

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

APRIL 3, 2013

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, Bosela, C. Bowen, W. Bowen, Bracken, Cory, Delatte, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Gelman, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, R. Henry, Holsinger, Horvath, Hrivnak, D. Jackson, M. D. Jones, Karem, Krebs, Liggett, Marino, Meier, Niederriter, Resnick, Rutar, Sridhar, Steinberg, Strauss, Talu, Tebeau, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, Volk, Witmer-Rich, J. G. Wilson, Wolf, A. Zhou.

Al Bitar, Artbauer, R. Berkman, Boise, M. Bond, C. Brown, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, McHenry, Parry, Sadlek, Sawicki, Spademan, Stoll, G. Walker, B. White, Zachariah.

ABSENT: T. I. Banks, Dixit, Jayanti, M. Kaufman, Majette for Sterio, Rashidi, Rickett.

Caspary, Drnek, Jain, Markovic, Percy, G. Thornton, Triplett, Vandemark, Zhu.

ALSO

PRESENT: Fodor, Kosteas.

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

I. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of April 3, 2013

Senate President Joanne Goodell stated that before she asks for approval of the Agenda, she would like to move around some of the items on the Agenda unless there are any objections. She would like to move directly to her report as item number II, after approval of the Agenda, and she would like to hold the discussion of the Resolution as item number III, then Approve the Minutes of the Meeting of February 6, 2013, as item IV, and Announcement of the Coming Elections as item V, then the remaining Agenda items in the specified order. Dr. Goodell then asked for a motion to approve the Agenda as she recommended amending it. It was then moved, seconded and the Agenda, as amended, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Goodell stated that the events about to unfold today have been a long time in the making. Dr. Goodell said, "As you know, when President Ronald Berkman arrived, he made student success his number one goal. What he may not have known at that time, was the faculty at CSU have always cared deeply about their students and their students' progress. That is why we have wholeheartedly supported the many initiatives undertaken over the past three years to improve student success. Most of these initiatives were recommended by the Faculty Senate *ad hoc* Student Success Committee. Some of these suggestions, such as intrusive advising and restricting enrollment of freshmen in online classes, have already borne considerable fruit with the freshmen results in this past fall, and the retention from fall 2012 to spring 2013. In addition, when the Senate was asked to consider adopting a cap on the number of credits to degree, we did so without reservation. Senate also agreed to a conversion of all general education courses to a 3-credit standard to make transferring into and out of CSU easier for students. However, the faculty know that the core of the student experience at CSU is the curriculum, and we are the ones who implement the curriculum, so when our advice on curriculum matters is either not sought or not listened to, we must respond accordingly. The decision to oppose the conversion of all courses at CSU to a three-credit standard at this time was supported by a 35-4 majority in the Senate at our February meeting. However, I do not think that this vote meant that faculty are unwilling to consider change, or that we are in any way turning our back on the administration. Quite the contrary; I have heard from many different sources across the university that there is some acceptance of the need to transform our curriculum where it makes sense to do so. Our biggest problem is the manner in which the process has unfolded, particularly the lack of communication to the entire campus community and the exclusion of faculty voices from development of a reasonable implementation timeline, the adoption of a new scheduling system, room allocation policy and time block schedule. The administration has ignored our calls for a transition plan or 'safety net' to protect students. Planning and care is crucial, because we will be running two curricula at once: one for students completing under the old system, and one for those entering with the new system. Without clear degree plans and advising procedures that spell out how to handle this transition, students may end up taking the wrong courses or more courses than necessary because of confusion in the course catalog or registration process. Our online advising has already misled students into thinking they are ready to graduate when they are not; a hasty curriculum change will only make this problem worse."

Dr. Goodell continued stating that these changes have been so controversial, the Senate officers who are also ex-officio Board of Trustees members, Dr. Duffy and herself, met with the administration and the Board on February 28, 2013, and believed that they had negotiated a solution to move this process forward in a way that respected faculty and student concerns: CSU would move towards a dominant three-credit model, but faculty would define the model and have a major role in developing the timetable and procedures, including regular communication by faculty with the Board to ensure protection of students as these changes moved forward. The resolution authored by the administration broke all of these promises regarding partnership between administration

and faculty for curricular change. In fact, the first draft did not even mention faculty at all. In the resolution, all of the authority for the curriculum rests in the hands of the administrators, most of whom do not teach our students. This “top-down” approach violates the ideals of shared governance that have been in place at CSU since its inception in 1964. Dr. Goodell said that at the joint caucus meeting last week, the majority consensus was that we had tried the traditional avenues through the committees we convene and non-traditional approaches such as meeting with the Board of Trustees to have our voices heard, and these appeared to have not worked, therefore our only recourse was to make a written statement and present the resolution you will hear today. As we approach our 50th anniversary, it would be terrible for the entire university community if we are unable to broker a plan that makes sense for students, faculty and administration. Dr. Goodell said that she believes we can only do this with open and clear dialogue between all parties. If yesterday’s open forum is any indication of students’ opinions across the campus, clearly they feel left out, as some faculty do as well. Educational reform has been likened to building a plane while flying it, since we can’t shut down the institution for a few years while we get everything in perfect working order. What we must avoid at all costs is crashing the plane and undoing all the good work that has taken place here at CSU recently.

Dr. Goodell mentioned the open forum held yesterday, April 2, 2013, and said she wanted to make clear that she will not tolerate the kind of behavior she witnessed at that event. She respectfully requested that everyone present today will adhere to the procedures she is about to lay out, which conform to Robert’s Rules of Order for deliberative assemblies. If any person present engages in unruly behavior, she will ask that person to leave this meeting. Remarks must be courteous in language and deportment, and refrain from alluding to others by name or to motives.

1. Only those people who are considered to be members of the Faculty Senate or corresponding members of the Faculty Senate will be recognized to speak at this meeting. Those include the elected members for each of the college caucuses, the administrative members, the retired faculty members, professional staff members, student members, members designated by the President of the University and ex officio members.
2. All speakers must be recognized by Dr. Goodell in order to have the floor. Speakers will speak in turn for no more than five minutes, preferably much shorter given that we have a limited time for this meeting, and there are many people who wish to speak. If, after everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once and there is time left, people may be recognized again, for no more than five minutes.
3. Once the motion has been read, Dr. Goodell said that she will restate it. At that point it is possible for a member to object to the consideration of the question. This is put to a vote and decided by a two thirds majority of those voting.
4. Debate must be limited to the merits of the immediately pending question.

5. If anyone wishes to call the question, he or she must be recognized by Dr. Goodell then must move the previous question. This motion must be seconded and adopted by a two-thirds majority of those voting.
6. Once debate appears to be over, someone may move to close debate, which is then voted on.
7. A motion to table the actions of the resolution may be made after the debate is closed and before the vote is taken.

At this point, Dr. Goodell thanked everyone for their attention to these matters.

Dr. Goodell then invited the members of the Academic Steering Committee who are representing the caucuses at the presentation of the resolution and to answer any questions from the floor after which time Dr. Norbert Delatte, from the College of Engineering, will present the motion and then the motion will be on the floor for discussion. She stated that there will be other members from the Senate who asked to be introduced as well.

III. Resolution regarding University Administration (Report No. 64, 2012-2013)

Senator Norbert Delatte reported that following their joint caucus meeting a week ago, the collective representatives of the College Caucuses drafted the following resolution. Senator Delatte then read the proposed resolution.

“WHEREAS, in April 2012 a joint Faculty and Administration committee recommended that the Faculty Senate consider issues related to student credit hours; and

“WHEREAS, in Fall 2012 the Faculty Senate recommended to the Board of Trustees a 3 credit hour cap on General Education courses and a presumptive 120 credit hour standard for graduation, recommendations the Board of Trustees has accepted; and

“WHEREAS, in February 2013 the Faculty Senate recommended against an across-the-board change of 4 credit undergraduate courses to 3 credit hours, relying on a report of the University Curriculum Committee showing that:

- In a survey of Cleveland State University students, 81% of respondents favored either a dominant 4 credit hour course model or a combination of 3 and 4 credit hour courses, with 19% of student favoring a predominantly 3 credit hour curriculum and the largest number of students preferring a dominant 4 credit hour one;
- An all-3 credit hour curriculum will require additional courses in order to satisfy graduation requirements, increasing textbook costs and adding to other burdens for students;

- An all-3 credit hour curriculum will require many students to schedule classes on additional days of the week, a substantial impediment to academic progress for the University's large majority of non-residential students;
- Scheduling difficulties associated with an all-3 credit hour model will severely affect evening students;
- The 3 credit hour model will also severely affect part-time graduate students and graduate programs because many undergraduate courses are cross-listed as graduate offerings;

and

“WHEREAS, the Administration has advised the Board of Trustees and the public that the number of 4 credit hour courses taken by students is the principal cause of the University's low graduation rate, even though the Administration has acknowledged to faculty that no evidence whatever supports such a claim; and

“WHEREAS, THE Administration has also falsely claimed to the Board of Trustees, and to the public, that the Faculty “deep-sixed” educational reforms; and

“WHEREAS, THE Administration has acted arbitrarily in other respects during the examination of credit hour issues, such as

- Falsely claiming in October, 2012 that the Faculty had already adopted a cap on General Education course credit hours and was flagrantly ignoring its own rules (a claim that the Administration withdrew when shown clear evidence to the contrary, and that it revived in part with the assertion that Faculty had “deep-sixed” reforms);
- Arguing that the sheer number of 4 credit hour courses presented a “problem of perception” because other Ohio public universities offer fewer such courses, while at the same insisting on the use of metrics that overstate the number of 4 credit offerings at the University and that exaggerate any remaining differences between Cleveland State and other universities after the General Education reforms¹;

¹ For example, a report by the Curriculum Committee Chair showed that in Fall 2012 half of the *courses* offered by the Department of Economics carried 4 credit hours. However, only 22 percent of the *sections* or classes in those courses carried 4 credit hours, and only 10 percent of the total student *enrollment* in Economics courses was in 4 credit hour course sections. (Page 9 of the accompanying Statement and attachments includes a course, section, and enrollment breakdown for the Department.) Do Economics offerings comport with a “dominant 3 credit model”? Although only 1 in 10 student enrollments is actually in a 4 credit hour course, the Administration insists on a metric that categorizes Economics as a department in which 50% of the offerings are 4 credits – a metric that has no relationship to students' actual educational experience.

- Accepting the University Curriculum Committee’s proposed timetable for action on credit hours without objection, and then announcing without warning in late Fall, 2012 that the Committee’s schedule did not line up with the Board’s and that the Trustees would likely act without even considering Faculty views;
- Endorsing a January, 2013 Resolution implying that curricular decisions traditionally have been the responsibility of Provost Office officials, when in fact such decisions traditionally are made by Faculty, both at Cleveland State University and across the United States;
- Adopting a too-rapid timetable for implementation that is likely to produce mistakes, harming students’ education;

and

“WHEREAS, the actions of the Administration regarding credit hours comport with other recent actions and statements of the Administration, including:

- informing the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in 2011 that Cleveland State University is no longer fully committed to being a research institution;
- proposing in 2012 to vest the Provost with the unrestrained power to define, charge and adjudicate academic misconduct, leading to the dismissal of tenured law college faculty members and department chairs, all without any review of the Provost’s definitions, charges or decisions;
- claiming in 2013 that it and the Board of Trustees can change fundamental Bylaws of the Faculty, including provisions regarding tenure without ever consulting Faculty while acknowledging that no precedent exists for doing so;

and

“WHEREAS, the Administration unilaterally abandoned an understanding reached at a meeting on February 28, 2013 that included the following points:

- the idea of “dominant 3 credit hour model” being a very general one,² its meaning and application would be determined through a process with substantial Faculty involvement;
- implementation measures for Board-approved curricular reforms would be determined with substantial Faculty involvement, every precaution being taken to avoid damaging students’ education;

²See footnote 1, above.

- while implementation was ongoing, the University Curriculum Committee Chair (together with the Provost) would periodically report on the progress of reform to Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees;

and

“WHEREAS, the Administration’s approach to the February 28, 2013 understanding is to refuse to discuss it or to acknowledge that it ever existed, a complete breach of faith with the faculty; and

“WHEREAS, the Administration’s nominal campaign to “help” students through credit hour reform will actually interfere with students’ educations; and

“WHEREAS, the Administration’s self-proclaimed effort to keep Cleveland State University from becoming an academic “outlier” is in fact endangering Cleveland State University’s very identity as an academic institution; and

“WHEREAS, THE Administration repeatedly has misstated facts, and has misrepresented the interests of Students and the actions of Faculty, both to the Board of Trustees and to the public; and

“WHEREAS, the Administration having misrepresented the actions of Faculty to the Trustees, the Faculty has no reason to suppose that the Administration has not also misrepresented the views of the Trustees to the Faculty; and

“WHEREAS, the Administration’s misstatements to the Board of Trustees have interfered with the ability of Trustees to discharge their duties; and

“WHEREAS, the Administration’s public misrepresentations have degraded the faculty and the University itself, in ways as unprecedented as they are inexplicable; and

“WHEREAS, the Administration’s actions and misstatements have damaged, and will damage, students’ education at Cleveland State University;

“NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty of Cleveland State University has no confidence in the Administration of Cleveland State University; and

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty calls upon the Administration to honor the understandings reached on February 28, 2013 regarding curricular reform and its implementation; and

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution, along with the Statement and attachments that accompany it, should be transmitted promptly to each member of the Board of Trustees of the University; and

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees shall formally present this Resolution, along with the Statement and attachments that accompany it, at the next full meeting of the Trustees.”

Senate President Goodell stated that the motion is now on the floor and any of the corresponding members or members of Senate may speak to or against the motion. She noted that for any people not seated around the table and who can't reach a microphone, there are multiple microphones around the room. If anyone wishes to be recognized, they should stand at a microphone or if they are seated, raise their hand.

Senator James Wilson stated that this is obviously a difficult day. There is no doubt that everybody here is committed to student success and education to develop student value. He noted that he worked with President Ronald Berkman frequently as the Faculty Senate President and all of us worked together to create the Student Success Committee that has been staffed by dedicated and competent people to move this school forward. So it is really a difficult moment for all of us to try to figure out what to do. He noted that his reaction, he didn't know how this fits in with all of the procedures, is that we should defer this motion until the next Faculty Senate meeting and allow another opportunity for the parties to meet and resolve their differences amicably as they almost did two months ago but unfortunately that deal fell apart. Professor Wilson said that he would like to revisit that and try to work this thing out without a formal discussion.

Professor Wilson stated that, in addition to that basic concern; there has not been an opportunity for us, as Faculty Senators, to fully discuss this with all of our colleagues. Given the gravity of the issue he would really like to have more opportunity to explore these concerns with his colleagues. He is willing to go into the issue and the merits and one reason to table it is that we don't have to go into all issues of the merits of deferring. He is opposed to the motion and he would rather deal with it later and see if this has any legs. He pointed out that, at the Caucus meeting, there was a minority of us that felt this motion should be deferred.

Senate President Goodell noted that Professor Wilson is not objecting to the motion but is just speaking to it.

Professor Wilson noted that he didn't want to say table it because if you say table it then there is supposed to be another discussion and that is just ridiculous.

Professor Goodell commented that you can't table the motion until after the discussion. You could object to the question and then it would not be discussed.

Professor Wilson said that he would like to have the discussion but he would like to have Senate consider not proceeding at this time. He thinks it would be nice to defer it for a month. Certainly there are people who are opposed to it and there would be a full discussion about that concern.

Professor Goodell noted that the motion is then not being objected to and we are still having a discussion.

Senator Wilson stated if he has to object to the motion, then he objects to it.

Professor Goodell stated that if Senator Wilson objects, then we have to put it to a vote. She then asked that the ballots be distributed. She noted that before there is a vote, there must be a second to the motion.

Professor James Marino indicated that he had a procedural question. He noted that there is some lack of clarity and some members would like clarification on exactly what the vote would be if there is a second to the motion.

Senate President Goodell replied that the vote would be on the objection to the question so it needs a second and a two-thirds majority would be favorable. If even a two-thirds majority were in favor of objecting to the question, the question would not be considered today; it would be removed from the agenda. Dr. Goodell stated that Senator James Wilson has objected the question and we need a second. A second to the motion means that the question will then go to a vote and if the vote passes, the question is removed from the agenda.

Senator Wilson stated that again, the word objection is not being used with or without prejudice. He is just saying that this motion could be brought forward at the following session if nothing could be worked out today.

Dr. Goodell suggested that Senator Wilson wait until the discussion is over and move to table the motion.

Professor Wilson disagreed with that approach, but noted that Dr. Goodell is the Senate President.

Dr. Goodell stated that we still need a second to Professor Wilson's objection.

Senator Aimin Zhou stated that there hasn't been enough discussion about the resolution and faculty need more information. Faculty did not know that we would have this kind of a resolution today. He believes that more information is needed and the discussion of the motion should be held up until the next Senate meeting.

Senate President Goodell noted that we still do not have a second to Professor Wilson's motion of objection. She asked if anyone disagreed with her. She again stated that we do not have a second to the motion, therefore, Senate will not vote on it. The motion is still on the floor if anyone wants to comment for or against the motion.

Senator Mark Tebeau suggested that the question be called and that Senate move to the next order of business.

Dr. Goodell asked if anyone else wished to speak.

Professor Wilson said that he will speak against the motion. He thinks it is premature, it is divisive and it will polarize the situation. The Board of Trustees will not interpret it the way it would make things helpful. He noted that in the past he has found that President Berkman and Provost Walker have been willing to reconsider issues such as amending the Green Book to significantly reduce our procedural protections in terms of tenure and, if something like that were to happen, or if they did follow through on what he considers to be ill advised suggestions that they can ignore the Green Book, then he would have a different position. He said that he knows this is a serious issue. He has great sympathy for the faculty in this situation, but he does think that this is not the right thing to do at this time.

President Ronald Berkman began by repeating some of the things he has said since he came to Cleveland State and some of them have to do with what he considers the nature of shared governance. He wanted to talk about how he thinks shared governance works in a university and to fortify his sense of belief that faculty governance or shared governance properly executed is an important instrument in any university. He has been in four universities, he has worked with four Faculty Senates, he has never had a breach with a Faculty Senate; he has never had a vote of no confidence from a Faculty Senate, so he feels that he has some experience in how faculty governance works. President Berkman first said that he thinks faculty governance requires a civic discourse. It should be respectful, it should be professional, and it should be civil and he doesn't believe that this discourse has occurred over a very short period of time. He wanted to remind everyone that we had a Faculty Senate meeting just about a month ago where none of these issues were on the table but he believes that in this very short time this resolution appeared, which he received by email six days ago, no communication, no call for a meeting, no request to meet with anyone on the Faculty Senate and the language in his estimation has not met that standard.

President Berkman said, secondly, transparency and again people can have different views on this but he believes that since he came to CSU and the first year that he came, we had a thirteen percent budget cut to take; and he formed a Presidential Advisory Committee largely composed of faculty. All of the data concerning the budget cuts and all of the data concerning scenarios for regional budget cuts were put before the committee. The committee made recommendations and he thinks that those recommendations were followed. He stated that this has continued with every major policy issue – the Student Success Committee, E-Learning, the Green Book, tenure and promotion. He thinks all of those issues have been brought before the Faculty Senate. He noted that there may be breaches in timing, there may be breaches in communication, they may not have gone to the right committee in exactly the right time, they may have not been communicated as well as they could have been communicated, but there was clearly on his part no attempt to officiate or conceal what his recommendations concerning these policy issues are.

President Berkman stated the following in terms of the issue of four credits to three credits: The Faculty Senate endorsed or accepted the report of the Student Success Committee in April of last year. The University Curriculum Committee made its first recommendation concerning two pieces of the curriculum proposal in November of 2012. So nine months went by between the time that the Faculty Senate accepted the report and we got a response from the University Curriculum Committee. Again, he understands and he knows the Senate President had trouble finding the chair of the Curriculum Committee; it was late in getting started, etc. President Berkman stated that he wanted to make the following two points: He noted that every document produced by the University Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, including its first recommendation, and Professor Kosteas was at that Board of Trustees meeting and its second recommendations were given in full to every member of the Board of Trustees. There was no attempt to interrupt the communication or the recommendation that the faculty was making. In addition, Professor Duffy and Professor Goodell are the faculty members of the Board of Trustees. They were at the Board of Trustees meeting and they had every opportunity to speak in terms of the recommendations that were being made by Faculty Senate. President Berkman stated that there are times in shared governance where Faculty Senate and the administration are not going to concur and he just does not accept the notion that faculty governance in its full maturity practiced at mature universities means that an administration and a Board of Trustees is obliged to accept every recommendation of a Faculty Senate committee. He noted that this was a case in terms of the four to three where the Provost and he did not agree with the recommendations of Faculty Senate in terms of the need to take more time to study the issue or the need to implement the policy.

President Berkman spoke about implementation which has been a major issue. He noted that he said this at least three times at the Faculty Senate. He was thinking this morning that he would donate money to the Faculty Senate so they can publish the transcripts of the minutes that were recorded here. Some of his previous comments could be recaptured. He said the following in terms of implementation: when he first introduced this, the changes we are talking about in terms of curriculum and the changes that we are talking about in terms improving student success and retention and graduation cannot be done through an administrative edict. Doing this from memory, President Berkman said that it will take the entire university village to make these changes. And what he asked at that time was that Senators, as the representatives of the faculty of that village, join him in trying to fashion a set of recommendations that would be helpful to move our students through the system and ultimately to graduate. President Berkman noted that he also repeatedly said he will not support any implementation plan that in any way shape or form puts students in peril and he came here and the thrust behind what we are doing is to take students out of peril. He believes, and he will say again, although there is a date in the resolution, the resolution indeed says the President shall make every reasonable effort to implement the plan by September 2014; not September 2013 like some Board members originally recommended; September 2014 – make every reasonable effort. He did not say, “will be implemented,” “will be fully implemented,” “will be in place” but that we will make every effort.

President Berkman stated that he also has said repeatedly, but he will say it again for whatever it is worth, he always anticipated that this process will involve Deans, Department Chairs, faculty members on faculty Curriculum Committees, students and the entire university community including the Faculty Senate. This process does not belong to one province. This is a process that every faculty member should have an opportunity to lay their hand on. President Berkman again said that he reaffirms what he has affirmed before; we have not, and this could be a failing on our part, we have not yet laid out a complete strategy for how faculty at the department level, faculty at the college level, faculty in the university Faculty Senate, and students would participate in this process but we have looked at how it has happened at other universities, we looked at how it was done at Ohio State University, we know the faculty committee structures that were put in place at Ohio State and how it was done with the engagement of over one hundred faculty members at Ohio State. President Berkman said, since the resolution only passed on March 14, 15, or 16, fourteen days ago, we have not had time to come to closure and fully articulate what this university-wide plan would look like but the Provost's Office has begun to work with every single unit to begin to designate faculty in those units who would participate in the implementation of the plan.

Finally, President Berkman said while he personally regrets the decision made, really in two weeks, to move to a no confidence vote; a vote again that he learned about – we are talking about shared governance, we are talking about communication, we are talking about transparency, a vote and a resolution that he learned about when he opened an email last Thursday. But what he regrets most about it is not that it is a vote of no confidence in him or the administration. What he regrets most about it is the damage that it will do to the university; the damage it will do to members of the faculty; the damage it will do to faculty's young colleagues who are trying to build a career here; the damage it will do to the work we have done in three years to track and cultivate donors who believe in this institution and are willing to give significant dollars to this institution; it will impact Alumni; it will impact perspective parents; it will impact perspective students because of the notion that we have a university in discord. He noted that the Resolution should say, "the Faculty Senate votes," not the faculty. He believes that the Faculty Senate votes – that is who is voting today on a vote of no confidence. He noted that it will say that the university is a university with a community that is divided. In his estimation, everyone could hold their own views. In the last three years, we have made a significant assent as a university; an assent that has been recognized State-wide; been recognized by our competitors and colleagues who would be delighted to see this happen; has been recognized by donors; has been recognized by the national academic community. When we look at the quality of the Deans who have been attracted to this institution, the quality of faculty attracted to this institution, the number of freshmen that we have attracted to this institution; the academic profile and diversity of that freshmen class; he thinks those are the things that are going to be most damaged. President Berkman stated that he didn't come to Cleveland State, as many may have speculated as a jumping point for a job at another college; he is not going to another college. A vote of no confidence does not impact his career. A vote of no confidence impacts the faculty careers and the career and the future of this institution.

President Berkman stated that he asked, as Professor Wilson did, that Faculty Senate pauses and takes a deep breath. This has happened in two weeks and this has been something we have been discussing for almost two years. In fact, the Student Success Committee had its first meeting in April of 2010 and while Professor Goodell is correct that many good things have already been implemented, and he thinks those things are helping our students here, they are not issues related to curriculum. They are issues related to administrative failure. They are issues related to an administrative structure that didn't work for students, whether it was IT, whether it was financial aid, whether it was mentoring and advising; it was a broken system administratively. He added that a lot of what we have done on that side has been to amend that.

President Berman noted that everyone has heard him say unequivocally his belief that Ron Berkman can say give me a curriculum with all three credit courses and it shall be done. He understands and he understands completely that faculty will play or need to play and academic leadership needs to play a principle role in this process. He stated that at the last Faculty Senate meeting, Senate took a secret ballot to indicate who was in favor and who was not in favor of the recommendation of the University Curriculum Committee so rather than take a secret ballot, he is going to absent himself after these comments and allow Senate to freely engage in a discussion but he is willing, able and here to answer any question anyone would like to pose.

Dr. Bill Kosteas stated that one of the big concerns moving forward is the time line. From his own personal perspective, that is his primary concern right now. He noted that the consultants that came from Ohio State indicated that when conversations first began, it was actually a ten year process. However, when Ohio State first decided to undertake the endeavor of switching from quarters to semesters, the whole process took something like three to four years. Dr. Kosteas said that our students deserve the same type of consideration. Instead of having all of the faculty rush to revise all of our courses, he has said this many times and in several places, to have it done by the end of the semester is not fair to our students. Actually the original proposal was to have it done in about a week from now and he pushed back against that and many Senators were not at these conversations. We were given a little bit more time so that we can work intelligently and move forward with a process that will not harm our students. If the transition is going to be a bear, we want to make sure that departments and programs have the time to make the right choices for their students when they are making these kinds of transitions. He noted that this is something that deeply concerns him. He would like some guarantees that the feedback will be taken more seriously because up to this point, he feels like, wow, it's a major victory that he managed to buy the faculty a few weeks in terms of revising courses. He doesn't buy into it and he feels that many of his colleagues feel the same way. He doesn't buy into this argument that, "You can go ahead and revise all of your courses, and then next year you can revise your programs. The two are inseparable." So, to ask faculty to please revise your courses, figure out which new courses you are going to develop and do that, by the way, within the next few weeks, and then later next year let's figure out how you revise your programs. He is deeply concerned by this timeline and he thinks we need guarantees of at least sitting down and having more of a voice in that process. Now, let's shoot for 2014 and then if it becomes

a mess, let's start all over again. He noted that this is the sense of what he sees going forward right now and he finds that very troubling and problematic. He stated that getting some movement on this might make people start to feel a little bit better.

President Berkman commented first, he respects the work that Professor Kosteas has done in this effort. It was an enormous task which required enormous time and dedication. So he is appreciative of what Professor Kosteas has done and he is willing to provide everyone with the following guarantee. He stated, "We will consult on an implementation schedule. As long as we feel that we are making satisfactory progress towards the goal, I am prepared, as I said before, to revise the implementation schedule to meet the task. Let me be honest. The truth is I don't understand the whole complexity of the task. You probably understand more of it than I understand. So given that I don't understand the entire complexity, I am saying to you, as the chair of the committee, that I'm prepared to work with you on whatever else is designated, in terms of an implementation schedule realizing that the departments and the chairs also have to be involved in this discussion since they are the agents of the curriculum change. But I am willing again, as long as we are moving towards a goal, and I am going to restate something again for the umpteenth time, I have never said that every course needs to be a three credit course. What I have said is that we would have hopefully a dominant three course model. There will, by necessity, by the nature of the program, by the nature of learning, by the nature of what a student needs, courses that will be four credits. So I again repeat that this is not monolithically as some of the literature has said about changing every single course in the university to a three-credit course."

Dr. Goodell thanked President Berkman for his comments.

Senator Nigamanth Sridhar stated that he is in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and this morning the department had a faculty meeting to look at this response to the UCC's exemption request for courses that need four credit hours. Regarding the timeline, he noted that there are two situations here. What President Berkman said was that this was the timeline that we will start with and if it doesn't work, we will go back and rework it. He noted that the problem with that approach as the faculty see it is that here is a deadline that we have to meet. So let's make decisions today, now, about what we want to do, right? And then we know that there are going to be problems; we know that there are going to be problems and we will deal with them later. Now, three years ago the Engineering Department went through a change process; they reduced the number of credit hours to graduation from 138 hours to 130 credit hours. To reduce those eight hours of material took the department about fifteen months of effort, by several faculty committees, and every single professor that was teaching classes reworked the material to produce what is needed to be presented and actually come up with something that was nice. The goal was to insure and enable students to graduate on time with a degree with the skills and abilities an engineer would need in industry. He added that he is happy to say that most of our undergraduate students leave campus in May with a job. That fifteen month process was a significant part of that success. Dr. Sridhar stated that we are talking about a similar change. Just to give one example; he noted that we used to have situations where we had four credit hour classes and two

credit hour lab classes which they figured out how to package for both curriculum and a lecture and a lab program. He noted that we are talking about a similar process right now but we are talking about doing it in a two week time limit. He stated that he is just giving everyone one example in one department in one college of the university but the point is that seeing that there is flexibility in the timeline when written documents say that there are dates and deadlines which are misleading at best.

President Berkman responded that he would not adopt the methodology. At the end of the day it is not going to be him that is going to need a new Provost who is going to be the architect of this process and that is who it should be – the Chief Academic Officer should be the architect and the leader in this process. He added, as well as the Deans, as well as Chairs, as well as faculty, but he would not favor the model that Professor Kosteas suggested and that is that we rush towards September 2014 and, in September 2014 if we haven't succeeded, that we scratch what we have done and start something else.

Professor Kosteas noted that that was not his suggestion.

President Berkman stated that that is a bad method in which to proceed. So, the Board Resolution says that he will report quarterly to the Board of Trustees on the progress being made. He doesn't see us waiting till that date to say, well to make a determination collectively in several programs or in colleges or in circumstances, we need more time – not in September 2014 but whenever the academic leadership reaches consensus that we need more time. So it is not rushing to that date and then trying to invent something new. Every three months there will be a report to the Board and the faculty who are involved including the Faculty Senate and the Curriculum Committee should be involved in advising the academic leadership of the progress that is being made. President Berkman stated that this is the point – every three months, at least as he sees it right now, that would be the point where you would make needed course adjustments. If after six months into it, we have a situation for example in Engineering where it couldn't be done because of accreditation, etc., then that timeline could conceivably be extended out. It would be a moving process and it would have these quarterly opportunities for everyone involved to make an assessment of where we are and what we need to do and how much time is needed.

Senator Beth Ekelman stated that she has done a lot of curricular development and design and she has never submitted one course at a time and then see what happens later. The process that is in place right now is a recipe for multiple errors. One course, and she has said this on two occasions at Faculty Senate meetings, we change one course to three credits and it has affected our Honors Program. There is always a downhill effect when you change courses and credit hours. You need to look at your curricular threads. You need to make sure the content of a major is covered. Just by saying I am going to reduce my course from four to three credits, just to comply with this, it doesn't work. She stated that she knows when asking for exemptions, faculty have to survey a number of universities and ask, "Do you do it our way or not?" She noted that other universities may not always have the best approach. There are no pedagogical exceptions

in the document and that is a major problem. We have pedagogical reasons for having courses that may be four credits. She noted that right now, her understanding is that there is not an argument to be made if we are asking for an exception based on pedagogical reasons except that if your program has an accreditation issue. The deadline that is on the document right now says, "by fall 2014." She noted that in order to meet that deadline, all these changes have to be made by fall of 2013 in order to allow us to schedule courses. That is not a realistic deadline so why start with an unrealistic deadline and then say we will move it if needed. When you make curricular changes, they have to go through the department Curriculum Committee, then through the college Curriculum Committee, then they have to go to UCC. Those processes are in place for a reason. We obtain meaningful feedback in how to make our programs excellent and that is what we want. We don't want to put it together hodgepodge and that is what this schedule is going to create.

President Berkman replied that he was not sure what a pedagogical exception is and he might want to know what a pedagogical exception is but he thinks what Dr. Ekelman is talking about is a process that needs to be vetted and discussed with Departmental Chairs, with faculty, with Deans, and then with the Provost's Office. He has always considered the Deans who are here as the on-the-ground academic leadership for this initiative. He thinks the Deans are and the Chairs are the correct individuals to make determinations or to make recommendations concerning exceptions or concerning modifications.

Dr. Goodell noted that Senate needs to speak to the motion on the floor and there are a number of people needing to speak.

Senator Jeff Karem said that he wanted to speak to issues of implementation and speak about the unintended consequences we are already seeing in place. He noted that Professor Ekelman spoke very eloquently about the interlaced nature of the curriculum and the problems rushing through it. Dr. Karem stated that regardless of perspective, it is the Senate in terms of faculty committees. In the GenEd conversion we have already seen problems occurring when the Senate approved and the University Curriculum Committee recommended converting all of the 100 and 200 level courses to a line with transfer standards and he supports that one hundred percent. In the implementation, departments were required to convert all upper level courses that were writing intensive, speaking intensive or capstone projects to three credits. He noted that in the English Department, those are the only courses that we want to be four credits – writing intensive and senior capstone projects. There is a pedagogical reason for this and that is these courses need more time. He said that the way the implementation has already gone has given faculty legitimate concerns that the flexibility that we are talking about isn't actually occurring in practice and some times we are getting a very top-down edict that is producing things that may make things worse with our majors unfortunately.

Senator Berlin Ray stated that since some Senators need to teach at 4:00 PM, she would like to call the question or allow them to vote by proxy. She doesn't want any Senators to be disenfranchised because they have to leave to teach.

Dr. Goodell noted that if Dr. Berlin Ray wants to call the question, Senators need to vote on a motion to call the question.

Senator Berlin Ray moved to call the question. Senator Mark Tebeau seconded the motion to call the question.

Senate President Goodell asked if Senate wishes to take a secret ballot on calling the question. She explained that calling the question means that someone from the floor has requested calling the question. The question comes back to the floor and needs to be debated. So if you vote in favor of calling the question; you are voting in favor of ending the debate so that we then vote on the actual question.

President Berkman noted that the Senate President should allow the people who she had noted earlier who wanted an opportunity to speak – the Deans and the President of Student Government should have the opportunity to speak before taking a vote on ending the debate.

Dr. Goodell stated that if the floor wishes to allow those people to speak, then she will vote to not call the question.

Professor James Marino commented that if he is not out of order, could he move that Senate authorize Senators who must leave to teach to vote by proxy so that the debate can continue? Senator William Bowen seconded Professor Marino's motion.

Senator Berlin Ray withdrew her motion to call the question.

Dr. Goodell noted that Senator Berlin Ray wished to withdraw her motion. Senator Berlin Ray said that she would absolutely withdraw her motion.

Dr. Goodell noted that Senate would need to vote to change the rules to allow Senators to vote now before they leave for class.

Dr. Marino stated, "Either to vote by ballot or to assign a proxy who will be authorized to vote for them."

Dr. Goodell stated that Senate would allow Senators to either vote by ballot now or to assign a proxy. She noted that this is not part of our rules so Senate would have to vote to suspend the rules on that point. She noted that we have a motion and a second to suspend the rules on voting by proxy or absentee. She asked if Senate could just take a voice vote on that. Dr. Goodell then asked Senators to vote to suspend the rules to vote by proxy or absentee. The motion was unanimously approved. Dr. Goodell then stated that those who need to vote by proxy or by absentee need to collect a ballot now or to authorize a proxy to the person sitting next to them.

Senator Tebeau pointed out that Senate also needed to vote on Dr. Berlin Ray's withdrawal of her motion.

Senate President Goodell stated that we are not calling the question; we have voted to continue the debate and we have also voted to extend the option of proxy or absentee voting. Dr. Goodell added that if anyone is going to vote by proxy, they should raise their hands and Senate Secretary Duffy will give Senators ballots.

Senator Tebeau commented that Dr. Goodell initially pointed out that five minutes were allocated to each speaker and he would appreciate those five minutes since Senate gave thirty-five minutes to President Berkman. Senator Tebeau absolutely thinks it is important that we give everybody a chance to speak but we really must ask that we adhere to that time limit for speakers or we will be here for a very long time.

Dean Gregory Sadlek reported that he has been asked by his fellow academic Deans to read a statement on this serious occasion. His statement follows.

“The CSU Deans are fundamentally dedicated to the goal of student success for all CSU students. This is the heart of our professional commitment but we know we share this commitment with the President, the Provost and all the dedicated and hardworking faculty members on this campus. Although we are concerned with the current item of business, we are encouraged by the current university conversations about student success even though it is a passionate one. There would be no such conversation if no one cared whether our students were able to graduate until they completed 120 hours or whether our course schedule is flexible enough to accommodate the busy lives of students who must work while striving to earn their degrees.

“The Board of Trustees has voted to move that the undergraduate curriculum be changed to a model that is dominated by three credit hour courses with an allowance for appropriate exemptions. We, as Deans, have listened carefully to all the arguments on this issue and support this decision. This we believe is the right course for the university at this particular moment in our history even though we share the understanding that this task is a daunting one. We therefore also recognize the legitimate faculty concerns about the difficulty of implementing these changes. We argue that adequate care must be taken in the process of conversion, adequate resources must be allocated and these changes must be implemented in the most thorough and complete manner. As Deans, we pledge to marshal our resources and put forth our best efforts to work not only with the administration but also the faculty to implement this conversion in the fairest way possible, and, most importantly, in a way that inflicts no damage on students who are completing their degrees during the transition process.

“As a university, we have made great strides in increasing the crucial measures of student success. The close cooperation between the administration and the faculty has lead, for example, to the institution of summer boot camps for remedial education, the creation of a math emporium, the improvements in advising and in particular what has been called intrusive advising. We are encouraged by the consensus that has heretofore

underpinned these efforts and call upon both the administration and faculty to continue the productive dialogue that has brought these measures of success to our campus.”

Student Government President Mr. Moatasem Al Bitar spoke next and stated that students do not have voting rights but he would share Student Government’s comments. He noted that this is the first time he has spoken about a faculty matter. He usually sits back and watches the discussions and then reports on what Student Government is doing. But he believes that at this time, Student Government needs to share a few things with Faculty Senate.

Mr. Al Bitar said, “I believe that we are all here because we care about CSU. We want this university to thrive and grow. I would personally hate for this university to reach this point. As a student and the student body President, I am speaking on behalf of my fellow SGA members. I think none of us can really deny what the administration has been doing for the past three or four years. The administration has been very supportive of many student initiatives and accomplished many things to support our university. Now whether we debate for or against the plans for student success, which is one item of many things that we debate every day, I do not believe it should reach this point of no confidence. I believe that there should be more chances for open and civilized dialogue. I believe that we are collectively to communicate our differences. We have a very distinct faculty body that cares about our students and we acknowledge that and we see that every day in the classroom. We come here to learn how meetings should be run and how to negotiate differences. Our faculty serves as our role models and for that sake I urge you to consider the possible ramifications should this resolution be passed today and how this will affect the image of our university. So please keep that in mind when you vote today.”

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O’Grady noted that President Berkman mentioned several times that governance should come down and shared governance should go through chairs. She stated that she is a Department Chair of the Art Department and she is also an elected Faculty Senator. She is a full professor and has spent her time here thinking about pedagogy curriculum for over a decade now. She wanted to share a little window into the mechanics of some of what’s happening. She stated that the President mentioned something from last April until this November when the Trustees imposed a mandate; so it was nine months time. March 18 was when we were told that the Trustees mandated undergraduate conversion. She was looking through her email and she had an email from her Dean’s Office entitled, “Complete Undergraduate Conversion.” She noted that we have been told, and she is a department chair, and maybe it’s just her college, but she thinks that everyone has been told that we are to convert our complete undergraduate curriculum. That means all of our faculty members should be working on this and have it completed by May 10 or by May 17, (we have a bonus week when faculty are not on contract if they need extra time). Dr. Visocky-O’Grady noted that as her colleagues around the table have mentioned, it’s simply an impossible task and it is being done too hastily. Some of the mechanics of this are that there is the illusion that Chairs should be a part of the discussion but she has been to multiple cabinet level meetings where Chairs have said that this is happening too quickly. She knows from the

last two Faculty Senate meetings, even when we didn't have the Board resolution, there were questions about how this would affect graduate programs because they have classes cross-listed with undergraduate. So she would propose that we have been having discussion of all of these issues all year long if not into previous years. She has great empathy and understanding with what the administration is doing to work on behalf of student success, and she does believe that there is a great deal of pressure from the State level for us to be a part of the three credit hour State system. She can report that in her department all year long her faculty have been actively working at the faculty Curriculum Committee level and the department level to consider revising voluntarily the Art Department's curriculum to three credit hours. However, too often this is being portrayed as faculty digging their feet in and saying, "No way; we are not going to three and that is not going to happen in my department; that's not what I see happening in all of the discussions at the cabinet level in my college; that's not what I see with my colleagues from other colleges. The mechanics that are problematic is how quick we need to do this is in the emails that come down from the top which are the problem." Dr. Visocky-O'Grady stated that she knows somebody has to set deadlines, but the deadlines start from above rather than how we can all work towards a common goal. She added that she would thoughtfully say that nobody came to the table today feeling good about issues; nobody came to the meeting last week when we discussed feeling like we had no more recourse but to entertain this no confidence vote. She believes that Cleveland State, with this vote, will still be a wonderful place for people to go to school and that the vote we are considering actually says that faculty care enough to be very active in our governance and it is a necessary check and balance. It doesn't say that faculty won't work with the administration; it simply says the faculty feel their voice has not been heard thus the lack of confidence. With that, Dr. Visocky-O'Grady renewed the motion to call the question.

Senator Tebeau seconded the motion to call the question.

Senate President Goodell stated that it has been moved and seconded to call the question. She asked if Senate wished to do a voice vote on calling the question. Several Senators replied, "No." That response means that Senators will decide whether we are going to vote on the vote of no confidence. The Senate will then vote on the vote of no confidence if we decide to vote on a vote of no confidence.

Senator Jeff Karem called a point of clarification. He stated that those with parliamentary experience can correct him but if we are going to call the question there has to be a two-thirds majority so it cannot be by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell then stated that Senators need to vote by ballot.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy advised the Senators to use the ballot that was passed out earlier.

Dr. Goodell noted that if Senators vote yes, that means that we will end the debate and we have to vote yes by a two-thirds majority to end the debate. If that passes, then

the debate is finished and we will then vote on the question which is to vote on the resolution of no confidence.

Senator James Wilson stated that he hates to additionally stir the pot but he is going to. He said that he never quite understood the difference between objection and table and he thinks that may have confused his arguments so he is going to make a motion to table in order to put off the vote of no confidence until next fall.

Dr. Goodell stated that this cannot be done until Senate votes on calling the question. She added that once Senators vote on deciding to call the question or not, if we are calling the question, then Professor Wilson can move to table it. She asked Senators to vote in favor or against calling the question on their ballots.

For clarification, Senator Raymond Henry asked if Senate has to call the question in order to table it or do we not call the question and then continue discussion and then the motion can be made to table it. Dr. Goodell noted that Senator Henry was correct – once the discussion actually ends.

Dr. Goodell stated that there is a procedural question about whether Professor Wilson can move to table after we vote to call the question.

Professor Wilson stated that it was important for the opportunity to table the motion somewhere towards the end and now it seems to him that this should be the case.

Dr. Goodell stated that “Roberts Rules of Order” are clear. If we had approved calling the question, then we must vote on the question immediately.

An unidentified Senator asked if it was possible to interject anything at this point. Dr. Goodell replied that it was not possible. We have called the question and it is being voted on and we are waiting for the results.

An unidentified Senator stated that he was not sure people understood what they were voting for – the vote of no confidence.

Senator Debbie Jackson remarked that we may need to revote then because that is not what we were voting on.

Senator Wilson said that he voted to call the question. He didn’t realize he was destroying his opportunity to table.

Senate President Goodell asked, “Before the Senate Secretary is finished counting votes, can we move to revote?”

Senate President Goodell stated that before she announces the vote, she would like to ask Senators if they were given an opportunity to change their vote at this time because they think they voted in error, when they may have voted yes to end the debate

and call the question immediately, to please raise their hands. Four Senators raised their hands.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy remarked that four votes would not make a difference. Right now the vote is 33 in favor and six against.

Dr. Goodell stated that even now when we have to vote on the motion, after that motion is voted on, we can still vote to table the question which means that we would bring it back to the floor at the next Senate meeting after the votes are counted.

Senator Steven Cory stated, "Only if it doesn't pass, right?"

Dr. Goodell again stated that if the motion fails, then we can vote to table it and bring it back next time. If the motion passes, then it passes.

An unidentified Senator stated that we are then going to vote on whether or not we support a vote of no confidence. If that fails, then we can vote on whether we want to bring it back... Dr. Goodell replied that she was correct. So tabling it would mean that we could vote to bring it back next time if it fails. The unidentified Senator then noted that the first vote is a vote of no confidence and the second vote is, if that fails, to bring it back. Dr. Goodell stated that this is correct.

Senator Wilson remarked that he doesn't know "Roberts Rules of Order" but it just seems to him that normally people table before they vote on a motion, not after. He added that it really defeats the purpose. The whole idea is to avoid for the very purposes he originally suggested and that gives us all time to reconsider what we are doing. After the vote is over, one way or another, to table doesn't serve the functions designed to serve. Again, this strikes him based upon all experience in the past as undermining the motion to table so he strongly disagrees with this particular approach.

Professor Henry said that he agrees with the points about tabling this because part of this vote is chastising the administration for moving in haste and he is not sure that is not what we are doing as well.

Senate Vice President Sheldon Gelman stated that it is in fact true that we can vote now on a motion to table.

Senator Jeremy Genovese commented that if the debate has been closed by ordering the previous question, which is what we have done, or by the expiration of the time to which debate was limited, then up until the moment of taking the last vote under the order, the question still before the assembly can be laid on the table. So that means that we have the opportunity to table it before the final vote.

Dr. Goodell stated that if someone moves to table it, we can vote right now to table the motion of no confidence. Senator Wilson moved to lay it on the table. Dr. Goodell asked for a second to the motion. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Goodell stated that Senate now needs to do a ballot on whether we are going to table the resolution. She noted that before Senate votes let us continue discussion on the tabling of the motion.

An unidentified Senator asked, "If Senate votes yes, what does that mean and if we vote no what does that mean?" Dr. Goodell replied that if we vote yes to table the motion, then that means it can come back. If we do not vote on it today, it can come back at the next Senate meeting if someone votes to bring it back.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones asked if the motion of no confidence is tabled until the next meeting, does language need to be incorporated in the motion to table. She added that she didn't think Senate wanted to table it indefinitely.

Dr. Goodell agreed that we don't want to table the motion indefinitely. She stated that the amendment is to table the motion on the vote of no confidence until the next Senate meeting.

Senator Genovese stated that a procedural point in "Roberts Rules of Order" says that a motion to lay it on the table is un-debatable because its legitimate purpose would be defeated if it was debatable.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray asked for further clarification. So this vote right now is, we vote yes if we want to table the motion until the next Faculty Senate meeting, or no if we do not want to table the motion. If this motion fails, then do we vote on the motion of no confidence? She noted that she was not sure what we do if it fails. If no discussion the next vote is the no confidence vote. If this passes, then obviously the vote of no confidence is off the table for now and we will revisit this at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator William Bowen stated that he understands the motion is still on the table. If this passes, it is on the table; it is not off the table; it stays on the table. Dr. Goodell added, "Until the next meeting."

Senator Berlin Ray noted that it is on the table for the next meeting.

Dr. Duffy stated to Senators, "To help the Secretary, please mark you ballots off or on."

Senator Berlin Ray remarked that this may help the Secretary but she doesn't think it is helpful for the Senators.

Dr. Goodell asked Senators to please mark their ballots for tabling or against tabling. If Senators are for the motion to table the voting on the resolution until the next meeting, then write "for." If Senators are against tabling the motion and wish to vote on the motion of no confidence, then write "against."

An unidentified Senator asked if members should have a blank ballot. Dr. Goodell advised Senators to use the back of the printed paper ballot.

An unidentified Senator inquired if this vote is a fifty percent or two-thirds. Dr. Goodell replied that this is a fifty percent. Dr. Duffy replied that it is two-thirds. The unidentified Senator stated that he is asking the parliamentarian before the counting begins.

Dr. Goodell noted that if anyone writes yes or no, we will determine yes to be for and no to be against. So please write for tabling the motion or against tabling the motion. She added that this is a majority vote, not a two-thirds vote.

Senate Secretary Duffy announced that the vote is tied, 21 all. The motion failed.

An unidentified Senator inquired if the chair voted. Dr. Goodell noted that she did vote. So without her vote it is not a tie. She stated that for her it doesn't really matter. She will withdraw her vote or declare that the motion failed.

Dr. Sridhar stated that if it is a tie, the motion failed. Dr. Goodell said that he was correct. It doesn't matter if she withdraws her vote or not.

Senator Tebeau noted that it then failed so let's move on. He added that parliamentary procedure was established before the meeting so let's move on.

Dr. Goodell agreed that the parliamentary procedure was that we follow "Roberts Rules of Order." She noted that her vote had broken the tie because she thought that Senate Secretary Duffy had already voted so she voted but he had not voted so she shouldn't have voted. It would have passed by a simple majority, 20 to 21.

Dr. Duffy pointed out that it would have failed.

An unidentified Senator said no, it would mean against. Another unidentified Senator asked, "What does it mean?" Dr. Goodell replied that the outcome means against tabling. Dr. Duffy agreed. Dr. Goodell stated that the vote was against tabling it. She continued stating that Senate now has to vote on the motion. She added that "Roberts Rules of Order" clearly state that presiding officers can vote and it doesn't have to be the voting of a tie break but in this case it wouldn't matter.

Dr. Goodell then stated that Senate needs to vote on the motion at this time. She asked the Secretary to distribute ballots for the resolution of no confidence.

Senator Cory confirmed that Senate is now going to vote.

Dr. Goodell noted that this is a different ballot than the ballot Senators had before and it actually states what we are voting on. The other ballots were just blank pieces of paper that did not have titles on them.

Dr. Davis Jones said that she still had a question about what happened to the vote. An unidentified Senator replied that the vote was tied 21 to 21 with Dr. Goodell's vote. Dr. Goodell stated that if it is a tie, it is not a majority.

Dr. Bowen inquired if Dr. Goodell could choose not to withdraw her vote. Dr. Goodell replied that she is not withdrawing her vote.

An unidentified Senator inquired if the proxy votes were turned in. Dr. Goodell replied that if anyone left a proxy then those can be counted at this time.

An unidentified Senator inquired if this vote needs a majority or a two-thirds vote. Dr. Goodell replied that it is a simple majority.

At the conclusion of voting, Dr. Goodell reported that the vote is 31 votes in favor of passing the resolution of no confidence in the university administration, 11 votes against the resolution and one abstention. She noted that the motion of no confidence in the university administration as written has passed and this is the end of the discussion. She stated that a number of actions will occur as a result of the vote of no confidence. The resolution will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees and Dr. Duffy and she will discuss it in the upcoming Board meeting. Dr. Goodell stated that she is calling upon the administration to honor the agreements of February 28, 2013. The resolution will include the attachments and will be transmitted to the Board of Trustees and the faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees will present this resolution along with the statement at the next meeting of the Board of Trustees on May 20, 2013.

At this point, Dr. Goodell stated that Senate will take a short recess. She added that there is still business for the Senate. She asked Senators to be back at their seats in three minute.

[Upon reconvening the Senate meeting, the tape recorder refused to work; therefore, the remaining Minutes were recorded by hand.]

IV. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of February 6, 2013

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the meeting of February 6, 2013. Approval of the Minutes was moved, seconded and the Minutes of the Meeting of February 6, 2013 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

V. Announcements of Coming Elections

Senate President Goodell referred to page two of today's Agenda and announced the coming elections that will take place either at Faculty Senate on May 1, 2013 or by a

campus-wide election for the Academic Misconduct Review Committee in the fall. She encouraged everyone to nominate colleagues for these posts.

VI. University Curriculum Committee

A. Proposed Merger of Religious Studies and Philosophy (Report No. 65, 2012-2013)

Dr. Bill Kosteas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, noted that the first item from the UCC is the Proposed Merger of Religious Studies and Philosophy. He reported that the merger is administrative, not programmatic because the curricula of the two programs will remain separate and distinct. The new department name will be the Department of Philosophy and Comparative Religion.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed the merger of Religious Studies and Philosophy and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Merger of the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Approval of CVE 427 as a WAC General Education Course (For Informational Purposes Only) (Report No. 66, 2012-2013)

Dr. Kosteas reported that the second item from the UCC, approval of CVE 427 as a WAC General Education Course, is for informational purposes only.

There were no questions or comments and Faculty Senate received the For Informational Purposes Only item from the University Curriculum Committee.

VII. University Admissions and Standards Committee

Dr. James Marino, chair of the University Admissions and Standards Committee, stated that the committee has two items for Senate's approval and one item for Informational Purposes Only.

A. Proposed Addendum to Existing Partnership Agreement between CSU and LCCC: Major in Spanish (Report No. 67, 2012-2013)

Dr. Marino noted that the first item from the Committee is a proposed Addendum to the Existing Partnership Agreement between Cleveland State University and Lorain County Community College, establishing a joint BA in Spanish. He noted that the main revisions in the proposed Agreement include allowing students to take more classes toward the Spanish major at LCCC, either through CSU faculty teaching courses or through IVDL courses from Cleveland State. The Agreement requires all majors transferring from LCCC to take Spanish 402 at Cleveland State.

Dr. Joyce Mastboom, Associate Dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, pointed out that in the memo to Faculty Senate it states “Lake County Community College” and it should have stated “Lorain County Community College.” Dr. Marino apologized for the error and noted that his memo to Senate should have stated “Lorain County Community College.”

There being no further discussion, Senate President Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed an Addendum to the Existing Partnership Agreement between CSU and LCCC (Lorain County Community College) and asked Senators to vote. The proposed addendum was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Proposed revisions to International Admissions Requirements for MS in Chemical Engineering and MS in Electrical Engineering (Report No. 68, 2012-2013)

Dr. Marino next presented the Admissions and Standards Committee’s proposed revisions to International Admissions Requirements to the MS in Chemical Engineering and the MS in Electrical Engineering. He reported that the major points of the revisions are: to allow students with TOEFL scores below 550, but at or above the University minimum of 525, to be considered for admission on a case-by-case basis; and to permit the MS/CHE program and the MS/EE program to require students admitted with TOEFL scores under 550 to take additional ESL coursework as needed. Dr. Marino added that this permits the MS/CHE program and the MS/EE program additional flexibility in admitting students whose core technical qualifications are strong but whose English language skills requires further coursework.

Senator Chieh-Chen Bowen commented that it should have a different name – it is very old and not appropriate. It should state, “Use of 550 or equivalent.” Senator Sridhar said it should say, “Using equivalent score.”

Senator William Bowen noted that universities and colleges can raise standards on their own authority. The minimum standard university-wide would have to come to Faculty Senate which is a better practice to keep discussion of our curriculum.

There being no further discussion, Senate President Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed revisions to the International Admissions Requirements for the MS in Chemical Engineering and the MS in Electrical Engineering and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the International Admissions Requirements for the MS in Chemical Engineering and the MS in Electrical Engineering were approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Proposed Block Schedule (For Informational Purposes Only) (Report No. 69, 2012-2013)

Finally, Dr. Marino stated that the third item from the Admissions and Standards Committee, a proposed Block Schedule, is for Informational Purposes Only. He noted that the Admissions and Standards Committee was advised by the administration that this is an administrative policy matter.

Senator Tebeau commented that the administration's point of view leads to the conclusion that there will be a change in the schedule with no faculty input.

Dr. Marino pointed out that Vice Provost Carmen Brown said that this was approved in 1977 by Faculty Senate and that the administration will not be asking Senate to approve the block schedule.

An unidentified Senator inquired when this block schedule would go into effect. Senate President Goodell replied that it will be finalized by this year and will go into effect in fall 2014.

Senator Visocky-O'Grady stated that she would like the block schedule established by May since Department Chairs have to submit the AY 14-15 schedule early in the fall semester. Chairs will need time to work with the new system.

Senator Robert Krebs inquired if there were any options for fifteen minutes between classes.

Dr. Goodell stated that this is actually a different block schedule.

Dr. Marino noted that Admissions and Standards did forward the additional revised schedule to Senators.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady inquired if anyone was present at Senate to answer questions about this block schedule and to clarify this schedule on the percent of classes outside of the block schedule.

Dr. Goodell stated that allocation of rooms will now be taken over by Central Scheduling except for rooms they don't have control over.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady referred to the exceptions for different colleges and noted that Music and Communication have a priority in the Music & Communication Building.

Senator Sridhar commented on fifteen minute breaks between classes. If the University adheres to an hourly schedule, this will not fit the definition of credit hour which is 25 minutes.

Senator Ekelman stated that for the record, the revised block is how four credit hour courses are being scheduled. The way they are scheduled is that in the morning four days per week of 50 minutes are allocated. Five days per week of 50 minutes is not a

good way of teaching the material, and not convenient for our working students who are employed between 10/20 hours per week.

Dr. Marino commented that Tuesday/Thursday time blocks will also be scheduled similar to Monday/Thursday time blocks.

Senate President Goodell reported that the block schedule is currently being modeled based on Ohio State University's schedule with no modification.

Dr. Marino reported that he is meeting the week after next with the Registrar who has asked for one additional meeting.

Dr. Goodell stated that faculty should get back to their colleagues.

Senator Tebeau asked Senators to remind everybody that these guidelines are issues we should communicate with our colleagues.

VIII. Parking Rates and Citation Fees for 2013-2014 (Report No. 70, 2012-2013)

Senate President Goodell noted that the new Parking Rates and Citation Fees for 2013-2014 were provided to Senate for Informational Purposes Only because they have already been approved by the Board of Trustees. There was no discussion on the new rates and fees.

IX. Report of the President of the University

President Berkman left the meeting early; therefore, there was no report of the President of the University.

X. Report of the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Interim Provost George Walker left the meeting early; therefore, there was no report of the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer.

XI. Student Government Association Report

There was no report from the Student Government Association.

XII. New Business

Senate President Goodell inquired if there was any new business.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray indicated that she had a question on the process now that the vote of no confidence has passed. She asked, "How do faculty proceed – stay in panic mode?" Dr. Goodell replied that she didn't know the answer to Dr. Berlin Ray's question.

Dr. Bill Kosteas reported that he is trying to give President Berkman time to make changes – a good faith effort. He said that he is not hopeful. Initially, the administration came in with the proposed date of October 15 for all of the courses to be submitted to the College Committees and they would finish their work by December. He is trying to figure out a way to give the UCC and the departments and then the Provost time. He noted that he is not hopeful. We have to move forward – 2014 is the deadline.

Dr. Sridhar asked, “You mean after all approvals...?”

Dr. Kosteas noted that there may be a deadline for departments to submit all of their proposals. He doesn’t know what the compensation will be for the UCC to work throughout the summer.

Senator Delatte said that Colleges would be asked to delegate that to the Deans.

An unidentified Senator noted that there was an email from Dr. Teresa LaGrange.

Dr. Goodell stated that she doesn’t know what will happen. She is trying to figure out what the administration will do as a result of the vote of no confidence. She is in favor of writing a statement of what the faculty want. She doesn’t know how the administration will react. She really doesn’t know. She said she was surprised that the President was that angry with her.

Dr. Berlin Ray said that she is pleased with the faculty.

Senator Jeff Karem stated that the faculty need to comply with what their superiors ask them to do; expressing our concern is not an option.

Dr. Kosteas noted that public perception is not good right now. We are being portrayed badly in the public and that will hurt us. This is a backwards way to go. The only thing we can do is work our best and be cognizant that there may be some back and forth. We have to do this for our students.

Dr. Marino stated that it is noted for the record that the timeline is too hasty. We must do our best effort to make it on time. We should do our best and work as hard as we can to proceed.

Dr. C. C. Bowen commented that the time block schedule was a big concern for our students. CSU has 1,000 beds, assuming 100% occupancy, then we are about six percent residential. When looking at the time block, you are assuming between 7:00 AM to 2:00 PM, fifty minutes; some blocks are one hour and fifteen minutes. If we decide to adopt this schedule, we should let our students know about it since it will be a big impact on them. A lot of our students do not know what a block schedule is. She noted that President Berkman said the first classes don’t start till 8:30 AM. This block schedule will start at 7:00 AM. Let the students know that they need to let the administration know

what kind of impact this will have. She went on to say that this will not help student success. This information needs to be shared with the students, emphasized and feedback provided.

Dr. Tebeau said he was wondering about whether we want forums with the students. SGA has not done an adequate job in advising the students. They have had untested elections and surveys that indicate a lot of mixed opinions. At yesterday's meeting, we may not have been impressed with their conduct but maybe this body should take some responsibility.

Dr. Goodell suggested that collectively, a few people should be asked to draft a reasonable timeline. She noted that she will take the responsibility of being the main architect saying this is what we like.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady asked, "Did not we have this conversation?" We may go to fall of 2015.

Dr. Goodell stated that she didn't understand what people were being asked to do.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady said that they are being asked to do the entire undergraduate curriculum by May 10 unless we want an exemption.

Dr. Goodell asked, "And the syllabi?"

Dr. Kosteas stated that if proposing a new course then, it also requires including the syllabus. If you are changing a course, you also need to change the relevant syllabus and explain how you are changing it. When converting to a WAC course, you will have to provide a new syllabus. For most courses, you just need to explain the changes.

Dr. Ekelman noted that you cannot divorce the elements of your courses.

Dr. Goodell stated that if the faculty have specific comments, they should please get them to her as soon as possible and she will try to put something together and present it.

Dr. Kosteas stated that anything the UCC does is advisory only. If you put a dominant model for something other than three credits, you will have a hard time selling that. We have no time to discuss it. It takes two weeks to plan and then have one day to present.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady stated that the faculty are not under contract during the summer.

Dr. Kosteas noted that the faculty have a few weeks prior to fall semester. Even if we start in August, then the College Curriculum Committees have September, October and November if you change the end date to 2015. You can get everything done by

2015. We can do it in a reasonable fashion faster than Ohio State but this falls on deaf ears.

Dr. Goodell stated that if we propose something and it is not listened to, then we know everything is lost. Today was the last opportunity to discuss this issue. It will not be what we want – it will not be carefully considered.

Dr. Karem commented, moving forward and continuing this discussion, departments will provide by a certain date their version of what the department's dominant three credit hour programs are. He added that he is concerned about the time here.

Dr. Ekelman stated that if Dr. Goodell does draft something, she should please send it to all Senators.

Dr. Goodell said that she would work with Dr. Kosteas, consult with department chairs and put something together.

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business. There being no further business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel