road and that is access to the data. In other words, making the data more accessible. This is an issue at many peer institutions. Having things buried in data-files is not the norm. We will need to initiate a discussion about the appropriate means to make this data available. If there is a unified database, you should have access. Dr. Karem stated that down the road, many people have suggested, "Boy would it be easier if we just did this on-line." Dr. Karem said that he agrees. One of the concerns of on-line response rates, even nationally, were terrible. At many institutions that he read recent articles on in the *Chronicle*, they have lamented the switch to on-line systems and then you have to figure out ways to control those who bribe students into responding. Dr. Karem said that there is a lot more work ahead but this is the point of departure. Approval is needed for the instrument that makes these kinds of questions even possible. Right now, we have is a system that is so broken, we can't even ask for meaningful comparisons.

Finally, Dr. Karem thanked everyone for their time and everyone will hear from him again in the future.

Senator Ekelman commented that one of the things that Dr. Karem hasn't mentioned is that years ago we developed a process or a procedure of how to distribute the questionnaires to make sure that the students, or somebody else other than the instructor, gave out the questionnaire so that the results wouldn't be given to the faculty member until all grades are in. She is assuming that is all staying as part of the proper procedure.

Professor Karem replied that in 2004 Senate actually passed those procedures. As far as he has heard, and he has consulted with a number of administrators, chairs and students, he doesn't believe that that procedure itself is problematic or has been compromised. He noted that many people questioned the turnaround time in getting the scores back to faculty but that's largely a process of technology. Testing Services, if they want to calculate particular scores, have to wait for things to come in and try to group them by departments and the reports go back to the chairs at the same time scores are sent to faculty. He added that there is room to revisit this issue.

Provost Deirdre Mageean commented on the question that Senator Hoffman raised and said that since one Board member is raising questions about uses of the process and may have received information from some sources that professors handed out the evaluations themselves and were in class. So, as everyone knows, it only takes one or two anecdotal stories to raise concerns. What she thinks she wants to do is to show the Board at the next Trustees meeting that there is a policy in place and that we have clearly set a policy we can enforce in every single class section. At this point, Provost Mageean pointed out to Senate President Goodell and Dr. Karem that the Board is very concerned. As you know, people report things to the Board members and they take them seriously. The Board are worried about this process being compromised by abuses in the system.

Senator Lieske stated that he had a question for the Provost. He asked, "What adjustments if any are going to be made for a student's expected grade?" He noted that we have the overall evaluation of the instructor and an overall evaluation of the course. The research shows that there is a strong correlation between a student's evaluation of the instructor and his or her expected grade. So it would seem to be if we are collecting data on the grade that the student expects to receive, shouldn't we try to adjust the overall rating of the professor of the course relative to this expectation?

Provost Mageean commented that her understanding is that the literature is quite divided on that; there is no clear cut evidence one way or the other. Actually, there is evidence quite to the contrary, but actually that's not in her purview to compare with it. That's still within your right to do that.

Dr. Karem said that he could answer that briefly. He noted that the Provost is right. The literature is divided on that and he thinks it would be impossible, quite frankly, to imagine some sort of appropriate statistical model where you correct it for grade expectation. The best we could do is to have the capability that if the faculty wants to make the case that evaluation scores are turning in this direction because students are

getting grades lower than colleagues, then that case can be made. But he doesn't know if there is consensus as to how you could build that into the system. He noted that he has never heard any evaluation system that does that.

Dr. Lieske commented that the standard technique would be regression analysis and adjusting for that expected grade.

Professor Karem responded that if you are wanting to correct for one kind of possible bias, then you can use a different evaluation system. Actually, as of last fall, each college and department was supposed to review its peer evaluation procedures so that should be happening. He commented to Dr. Lieske that there are things out there to answer his concerns. He has looked at many evaluation instruments and nobody has developed a magic number to address what Dr. Lieske is looking at and that is as close as he will get to a math quiz.

Dr. Goodell thanked Dr. Karem and UFAC for an outstanding and well done job. A round of applause ensued.

## **B. Budget and Finance committee**

### **Informational Report (Report No. 34, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Andrew Resnick, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, reported that the next meeting of PBAC is on January 23, 2014. He reported that the items they considered in a previous meeting were a little more focused relative to the breakdown of faculty salary expenditures. PBAC were also asked to provide a summary of the budgetary impact of the Affordable Care Act and also a little bit more information about the recent bond issue.

Professor Resnick first discussed salary expenditures. He noted that the first table shows how the budget is broken down to extract that information. On the top row, there is what is called Program Codes. For example, Item 01 is Instruction & Department Research; Item 60 is the Plant expenditures and Item 80 is Auxiliary Enterprises. On the vertical tab are Account Codes. You can imagine that there are quite a few of these. He noted that most of the people in this room have specific line items and specific account codes and can put their name on them. Dr. Resnick mentioned that this budgetary information is publicly available. One can go on the web site and get it from the State web site and also from the CSU web site.

Professor Resnick stated that for faculty salary codes, there are nine different codes – 0120 through 0159. The first two codes, i.e., 0120 and 0121, combine and they account for full-time faculty salaries and the other ones were related to part-time. He noted that item 0159 is Released Time in italics and that is actually categorized as income, not as an expenditure. Similarly, on the non-faculty side, there are fourteen different account codes. Again, the bold faced ones when combined are defined as full-time non-faculty salary. He is stipulating non-faculty salary administration because the

budget doesn't distinguish between administration and janitorial services or technical support – all of them lumped together is non-faculty salary. So, you can imagine for every single year there is a large spread sheet called salary information. The Budget Office provided information for the previous three years which he analyzed and put together and summarized on the next page, "Findings of Salary Expenditures Summary." He noted that the first finding has to do with comparison of full-time and total salary expenditures. We have the previous three years laid out and you will see for faculty salary expenditures the approximately 80% of the total salary expenditures as related to full-time faculty and that number is pretty constant with the previous three years. Similarly the number for the previous three years for non-faculty is about 83%.

Professor Resnick reported that the next finding had to do with the total salary expenditures as a percent of the operating budget. Again, for the previous three years, with the total faculty salary, not full-time faculty salary and the total non-faculty salary, not full-time non-faculty salary and those numbers often trend in similar directions. They maybe dip down a little bit and it's hard to say if there is a real trend there or not but they seem to be fairly consistent for the previous three years. Professor Resnick said that what was interesting to him was looking at the salary expenditures. Here he averaged over the previous three years and we see a really big difference between the faculty and the non-faculty salary expenditures. He noted that 99% of all faculty salary expenditures is accounted for in a program called 01, while the distribution of non-faculty salary appears fairly and uniformly across all different program codes. He added that he just found that interesting and that's all he is going to say about that. At this point, he asked if anyone had any questions about the salary information.

Professor Resnick continued stating that impacts of the "Affordable Care Act Budget was considered. ." He reported that this information had been presented by Jesse Drucker, Vice President of Human Resources. The formula used to determine for part-time employees to obtain health benefits is eight credit hours per semester. Eight credit hours per semester is equivalent to thirty hours per week. The first year of employment is called the "measuring year", and an employee does not receive health benefits during the measuring year. The measuring year runs from July 1 through June 30<sup>th</sup>. If at the end of that twelve month period the part-time employee has accrued eight credit hours per semester or equivalent, then that employee is eligible for health benefits in the following year even if that employee is no longer employed by CSU. So, you can work at CSU for a year, receive no health benefits and you quit or you leave and then CSU will still have to provide your health benefits for the following year. Dr. Resnick noted that they estimate the budgetary impact of that rule to be approximately \$900,000 per year. Now that number is a little different because of what we call the "Safe Harbor" provision. The "Safe Harbor" provision is a safe harbor for CSU, not for the employee. So, there is a rule that CSU needs to provide a certain percentage of health benefits to those eligible part-time employees. However, CSU could provide fewer than is required by law by a certain unknown percentage without penalty. The budgetary impact from the Affordable Care Act is likely to be less than \$900,000 per year – we don't have any specific numbers at this time. Dr. Resnick noted that they are really interested in this work hour formula which was the main point of the committee's discussion.

Senator Krebs asked if this does not require summer employment. Professor Resnick replied that it is the measuring year is over a twelve month period.

Senator Helen Liggett reported that this past summer many faculty got a notification in their mail box that summer employees that were not employed more than half time would be ineligible for health care benefits. Professor Resnick said that he is not sure, therefore, he couldn't answer Dr. Liggett's question.

Vice President Jesse Drucker responded that it is a standard notice that is sent out concerning anyone who is working less than half time. Half time or less is not eligible for health care benefits.

Professor Liggett stated that her memory of it was that it was explicitly tied to the Affordable Health Care Act as if this were a new policy and she wondered if that was the case. Vice President Drucker said that he would have to review that and he would provide an explanation.

Professor Berlin Ray asked for some clarification. For part-timers, in order to be eligible for health insurance, how much do they have to teach in a twelve month period? Professor Resnick responded that he believed part-timers have to teach eight credit hours per semester. His understanding is that it would be sixteen credit hours over the twelve month period. Vice President Drucker stated that Professor Resnick was correct.

Professor Berlin Ray noted then if you are not teaching in the summer, that's going to penalize an individual unless they teach eight credits in the summer. She wondered how many of our part-timers teach in the summer semester.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy, directing his question to Tim Long and Jesse Drucker, asked if they have to teach eight credit hours in the summer.

Dr. Goodell responded that it is sixteen credit hours for the whole year from July 1 through June 30<sup>th</sup> so it could be five, five and six, or four, six and six, or three, three and ten, whatever it takes to make up sixteen.

Finally, Dr. Resnick moved on to the last item, "CSU 2012 Bond Issue Summary." He noted that the first page just summarizes some of the details about the bond issuance. CSU issued approximately \$153 million worth of debts underwritten by the following four financial companies: RBC Capital Markets, Barclays Capital, Inc., PNC Capital Markets, Rice Financial Products Co. Dr. Resnick noted that the bonds mature within thirty years with an average yield of 3.38%. The \$153 million was allocated for several different categories including new construction of the CIHP Building (approximately \$47 million), maintenance projects (\$26 million) and to refinance existing debt (approximately \$80 million). The total debt service over the life of the bonds, principal plus interest, comes out to approximately \$258 million. Professor

Resnick noted that the last page is a detailed payment schedule of the bond issuance. He added that this is what was presented the last month.

**C. Administrative Expansion (Report No. 35, 2013-2014)**

Senator Jeff Karem commented that for the record, he is on the Agenda twice so this is why he is wearing a sports coat; if he wasn't on the Agenda twice, he would be more casual.

Dr. Karem stated that this is a report that was compiled in response to some questions that were raised at the beginning of the semester about resources and allocations. He noted that President Berkman very honorably and openly said at the first Faculty Senate meeting that as we look at every aspect of the university we also need to look at administrative units to think about recalibration potentially. He has reported in another context and in other auspices about the decline of faculty hiring at the full-time tenure-track level. He referred to the chart he distributed to Senate and noted that this chart was compiled as a counter point to see how things were in the administrative area. He briefly described his very arcane methodology on the last page. He does archival work so he likes to look at paper. He looked at this very old school, looked at hard copies of phone directories for titles and for names. He has a very odd looking spread sheet where he has everyone's name from the different phone directories. He said he spared everyone a chart on that; it simply would have been numbers. He did an apples to apples comparison of different offices, the administrators from each of two different data sets – academic year 2004-2005 and academic year 2012-2013 – and removed names for the sake of legibility. He noted that he can get a copy of that if people would like it upon request; it's pretty messy fitting all of the names on the spread sheet. He updated this in fall 2013 based on campus announcements or current web information. Department chairs were excluded from this list because their number is generally constant. In addition, for Senate membership and Faculty Senate committees, they are considered comparable to full-time, non-administrative faculty. Academic directorships held by bargaining unit faculty were excluded from this list. Dining Services, the Athletic Department and the Wolstein Center were all excluded from this list because they are either self-funded or contracted services. Dr. Karem said he mentioned that because he is really trying to be conservative in counting these numbers. There are a lot of people here with the title of Director who were Director of Undergraduate Studies or Director of the Center within a program. They have a full-time appointment and it doesn't make sense to double count them on both sides.

Dr. Karem noted that what everyone can observe from the general trends is there are more administrators. There is no one locus where this occurs although he would have to say that the Law School seems to have had more growth than other units in administrators. Interestingly, the academic side of administration hasn't grown very much at all, in fact, we are down a Vice Provost although there might be one hired in the Spring and that does run counter to some national trends where there are allegations of proliferation of deanlits. We don't have a deanlit issue. We do have more variations of Vice Presidents, a substantial increase in directors, things of that nature. As we move



forward, if we are thinking about where our resources are going, where they have been allocated, Senate needs to bear in mind where some of these resources have already gone. In previous reports from Senator Andrew Gross, we have seen that there has been shifts in spending from academic to non-academic. This is a different axis of comparison here but it should suggest of concerns that perhaps we are not funding some of the core missions that we need to be doing in terms of helping our students in the classroom. He just presents this report not as a conspiracy theorist but by way of providing information as we move forward to other discussions about resources.

Provost Mageean stated that she thinks it is certainly appropriate and necessary for these things to be reviewed from time to time. Responding to Dr. Karem, she said, "So now you've got your passing grade on measures of central tendency for normal and integral data in your survey." Provost Mageean commented that she wanted to talk about sources a little bit. The administration doesn't think the phone book is the best way. She understands what Dr. Karem was trying to do. She noted that her previous institution always had the phone book out of date as soon as it was published. She doesn't think it is the most reliable source to go to for doing this kind of work so she applauds Dr. Karem's efforts at trying to wade his way through all these historical records with phone books. She offered Dr. Karem the opportunity to actually sit down with the HR data which she thinks actually is the best complete data we have and see how people are categorized. She would be more than happy to provide that to him and then work through that with him. She said then that really gives us a reliable source of data and then they can start looking at what the numbers are. Provost Mageean said that when Dr. Karem starts looking at the numbers, he will see the decline in most sectors since the data she has goes back to at least about 2004. She noted that the classification as a director is really a rather interesting one. It seems to be many things – many kinds of classifications. She noted that according to the HR data she has in the professional sector, they've actually seen a decline of three directors. She added that is in non-faculty directors. You do see some areas where that title is used much more expansively. She said that Law does use that title and similarly in the area of Advancement and Development. You will find that a number of people called directors, and there are reasons for that, is because it is more effective when they go out and fund raise, etc. Provost Mageean stated that what she really wanted to extend to Dr. Karem is the opportunity to sit down, open up the data to him, show him what they have and then perhaps jointly discuss it.

Dr. Karem indicated that one other thing he would add in response to some of the data that Professor Resnick has been provided is that overall some areas of Human Resources spend down across the board in terms of total hires. He would suggest, just provisionally, that if they combine that data with this, what it suggests is that while there may be fewer people at both the academic and administrative sides at all levels, at least based on what he found in our phone books – he didn't write the phone books; these things are published by the university – that the one area where the growth is increasing is within a layer within the administrative side. He noted that many of us witnessed this during the budget cuts is that we didn't lose Deans and Directors, we lost Office Coordinators or Assistants so if we thought of them all as administrative staff, definitely, that's shrunk but that still means that there is one area that is expanding rapidly. He

added that he welcomes the chance to look at more data and not to look at phone books again.

Senator Joel Lieske commented that Jeff Karem did another great job. He noted that he is trying to figure out the decline in the number of tenure-track faculty from Dr. Karem's figure. It seems to be almost 450 in 2007 and seems to have gone down to about 360 in 2013. He asked Dr. Karem, "Exactly how many tenure-track spots have been cut? Is it 90, 80 slots?"

Dr. Karem responded that in looking at the chart, yes, that would be approximately 90. He added that a number of those have been filled by College Lecturers but there was already a ten percent cohort of College Lecturers prior of term faculty in addition, so if we factor those in in this chart, and the data is not as good going back, what we may end up doing is lifting the entire chart up a certain amount if you will. You will have a higher line but the declining trend would still be quite similar. He noted that he can say that this is something that has been a source of concern for many faculty because when the College Lecturer position was devised, it was clearly understood as a way of improving and pulling out part-time instructors into full-time contacts and taking those and combining them to bigger positions, not swapping out tenure-track positions. It was supposed to be above them and not either/or. He believes that many departments have found that it has been an either/or.

Senator Andrew Gross stated that he thinks Dr. Karem has done a great job on both counts. He noted that with regard to administrative, and he uses the word cautiously, bloat, the *Wall Street Journal* had a major, major article about ten days ago, "Managing for Value, Universities and Colleges across this Nation, and in that they left no doubt that there is administrative bloat, it has been increasing far faster as we can see here, and teaching faculty adjunct or tenure-track, whatever, and they propose no major solution. However, later in the article, there was a major statement about the State of Oregon having much more transparency than other states. He noted that what he would like to see of course at the State level is the same thing here. Finally, at the Cleveland State University level, whenever an administrative post is added, especially at the high level, he would love to see the President make a justification while praising the candidate who accepted the position.

Dr. Karem commented that he did read that *Wall Street Journal* article and while it didn't propose solutions, he found it interesting that the *Wall Street Journal* would just not necessarily note it for taking on issues of administration. If it is describing an economic problem, it's affecting student tuition costs, he feels it is something we all have to take seriously.

Dr. Goodell thanked Dr. Karem very much for his hard work.

**D. Parking Rate Increases and Parking Policies (Report No. 36, 2013-2014)**

Ms. Clare Rahm, Associate Vice President, Campus Support Services, stated that the information she would like to draw to Senate's attention was in the packet for the December 4, 2013 Senate meeting. She noted that at this point in time, she wanted to frame where this opportunity for discussion exists. There is a consultative process that is voluntary on the part of the university administration to seek from stakeholders their opinions related to proposals on parking rates. At this point in time, as she stands before Senate, she has visited with Student Government, she has visited with her Advisory Committee and she has visited with representatives from organized labor – SEIU, FOP, etc. She noted that Senate is the last on her tour of groups that she would like to listen to, the feedbacks provided prior to any consideration of these proposals by senior administration. So, this is the precursor for the point in time when Vice President Stephanie McHenry would make a determination as to what she will be asking the President and, in turn, what the President may be asking the Trustees to act on. Ms. Rahm noted that at this point in time, she wanted to briefly summarize what is in the handout which is a commitment to holding the white hangtag pricing as it is. What that means is that for students, the white hangtag is still less expensive than the rate we charge students for an all campus pass in FY 11-12. It is also equal to what they charge faculty and herself, employees, for FY 12 for hangtags. So the white has been our standard product and our most cost effective product. There have been increases in the green category and there have been increases related to each year since the new program was put in place. She stated that at this point in time, the proposal Senators have in front of them is for a two percent increase for FY 15. For a student on a fall semester pass, that would be \$5.00 more; for a faculty or a staff person on a fall semester green pass that would be \$7.00 more per semester. There are also some additional sundry fees listed on the handout that relate to Prospect Garage which is a specialty location and overnight parking which is assessed folks who need to leave their vehicles here either because they live in the residence halls or because they live in a neighborhood more or less expensive. Ms. Rahm stated that this is the nature of her general comments that this is where we stand right now from a business proposal and she is very interested in listening to those at Senate. She noted that she did have a chance to meet with folks from Academic Steering but again, they speak both locally and for themselves and so she would like to listen to additional voices as well.

Senator Barbara Hoffman stated that if she has calculated this correctly, going from a green annual hangtag, going from 2010 to the proposed level of 2015 is a \$281.00 increase, and if she has done the math correctly, that is a 44% increase in four years.

Ms. Rahm noted that the green hangtag is our premium product and she is no better at math without a calculator, but she would say that in general, certainly that is the parking product that has seen the growth because that is the premium product.

Professor Hoffman asked, "What are we getting that is 44% better this year then it was in 2010?"

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy said that he would amplify that question by simply pointing out we have an excess from a budget standpoint in Parking Services last

year to the tune of \$400,000. He asked Mr. Tim Long if that is right. He noted that he is pulling this off the top of his head. Dr. Duffy asked, "Why are we raising parking rates if last year we were \$400,000 ahead of the game and we are ahead of the game this year as well? So, why raise rates and what do we get?"

Ms. Rahm replied, "Briefly, Professor Duffy, and we have discussed this in the Advisory Committee as well, we are seeking to find the reserves to repair aging facilities. The reserve transfer is made after the operating budget commitments have been made and so it is not a budgeted amount every year, it is the surplus that is then moved into reserves." She noted that as a recent example, a partial repair of the Central Garage cost us a little bit more than \$2 million and so at this point in time, we are playing catch up as a Parking Department on the funds available for us to do our repairs.

Professor Duffy stated that he doesn't buy that explanation. He asked, "We just borrowed how many millions of dollars to fund maintenance on campus with the bond issue?" Mr. Tim Long, Associate Vice President for Finance, replied that it was \$27 million.

Ms. Rahm commented, respectfully, the Parking Department facilities were not included in that issuance.

Professor Duffy asked, "They are not part of the university?"

Mr. Tim Long stated that deferred maintenance projects of \$27 million are a scheduled separate list of campus-wide projects ranging from concrete sidewalk repair to building systems, heating and air conditioning, and things like that. He noted that as Clare said, the parking entity does not share in that \$27 million for deferred maintenance. He added that the set up with parking is that they have their own what we call Parking Plan Fund or Parking Reserve Fund and we try to keep it a certain level to address issues of maintenance and repair of parking lots. That's funded by surpluses if and when they occur from the yearend performance of parking operations. He noted that we exhausted most of that reserve for the work on the Central Garage that has been completed and is a little bit still ongoing. That work is not totally completed.

Ms. Rahm replied that Mr. Long was correct. She noted that there is another phase that hasn't been funded.

Mr. Long stated that the \$400,000 or so that we speak of after FY 13, the parking fund would then go to replenish that parking reserve fund so they are not sharing in the \$27 million. He added that Parking is an auxiliary enterprise; it's not part of the formal university that gets funded by plant project money like bonds; it doesn't share tuition revenue; it doesn't share in State subsidy. We have to run it like a business and so we have to reserve for appreciation and disrepair and that's the purpose of a fund like the Reserve Fund.

Dr. Duffy asked, “The \$2 million was spent over what period of time?” Dr. Duffy stated that he didn’t doubt that the \$2 million was spent but as he remembers, the \$400,000 was in excess last year. So how do we end up with an excess last year?

Ms. Rahm stated that the timing of the year-end close was such that funds were available in the operating budget and had not yet been needed to finalize the payments, in her recollection, on the Central Garage. The Central Garage project and what was due really became known at the end of FY 13 and so one of the things, and Professor Duffy may or may not know this, we are continuing to review whether or not our reserves have been maintained at a proper standard to begin with. Second, they are coming back to PBAC on January 23, 2014 to talk about parking and other auxiliaries. At this point, the funds that were available once parking and the overall auxiliary budget were balanced for FY 13 were then moved into the reserves for future spending. She noted that one of the things that was recently approved for reserve spending was the additional technology to capture additional revenues through transient use in the West Garage, the East Garage, and Central Garage and that is those folks evenings and weekends who might want to come down here for something other than class and at this point in time, we don’t necessarily collect revenue from that. Professor Joel Lieske has made some recommendations over the years on several occasions about doing a better job of collecting revenue. In the West Garage and the technology that we hope to install in the summer months this calendar year will allow us to do some of that and take some of the burden off of the hang tag sales to support the department.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltdt stated that she had a comment and a question. Her comment would be that the faculty and the students are subsidizing a bad budget model for parking. Having it separate as auxiliary and not folded into the regular maintenance of the university strikes her as odd. She noted that her question would be, we only know the system, most of us, so she would be very interested in some sort of both some comparative data and some comparisons to like institutions and how they manage their parking and their parking maintenance – she is thinking of places like Akron, University of Cincinnati, and other urban campuses where faculty and students are probably paying something of a premium to park but not knowing anything other than the situation at CSU, she has no context for this so that would be useful information.

Ms. Rahm commented that the odd budget model is actually dictated by the State of Ohio and so while she may wish that she had a different model, it is very similar across the other states that she happens to have been employed in that an auxiliary may not benefit from the operating funds available from other sources. It needs to generate and support itself.

Professor Lehfeltdt asked if parking is universally defined as an auxiliary. Ms. Rahm replied that it has been in her experience. Professor Lehfeltdt stated that she would still like to see the comparative data on what they are paying in Cincinnati and Akron.

Dr. Lieske complimented Ms. Rahm on collecting parking fees. He commented that right before Christmas he went to an event and asked the attendant, this was about 7:10 PM, how many cars had been charged the \$10 fee, and it was 68 cars so he imagined we were at least at 100 so that's \$1,000 and if you multiply that by 300 on a weekend, that could have been \$3,000. He asked Ms. Ram, "What's your data? How much are we getting?"

Ms. Rahm replied that she didn't have that data with her but she would be happy to share that data with Professor Lieske.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady commented that since Parking Policies is on the Agenda, she is going to ask the question that she asks Ms. Rahm once every three months, she is asking it publicly on the Senate floor, because she thinks it is beyond Ms. Rahm's control. She is at the Middough Building now which is in the Playhouse Square district and far away from any CSU garages except for the really full one that is Urban and Business and everything else and she pays right now \$1,224 per year and that's not with the increase. That is just what she pays to park so when she works in the morning or at night when it is dark, she can park within an Amco lot that is close within walking distance. She noted that it is really inconvenient to have to pay that bill every month because she is busy and so she would love to have the payroll deduction. She is working in a building with Playhouse Square employees and in a building with the Cleveland Playhouse and the Middough Corporation. They all have buy-ins to the Amco Lot so they get preference like they just bought 23 spaces in that lot. She said she wishes CSU could do some of that for CSU employees or at least work out a deal with Amco. She doesn't mind paying more to park closer. She recognizes that that is a choice but it would be awesome if it could come out of the payroll deduction for both convenience and for the financial advantage because it comes out of the payroll deduction instead of after the taxes have already come out. Also, she noted that there is construction because we are getting an Opera House and so that means a lot just closed. Today, her students who are used to being able to pay for the Amco lot, there are 23 less spaces because Playhouse Square bought the spaces in the lot for their employees – she doesn't know if it is by permit or if they rent them out or whatever, but Middough is a pretty small business. If Middough can figure out how to do that, it seems like CSU could. But Parking Services can't because the way she is hearing it, we are an in house business so it is to our disadvantage to help employees to buy from someone else so it is not really Ms. Rahm's job; it might be an HR or a benefits department issue but she knows that Amco is the big provider in Cleveland and as campus expands, and she thinks it is great that we are, maybe there are some other lots across campus that employees could have access to and buy through payroll deduction.

Professor Berlin Ray noted she had two items. One, she is a little concerned in the discussion that raises student parking rates and the idea that it seems like it's only \$5.00 more or it's only \$7.00 more and that reminds her when she goes into a store and they say if you buy one you get the next one half price and it's kind of like, oh, it's only and you are saving money. So you buy fifteen of them because you get one for half price and she is not sure that metaphor is going to play ball way out here but her big concern is,

to our students, they are going to be taking more classes, they are going to be coming down more, they are going to be paying more for more books, they are going to be etc., etc., etc., \$5.00 or \$7.00 more is not something to just be waived away and we need to take that very seriously. She said that she won't even go into the faculty issue. But for our students, she thinks that at this point we should be doing things to help them and we are not here. To her and our student body, that's nothing to just be, oh, it's just another \$5.00 or next month it's only another \$7.00. Dr. Berlin Ray stated that we need to look at that very seriously and try to help our students because it's only costing the students more in a lot of different ways with the conversion and everything else. Dr. Berlin Ray stated that another concern is that with the conversion, part-timers are going to be earning less of course. They don't get any help with parking costs. So basically, to her, they are getting less money, they are going to be paying more for parking; are they basically going to end up paying us to come down here to teach our students? She added that she just doesn't understand and she doesn't understand from a pragmatic philosophical, not even a financial place. She doesn't understand why we would treat people like this; she just doesn't get it. We want them to work with our students and help our students and make our students come out of here more educated; we want the best we can get and yet we are barely helping them eek out. She added that we need to look at that very seriously.

Ms. Rahm took a moment to respond to a couple of comments. First, the Parking Department and she personally take it very seriously when we have to talk about student rates. Within this group typically, she has focused upon faculty/staff rates because that's been the topic of interest so the \$5.00 increase is not, she was not intending to be flippant and if she sounded flippant, she apologized. She noted that the matter of the student rates is a very important one and actually, within Academic Steering Committee, she was offered a suggestion that she consider holding student rates, irrespective of what the decision might be related to faculty rates and so certainly that has been introduced and is part of their working notes as they continue to try to finalize what their proposal might be. With regard to our support of our students, while their rate discussion may not reflect that, she worked very closely with the Provost at the end of the fall semester to create a parking product to better meet the needs of our evening students. The new evening rates would start at 6:00 PM based on the data from last year. Based on the data provided by the Provost a determination was made by Vice President McHenry and she that they would change that so now that's valid at 3:30 PM in the afternoon. They have capped the inventory at this point in time to those spaces that they know are empty at 3:30 PM. As they move forward with technology, they may be able to slice that pie slightly differently and sell products that are eligible for a 6:00 PM start versus a 3:30 PM start. Ms. Rahm noted that there are several things that they will be able to consider. When technology is more readily available in our garages, and the part-time faculty discussion is part of that, in that they don't have a product that they sell for one day per week, two days per week, three days per week – that is a hangtag product. We do have a scratch off product that is sold that one can buy X number for a given semester and some of our part-time faculty do make use of that product. Ms. Rahm stated that she appreciates the comments and looks forward to others.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady commented, building on Professor Berlin Ray's comments, and that maybe there is a way to turn some of these issues to an advantage. She noted that our Art Department and Theatre and Dance students are all paying as much as she pays to park within what they deem as a safe walking distance. So if we are complaining about a \$5.00 increase, you can imagine what it is like to be an art student right now. A lot of the students are having trouble obtaining parking space and so she wonders if some sort of conversation should be had with some external parking lots. Would it be an advantage for students coming to Cleveland State as commuters to be able to buy in to popular downtown lots and be guaranteed a parking space. They could use that pass for other things. She stated that when they moved to Middough, for that first semester when Geoffrey Mearns was Provost, he worked something out so that we had access to one of those lots with either a CSU pass or we could buy into them at a cheaper rate. So it's been done before on a short term basis. She wondered if that model could be looked into, not just here, but as we expand in different directions. When Health Sciences goes up, maybe there parking lots on Prospect that would be more attractive to those students. It's worth looking into.

Senator Helen Liggett had two comments. First, she thinks that one thing to consider would be what if we didn't think of this as a product? What if we thought of this as a service – that the Parking Department should provide a service? She asked, "Would that change how we think about it?" Next, she thinks that it may be true that we are spending an inordinate amount of time on this compared to the amount of time we spent talking about the decrease of tenure track.

Senator Kathleen Little noted that Clare Rahm discussed these issues at the last Steering Committee meeting and had said that she would look into it so she would just like to hear from Claire Rahm. It doesn't have to be with rates, but at least in the East Garage, you are not allowed to enter unless there are ten spaces available which is absurd and so Ms. Rahm said that she was going to look into that and said that it was a reasonable request.

Ms. Rahm asked Ben Rogers, Director of Parking and Transportation, if he was able to provide an update on the topics under discussion. She knows that they talked about it and she had potentially misunderstood.

Mr. Rogers stated that he believes that it was about a year ago that this issue was brought up. Professor Little responded that she called Mr. Rogers' office about a year ago and brought it to Ms. Rahm's attention at the last Steering Committee meeting.

Mr. Rogers noted that it was the beginning of spring semester and they have not been imposing the ten space rule because we have been so tight on space.

Professor Little replied that that is not what the student workers are telling her when she is waiting in line. She asks to go look and stipulates she will leave if there is nothing and the students response is, "Oh no, we have to have ten spaces available."



Mr. Rogers stated that the students are told to let people in if they know they have spaces. The problem with the East Garage is the exit is not adjacent to the entrance and once again this goes back to the point Ms. Rahm made about technology and not having that information. While they try to go one for one, they might not get it right all of the time.

Professor Little commented, "So there is no longer a policy about the ten spaces?" Mr. Rogers replied that Professor Little was correct. That change in policy has been in place since fall semester. Professor Little stated, "So if the students say that to me, I can say to them to call you?" Mr. Rogers said, "Yes and I will re-enforce that with our staff and our team to make sure that that's not the message being delivered."

Senator Claire May said that she teaches legal writing and so to her words make a difference. She takes issue with calling being able to park a safe distance from your work place a premium product. She would hope to be able to park a safe distance from her work place as a matter of course. To relate this perhaps to eventually the tenure-track discussion, and especially as a non-tenure-track faculty member, and she thinks this is actually true of our tenure-track faculty members and our tenured faculty members as well, she hasn't exactly seen a 44% increase in her salary over the past few years and so the parking is taking an increasingly large bite out of her wages. She noted that one thing they do often at the Law School, and she is sure people hear it across the university, is that faculty are encouraged to be on campus as much as possible. She stated that when she looks at these numbers, it's frankly becoming more appealing to not buy a new pass and not be on campus as much as possible so she would hope that the administration would take this into consideration. Finally, Senator May said that she had a personal anecdote – she knows that there have been repairs under way at the Central Garage for some time. She commented that several years ago, she actually slipped on the ice and fell down the steps on the East 19<sup>th</sup> Street side of that garage to the lower level. She noted that the stairs have not been repaired. They are about five inches deep and extremely steep and jagged and it's been several years now since that happened to her. She would like to see those repairs implemented and the university taking into account the safety of the people that use the facilities.

Senator Glenn Goodman commented that he had a very quick follow up to Professor Little's comment. He stated that reserved spots that are left open in the East Garage are never used and he is wondering if there could be a change and some of those spots made available for those of us that would like to park in the East Garage. Ms. Rahm asked Dr. Goodman which spots he was speaking of. Dr. Goodell stated that Professor Goodman is speaking of the eleven reserved spaces in the East Garage.

Ms. Rahm asked if those spaces are the spaces assigned to the colleges. She stated that they have made available to each college a certain number of parking spaces for college business/college guests. She said she would be happy to revisit the use of those spaces with the deans to whom that offer was made and determine whether or not there is a means by which they could release more of those spaces. She added that she is happy to look at it; they want to make it easier for each of the colleges to do business.

The lack of availability of parking for guests at a last minute type of situation was something that had been communicated very clearly and consistently last year and so this feature was added. She said they will certainly take another look at that.

Dr. Goodell commented that if she could propose a solution to that after the meeting, she would be more than happy to talk to Clare about that. She added that she goes in and out of the East Garage all of the time and there are never more than two or three cars parked in the entire eleven spaces so perhaps five spaces that all of the colleges can share might be a better way of doing that.

## **VI. New Business**

### **A. University Curriculum Committee**

Dr. Bill Kosteas commented that we are all busy at the beginning of the semester. He asked if he needed to mention each item on his long list or could he just say, "You have the list." He wanted to let everyone know, he tried to list the programs as they are provided to Senate because sometimes the names will be different than the proposals. He added that faculty could just send him a note and he will point them to the appropriately named submission if people are trying to match it things.

Professor Kosteas reported that he has a big agenda for the UCC meeting this Friday as well. They are almost completely through several colleges. A couple of colleges may have one department here or there left. UCC is well on their way with CLASS, and in fact, they are actually ahead of schedule. CLASS was ahead of schedule in getting departments to the UCC so they are in pretty good shape on that front, letting departments move forward with getting transition guides in place and starting the work of advising our several thousand students who will need advising.

- 1. Proposed Undergraduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion: (Report No. 37, 2013-2014)**
  - a. Art Major (tracks: studio art, design, art history, art education), Art Minor, Art History Minor**
  - b. Linguistics Major and Minor**
  - c. Anthropology Major and Minor, Native American Studies Minor**
  - d. Economics Major and Minor**
  - e. Economics Honors Program**
  - f. French Major and Minor**
  - g. Sociology Major and Minor**
  - h. Criminology Major and Criminal justice Minor**
  - i. Black Studies Major**
  - j. Social Science Major**
  - k. Political Science Certificates**
    - Revised: Latin American Studies**
    - Removed: International Studies and Central and Eastern European Studies**

- l. Political Science Major and Minor**
- m. International Relations Major**
- n. Journalism and Promotional Communication Major (Journalism and Integrated Promotional Communication Sequences)\***
- o. General Communication BA**
- p. Communication Minor\***
- q. 4+1 Master of Applied Communication Theory and Methodology Program with emphasis in Strategic Communication**
- r. Communication Management Major**
- s. Science Writing Certificate**
- t. Multi Media Advertising Certificate**
- u. Journalism Certificate (delete)**
- v. 4+1 BS in Health Sciences/MS in Health Sciences**
- w. Graduate Spatial Certificate\*\***
  - \*Conditionally approved**
  - \*\*Conditional on approval of the Graduate Spatial Courses**
- x. Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences: Pre-Physical Therapy, Pre-Occupational Therapy, Pre-Physician Assistant, General Interest, Associate Degree Completion Tracks (added to agenda - Honors and Scholars Program)**
- y. Gerontology Certificate**
- z. Communication and Health Certificate**
- aa. Suspension of the Pre-Podiatry Program**
- ab. Post Bac. NEOMED (added to agenda)**
- ac. Urban Health Concentration (added to agenda)**

Dr. Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed curriculum changes to the Undergraduate programs as part of the 4 to 3 conversion – items 1. a. through z. and also items aa. and ab. which she read previously and item ac. with the addition of the Honors Scholars Program under item 1. x. Dr. Goodell asked if there were any questions or comments about any of the mentioned programs.

Senator Beth Ekelman noted that Dr. Goodell had only mentioned the Honors Scholars Program. UCC is also adding the Post Bac. NEOMED and Urban Health Concentration.

Dr. Goodell noted that that is item ab. Post Bac NEOMED and item ac. is the Urban Health Concentration. She stated that those will be listed separately in the Minutes. She asked if that was okay. There were no objections. Dr. Goodell then asked for a vote. The University Curriculum Committee proposals from Item 1.a. through Item 1.ac. were approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Kosteas reported that the UCC reviewed graduate programs from Psychology. Several more graduate programs came to the UCC after the last Graduate Council meeting but there was not enough time for UCC to act on them. They are on the UCC Agenda for this Friday, January 17, 2014.

- 2. Proposed Graduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion: (Report No. 38, 2013-2014)**
  - a. Psychology PhD Program**
  - b. Psychology MA Program**
  - c. Psychology PsyS Program**

Dr. Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed Graduate Program revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion – Psychology PhD Program, Psychology MA Program and Psychology PsyS Program and asked if there were any questions. There being no questions or discussion, Dr. Goodell asked for a vote on the proposals. The proposed revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion to the Psychology PhD Program, the Psychology MA Program and Psychology PsyS Program were approved by voice vote with one abstention.

Dr. Goodell noted that there are two items from the UCC for “Informational Purposes Only.”

- 3. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 39, 2013-2014)**
  - a. Changes to esc 350**
  - b. CHM Program new Courses**

Faculty Senate received the “For Informational Purposes Only” items.

Dr. Kosteas stated that Dr. Goodell could ask her various colleagues as she talks to them – not just submitting more courses at this point. He stated that UCC’s emphasis is going to be completely directed on the programs. UCC has to get through the programs. He commented that if a department says, “Maybe we would also like to think about changing this,” please don’t do it. Wait until next year. Professor Kosteas noted that the UCC is really under significant time pressure. UCC still have several proposals to work through. Dr. Kosteas said, “So, if you are starting to say, ‘Hey maybe we would like to do this as well’, just don’t do it. Please have mercy on us and let us get to those proposals that that we really need to. We are getting really pressed for time because we do need to begin advising our students and in the next few weeks we will begin the advising process as well.”

Dr. Sridhar commented that we have said this before but, as a member of the University Curriculum Committee, he really encourages all Senators to go look at that 4 to 3 website and look at the program submissions that have been up there. They are taking these votes under the assumption that people have actually looked at them and read them. He noted that if people have not been doing that, please do so before the next votes so that there is some level of accountability.

Dr. Lehfeltdt stated that she had a comment that was not specifically for Bill Kosteas and the UCC. But, since Dr. Kosteas raised the question of the need to begin advising students, and she understands the communication blitz is going to begin at the

end of this month, she is wondering, and perhaps the Provost knows what the time table is for the approval of transition guides.

Professor Kosteas replied that UCC is working through transition guides as they get them. He knows that that has been the case.

Dr. Teresa LaGrange stated that all of the programs that have submitted transition guides have been provisionally approved by the UCC. She added that those who have submitted transition guides, thank you very much. For programs that have not met and been reviewed by the UCC, they will be posted in Black Board and they will be reviewed but they are provisional. She added that they can't really communicate any final approval on those transition guides until they are sure there are not going to be any modifications to the programs.

Provost Mageean stated that in general, people are actually ahead of schedule of where they thought they would be and so thanks and commendations to everybody.

Dr. Lehfeldt commented that she just entered a department that didn't have a deadline until December for program revisions and then she turned in her transition guides by January 7<sup>th</sup> and she has to start training her faculty to do transition advising so she just wanted to make sure that she has accurate information.

Provost Mageean stated that they have to parse things out to get them through the system. She added that it's not that you are behind the eight ball, it's just that you actually have to be almost an over-achiever to get here.

Dr. Goodell noted that the transition guides won't be approved until the program has gone through the UCC. Dr. Lehfeldt commented, "That makes sense; thanks."

Dr. Goodell added a little comment of her own. She was discussing with the Provost yesterday, hoping and praying that the UCC would not be as busy next year as they are this year with additional changes that have resulted from unforeseen consequences of the rush that we have taken in getting these changes through. While everyone is to be commended for their extreme hard work, she does want to take this opportunity to say that had we had another year, things would be oh so different.

## **B. Admissions and Standards Committee**

Professor Jim Marino reported that the Admissions and Standards Committee has two items that they worked out with UCC because they are associated with things the University Curriculum Committee had passed and because more things are coming.

### **1. Proposed changes to the Math 4+1 Program (Report No. 40, 2013-2014)**

Professor Marino stated that the first proposal is revisions to the Math 4+1 Program regarding admission to the program. He noted that there are two significant changes. Under the old rules applicants took three out of four 200-level math courses in a particular sequence. Under the new rules, the new 3 credit hour rules, students will be required to take all four courses in order to apply. He noted that other differences under the old system is that applicants had to have a 3.0 or higher overall GPA and a 3.0 or higher mathematics GPA. Now the admission requirement is a 3.0 GPA overall and a 3.5 GPA in those four 200-level math courses. Everything else stays the same.

Dr. Goodell noted that she has some knowledge of the math program and they had changed that requirement for all students. So, all math students in the degree will now have to take the four 200-level courses.

Professor Marino added that this is an admission requirement. What Dr. Goodell is referring to is part of the curriculum change.

Dr. Krebs asked if he had heard Dr. Marino correctly. The GPA for the four courses has to be a 3.5 so the students must have at least two A's and two B's. Professor Marino replied that this is for admission to the concurrent Master's degree program.

Senator Jones wondered what the rationale was for changing the GPA requirement from 3.0 to 3.5. At this point, Dr. Marino inquired if anyone from the Mathematics Department was present. Dr. Goodell stated that she can't speak to that question. She inquired if anyone from the UCC could respond to Dr. Jones' question. Professor Kosteas stated that UCC did not discuss that item.

Professor Marino stated that it does have the effect of focusing on measuring performance of those four classes rather than a prior accepting of classes, etc.

Dr. Goodell commented that the classes are discrete math, multi variable calculus, linear algebra and differential equations – those are the four classes.

Professor Marino noted that the implicit rationale is that these four courses are heavily correlated with success in graduate courses.

Dr. Goodell added that before in the program, when there were four-credit hour classes, the students didn't have all of those courses particularly the multivariable calculus. They really didn't get into Graduate School anyway and so that was actually her big rationale. That was one of the reasons she was always in favor of having the three-credit classes so the students could get the break that they needed in the lower division classes that they weren't getting under the four-credit model.

Professor Marino asked if there was any further discussion.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed changes to the 4+1 Mathematics Program and asked

Senators to vote. The Admissions and Standards Committee's proposed revisions to Admissions Standards for the Math 4+1 Program were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**2. Proposed Admission Standards for the new MEHPE Program  
(Report No. 41, 2013-2014)**

Professor Marino reported that the MEHPE Program (Master's of Education in Health Professions Education) is a new program and the Admissions and Standards Committee is proposing that they actually have admissions standards. He noted that it is basically a holistic process. This is a professional program for people who are primarily working health professionals already. To summarize, a student must have a completed bachelor or terminal degree; official transcripts from all degree granting institutions; a personal statement by the applicant describing previous educational experiences, alignment of the MEHPE degree with the applicant's personal or career goals and the applicant's commitment to completing the MEHPE as a member of a two-year cohort; a curriculum vitae showing relevant work and teaching experiences; a letter from the applicant's immediate supervisor acknowledging the applicant's commitment to health professions education and granting the applicant necessary release time from work responsibilities to take part in program coursework; and a graduate degree application to Cleveland State University's Office of Graduate Studies. Dr. Marino went on to say that this is for working professionals but it is also a cohort-based program so there is a great deal of emphasis on the program making sure that they move in lock-step through the two year program.

Senator Little inquired what department this program resides in. Professor Marino replied that it belongs to education. Professor Little commented that the College of Education had several curricular proposals. She said that she would just like to know what department this proposal is from.

Professor Marino replied that the Admissions and Standards Committee received it from the University Curriculum Committee.

Professor Kosteas responded that he can't remember which department it was but believes it was from the College of Education.

Professor Marino stated that it is a Master's of Science degree in Education.

Professor Little commented that she understands that part but wishes to know in what department the program resides. Dr. Goodell stated that Kathy is in a department that has science-based programs and she is not familiar with this program.

Professor Kosteas noted that there was a slight change in the name that was proposed that actually came up earlier. He believes that before, it was something like Master's of Education in Health Education.

Professor Little stated that her department voted on the curricular changes they made but she doesn't remember this summary. She added that they are a real small department so she thinks that she would remember. She said she just wanted to make sure that this wasn't a competing program in a different department.

Dr. Goodell commented that it has gone through the Graduate Council already.

Dr. Little again stated that someone should be able to tell her what department this proposal is from.

Provost Mageean said that if you had a competing program, that issue should have been dealt with in Graduate Council.

Dr. Jianping Zhu, Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, stated that the issue was discussed at Graduate Council and they had a similar program on campus.

Professor Kosteas said that the issue is competition with Nursing and the College of Sciences.

Professor Little stated that she still hasn't heard the answer to her question – what department is this program being offered in? Professor Kosteas stated that he does not remember. Dr. Beth Ekelman stated that it is not Health Sciences.

Dr. Sridhar pulled up on his laptop the original proposal from Graduate Council.

Professor Kosteas reported that this did go through the College of Education's curriculum process so it should have been vetted at that point.

Professor Krebs asked, "Why are we voting? As soon as this question was raised, why are we even considering the proposal? That doesn't make sense."

Dr. Goodell reported that the program is out of CASAL (Counseling, Administration, Supervision and Adult Learning), not out of Professor Little's department. Professor Little commented, "That's why I'm not familiar with it." She noted that it appears to be a little competitive.

Dr. Goodell stated that the way the College of Education works, these things do not come to a whole college vote. They go through one committee or another. They either go to Undergraduate Affairs or Graduate Affairs in the College of Education. "We don't have a college-wide curriculum committee for all of the programs and the programs do not come to each college so that's why Kathy doesn't know about it. Plus, we didn't want to hear about it because it didn't affect any of us. It was assumed that it wasn't going to affect us. This speaks to a wider problem of college-level governance which I think I had spoken about at a previous meeting and that we really need to take a good long look at our college-level governance structures in our college. I am wondering if



any of the other colleges are thinking along the same lines.” Dr. Goodell asked Professor Little if she wanted to move a motion that the proposal be tabled at this point.

Professor Little commented that she wished that Dr. Liz Lehfeldt hadn't left the meeting already. She needs some counseling because she doesn't really want to sabotage a potentially viable program even though it does make her a little nervous.

Dr. Goodell reminded Professor Little that it is not from the CASAL program. It is not the Counseling faculty.

Dr. Little stated that it's not Nursing. Professor Little stated that she sees a lot of overlap in her program and their program.

Professor Marino reported that he will admit that the Admissions and Standards Committee only looked at the admissions section of this proposal and they looked at it very narrowly.

Professor Little remarked that somebody spoke to this. She asked, “Does the UCC or the Graduate College look at competitive programs internally?”

Dr. Jiaping Zhu stated that Graduate Council sent the proposal back to actually contact other academic units.

Professor Little commented that she doesn't believe her department was contacted. She added that as Dr. Goodell said, the Education College does not meet to discuss the departmental issues that could possibly be competitive. Professor Little then stated that she would like to put proposal on hold if that's possible. Professor Little moved to delay the proposed Admissions Requirements for the new MEHPE Degree program until the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Goodell stated that this was an item that was added to the meeting for today without going to the Steering Committee so therefore she (Professor Little) wouldn't have had an opportunity to review it at Steering. Professor Krebs second the motion.

Dr. Goodell asked if there was any other discussion of the proposal.

Dr. Sridhar stated that this proposal came to Graduate Council twice. The first time it came up, several members of Graduate Council had the same question that Professor Little had raised about competitive programs. Then the program was asked to provide support from the other departments and colleges and they did in fact have letters from the Deans. In particular, the Department of Health Sciences had questions about this but Professor Little's department did not. He went on to say that he supposed that there was nobody in Graduate Council who said that your department would also be affected by this and because we had letters from the Deans, Council took that to mean that there was discussion in the college. Graduate Council did not realize that there

wouldn't be discussion in the Education College because that's where the proposal originated.

Dr. Little noted that as Dr. Goodell pointed out, they have some governance issues in their College.

Dr. Marino stated that he will forward the original proposal to Dr. Little since he has the whole proposal.

Dr. Goodell asked if there was any further discussion or questions. There being no further discussion or questions, Dr. Goodell asked Senators to vote on the motion to suspend voting on the proposal and passing it back to the governance structure within the college for further discussion. The motion to suspend the proposed Admissions Requirements for the new MEHPE Degree was approved unanimously by voice vote.

At this point, Dr. Goodell stated that Senate could now vote to end the meeting. Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady moved to adjourn and Senator Jim Marino seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy  
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel