

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

SEPTEMBER 11, 2013

PRESENT: Boboc, Delatte, Dixit, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Gelman, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, Gross, R. Henry, Hoffman, D. Jackson, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Kalafatis, Karem, S. Kaufman, Kent, Kosteas, Krebs, Lehfeldt, J. Lieske, Liggett, Little, Majette, Margolius, Marino, C. May, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Resnick, Rickett, N. Sridhar, Steinberg, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, Welfel, J. G. Wilson, Wolf.

Artbauer, Berkman, Dumski, Fedor, J. Ford, Mageean, McHenry, Novy, Sawicki, G. Thornton, Triplett, B. White, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Berlin Ray, Delgado, Fodor, Gorla, Meier, Rashidi, Talu, Witmer-Rich.

Boise, M. Bond, C. Brown, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Massola, Parry, Sadlek, Sawicki, Spademan, Stoll, Zachariah.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:08 P.M.

I. Eulogies

A. Paul L. Aspelin (Anthropology)

Professor Barbara Hoffman delivered the Eulogy for the late Paul A. Aspelin. Her remarks follow.

“Paul L. Aspelin was born on October 10, 1945, here in Cleveland. His Bachelor’s degree was in International Relations with a concentration in Economic Development and Social Change in Latin America. He did both Master’s and Ph.D. at Cornell University where he defended his dissertation in 1975 on the Artifact Trade of the Mamainde Indigenous People of Mato Grosso, Brazil.

“Before beginning graduate school, Paul spent the summer of 1966 working with Archeologists from Case on early indigenous habitations in the Scioto River Valley. While he was still a doctoral candidate, Paul was hired by the incipient Anthropology

Department here at CSU in the fall of 1972. He retired after 40 years of dedicated service to CSU, in May of 2012.

“Paul Aspelin personified the holistic four-field approach that became and remains the hallmark of Anthropology. A cultural anthropologist in title, he did archaeological fieldwork, worked as an applied anthropologist, taught courses in biological anthropology, and late in his career, became the Director of the Linguistics Program. He spent the last six years of his career chairing the Anthropology Department, growing its numbers of majors by nearly 300% during that time.

“His early years were devoted to the basic survival issues of the native peoples of Brazil during a time of tremendous social upheaval and culture change. The priorities of the Brazilian state in the 1970s took precedence over those of the indigenous populations – the state’s need for energy drove the government to construct 25 hydroelectric dams on the Uruguay River, displacing great numbers of Indians from their homes with little care for the consequences to their ways of life. Paul worked with a Brazilian colleague throughout the 1970s and 80s to assess the impact of this brutal social change, and spent a year at the Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil, as a Fulbright Lecturer and research Scholar, working collaboratively to bring the inequities suffered by the native peoples into the public eye, publishing a book on the topic and organizing an international conference on the Socio-Cultural Consequences of Dams in Latin America in 1989.

“Around this time Paul began to suffer from a debilitating condition that would prevent him from conducting further fieldwork in Brazil. Many people would have chosen to retire on medical disability at that point. Instead, Paul redirected his remarkable intellectual energies into his teaching, advising, and mentoring of our students, and into a dedicated service role within the department, the college, and the University. His devotion to our students and to our program consumed the rest of his life. He passed away just one year after retiring.

“He is remembered fondly by several generations of students who have gone on to graduate programs in Anthropology and related disciplines, as well as by thousands of students who merely took one course with him. His unforgettable stories of the adventures of fieldwork and of his passionate campaigns on behalf of the native peoples of Brazil keep him alive in the memory of his students. His enduring conviction that to understand what it is to be human, one must consider the humanity of those different from us, lives on in them. They are his finest contributions to the future of our Greater Cleveland Community.

“He is survived by his wife, Eileen Hoge, who is here today, his two children Christopher and Kelly, his brother Carl, and a host of cousins, nieces, and nephews.

“He is profoundly missed by his colleagues in the Anthropology Department. It was an honor to have been his colleague and friend.”

B. Donald G. Lindmark (Biology)

Professor Tobili Sam-Yellowe delivered the Eulogy for the late Donald Lindmark. Her remarks follow.

“Twenty-three years ago when I met Don, I never would have imagined speaking to this September gathering, about him in this way. Don would have no patience for something like this. I can just hear him with his characteristic laugh: ‘Get a life! Don’t you have anything better to do?’

“Our friend and colleague Donald G. Lindmark passed away on May 18, 2013. He was a long time member of the biology department, since 1984. Don received his PhD in Bacteriology from the University of Rhode Island. He was the Chair of the biology department from 1984 to 1990. Don was a highly respected, accomplished and celebrated scientist. His scientific interests ranged from the biochemistry and cell biology of bacteria and parasites to the chemistry of making wine. Don taught and trained numerous students over the years. He was glad to work with colleagues in the department and across the university on a number of committees. I could list Don’s numerous achievements and awards, but anyone here can find that information.

“I knew about Don before I met him. I remember hearing about Don in 1986, when I arrived at the Rockefeller University in New York, in the labs of the Nobel Laureate Christian deDuve. I had arrived at the deDuve labs to begin my postdoctoral research. Everyone it seemed talked about Don, who at this time lived in Cleveland. In the early 1970s, Don and Miklos Mueller at the Rockefeller University made the seminal discovery of the hydrogenosome in trichomonads. In the years following the discovery, they characterized the metabolic pathways of the organelle. In the deDuve labs, already rich with the history of the discoveries of the lysosome and peroxisome, the discovery of the hydrogenosome paved the way for the use of the drug metronidazole as standard therapy for anaerobic bacterial and eukaryotic pathogens.

“I finally met Don in 1990, when I arrived at Cleveland State University to interview for the position of assistant professor in the biology department. I was offered the position and I arrived in August 1990 to begin work. I remember how helpful and kind Don was as I settled in and started work here. It was a very busy time but also an enjoyable and fun time. In addition to lab work, there was tennis with Don, Ed Jarroll and lab members on the roof top of Don’s downtown apartments, good food, dinners with visiting speakers, and travels to meetings and conferences in those early years. Don was an excellent tennis player. He had a wry sense of humor. In those early years, I learned that Don loved the color orange. He would never explain why he liked orange.

“Things were not always rosy. For a few years, Don and I had a rough relationship. Nothing seemed to work. Throughout those frustrating years, I never forgot how kind Don had been to me when I arrived in Cleveland.

“I will tell you that in my persistence to understand Don, I discovered that underneath the sometimes gruff and crusty exterior was a very loving, generous, humble and caring man. I got to know a different side of Don. He was a good listener. He was fun. He enjoyed a good conversation. He was meticulous in his scientific work. I would even call him a perfectionist. He was a great mentor. I respected Don for his insights and wisdom. I remember going to see Don in a panic, a few years ago. I had submitted a manuscript with an incorrect name for a protein that was originally described in a multi-authored, multi-national publication, in a very contentious area of malaria research. I did not notice the error earlier and publication of my paper was imminent. I said, ‘Don, people will be mad at me in multiple languages. They are not going to like this. What should I do? How do I correct this?’ ‘Are you having fun yet?!’ came Don’s reply, followed by laughter. He then proceeded to tell me what to do.

“Don cared about his students and wanted them to succeed. Don loved plush microbes and used them in his teaching to engage students in microbiology. Don enjoyed teaching at CSU and was looking forward to teaching microbiology this fall, in his retirement. He was dependable. If he told you he would do something for you, he did it. Don did not suffer fools gladly. If he was displeased about something, he let you know about it.

“Don loved his family. I remember his talking about some trip or family event that was coming up, some event that he was to attend where he would have to be formal. It was always nice to hear him worry this way. When he spoke of his children’s achievements, you could sense the pride that he had for them. I remember occasions when he would be leaving to have lunch with his son Peter. When he spoke of his wife Jane, you could tell how much he loved and cared for her. His wife Jane and son Peter are here today. This is the side of Don that I will miss the most. I gained a new perspective on how to view family and work; a perspective on which of these two should be the most important.

“I will miss my friend and colleague.”

C. Paul D. Skalski (Communication)

Professor Emeritus Leo Jeffres delivered the Eulogy for the late Paul Skalski. His remarks follow.

“Paul Skalski was born on April 20, 1973, in Cleveland and he was proud to be a Clevelander. In 1991 he entered Cleveland State University as a freshman. While majoring in Communication, Paul excelled in the research methods class, attracting the attention of faculty who saw his potential for graduate work. In the Master’s program at CSU, he served as the Research Assistant in the Communication Research Center, where he worked with me, Kim Neuendorf, and David Atkin.

“At faculty urging, Paul continued his graduate studies in the highly respected doctoral program in Communication at Michigan State University. He completed the

Ph.D. in 2004 and accepted a position at the University of Minnesota-Duluth. There he developed an undergraduate course in video game behavior and continued his research interests in communication technologies. Paul served on the faculty at Duluth until 2007 when he joined the Communication faculty at CSU. Paul had quickly established himself as one of the foremost media and technology scholars, focusing many of his efforts on the impact of video games and presence. His vitae show contributions to many other streams of research, from media effects to audience analysis to humor in the mass media. He was the author or coauthor of 35 journal articles and book chapters, as well as nine published conference proceedings, 13 encyclopedia entries, and more than 70 conference papers and presentations. He was co-editor with Dr. Cheryl Campanella Bracken of the 2010 book, *Immersed in Media: Telepresence in Everyday Life*, published by Routledge.

“Paul was quiet and modest, yet competitive and enthusiastic. He was an active member of several research teams and proud of his productivity, which, as noted, was impressive for a young scholar. Video gaming was one of his main research interests. He thoroughly enjoyed playing all sorts of video games and could be quite competitive. Last year he offered a special topics seminar in video game behavior and the course immediately filled. His general enthusiasm extended to every aspect of his life, from films and rock concerts to developing new lesson plans for his classes. Paul had become active in administration within the School of Communication and after serving as Graduate Program Director last year, he became Director of the Film and Digital Media major. In fact, he was leading a meeting of the Film and Digital Media faculty when he collapsed with what we later learned was a massive heart attack.

“We might say that Paul Skalski was the quintessential Cleveland State University success story – a first generation college graduate, he worked his way through college on the ‘six-year plan.’ He excelled in our top-ranked masters program and was welcomed into a top doctoral program. His goal always was to return to Cleveland State University, which he did in 2007. He was awarded tenure in 2011, and looked forward to a long and fruitful association with his beloved alma mater. This was not to be. Paul died on May 20th. All of us in the School of Communication – fellow faculty and students alike – are still trying to come to terms with his death. He loved this institution and was dedicated to its mission of teaching the non-traditional student. He was intensely proud of the School of Communication’s research productivity. He made a mark at CSU and will be missed for many years. Paul is survived by his mother, his fiancé, his sister, and other family and friends in the Cleveland area. He also is survived by friends and colleagues at CSU, Michigan State and Duluth. At this year’s CSU Homecoming there is a School of Communication Reunion and at 4:00 PM on Saturday, October 19, 2013, there will be a gathering in remembrance of Paul. We invite you to join us.”

Senate President Joanne Goodell asked for a moment of silence in memory of our colleagues Professors Paul Aspelin, Donald Lindmark and Paul Skalski.

II. Approval of the Agenda for the September 11, 2013 Meeting

Senate President Goodell stated that before approval of the Agenda, she would like to propose two small amendments to the Agenda for today's meeting. The first amendment is to remove approval of the Minutes of the May 1, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting which are not quite ready for approval. The second amendment is the addition Admissions and Standards Committee under Item IX 2012-2013 Annual Reports. She then asked for a motion to approve the Agenda for today's meeting. Senator Paul Doerder moved and Senator Elizabeth Welfel seconded the motion and the Agenda, as amended, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of March 6, 2013 and April 3, 2013

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the meetings of March 6, 2013 and April 3, 2013. Approval of the Minutes of the meetings of March 6, 2013 and April 3, 2013 was moved and seconded and approved unanimously by voice vote.

IV. Announcement of Coming Faculty-wide Elections

Dr. Goodell announced the coming faculty-wide elections that will take place during the fall semester for the University Peer Review Committee (UPRC) for one at-large member and for the Academic Misconduct Review Committee for one member.

V. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Joanne Goodell welcomed everyone back to the new school year. She noted that she attended the President's picnic today, and it was a great success. As everyone knows, we welcomed the largest ever freshman class this year, which has put us in an enviable position compared to some of our neighboring schools. She urged everyone to do as much as possible to ensure the success of all of their students, but particularly freshmen, who are in the most vulnerable year in terms of dropping out. There are many more supports for students now than when she first joined CSU 14 years ago, but still the major influence on a student's decision to stay is the experience the student has in our classes. She said that President Berkman is still very much focused on student success, so she hopes that the faculty searches that have been authorized this year are successful. It would appear that we did not fill a number of open positions this past year, and with the largest freshman class ever, this puts an even bigger strain on the established faculty to pick up the teaching and service loads for unfilled faculty lines.

Dr. Goodell noted that later in this meeting, everyone will hear from Professor Bill Kosteas about the progress of the curriculum approval process that began last year and progressed over the summer. The University Curriculum Committee and Bill worked hard to keep to the deadlines, and we thank them all for their hard work. In her recent meeting with the President and the Provost, she urged them to look closely at what she believes has the potential to be a major stumbling block in the implementation process, and that is the timely and thorough advising of students in transition that will

have to take place in the Spring once all of the program changes are approved. Given the complexity of the changes we are implementing, there is no easy way of doing this, other than face-to-face appointments. Our advising staff and faculty advisors are already managing huge case loads, so it is imperative that the university administration working with faculty and staff do some strategic thinking and planning around this issue.

Professor Goodell reported that last year Senate approved some changes to our standing committee structure, and we now have two new committees, Electronic Learning and Academic Technology. She will be contacting the new chairs of those committees soon to discuss the role and function of the committees as outlined in our Bylaws.

Dr. Goodell reported that it was pointed out to her that our March 2014 Senate meeting had been scheduled during Spring Break. Therefore we need to move it. She suggested changing the meeting date to March 19, 2014 instead and asked if anyone has any objections to moving the March 12 meeting to March 19, 2013. Senator Andrew Gross seconded Dr. Goodell's motion to change the March 12, 2013 meeting to March 19, 2013 and it was unanimously approved by voice vote.

Professor Goodell noted that Byron White, the Vice President for University Engagement, asked her to alert everyone to a survey that his and the Provost's Offices will be sending our way in the next few days. It concerns the community engagements we have participated in over the past year as part of our academic work. There are \$2,500 grants to support work that faculty will be eligible to apply for once they submit a survey. The data will be used to support the university's application to the Carnegie Foundation as a community engaged university status that a university-wide group, including faculty, are in the process of applying for. During her discussions with Dr. White about this, she inquired as to the possibility of using the existing data from the FAAR reports that all faculty submit every year. Dr. White told her that these data are not in a format that is accessible or suitable for this purpose, so as much as she doesn't like to ask people to do one more thing, she urged everyone to complete this survey. She stated that she will inquire with the appropriate persons about upgrading and or personalizing the FAAR/Faculty 180 system. She noted that it is not used in the College of Education and Human Services, although she did try to use it last year to submit her FAAR and it was extremely difficult to input the data. It was not at all suited to the kinds of data she needed to include in her report. Dr. Goodell commented that if anyone has any feedback about the use of this system, she would appreciate hearing it. She asked faculty to ask their colleagues for some input and send her an email so that she can bring some of the concerns to the attention of whoever she finds to hear it.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady inquired if there was a single person purchasing software systems or do individuals purchase their own?

Dr. Goodell replied that in the past probably everyone did their own thing but there is definitely a desire to move to a more standard system. Now that we have a new Academic Technology Committee rather than two separate committees as we had last

year perhaps that is an issue that the new committee can take on so maybe that is the starting point. Dr. Goodell stated that if anyone has specific comments about an electronic file, please email her.

VI. Elections

A. Senate Nominating Committee Election of Faculty Senate Vice President

Senator Robert Krebs, Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, commented that Professor Sheldon Gelman has been on Faculty Senate as an officer and as a Senator for many years and is going to step away from that for a little while and so we are looking to replace him this year. He noted that he was asked this past summer to start soliciting good candidates to replace Professor Sheldon at the front of the table and the Nominating Committee chose three individuals to nominate that have agreed to serve if they are elected. He then presented the slate of candidates for Senate Vice President: Norbert Delatte (Civil Engineering), Barbara Margolius (Mathematics) and Nigamanth Sridhar (Electrical Engineering).

After ballots had been counted, Senate President Goodell announced that Dr. Nigamanth Sridhar of Electrical Engineering was elected to a two-year term as Senate Vice President.

B. Election of one faculty representative to the Equal Opportunity Hearing Panel

Senate President Goodell that noted that Senate also needs to elect one faculty member to the Equal Opportunity Hearing Panel for a two-year term to replace Teresa Holt who has retired. She noted that Professor Monica Gordon Pershey had indicated her willingness to serve. Professor Monica Gordon Pershey was then nominated and elected to a two-year term on the Equal Opportunity Hearing Panel.

VII. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Bill Kosteas, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, noted that he has four items this afternoon that were submitted in the spring but given all of the other items, the UCC didn't have time to get to them until after the last Faculty Senate meeting – three items require a vote and one is for “Informational Purposes Only.”

A. Proposed Deletion of the THE Playwright Track (Report No. 1, 2013-2014)

Dr. Kosteas noted that the first item is the proposed deletion of the THE Playwright Track. The rationale is the lack of enrollment in the track and part of the department's effort to streamline their programs in response to the 4 to 3 conversion.

There being no questions or discussion, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed the deletion of the THE Playwright Track and asked Senators to vote. The proposed deletion of the THE Playwright Track was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Proposed Deletion of the BGES Museum Studies for Natural Historians Graduate Track and Certificate Program (Report No. 2, 2013-2014)

Dr. Kosteas stated that the second item is the proposed deletion of the BGES Museum Studies for Natural Historians Graduate Track and a Certificate program deletion is due primarily to the lack of enrollments and also something that many departments are experiencing and that is several instructors originally involved with the program are no longer at CSU.

Hearing no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed the deletion of the BGES Museum Studies for Natural Historians Graduate Track and Certificate program and asked Senators to vote. The proposed deletion of the BGES Museum Studies for Natural Historians Graduate Track and Certificate program was approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Proposed new Track in the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction Program (Report No. 3, 2013-2014)

Dr. Kosteas presented the third item requiring a Senate vote. This item from the UCC is the proposed new Track in the Master's in Curriculum and Instruction Program. It has a minimum of 32 credits very much in line with the standard Master's programs. The new track was designed in response to demand from the local chapter of Teach for America. The instructors in the Teach for America program typically have their major field of study outside of Education and require a program that will provide them with the training needed to be successful in the classroom. This program will be useful for those students.

Hearing no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed a new Track in the Master's in Education in Curriculum and Instruction and asked Senators to vote. The proposed new Track in the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction program was approved unanimously by voice vote.

D. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 4, 2013-2014)

- 1. Proposed changes to the Adult Learning and Development Program (Remove ETE 501 – Technology Strand as a requirement)**
- 2. Proposed revisions to the MSHS Physician Assistant Track**
- 3. Enforcement of first year writing sequence prerequisite for all WAC courses, effective fall 2014**

Dr. Kosteas stated that there are a few “For Informational Purposes Only” items. These are minor changes to the Adult Learning and Development Program, proposed revisions to the MSHS Physician Assistant Track, and also an item that came up regarding the enforcement of the first year writing sequence prerequisite for WAC courses which was intended when GenEd08 was developed and was somehow overlooked. It is very basically that all WAC courses and other prerequisites that departments and instructors have designed for that course as well as the completion of the first year writing sequence are all prerequisites for WAC courses. This is very logical and you want to make sure your students have a foundation in writing before they take on more advanced writing within their discipline.

Professor Kosteas reported that in addition, UCC has some updates on the conversion process. Everyone should have a list by departments. This list includes all of the departments whose proposed course revisions have made it all the way through the final approval level of the UCC. The list is also split up here by whether courses were revised or inactivated or new courses. This goes just through the UCC meeting on September 3rd. Since that time, UCC has also approved undergraduate courses – Anthropology, Economics, English and some graduate proposals as well and others which will be provided in the UCC’s next report. Dr. Kosteas stated that graduate programs are also coming in for approval on line. Through the September 3rd meeting, UCC has approved 924 courses, 116 of which were in-activations, 57 representing new courses and 753 revised courses. Not all of those 753 revisions were necessarily 4 to 3s. Some were tweaking things like prerequisites and course descriptions but they were predominantly 4 to 3 credit hour conversions.

Professor Kosteas mentioned a couple of items UCC wanted him to report on throughout this very, very long process. UCC noticed a couple of trends which are troubling and these are items that do need to be addressed. First, in order to expedite things, given the fact that they were given such little time to do all of this, UCC didn’t ask Departments when they were submitting revisions for GenEd courses to submit all of the GenEd criteria. When you submit a course for the first time, you have to submit all of the criteria to make sure that it qualifies as a GenEd course. One of the things that happens in every department throughout campus is, if you have a GenEd course and eventually that course gets passed on to somebody else, that person might be told that you have to do some writing in that course but they don’t necessarily understand what that means for that course to be a WAC course or what it means for it to be a GenEd course with a social sciences or quantitative literacy designation. One of the concerns UCC has is that many of these courses, as they were being paired down from 4 to 3 credit hours, may have lost the components that qualified them as GenEd courses. He noted that it was easy enough to determine for WAC and SPAC courses because of the clear guidelines that are then articulated in the syllabus. However, because UCC didn’t have the time to ask faculty to put all of the materials in that are required for a first time submission of a GenEd course, some courses may no longer meet requirements. There will have to be some kind of review to move them forward along with the GenEd courses. In fact, it may not be a bad idea to periodically review these courses as they

change ownership from instructor to instructor to make sure that they are still meeting the requisite criteria.

Dr. Kosteas stated that the other trend UCC noticed is that as departments were trying to figure out what material content to remove from a course, the tendency in many cases was to cut out material related to experiential learning, i.e., the applied content or the not quite internship content when a company from outside. Maybe the instructor does a project using data that's related to that company or that has speakers that you do mock reports for. This was the material that tended to be cut from our program and it's a shame. He went on to say that if you think about what gives Cleveland State's students a leg up on the competition when they go out in the work force, it is having that applied experience. It's not just the theoretical content. In fact if you have ever looked at surveys of employers, and pay attention to what employers find lacking in students, it is that college graduates are lacking what surveys say is unfortunately what's left on the cutting floor. It is the general sentiment of the UCC, that departments will find ways to reincorporate those activities and those exercises and that content back into their programs. However it is not going to be easy and we don't have a lot of time to do this. He is afraid that there is going to be 4 to 3 round two the following year or at some later date when departments' have a bit more time to reassess the revisions that have taken place.

On a final note, Dr. Kosteas mentioned that as departments are beginning to do their program revisions, UCC has a template on the web site. He asked faculty to please use the template which will make UCC members' lives easier. He added that if anyone has any additional information they want to submit, just go ahead and put everything in one big packet with the template first. In some cases, departments have been working on revisions on their programs for a year or two and they have large program proposals that should be tacked on at the end. Give UCC a good side by side comparison of the way the program is currently designed and what it is proposed to look like after we go through this conversion. Catalog copy is also needed so that UCC doesn't have to chase people down six months from now to update the catalog. In addition, UCC is requiring departments to submit degree maps for these changes because we want to make sure that as new programs are designed, everybody has thought through how students will advance through that program. Also make sure that when you are looking at courses that are offered as part of your program but simultaneously offered in other departments, that those courses are being offered in a way that satisfies all programs. Dr. Kosteas noted that this is his report and update and offered to answer any questions.

Senator Barbara Hoffman commented on the hard work that the UCC and the college committees did all summer; it is absolutely astounding the number of courses that they were able to process and that UCC was able to evaluate and channel information back to departments. Dr. Hoffman thanked Dr. Kosteas for emphasizing the necessity for students to complete their introduction to writing before they take a Writing Across the Curriculum class. As someone who regularly teaches both WAC and SPAC courses, it is delightful to have students who have had that basic training and only students who have had that basic training.

4. The following departments/programs have received final approval for their proposals:

CLASS: Art, Black Studies, Classical and Medieval Studies, Communication, Economics, History, Modern Languages, Music, Philosophy, Political Science, Religious Studies

COB: Finance, Operations and Supply Chain Management

COEHS: CASAL, Curriculum/Foundations, Teacher Education

SON: Nursing

COSHP: Health Science, Mathematics, Physics, Psychology

LCUA: Urban Studies

5. Course Revisions

Senator Beth Ekelman commented that her department is in the process of looking at their major within Health Sciences and she is noticing some courses that they need to revise in order to work with their program to make their major make sense. She stated that she is not sure what to do with courses that haven't been revised yet. These courses could have had a separate submission to her curriculum committee. The courses trail behind and yet they are critical to the revision of the major. She asked if courses can be added in this submission.

Dr. Kosteas inquired if Dr. Ekelman was talking about revisions or new courses. Dr. Ekelman replied, both. Dr. Kosteas noted that new courses are going to be easier because it is just a matter of tacking them on. The issue is just making sure that everything goes to the appropriate audience, including the Registrar's Office, and the UCC can take care of that. Dr. Kosteas noted that the simplest way to approach this is to include these courses with program revisions instead of making it a separate submission because given the sheer volume of what's coming down the pipeline, he is afraid things will get lost. The reality is, if we were to do this the right way, UCC would have looked at courses and programs together but of course UCC didn't have time to do that. He stated that's his suggestion. He noted that several UCC members are present at Senate today and they could respond on whether this is a bad idea.

Dr. Ekelman noted that one of the things she finds missing when submitting these changes is an analysis of how are these changes affecting other programs. Recently she found out about a change in statistics courses that will affect Health Sciences majors and their four-year plan. She is also not quite sure of the GenEds. She asked Dr. Kosteas if he had suggestions.

Dr. Kosteas responded that initially course revisions had to move forward with letters of support. He was in early meetings with Associate Deans and feedback was received from some department chairs saying, "Look, given the time frame that we have to get this done, there is not enough time, a) for us to get the letters, and b) to figure out what programs using our courses are being revised." So at this meeting Professor Kosteas said, "Well, if everybody feels that this is completely going to bog down this process, we will simplify things and shift the burden on to the departments. The

Departments will know which courses are using the revised courses and since all of the proposals are on line, then check on line to see what's going on." He added that unfortunately this is not ideal and it is not what he would have wanted to have done in the first place.

Dr. Ekelman commented, "You don't know what you don't know so it's complicated." Dr. Kosteas replied that again, this was one of his concerns because there is not enough time. He is encouraging departments to keep lines of communication open but he knows that this hasn't happened universally and departments haven't always been pro active even though we haven't said that letters of support have to be obtained from affected departments. UCC encouraged the departments providing revisions to at least inform other departments of their changes. The UCC's problem is that in a lot of cases departments have been trying to put off making these decisions until the very last moment. When you actually find out about it, it seems too late.

Senator Ekelman inquired about the degree maps – transition maps for the students. What about maps for the students who are here now? She noted that nobody is talking about degree maps and that is a big issue.

Dr. Kosteas stated that UCC has talked about it. The problem is that transition guidelines should be out right now. Realistically, if we were talking about an effective fall 2014 deadline, right now we should be in the middle of finishing up our transition guidelines. Departments should be finishing those up, having conversations with advisors, getting done so that at the latest or by the latter half third of fall semester we would be fully engaged in advising those students who are going to be caught in this transition. But we can't do that because we still don't know what the programs are going to look like. Obviously, you cannot develop transition guides if you don't know what it is that you are transitioning to. Unfortunately, there is a timetable and for many programs it is not going to happen until spring. He would encourage departments to start developing those transition guides. Once program revisions are finalized, start working on transition guides. The reality is you are not going to be able to anticipate every possible scenario but the key is to try to figure out what the biggest and the most likely scenarios are – where are students going to encounter problem where exemptions will have to be made, and were special courses developed. Beyond that, we will need flexibility in how to deal with these cases because every student is going to have a unique situation. Depending on whether they are transfer students or whether they have been here since their freshman year, or they are a junior but they took a semester off after fall of 2014 and then came back; there are going to be so many different ways that students can get caught in this transition. Dr. Kosteas encouraged departments to start considering these issues right now. He is not really sure if the UCC will be providing guidance on that; they really haven't reached a point of figuring out whose responsibility this is because honestly that's not curriculum. That's not a curricular issue; that's more an advising issue and so we do need some clarity as to who ultimately is going to be taking on that added responsibility.

Dr. Kosteas stated that the first of every month a new group of departments will submit proposed program revisions to UCC. This will extend all the way into February; UCC will still be processing program revisions until the end of February. Presumably we need to be done before March 2014. He commented that he didn't know when the new catalog needs has to be rolled out. All changes have to be approved and before the catalog can be put on line. The new catalog will represent the rights of students for coming into CSU effective fall 2014. He stated that he can't provide any more guidance because he doesn't think that is going to be the purview of UCC. But, UCC is so caught up in trying to figure out how to get through the next stage, they don't have the time.

Senate Vice President Nigamanth Sridhar commented on the question about other departments' courses. Regarding departments changing courses that are used by other departments, if your program is using a course from another department, ask. For example a problem arose in the Computer Engineering program with students who take courses from Computer and Information Science. That program is in flux. They don't know yet exactly what they are doing but they have given us a preliminary assessment – here is what we think we are doing. Dr. Sridhar said that they are using that and the Computer Engineering program revision proposal is going to come along with question marks saying, “If CIS does this, we do this. So, that's the best that we can do.”

There were no further questions or comments on the five “For Informational Purposes Only Items” and Faculty Senate received the informational items from the University Curriculum Committee.

VIII. University Admissions and Standards Committee

Update on Block Schedule (Report No. 5, 2013-2014)

Professor James Marino, Chair of the University Admissions and Standards Committee, reported that during the summer he was approached several times by administrators on issues where they sought input from the Admissions and Standards Committee. In one case, he had to respond that this item was something that had to wait for the full Senate to be in session. He noted that for the other item regarding holiday scheduling, that issue will come before the Senate at the next meeting. He noted that he did contact the committee by email but it was decided that the holiday scheduling was not urgent and the other issue is no longer on the table.

Senator Marino reported that the major issue this summer of course is the block schedule. He noted that he did work with two of the Vice Provosts on the online faculty survey. He thanked those who responded to the survey; over 90 responses were received which is more than one quarter of our faculty. He stated that the survey closed on July 15th and the results were communicated to him on August 15, 2013. The hope had always been that the survey would either identify one of the three proposed grid models as a clear favorite among the faculty or through the faculty feedback would allow the construction of yet another option which would be more broadly popular. Dr. Marino said that he was very sorry to report that the survey produced no clear winner. All three

options scored roughly the same in number of popularity – two with a mean score of 5 in a 1 to 10 scale and the other lagged slightly behind with something like 4.2. Dr. Marino stated that it is also the case that none of these options include a summer grid for 2014. Last week he was informed by the Registrar that construction of the summer grid would begin only after the spring and fall grids have been determined. The Admissions and Standards Committee met last week and under these circumstances the committee could not make a recommendation to Senate. He added that he is very sorry to be standing in front of Senate without a recommendation.

Dr. Marino said that he could only speak for himself, not for the Admissions and Standards Committee, but simply as a Senator and make a proposal for Senate debate. He stated that his personal suggestion is to propose a resolution authorizing the administration to choose a grid for the interim period. He added that two years would make sense. This will give us time, first of all, to decide whether we need another go and would allow time for that schedule to succeed if it is going to succeed. He said that there is no time to wait to develop any other model before we have to start scheduling now. He stated that it would be fairest and least disruptive to hold for an interim an alternate model next spring of 2015 for a roll-out one year later. This approach would allow time for input and deliberation but also time for faculty to decide if the administration's grid is something they would like to keep or to identify issues that need to be worked out unless faculty would like to keep one of them. At this point, Dr. Marino asked if there were any questions.

Senator Barbara Hoffman commented, "Why not just stick with the one we have until we are able to decide on a grid."

Professor Marino replied that the consistent answer he has been given is our existing schedule works with the four credit block.

Dr. Hoffman stated that her department currently has three credit hour classes and they also have two credit hour classes and one credit hour classes. She said that she has not heard any student complaints about our current block schedule.

Professor Marino said that he raised this issue on behalf of the Admissions and Standards Committee. He noted that if sticking with the one we have is Dr. Hoffman's proposal, then that is her proposal.

Senate President Goodell stated that Dr. Marino has made a suggestion on his own behalf that the recommendation to the administration is that we take a two-year period to evaluate a choice made by the administration.

Senator Barbara Hoffman moved to adopt Dr. Marino's suggestion and Senator Paul Doerder seconded the motion. Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Hoffman if she was proposing an amendment or should Senators just vote. Professor Hoffman replied that it is a different motion altogether. She then asked if she needs to make it before Senate votes.

An unidentified Senator stated that there is a motion on the floor and no one can make another motion.

Professor Krebs mentioned that in Steering there was some discussion about a student poll that was taken and asked if that should be announced at Senate.

Dr. Marino replied that the student poll wasn't conducted by Admissions and Standards. He said that there was, in addition, a student preference survey given out at the very beginning of classes this year. Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange conducted the survey. She received a very healthy response of about ten percent of the student population. She does quote certain things that they prefer. There seems to be some strength in support of fifteen minutes rather than ten minutes between classes. This is an issue that divided the faculty. So some of the issues that divided the faculty have a clearer response in the student survey.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltdt said that she worries about going with something that the administration chooses for two years and then changing things up again. We just heard the report from the University Curriculum Committee about the concerns we have about transitioning students from the four credit model to the three credit model and how disruptive that is going to be and how much time we need to take to do that. Playing around with block schedules for the next two or three years seems to be similarly disruptive and we need to take that into account. She went on to say that faculty need to take ownership of this and she is not entirely sure she is comfortable conceding that position to the administration at this point.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones said she has concerns about implementation. We have to plan so far ahead for our courses and where they are going to be taught etc. There was also an issue of under utilization of space that went along with the conversion process. Keeping it as it is would not allow us to address that problem, if we do indeed have had a lot of rooms that were not being used because of the way the current schedule is set up.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady pointed out that there was also a survey of chairs that happened early in the fall semester or a week or two before classes started. She doesn't know the results of what the chairs and the students and the faculty all say together. As someone who hustled over from the Middough Building to get half way across campus today, it took her ten minutes and she is pretty fit so she would love a fifteen minute schedule in-between.

Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Teresa LaGrange if she had any feedback from the faculty chair survey.

Dr. LaGrange replied that the chairs were encouraged to log on and take the same survey as the faculty but as it had been set up for faculty members, there was no question that asked, "Are you a chair" or "Are you a faculty member" and they couldn't sort them out and so they are unfortunately all part of the response group for that survey.

Dr. Marino asked Dr. LaGrange if it was the second round for the chairs. Dr. LaGrange responded that yes, a second request was sent for people to respond to and it was sent specifically to the chairs but like she said, there is no real way to distinguish it. One way of doing it would have been to go by the timeline when people responded, but people logged on throughout the summer to respond so that won't work.

President Ronald Berkman commented that maybe for everyone's edification, Dr. LaGrange could just review what the three proposals were because really there are very little differences or minor differences between the three alternatives. One difference is the ten minutes versus fifteen minutes between classes; the second difference is the "Common Hour" in which the students were agonistic about. The students were robust in terms of their fifteen minute break so maybe Dr. LaGrange could just review that so that everybody understands what the three models are on the table and that these were the three presented at the beginning of last year. The Administration went back to the committee with Jim Marino's help and the faculty survey, as well as the student survey, were conducted. He said maybe that would be helpful for people particularly new Senators to understand it.

Dr. LaGrange stated that the three models that were offered from to faculty throughout the summer were different primarily with respect to the length of time between classes. Versions A and B have fifteen minutes between classes and version C has ten minutes between classes. The faculty had slightly higher support for both A and B then C. The fact that both A and B were fifteen minutes between classes and the fact that the students overwhelmingly supported fifteen minutes between classes, it appears there is a lot of support across campus for that particular time between classes. Dr. LaGrange noted that one of the differences between models A and B was the place for the "Common Hour". Students that were on campus during the day tended to prefer the "Common Hour" remaining where it currently is which is, Tuesday/Thursday from Noon to 1:00 PM. The students that typically enroll in the evening, which coincidentally are graduate students, didn't care. Those were the main outcomes for the student survey. Dr. LaGrange stated that in terms of the schedules themselves, one of the things she noticed was that a lot of the faculty comments had to do with a misunderstanding of what the schedules would apply to. Faculty were concerned about labs, for example, studio courses, clinicals, internships, and all those types of classes. Faculty were very concerned about time to squeeze them into the blocks and actually the time blocks contained in those three models apply only to on campus lecture classes; they don't apply to any of the other various classes that faculty were legitimately concerned about.

President Berkman mentioned that there was one other interesting item in the student survey and that is that we found a really unusually large number of students who are coming to school five days a week.

Dr. LaGrange stipulated that over forty percent of the undergraduate students were mostly attending during the day and were coming far more often than they wanted. The undergraduate students' preference was to attend classes three days a week. One of the advantages of going to a different scheduling pattern is that we would be able to set

up a schedule in such a way that students could achieve that. This can't be done with the current block schedule.

Professor Marino said that the proposal is for the location of classes that are shared between many departments – a common pool of classrooms. So, if you have elapsed space against studio space, if your department or school has dedicated space that you schedule, then you can pick what blocks you want for those clinical experience classes which don't have a community. Of course you don't need to struggle with other departments when your students go out in the community so that should ease some problems. Dr. Marino said that a lot of the focus in the time grid scheduling has been about how to maximize the efficiency of allocating that shared space.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady pointed out that she teaches a lot of studio classes in her department so they still have to look at that common scheduling block because if they put them in the middle of the blocks. It creates problems for students who want to be able to take their GenEd requirements as well. Right now, their studio classes meet across two blocks but they fall in line. They might end up a little bit early but they are at least looking at that. So the blocks matter for the students in some ways. Dr. Visocky-O'Grady asked if it would be possible, and she doesn't know *Roberts Rules of Order* properly, but could she move to eliminate model C since the students don't really love it and less of the faculty love it. If someone has to do the scheduling by October, it is a Rubik's cube this year, at least when she was working with fifteen minute intervals.

Senate President Goodell pointed out that Senate is still discussing the motion that was put forth by Professor Marino so we can't let any other motions come forward.

Senator Jeremy Genovese stated that this is an amendment to the existing motion so Dr. Visocky-O'Grady can make that motion and Senate can vote on it.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady stated that she would make the friendly amendment. Senator Marino seconded the motion.

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any discussion about the amendment to eliminate option C and only consider options A and B with fifteen minutes changeover time.

Senator Bill Kostas remarked that the motion is a great idea.

Dr. Goodell then asked Senators to vote on the motion to eliminate Option C of Dr. Marino's original motion. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell stated that the original motion now is that the administration choose either option A or option B on a trial period for two years with a review at the end of spring of 2015 which would be a one year implementation to potentially change for fall 2016 which would be after the second year of implementation.

Senator Lehfeltdt asked, "What are the other substantive differences between Option A and Option B?"

President Berkman stated that the difference between A and B is the "Common Hour."

Senator Lehfeltdt stated that this is a decision that Faculty Senate could make because the students right now are thinking about the Common Hour and both A and B allow fifteen minutes between classes. This is something we could actually take ownership of and make a decision about.

Senate President Goodell asked for clarification on the two different options for the common hour.

Ms. Janet Stimple, University Registrar, replied that the common hour in option A is from 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM and in option B the common hour is from 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM on Tuesday/Thursday.

Dr. Goodell inquired which of the two options the students were most in favor of or were they were in favor of either.

Dr. LaGrange replied the students preferred the fifteen minutes between classes and they tended to favor the earlier Common Hour, as it is.

Senator Marino commented that as we currently schedule classes, the 1:00 PM block on Tuesdays/Thursdays is the most commonly scheduled class. We schedule more classes then. University Registrar Janet Stimple said that Dr. Marino was correct.

Senator Kathleen Little noted that as she recalled, both A and B have three and four hour graduate classes that meet one night per week starting at 6:00 PM as opposed to the current 5:00 PM and she doesn't know of any graduate students that supported that.

Ms. Stimple stated that currently it has 5:00 PM listed on it and both of those models have a one per week 5:00 PM and 6:00 PM start time on them.

Dr. Goodell noted that both the A and B options have a 5:00 PM or a 6:00 PM start for a three or a four hour class.

Ms. Stimple stated that there is a block that starts at 5:00 PM that goes to 8:50 PM and then there is also a block starting at 6:00 PM that goes to 9:50 PM. She noted that this allows departments flexibility based on their programs

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady had another thought about this Common Hour issue because she felt that we were getting close to something. She noted that between the 1:00 PM to the 2:00 PM and the 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM, she has a student group that meets all the time and she has some students who are working full time and they can

come on their lunch hours and maybe have meetings occasionally but 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM is not their lunch hour and so she feels that the 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM fits closer to what she believes students are saying which is to keep it where it is. She would move to propose that Senate picks the 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM Common Hour.

President Berkman commented that Dr. Visocky-O'Grady almost had the decision down.

An unidentified Senator seconded Dr. Visocky-O'Grady's motion that the 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM common hour be kept.

Dr. Goodell stated that we now have a motion proposing option A and Senate has moved and seconded the motion. She then asked Senators to vote.

Senator Hoffman wondered if she could add a motion on top of Dr. Visocky-O'Grady's motion. She said that she had a motion that she felt might bring us to a fair and practical conclusion. She asked, "Could we amend Jim Marino's proposal to allow the Faculty Senate here and now to vote on an option after having this discussion and garnering all of this information?"

Senate President Goodell responded that this is what Senate is doing.

Senator Marino commented that he could withdraw the motion about the two-year trial thing; he is happy to table that. He then withdrew his original motion. Senator Paul Doerder, who seconded the original motion, withdrew his second.

Dr. Goodell noted that the original motion has been withdrawn.

Senator Lehfeltdt moved that Senate approve option A, the 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM common hour, fifteen minutes between classes. The motion was seconded by Senator Robert Krebs.

Dr. Goodell asked if there was any further discussion.

Senator Marius Boboc asked if Dr. Goodell wouldn't mind specifying the details of option A so that people don't get confused.

Senate President Goodell noted that option A includes a fifteen minute changeover time between classes and an 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM common hour on Tuesday and Thursday and there are blocks for evening classes that begin at either 5:00 PM or 6:00 PM.

Senator Glenn Goodman asked if option A has two day per week options for four credit classes. Ms. Stimple responded that there are always several two day options in the evenings.

Professor Hoffman asked if Ms. Stimple could review for Senate the starting and ending hours of each block in option A.

Ms. Stimple stated that all of the time blocks are a 7:00 AM start time as an option. That block would run from 7:00 AM to 7:50 AM on the Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedule and from 7:00 AM to 8:15 AM on the Tuesday, Thursday schedule. That block also has an option for a Monday, Wednesday, Friday four-hour class that would start at 7:30 AM and would end at 8:35 AM. The next block starts at 8:05 AM and the original three-hour class would run till 8:55 AM on Monday, Wednesdays and Fridays. The Tuesday, Thursday block would start at 8:30 AM and run till 9:45 AM. That block also has a four-hour two day per week block built into it. The next block would start at 9:10 AM for a three-hour course on Monday, Wednesday, Friday which would then go to 10:00 AM and on Tuesdays and Thursdays, that block would not start until 10:15 AM. On Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays we will have a 10:15 AM. So there is a 10:15 AM start time for Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Tuesday, Thursday for 3s. Then on Monday, Wednesday, Friday the three-hour class starts at 11:20 AM to 12:10 PM – that's when the common hour is for Tuesday, Thursday and there are no courses during that hour. The next start time for the 12:00 PM hour on Monday, Wednesday, Friday is from 12:25 PM to 1:15 PM. That one also has a four hour block that would start at 12:15 PM and also run till 1:20 PM three days per week. There is also a Tuesday, Thursday at 12:30 PM for a three-hour course that would go to 1:45 PM and we also have a four-hour block that would run from 12:30 PM to 2:20 PM on two days per week during that time. The next start time is 1:30 PM to 2:20 pm on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Then we come to 2:35 PM on Monday, Wednesday and Friday till 3:25 PM and on Tuesdays and Thursdays that start time would be 2:00 PM till 3:15 PM. Ms. Stimple noted that after 2:00 PM there are also four-hour blocks two days per week. So from 2:00 PM on there are options for the 2:00 PM blocks. She noted that the fifteen minute time between classes does push things so they obviously don't start on the hour but the campus community can get used to it.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell noted that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed to support the option A block schedule as described by the Registrar and the motion was seconded. She then asked Senators to vote. The proposed block schedule option A was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell stated that next on the Agenda are the 2012-2013 Annual Reports from various Senate and other committees except for the Annual Report of the Admissions and Standards Committee which was just distributed today. She noted that it isn't usually Senate's custom to have presentations on each of these reports unless there is something Senators would like to ask any of the chairs of the committees.

IX. 2012-2013 Annual Reports

- A. Admissions and Standards Committee (Report No. 6, 2013-2014)**
- B. University Faculty Affairs Committee (Report No. 7, 2013-2014)**
- C. Minority Affairs Committee (Report No. 8, 2013-2014)**

D. Committee on Academic Space (Report No. 9, 2013-2014)

E. E-Learning Committee (Report No. 10, 2013-2014)

F. Undergraduate Student Success Committee (Report No. 11, 2013-2014)

There being no questions, the 2012-2013 Annual Reports, were received by Faculty Senate.

X. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman commented that as we were having this last discussion about the block schedule, it occurred to him, and it is something he is hoping he can at the next Trustees Academic Steering Committee meeting talk to Steering about, that an interactive process, a process similar to the one we just had where there was really an exchange of information between Senators and administration was, in his estimation, a more interesting and more holistic way of doing it. At the beginning of the discussion of course it was understandable that most people didn't know what the three options were and most people didn't know what the differences were or whether there had been a student to go over all of the information that ultimately led the body into making a decision. Not seeding to the administration making the decision and again, as everyone can see, when you have more information, the differences between A and B were not gigantic but none-the-less it was a good process. It was a constructive process and a good consensus building process that we were able to have the kind of dialogue that we had. He noted that typically on a lot of issues that we discuss, we don't have that kind of dialogue. Basically the first large part of the meeting is the Faculty Senate meeting and then the administration comes up and makes some comments. President Berkman noted that you see this in Faculty Councils in many universities that this process in which there can be more dialogue, more discussion, more interchange, more sharing of information may help us as a group work together. He noted that if the Trustees Academic Steering Committee is willing, he would like to come and at least solicit some members' ideas about a change in the structure. President Berkman stated that for the five years he has been here, the faculty agenda has never changed. It has been exactly the same for five years in terms of structure. He noted that the issues have changed obviously but the basic foundation, the basic way the meetings are conducted have not changed and maybe people don't want them to change but he thinks it is at least worth a discussion with the Steering Committee to see whether some adjustment in the process would help us to do what we just did now when the information was there, when the questions were asked, when the information was provided, the body was able to make an informed decision about an extremely important issue in a very timely fashion rather than tabling it, waiting two years, having a trial period, having a transition period, coming back and considering it again... He noted that as Professor Kosteas has said, there probably is enough on the stove right now to occupy everyone and we didn't need to do it and do again and revisit. President Berkman stated that this is just an observation from the discussion that we just had.

President Berkman added his thanks to Professor Kosteas but mostly to all of the colleagues and all of the departments and all of the curriculum committees and all of the

faculty members and all of the chairs and all of the associate deans who were all part of this process. He noted that it was incredibly well led, it was incredibly well put together; there was a good methodology which helped enormously that UCC put together but it really was in many respects an all-university activity. President Berkman said that everyone's colleagues at one time or another were engaged in this discussion, at least he hopes they were engaged in this discussion – 953 courses got changed. He said he hopes there were a large number of faculty involved in this discussion. President Berkman stated that it was extraordinarily productive. He also underlined something that Professor Goodell said at the beginning of the meeting today which he has become increasingly aware of and appreciative to the leadership of the Senate. The administration has to get their hands around the advising components that are involved in the transition plans and the advising components that are going to be involved for entering in-coming students. He noted that this is going to be a major revision in the degree audit technology in the degree audit programs. There's going to be a real orientation of students in using them; there's going to be a lot of communication; it's going to be an up-tick in the number of advisors who are going to need to carry out that activity and the Provost is already having discussions about what new core of advisors we need to bring on. But there are a lot of moving parts and any change of this magnitude and any organization has a lot of moving parts, but again, it is everyone's intention to do everything they can to make sure that students are not adversely affected by the change that we are making.

President Berkman stated that as we get toward the middle of the year, the University will turn fifty years old. He noted that it is not exactly clear what day is its birthday. Is it the day the legislature wrote it to create Cleveland State University; is it the day that faculty were hired; is it the day that Rhodes Tower was built; but the seal says 1964 and when you add fifty to it, you get 2014. He said that sometime during that year or maybe all of that year is our birthday and it is a very significant moment in the life of the University – fifty years. President Berkman said that he wants to do everything he can. He is in collaboration with all University constituencies to make it a very special and different year so when we look back we will be able to say, we recognize or we remember the fiftieth year at the University, the fiftieth anniversary of the University. President Berkman noted that in the next couple of days he is going to appoint a rather large committee – he hasn't decided who would be asked to lead this large and diverse committee. He has everyone except for a chair so far but it will be faculty, it will be staff, it will be students, Board of Trustees members, Foundation members, Alumni and members of the community will all be represented on the committee. It will be a committee charged with plotting a course for us to celebrate this fiftieth year.

President Berkman noted that as some people have heard the University has now engaged a consultant to look at the feasibility of a fiftieth year fund-raising campaign. This process took place over the summer. The Foundation was involved, the Board was involved and the administration was involved. They identified and did an RFP for campaign consultants; they reviewed the RFPs, they were scored, the firms were interviewed and asked to make presentations, and a firm was selected who has begun to develop preliminary stages. President Berkman said that this doesn't mean there will be

a campaign; it is a feasibility study about the University's readiness for a campaign. But clearly, at the fifty year mark, he personally thinks this would be an important step forward in building or continuing to build a fund-raising culture.

President Berkman stated that what we also need to do this year, since it has been ten years, is to do a re-examination of the University Master Plan – not the University's Strategic Plan. Everyone should remember a year ago or so we finished the bounded Strategic Plan which was suggested by the Academic Steering Committee of the Senate two years ago and we finished that plan. But what we haven't done in ten years is a physical master plan of the campus and it's an incredibly important process A) because we have facilities that are not being used, that are costing the university significant dollars; we have other facilities that are being over-used; we have to better match the academic needs of the university with the physical plant of the university; we have to understand where we need to make updates in the physical plant of the university and we need to get a fit and shape of where we want to go over the next ten years with the university. He noted that this will also require, as it generally does at almost every university, using a master planning firm – there are firms all over the country that specialize in campus master planning and it's important to have one of those because, the essential theorem is really the match, the compatibility, the synergy between what we do academically and what the physical plant looks like and what we want to do as a student community and as a neighborhood.

President Berkman commented that he doesn't know if anyone has heard this and how many people have seen Langston. He used to think that Euclid Avenue was the main street but really Chester Avenue is the main street that everybody who goes to work Downtown seems to use; almost no one uses Euclid Avenue so we built the Euclid Commons which is a great dormitory with hardly a whisper and with Langston, it has really been a shout in terms of how many in the community have seen the development of that mixed use housing which has about 630 beds and is close to ninety percent occupied even though the last two phases only opened in August. So there has been another surge of activity onto the campus and it is a mixed group that is living there – there are residents from the Cleveland Clinic, there are people who work Downtown; there is a faculty member or two and we are going to try to find ways to incentivize and encourage more faculty to consider it as an option so then you would only need ten minutes between classes to walk across the street to your class.

President Berkman mentioned the once yearly convocation where faculty colleagues are honored yearly for teaching, for research and for service. He encouraged everyone to encourage their colleagues to come and provide support and indeed a show of gratitude for those faculty in the particular year who have excelled and who have been recognized by their peers as excelling in those areas and being awarded those awards at convocation. He added that the convocation is on Thursday, October 3, 2013.

President Berkman stated that he is also really proud and personally gratified to tell Senate that the commencement speaker and the honorary degree recipient at the December commencement exercise will be Representative John Lewis from Georgia.

Those people who know the incredibly storied career of John Lewis from his days as the founder of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, it has now been forty years that he has been a champion for human rights; not just civil rights, but a champion for human rights and he has agreed to come to Cleveland State. President Berkman noted that this is the first honorary degree he has accepted in the last five years. President Berkman said that the credit goes to Congressman Louis Stokes who was instrumental in helping him to twist his arm to come and speak to the graduating class. President Berkman stated that this is a special moment for the entire university and we should find ways to celebrate Representative Lewis' two day visit to the campus. He added that he finds it really exciting.

President Berkman commented that at the picnic today, he didn't know whether Steve was there, Steve Duffy is a coordinator for the STEM High School program. But we had the STEM high school students at the picnic along with Jeff McClellan, the principle, and Jeff's main concern was getting the students fed, getting them rounded up, and getting them back into class. He commented that this summarizes Jeff's operating style – get them nourished, get them educated, get them in class, and get them to follow this regime in the STEM High School. He noted that for those who don't know, we will talk more about it at some future point. The STEM High School runs on a totally different calendar and a totally different instrumentality than any high school in Cleveland – maybe there are a couple of others. The school operates for ten weeks, they have a two-week recess, then they come back for ten more weeks, then two weeks recess, then ten weeks, then two weeks recess and they do that throughout the entire year. So there never is a period where the students are absent from school, from instruction, from learning more than two weeks. It is a really interesting model for those in the school of education, but most of all it is a collaboration which he thinks will produce because Key Bank is providing scholarships for the graduates of the STEM High School to come to CSU which will produce a significantly enlarged cohort of minority students who will be well trained, well schooled and well prepared to enter STEM disciplines at Cleveland State or wherever their aspirations take them. President Berkman said that he is excited about them being here. He congratulated Vice President Stephanie McHenry and her team and Julian Earls who did so much work in putting this together; it was a really difficult process. The students can't eat the same food that CSU students eat, they can't use the same recreation facilities, and it is a totally different regime that we needed to put together. President Berkman said that his hope, and hopes that Steve shares it, is that when these students finish these two years at Cleveland State University, they will have anywhere between eighteen to thirty PESOP credits coming into the university. One of the great barriers to them getting early to college and to them getting PESOP was the insurmountable logistic problem of moving them from Nela Park in East Cleveland in one period down to Cleveland State to take a PESOP class, back up to East Cleveland to get back into their curriculum. He hopes that these students being on campus will facilitate them moving, maybe not seamlessly, but certainly much more easily into many more college courses, many more PESOP courses.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy added that he has had quite a bit of help with the STEM High School from two individuals sitting to his left and to his right, Nigamanth

Sridhar and Joanne Goodell, and another Senator who just left the meeting, Debbie Jackson. He said that it has been a labor of love and it was a lot of fun working with Jeff McClellan who is amazing.

Senate Vice President Nigamanth Sridhar said that he actually had the pleasure of teaching these kids. He taught a three week short course this past summer and it was fascinating. He taught the version of Introduction to Engineering Design class for college freshmen and he had tons of fun doing so.

Next, President Berkman talked about the Campus International School. He has been anxiously waiting to receive the report card. You don't get report cards until you finish the third grade, but we now have the results for the third and fourth grades for our Campus International School. One of our goals of the Campus International School aside from using it as an anchor for a neighborhood and for a community was to demonstrate that through collaboration we could raise the performance levels of students who have been chosen through a lottery. These students have not tested in, these students have not been taken off the top of the crop; they came in through a lottery. There were allocations for different categories but there was no pre-testing. So, here is the Campus International School's report card. Third year reading – students in the International School who read at the third grade level – 84%; third grade math, 86.3%; fourth grade reading, 89.1%; fourth grade math, 86.1%. State-wide out of all of the performance indexes, the Campus International School is in the 99.4 percentile State-wide. President Berkman said that those in the School of Education and all the other schools that are participating – Nursing, Art, and all of the other schools who have participated, have allowed us to make a really important statement about the power of collaboration. President Berkman thanked everyone.

Finally, President Berkman talked about enrollment related to finances. He noted that it was the best of times and it was the worst of times. It was the best of times in that we enrolled a record number of freshmen, almost twice now the number of freshmen from when he arrived at Cleveland State University and that class was academically, in terms of ACT/SAT grade point average and diversity, ahead or on par with all of the class of last year. He noticed yesterday in *US News and World Report* where Cleveland State was again named one of the best colleges in America and that we had only a 63% acceptance rate for freshmen. He actually noticed that Akron, Bowling Green and Kent State were much higher in their acceptance rates so *US News and World Report* are now showing all of the indices they use to rate the universities and one of them was the acceptance rate. So that is the wonderful news. He noted that the worst of times news is that graduate enrollment is down twenty percent in the university. Otherwise we had really an incredible banner year and we even held to single digit losses in graduate education. It turned out to be a good year; good in comparison to what the State is going to look like for sure. For those who read the *Chronicle* there happens to be a front page article today in the *Chronicle* called "The Crises of Graduate Education." It notes that graduate education and graduate applications and enrollments in every discipline across the nation are down. This is going to be particularly significant for us because one third of our enrollment had been graduate students. As we have consciously tried to increase

the FTIC number and the transfer number, the percentage of graduate students has gotten so much lower to some degree that we have limited our vulnerability but it is something that we are going to have to discuss; it is something that we are going to have to be creative about; and it is something that's going to be a challenge for a number of years going forward. One of the major death blows to him and it unfortunately speaks to our government's feeling about higher education and public policy about higher education was the elimination of the subsidized graduate student loan. So for anyone who wants to go to graduate school now, wants to get a Master's degree, wants to get an MBA, wants to get a degree in accounting, wants to get an engineering degree, needs to go out if they need to borrow, and they all need to borrow, needs to go out and borrow at market rates from commercial banks. He went on to say that this has, in one stroke, changed the entire dynamic of graduate education in the United States.

President Berkman said that all in all, even with these changes, the student credit hours, which is the only number that counts at the end of the day, the State funds us only on the number of student credit hours that we have. It doesn't matter how many heads are represented by those student credit hours, student credit hours are up by about 30.5% for the university. So in that sense, it has been a good effort by Vice President Carmen Brown, the Registrar, Financial Aid, Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange, who was really a team supporter and Tim Long are all to be congratulated for this year. It has become much more competitive in this marketplace and it is going to get much more competitive in this marketplace.

Senator Jeff Karem thanked President Berkman for the good news about enrollments and the physical infrastructure. He noted that his father is an urban planner and was here for a visit and was very impressed with the campus and the surrounding community. He added that if President Berkman can impress a former state senator and urban planner, he is doing better than he (Jeff Karem) can on a weekly basis. With that said, if we are thinking about a twenty percent decline, he is interested as we move forward with these master plans, if there is a master plan to rebuild the faculty because we've had a twenty percent decline in tenure track faculty since 2008 – we lost 20 tenure track faculty just last year alone and these are startling numbers to him especially as enrollments increase. He really worries about our ability to provide a successful experience for the students.

President Berkman indicated that he worries as well. He noted that the Provost is going to talk in a little bit and the question is, yes, absolutely and we are going to do it as fast as revenue allows us to do it. One phenomenon that happened this year, and it is something we've addressed with the deans, is that we had a more than average number of failed searches; searches that were put out there. It is very interesting because it's kind of ying-yang. For any of you who were at the new faculty orientation, just some superb new faculty were at the new faculty orientation. Maybe half or more from AAU/PHD institutions; really some superb new faculty but then again there were a lot of searches that weren't consummated. We should have an opportunity now to invest and reinvest in significant resources; there are significant retirements this year; there are significant retirements next year. We absolutely need to rebuild the faculty and we are going to do

something else and that is we are going to in the same way that we are looking at the faculty issues and financing and accountability, etc., we are going to do that on the entire administrative side. We are going to go through an exercise in which we look at what are the appropriate administrative levels in various administrative departments and do we adjust accordingly if we need to between the academic side and the administrative side.

Senator Stephen Duffy indicated that President Berkman talked earlier about the Langston and asked if the income stream has started flowing from the Langston yet?

President Berkman indicated that Vice President Stephanie McHenry is the person to direct that question to.

Vice President McHenry stated that yes, the rent commencement started August 1, 2013 so people are now making the payments that cover the debt service on what we had to borrow to get the site prepared and also our fee.

Senator Duffy asked, "And over and above that, wasn't there a component that the university was going to see something more than just the debt service?"

Vice President McHenry replied that there was and the time frame for that doesn't start for a couple of years.

President Berkman added that the first revenues that we get from them we need to use to pay off the debt service. He noted that this was \$13 million incurred when he came to CSU. At the end of this, CSU will spend nothing on this project. We did have to clear the site and to make the site useable which we did. They are paying us back for that now. The other provision we are happily going to get close to is that there is a provision in our contract that we can't build new student housing unless their occupancy is ninety-two percent for two or three consecutive years. He said that he feels that we are going to get there and he hopes that we are going to find another private developer who is willing to venture and build something that looks as good. He added that Langston is the only project that looks better built than it did on paper.

Senator Duffy asked President Berkman if he would comment on the potential of having a capital budget.

President Berkman replied that we are going to have a capital budget. On the 27th of September he is going to go to Columbus, at least that is his understanding right now, and the Governor is going to introduce the senior college presidents who will be on the Capital Budget Commission. There will be three or four senior college presidents on the Capital Budget Commission, two or three community college presidents, the respective chancellors, and they will make the recommendations to the Governor in terms of the capital appropriation. The number is the contentious issue. The number that ICU and the presidents are collectively asking for is half a billion dollars - \$500 million in capital money. The last time we received about \$300 million capital dollars and no community projects were funded. So there is a very strong community non-profit sector out there

that is lobbying to also get capital projects in the cycle but the good news is it's starting in a couple of weeks, much earlier than the original time table.

At this point, Senate President Goodell introduced to Faculty Senate for the very first time our new Provost Dr. Deirdre Mageean.

XI. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Mageean commented that the President gets to talk about all of the grand things and she gets to talk about all of the nitty-gritty stuff. First of all, Provost Mageean said that she was honored and pleased to be here with everyone today. She was here for the last week of spring semester but now she is here in her role and then slowly getting to know Cleveland, Cleveland State University and the faculty and students of this great institution. She noted that she managed to attend three college retreats thus far and at our new faculty orientation got to meet some of our great new faculty, both tenure track, adjuncts and lecturers. She stated that she has asked all of the deans of the respective colleges to work with her in her office to make sure that she comes around and visits each of them in their departments. She noted that this is going to take a little while because she does have a few other things to do on a daily basis but she really wants to get to know the faculty, get to know the issues in departments, get to everyone a little better on what are the problems and potential good things that they can work on together. That is going to be phased throughout the year but she will get to everyone slowly.

Provost Mageean commented that her predecessor did release 32 positions last year and of those only 25 were filled. There were seven unfilled due to failed searches which was kind of an unprecedented number. She said that both the President and she were very concerned about these searches. Some of them are kind of understandable – Nursing for instance, there were two there; they have a really hard time because there is just an acute shortage of nursing faculty so it is really hard to recruit nursing faculty. Dr. Mageean noted the other failed searches and so we are looking into ways that we can try to avoid this circumstance because that is a lot of effort, a lot labor, a lot of time, a lot of resources, and money put into something and then it comes to nothing and then you have the burden of trying to find people who can teach those courses. She noted that Dean Karlsson very wisely has brought in a group to work with her chairs and her faculty on how best to conduct searches to avoid this kind of situation. Dean Karlsson has made those resources available to other deans and chairs. That is a great move and we will monitor that to see how successful that is. Dr. Mageean added we may need to do a lot more coaching. Maybe the Center for Teaching Excellence actually can take up how best to conduct searches and make sure we don't end up with these results none of us likes which are failed searches.

Provost Mageean stated that speaking of the Adjuncts who work for so many of us and teach such large course loads, a lot of the Deans and some of the Chairs have spoken to her about their concern that the Adjuncts had received no pay raise in many, many years. Of course we are also looking very carefully at how they will be affected by the whole medical reform and how they will be affected by health benefit issues. One of

the great concerns was knowing that many of these people have to hold two or three jobs to make a living; that they could be lured away and if we lose them, we will lose some of our best so she made the decision to give them an across-the-board five percent pay increase and that will kick in during the spring. She noted that it doesn't sound like a lot but it is actually quite a substantial sum in the budget but at least this is an initial step to help us retain some of the very good Adjuncts that we have and she has authorized a five percent pay increase across the board. As she said, that will kick into effect in the spring.

Provost Mageean commented that one of the things she will be spending a lot of attention on is the retention of the students because, as the late Gordon Gee once said, accessibility and affordability is no bargain without completion. Of course we are going to be examined by the State and much of our revenue will now depend upon completion so we are pretty involved with student success. Dr. Peter Meiksins has taken over from Dr. Rosemary Sutton and is doing a lot of great work there. We are looking at the whole advising structure and, as President Berkman said, we will make more resources available to deal with advising as we go through this transition period. She noted that they are also looking at some special efforts that might be put into some populations where we seem to see a lot of turnover, maybe transfer students, so we need to look at all of these different populations and sub-populations within the larger student body so that we can advise them well and make sure that their experience is a good one and that they stay with us and have successful graduations.

Provost Mageean noted that student success, of course, is also related to faculty success. We can advance all these resources in our students but what makes successful students successful are faculty. She noted that one of the other areas she wanted to put some additional resources into is what's now called The Center for Teaching Excellence. Maybe calling it The Center for Faculty Excellence would make sure that its brief is even larger such that The Center deals with helping the faculty improve, enhance, re-skill, whatever it is that faculty need to do in the areas of both teaching and in research, in service or engagement. She noted that faculty can look for some changes there. Dr. Mageean said that she welcomes any suggestions faculty may have or suggestions which can be sent to Dr. Peter Meiksins. She and Dr. Meiksins will be working together on what this will look like and how they can best serve the faculty so she does hope for many suggestions in that area.

Provost Mageean stated that a number faculty have also been asking about replacing Dr. Vijay Konangi in that position. She said that she has been giving it a lot of thought and didn't rush to fill it because she wanted to think first of all, how that role will fit into the overall structure in Academic Affairs and how we can best utilize that position. The position was known as the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. It may be renamed Vice Provost for Special Projects but with a special emphasis on faculty affairs. She said that she would welcome people who would like to participate in that role. One of the things she did at a previous institution was to create a kind of a mini ace fellow within her own institution so you would welcome people who come from the departments and the colleges, who would be a fresh voice from the departments and colleges and would help them in communication. Provost Mageean went on to say that it would also

afford an opportunity for people who wanted to try out their hand in administration. So, any people who are feeling the seduction of going over to the dark side, that possibility exists. She said she will be talking to some people proactively but if some faculty are interested and, she knows people who would be, she would be very interested in hearing from them.

Provost Mageean reported that the other position some people may or may not be aware of that needs to be filled is Dr. Jim Drnek's position. He was the Provost for Student Affairs and left us just about a week ago. At the moment, Student Affairs is currently in the capable hands of Dr. Willie Banks who is here with us today while we find an interim leader in that area. Some people may know that Student Life and Student Affairs is an area that is being looked at again along with student success. We want to see how we best structure and organize Student Affairs so that it is supportive of the academic mission and works with the academic mission holistically to assure student success. So they are going to take another look at that position and see how they want to best structure it and, in the mean time, there will be an interim chosen in the next few weeks and she will hopefully come back to the next Senate meeting and let everyone know what is happening there.

Provost Mageean stated that they have talked about some of the changes going on – many of the sea changes that are affecting higher education. The huge tsunamis have affected graduate education; the increased monitoring by the State and by the Federal Government. She noted that many people probably listened and read over the course of the summer some of the suggestions coming from the Obama administration; how to monitor and reward universities – there is increased attention on accountability, demands by students and parents, so there is a lot of change happening out there and of course we are always constantly working to make sure that Cleveland State University is positioned to be the best university it can be and the best for its faculty and the best for its students. She noted that she is always a great believer that we should initiate change and do things ourselves before others do it to us because it's usually much better and more acceptable when we do that. So, we will be picking up where we left off in some areas looking at comprehensive program review and she will hope to come back to Senate at the next meeting with some narrative and plans on that and she will be working very closely with the Senate leadership in how we move forward on that.

Provost Mageean stated that one other thing she would like to do, because it strikes her, especially this summer with all of the hard work that the Curriculum Committee and many others put in; laboring in the vineyards sometimes tirelessly and sometimes you think without much reward; She commented that the reason all of us decided to embark on an academic career, a creative part of us, that's the part of what drove us into academia – one of the things she would like to do is to set up a forum or standing committee. She has not formalized the idea as yet but she would like to have either a standing committee or an *ad hoc* group of faculty who will simply come and talk with her on positive and creative ideas that they have for moving this university forward. She would really prefer it to not be a whining session or a problem probing session, but noted that faculty have ideas and experiences working with the students and working

with all of these issues and they have plenty of time to think about the things that are good for CSU. So she would like to constitute that group and get something going where we can all sit down together and maybe shoot the breeze a little bit and listen to some good ideas that faculty have on how we can best move this university forward and make sure that it pertains to all of the good things we have and advantages to grow and get better. Provost Mageean noted that these are the things she wanted to mention now. She said she would be happy to take any questions that Senators would like to offer.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady commented that she is getting ready to schedule for the next academic year with that Rubik's Cube and they have a faculty position open. She is not going to put a standard teaching load in the description that's going out for the opening and so it's very difficult to be cognitive and know what to schedule the people for if we aren't hearing what the workload will be. She noted that previously it was a two/two which was the average and now we will be moving to a three/two or two /three type thing on average. Now all of a sudden she is hearing that maybe that's different.

Provost Mageean replied that she believed those are negotiations going on with Dr. Zhu and that is part of some of the discussions that are going on at the moment. She asked Dr. Zhu if this was correct.

Dr. Zhu stated that this is still being discussed – fifteen or sixteen credit hours. He stated that the contract language still stands as it is now; for faculty that are productive in research and it's fifteen to sixteen credit hours.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltd commented that when she asked her Dean's Office for a ruling on what a standard workload should be so that she can schedule courses for next year, she was told that they will not at this point commit to what Dean Zhu had just said. She went on to say that faculty are getting mixed messages and faculty need a clear message so that they can move forward to plan the next academic year.

Dean Jianping Zhu replied that this is because we are now in the final year of the contract and how it is going to come out with the next year's contract has not been finalized yet.

President Berkman stated that the Provost should take what he is saying and the Deans need to provide clear instructions to the Chairs on what they consider to be baseline. He noted that they have gone through an exercise in differentiated faculty assignments recognizing that some people have stronger teaching inclinations and responsibilities, some people have stronger research and there ought to be a balance between them but the Deans have to take the leadership in setting out for the Chairs what the parameters are that they want to use in terms of teaching loads. He has always felt that ultimately, we need a university policy. He noted that the current university policy in the Collective Bargaining Agreement is as most would argue not really helpful because it stipulates that the load is twenty-four credits per year for every faculty member. He noted that this is the baseline in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. This provides

mechanisms by which faculty can reduce that but the baseline that is provided contractually in the Collective Bargaining Agreement is indeed twenty-four credits.

Senator Jeff Karem commented that he didn't want to start the negotiations early but he disagrees that the twenty-four credit hours is the baseline teaching load. Twenty-four credits is there as a workload baseline to be divided into different areas. One issue that is puzzling is the normal range of research for faculty is between six to sixteen credit hours under Article 13 B. It may be that fifteen/sixteen ends up being utilized. He noted that he does think if we were thinking about recruitment ambiguities about workload make it very difficult to recruit. He noted they got their top candidate in English but they are really good at rhetoric so they were able to overcome any anxieties on that front. He does know that is going to prove a big challenge in many ways if there is not any sense of baseline. People may assume the worst so it may be that even recognizing that there are still negotiations ahead, among themselves, administrators and search committees may need to find some accommodations so that we can still be attractive in the midst of the transition.

Provost Mageean stated that Dr. Karem is absolutely right and she will work with the Deans to make sure some guidelines get up there. It is important because when talking about the number of faculty, there are thirty-five new positions and if you add that to the seven previous searches that failed, we have forty-two searches going on this year. She added that it is very important.

Senator Robert Krebs commented that the Provost said during the previous year we filled twenty-five positions. He asked what was the breakdown between tenure track versus college lecturer of those twenty-five positions.

Provost Mageean replied that the twenty-five were all tenure track and there were also nine lecturer positions and they were all filled. This year they will release thirty-five tenure track positions and seven lecturer positions.

Senator Beth Ekelman stated that she is concerned about the new on-line system that we are using for recruitment. She knows there are lots of bugs in it and because we had failed searches last year, she just hates to ask if the online system will be required for future faculty searches. She said she knows that change is hard, but she thinks the bugs should be worked out before we actually use it and she knows there have been lots of concerns about that. She is chairing a search committee and she is very concerned about it.

Provost Mageean said she has begun discussions on this with the Deans and has constant communication with HR. They have had some requests for waivers from a number of departments mainly in Sciences and Health Sciences and she has sent those off to Jesse Drucker and he has granted those waivers. She noted there are certain issues with the mathematics department that are of concern. They and some of the other departments in Sciences and Health Sciences asked for waivers so they are working with the departments almost on a daily basis.

Senator Hoffman asked if Provost Mageean could provide the breakdown of the allocation of those positions by college.

Provost Mageean said that she doesn't have that information with her but would be happy to supply the breakdown to Dr. Goodell. Provost Mageean stated that there is another process for this allocation if the Deans all present their cases and there is a series of votes including the Deans themselves and they do arrive at a very good process looking at the positions and how they relate to the various needs of the university. She added that most of the Deans were very happy with the allocations they were given this year.

XII. Student Government Association (Report No. 12, 2013-2014)

Since Jon Fedor, President of the Student Government Association, had to leave early for class, SGA Vice President Allison Dumski gave the SGA report. She thanked everybody for sticking around for such a long meeting today. She stated that the SGA President Jon Fedor, Secretary Emily Halasah and Roman Boychuk all had to go to class. She noted that she has a fantastic three credit hour schedule where she only has to come two days per week so she is able to talk to Senate today.

Ms. Dumski stated that SGA has been very busy since the beginning of school and even throughout the summer. This year has started off with lots of plans and this is a huge opportunity to show off Cleveland State, our Colleges and the work and research that is done here at the university. SGA has been involved with planning the parade, the tailgate, securing the headline entertainment for the Saturday evening of Home Coming and it has been fun and a great learning experience. They have been working very hard on various projects to help boost campus pride and some traditions on campus.

Ms. Dumski reported that SGA just finished filling their cabinet positions with the directors. These individuals will work with SGA executives to insure that their organization stays on track with its mission to represent the academic interests and concerns of the students, both undergraduate and graduate, at Cleveland State. She noted that this past Friday evening they ratified seventeen new senators as members bringing their Senate close to a full complement. They gathered information from their Senators about which committees they would be interested in so they can insure that their student representatives are appointed to the committees with faculty members. That way they can represent the voices of the students in the decisions that are being made.

Ms. Dumski stated that SGA is also very excited about the student success initiatives that have been launched. These initiatives will provide more information to students about the incentives available to them; details about the credit conversion; the credit hour cap; and the new time block. SGA whole heartedly commends the faculty for working so diligently on the students' behalf to implement the changes needed for credit conversion. She noted that it is not easy and SGA recognizes the large amount of work

that was needed and the extra effort that was made to restructure the classes, evaluate how to teach the required material and codify information into course descriptions.

Ms. Dumski noted that SGA is focused on advocating on behalf of the students, providing information to students and opening doors for students to be involved at Cleveland State. Being informed and understanding the decisions being made at the university is critical to fulfilling this mission. The faculty and the faculty leadership at the university are one of the most important sources of information and SGA would consider it a pleasure to stay informed about the activity in the movement of the Faculty Senate.

Finally, Ms. Dumski said that the SGA Senate meets on the first and third Fridays of every month and is open to the public. Senators should please contact SGA if they would like to request to be on the SGA Agenda if there is information they want to share and communicate with the student representatives. They would be happy to welcome Faculty Senators to their body of leaders as well. Ms. Dumski stated that they take their duties to represent the students very seriously as does Faculty Senate to represent the faculty and it is a privilege for SGA to be partners with the Faculty in continuing to grow this university.

XIII. New Business

Senate President Goodell reminded Senators that two of the Senate meetings will not be held in the Student Center this year; the November 6 and December 4 meetings will be held in Fenn Tower, Room 303.

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:20 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel