



CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

To: Cleveland State Faculty Senators
From: Prof. Rachel Carnell, Faculty Senate Secretary
Re: Correcting the Record
Date: 8 March 2022

As Faculty Senate Secretary, I am charged with keeping an accurate record of what occurs at Faculty Senate meetings; I am also charged with drafting the Senate agenda during Steering meetings. In keeping with my responsibility to ensure an accurate record, I am writing to correct several misstatements in an email missive that was circulated to Senators by Senator Ausherman on Thursday, March 3, 2022.

- 1) I begin with Senator Ausherman's final question, "Why are we not allowed to keep minutes in steering?" The archival record of Steering consists of the final agenda for Senate, produced and voted on in that meeting. There is no Cleveland State precedent for keeping other minutes; the Faculty Senate Secretary is busy during Steering updating the Senate agenda in real time and so is incapable of simultaneously taking minutes of the Steering meeting itself. However, Senate's administrative assistant often keeps brief notes on the votes that take place in Steering, as she did on February 25, 2022. I have consulted those notes in offering these corrections to the record.
- 2) The motion and vote "to remove" an agenda idea to which Senator Ausherman refers was *not* a motion "to remove," but was a motion "to reconsider" a previous motion to put an item on the Senate Agenda. (The motion "to reconsider," if passed, as President Krebs explained in Steering, would effectively mean removing the item from the Agenda.) The motion "to reconsider" was moved by a senator who had voted "yes" on the previous motion to introduce this item (a requirement under Robert's Rules). Although three members of Steering had left the room before that vote (which occurred slightly after 6:00 p.m.), the outcome would not have changed, because (after a wide-ranging discussion) no one raised a hand against the motion to reconsider. If anyone said "nay," it was not heard by the administrative assistant or by any of the Senate officers. If there had been one "nay" vote inaudible to one end of the room, it would not have affected the outcome of the vote. The Senate officers believe, therefore, that the vote to reconsider *did* comply with Robert's Rules of Order.

Furthermore, at several points in the Steering meeting on February 25, 2022, President Krebs made clear that any senator could still bring any motion to Senate in New Business on March 2, 2022. No one did so, although the meeting could certainly have extended past its 5:05 pm adjournment (as many other Senate meetings have done).

- 3) On the matter of secret ballots: per Robert's Rules, a secret ballot may occur *only* if a motion for one is introduced and passes a vote. At Steering on February 25, 2022, Senator Ausherman put forth a motion for a secret ballot for her motion to place an item on the Senate Agenda. That motion was discussed, voted on, and defeated. Therefore, there was no secret ballot, and her prepared slips of paper were not used. As to why there *was* a secret ballot for the vote concerning college reorganization under CSU 2.0 at the April 28, 2021 Senate meeting, *that* ballot occurred because a motion was made and passed (by voice vote) for a secret ballot for that April 28 vote during the March 31, 2021 Senate Meeting.

- 4) As to the assertion that Faculty Senate officers are "not representing faculty," I respectfully must correct the record: Senate officers have tirelessly, at every step in the CSU 2.0 process, insisted on Senate input and votes. It was *only* because of our strenuous insistence on faculty participation in the CSU 2.0 process that the following meetings, opportunities for input, and votes took place at all. We believe that our insistence on these supplemental meetings and votes has already effected a 12-month delay in a process that was originally intended to have been implemented by the start of fall semester 2021.
 - A. Repeated insistence by Senate officers for Senate review of CSU 2.0, during Pre-Steering meetings with the Cleveland State president and provost in September, October, and November 2020; a suggestion by Senate officers in the November 2020 Pre-Steering meeting for a special supplemental Senate meeting in January devoted entirely to this topic.
 - B. A supplemental Senate meeting on January 13, 2021, which lasted two hours and seven minutes, to give senators opportunities to ask questions about the CSU 2.0 Task Force reports.
 - C. A supplemental Zoom Pre-Steering discussion on February 17, 2021 (following the prior February 10, 2021 Pre-Steering meeting), about Senate procedures on reviewing CSU 2.0, in response to a pointed email sent by the Faculty Senate Secretary to the university president that morning insisting, that "Senate needs to approve the college reorganization (as it has for all other reorganizations and renaming of colleges), so it would be best to make sure we approve a procedure for that asap--and Steering should either decide the procedure or assign the appropriate committee to recommend a procedure."
 - D. A motion brought by the Faculty Senate Secretary at the March 31, 2021 Senate meeting "that on April 28, 2021, Senate vote on the general acceptability of the college reorganization proposal in the CSU 2.0 document that was distributed on 3.26." This motion was discussed thoroughly and then approved by voice vote.
 - E. A discussion in Steering on April 14, 2021 about procedures to ensure adequate faculty discussion and input for the April 28 Senate meeting. The

motion for the secret ballot, mentioned above, was also introduced and approved.

- F. A vote taken April 28, 2021 on the “General Acceptability of the College Reorganization Proposal in the CSU 2.0 Document,” following 46 minutes of heated discussion with a result of Acceptable – 25/ Unacceptable – 19/ Abstain – 5.
(The separate vote on the “Overall Acceptability of the Entire CSU 2.0 Document” came from a motion from a university administrator at the April 12, 2021 Steering meeting, not from a faculty member.)
- G. A special Zoom meeting (unprecedented at Cleveland State) *solely* for the faculty of Faculty Senate at noon, January 12, 2022, to articulate concerns about shared governance in the CSU 2.0 process.
- H. A strongly worded Open Letter, dated January 19, 2022, written by the Senate President (with editorial input from the Senate VP and Secretary) to Cleveland State’s president and provost, reiterating ongoing concerns, articulated at the January 12, 2022 meeting, about shared governance and a growing perception among faculty that all the hard work done by them during the pandemic, in keeping the primary function of instruction going on without major disruption, was not being acknowledged by the administration from the disrespect shown during the contract negotiations.
- I. A Senate plan, conceived and reported on by UFAC at the February 2 and March 2, 2022 Senate meetings, to allow senators and other faculty opportunity for input to UCC on the specific proposals for forming college structures, was distributed on March 4, 2022, with a final Senate consideration of the UCC summary report due at the April 27, 2022 Senate meeting.

As Senate President Krebs urged in his March 4, 2022 email to Senators: now is the time to offer “your concerns, your suggestions, and your requests” for further Senate procedure “deliberations” and “review” through the process now available to you. In other words, faculty, including senators, may comment on the specific proposals in Teams for re-structuring, using the system that UFAC set up; senators retain their right to comment or propose actions by the means available to them as senators, such as making motions (for votes) in that April 27, 2022 Senate meeting.