MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE

OCTOBER 10, 2012

PRESENT: Banks, Berlin Ray, Bosela, W. Bowen, Bracken, Cory, Delatte, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Gelman, Genovese, Goodell, Henry, Holsinger, Horvath, Hrivnak, D. Jackson, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Karem, M. Kaufman, Krebs, Liggett, Marino, Meier, Niederriter, B. Ray for Whitmer-Rich, Resnick, Rutar, Sridhar, Steinberg, Sterio, Talu, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, Volk, Wolf.

Al Bitar, R. Berkman, Caspary, Drnek, Markovic, Percy, Sadlek, Sawicki, Stoll, Vandemark, G. Walker.

ABSENT: Boboc, C. C. Bowen, Dixit, Goodman, Rashidi, Rickett, Strauss, Tebeau, J. G. Wilson, A. Zhou.

Artbauer, Boise, M. Bond, C. Brown, E. Hill, Jain, Karlsson, LeVine, V. Lock, McHenry, Parry, Spademan, G. Thornton, B. White, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

ALSO PRESENT: Kosteas.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M.

I. Eulogies

A. Charles T. Rini (Finance)

Professor Emeritus Edward Thomas delivered the Eulogy for the late Charles T. Rini. His remarks follow.

"Charles Thomas Rini, Sr., Associate Professor Emeritus, passed away on February 20, 2012. Chuck, as he was known to his CSU friends, had been retired from CSU since 1998.

"Chuck was born in Cleveland on August 24, 1934. A graduate of Cathedral Latin High School, he attended John Carroll University, where he received his Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration in 1957. He then earned his MBA in finance at Northwestern University in 1958. Upon graduation from Northwestern, he joined the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, where he worked for almost eight years as a systems and financial analyst.

"Chuck's desire to become a teacher was first manifested during his years at CEI. Several times while at CEI, he, in his own words, 'taught the ABC's of securities course' in the Employees' Personal Development Program. From 1959 through 1963, he taught finance courses as a part-time instructor at John Carroll University. After he left CEI in 1966, he took a one-year, full-time position teaching finance at John Carroll.

"On July 1, 1967, Chuck married Eileen Halter, and, in September of 1967, he entered the Doctor of Business Administration program at Kent State University. He joined Cleveland State University as an ABD instructor in 1969, and was promoted to Assistant professor of Finance upon completion of his DBA in 1971. He was promoted to Associate Professor in 1975, and he served as chairperson of the Department of Finance from 1982 until 1989. He earned the Chartered Financial Analyst certification in 1975, and he was an active member of the Cleveland Chapter of the Financial Executives Institute for many years.

"Chuck was one of the first people that I met at CSU when I joined the business faculty in 1973. In those days, faculty members taught five days a week if they had daytime courses, so Chuck was always around. He was popular with students and his faculty colleagues. He was a warm, generous, funny guy, and he had a reputation for being a fine classroom teacher. He was often described by students as 'tough but fair.' Although he did enough publishing to get promoted, he was more interested in imparting practical knowledge and advice to students than in doing theoretical research. He liked to kid around with his students and colleagues, and he was always telling jokes or using cartoons on transparencies to liven up his lectures. Most of all, he liked to use his work-world experiences to give students a sense of how 'things really are out there in the business world.'

"Because of his business contacts, Chuck helped many finance students find jobs over the years, but he had a standard speech that he gave to the students, almost all of whom were young men, before they went for an interview that Chuck had arranged. According to Eileen Rini, the speech went like this: 'You will get a haircut; you will dress in a suit and tie; and you will shine your shoes. If you don't, you won't get an interview.'

"I vividly remember a story Chuck related to me early on. He told me that, when he was applying for a position at CEI, he had made it through several rounds of interviews and was finally being offered a job. However, in the final discussion about the details of the offer, the CEI executive that he was talking to said, 'Chuck, before you agree to take the job, there's something you should know. CEI is a 100% supporter of

United Way.' To this, Chuck replied, 'That's nice.' The recruiter said, 'Chuck, I don't think you understand. We are a 100% supporter of United Way.' Chuck said, 'It's good to know that the company is community-minded.' When the interviewer repeated his statement a third time, Chuck suddenly realized that contributing to the United Way drive would be a job requirement. Laughing as he told the story, he added, 'They even told me how much I would be expected to give.' Apparently, Chuck agreed to become a '100 per center' since he got the job. I have used Chuck's story many times over the years in my business courses when talking about 'corporate culture.'

"Chuck was a devoted family man. He and Eileen had one son, Charles Thomas Rini, Jr., who is known at Chip. Chuck and Eileen doted on Chip and he grew up to be a fine adult. Chip graduated from St. Ignatius High School and earned his undergraduate degree at William & Mary. Obviously influenced by Chuck, Chip studies finance and has worked in the area of investments for a number of high profile firms, including his present employer, Addison Clark. He and his wife, Ashley, live in Charleston, SC, with their two sons, Charles Thomas Rini, III, and James Alexander Rini.

"As devout Catholics, Chuck and Eileen were volunteers for the Christ Child Society of Cleveland, a charitable organization that provides services to needy children. In 1982, they chaired the Christ Child Society's annual fundraising ball, which was held in the atrium of CSU's University Center Building. Eileen is still involved with the organization, often volunteering in its Layette Packing Program at Parmadale and at its resale shops.

"Near the end of Chuck's career at CSU, he had a number of health problems and, after taking a series of medical leaves, he decided to retire in 1998. We didn't see much of Chuck after he retired, and I understand from Eileen that he continued to fight a number of medical conditions over the next several years. About ten or eleven years ago, they moved from their longtime home in Cleveland Heights out to Aurora, where they were living when Chuck passed away.

"Chuck Rini was warm, kind, and caring man, and he will be missed by his many friends."

Senate President Joanne Goodell thanked Dr. Thomas and asked for a moment of silence in memory of Dr. Charles T. Rini.

B. Harold E. Dailey (English)

Associate Professor Emeritus Jeffrey Ford delivered the Eulogy for the late Harold E. Dailey. His remarks follow.

"Harold Dailey, Associate Professor Emeritus of English, died peacefully at his home on September 7 at the age of 82.

"Harold received his B.A. from the University of Missouri in 1952 and his Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1972. From 1955 to 1957, he served in the United States Army as an information and education officer. He joined the faculty at Cleveland State as an Instructor in 1968, and was appointed Associate professor in 1972. His areas of specialization were nineteenth-century British Literature and the Victorian novel.

"Harold was an Associate Editor of the five-volume Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, and the research project that occupied most of his professional career was an annotated bibliography of reputation studies in English and American Literature, for which he compiled and indexed about 12,500 entries.

"From one point of view, Harold's particular professional skills and temperament were those often associated with an older scholarly tradition in the humanities – patience, accuracy, thoroughness, attention to detail – qualities of an excellent editor or bibliographer, and Harold was both. But, in another respect, he was ahead of his time. He was a pioneer in introducing the use of the computer to the humanities. He and his colleague, Louis Milic, learned a specialized and rather exotic computer language, which, to Harold's delight, was called SpitBol, and was primarily designed for the analysis of text rather than mathematical computation. They applied it to stylistics and editorial work. Harold brought the computer to his 'reputation studies.' But he also became fascinated with the computer's potential for various kinds of problem solving. He was involved with the freshman composition program at CSU for ten years, three of them as Director, and it was in connection with freshman English that he and I worked most closely together. During that time he computerized the administration of the program to track the results of placement testing and identify student eligibility for courses in the sequence. Perhaps his most spectacular piece of ingenuity was the creation of a test of grammar, usage, and punctuation that the department had decided to require all students to pass at some point during the academic term in order to pass their freshman English course. Harold single-handedly created a database of questions for each of the three sections of the test and then wrote a program to generate tests by randomly selecting a prescribed number of questions from the database for each section and printing three different versions of the random selection with the questions in a different order. All of Harold's computer work was done on an IBM mainframe, and, of course, he wrote the whole thing in SpitBol. Harold regularly served as a consultant to members of the department whose work brought them into contact with data processing. Among other things, he was a computer consultant to the *Spenser Encyclopedia* and to the *Early English Composition Assessment program of the Northeast Ohio Writers' Project.* And he made me learn to program in a multipurpose language.

"Harold was a man who thoroughly enjoyed life, and he cultivated pleasures with the disposition of a connoisseur. He would speak eloquently and lyrically about the sights, sounds, and sensations of his favorite Tuscan towns and of the coast of Maine where he returned in the summers for many years. He was also a lover of wine and made a collection of labels from memorable wines he had experienced. He also loved and collected films and told me he intended to develop a database from his collection. It was perhaps in his penchant for collecting and for making databases that Harold's scholarly

and life values came together. I think he collected and made databases as a way of preserving past experiences and pleasures, and I suspect that he was fascinated with the possibilities the computer provided for retrieving these experiences selectively, or in new and different combinations.

"Harold was a witty, enthusiastic, and eminently sociable man with a completely disarming smile. He was a founding member of a poker group that began in the English Department over twenty-five years ago, and still meets monthly. He last joined us for the August game.

"He is survived by a daughter, two sons, two granddaughters, as well as his dear friend, Debra.

"Harold was a good friend, a good colleague, and a good companion. He is and will continue to be missed.

Senate President Goodell thanked Dr. Ford. She then asked for a moment of silence in memory of our colleague Dr. Harold E. Dailey.

II. Approval of the Agenda for the meeting of October 10, 2012

Senate President Joanne Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Agenda for today's meeting. It was moved, seconded and the Agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Goodell welcomed everyone to the Senate's second meeting for the year. She stated that there are a number of developments she will report on today, but the lion's share of this meeting will be devoted to hearing everyone's voices about the curriculum review proposals currently before the University Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Goodell noted that as we heard at our last meeting, over the past two years the number of tenure-track faculty has declined by around 50 people. Provost George Walker has managed to pull a rabbit out of his hat so to speak, and find funding in the Provost's position fund to authorize eight additional searches for next year, so that is very good news for those departments who are the beneficiaries.

Dr. Goodell reported that she will be joining the University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) for their first meeting to kick off the review of the committees of the Faculty Senate and ad hoc committees such as eLearning and Undergraduate Student Success. She stated that if anyone has any insights to share, please discuss these with her or a member of UFAC as soon as possible.

Senate President Goodell stated that a group of university and community college presidents under the leadership of Gordon Gee has been charged by Governor Kasich

with developing a new funding formula for Ohio's state supported universities and colleges, and the work is proceeding quickly. The plan must include a way to reduce the cost of college education. The group is supposed to have their report completed before Thanksgiving. She noted that President Ronald Berkman told her yesterday that the current thinking is to make at least 50% of the SSI dependent on outcome measures such as retention, progress towards degree and graduation rates. This differs markedly from the current situation in which only five percent of the formula is based on outcome measures. Given that CSU is ranked at or near the bottom of the other state universities on some outcome measures, this does not bode well for us in the medium term. The funding formula changes are expected to come into effect in the next biennium. This is a compelling reason why we all need to own a part of this problem and do whatever we can to improve these measures as soon as possible. Reviewing the curriculum is the place we can and must start immediately.

Dr. Goodell informed Senate that Dr. Bill Kosteas from Economics has bravely agreed to chair the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) for the next two years, and he has already jumped in with both feet. She said that she truly thanks him for his willingness to take this on. He will be filling everyone in on the progress and the process that UCC has already begun in a few minutes.

Dr. Goodell stated that another indicator that our curriculum is not what it could be comes from the national Survey of Student Engagement (fondly known as NSSE). One set of items measures active and collaborative learning. When CSU freshmen and seniors' responses are compared to other urban universities, CSU's mean scores are significantly lower than our peer institutions. She noted that Dr. Teresa LaGrange, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, has all of the data provided by the NSSE and will be presenting to Senate on this in the near future. She went on to say that the Deans and others have already heard and received some information about this so people may have already been apprised of some of these statistics. Some are good news some are not very good news unfortunately.

Dr. Goodell thanked everyone for their attention.

Dr. Goodell noted that for a large part of this meeting, Bill Kosteas, who is the new chair of the University Curriculum Committee, is going to give everyone a very brief overview of the discussions that have taken place in UCC to date and then he will invite people from the floor to make comments. She added that people not from the Senate are also welcome to make comments. Dr. Kosteas will be chairing part of this discussion so she will have her say as well.

IV. Information Gathering Re Curriculum Redesign (Report No. 27, 2012-2013)

Dr. Bill Kosteas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, reported that last Friday the UCC had its first meeting of the semester and so they are just getting underway with this whole process. UCC put together a memo that went out this morning to all of the department chairs and the college deans requesting some information to help

them in putting together their assessments and commenting on two recommendations from the Undergraduate Success Committee.

Dr. Kosteas stated that the recommendation is to move to a maximum 120 credit hour requirement for undergraduate degrees. And, on what will be a much more involved recommendation of moving (at a minimum) a three credit hour standard for all GenEd classes and a maximum of three credit hours for the entire undergraduate curriculum.

Dr. Kosteas noted that he is viewing the UCC's role here in putting together this report as one of coming up with a recommendation of whether these recommendations make sense for us to implement and if so under what conditions. And, under what conditions can we make this a successful transition if we do decide to go in that direction. Dr. Kosteas noted that they will be relying quite a bit on the information they gather from department chairs to give a sense specifically of how each department will be impacted. He noted that some departments may not be affected very much at all if they are already offering three credit hour classes. Others may have to see a change-over of their entire curriculum. There are some staffing issues that will have to be addressed in terms of reinventing the entire curriculum down from four to three credit hours. Does that mean there will be an increase in the number of elective courses you have to offer; or simply increasing sections of electives? If you have to offer many more new electives, do you have the faculty to teach those classes and there are workload issues and so on. Dr. Kosteas noted that this is basically where they are at this point. The UCC has invited the administration to present to the UCC at their meeting one week from this Friday, October 19, 2012, so that they can get some information from the administration and move forward from there, and they hope, within a month from that time by mid November and provide a report at that time.

Dr. Kosteas opened for questions.

Senator Robert Krebs asked if Dr. Kosteas could explain, for those of us who are in departments that are entirely four credits, why is this being pushed and what is the perceived benefit of requiring all classes to go to three credits?

Dr. Kosteas replied that he is sure that the administration could speak better to Dr. Krebs' question than he can, but from what he understands, there are multiple issues here. One is the concern that our curriculum is first, not in alignment with a lot of other universities and so we know that we have some issues with students when they transfer in; a lot of them are transferring in with three credits for courses here that come to four credit hours. The new GenEd requirements were actually set up on a three credit hour basis so that basically you could complete all of the GenEd requirements if all of them were three credit hour courses. But in effect, many of those classes are actually four credit hour courses because there was no requirement to make them three credit hours. Dr. Kosteas noted that there is a sense this could potentially lead to some simplification for students. There would be fewer total credit hours devoted to taking up just simply going through the GenEd requirements. This will put us in harmonization with other universities. There is also an issue of our classroom utilization rates which are the lowest

in the state and so there would be a move to have a block schedule revolving around three credit hour classes. He noted that those are some of the arguments that have been put forward. He is not going to claim that this is a comprehensive list. He will have more information from the administration when they present to UCC formally on October 19th. But he understands that those are some of the arguments in favor. This is all tied in to the change in the funding formula and then the fact that we don't have the best success rates in terms of retention and graduation. The sense he gets is that this is one way we could try to make some improvements on those fronts. He added that he personally sees many other things that we would have to do. We can't look at this as a one magic bullet here that is going to fix all of our problems. He noted that if there is going to be a net benefit to moving forward on this, that can only be seen as part of the solution. Other things are going to have to happen in tandem with this change if it goes forward. UCC hasn't already come out and said yes, we are in favor of it; we have to get all of the information first and so that's the information he has so far.

Senator Beth Ekelman asked if anybody has looked at how the TAG (Transfer Assurance Guides) system is going to be affected by any of these changes. It helps with transfer students when credit hours equal courses that are offered at other universities and you have to have certain content, and certain credit hours in order to be considered as TAGs so that they are equal courses. She feels this is something we need to look at before we start changing things because if we lose those TAGs, that could effect transfers and things like that.

Senate President Goodell noted that actually, all the TAGs are three credit classes and that is one of the problems with students transferring in. They transfer into a three credit class that technically meets the four credit requirement for us but then they are short a credit. If that happens over two or three classes, then they end up having to take a four credit class which they have to pay for and schedule. For transfer students, the TAG issue and transferred courses is one of the big issues.

Dr. Ekelman commented that in one of the sciences, courses are not three credits; they are more than three credits. It depends on the course, like physics.

Dr. Goodell remarked that there are some exceptions.

Senator Miron Kaufman stated that our sequence in general physics is exactly like at Ohio State and at Ohio State, each of those is a sequence of two courses and each of those two courses is five credits including the lab, those covered by TAGs. What he is trying to say here is that there are GenEd and there are different types of GenEd. The ones that are covered by them we have to be extremely careful not to disturb their requirements. He noted that all the other courses in the GenEd could move to three credits but those courses that serve the engineers or in physics have to have certain content and that cannot be done.

Dr. Kosteas responded that in that case, one of the things that UCC would like to know is could there be an alternative set up that would work for that. He doesn't know

how that class is set up. He asked if that class is set up at five credit hours just for a lecture component or is it three for the lecture and two for the lab. Senator Kaufman replied, four and one. Dr. Kosteas noted that there are a lot of issues that UCC needs to consider. He added that this is the kind of information they are looking to gather. He was not aware of that and thanked Dr. Kaufman for that information.

Senator Jeff Karem mentioned that there are also potential licensure issues. He knows that in professional programs there are a lot of dimensions to that. He is in the English Department and one of the things they do is secondary education licensure and the State has a vast array of requirements that have to be covered. In fact, many of their courses involve in aggregate a certain required number of course content meeting certain guidelines and it may be very difficult to uncouple that and still have students get precisely what they need so that is another dimension to that. He went on to say that students may have to take many more courses at the baccalaureate level to meet that and he is worried about the staffing implications and having our students take even more courses. He added that this might actually be an obstacle toward retention.

Dr. Goodell commented that this actually would be an advantage for those in the mathematics area as opposed to maybe the English area. In mathematics and science, because all of the classes are currently four credits – she is not talking about calculus I and calculus II which are part of the TAG and they are four credits everywhere and they will most likely stay four credits but after that, all of the other classes in other universities and everywhere else, are three credits. Because of the NCTM, our professional body requirements, our students don't get to take any electives at all because they have to take all four credit classes. So, if many of those become three credit classes, there will be much more flexibility in the curriculum for them. It would be a definite advantage for us in mathematics. She suspects that most of what is met by four credit classes for licensure purposes can be equally well met by a three credit class. There is more in the four credit class that is not required in many cases for the licensure.

Dr. Kosteas commented that whatever recommendation they come up with is going to take into account licensure and they would not recommend that that program be amended or adjusted or forced into making the switch in any way shape or form that would jeopardize their accreditation.

Senator Norbert Delatte commented that in many cases the programs that have licensure requirements are offered by other universities in Ohio maybe on the three credit model or something like that and it is worth benchmarking against what other people are doing. If other people are able to offer them in that model, then he suggests that we could as well.

Senator Ekelman stated that a one size fits all kind of makes her a little bit nervous too. She knows that when they were changing the quarter system to the semester transition in Health Sciences anyways, for example, they might have had four courses in the quarter system and they ended up making one four credit course. There were four four-credit courses and now it is one four credit course because it is very heavy and full

of content so she is hoping there will be some ability to ask for an exception for some of these courses because she just doesn't see how we can change that – certain courses that they did that with when they were trying to be as efficient as possible and making them three credits is just jam-packed.

Dr. Kosteas responded that there is going to be a range of possible solutions and some may not work. In some cases, we may have departments that say, right now we have this sequence that's two four-credit hour classes and we can't cut out the contents so what are we going to do? Well, instead we are going to make it a sequence of three three-credit hour classes which would actually effectively raise the required content from that course up by one credit hour. He added that this is a very reasonable response if we do move forward with this. He would only put his name on any recommendation, if that recommendation can be implemented in a way that is going to preserve the academic integrity of our programs and our ability as faculty to continue to conduct high quality research. He noted that most everyone would agree with him.

Dr. Kosteas noted there are two primary functions for a university and its faculty. One is to educate our students and to give them skills and to prepare them either for graduate work or for productive working lives and the other is to contribute to the knowledge base and, any changes that we make that might be detrimental to either of those two core missions, does ultimately have a negative impact on the students. We want to make this transition if it is going to be a net positive for our students. He stated that we also have to be aware that not all students might actually benefit from this kind of transition. One that stands out for him is students that come in the evening. We still maintain that we are going to have two evening blocks. Right now, a student who is working and comes down to campus, for example, for a Tuesday/Thursday class can take eight credit hours from 6:00 PM to 7:50 PM and 8:00 PM to 9:50 PM and still maintaining that there are only going to be two blocks, that student can only take six credit hours now so we have to be aware that for some students, again, depending on how we implement this transition if we do so, what would we do for those students because otherwise those students would actually see their graduations delayed. There is the question of how do we deal with each of these scenarios? Dr. Kosteas stated that he wants to identify the issues but not simply identify them to an extent of being quantified to the extent possible. How big is each issue and what would be the potential ways of dealing with them?

Senator Miron Kaufman inquired, "What is the reason and who will benefit from this?" He understands that we want to improve retention so let us keep the eye on this. What would happen if we go to three credits? That would mean that a student will have take 33% more courses and that is 33% more exams and 33% more possibilities to fail. He believes that we should also look at what the students think about this change. We should ask to see what it means to go to this system of three credits. He noted that he may be wrong but that is what he is thinking – a simplistic approach – 33% more courses and 33% more exams.

Dr. Kosteas commented that if we move the total credit hours down to 120, essentially, that's why the faculty perspective is needed. This is something that has been raised several times – moving from many faculty from teaching a 2/2 course load of four credit hours to the 3/2 or 2/3 and he believes most would agree that in the latter, it is one less contact hour; it's significantly more work because it is more preps and more exams. Some issues will come up – is there going to be a limitation on the number of preps? This semester you have three preps; are we going to have guarantees that faculty only teach three courses but only teach two preps? Would it even be possible for department chairs to guarantee that given our current staffing levels?

Senator William Bowen commented that the way to look at that, 2/2 versus 3/2 or another way to look at it, it is a fifty percent increase in the number of classes we teach every other semester and that fifty percent increase in the classes taught every other semester amounts to less research or something – probably less research. That's what would happen in his case – less research. He stated that he feels his students benefit by the research he does because it keeps him active; it keeps him doing things in the classroom and saying things he has recently discovered and that he passes on to them. So, to his way of seeing it, there is a real cost in terms of the experience of the students and the quality of the education that they are apt to get that will come in consequence of this fifty percent increase in the number of classes professors have to teach every other semester.

Dr. Kosteas commented that if we just take it at face value that this is the end of it, Dr. Bowen is right. There is no question and he agrees with Dr. Bowen one hundred percent that being active in research personally makes him a much better instructor – not just his own research but going to conferences and seeing what everyone else is working on and being able to come back and tell his students, "Hey, you should see this really cool idea that I just heard about at the conference." He said there is no question on that front but, again, the idea is, is there a way to address that? If there is a reasonable way for us to address that issue, then maybe it will make sense to move forward. That's what we are trying to uncover. He went on to say that he does intend to take a fairly holistic approach. He knows the University Curriculum Committee typically looks at curriculum matters but he does think some faculty body has to take a relatively holistic view of what these changes would entitle, not just in terms of how much you are going to have to revamp the curriculum, but what does it mean for faculty workloads. What does it mean for possibly staffing these additional sections that will have to be offered to make the reduction in the credit hours of each individual course? He noted that we can't simply divorce the content of the curriculum from the workload being placed on the faculty and from the ability to staff courses. It's all tied into each other and we can't look at it piece by piece.

Dr. Karem noted that the holistic question Dr. Kosteas brings up is a really good one because many departments are much smaller than they used to be – this is widely known. He is thankful that the English Department will be getting an additional tenure-track faculty and thanked Provost George Walker. He continued stating that we are still fifty percent down from where we were five or six years ago so our capacity to teach

many more sections is greatly diminished. There are workload implications but it is also a fact that many faculty who have thesis hours and who do other surface work, have credits back so it may well be that a lot of faculty can still teach if they are sufficiently productive at a 2/2 level which is great for the individual faculty member, but then it also means that you are going to have more part-timers teaching those new sections and he doesn't think that any of us feel that having more part-time instruction is better for our students' retention and completion. Dr. Karem went on to say that if we had a really strong body of faculty hiring, it would be much easier to make this work. But, he doesn't feel that we are there yet.

Senator Raymond Henry stated that it seems some of these recommendations for this change in the curriculum are driven by our retention rates but it doesn't seem that there is necessarily that much evidence that the three or four hour courses are what leads to the problem of retention. He asked if there are any plans in place to obtain that type of information as to what type of faculty this is or are we just saying we have a problem and let's do something although that something might not actually be addressing the problem we are trying to address.

Dr. William Beasley stated that he can only speak to part of Senator Henry's question which is the connection between the two. Over the past couple of years, the Student Success Committee looked at a lot of different components and one of the things that occurred to the committee over time is that there are some things we can affect and some things that we really can't affect. We can't affect the fact that physics is hard. When you teach it, well it is still pretty hard to learn so some things we have will to cross off and say, the students will have to confront that. There is another whole category of things that are obstacles we place in the way of students who are trying to move as expeditiously as possible through a program of study. Obstacles may be there – things like advisors who might be hard to locate, scheduling that might be hard to master, specific requirements of a program that are hard to pin down and get details about that make it harder for students to make their way through smoothly then it would be otherwise. In the presence or absence of those visits, it is still going to be hard but if we can remove the unnecessary obstacles, in general, their path is going to be easier and smoother and one of the things that's true about our programs of study here is that they are a mish-mash of two and three and four and five credits and he was told that one was a six credit class and it is very difficult for students to smoothly assemble four, four and one-half, or five years worth of a program study through which they can move expeditiously in trying to put together those building blocks of different sizes. Much of the rationale behind looking at moving to three credits, at least in the case of GenEd, is an attempt to make the building blocks the same size so that they can fit together smoothly and the students can have fewer unnecessary obstacles.

Senate President Goodell stated that the simple answer is we don't have hard data as yet where we can say how many students didn't complete on time because of this or that, but clearly it is an obstacle and she has encountered it herself numerous times when advising her own students. She commented that she sees people nodding their heads around the room and said she wishes they would speak up because it is an obstacle for

our students. It is an unnecessary obstacle that we put in the way. She commented that she doesn't understand why every other university can have a three credit schedule but we can't. What is so special about CSU or our students or our faculty that we can't follow the model that 99.9% of other universities in this country are currently following?

Senator Cheryl Bracken stated she didn't think that was entirely true. In looking at other programs in our area in communication, many state universities in Ohio have four credit classes. She asked, "Are we a university or are we a community college?" She stated that we have standards we are trying to uphold and one of the other things she finds frustrating in terms of student retention in advising students is the students have told her they cannot come over and talk to their faculty advisors until they are completely done with their GenEds. How are they going to be part of our program; how are they going to be part of our university if we are withholding them from the degrees and the faculty which are supposed to be most engaged. She stated that there are so many other things we can do to improve retention and student/faculty relationships but she doesn't think it is all about credit hours and she doesn't think the standard is three or four; she feels that it does vary.

Senator Holly Holsinger commented that those of us in the arts need the time because a lot of what we teach is actually hands on in the classroom so she worries about having less time in the studio situation.

Dr. Kosteas stated that hopefully they would be able to… If, and he is going to keep reiterating if, because the UCC has not come up with any conclusions. They are just starting to gather information that under such a transition there would be a way to continue to devote the classroom time as his fair share of theatre classes as an undergrad. He said he remembers quite well the amount of time they spent in the class before… He noted an important point to raise is, is there a way we can address that? Again, it is not enough just to identify the potential problems with the transition but to figure out if there are solutions to each of these important problems. Can we do this in a successful fashion? In a way, that is going to be our net positive for our students. That is the ultimate bottom line. Dr. Kosteas said he doesn't see this very simplistically as well. We will make the curriculum a little bit more straight forward, therefore, it's a net positive for our students. It's more complicated than that. Dr. Kosteas noted there are definitely arguments in favor of this and simplifying the curriculum would benefit the students – how much, he doesn't know. He doesn't if they can come up with an exact figure, but they can get a sense of the bounds. Going back to an earlier question, we can get a sense if we just focus on the GenEd, what this would really say on average for students. Is it one or two credit hours? We are talking about reducing the average number of credit hours to completion by ten; that will only get us twenty percent of the way there. So then we would have to be looking at a whole host of other measures to try to get us all the way there.

Senator Nigamanth Sridhar commented that we are clouding the discussion too much by talking about both GenEd as well as major courses. Most of the points that people here are making about how these might effect their students have to do with major

courses. UCC should first look at the GenEd courses. His feeling after looking at his curriculum and through discussions in his department is that it is not going to go down to one credit hour– it's going to be larger than that because it is structured as a three hour model but we didn't get any because of the four credit model. If we just put credit hours within the majors off the table for now, it might allow us to have a more constructive conversation rather than having to reinvent programs as well as the GenEd program; we can look at the problem and actually solve it.

Dr. Kosteas responded, do we just look at the GenEds or do we look at holistic undergraduate changes and whether down the road does it makes sense to do it piecemeal. We have to look at the potential for both but we will comment on both because the report did say to consider both scenarios; we will consider both and we will comment on each in turn separately. In part, there is this question of, "Does it make sense to do something in a piecemeal fashion?" As the UCC chair, he really doesn't want to see three hundred proposals to change GenEd classes and then all of a sudden three years later, we decide to move over the entire undergraduate curriculum. Guess what, everybody can be designing curriculum again, so for that reason, UCC will take up both scenarios in their proposal but they will consider them as separate options.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones stated that it seems to her that a large part of our issues is the lack of uniformity in terms of the three and four credit hour courses and what outcomes we expect. She noted that Dr. Kosteas mentioned logic. If we were to do a logic model, she is not sure that the inputs that we are talking about would move to the outcomes we are discussing. She remembers when we moved from quarters to semesters; part of the reason was that we probably contributed to student success because we spent more time covering the material with students and so even though it is not an object on the table, it seems to her that maybe we should be going to four credit hour courses for all courses instead of in the opposite direction and perhaps the GenEd requirements do need to be revisited in keeping with four credit hour courses rather than three credit hour courses. If we are really talking about student success and maybe leading the movement rather than following what other people are doing, that maybe should be the approach that is taken.

Dr. Sanda Kaufman stated that she had another concern. When we made this move from quarters to semesters and for instance, for our reading classes, we had two classes of three credits and after incredible negotiations, we moved to one four credit class. Now if we move it to three credits, it is going to be even worse. It will be very hard. There will be battles among faculty. Another concern she has is when they move from four credit hours, our students are not wealthy and if we add a third more courses, we are asking them to buy one third more text books each at least $100 and it seems like an obstacle for graduation. Pretty soon they won't be able to afford our courses, they will have more opportunities to fail a test and they won't be able to pay for this. So if we are moving toward conformity, which is an interesting criterion, maybe we should move to all four credit hour courses.

Senator Paul Bosela commented that it is very difficult to de-couple the credit hours with the teaching loads. When we converted to two semesters from the quarter system – our undergraduate Civil Engineering program is basically a majority of three credit hour courses. He didn't think anybody envisioned at the time that we would be talking about teaching three different courses in the semester. So when you look at other programs in the state and you say well they are based upon a three credit hour system, you also have to look at what are the faculty members' teaching loads. He is not saying that we shouldn't look at it, but it is something that he thinks causes a big concern when you don't know what the outcomes are going to be on teaching loads. He went on to say that it also depends on which type of students we have in that particular course and we are talking about full-time students in undergraduate courses. We talk about part-time students in a graduate course because some of these things can go either way. A part-time student that is in a graduate course is coming down and may be able to take two courses and, as stated earlier, they are not going to be able to take three courses so if it is two three credit hour courses, that is what the student is going to take; if it is two four credit hour courses, that is what the student is going to take but students will not take a third course. An undergraduate student may feel like it really doesn't make any difference. I am paying to be a full-time student and I'm going to take the courses I need to take. All of those things are a consideration on whatever is decided.

Dr. Kosteas stated that is why he is taking a very holistic approach. You cannot consider just the curricular changes in isolation from the faculty and students are going to be impacted in the same way.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady commented that this is a big sea change. She is from a College where almost all of their classes are four credits so we are looking at whole departments where most of the classes are four credits. She noted that she is interested in the conversation. Her husband works at Kent State with all three credit hour classes there. Her issue is how quickly this is pushing down. Today she received a memo from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) because she is a department chair as well and in the same week UCC wants back all of this information; she has to get the schedules in for the next academic year, she has tech requests due, it is mid-term grading time, and the President's initiative proposal from the colleges is due so we are talking about all of these things at the same time. At this point, Dr. Visocky-O'Grady invited everyone to visit the Art Gallery if they have nothing to do. Her question is, "for these sea changes, should we be taking more time to talk about parsing these different issues. There is an issue of how this affects us as faculty members – where the carrots are. A lot of us picked CSU so that we could dive into our research because there was a lighter teaching load. Referring again to her husband at Kent State, she noted that they teach the in same area and he is compensated a lot better than she is because he has a higher teaching load so there is a give and take. So, there are faculty only issues, there are tons of student issues and she understands all of them and thinks we should be exploring them. She worries right now that we are exploring them too quickly. Like let's have a Senate meeting and then get all the stuff in by the 19th. She would like to see a production schedule with a year of Senate meetings devoted to specific issues and some

time to think about it so that we put these systems in place to benefit our students and keep them here and benefit our faculty and keep them here.

Dr. Kosteas stated his one concern is that if this is pushed forward in a bad way, it is going to hurt recruiting and retaining faculty. He knows how we try to sell CSU as a great place to work and yes, if this is done in a way that has a negative impact on faculty, it is going to harm our ability to recruit and retain faculty. And there is no question that it is going to do that. There is no question that it will harm the students. He commented that as for the time frame, he just put out a couple of general questions. He hasn't been a department chair and he doesn't know how long it will take for department chairs to gather that kind of information. Some department chairs might have access to that more readily than others, but the reason for requesting that information by next Friday was to coincide with the presentation by the administration to the UCC. He stated that they could talk about giving a little extra time.

Senator Vera Vogelsang-Coombs commented that she is a very practical person and she recalls that the two issues before UCC – one is the conversion of four credit hour classes to three credit hours and the second issue is the reduction of the total undergraduate programs to 120 credit hours. She noted that she would speak to the second issue rather than the first. Right now, the university has a minimum of four undergraduate programs set at 120 credit hours. Years ago, academic units in the colleges were given the option of raising the total number of credits in the undergraduate programs to complete a bachelor's degree. In Urban, where she is from, they chose to set their curriculum at 128 credit hours and some other colleges did the same. She can speak for Urban. They have a very good graduation rate the last time she looked at it. But, what she would like to suggest is if we want to standardize all undergraduate programs at 120 in response to Columbus, then why not leave it up to the individual academic units to determine how to best accomplish this goal given that academic units know their students the best; they know the licensure and the field requirements the best; they know the completion rates the best; and they know their student markets the best. Now, being the practical person that she is, at the same time this option would allow the advocates of the three credit hour classes to experiment – she added that she believes in experimentation – to experiment and test out their schemes at the program level and we can gather data based on our experiments to share about the impacts. What she is very concerned about is the law of unintended consequences. For example, CSU does not have a good record with a large scale organizational change, and to underscore this, she will invoke those magical words, "PeopleSoft." A lot of the people, especially students, were harmed. She applauds UCC for wanting to develop a process, a very carefully designed process. At the same time, let the academic units do the experimentation and start with the reduction of the undergraduate programs to 120 credit hours.

Dr. Karem noted that what hadn't really been brought up was the 120 credit cap. If we are thinking of this in terms of strategy, what's the primary objective? Is the most important thing standardization or is it total hours to the degree. If it is total hours to the degree, he agrees with Dr. Vogelsang-Coombs. We should think about that because in his college (CLASS), they actually have the most four credit hour courses but in the data

they saw in Steering last week, they actually have fewer total credit hours completed by students upon graduation and in some colleges, they had three credit hour models in which case it doesn't seem like we are going to get the result from a three credit conversion. We would if we just told everybody to reduce the total number of credits which is what state legislatures have been mandating around the country. That seems the more likely change to come from Columbus.

Dr. Kosteas remarked that UCC might come out and say, in fact, let the colleges make the reductions. He didn't say, "Hey, give me this task." He noted that this was the task given to him as the UCC chair, and so they are moving forward but that could be their recommendation in the end. It is a very free market approach or a very federalist approach is what he should call it.

Dr. Goodell stated that in practice, all four credit courses in a three credit model means that many students take six, eight, ten additional credits more than they need to take to satisfy their requirements and that is definitely something that is adding to those extra credits that they take. She doesn't know if just the GenEd should be considered. She did think that for a while but she is on the fence.

Dr. Delatte referred to one of the questions asked in the memo, number three, which is, can you meet the challenges of covering the changes in course offerings with a given faculty? Maybe one piece of information the departments should be giving to UCC is, if we went from four to three, but then went to a 2/2, how many faculty would be short? Then you can reply. If it is one or two per department, that adds up to quite a bit across the university. He fully agrees that if we go to a 2/3, the scholarship that you can produce in that semester with three different courses is virtually none. Maybe that is the piece of information we owe UCC as part of this fact-finding.

Senator Tachelle Banks stated that she feels it will be beneficial to maybe look at comparable institutions and see what they are doing at the GenEd level with three credits and also see which institutions are teaching three credit hour courses. She asked if this would be classified. She said that it seems to maintain the integrity of the GenEd or end their programs and she is still not convinced to do this. She knows that Akron and Kent State are predominantly three credit hour programs. In addition, institutions that are on the 2/3 model may be institutions that don't hold rankings similar to CSU or are more like research institutions. She thinks that this information would really inform the conversation.

Dr. Kosteas replied that he does intend to gather that kind of information for UCC's report. It is something that should be readily available either through the AAUP – he believes they gather some of the information and some of it could also be gathered by the state of Ohio. Data is available there as well. He will look into it more.

Dr. Banks added that this process is being initiated on an exploratory basis right now and the faculty they have spoken to across the College of Education, just really aren't resistant. They may have questions and need support in making those changes, and

that support is being provided, but overall resistance to this – if it is student orientated first, the outcome is for students first. Finally, at the college level, what they found generally is that they had to shrink programs. So it comes to what is important – their major or the GenEd piece – and that is critical to the conversation. She agrees that programs maybe do need to look at this stuff but that is what the students pay for and student perspectives is important.

Senator Linda Wolf noted that she could barely hear what Dr. Banks was saying. She commented that this goes back to the number of classes you are teaching and she mentioned this at the Steering Committee meeting. In Nursing, they teach a minimum of three classes each semester. She has taught that since she started at CSU and for the next semester, she is scheduled to teach five sections of a lab plus a graduate level course. Now, it is just harder for her to understand how you only want to teach two classes. Granted it interferes with research but we are here for the students. We are here because of them. If it wasn't for them, we wouldn't be here. And yes, our research is important. She would love to be able to do it as would her colleagues but they are in the classrooms with their students and it is just harder for her to hear people upset that they might have to teach one more class per semester.

Dr. Kosteas said that he really has a hard time with interdisciplinary comparisons because our disciplines are very different. He can say that even within his own discipline, the amount of time he has to devote to teaching intermediate principles of micro economics, the amount of effort that is required, is much less than teaching a more technical class. We are all faculty but we still have very diverse backgrounds. For someone from the natural sciences or engineering or any technical fields, we know that the amount of prep that goes into an upper level technical course is very demanding.

Dr. Wolf asked Dr. Kosteas if he would like to come to Nursing and follow the faculty some day. She noted that they would be glad to have Dr. Kosteas. They actually had Dean Jay McLoughlin come and visit one of their clinicals. He could not believe the amount of work they do in nursing. And, nursing has a technical side as well. If they didn't teach how to be technical, there are people in here who would be dead.

Dr. Kosteas replied that there are degrees of technicality. He noted that he doesn't want to get into an argument about this. Again, it seems what Dr. Wolf is arguing is let's just be a peer teaching school and what she is saying is huge.

Dr. Wolf remarked, "No, that is not."

Dr. Kosteas commented that if it is, you are talking about having everyone teach three and four courses. If we look at the example that Dr. Wolf is putting forward, he believes that she even said in Steering that, in fact, she doesn't have time to do much research, but there is no question it would hurt. No one is going to claim that these effects are going to be uniform across disciplines and across people that teach different types of classes. That is a ridiculous statement to make. He hopes that nobody who understands anything about academia would make that kind of statement. The impacts

are differential; there is no question about that. He said he doesn't think faculty don't want to teach an extra class – there is concern in large part because, as Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady said, when we came here to CSU, we came here under a certain set of conditions. He remembers when he was interviewing, and it wasn't that long ago, and he interviewed with well over a half dozen academic institutions and the question was, "What's the research teaching mix?" He stated that we are going to draw a different type of faculty if we do make a shift in that workload. There is no question about that. You are going to draw from a different pool. He noted it may be decided that this is the direction we want to go in but we have to be cognizant that this will be a real effect.

Senator Helen Liggett stated that it seems to her it is not only the issue of drawing from a different pool but you would risk losing valuable research faculty that you already have. Dr. Kosteas responded that this might lead to some degree of turnover. Again, because we recruited faculty under one set of expectations when we recruit people and if that expectation changes, we have to be prepared to that potential. He has studied turnover in jobs in his research center and he is personally well aware of that.

Senator Pamela Rutar commented that after sitting here looking at a couple of different universities that we complete with, e.g., Kent State, almost to a program when looking at their disciplines – Finance, Sciences, those kinds of things – 121 credit hours to graduation for all of them. At Ohio State, 120 credit hours. Akron isn't really comparable. She stated the reality is that we have a pool of students coming here that are already financially, in many cases, at a very big disadvantage compared to some of the other universities. They are looking to get in and get going in their profession and graduate and, if we can't at least make our credit hours to graduation comparable with the people we compete with, we are going to lose in the long run from the standpoint that we won't be able to attract the students.

Dr. Kosteas noted that there are two separate issues before us. The one is the move down to 120 credit hours and we could very readily accomplish that. He stated he doesn't know that there is the same kind of resistance to that particular move as there is to the more potentially contentious issue which seems to be the four to three credit hour issue. Those are two separate issues and UCC will consider them separately and also…

Dr. Davis Jones asked for a point of clarification. She stated that as a chair of a department with a very large undergraduate program and also a very large graduate program, the master's program, it is impossible for her to think about a change of this magnitude in those two separate categories with undergraduates and graduates. Most of their faculty teach in both the undergraduate and graduate programs and so given that issue like scheduling and workload, and cross-listed courses, how does one cross the undergraduate and graduate divide? She assumed until she attended this meeting this afternoon, that we were going to be responding about the transition for both graduate and undergraduate courses and now what she is hearing is this is really about undergraduate courses. She was wondering if Dr. Kosteas could clarify for her what the mix or the issue under consideration is.

Dr. Kosteas responded that the report we are commenting on basically gave us two ranges, at a minimum, to think about the general education requirements – all those courses that fulfill GenEds to be standardized to three credit hours. Obviously the labs will continue to be one credit courses. At the other end, it would be all undergraduate courses – that would be the maximum of the range that was given to him and that is in the Undergraduate Student Success Committee's Report to the Faculty Senate that came out last spring. So that is the range we are looking at. The cross-listing of courses is another complication in all of this. He says this as someone who is in a department where they do have some cross-listed courses between graduate and undergraduate and then it becomes the question of, "Well what do you do? Do you adjust your graduate courses down or do you have a hybrid class that's four credit hours for graduate students and three credit hurts for undergraduate students and then what credit do you give to the faculty member for teaching that class?" Dr. Kosteas noted this is not something that can be simply brushed aside because it isn't a trifle issue. He doesn't know the magnitude of that; he doesn't know to what extent departments are affected by that or how many are affected by that. He is hoping to get a sense of just how big of an issue that is with the department chairs.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray mentioned that if we are looking at cross-listed courses and end up with that scenario of making the graduate class a four credit and the undergraduate a three credit, essentially what you are doing is a two-course load for the faculty member. As a faculty, you are teaching two separate classes, undergraduates and graduates.

Dr. Kosteas replied that he doesn't have a clear sense of exactly how that is done.

Senator Berlin Ray stated that when she has a cross-listed course, she has graduate and undergraduate students and if she has to target the graduate portion to that, essentially the four credit class, and the undergraduate part of that class, the undergraduate students with a three credit course, she is prepping two different classes essentially. If you add that two with a 3/2 load, essentially she is getting an extra class.

Dr. Kosteas responded that he agrees with Dr. Berlin Ray fully; there is no question that this would increase the amount of prep time.

Dr. Delatte commented that the letter then stated there are really actually only three separate issues. There is the GenEd three to four issue, there is the undergraduate course issue and then the graduate courses are really separate; they overlap some, but it is a separate issue, even though it wasn't part of the undergraduate student success, it does factor in.

Dr. Karem commented that what makes CSU different than these other institutions is that we can have a higher retention rate with 3/3 credit hour courses, but one difference is we have far fewer faculty than Kent or Akron. It is his job to harp on this every Senate meeting.

President Ronald Berkman commented that it is just not true because when we look at the faculty/student ratios at Kent, Akron, Youngstown and Cleveland, Cleveland has the best faculty/student ratio of those four peer institutions. He commented that Dr. Karem should check it out.

Dr. Karem stated that he looked at OBOR's data.

President Berkman stated that Dr. Karem should check out the web site. Dr. Karem should be honest about what he is harping on. He went on to say that CSU has the best student/faculty ratio of all of those four institutions.

An Unidentified Senator called a point of order stating that Dr. Jeff Karem has the floor.

Dr. Karem said that he was sorry and he is not trying to be dishonest with President Berkman but he looked at the ratios of tenure-track faculty members including non tenure-track members who are part of bargaining units and college lecturers, and we do fall considerably behind most universities in Ohio. Cincinnati has twelve hundred tenure-track faculty members and a tremendous retention rate. Akron does have many more tenure-track faculty than we do. They do have more students and he is not arguing about ratios but he thinks a number of universities have a critical mass of faculty who are present all of the time that have full-time engagement with students and he thinks we need more of that. That is one of the x-factors here that's part of the mix.

Senator Beth Ekelman mentioned that in Health Sciences about seven or eight years ago, when they were developing new courses, they started doing the three-credit model of courses and they have since hired a couple of tenure-track faculty who actually do have to teach five courses. They are now just starting to be reviewed for tenure so she doesn't know if it is a struggle or not for them. They have really been trying to protect them by giving them similar tracks so they don't have to continually do new courses. She doesn't think it has effected who we have attracted because we've got some great people that we've hired, but it is doable and they have been doing it for a while. She was not sure how it has affected their productivity with scholarship yet because they are now just seeing that; they are just now going through the tenure review process.

Dr. Kosteas inquired if they teach three during a semester. Dr. Ekelman responded that they teach three and two. Dr. Kosteas asked if it is three preparations or just two sections of one class. Dr. Ekelman said that the way they made their teaching loads, they are trying to make it so that they are teaching two sections of the same class and are not having to do too many new classes with too many preps. They are trying to protect them.

Senate President Goodell commented that from personal experience, her husband teaches at Akron and he has always had a 3/3 load. His productivity is amazing. He has in four years six articles in top finance journals which is a pretty hard thing to do and he still manages to spend time with her daughter and her even though she would probably

like it to be more, but it is possible to do this. She stated that he serves on many committees and does it all with a 3/3 load in a hard subject. Publishing in finance is pretty difficult as those people in that department would know. "So, why can't we do it? What is wrong with CSU faculty that it is not going to work for us. I don't understand."

Senator Robert Krebs asked to clarify a couple of points. One that he hadn't quite clicked with was the problem with the graduate programs that were not including it. We said one of the advantages would be in scheduling course blocks, but if we still have four credit classes out there, that is something to think about. He noted that the other, the fact that we don't mention here at all, is the part-timers which while we call them the part-timers, these are faculty who teach full-time but they just teach part-time here and part-time somewhere else. He said assumes that we are going to move them from teaching two four-credit courses, I believe the Greenbook says they have a two course limit, but he knows that is violated and we look the other way and that is actually okay, but the fact that they are going to be teaching three courses here, we still have to compete for the good ones. So, this is just something to consider on the table as well.

Senator Debbie Jackson commented that something to keep in mind as she has listened to the discussion, we have talked about several universities that are not comparable to us, so we could focus more on comparing ourselves to institutions across the state or out of the state and make sure that we are making comparisons to comparable institutions. When she came to Cleveland State, she came because one of the routes to get tenure was through teaching and she thought that teaching was important at Cleveland State. So, we should just focus on comparable institutions, Carnegie ratings or however you want to make comparisons, but she didn't think that we should talk about Cincinnati or Ohio State and we should be talking about Kent and Akron and OU and other institutions that are similar to us, and they do teach more than we do now.

Dr. Kosteas thanked everyone for their feedback.

Dr. Goodell stated that she is sure we haven't said the last words on this by any means. She thanked Dr. Kosteas very much for chairing this part of the meeting and allowing her to have her say.

V. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman commented that he didn't know if anyone read the *Chronicle* but just to give everyone a sense of what's happening around this country and in terms of cuts to public universities, there is a front page article in the *Chronicle* that talks about the NFS – the NFS sounds alarm over cuts at state universities and some of these numbers are really quite staggering. He stated that the cut-backs in funding to public universities and state universities is over the last year. Oregon 32%, California 30%, Colorado 48%, Michigan 31%, Illinois 37%, Rhode Island 47%, and four other states above 30% - a 30% or more cut back in state funding. He has been trying, since he has been addressing this body, and he has been here to try to alert Faculty Senate as a faculty that we are in a different day; we are in a different climate and we are right in the

middle of a paradigm change that is going to happen this semester. It is going to happen as the chair noted before Thanksgiving.

President Berkman mentioned the six reform goals that the Governor gave to the College Presidents as a mandate for the Presidents' attempts to construct a formula.

1) Increase participation rates in higher education among all Ohio school graduates.
2) Encourage the brightest Ohio school graduates to continue their education here in Ohio and encourage the brightest students throughout the country to come to Ohio.
3) Improve graduation rates and the time for graduation.
4) Make education much more affordable.
5) Graduate students with skills needed to achieve success in jobs and careers.
6) Encourage graduates of Ohio colleges and universities to stay in Ohio as they pursue their post college opportunities.

President Berkman noted that a lot of these are focused on the Governor's aim to increase the number of co-op opportunities for students, the number of internship opportunities for students and to provide strategic funding in particular areas and in particular domains. He reported that they had a briefing yesterday and they are a long way from finishing at the commission but where things are right now and what are being considered are essentially that there be performance criteria – two essential domains of performance criteria. One is retention – retention from semester to semester; the percentage of students that you retain from semester to semester and the second would be graduation rates. Right now the number that is being bandied about, and again, we are not close to resolution but the number that is on the table as the minimum, the suggested minimum part of the formula in terms of the performance of element of the formula is fifty percent. Fifty percent of our funding would be dependent on our ability to meet or compete in these two criteria – retention and graduation. There are other proposals that call for seventy-five percent of the university funding to be based on those criteria. It will begin in the next biennium. Whatever the number is will occur in the next biennium so when we face the next budget, we will have a new budget formula and that new budget formula will be implemented during the next budget biennium.

President Berkman went on to say that right now, it is the direction in which the discussions are trending. Where they turn out, how the Legislature receives them, how the Governor receives them are all issues that are yet to be determined. But there is no doubt and never has been any doubt that we will no longer receive funding based on the students that we put in a classroom or the students that we admit. Aside from that, what he has said repeatedly, his goal is to help students to remove the obstacles – to remove the obstacles that students have who are qualified to give them the best opportunity to retain and graduate from the university. Not only because it will impact the future of the university in a new universe but because it's the right thing to do for students. He stated that this is where things are in the formula.

President Berkman offered to take questions.

Senator Brian Ray said that he recalls from the last time one of the big issues that disadvantaged us was the fact that the performance ignored transfer students in essence and also the phenomena of people leaving early and going to Ohio State, etc. He asked President Berkman if there are any specific proposals to try to account for that and have they been discussed?

President Berkman replied that there is a formula right now and the formula is part of the discussion in which students would be assigned a risk factor so all students would not start on an equal footing; there would be a series of risk factors. One would be age, one would be preparation – there are four risk factors in the formula. They add up to an index score; those index scores are summed and weighted and they do impact what the allocation is. Whether those risk factors will stay in as they as to today he is not sure. He can say that every college president, at least those he has been with around the table, is in favor of continuing to have risk factors be part of the formula discussion. They are in there now but they don't play a dominant role in terms of what happens at the end of the day in terms of funding but they are in there and everyone is arguing to keep them in there. The transfer student question is one that he has argued from the very beginning and continues to argue at every opportunity that the goal of the State and the goal of the Nation at least as he understands it, is to produce more baccalaureates. It is not the goal of the State to produce more baccalaureates that start at one institution and finish in the same institution. And again, we are beginning for the first time to see the National Student Clearing House begin to talk about the need for a different formula where actually the student is the unit of analysis. And what happens, in terms of the success and trajectory and success of the students overall, is the unit of analysis and not the institution. The institutions are viewed – this is pretty much the words of the Clearing House report – the institutions are viewed as educational stepping stones in helping the students to achieve their educational goals. It is part of the dialogue. President Berkman said that we definitely need a metric; we will be significantly disadvantaged if transfer students are out of the equation and all of this is calculated the way IPEDS calculates the data.

Professor Ray asked President Berkman if he had any sense of the legislative landscape so that when this comes out as a proposal people will be wondering if it turns into legislation. If so, then we should implement changes through the legislative process.

President Berkman stated that the analysis he has heard of the incoming legislative leadership is that they are considerably less sympathetic to higher education than the existing leadership we had last year. So, when President Niehaus leaves, we will have a Senate President who was last year the Chair of the Senate Finance Committee and was the author of some very, very difficult legislation facing higher education. We will have a less friendly climate in the legislature. His hope would be that the Governor would be able to come forward to the legislature in his budget with a formula that reflects the collective concerns of the legislature and by doing that to be able to get ahead of the

political curve and be able to make claim to the legislative leadership that this new formula accomplishes much of what you have argued for over these last couple of years.

Senator William Bowen commented that when we are in the middle of this paradigm shift in the performance criteria that impacts the health and welfare of our university, he just doesn't understand why we spent $46 million of our operating budget on a new building. Why not take that same money and invest it in making sure that we collectively, as a faculty and administration, have the capacity to be able to meet these criteria.

President Berkman replied that the $46 million is capital money. We cannot take bonded money and put it into the operating budget and use it as recurring money. They are completely discrete and separate pools of money funded from completely different sources. He thinks we build building because a building, and this particular building, adheres to a strategic theme that's important to the university, that's extraordinarily important to this community, that is an increasing importance to the students who come to the university and it demonstrates our university's visible commitment that we will continue to build and develop the teaching classroom building that will also, hopefully, facilitate interdisciplinary research. Facilities are an enormously important part of this competitive equation that some people talked about and that's the reason why the decision was to go ahead and build the building.

Dr. Bowen noted that he was misinformed and was told that the bonds were issued on the operating budget.

President Berkman stated that the bonds are secure – they are revenue bonds. They are secure but they are not issued to be used as operating dollars; they are issued to build the building. All bonds have to be secured by something and when public universities bond, they bond against revenue.

Senator Krebs asked President Berkman if there is any feeling out of Columbus whether Chancellor Petro thinks that Ohio universities need to start being more selective about who they accept or are we being too broad and the national federal government is pushing for this concept that everybody should have the opportunity to go to college? "Is there a throw-back from Columbus?"

President Berkman responded that actually, there is a real tension there too in the dialogue because there are several universities in the mix who have a greater and a broader and a more historical access mission and want to protect that access mission. We understand – it's not that complicated. If we really wanted to improve our outcomes, although it is not the only mechanism to improve our outcomes, and if we had a pool of highly qualified students, and if that pool of highly qualified students was willing to enroll in CSU, we could probably use that as a mechanism to increase our outcomes. But, the reality for us is that we do have an access mission. We need to protect that access mission while still bringing in students who we believe have the best chance of being successful. And, the metric has been going up; it hasn't been going up by leaps

and bounds; it hasn't been going up for anybody by leaps and bounds but the GPA increment, the ACT increment has been going up and it has gone up for the last four years. Hopefully that trajectory will continue and we will see students who are somewhat better prepared. But there is a real danger and you speak to it, and that is universities will all seek to compete for the best and brightest students because their funding will be at stake.

VI. Report of the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost George Walker stated that he recently authorized eight additional hires and that comes to a little less $850,000 to $1 million. That's the equivalent to building a new building because over the lifetime of those faculty who will be here 35 years or so in general they will have pay raises, they will have a variety of things and so every time that you add $1 million in continuing funding to tenure-track faculty, it is roughly the equivalent of building a $40 million building. He believes in terms of balance, we spent about $2.3 million this year. In terms of balance, certainly the faculty come first and he is going to do everything he can to make sure that we do more of that. He noted having these strategic investments that he will mention in a moment, as well as building buildings, allow us to change and do things that are more important for the future insofar as our judgment sees it with regard to health care. It is important – you want to have a balanced portfolio. Dr. Walker stated that in addition to the eight new faculty hires, there is this $1.25 million of one-time money that the President has set aside for strategic investments. Many faculty around the table have been involved in putting together these proposals and the great thing about them is that we provided incentives so they tend to go across not just individual departments but also individual schools and colleges. So even if many of the proposals can't be funded because there are so many good ones, we at least have people talking with each other and if there are resources available or foundations that we can go to, we can also take those and see what we can do with getting it started. Provost Walker stated that this is a really good idea and those are due this Friday, October 12, 2012.

Provost Walker turned to promotion and tenure. He noted that he had talked about this a couple of times with the Steering Committee. He is setting up a web site where the information including the appendices, which are huge, will be available so that department chairs and faculty and others can see the background material that the Task Force on Promotion and Tenure had. He has been meeting with the Deans although all of the heavy listing is going to be related to work they need to do. The basic idea is to make sure that our faculty, during a very stressful time, are going to have a promotion and tenure process and all the attending information in a transparent process that allows faculty to put forth the best possible case that they can put forward and that it is reasonably consistent given the fact that we have very different disciplines. He stated that this is a very, very important issue.

Finally, Provost Walker said that he asked a question of Steering; he won't tell what the answer was – there was lots of discussion. He said, "As you look back historically, do you believe at this institution that we have been very data driven or

disciplined with regard to differential teaching loads based on scholarly productivity? I know that most of you here, if not all of you, are very active scholars. But maybe that doesn't apply to all of our colleagues. And so, I think that we owe, in terms of fairness, to take a careful look at that. This is not something that I should do; this is something the department chairs and the deans should do." Provost Walker said that the response he thinks he got was that we could do a better job. When he asked, "Why haven't we?", what he thought he heard was, "Well you know historically, when we tried to do something like that, we found that some of the administrators in the schools have been more driven by political and other differentiation than sort of a data-driven disciplinary approach and so we kind of avoided it because people didn't step up to the plate." Provost Walker stated, "If that's true to any extent, that's not a respectable reason for us not taking a careful look because suppose it were true, ten, twenty, thirty percent of our faculty in certain areas have not published anything for a few years; have not submitted grants, have not had graduate students." He said that he doesn't know. But, to the extent that people haven't engaged successfully in some kind of productivity research, we ought to be helping differentiating so that those of you who are more active in scholarship will have the opportunity to have lighter teaching loads because you are productive in scholarship. And others, who are clearly more focused on teaching, would have a more heavy load. Provost Walker stated that he is just a short-time Provost so the things he says are gone with the wind. But it seems to him that a Provost ought to be able to work well with deans and department chairs to figure out how we can do something if there needs to be more flexible teaching loads and that we do it in a way where we make sure if somebody were to have three course preparations in a given semester that only two of those would be different. That seems to be a very reasonable thing. He noted that at institutions he has been at it was possible; maybe it's different here. So it seems to him that the Provost working with the deans can be helpful and provide incentives and work together so that some of these things become a little more palatable especially once we see that the future is going to resolve very significant differential teaching loads based on data if that's true.

Senator James Marino indicated one point of clarification. He thanked the Provost for his point about the cost of new hires and thanked him for the new hires very much. He noted that the Provost had said it is about $850,000 to $1 Million and made reference to this money as an investment.

Provost Walker remarked that fringes and start-up costs are in there.

Dr. Marino stated that his understanding was that 3.75% interest on $46 million is $1.7 million and that's before we get to the principle. Perhaps he has misunderstood the investment comparison.

Provost Walker responded that one of the things to remember is that over $10 million of that is provided by NEOMED. So you bring the $46 million down to $36 million. You also have to subtract, and it's not going to be there forever, the fact that we have refinanced some bonds and there is a lower rate associated with that refinance. Even if it is $1.7 million, we spent $2.3 million. He is not arguing that we shouldn't

invest in faculty; he is pointing out that if you hire 20 – 30 faculty, you are actually making an investment that's far more than a specific building and we have areas where we believe we are going to expand in terms of health related activity and faculty and students that really want to do that, get jobs whatever, qualified students that want to come and we can do a variety of things. It seems to him this is something we ought to think about very seriously and the university did a wise thing by doing it. What you think about that will depend upon where you sit and what you see your own needs are. He understands that but it is not a frivolous or egotistical kind of thing that people do. They look at it from the point of view of how to serve a diverse community at a university and outside the university and we all agree that there is a paradox here in higher education. And those things that have worked for Cleveland State in the past probably are not going to work in the future. So if we were to just stick with the status quo, even though there is risk in doing new things, it is almost like unless we do some things to change, we know we are going to be in deep, deep trouble. The university administration in working and talking with faculty and administrative leaders and other partners like NEOMED, like the Cleveland Clinic, like Parker Hannifin, etc. are working on ways to diversify. We have also made a decision to reinvest and build up engineering. People can argue and say well that doesn't seem like a very good thing to do because engineering is expensive. Provost Walker stated that we know there are industrial partners out there who really like our graduates and are prepared to invest in us and were very upset when they heard, like Parker Hannifin a few years ago, that maybe we were de-investing in engineering. We have to look at a balance of these things and realize that yes, anytime we invest in engineering, anytime we invest in a new building, anytime we invest in Playhouse Square, anytime we invest in an international school or a STEM high school, yes, that is taking a certain amount of resources away from what we did before but it could well be that those very things are going to be extremely helpful, in fact save us, in the future.

Professor Brian Ray commented that it is great we are having this conversation about the numbers, but he feels it is going to be really important going forward and before they set the benchmarks, the real data that can answer the question of the discussion we just had is looking at the budget in each university sector and we know for a fact that debt service has ballooned over the last decade and we know that it has been added to and we can debate or should debate exactly where the money is going. We know that it has increased by at least $5 million this year and it will increase $7 million next year and that is the actual cost.

Provost Walker added that of course this is small compared to the $13 million that we've lost every year in just this first round of budget cuts in the state.

Professor Ray said that what we need though is to really have a conversation at Senate and what we need is a sector division of the budget so that we can see over time where the operation money is going, right?

Provost Walker stated that even though you have all those numbers, how you weigh them and how you interpret them, there will still be a story. He continued stating that one of the nice things he thinks about the new portfolio for the new Provost, the

Provost is the chief operating officer and that means the new Provost has the responsibility to and authority to work on the budget across the university with the President. That is why he was able to change the budget policy in order to be able to hire eight new faculty. And the good news is, we will have a new Provost and we will have that overall budget and we will be able to very clearly, from an academic perspective, look at all of these things and put it together for Faculty Senate.

VII. Student Government Association

Informational Report (Report No. 28, 2012-2013)

Student Government President Moatasem Al Bitar first congratulated Dr. Joanne Goodell to a new term as Senate President and thanks Senate for having him at this meeting today.

SGA President Al Bitar said that he is privileged to be the student representative on the Provost Search Committee; he is very lucky. He noted that they had Provost open forums in the Business College and in the Engineering College and have a good amount of responses from students that they will be using at the next meeting. The responses are really across the board; a lot of students talked about certain qualities that the Provost should have and other students spoke directly about the issues – parking was number one.

SGA President Al Bitar reported that they also have an additional $100,000 in their Finance Committee budget so that's very interesting and exciting to Student Government. They are now able to fund more student organizations adequately and fund different events that happen both on and off campus which will help greatly their university goal of increasing freshmen graduation rates. Student Government believes that the more involved students are, the better equipped they are academically in post graduation.

Mr. Al Bitar moved to parking. Student Government has been monitoring the situation closely and they have been getting a lot of responses from students. They believe that there has been an improvement in the parking situation.

Mr. Al Bitar reported that they have almost a total roster in Student Government which is very pleasing. They have freshmen membership. Typically it is either the junior or the senior students who apply to student government, putting their resumes out before graduation but now they are seeing more freshmen students applying and there is a lot of interest. He added that this really compliments the energy they are seeing on campus from the largest freshmen class ever.

Mr. Al Bitar introduced Mr. Christopher Caspary, the SGA Vice President, and said that he is going to talk a little bit about the new Homecoming.

SGA Vice President Caspary reported that CSU's Homecoming will take place from October 11 through 14 and it is part of the new initiatives of things going on around

CSU. He noted that a parade will occur on Saturday, October 13; this is the first time they have had a parade since the 1960s. Mayor Frank Jackson will be the Grand Marshall and they will have 29 student organizations, floats, and a lot of other different things going on. He said that ten Cadillacs from the dealership up the street will be used including a convertible for the day. They are really trying to use resources. He invited everyone to attend the parade which will begin at 5:00 PM on East 24th Street and lead up to the Wolstein Center and should last for approximately thirty minutes. After, there will be a Tailgate Party with free food at the Wolstein Center. The basketball team and coach Waters will come on and then there will be a concert to close out the evening. Mr. Caspary commented that it should be very exciting. Student Government is just trying to get everyone involved and would appreciate everyone showing up. In addition, there will be a lot of college events from all of the different colleges who will come together for this exciting event.

Senate President Goodell asked Mr. Al Bitar how aware are students of this 120 credit hours and three/four credit hour conversion issue that we have been discussing today. She asked, "Are the students aware of it and, if so, what do they think?"

SGA President Al Bitar replied that he had no knowledge at all. Mr. Al Bitar commented that there is actually a faculty representative at their SGA Senate meetings and he could possibly speak on this issue.

VIII. New Business

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. Senator James Marino moved and Senator Brian Ray seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel