

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

**MARCH 6, 2013**

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

Al Bitar, R. Berkman, M. Bond, Caspary, Sadlek, Stoll.

**ABSENT:** Jayanti, M. Kaufman, Meier, Rashidi, Sridhar, Talu.

Artbauer, Boise, C. Brown, Drnek, E. Hill, Jain, Karlsson, LeVine, V. Lock, Markovic, McHenry, Parry, Percy, Sawicki, Spademan, G. Thornton, Triplett, Vandemark, G. Walker, B. White, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Kosteas.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M.

**I. Approval of the Agenda for the meeting of March 6, 2013**

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

**II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of December 5, 2012**

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the meeting of December 5, 2012. Senator Jeff Karem moved and Senator Jim Marino seconded the motion and the Minutes of the meeting of December 5, 2012 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

### **III. Report of the Faculty Senate President**

Senate President Goodell welcomed everyone today which seems so tantalizingly close to spring! Since the last meeting, there has been quite a lot of discussion about the proposed changes to the structure of our curriculum. She said that as some members know, she met with President Berkman and Provost Walker on February 13, 2013 about this issue. She first asked both of them to summarize what the intent of the proposed changes were. President Berkman stated that it is to better provide schedules for students so there is not so much time wasted during each day to reduce the credit hour load on students and to better align CSU with the rest of Ohio and the United States.

Dr. Goodell reported that they also discussed the administration and Board's reaction to the vote of the Senate in support of the University Curriculum Committee's recommendations taken at our last Senate meeting. President Berkman assured her that it had always been his intention to forward the UCC report to the Board. He also reminded her that at the last Senate meeting, he stated that he would do his best to make sure that the timeline given in the first resolution in the fall of 2014 was flexible if he felt that students would be harmed in the implementation process. She then requested that Dr. Stephen Duffy and she have an opportunity to meet with a small number of Board members before the next public meeting of the Board on March 18, 2013 to make their case in person and he agreed that this would be a good idea. They subsequently met February 28 with Chairman Rawson and Mr. Moreno, chair of the Academic Affairs Subcommittee, along with the President, the Provost and Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange. They discussed the UCC report (which they had both received and read) and other issues that had been reported in the *Plain Dealer* and student newspaper. Both of the Board members expressed their gratitude to the faculty for all of their hard work and assured us that they valued and needed our guidance and input on curriculum matters.

Dr. Goodell noted that they also discussed what the final resolution for the March 18 Board of Trustees meeting might look like and President Berkman offered to discuss that with her as soon as possible. She talked with him on Monday afternoon, and while she has not seen a draft (which would be well outside normal Board operating procedures) she is confident that the resolution will address the ideas that were commonly understood by Dr. Duffy and she after the aforementioned February 28 meeting with senior administrators and Board members. These ideas are that the University will move towards a dominant three credit hour model; that we should begin this process as soon as possible allowing for discretion by the President with the timeline to ensure that students are not harmed; and that a regular report on our progress will be sent to the Academic Affairs Subcommittee. She is sure that we will have more discussions about this after the next Board meeting when the resolution is presented and depending upon the outcome of that vote.

Dr. Goodell reported that another issue that is generating a lot of discussion around campus is the proposed changes to the block schedule and room allocations policies. She was forwarded a new policy document that had been circulated by the Provost last Friday afternoon to department chairs and to deans and associate deans. The

policy changes concerned the central control of rooms on campus that will come into effect this coming fall 2013. Also proposed is a new block schedule that would be implemented in fall 2014. She reminded the administration through a series of emails this week that there are two committees that play an advisory role in the scheduling of classes and room allocations. The Admissions and Standards Committee charge includes the following statements: 5) to act as an advisory council to the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and Services upon all problems arising in connection with his or her duties. 6) to work with the administration in all matters concerning the academic calendar and the scheduling of classes. In addition, the charge to the Committee on Academic Space includes: 2) to evaluate the suitability of proposed classroom space for academic use; and 3) to oversee policies on classroom allocation and evaluate their effectiveness. Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange has assured her that she and the Provost are in complete agreement that faculty need to be consulted, and that these discussions will take place. Dr. Goodell stated that she hopes this means that the policy that was circulated on Friday is really only a draft policy that will be finalized after faculty feedback (and students' feedback as well) has been sought through the appropriate channels and given due consideration

Dr. Goodell stated that last week, as everyone knows, the University has been conducting a search for a new Provost and it is down to the final stretch. Four candidates came to campus in February, and the President is now faced with a very tough choice. She hopes that faculty were able to attend some of the open forum meetings. They were very informative. All of the candidates she thought put on a great forum for the faculty and students and other campus representatives that were present. She noted that we had four candidates that could easily have done the job so it's up to the President now to inform us when a decision has been made and the candidate accepts.

At this point, Dr. Goodell asked if there were any questions on her report. She then invited Dr. Joel Lieske to tell us a little bit about the most recent Ohio Faculty Council meeting he attended as our representative.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray asked for a little clarification if possible. In talking about some flexibility with the GenEds being instituted in 2014, she asked if that was correct.

Dr. Goodell responded that the statement she understood to be made was that there would be flexibility with the timeline if students appeared to be going to be harmed by the implementation timeline.

Senator Berlin Ray asked, "In instituting the GenEds?" Dr. Goodell replied, "Yes." Dr. Berlin Ray then asked if that could affect the structure of the loss if that is going to be put into place in 2014 and we haven't quite moved there.

Dr. Goodell stated that Dr. Berlin Ray was asking whether the block schedule changes will take affect in 2014 even if the GenEd conversion doesn't happen at that point. That's something that has not been discussed. The interaction between those two

things is something she had asked Dr. Carmen Brown about at the last meeting and they have been having discussions about where that whole process is. The AdAstra scheduling software is being tested and will be implemented, so a lot of these things have been going on simultaneously and she doesn't think there have been a great many discussions about how all of these initiatives interact. She is hoping that this will occur in the very near future.

Dr. Berlin Ray commented that she hates to have new blocks put into effect that are a less flexible timeframe.

Dr. Goodell thanked Dr. Berlin Ray for her feedback. She noted that Ms. Janet Stimple, University Registrar, will be going to the Academic Space Committee meeting this week and giving them some information about how the block schedule that was circulated was arrived at and that the Admissions and Standards Committee received her request the other day to look at that issue. Ms. Stimple is also a sitting member of that committee and she will also provide the University Admissions and Standards Committee with some more information on the blocks. She noted that a choice of one is not really a choice, so she hopes that we will have an opportunity to discuss properly options that may be better suited to Cleveland State particularly given the diversity of our campus, of our students, and the programs that we offer.

Senator Stephen Cory wondered what procedure would there be for getting faculty feedback on the block scheduling.

Professor Goodell responded that the procedures go through the committees and each of the committees she mentioned have representatives from each college so she would assume that it would be incumbent upon those members to collect the feedback from their individual colleges or, at the discretion of the chair of that committee, they may decide to do some kind of faculty survey or hold an open meeting or something like that. She mentioned there is no such thing as too much information when we are going through changes like this so the more open communication we can have the better for everyone. And the more opportunities for input and feedback so that we make decisions that informed and not rushed is most important.

Senator Cory asked what committees Dr. Goodell had mentioned. Dr. Goodell replied that the first is the Committee on Academic Space, which has a meeting scheduled for Friday, March 8 and Professor Judith Ausherman is the chair of that committee. The second committee is the University Admissions and Standards Committee. Senator Jim Marino, chair of Admissions and Standards, noted that he will be scheduling a meeting the first week after spring break. Dr. Goodell stated that if anyone has any questions about the committees they can always email her or Violet Lunder.

Senator Beth Ekelman stated that she is concerned about the rate of the GenEd exemptions or the timelines that were given to ask for exemptions. She knows many people only had a week to get their exemptions in to their deans so that the deans could

compile their list. She could speak for Health Sciences. They are changing their five credit upper division writing course to three credits and they realized after thinking it over a little bit that this would affect their honors program. So, she thinks that we really need to slow this down because we all know there are domino effects and things can happen. You change one thing here and it may affect something else. She added that Health Sciences would appreciate it if things are slowed down a little bit because they need to think things through.

Dr. Goodell stated that everyone has a similar sentiment; the speed at which they are trying to do the conversion was a significant road block for gaining support around the campus and actually making it happen in a way that would not harm the students. She added that we certainly don't want to do that.

Professor Barbara Hoffman noted that the acoustics in this meeting room are not very good. She was not sure that she understood clearly but she thinks she heard Dr. Goodell say that the resolution that the Board will be voting in favor of says that we will be moving toward a three credit dominant model and asked if that was correct.

Dr. Goodell replied that it does not define what three credit dominant means and that is where they (the Board) needs our help. So her advice to the faculty will be if their resolution is approved, to do your home work very carefully; to look around the State and the nation at other similar programs and the way you feel that your courses, which are currently four credit courses, should remain four credit courses because they are similar to other universities, then you make that case. So there will be exceptions where there is warranted need for exceptions but that would be incumbent upon anyone in any program to make that case. If you make a strong enough case, then the exemption will be considered.

Dr. Barbara Hoffman then asked if the University Curriculum Committee's report did not make the case against a three credit dominant model.

Dr. Goodell replied that she could safely say that. The Board considers that it is in our best interests because of the external pressures upon us mostly, and also because of the students' internal pressures for their scheduling of classes during the day, that we will be moving to the three credit model. She went on to say that is what has been proposed in the resolution. It may not pass. She doesn't know; she cannot answer that; she is not the Board. She is just an observer on the Board.

Dr. Hoffman then commented that this body voted against such a conversion. Dr. Goodell replied that it did.

Professor Cory asked what is the meaning of faculty governance if the UCC studies it very carefully, surveys the students, issues their report that it is not in the best interests of the students to convert to a dominant three credit model and then this is completely ignored.

Dr. Goodell replied that it is called shared governance, not faculty governance and she has been reminded of that. She also has reminded the university that at times, particularly regarding the time block schedule and room allocation issues, it goes both ways. Yes, she agrees with Dr. Cory. She added that on this occasion our advice has not been heeded but when it comes to decisions about the operation of the university, the Board has the final word. As she said many times to her colleagues, 999 times out of a thousand, they take our word; they take our advice; they follow what we have suggested in this instance.

Senator Cheryl Bracken commented that she doesn't understand why we are all sitting here and giving our advice and putting time and effort into things if we are just not going to be listened to. Students filled out a survey and gave their opinions about what they want in terms of three credits and they were not in favor of it. We voted at our last meeting to support the UCC's report that said they were not willing at this point in time to convert to three credits and everything that Dr. Goodell has now said basically suggests otherwise. Senator Bracken stated that she doesn't understand why all of us are spending our time and giving our energy if we are not going to have a voice in terms of faculty governance.

Senate Vice President Sheldon Gelman stated that there is more to the story regarding the meeting Dr. Goodell just described and that Dr. Goodell and Dr. Duffy recently reported on a meeting to the Academic Steering Committee. He should also say that a draft resolution was prepared for Academic Steering's consideration which didn't go anywhere because of the outcome as Steering understood of the February 28 meeting. He doesn't think that Dr. Goodell mentioned that the Board's resolution, as we currently understand it, will call for meetings between the Provost and the chairman of the University Curriculum Committee and the relevant Board Committee. He noted that Dr. Goodell did say that the meaning of a dominant three credit model remains unclear. It may well be that the Board will finally adopt a plan which is inconsistent with what the Curriculum Committee recommended. But it is at least possible that they won't or at least that a very substantial change in our curriculum which is produced by what the Senate has already voted, namely the changes to the GenEds and the 120 credit hour change will in fact land us in a place where there is a dominant three credit model. He for one was heartened by what he heard about the February 28 meeting. It does not guarantee an outcome that's consistent with the Curriculum Committee recommendation but it really doesn't preclude it either. He thinks the opportunity that the Curriculum Committee chair will have to meet directly with the Board and work with the administration in advance of those meetings is a very significant development. He thinks it is too soon to say what the outcome of this process will be. He noted that we are not where he hoped we would have been this past September but we are not where we were last month either. Again, he is personally grateful for the changes that have been made in the process.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones commented that along the line of what Professor Gelman said, she thinks that part of the issue is what does a dominant three credit model mean? Does that mean that 51% of the undergraduate courses are three credit courses

and that is attainable from just changing the General Education courses but some of the data that was originally provided regarding how many of our courses were four credit hours was faulty and that it did not really reflect the percentage of our courses that were already three credit hour courses. Again, if dominant means more than half, it is achievable without changing the entire undergraduate curriculum.

Senator Berlin Ray commented that the dominant three credit hour model is confusing her. She hears it referred to as meaning the GenEds and, when we change the GenEds to three credits, then we have the dominant three credit model. Now she hears it being referred to as all of our programs are going to be converted to three credits to meet with other universities.

Dr. Goodell responded that it was actually part of the Complete College Ohio Task Force recommendation, i.e., that Ohio universities will align with each other in terms of their curriculum structure and offerings. She noted that we have to have our report by December of this year as to how we are going to achieve those mandates in the Complete College Ohio report. This is part of the move towards a University System of Ohio and it is a force over which we have very little control. She might say though that she knows that the President has been to Columbus on a number of occasions and met with the Governor and discussed with him how Cleveland State faculty and staff are among the first to adopt the 120 model and that we are actively working to reform the other classes because we were firmly in the Governor's sight in terms of being out of sync. Whether that is a true perception or not, in this case perception is everything. The Governor and others in Columbus see us as being the problem child, the one out in left field. This decision is not one that is taken lightly nor is it one that we can actually avoid. The forces outside of the university are causing a lot of the pressure that we are feeling.

Professor Berlin Ray stated that she didn't mean to be flippant about it. Her concern is where we are ending up and can we possibly do it in a serious way, which is what the UCC report was all about and that's a concern.

Dr. Goodell replied that she is sure, as she said to others many times, the students come here to get a degree so that they can lead productive lives and get on with it. They don't come here to fail and they don't come here to drop out. They come here to get a degree; it's incumbent upon all of us to make sure that they do and so all of these initiatives taken in the last three years to improve student success are directed towards that goal. She doesn't think that anyone is doing or saying these things because they want to just annoy the faculty or set the students up for failure. That is not the reason, and she is convinced of that. There are a lot of good people working very hard across this entire university – everyone in this room to be counted among them.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy reported on what he heard from other individuals who were at the February 28 meeting. The statement he heard from Board Chairman Rawson is that we are going to get from "here to there" meaning "here" is a four credit hour dominant model to "there", a three credit hour dominant model. He noted that when he asked Mr. Rawson where is there, he said, "Well the faculty will help define where

there is.” Dr. Duffy stated that what he heard from the meeting was that UCC will work with the Board Academic Sub Committee and the Provost’s Office to help define where there is and we will do it in a measured fashion. We will start with the freshmen cohort of 2014 because the GenEds will be in place by 2014 and it was felt that the freshmen would have access to the three credit hour courses from the GenEds to start the process off and then each cohort after that freshmen class of 2014 we would add more and more curriculum. It would give us time to first of all define where there is meaning the dominant three credit hour model and it would give us time to put the various degree programs in place. The Board expressed the desire to have the planning process wrapped up by fall of 2016. He went on to say that the issue in his mind is Columbus sees us having a retention and graduation problem. When they look at Cleveland State and make a comparison to the other public universities around the State one of the things that leaps out to the individuals in Columbus is we have a dominant four credit hour model. So the reaction is to move from a dominant four credit hour model to a dominant three credit hour model and with the intent of helping the retention and graduation problem. He indicated that’s what he heard. He noted that as Professor Gelman said he is comfortable now with the process. We are back contributing to how the process is going to take place but, from what he heard from the Board, we are not going to stand pat. The four credit hour dominant curriculum is not a stand pat situation if the Board wants us moving off that issue.

Senator Mark Tebeau indicated there are two issues that appear to be repeating that he would like some clarity on. The first is the impression that the dominant four credit hour model here is the impediment to student graduation somewhere outside of this university. Dr. Duffy noted that this was a good assessment. Dr. Tebeau stated that the UCC report identified that it was clear that the four to three conversion does not appear to have any positive impact on students. There has been no evidence presented to this body or anywhere else, even in that *Plain Dealer* article that four to three will improve student retention. He has yet to see evidence of that. He is willing to be persuaded, but there is no evidence. He thinks that point apparently is not leaving this room and that is of great frustration to many of us. That doesn’t mean that you don’t convert from four to three; it’s merely a statement that this will not of itself improve graduation rates. There is no evidence of that and in fact we have an argument that it might harm the students. So that is one frustration here of the faculty that is very interested in student success.

Senator Tebeau stated that the second issue is this mystical or some magic number that is dominant and we now get to participate in that conversation. He said he is glad we get to participate in that conversation. But, he would actually like to know what that dominant three credit unit means to the administration, to the Board and what they think the magic number is.

Dr. Goodell responded that they don’t know and that has been told to us many times. It is up to us to define that.

Dr. Tebeau commented, “If we come back and say it is 33%, they will say fine.” Dr. Duffy said no. To be realistic, and this also came up in the discussion at that meeting,



every degree granting program should look at what's being done in other degree granting programs in public universities across Ohio and move to a situation where, if you held your program up to everybody else's in the mirror, you couldn't tell the difference. He thinks that is driving what he heard on February 28.

Dr. Tebeau replied that he appreciates that but there surely is a point at which we will say this is what we think it is. He and many of his colleagues would like to hear that the Board and the administration will respect that point.

Professor Duffy stated that coming out of that meeting nothing tells him that they won't. He added that you have to take that on face value.

Professor Tebeau said that he appreciates Dr. Duffy going to that meeting and sharing this. He just wanted to cut to the point.

Dr. Duffy stated that the point is we are getting beat over the head with a political club externally and he would do things to take the political club out of the other individual's hands and if it means making our programs aligned with other programs in the State of Ohio that is reasonable.

Senator Cory stated we have information as to how our students compare academically to some of the other schools because we are an urban campus and it seems to him that our students have some issues or problems that maybe aren't as prevalent in other schools. He asked if this is just his perception or is there some truth to that, and if there is truth to it, why is that not being considered.

Dr. Duffy said that he would allow President Ronald Berkman to address that issue. His sense is that yes, they recognize that to the extent that they recognize that in Columbus but President Berkman will have to address that.

President Ronald Berkman stated that if you looked at the data for the peer institutions in Northeast Ohio and you looked at ACT scores and GPA, average age of the entrants and other criteria you would find almost no material difference between Akron, Youngstown, Cleveland State and to a lesser extent, Kent State. So, the answer is no, our students do not. Then if you go and compare the students also to Central State or Shawnee, some of the other institutions throughout the State, again, they have similarly if not more challenged at risk students. There is actually an at risk index that the Board of Regents calculates which looks at these aggregate factors by campus and does an at risk index; it is part of the formula for how universities are funded so it is supposed to balance the table, e.g., if you are dealing with students who are an average of twenty-six years old and returning to school, your SSI formula is weighted differently to compensate theoretically for the services and the extra effort that is needed to educate this type of student. But in terms of Northeast Ohio, the institutions he is talking about really have comparable student bodies. As a matter of fact, we are edging towards, in terms of Akron and Youngstown, in terms of median ACT scores and GPA, we are headed towards the top of that group.

Senator William Bowen wondered if that is true also in terms of the percentage of our students that are commuters. President Berkman replied, "Yes."

Professor Duffy noted that he would like to follow up to Professor Tebeau's question about whether we are going to be taken seriously or not. He stated that the first step in really determining that will be the language in the Board resolution. When we see the language, we will have a really good idea of whether the meeting we had on February 28 will bear fruit. He has no reason not to believe that we are moving down the right path after that meeting on Thursday. He added that we now have a solid voice in the process but we really won't see concrete evidence of that until we see the Board resolution.

Professor Charles Hersch stated that it would be better if we have more say in what dominant means. He thinks we should be clear that the University Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate voted not to have the dominant model be three credits. We should not kid ourselves that somehow because we have some say in what dominant means that somehow we are somehow being taken into consideration.

Professor Gelman said that he wanted to briefly compare where we were at our last Senate meeting with where we are now. We were completely shut out of the process at the last meeting and it was very clear, so it seemed, that the Board would adopt a resolution which made the Provost Office's current vision of the curriculum the one that would control. He doesn't think that is where we are now. There is no guarantee that the outcome will be one that the majority of the people in this room or maybe anybody in the room would like, but we don't know what the outcome will be. He thinks it is too soon to bemoan the outcome when it could possibly be quite favorable. Under the changes we have already made to move from that 43% of our sections being four credits to something like 27 or 28%, which is not far from where Akron is, he asked, "Is that going to be acceptable to the Board of Trustees?" He said that he doesn't know how many more sections will have to change before it's acceptable. He doesn't know but he also doesn't think that anybody knows. He personally thinks it is too soon again to regret the outcome because we don't have an outcome yet. And, on the question of process, there have been very welcome changes and the opportunity for a faculty committee together with the Provost's Office to meet directly with the relevant Board committee is unprecedented. He again said that he can't think of a single instance when anything like that has happened before. He does think that we will be heard but we don't know what the outcome will be. He said he is really delighted with the process and again, when the time comes to assess the results of it, that will be the time to do it.

Dr. Goodell stated that Professor Joel Lieske will give us some idea of what is going on at the Ohio Faculty Council.

Professor Lieske reported on what happened at the February 8, 2013 meeting of the Ohio Faculty Council in Columbus. He noted that they used to meet in a spacious conference room on the thirty-sixth floor of the State office building overlooking the

State Capital and looking out to the Ohio State campus. He noted that this time they met on the sixth floor of the Education building at the corner of Main and Front Streets. He understands that this Friday the Council will meet in the basement. So like most Ohioans and the rest of the country, we seem to be downwardly mobile. In brief, their discussion revolved around three issues. First were the warning sirens that are being sounded on the campuses of Toledo and Bowling Green. Dr. Lieske stated that the second is the growing levels of debt and debt service that are occurring around the State. He noted that the third is the erosion and loss of faculty governance.

Dr. Lieske commented that before we get started on these issues, however, the Vice Chair from Wright State briefed the Council on what he felt was the good news we could find in Governor Kasich's budget. First, even though higher education is the most formidable item in the budget, mainly because it lacks a politically active constituency, it is slated for a 1.9% increase. The Council also learned that there will be a two percent cap on tuition increases. In addition, there will be no State mandated teaching workloads. As many people know, Toledo is facing deep cuts as administrators look to close a projected short-fall that could be as high as \$36 million. According to the Toledo representative, it could be as low as \$24 million or as high as \$40 million. Apparently they don't have a Tim Long or Bonnie Kalnazy to advise them. Dr. Lieske noted that he likes to praise Bonnie and Tim in public. He stated that full-time faculty teaching loads will be increased to twelve credit hours per semester; part-time and visiting appointments will be eliminated, and minimum class sizes will be raised – thirty for undergraduates, fifteen for Masters students and eight for doctoral. The Provost's Office at Toledo is now assigning workloads. It used to be assigned by chairs in consultation with the deans. At Bowling Green the administration announced that budget shortfalls will force it to cut the size of its faculty by eleven percent and eliminate one hundred full-time faculty jobs. According to the Bowling Green representative, their Provost wants to cut the number of instructors and raise class sizes but the cuts are expected to come largely from retirement, attrition and termination of part-time contracts.

Dr. Lieske asked, "What is behind the financial turmoil that is engulfing both institutions?" He noted that in one newspaper article, Toledo's Faculty Senate President laid some of the blame on the priority the university had placed on capital projects. In the face of many budget shortfalls and enrollment increases, she said, "More resources should be used to support the academic mission and invest in our students and give them more scholarships." In his report, the Toledo representative pointed to some \$450 million in construction costs that had been paid off including some \$330 million that had been assumed in the last seven years. Later in the meeting, the representative from Akron noted that what was happening at Toledo is also happening around the State. Dr. Lieske went on to say that they are still trying to understand these developments and why they are happening. Some of the committee members feel it is because of the bad economy and the corrosive effects of free trade and economic downturn for the job prospects of our students. Others pointed to Republican reformers in Columbus who want State colleges and universities to be more accountably responsive to the economic and social needs of Ohioans. Some others decided that it is the growing centralization and decision-making authority of their Presidents, Provosts and Boards of Trustees. One

cynic thought that a little bit of old fashioned banality and greed might also be responsible.

Dr. Lieske commented that he would leave it to people to decide what it all means and what, if anything, people want to do about it. In any case, Dr. Lieske said he wanted to thank Faculty Senate again for the opportunity to serve and represent the Senate in Columbus. He added that it has put him in touch with some of the finest and most dedicated people he has met during his forty some years in the academy. Like our entire faculty, they love the academy and all that it stands for. He added that it is because all of us see ourselves as the guardians and the sentinels of respected institutions from which we receive no material reward, at least in terms of workload. He stated that he hopes our Provost proves him wrong.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones noted that Dr. Lieske said that higher education does not have a political constituency. Dr. Lieske replied that a statement was made that unlike the military budget at the federal level – there is no firm constituency of notice and no lobbying.

Dr. Jones stated that she disagrees that there is no constituency; you can organize a political action committee or something. She added that more needs to be done to mobilize the constituency that she thinks does exist – students, faculty and staff, etc.

Senate President Goodell noted that it is nothing like the K-12 constituents that would support K-12 education because everyone attends K-12 schools – and all parents are constituents. Every kid is compelled to go to K-12 schools so there is a much bigger and stronger group of voices in that particular constituency. Dr. Goodell asked President Berkman what the comment was that the Governor made to him.

President Ronald Berkman replied that he said that Governors around the country believe that higher education is the easiest thing to cut in a State budget. You have a constituency but you don't have an organized constituency. And as you know when you go to State capitols it is to count the votes. How many votes are there in higher education and how many votes are there in K-12? And after you count the votes you can follow the money.

Dr. Jones remarked that there is a lot of money in K-12 and non-profits also.

Dr. Goodell noted that it is an interesting perspective. Whether we agree with it or not, that's the perception of the governors around the State.

President Berkman commented that it is a matter of what the political establishment believes to be the case.

Dr. Goodell stated that the fact that we got an increase in the higher education budget is quite incredibly amazing given everything else. She added that certainly being

a Senate President has helped her understand the political realities of higher education of which she had not very much idea before she became Senate President.

#### **IV. University Curriculum Committee**

##### **A. Proposed Revisions to the Master of Music, Performance Program (Report No. 55, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Bill Kosteas stated that before he gets to the one item from the UCC that does require a Faculty Senate vote, he wanted to address some concerns from earlier. He noted that the Academic Steering Committee felt that putting this quick timeline for getting the exemptions started was to show the Board of Trustees that we are moving quickly. In the UCC, he personally has recognition that there may be the need for one or two submissions for people as they continue to rethink things for exemptions. There are also some issues that maybe people do not fully understand like submissions of TAGS courses that some departments may not have fully thought through. Again, if there is a push toward a three-credit hour standard, there will have to be a second wave of exemption requests anyway so those can be taken into account as well. He added that it is not like there is a hard drop/dead deadline. They don't want to see a flood of second round exemptions requests, but he believes the UCC can accommodate them.

Senator Beth Ekelman commented that this was just crazy. Seriously, a lot of people just had one week. Dr. Kosteas replied that he would say that he takes more time for things. He noted that the UCC did receive ten exemption requests for the 120 standard and another forty GenEd course exemption requests. The UCC will have their recommendations on these requests finalized by Friday, March 22 after spring break. The UCC has broken up into subcommittees.

Dr. Kosteas noted that the UCC has one curriculum change proposal that does require Faculty Senate approval. He then presented the UCC's proposed revisions to the Master of Music, Performance Program. He noted that there is a change of the core requirements for all Master of Music programs (Composition, Curriculum, Music Education and Performance). He noted it is either removal of MUS 514 Introduction to World Music or the addition of MUS 540 Intro to the Psychology of Music performance and pedagogy and addition of MUS 601 Approaches to Research in Music – removing three credit hours in required course work and adding four credit hours of additional required course work to offset that there is a reduction of the elective credits needed by one credit hour so the total hours of the programs remains unchanged. There is also some clarification of the tracks in the performance program at the individual level. He noted that Dr. Birch Browning is present at Senate today to respond to any questions.

There being no questions, Senate President Goodell noted that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed revisions to the Master of Music, Performance Program and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Master of Music, Performance Program were approved unanimously by voice vote.

At this point, Dr. Goodell stated that the other items on the Agenda from the UCC are for Informational Purposes Only. She noted that if anyone needs any additional information on those items, they should contact the UCC or Ms. Violet Lunder.

**B. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 56, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Kosteas noted that there are several items from the UCC for informational purposes only.

1. **Proposed BA Program Integrated Licensure for CSU Teach**
2. **Approval of CHM 261H as a Natural Sciences General Education Course**
3. **Approval of CHM 301 as a WAC General Education Course**
4. **Approval of HIS 335/MLA 333 as a WAC General Education Course**
5. **Approval of ART/MLA 378 as a WAC General Education Course**
6. **Proposed changes to the BA in Organizational Leadership**
7. **Proposed reduction in Credits for ADM 613 and ADM 674**
8. **Proposed Dual MTH/PHY Licensure for CSU Teach**
9. **Proposed revisions to the MS in Electrical Engineering**
10. **New Specialization for the MS in Electrical Engineering – Nanobiotechnology**
11. **Catalog changes for EUT 201, 215, 217**
12. **Approval of ART 252H as an Arts and Humanities General Education Course**
13. **Approval of HSC 487 as a Capstone General Education Course**
14. **Revisions to the Graduate GIS Certificate**

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

**V. University Admissions and Standards Committee**

Professor James Marino reported that we have three items today from the Admissions and Standards Committee.

**A. Proposed BA in Economic Development (Report No. 57, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Marino reported that the first item is a proposed Bachelor's degree in Economic Development. He noted that it is an interdisciplinary program consisting of courses in accounting, economics, marketing and urban studies. The program requires a total of 36-39 credit hours for the major. This program is to prepare students for jobs with local and regional governments and other agencies engaged in economic development.

Hearing no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed a BA in Economic Development and asked Senators to vote. The proposed BA in Economic Development was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B. Proposed changes to the ART Major (Report No. 58, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Marino stated that the second item from the Admissions and Standards Committee are proposed changes to the Art Major. Art majors (Studio Art, Art History and Art Education) must pass all art courses with a C or better in order for the courses to fulfill their major requirements. He noted that we have a content expert present at Senate today to respond to any questions.

There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed changes to the Art Major and asked Senators to vote. The proposed changes to the Art Major were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**C. Proposed Limits to Credit Hours for Developmental Students (Report No. 59, 2012-2013)**

Finally, Dr. Marino noted that there is a relatively complicated package of changes – Proposed Credit Hour Limitations for Developmental Students and for entering first year students as well. He noted that this is partially in response to a change in our tuition structure, the so called tuition band. There was anxiety that students who are most in need of taking things slowly would have a tendency to try to take on too heavy a course load damaging their prospects for graduation and for retention. Dr. Marino stated that the main revisions include:

- Entering freshmen will be limited to no more than 17 credit hours during their first two semesters at CSU. That excludes the PSEOP program where local high school students are taking our classes and any exceptions approved by the student's primary advisor are reported to the Director of University Advising.
- Students on academic probation and also students with an academic warning would be limited to no more than 13 credits hours (an existing but inconsistently enforced rule).
- Students placed into developmental English would be required to enroll in developmental English beginning their first semester especially because English here is a GenEd writing requirement and is a two semester requirement.
- Students placed into developmental Math are required to enroll in developmental Math sometime within their first four semesters at CSU.
- Students placed in both developmental Math and English will be required to enroll in a designated Freshman Foundations course cluster in consultation with their course advisors since those are students we need to target for extra guidance.
- Students placed into either developmental Math or English would be barred from enrolling in the summer before they begin since they need fundamental work other than bridge programs such as Academic Boot Camp which are courses designed to help them make a transition.

- Any exceptions will be approved by the Director of University Advising or his or her designee.

Dr. Marino asked if there were any questions.

Senator Chieh-Chen Bowen asked Dr. Marino to explain why developmental English needs to be taken in the first semester but developmental Math can be delayed for four semesters.

Professor Marino responded that the developmental English was imagined to be something that is a core transferable skill that students need in all of their other coursework and the fact that the course is a two semester sequence there is an expectation for the student to begin sooner rather later. The Math side is more complicated. The reason to require students to take developmental Math in the first half of their program is because of problems with students in a social sciences major where much of the coursework does not require mathematics but later courses do. Students tend to get started very late in that program, needing these statistics requirements, despairing and changing their major too late to graduate in a timely way. We also have students putting off math till the very final semester, say, semester twelve and then failing. The thinking behind not requiring it in the first year is that students who are not going to be using math in much of their coursework might in fact be retained at a higher rate if they were allowed to take developmental Math in their second year. He noted that he was given to understand by a high ranking administrator that the President felt that failing developmental Math was a major challenge for first year retention. He asked President Berkman if he was correct.

President Ronald Berkman commented that what they saw as they looked interestingly at the trajectory of students taking developmental courses is that students who took developmental Math later in their academic career did considerably better than students who took remedial Math in the first semester of their academic career. So when they looked at data that also indicated that some ramp up period to college life and getting through some courses before confronting remedial Math was actually additive. He believed that there was a twenty percent difference between those who took it in the first semester and those who took it later in their curriculum.

Dr. Marino stated that the first four semesters is a compromise that is designed to not damage our first year retention rate. The fear is that requiring it in the first semester might damage our first year retention rate. Then requiring it later than the fourth semester might damage our graduation rate. He added that this is the compromise.

Dr. Bowen stated that they are just delaying the pain. They don't have a solution to the problem.

Dr. Goodell remarked that it is not actually our problem but in some sense it is.



Professor Joel Lieske complimented Dr. Marino and the Admissions and Standards Committee on the work they are doing. Dr. Lieske asked if Dr. Marino had any data on the retention and graduation rates of students who are admitted on a developmental basis, deficient in Math or deficient in English and that may be part of the retention and graduation rate problem here.

Dr. Marino replied that he did not have that data offhand although he could request it.

Dr. Goodell remarked that she is sure that the Provost's Office has that data. Dr. Teresa LaGrange indicated that they did have the data.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones referred to the third and fourth bullets, where it basically mentions students placed into developmental English but not developmental Math, and wondered if that should be stated more clearly that they do one and not the other. In addition, Dr. Jones asked if this was based on the assumption that they are full-time students or should it be converted into credit hours as opposed to the first semester or within the first twelve credit hours or something like that.

Professor Marino stated that if the Senate prefers we can send it back to the committee to consider Dr. Jones' recommendations or someone could move to amend the recommendations.

Dr. Jones asked if the thinking is based on the student being a full-time student. Dr. Marino replied, "Yes." Dr. Jones asked if it could be translated into the first twelve credit hours for the first semester and the first 48 for Math without changing what was intended.

Senator Jeff Karem said that he understands the impetus to go by credit hours but he guesses that perhaps the chair can speak to this further. His concern would be simple chronology here which is that if the idea is there is a core transferable skill that needs to be acquired within a certain time period, if you let the credit hours spread out over a longer period of time the student may be taking more and more courses without that skill set and that may not move them forward in a way that we would expect. It would seem to him that there would be no advantage to the students in letting them delay taking these core courses that he could think of.

At this point, changing of the tape-recording took place.

Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Bowen when the students were supposed to take the course. Dr. Bowen replied that they are supposed to take it as soon as they can because that is a required course and they need to take it for graduation. By allowing the students to delay the time they are taking that course, you are just delaying the time you are going to kick them out.

Dr. Goodell asked why they aren't taking it earlier and is it a prerequisite for other courses. Dr. Bowen replied that if they can't even pass the developmental Math how do you think they can pass a 300 level course.

Dr. Goodell noted that she didn't quite understand what Dr. Bowen was asking. If the students had taken developmental Math in the first four semesters presumably that would prepare them for the next Math courses and then the statistics course.

Professor Bowen stated that if a student could not pass Math 87 and you put the student in 311, do you think the student would be successful?

Dr. Goodell replied, "No." She asked if there are prerequisites for 311. Professor Bowen replied that it is in sequence. If the students don't have to take developmental Math until the end of their second year, when do you think they will take 311?

Dr. Goodell asked if Dr. Bowen was proposing that students take developmental Math in the very first semester if they need it. Professor Bowen stated that it needs to be moved up. She suggested the first two semesters.

Dr. Goodell remarked that this is not the proposal that is on the table. She noted that the proposal is that the students take it in the first four semesters so Dr. Bowen can either move an amendment to the proposal or vote against it.

Professor Bowen stated that she proposes an amendment to the proposal.

Senate President Goodell asked Dr. Bowen what her amendment would say.

Dr. Bowen stated that on the fourth bullet it should state that students placed into developmental Math should enroll in the first two semesters instead of the first four semesters.

Dr. Goodell asked for a second to Dr. Bowen's motion. The motion was seconded.

Senator Robert Krebs indicated he felt exactly the same way as Dr. Bowen when he first heard this proposal in Steering. It took a little bit of time to think about. He noted that one of the big issues that comes into play when we are talking about retention is showing significant progress. So students that come in and take both English and Math as developmental students are going to spend an entire year in college and feel like they haven't accomplished much. It is very important; one, the basic experience and two, that they do feel like they have finished something when they finish their first year here at Cleveland State. If there is too much developmental course work at the same time, that is sort of a concern. That, at least, was the argument for him. While yes, he would like to encourage every student to be able to get the developmental courses out of the way, he doesn't want to make that a hard requirement.

Senator Mark Tebeau asked how, as chair of the committee, Dr. Marino feels about that. Dr. Marino confessed that this bullet in the proposal has taken various forms over this academic year and there has been a proposal before Admissions and Standards that would do exactly what Professor Bowen says – requiring the developmental Math course in the first two semesters. He noted there has been a draft before the committee that eliminated this requirement entirely and finally, what is before Senate today was the compromise. He noted that he voted for the current proposal and he will leave it at that but he is not going to argue strongly against Dr. Bowen's points. He did vote for this proposal and he does hear President Berkman's argument about student acclimation to university life and study habits before taking on a developmental course that could, for some degree programs, be delayed slightly. He does think that taking any Math requirement, whether or not you are mathematically inclined, in the last semester is a recipe for a terrible meal. He said that we should look at other ways within majors to discourage that and we should also talk to the Advising Center about strongly dissuading people.

Dr. Karem commented that in terms of thinking about structures within the major this has come up many times in different Petitions Committees when people have trouble completing things in a timely manner and it's often the case that there is not a strong prerequisite structure within the major as there could be. So, he would submit that in the distance between developmental Math and English to the upper level courses, there is a lot of room for departments to create some scaffolding to make sure that students don't end up in a particular statistics course until they have taken certain things. He doesn't imagine that the given time between the first and second year to get this completed necessitates students rushing into the upper level courses if you insist then that they take other courses moving up to it. This is part of a package where you have to figure out what are the incremental steps and we have to make sure that Registration reflects that.

Senator Helen Liggett stated that the notion of developmental seems to her to do with the content of the course but it also has to do with the notion of higher education. If people are put into developmental it seems to her there is a pedagogical reason for structuring it in such a way they would do that first and the accomplishment would be now you are ready for the big leagues full-time. She went on to say that she didn't see the advantage of delaying it; she doesn't see the pedagogical advantage of delaying that; it may be statistically advantageous but she doesn't see the logical so she would support the amendment.

Senate President Goodell asked if anyone was present at Senate today from the mathematics department. Dr. Goodell stated that she is a mathematics education professor and she can see both sides of the coin. She can understand what Dr. Chieh-Chen Bowen is saying; she can absolutely know exactly what she is saying. Students shouldn't take courses that they are not ready for. But she also sees the other side of the coin. We all know how scary Math is. Math people are guilty as charged of making them disconnected from the real world, boring as it could possibly be and the most distasteful thing that most people have in their mouth at the end of their school career. So we have no one to blame but ourselves, Math people, for doing that to the population

such that they don't want to take it until they absolutely have to and therefore delaying the absolutely inevitable horrible thing of taking another Math class.

Dr. Bowen said that she completely agrees with Dr. Goodell. The key point here is by delaying one year would not make Math any less scary.

Professor Liggett stated that she doesn't teach Math so maybe she doesn't know what she is talking about but you could also think about mathematics as a beautiful system, as an intellectual exercise, as a way to use your head, as a way to learn about things. So defining Math in terms of the fact that our students don't like it because they don't think it's groovy is not a good way to go. We don't need to necessarily denigrate our disciplines.

Senator Norbert Delatte pointed out that this is a floor and applies to all programs and any program is free to set a higher standard as appropriate. He noted that this would have absolutely really no implication on engineering programs but he thinks we should require developmental courses the first two semesters for every program possible.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray stated that to our students and to all of us Math is predatory in life. We have faculty members who can teach it in ways that makes it meaningful to our students and exciting to them. She added that she would not like us to loose sight of that. Exactly when it is required because it is developmental it can be taught in a way that is exciting for the students so perhaps success with them would only increase retention. There are components that we don't want to loose sight of.

Senator Raymond Henry said another thing to consider is that with developmental students do we help them succeed in Math by removing them in time from the last time they took it? By postponing it we are delaying – we are removing them from the last time they took Math which probably only exacerbates whatever problems they may have in Math.

At this point, Senate President Goodell stated that an amendment is on the table to change the wording of the proposal to require that developmental Math be taken in the first two semesters of a student's academic career. Dr. Goodell then asked those in favor of the amendment to raise their hands. The vote was 14 in favor of the amendment, 17 opposed to the amendment and four abstentions. The amendment failed.

Dr. Goodell stated that we now go back to the proposal that was originally on the table that is to retain the original wording. Dr. Goodell then stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed Limits to Credit Hours for Developmental Students and asked Senators to vote. The proposal was approved by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell reported that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has been working trying to get the proposed Bylaws changes and committee structure revisions to us in time for our voting meeting which is coming up on May 1, 2013.

## **VI. University Faculty Affairs Committee**

### **Proposed Senate Bylaws Changes and Committee Structure Revisions (Report No. 60, 2012-2013)**

Senator Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, said that at our last Senate meeting, Senate President Goodell mentioned that the Greenbook is undergoing revision and he is proud to report that thanks to UFAC members, on Valentine's Day, appropriately enough, they completed the first complete intermediate draft from the faculty committee. He noted that it is now in the Provost's Office and he and UFAC will be working with the Provost and have further dialogue. He hopes that we are still on track to have this all completed and ready for the Board of Trustees in May. He added that if we can get that done, it will bring to closure an almost five year process. He thanked everyone who has helped the committee. He noted that there is one small step that we can certainly vote on right now which is our own Bylaws changes because that is precisely the purview of the Faculty Senate. He noted that he would guide everyone through some of the changes and certainly answer questions in probably more detail than anyone might like. Dr. Karem stated that last semester, as part of the Greenbook revision and at the behest of Steering and Senate President Goodell, the University Faculty Affairs Committee undertook a review of our rather extensive standing committee structure and Violet Lunder has been instrumental in gathering a large number of reports – kind of an archeological exhibit to get this out.

Dr. Karem stated that they have specific language with helpful strikethroughs and new language. He said that he would help everyone through the general proposals and give some rationale and offer time for questions. He noted that he would start with the scary one first which is to eliminate the Environmental Safety and Health Advisory Committee. He noted that this may sound alarming but UFAC is proposing elimination of the Faculty Senate standing committee on this subject and actually the chair of the committee specifically requested their committee be disbanded. He stated that as everyone probably can imagine, health and safety are not exclusively a faculty concern. Safety is everyone's business at Cleveland State and it involves multiple constituencies, hence, we have a General Safety Committee. The current role of the Faculty Senate standing committee is to send its members to the General Safety Committee. UFAC proposes eliminating the middle person here and simply ensure ongoing participation by faculty in the General Safety Committee. He noted that it seems noncontroversial to him but he certainly welcomes questions as we go along.

Dr. Karem noted that perhaps a bit more substantive in terms of technical details, UFAC has two different committees that deal in one way or another with academic media or technology – Instructional Media Services Committee and Computational Services Committee. He noted that in many cases, there has been a duplication of service or even some confusion about jurisdiction. As he understands it from historical excavations the Computational Services Committee and the Instructional Media Services Committee divide reflects a moment when for instance Computational Services was a pre lap top, pre bringing the material from your office to the classroom situation. Perhaps there is a super

computer somewhere in the basement as part of that history. He noted that Instructional Media Services focuses on the technology in the classroom. Both committee chairs indicated that they see an overlap in their mission and were recommending an Academic Technology Committee that kind of breaks down this wall and simply brings all of the relevant discussion to the table with respect to how we use technology for our teaching and research throughout the university.

Dr. Karem stated that the third proposal, and this is a complex jurisdictional matter, is the elimination of the University Strategic Planning Committee. This is with some caution because strategic planning is vital and we believe in it and it is also not typically a Faculty Senate standing committee. It was approved as a joint committee by the Faculty Senate and the administration at the end of President Schwartz's term. The committee simply has not met for years and it hasn't done any strategic planning. Ms. Violet Lunder has not been able to find any reports. Several members of UFAC have been on the committee and noticed that it was a very intensive committee to serve on we could say. UFAC is proposing that, if we are thinking about strategic planning, a better venue would simply be regular consultation between the administration and Senate Steering. The rationale there is that Steering has representation from all the colleges; it has the heads of all of the committees that would implement strategic changes – UCC, Admissions and Standards, PBAC and UFAC – and it seemed to UFAC that perhaps by eliminating this separate body, which requires actually a large number of nominations and we still have to fill some vacancies on a committee that has not met, it seems perhaps good to streamline them.

Dr. Karem stated that fourth, UFAC is proposing the addition of a new Senate standing committee for Electronic Learning. It has become apparent as we move forward with more online construction and other technologies that there were specific concerns and locals for dialogue that need to occur. He noted that we have multiple ones at present – different task forces of various kinds and UFAC advocates providing a clear stable venue within the Faculty Senate structure for E-Learning consultation. A crucial point to make is that we are envisioning this committee, if you look at the language, as making recommendations and developing policies with respect to E-Learning, but if there are new changes to academic standards, curricula or other policies, those would still go to the relevant Faculty Senate committees. It is not a new avenue of governance; it is another precursor to other committee work because the demands, for instance, of student evaluation are to an electronic learning course. UFAC welcomes feedback from E-Learning committees on that subject.

Finally, Dr. Karem moved to the last subject that came to UFAC's attention which was the question of whether or not the Undergraduate Student Success Task Force should become its own standing committee within our Bylaws. He stated that he views this as something parallel perhaps to the General Safety Committee and he certainly thinks that safety is crucial to student success too, but student success, obviously faculty have primary responsibility here, but the university community at large is responsible for engaging in this task. By the nature of developing a task force, a task force has a finite mission and a finite timeline. Indeed, the former head of the task force from the faculty

side was on UFAC. He also thought that engaging a task force is crucial and that there be a definable set of deliverable outcomes. So, while we think we all need to be monitoring student success, we believe that the particular standing committees that already exist should be implementing those particular recommendations. And should there be the need for a new task force of all kinds of matters that the new one be constituted with input from the administration and Steering. In a way student success is everyone's responsibility. If another critical issue arises, we can develop another task force.

Dr. Mittie Davis Jones noted that her first question is regarding the Environmental Safety and Health Advisory Committee. She noted that Dr. Karem had said that this committee sends delegates to the General Safety Committee and asked how those persons from the faculty now will be chosen.

Professor Karem replied that Dr. Jones raised a very good point. He stated that when there are committees that aren't Faculty Senate standing committees and there are many committees, it comes to Steering who solicits nominations and then sends people to the committees so there would still be a means to insure faculty participation; it would just work the way all of the other non standing committees work.

Dr. Goodell noted that we do have some elections to some of those other committees.

Professor Karem asked if Dr. Jones was suggesting we should take under advisement whether or not this should be a committee to which people are voted or appointed to. Dr. Jones responded that she didn't really have a preference or suggestion. She was just wondering how it would be done. Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy said that the default would be that Steering appoints.

Professor Karem said that he would recommend in general that most of the non standing committees involve appointment by Steering. He said he believed that Strategic Planning is an exception; there is an election for those members although it has been relatively sparse recently. He added that Steering is up to the task of finding people to serve on the General Safety Committee. He went on to say that General Safety also already has representation from all the other different constituencies on campus – all the unions are represented on it, etc. so there is already a built-in structure that guarantees wide participation. He noted that he had asked that question of the committee chair: "Are you concerned if this committee is dissolved that the faculty voice with respect to safety would disappear?" He noted that there was not a concern about it anymore because it would be highly counter productive to imagine a General Safety Committee deciding not to have faculty on it.

Senator Andrew Resnick commented that he sees a lot of potential overlap between the committee on E-Learning and the Technology Committee and asked how Dr. Karem sees a clear distinction between those two committees.

Professor Karem replied that the distinction he would see and perhaps the folks who are currently involved in E-Learning, is that in thinking about the hardware for example, he would take that to be an academic technology province. But if we are thinking about particular adoption of software structures or policies about attendance or academic standards or things like that those would originate with the E-Learning Committee. He noted that at present, there are at least three different E-Learning groups working – the Dean’s IT Task Force, a strategic committee for E-Learning and then there is another task force that is more tactical so it’s clear that there is plenty of work to be done outside of the hardware issues. Professor Karem agreed with Dr. Resnick that there would need to be some communication there, as much as there would need to be between E-Learning and standards and curriculum. It is kind of in this role where it is doing something special but it is still connected to everything else that we do.

Senator Glenn Goodman said that he thinks Professor Karem ended up saying everything he wanted to say about that. There are so many issues with E-Learning that need to be dealt with that if one committee was tasked with all of that it would be really problematic.

Professor Jones referred to the Undergraduate Student Success Task Force and asked what the original term of appointment is. “Does it end this year? She noted that it says indefinite term of appointment.

Dr. Karem replied that he believed the original vision of the Task Force was to end its service this year and this is why the question came to UFAC which was, “What next?” He noted that there is no reason why it couldn’t continue in its existing form but UFAC is simply not recommending importing it into the Bylaws as a permanent faculty standing committee.

Dr. Jones stated that in serving on that committee she knows there are a few things they perceived that they need to continue.

Senate President Goodell noted that it wasn’t the intention to eliminate the Task Force. She asked UFAC to consider whether the Task Force should be part of the overall structure of standing committees and UFAC decided that it shouldn’t because the task of student success should be a finite one. We have a lot of the changes and simple structures in place and there wouldn’t be a need for an on-going standing committee.

Dr. Jones commented, “So then when the committee gives its report this year it could be decided that it would continue as a Task Force for another year or two. Dr. Goodell replied, “Yes.”

Senator Karem stated that one of the things UFAC had to be mindful of is with respect to strategic planning and undergraduate student success. UFAC has no purview so they are just offering a general recommendation. So if the Task Force has uncompleted tasks, it is preferable for the Task Force to continue in its existing form than for UFAC to disrupt its work by proposing that the Task Force reconstitute itself as a new



committee. He added that part of the issue here is that a lot of flexibility and adaptability is needed for these Task Forces and, as soon as we write everything down, we may well find ourselves needing to create exceptions the next time around and he would recommend that we preserve that flexibility.

Dr. Goodell noted that the Undergraduate Student Success Committee had produced a lot of incredibly good recommendations that the administration had implemented. The Committee already started to show proof that there were a couple of things like the retention plan that she had asked the committee to consider this year, and also the College Completion Task Force report that had implications for student success at Cleveland State, and this is the work that the committee has underway currently.

Professor Jones commented that in addition to that, there were some recommendations of the previous committee that had not been addressed yet so the committee is pursuing those as well. Professor Jones asked if the Equal Opportunity Hearing Panel is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Goodell replied that it is not a standing committee; it is a joint committee and Faculty Senate elects our representatives.

Professor Jones stated that she really didn't know what that committee is supposed to do even though it is not one of our committees. She is on the Committee and they have never held a meeting or a hearing so she is just wondering about maybe the fact that they haven't met means that they don't have any issues.

Dr. Karem said that he could speak to that at great length. He reported that he has had this discussion with the Provost for precisely the same reason that Dr. Jones raised. He noted that this is in the Greenbook which is not our Bylaws but the general policies and procedures and it is somewhere in the 8.3.1 section. He noted that there is a question as to whether or not the responsibilities preserving equal opportunity are already met by the work of the Affirmative Action Office or through other procedures such as for those in the collective bargaining agreement with procedures within the contract. In speaking with Mr. Drucker, he actually looked at this and said this seems sort of out of date and in fact we might potentially be in trouble if we use this instead of the Affirmative Action Office because it may not adequately discharge timely responsibilities. UFAC has their eyes on that issue and it is one of the things that there will be a dialogue on. He said that he was similarly on that Panel for many years and never met.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray stated that she has been on that Panel for probably fifteen to twenty years and knows that they have never met.

Dr. Goodell remarked that it is a great thing to add to your résumé isn't it.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed Senate Bylaws Changes and Committee

Structure Revisions and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Bylaws Changes and Committee Structure Revisions were approved unanimously by voice vote.

Senate President Goodell reported that Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange is going to update Senate on some proposed changes to the Program Review Process.

## **VII. Revised Program Review Process (Report No. 61, 2012-2013)**

Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange noted that everyone had received in their meeting packets a number of documents relating to program review and their finite purpose was to provide a context for a single change that she is asking Senate to consider which is to change the start date for program review from its current point in time which is at the end of spring semester to the start of fall semester. She stated that the reason for requesting this change is that the first part of the Program Review process involves the writing and the self-study. Starting at the end of fall semester means that basically chairs of the department undergoing program review end up writing the self-study for the most part over the summer and the chairs that they talked to, each of the chairs that had gone through a program review during a five-year period had responded to the need to write the self-study over the summer in various ways. Some wrote it all by themselves, others brought in staff to help them with it, others had graduate students help them with it and really any of those outcomes are contrary to the purpose of conducting a program review which should begin with faculty meeting together to discuss their strengths and weaknesses, their objectives, their curriculum, their students, and they can't do that during the summer when most of the faculty are off campus. One of the things she provided Senate as well is sort of a restructured timeline showing the starting date; chairs would be informed of the fact that they would be going through a program review the following year at the end of spring. She noted that the reason for that is to allow them time to collect documents and then when fall comes, they can meet at the very start of the fall semester and begin talking to their faculty about the process.

Professor Ekelman commented that even though faculty are off for the summer, under the old timeline, people had five months to get their reports together and while under the new one they only have three months and she is concerned with that. She said she thinks of our school which is huge trying to do an assessment of all of our programs in three months. She has been through the program assessment process and it is very detailed. She is concerned about that in terms of time because three months isn't much time. Currently having to do things right at exam time, writing an exam and doing grades, this is really hard for faculty to finish reviews by the end of the month. She doesn't know if other chairs might want to speak to that timeline and whether they view that as a challenging one for three months.

Dr. LaGrange noted that she would say that really almost all of the timeline is flexible as far as she is concerned. The primary thing that needs to be decided is the starting point. She has been involved when she was an Associate Dean in probably fifteen reviews and she can't remember that a single one of them actually adhered to the

specified timeline. So really what she is asking is primarily a change to the beginning point.

Senate President Goodell asked if Dr. LaGrange wanted Senate to vote on the proposed revision.

Senator Visocky-O'Grady asked if there is an outcomes statement with this new system. In the Art Department they just went through a program review and in that meeting for program review she lost a concentration, but all of the things that were causative never came through and then she started pushing for them and she kept being told to look at the program review material. In the new system, she was wondering if there are some outcome ideas so that we can discuss pros and cons.

Dr. LaGrange replied "Yes." The way in which program review is concluded is in terms of having some agreed upon outcomes and then having a follow-up meeting – that's an important change as well. She doesn't think that really requires changing the process. It just requires greater attention to what the goals and objectives of the process are.

Professor Jones said that she would like to suggest, as Professor Ekelman said, that we change the time for completion from three months to five months because even if there is flexibility, she thinks that when we are not here for three months it may produce undue stress as to how this is going to actually happen particularly since it has to go to the Vice Provost. She assumes that this means it needs to go through some review within the department including the Deans, Associate Deans, and what have you before it goes to the Vice Provost so as to allow for enough time.

Dr. LaGrange responded that what typically occurs is that when the chair and the department prepare the self-study, it goes directly to the Vice Provost who then disseminates it so that's another step in the process that has its own timeline associated with it. She appreciates the fact that people are concerned about a shorter timeline. One of the issues to consider as well, however, is that one of the issues that chairs raise was the fact that the program review process, as it currently exists, drags out over a two-year period. By the time the implementation meeting convenes at the end of that process, there may have been so many changes in the program itself that a lot of the conclusions and statements that were made two years previously are no longer relevant. One of the goals would be hopefully to shorten the time period that's involved in doing the review so that then the outcomes can be useful to the department.

Professor Jones commented that maybe the flexibility that was mentioned isn't there.

Dr. LaGrange replied that she doesn't think any of those dates are hard and fast but it is in the interests of the departments to not have to spend two years on a process of review.

At this point, Dr. Mittie Davis Jones moved that the timeline be five months instead of three months.

Dr. Goodell stated that she didn't know if it really was the Senate's process to move or make.

Dr. LaGrange stated that her primary request is that Senate approve the start of the process being the fall instead of at the end of spring so that chairs aren't required to work over the summer preparing a self-study that may not reflect the voices of their faculty.

Dr. Goodell noted that the vote would be then to approve the change of the start date from the end of spring to the beginning of fall semester. She then asked Senators to vote. The proposed revision of the timeline for the Program Review timeline was approved by voice vote.

### **VIII. Report of the President of the University**

President Ronald Berkman said that he would be remiss if he didn't start by saying that he received an email from a student today which was a little unusual saying that Professor Marino was the best professor that they have had in their entire life – better than their kindergarten teacher. He also mentioned a couple of interesting factoids as he joined the meeting – a faculty member who said that she's been on a committee for twenty years that has never met. He said he thought that was an interesting one. And, a Vice Provost who said that she's been through fifteen program reviews and none of them have ever finished on time.

President Berkman noted that first he wanted to talk about the searches. He thanked everyone in Faculty Senate who participated in those searches and as everyone knows they have reconfigured the Provost Search Committee to broaden that representation. He thinks both the Provost Search Committee and the Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Business did really a remarkable job and we are going to have at some juncture a reception to thank everyone for the work they have done. President Berkman said he received the report of the Search Committee on Business today and again, extremely thoughtful. A lot of work went into it; a lot of calls went into both these searches; a lot of time went into both of these searches and we are almost there. He hopes by the end of the week that he will announce the selection of a new Provost so that piece will come to completion. The Dean of the College of Business in many ways needed to come after the appointment of the Provost because particularly the more experienced candidates asked the question, "Well, who am I going to be working for next year?" They were reluctant somewhat to move ahead towards a final consideration without having a discussion with the incoming Provost. President Berkman said that he hopes we will have an incoming Provost as he said by the end of this week or early next week. We will then connect that Provost with the Dean candidates in the College of Business and hopefully bring that to conclusion. He noted that we are still early in the recruitment year and he thinks getting out of the box as quickly as we did had

really allowed us to get candidates many of whom were in other searches, but to be a little bit ahead of the curve in terms of when we brought them to campus and when a decision was made so we had our opportunity to make the first offer.

President Berkman commented on the Governor's budget. He noted that Professor Lieske had mentioned some of his points but there is one he mentioned in which he said that there was nothing in the Governor's budget that spoke to the faculty workload question. But, in fact, there is something in the Governor's budget that speaks to the faculty workload question. He noted that it says: "Requires the Chancellor on or before January 1, 2014 with all state universities to develop standards for instructional workloads for full and part-time faculty in keeping with the university's missions and with special emphasis on undergraduate teaching. Gives permission for Boards of Trustees for managing authority of each institution of higher education to choose: 1) modify its existing faculty workload policy or, 2) adopt a faculty workload policy if it does not have one to increase the instructional workload of each full-time research and instructional faculty member; mandates that policy require each faculty member who was a full-time research or instructional faculty member during the 2012-2013 academic year to teach at least one additional course during the 2014-2015 academic year from the number of courses that faculty members taught during the 2012-2013 academic year. Stipulates that each academic year thereafter each faculty member shall maintain at a minimum the same instructional workload as either during the 2013-2014 academic year or the 2014-2015 academic year whichever one is greater." President Berkman stated that Professor Jeff Karem is knowledgeable about this. This is section 3345.45 of the Governor's Budget Recommendations. He noted that this is what is going to go to the legislature. As he mentioned the last time, the legislative season has started. We will have a visit on Friday from the chair of the House Committee on Higher Education; Representative Rosenberger will be here from 7:00 AM in the morning; the President will breakfast with him at 7:00 AM and he will stay till 9:00 AM. President Berkman noted that his intention when asked, and we will be asked he is sure, is to oppose that there be any legislative mandate on workload. He thinks that this is a trespass and again, it is his position and he doesn't know what the position of the other presidents are; it has not yet been discussed at IUC (Inter University Council) but it will be his position that this is something that should be institutionally determined and something that should be determined through a process in conjunction with governance. President Berkman said again, he doesn't know what position the other presidents are going to take, maybe Toledo who has already mandated this will be happy to see it come down the pike but this is what the Governor has recommended.

President Berkman reported that there is also a provision of the Governor's recommendation on college completion plans. It requires all of the institutions to provide initially by May 1, 2014 a full college completion plan and then to provide each year a set of metrics related to that plan. It requires that each plan contain the following elements: increase alignment of the institution's programs with programs of other educational institutions. This, if everyone remembers, was something that was in the Governor's Completion Task Force and has now been memorialized in the Governor's budget. It requires increases in support to ensure success for first year students, an increase in

career access counseling and mentoring, the redesign of remediation, for those who are aware there is also a provision which eliminates funding for remediation for senior colleges. So, under this provision, if we gave remedial courses, those courses would be removed from SSI funding and we would have to fund them out of our existing operating budget. It also requires the development of an institutional system to accelerate student progress towards completion such as the coordination of all transfer and academic credit of a system for academic credit and alternative study. So this is the prior assessments that everyone has been hearing about.

President Berkman stated that the good news is that the Governor, and this was a little bit of a struggle, but the Governor has memorialized the NEOMED CSU Medical School collaboration in permanent statutory language. It existed before in temporary statutory language so it provides in the Governor's budget for the funding fully for thirty-five additional medical students who will be at Cleveland State and mandates by law that at least fifty percent of their instruction and clinical experience take place at Cleveland State. He noted that we are fortunate, at least he believes we are fortunate, to have this now memorialized. Of course it still has to go before the legislature to have this memorialized as a feature of the Ohio Revised Code.

President Berkman noted that the tuition recommendation that Professor Lieske talked about actually, just to clarify, it's both two percent for tuition and fees. It is not a two percent tuition cap; it's a two percent cap on both tuition and fees in the aggregate. So we cannot increase tuition and fees more than two percent in each year of the biennium. He noted that several universities have already indicated, prematurely in the political dance that they intend not to raise tuition at all; Toledo is one of them and the Ohio State University is the other one. The President stated that if he had \$2 billion in his endowment he might take a pass on a two percent tuition and fee increase for one year but, at least in his estimation, it is going to make the task of keeping this in the legislature and getting this passed much more difficult for it will provoke the question of, "Why is Toledo, who is in financial emergency and was reported as instituting a mandatory three course load for every faculty member at the university, why are they able to not have a tuition increase and why do other universities need a tuition increase?" President Berkman went on to say that if anyone remembers, he always thought that this was one of the most vulnerable pieces of the Governor's budget, that is, whether the legislature will agree to any tuition or fee increases at all in the upcoming biennium. If they don't, obviously it constricts; even we have not made a decision. We have been looking at different scenarios. We are very respectful and conscious that the world is watching in terms of the cost of college. Parents are looking in terms of the cost of college. We operate in an extremely competitive market so we are very cognizant of all of that but we have not yet thought through whether we will make a recommendation about tuition. He noted that by the time we get to the May Board of Trustees meeting we will know more about where the political winds are blowing in the legislature concerning the ability to raise tuition. It is as Professor Lieske said very extraordinary that we did get in essence a two percent increase in the higher education budget. The Governor was here in Cleveland yesterday. We had a meeting with a larger group and now, according to the Governor's budget director, seventy-five percent of what a university will get from the

SSI calculation will be a function of either graduation rate or course completion. So three quarters of the entire budget will be driven by graduation rate and course completion. Enrollment will no longer be a factor. It will be a factor to the degree that the more students you can get in the more courses you can complete and ultimately the more students you can graduate. But it's not obviously going to be a factor in the way it was in which eighty percent of the budget had to do with enrollment – had to do with the enrollment input.

President Berkman said he wanted to call one other thing to everyone's attention and it is extraordinarily important. It's in our wheelhouse and we have an opportunity to take a more tremendous advantage in terms of our ability to do this. There was a report released yesterday that was a joint report from NPR and the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and it was the results of a report in terms of what employers across a broad number of sectors value now in terms of making employment decisions. He referred to today's *Chronicle*. He noted that he was just going to read two paragraphs. He said that we have an opportunity here because we have begun, before many other universities, to think about and practice engaged learning. We have a city out there in which there are abundant internship and co-op opportunities for our students. So we have a much bigger tapestry and a much bigger laboratory than many universities who are not geographically situated where it is going to be as easy to face students. It is not easy anywhere but it is not going to be easy or even possible to place students and keep them in a curriculum. He then read the two paragraphs from the *Chronicle*.

“Students don't just want internships they need them. When evaluating recent graduates, employers weigh internships most heavily, more so than the applicant's college, their grades or their major according to the survey commissioned by the *Chronicle* and the American public media market place.” From the study: “An internship is the single most important credential for recent college graduates to have on their résumé.”

President Berkman stated that this is going to be and he believes this to be the case, and he believes what we have started with new pathways and the notion that we need to provide a run-way, a bridge for students from their college experience, their classroom experience, to experiences in the work place, in the theater, in the studio or wherever it may be, is something that we need to ratchet up considerably. He noted that the other thing, and again this is something we need to think about as a university, the second most important factor and one that is found to be incredibly lacking is communication skills. After this experience, the second most important factor for employers is can the students speak in whole sentences? Can they speak with their mouths rather than their fingers? Did the students write a letter after they came to the interview? Was it grammatically correct? So this communication issue is really important. President Berkman commented that he met with a CEO this morning, and it's a very big fortune 200 corporation, that for them in their hiring, (the CEO didn't know about the survey), a student's ability to write and speak trumps whatever major they are in. “Get me someone who can write clearly, speak clearly, have some critical thinking skills – they don't have to be an MBA, they don't have to be a business major; they can

be any major if they bring those skills to the table. President Berkman said that it is important that we really begin, as a faculty and as a university, to think how we can across the curriculum begin to equip these students with these communication skills.

Senator Mark Tebeau commented to President Berkman that he loves it when he talks liberal arts. Professor Tebeau referred to the budget and said that he was curious how the two particular numbers President Berkman had mentioned – the two percent across the board and the seventy-five percent that will be based on student retention, how that would have an impact on the budget projections that he told the Senate about back in September.

President Berkman responded that we have gone through ten simulations and Vice President Tim Long may know how many we have gone through trying to use these factors. The good news politically for CSU is that we were able to make a positive change in the variable that most negatively impacted us. The change is the following: that we would not have received a full weighted credit for any student who transfers and then graduates from Cleveland State University. So when half of your students are transfer students, in essence you would face a situation in which half of your graduates would only be counted in the formula. We were able to make a change which now goes back to what was currently in the formula and that is the universities will receive full credit for transfer students as well as FTICs. So, for the moment, that has given us more potential dollars in the formula. It depends on which reiteration you looked at between \$2 and \$5 million we were slated to lose in this formula and our situation, as of today, is much brighter.

Senator William Bowen stated that he knows it has been brought up before but we keep making ourselves the same as other universities as a kind of self-evident value and he is just not sure what that value is and if that is getting talked about. Our students don't, as a rule, have a realistic alternative of going to Miami. They live here or they don't have a realistic alternative of going to OSU or Cincinnati so why are we so worried about trying to make ourselves like every other university.

President Berkman responded that he didn't think we are trying to make ourselves like OU or Miami; he doesn't think that's who we want...

[From this point, the tape recording stopped working.]

#### **IX. Student Government Association Report (Report No. 62, 2012-2013)**

[From this point, the tape recording began to work again.]

Student Government Association President Mr. Al Bitar...

... to spend the money only on approved places so, no liquor, no certain expenditures. Viking cash is out of the picture and the discussion is now about dining dollars and that is really related to Chartwells; we outsource our dining services and so



there is a lot of stipulation in the contract on how that works. We are still trying to engage and see how we can allow our students to use that. Also, with the arrival of Huntington Bank on campus, some of these discussions ought to be included.

Mr. Al Bitar reported that SGA is also doing a survey of the dining services in general on campus and how we can improve the quality of the services provided to our students. As we move to increase the number of our residents on campus, we would like to put pressure on Chartwells to provide what students would consider good quality food that serves their needs. He noted that some students have dietary restrictions and it is hoped that more options will be provided.

Mr. Al Bitar reported that the Student Government elections will be held in April. This is a very exciting time for SGA and they are hoping for a turnout of seven or eight percent; ten percent is their goal. Attending a recent conference, they were told that ten percent means you are there; you have a good sample of students voting in your elections.

Mr. Al Bitar turned to College Pride Week. He noted that he had mentioned this before and it is happening this year on April 24, 2013 through April 26, 2013 and that is their biggest event for this semester. Basically, this event is for three days, and it consists of competitions between the different students and colleges on campus for a trophy. This is really a good chance for students to express their pride and show their gratitude that they belong to their colleges and compete in fun games. SGA would like conclude the College Pride Week with a major event on Friday, April 26. They are still working on the details and hopefully Pride Week will be hosted at the Wolstein Center. He encouraged everyone to seek out SGA and visit the Student Center on these dates.

Mr. Al Bitar mentioned that there was a *Plain Dealer* article on Monday, March 4, 2013 and it was basically reporting on the new rules of the dorms at CSU. He noted that it is a little late because these rules were imposed a while ago, but apparently the *Plain Dealer* is running back stories. But, they are now looking at our dorm policies and he believes that it is a little bit more negative than what it really is and this is bad publicity for the university. It was also re-recorded by the infamous *Cleveland Scene* weekly magazine. They had more bold statements to say about our policies. He noted that SGA is working with Residence Life to try to reach a compromise about the visitation policy which he believes is stricter than the average dorms on residential campuses. Hopefully there will be a positive result and students would still be encouraged to live on campus and, students who are reading the *Plain Dealer*, if any, would not be discouraged.

Mr. Al Bitar mentioned that he has talked about voting rights at the Faculty Senate meetings for students. He is not sure if Student Government is going to push this issue forward, but he is guessing that SGA would take this issue to the Steering Committee or the applicable standing committee.

Senate President Goodell noted that this issue has been discussed at Steering but she hasn't gotten back to SGA.

Mr. Al Bitar reported that another item SGA is pushing for is a proposal from Student Government to shift some of the responsibilities of the Student Life Faculty Senate standing committee to one of the existing standing Student Government committees. He guesses in the spirit of committees not meeting, there are a few. It is really difficult for the Faculty Senate Student Life Committee to schedule meetings due to the schedules of the faculty which is understandable, but what that does is really delay the process by which student organization constitutions are approved. So one of the responsibilities of this committee is to supervise student organizations and, in particular, any group of students desiring to organize and be recognized as a university organization without obtaining permission from the Student Life Faculty Senate committee. He noted that the delay in the process is really not helping our student organizations willing to start a new organization on campus or even amending the constitution so they have to wait. He believes that the committee has met two times last semester and has yet to meet this semester.

Finally, Mr. Al Bitar mentioned the Urban 13 universities. He stated that it is difficult for Student Government to be the organization or the entity that would approve new student organizations' constitutions, to get them working together with the Department of Student Life and the students. He noted this was one of SGA's proposals. The other one is to also shift the supervising of student publication responsibilities to Student Government. This way they are more in contact with student groups to see what they do on a semester basis and they could offer more feedback. He noted that SGA is gathering a lot of feedback from different parts of the university and SGA has forwarded their proposal to the University Faculty Affairs Committee.

**X. New Business (Report No. 63, 2012-2013)**

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy reported that he attended a Parking Subcommittee meeting this afternoon and he wanted to introduce the recommendations from the Parking Committee on next year's fee schedule. He noted that he will include this document as a point of information in the Senate meeting notes.

There being no further business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:15 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy  
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel