

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

**DECEMBER 4, 2013**

**PRESENT:** Berlin Ray, Boboc, Delatte, Delgado, Doerder, Ekelman, Geier, Genovese, Duffy, Goodell, G. Goodman, Gross, Hoffman, D. Jackson, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Kalafatis, Kareem, S. Kaufman, S. Kent, Kosteas, Krebs, Lehfeldt, J. Lieske, Liggett, Little, Margolius, Marino, May, Meier, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Resnick, N. Sridhar, Steinberg, Talu, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, L. Wolf.

Artbauer, R. Berkman, Boychuk, C. Brown, Dumski, Fedor, J. Ford, Halasah, Lock, Mageean, Sadlek, Sawicki, J. Zhu.

**ABSENT:** Dixit, Fodor, Gorla, R. Henry, Majette, Rashidi, Rickett, Welfel, J. G. Wilson, Witmer-Rich.

Boise, M. Bond, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Mazzola, S. Y. McHenry, Novy, Spademan, Stoll, G. Thornton, Triplett, B. White, Zachariah.

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Strauss for G. Thornton, Markovic for Triplett.

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

**I. Approval of the Agenda for the December 4, 2013 Meeting**

Dr. Goodell noted that she has one amendment to the Agenda and that is to add item VI after item V, a discussion of Credit Waivers for Graduation. In addition, Bill Kosteas had some amendments to the University Curriculum Committee as well.

Senator Bill Kosteas reported that one of the things UCC would like to try to do, since we are not going to have another Faculty Senate meeting until February 2014, UCC had two meetings after the last Steering Committee meeting and so one of the things he requested is that they could add whatever was approved by the UCC at those meetings to be put on the December Agenda. He noted that several of those items were conditionally approved based on very small changes. In some cases changes that aren't even changes

in the program itself, just comments that needed to be added to the degree maps. He stated it will be a very short list that he submitted to Violet to add. He also noted that “Suspension of Geology programs” that is not on the list of Agenda items of the UCC and that should have been on the list. He apologized for missing that item among the two or three items that needed to be added. He noted that there are a few other items where he is requesting that Senate conditionally approve them including two proposals on the Agenda from Psychology. He is just waiting for a note to be added to the degree maps for both of those. UCC approved the programs themselves. In addition, the two Engineering Technology programs on the Agenda. UCC is just waiting for some comments on the degree map. He noted that on the other one, it is just a tweet. It actually came up to 121 hours rather than 120 credit hours so they just have to adjust the hours. Dr. Kosteas asked if it was okay for Senate to vote on those so the Departments, once those changes are made and they get final approval, can go ahead and start working on transition items. He added that this is the real issue. We want departments to feel comfortable so they know they can finally get to work on transition guides and they can begin to advise students as early as possible.

Senate President Goodell asked Dr. Kosteas to inform Senate of the numbers on the Agenda to which these requests apply.

Dr. Kosteas stated that what we are looking at is under Agenda item VII. University Curriculum Committee, A. 12 and 13 – those are still conditionally approved. He noted that on items 14 through 20, the conditionality has been removed and those are now finally approved. UCC received those revisions. Dr. Kosteas said that items 21 and 22, the BA in Psychology and the BA in Psychology Honors program Senate could conditionally approve. He noted that again, 14 and 15 and then 21 and 22 would need conditional approvals. We should add to the list item number 23, BS in Environmental Studies Major and Minor, and add the suspension of the majors in Geology.

Dr. Goodell commented that she cannot find the revised Agenda.

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Agenda as amended for today’s meeting as outlined by Professor Kosteas. It was moved, seconded and the Agenda as amended was approved by voice vote.

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

Dr. Goodell noted that Senate has a very full agenda today so her comments will be brief.

Senate President Goodell reported that at the last Steering Committee meeting she discussed the issue of College-level governance issues based on her own experiences in the College of Education and Human Services. A number of issues had arisen that seemed to indicate that the Faculty and the Administration were not communicating well, and not adhering to our own Bylaws. The COEHS had a special college meeting to discuss this two weeks ago, which was well attended and, she feels that administrators

and faculty came to some fruitful understandings about how to move forward. But the whole process drew more sharply into focus for her the stresses everyone is under as a result of the 4 to 3 transition. Shared governance is a cornerstone of the university system, and when it works well, everyone benefits. When it doesn't, the opposite happens. Dr. Goodell noted that just today she found out that a last minute change has been made regarding the hooding procedures for doctoral graduates at the commencement ceremony being held on December 15, 2013. To save time in the ceremony, graduates will be hooded in unison at their seats before proceeding to the stage. She has not had a chance to check with the Graduation, Convocation and Assembly Committee as to what discussion of this change occurred at their most recent meeting, but she will. She noted that if anyone has comments or suggestions about this change, please let Professor Lynn Deering, the chair of the committee, or herself know.

Dr. Goodell urged each college to examine its own procedures and Bylaws at this time to ensure that we are all following procedures and doing our part as faculty. She stated that she knows that the College of Sciences has already done that and they have already done that in her own College of Education and Human Services. She would urge everyone to take some time. She knows that there is no time, but that is a really important thing that we need to be ever vigilant of because once we start down the slippery slope of not caring, then things just slip and it is not a good place to be.

Dr. Goodell reported that President Berkman has to leave the University today at four o'clock so he has asked that if there are any comments or questions he can take those directly after his comments.

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

President Ronald Berkman stated that some members may have heard today what became public and that is that the Jewish Federation is selling to a Chicago based real estate developer, the approximately two acres that comprise the Jewish Federation building. The old Key Bank building next to it and the parking lot in back of it would shut, running from Prospect through to Euclid. Again, if anyone saw Cleveland.com that developer is proposing to build 517 units of new student housing at Cleveland State and we have not put any money into the deal. The land and construction is totally funded privately by this development group in Chicago. He believes that it is for him a very exciting vote of confidence in what people see going on at Cleveland State and where they think the trajectory of Cleveland State is going because \$47 million is a significant investment to make in terms of the future. He said that he has seen the renderings; some renderings don't really render the development as well as it should but it's actually a pretty high-end student development. It is going to have indoor parking, 220 spaces or something in that neighborhood. Just as a note of interest these days, it costs \$25,000 per space approximately to build indoor covered parking. Even building the three-decks of parking in an eight story building, three decks are going to be parking decks are a very significant investment. Again, for President Berkman, as he just said in some interviews that he did, it is a vote of confidence in the present and in the future of the university and we all ought to be proud and gratified. Remember the last two projects, Langston and

now this project, where student housing at the university put no money into. When we can get the private sector because of their assessment of return on investment to build housing for us, it is really an aspiration of all universities.

President Berkman gave an update on the capital bill process. He reported that there was a meeting yesterday or the day before of the Capital Bill Commission. There will be another meeting in Columbus on Tuesday of the Capital Bill Commission, then there will be one more final meeting during Christmas week of the Capital Bill Commission and the recommendations will be delivered to the Governor just before Christmas. President Berkman noted that the process has been a good one and he thinks that we will get very near the yield that we asked for. As he mentioned to Senate last time, actually all of the dollars in this year's capital request are dedicated towards renovation of classrooms and laboratories at Cleveland State. He noted that it was interesting yesterday to hear someone from the State government talking about the fact that this is something that we wrote in our proposals that there are students who go to high school in Ohio and have better lab facilities. There has been a ton of money poured into high school construction through 12 construction dollars. Students come to a university and discover that the laboratories are much diminished from what they used when they were in high school. And of course, that goes for the instructional spaces themselves which we can't describe as anything but downright ugly and unappealing for most of them. President Berkman reported that we have about \$4.5 million dedicated to classroom renovation. He trusts that we will have those dollars and he trusts we will create a better learning environment for our students and a better teaching environment for our faculty.

President Berkman stated that some are nostalgic while watching Peabody's come down. He noted that for any of you who have passed by, this was part of the agreement that we made with Rascal House who has been here at the university 32, 34, or 37 years. Obviously it has been a long time and we wanted to be good colleagues and give them time to stage their relocation to 1836 Euclid Avenue, which for those who are Rascal fans, you will now be able to find them at 1836 Euclid Avenue. He added that this slowed down the demolition. There was a Peabody's yesterday and there is about one third of Peabody's today. He noted that it is coming down quickly. On Monday we will have a largely small and ceremonial groundbreaking for the building. At least some of the construction packages are out already to bid so he expects we will see construction going on in the next couple of months.

President Berkman said, just to reiterate what he talked about a little bit at the last Senate meeting. He asked if Professor Duffy and Professor Goodell would make a presentation to the Board concerning the student evaluations. Professor Goodell and Professor Duffy engaged with the Board around this issue of student evaluations; he will just tell everyone that this issue is not going away. He represented and Professor Goodell could comment that the Faculty Senate had gotten out ahead of this issue and had done considerable work in looking both at product and process, and we need to look at both product and process and consumption, and the Board is interested in who sees these

evaluations, when they see them, and that the Faculty Senate had been actively working in that domain.

President Berkman stated that this is his report and again he will try to be brief also. He wanted to thank again as he did the last time, the University Curriculum Committee, all those who have participated in a very, very difficult and demanding exercise and that includes the members here at Senate, the curriculum committees at the colleges, at the schools, the chairs, the deans, and everybody who had an oar in the water here. He said he is very, very appreciative to how much work has been accomplished during this semester. President Berkman said that maybe Professor Goodell will have a Christmas break and she will get to sleep a full night and put it all in perspective and come back energized, not that she's not energized now, but come back even more energized in February 2014.

Finally, President Berkman said that for those who haven't heard, the university is closed from December 24, 2013 through January 1, 2014 and will open on January 2, 2014 so if your lunch is in the refrigerator and you need to take it home before Christmas, he would do that. The facilities, unless special arrangements are made, are not going to be available except those critical facilities and operations that impact physical plant and students and you will get paid.

Dr. Goodell asked if anyone had any questions for President Berkman at this point. There were no questions.

President Berkman then thanked everyone and said to enjoy the holidays.

#### **IV. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer**

Provost Deirdre Mageean stated that she would pick up where the President left off in terms of the work that is being done on the transitions. She added that this will probably be a standing item for the next six months, keeping up to speed with where things are. Provost Mageean noted that today's agenda has the sort of not quite the last hurrah but certainly the one last big swathe of courses going through. Now we are in the process, as many are aware, because Dr. Goodell and she jointly sent out an email to all faculty and staff that we are getting all of the transition guides ready. She noted that they sent out to accompany that email, the guidelines for faculty and staff on the four to three conversion. This is the product, the assembled wisdom of the transition team and so that all of the faculty and departments and programs will have these core principles and processes that are expected and be cognizant of and abide by understanding that within their own programs and respect the colleges and departments that will be at their own tweaking and additions that need to be done.

Provost Mageean reported that today an email is going out to all students just to remind them of the fact that we are undergoing this process, just in case any of them forgot it, and over the month of January while they are at home, that there will be an official looking letter sent out, the kind that prompts Mom and Dad to say, there is

something important here and you need to read it. We know that not all of the emails are read by all students. There will start to be more details and a follow-up and then we will send out another one that says, now you must go and see your advisor. Provost Mageean stated that at this stage, we are not asking students to see their advisors because there is not much they can tell the students at this point until all of the transition guides are out there. These guides are now coming in; we now have about four or five up on Blackboard that are being examined, as will all of them by the Transition Team. Provost Mageean said that she is feeling doubly sorry for Dr. Kosteas because having done service above and beyond the call of duty on the UCC, now with the Transition Team, he is doomed to read all of the transition guides as well along with Dr. Nigamanth Sridhar. She actually regards this Transition Team as shared governance and teamwork at its best because this is a body of equal numbers of administrators and faculty representatives working through this together and this is a good example of what can and should be done as we work through it. She added that this will not be the last issue; she is sure of all of the upheavals of higher education and she thinks it is a good model for how we can sit down and work together and get things done. So she wanted to just say she is thankful of them. She knows that there is plenty more work to do there and she thanks them for all of their continued work. In anticipation of getting these transition guides in, speed is of the essence but obviously so is quality and validity and all of those good things that we need to have in the guides.

Provost Mageean mentioned that she has also been in communication as the members of the team visiting the colleges and visiting the individual departments where necessary to talk about the process, answer questions and also alert them to the fact that the resources are ready. Last week they already transferred some resources where those departments identified what they need. She understands that the models are different in every place in colleges like Business with a central advising model and others more highly involved. We do understand that we do have some departments and programs that are as big as some colleges so we have big programs in Psychology and Social Work and Political Science and a number of others that are over 500 majors and so we have to allocate resources and develop strategies for each of those programs. But that information is coming back through the chairs and the deans and through the advising counsel and advisors. She noted that in some cases we have already sent in money for extra staff and graduate students who will liberate up some of the faculty and advisors so that they have more time to spend on this issue and in some cases, like in buyout time. It's whatever works for the particular program and college. Provost Mageean again thanked everybody that is doing this.

Provost Mageean stated that we do realize of course now that we are in the final sprint towards the end of the fall semester and this is a stressful time for everybody concerned – faculty, staff and students alike. She said she does want to take this opportunity as she will in a follow-up letter to all the faculty and chairs that we have an exam schedule printed on line. This is what the students are working towards organizing their studying, organizing their schedules – you should not be deviating from that exam schedule. In other words, it is not appropriate to cancel that exam and hold it in the last week of class. The last week of class contractually is teaching, instruction, and

recitation; it is not an occasion to which you hold exams and all chairs are being asked to monitor what is going on in the departments. It is not correct to change that schedule or to cancel something that is scheduled or hold something in the week of instruction or to put it under the guise of a final term paper, so that's a friendly reminder that will be going out to that end. She said also cognizant to the fact that it is a stressful time, she wanted to let everyone know that Student Affairs, the Counseling Office and all of the Student Affairs staff are ready to help on standby for students. We all understand and we have already seen cases like – Dr. Boyd Yarbrough told her yesterday that a student was actually knocked down by a car just outside here; there was some kind of distraction and focusing on something. She said we have to be aware that this is a tough time for the students. She said that people should please refer students that they see are stressed and who are not well in many ways or just anxious, send them to Student Affairs where the staff there will help them. I'm sure they will take the approach from the faculty too and the stress accompanies that.

Finally, Provost Mageean addressed the issue of the hooding. She stated that she is a little surprised that something was communicated for her because, as of this morning, this was still being discussed with the deans. This was only being floated as a proposal to see if this was something that they were comfortable with. Provost Mageean gave a little background and give full details on what was being proposed because it sounded a little alarming as it was presented. Provost Mageean said that they are aware that they already try and be very good and shake hands with every student since they have their day in the sun, on the stage being photographed, all of those things. Of course as we graduate more and more students, it leads to longer and longer ceremonies and people start getting up and walking out. Our doctoral numbers are quite large and we have real mixes of classes and professional doctorates. We in no way want to differentiate between any of those groups; we want to make sure they all have an opportunity on stage, but hooding now some 50/60 doctoral students individually takes an amount of time. So, as an experiment this year, students are being asked to sit with their advisors, realizing that cases of big programs like DPT, that means that maybe six students might be sitting with one advisor. In Education we sometimes get a number of students with one advisor. They will at a certain point in the script be asked to turn around and hood their students. However, having done that, we will then call every student individually up onto the stage where they will receive their certificates and where their advisor and the dean of that college will be present. So, we are not removing them from the program; it's an experiment that is one that was proposed to the deans thus far this morning so she is not sure how it got to Dr. Goodell.

Dr. Goodell said that is just got to her as an email. An official kind of email was sent to doctoral advisors who will be at the ceremonies as far as she knows.

Provost Mageean said that she will check that out on Monday. She said that she didn't know who sent the email, but that was an attempt to deal with getting through the ceremony in a way that does not discourage faculty or parents or students from attending; we all would like for them to be there, but it seemed like being able to recognize every

student. So, this is a somewhat compromise; we'll see how it works. If it doesn't work this year, we will try something different and she is open for suggestions.

Provost Mageean stated that she is open for questions. There were no questions.

Senate President Goodell thanked both the President and the Provost.

#### **V. Report of Student Government Association (Report No. 25, 2013-2014)**

Student Government Association President, Jon Fedor, reported that he has a surprise visual presentation for everybody. He stated that it is a pleasure to greet everyone from the Student Government Association. He noted that he had a couple of updates to share with everyone about what SGA has been doing and what their upcoming plans are for closing the semester and then moving into the spring semester.

SGA President Fedor noted that number one on their list is basically a part of their advocacy and advocacy is primary part of what they do in the Student Government Association on behalf of students and that includes all student of every different type of group that you could think of. They have been approached by a number of veteran students over two semesters (end of the last academic year and the beginning of this semester) and veterans are looking for a way to translate the experiences that they have into more culture at a state university like CSU. SGA, along with the coordinator for the Veteran Students Success Program, Bob Shields, have put together a proposal for a class designated VET 201. They are looking, at getting it into place by fall of 2014 and, if not, working on it steadily to have it in place as soon as possible. Mr. Fedor stated that it basically gives the ability for veterans to transfer credit, to obtain credit for experiences that they've had overseas, as long as they have served six months or more over seas. The veterans who provide documentation of their experiences overseas to the Veteran's Office and then receive credit for their exposure to and diverse interactions with other cultures. He added that this is an idea SGA is in favor of. One of the major roadblocks to this idea is the oversight of the program. It has been suggested that they have an academic department to oversee this program. SGA does know that there are other courses that are kind of introductory, 100 level courses that are overseen by the university or administrative departments. SGA is looking into how the oversight would work for this, but essentially would be a way for Veterans to fulfill the arts and humanities non US experience, general credit. Mr. Fedor stated that this is just something to put on radar screens, something that SGA is working on and would love to continue to partner with the Faculty Senate. He noted that if anyone had any questions about this proposal, please email Allie Dumski, SGA Vice President at [vicepresident@csusga.com](mailto:vicepresident@csusga.com).

Secondly, Mr. Fedor reported that SGA is working on a number of initiatives to alleviate the text book burden on students. Obviously, this is something that comes up all of the time; it's kind of a constant need that can never be fully solved to the extent that the students want it to. If SGA had a way, they would all go for free but that is completely impossible so they are looking at ways to alleviate the text book burden. They were hoping to kind of do something alongside faculty leadership. He stated that if



there are any committees that are looking specifically into this issue of alleviating the burden of text books on students, whether there is a university committee or if it's other university committees that are tangentially related to this issue. SGA would love to work with any university committee that is involved in this issue. Specifically, they are looking at investigating alternatives such as a block text book being a requirement for a class if only homework problems from the back of a couple of chapters are being used out of that textbook. He has encountered that a lot in his engineering major. So, SGA is hoping to do that. He added that if anyone had any questions about that, there are several contacts in SGA including himself, Allie Dumski as well as SGA Treasurer, Jake Wehner who are all interested in this issue.

Mr. Fedor reported on his next issue – University committee attendance. He stated that another way SGA accomplished advocacy on a large part is by being included as student representatives on university committees. He noted that there have been some issues with students showing up. There have been communication issues between chairs' committees and SGA's leadership and SGA apologize for communication issues on their end. But, they are very much aware that they have an issue in that area and would like to take seriously their performance in the area of their student representatives on these university committees. He added that there are decisions being made every single day and that they have even heard about today where student input can be leveraged and can be provided by the SGA. Mr. Fedor said that they are resetting some expectations within the Student Government Association to address this issue with their membership and they would definitely like to ask for Faculty Senate's patience with them as they do that. He said that if you are a chair of a university committee, especially as faculty, but even the staff or the administration and there seems to be a lack of student representation on committees or you don't really know who the representative is from SGA, please get in touch with the SGA secretary, Emily Halasah and she can be reached at [secretary@csusga.com](mailto:secretary@csusga.com) – this is a responsibility that they take very seriously and want to re-up their commitment on this.

Finally, SGA President Fedor said, speaking of finals week coming up, SGA has a semester event that they hold every semester; it is Late Night Study. SGA works with the Library, with the police and a number of other departments on campus with facilities and maintenance in order to put on this event where the Library is kept open from 10:00 PM to 3:00 AM and that is starting on Sunday night, December 8<sup>th</sup> and going till Thursday night, December 12<sup>th</sup>. He went on to say that this is something SGA does along the same lines of our Provost Mageean's address to alleviate the burden on students to give them a place to come and study, to gather – a lot of times when you have the accountability of other eyes on your work, you work better, you work harder. Food is provided. There will be prizes and they are really just trying to make a place for students to feel comfortable affording an opportunity to excel in their preparation for finals week. He noted that this is something SGA loves doing. They have seen increased attendance for the past four semesters and they love partnering with the different parts of the university to make this happen.

Mr. Fedor commented that if anyone would like to suggest the Study Night to any students they see, then please pass on the word. He said he would be happy to provide any other details and would be happy to respond to any questions by emailing him at [president@csusga.com](mailto:president@csusga.com). He added, best of luck with the rest of the Senate Agenda. He knows that time is valuable to him and it is short today.

#### **VI. Discussion of Credit Waivers for Graduation (Report No. 26, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Goodell gave Senate some background on the Credit Waivers for Graduation issue and why we are discussing it now. She noted that this issue came to the Admissions and Standards Committee of the College of Sciences and Health Professions. There was a discussion about the waiver of the 128 credit hour graduation requirement to allow students to graduate early. This was then passed on to the Senate Steering Committee and they passed it on to the Senate Admissions and Standards Committee. Dr. Goodell then read the text of the memo that was sent by the COS Admissions and Standards Committee:

“The full committee on Admissions and Standards has voted to extend blanket authority to the college advising office to approve graduation for those students who have met all three requirements and the exception of earning 120 credit hours. With the exception of earning 128 credit hours total, partly enrolled students should be held harmless in consideration of the upcoming credit hour change to 120 credit hours.”

Dr. Goodell stated that this issue was brought to Steering and Steering had a long discussion about it and asked the Senate Admissions and Standards Committee to consider the issue and come to a conclusion as a committee. When they came back to the Transition Team, the Registrar Janet Stimple and the Associate Registrar Kevin Neal pleaded with them to make some sort of ruling from the Senate about these issues of waiving credits for students who had met all of their other graduation requirements apart from meeting 128 credit hours. She went on to say that obviously this is going to become and is going to be an issue for students as we move into the transition. Dr. Goodell noted that there are a number of things Senate needs to consider and she will outline what she thinks they are and then anyone else can please speak to the issue and we'll take it from there.

Dr. Goodell said that the first thing she thinks is an important issue and that needs to be discussed is if there are students due to graduate this semester, will they delay graduation to fall 2014 in order to avoid taking the extra credits over 120. This something Senate should be concerned with. Dr. Goodell then asked if anyone would like to speak to the issue at large of waiving credit hours for graduation in this transition period.

Senator Beth Ekelman stated that she is from the College of Sciences and she is working on the transition plans now. She asked, “If somebody has completed their upper division credit hours, 42 in her college, they've completed the major requirements,

they've completed their GenEd and all they have are three electives, and they are two free electives shy of graduating, why delay it? It doesn't make any sense to make him jump through a petition process hoop; it just streamlines the process and makes it easier for everybody if you just say, accept anything from 120 to 128 and make it easy on the students."

Dr. Goodell commented that that would mean the students graduating this spring 2014.

Dr. Ekelman said that she doesn't understand the problem. She just thinks if the students can get out sooner, let them get out. Why make them delay graduation or force them to take two free electives that really aren't meaningful to them at all. She said that she also thinks it is a college issue – it's a college requirement.

Dr. Peter Meiksins, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Programs, spoke on behalf of the Transition Team. The Transition Team actually drafted language which hasn't been presented here at Senate. The language says that colleges should continue to grant waivers of requirements to students if they believe they are appropriate as they have done in the past, but that the curriculum conversion should not be used as the reason for granting a petition until the new rules come into effect in the fall. So you can keep doing it as in the past. If your practice is to waive eight hours, that's your right to do so. The Transition Team was concerned about it – at some levels consistency across units because if one college can grant petitions to this effect and another college says, "No, we don't want to do that" somebody's going to have to read immense numbers of really complex petitions dealing with equity, unfair treatment of students, inequality across divisions and across units, then that jeopardizes an already shaken relationship between students and faculty and students and administration when we're changing the curriculum from one thing to another. In other words, to ensure equity, we should be consistent with what we've done in the past.

Dr. Ekelman stated, "But they are college requirements so there might be..."

Dr. Meiksins asked Beth Ekelman if her college in the past had waived eight hours. He stated that if they have, then by all means continue to do so.

Dr. Ekelman commented that they haven't traditionally waived eight hours but she is just saying isn't this all about getting the students out, done? She asked, "Why make them stay an extra semester and take eight credits?"

Senate Vice President Nigamanth Sridhar said that one issue getting back to what Dr. Meiksins just said is, "What about a student that maybe is taking just two free electives this fall semester, has already paid tuition, has already taken fifteen weeks of classes and has finals next week, and comes along and says, why did you make me take those two classes when somebody who is graduating next term doesn't have to take these credits?" Dr. Sridhar commented that this is the issue. This is the slippery slope but now students look it up but there may be students that are taking just the two free electives this

term and if you are doing that for students for the next term, then you should be allowing that for this term as well.

Dr. Ekelman stated that the transition plans aren't developed yet and they focus on fall semester. She said she is thinking of people who want to graduate fall 2014; she is not thinking about people who are graduating now.

Professor Sridhar commented, if that is the only issue, then this is not a problem because the memo that the Transition Team looked at was looking at students that would graduate in spring of 2014. If a student is graduating in fall 2014, December 2014, that's perfectly reasonable. Now you have a new curriculum on the books and a student that petitions will graduate under the new curriculum.

Professor Ekelman commented, "But will people have that right to change; there are going to be people that chose the old curriculum for fall 2014. She said she doesn't see what the problem is to letting them graduate in the spring. If we have our transition plans in order and the students are getting ready to get out of here, what does it matter?"

Dr. Sridhar stated that we don't. We don't have all of the programs approved yet.

Professor Ekelman stated that she knows that. We don't have the programs approved. We are supposed to do our transition plans before they are approved. She added that Health Sciences hasn't had ours approved yet and we are supposed to be getting our stuff in.

Senator Robert Krebs commented that the simple answer is that we can't worry about what happened this fall. We are just moving forward now. We know where we are going and the students know and we are trying to make everyone aware. And, sadly, faculty with huge numbers of petitions that we expect to approve is just wasting time. We have so little resources right now. We sort of need to make a decision and just go with it. He added that he didn't think it was that many students that will be effected.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady asked if she is translating this right. She is trying to simplify it so that she understands it. "So we have agreed as a university starting the next academic year it would be 120 credit hours to graduate, but currently on the old major plan, we've got a number of students who have a 128 kind of requirement. So, what Dr. Goodell is asking is, "Does the Senate want to approve a petition in mass saying any student who now know that starting next year, everyone is going to have 120 are held harmless from this day forward. It's too late for the kids that are graduating this fall; that's already kind of said and done and locked up, but for spring semester, you would let anyone who is working towards 128 but had already achieved 120 credit hours go on to graduation.

Dr. Goodell responded, "Yes." She went on to say that she talked to an advisor in one college who remembered when the foreign language requirement was eliminated; it

was eliminated instantly so from that date onwards, no student had to meet the foreign language requirement so that was some type of precedent in her mind at least anyway.

Senator Barbara Hoffman stated that she thinks if we try to move the effective date of one part of our new curriculum forward, then we run the risk of having the students come in and say, “Well, what about this other part of the new curriculum? Can I have that apply to me for graduation in May?” Dr. Hoffman continued saying that we are already dealing with so many different configurations, that she is not sure that we want to open that can of worms.

Senator Stephanie Kent asked, “Starting next fall, everybody will be held to 120 or what about students who chose the old catalog rights. Will they still be held to 128?”

Senate President Goodell responded that would be her interpretation. If you elect to retain your old catalog rights, then your old catalog specifies your requirements.

Professor Kent noted that this would only be for students that are choosing the new plan – the 120.

Dr. Meiksins commented that questions is still actually up for grabs. If the issue is whether the rules should be applied retroactively to fall or spring this year... The question of what would happen to students who chose old catalog rights for fall 2014 graduation should they be allowed to graduate with 120 is a different discussion. He noted that somebody said it’s a much more reasonable approach to say that perhaps under those circumstances you can have this piece of the old curriculum and this piece of the new curriculum to avoid confusion at that point. But, somebody is going to have to decide and that’s part of the process of getting the transition guide set up and everything organized and he doesn’t think that’s been determined.

Professor Visocky-O’Grady asked if it would be agreeable to say that if students met all of the GenEd requirements and major requirements and have 120, that’s what the proposal is. Dr. Visocky-O’Grady said that she would support that proposal because that means it is just elective credits and that seems fair because they’ve already earned the 120 but they are still needing so Dr. Hoffman’s argument that if there are too many back-room deals going on for what they can get out of, there are still clear requirements that they have to meet, it’s not a vast number of credit hours we are talking about, just electives.

Dr. Meiksins noted that he was just arguing Dr. Hoffman’s point for her. What happens to a student who is a major where a requirement that was dropped under the new curriculum and they still have to complete it? For example, in the College of Business, they dropped their requirement for a third economics course. The student still has to take the second and third economics course, hasn’t done it yet, it’s spring this year, should that student take that course or should that student not take that course – everything else is done.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady stated, "I would say get them out of here."

Dr. Ekelman said that she would too; let them finish the major; the major that's on the books for spring. They have to finish that major.

Professor Ekelman commented that she is just saying, "They satisfy the major, they satisfy the GenEd, they satisfy the upper division, it's an issue of free electives. It's not an issue of the major courses. It's about the free electives."

Dr. Meiksins stated that the example he gave involves different courses.

Professor Ekelman stated that she feels that is a different issue.

Senator Jeff Karem commented that as someone who spends a lot of time with bylaws and governance, one thing that concerns him is that he doesn't get the sense that there is general consensus among members of Senate. He wondered if the College of Sciences has actually voted to change its graduation requirement. In other words, if we are thinking about it being a college matter, college governance, and he does think that is a compelling case to make, has your college had a meeting where they voted to say we want the graduation changed from 128 to 120. Dr. Karem added that he still doesn't even know where that would stand with respect to transition plans but that would seem to be the necessary first step for anything. Right now, your college, as Dr. Meiksins said, the requirements are on the books, otherwise there would have to be a waiver procedure.

Senator Barbara Margolius noted that the College of Sciences' Petitions Committee requested guidance on how to handle petitions of this sort at a college meeting and the college said, do away with the proposed. The chair is present at Senate and he can correct if she got that wrong. She continued stating so what we are discussing now is the guidance of the College of Sciences to its Petitions Committee on how to handle students in that situation.

Dr. Goodell offered her sincere apologies to Senators for not getting a statement to them. It was sent to her but she didn't send it out so she totally takes responsibility for this matter which is just one of those things that fell off her plate. Dr. Goodell commented that perhaps if she reads the statement, everyone can consider it. Dr. Goodell read the following statement:

"The modified curriculum requirements implemented as part of the conversion from 4 to 3, 4 to 3 credit hours will become effective beginning fall of 2014. To ensure fairness to students graduating in academic year 2013-14 college and university requirements regarding credit hour totals major and minor requirements, etc. established for the fall credit hour curriculum remain in effect until the end of summer 2014 semester. As in the past, colleges may consider requests for waivers of credit hours or other graduation requirements by petition on a student by student basis. Decisions should be determined by the individual

circumstances of each student. The 4 to 3 conversion should not be used as a basis for waiver of credit hours or other requirements prior to fall 2014.”

Dr. Goodell stated that this is the statement that the Registrar’s Office would like us to approve as a university. That still leaves room for colleges to grant waivers in the manner that they have traditionally granted waivers. If the college decides that it wants to waive the petitions process in this instance, then she guesses that would be in her estimation at least a college decision. Dr. Goodell added that it does set us up for some students to be unhappy about it if it’s a blanket kind of approval across a college and not across another college. To her, that’s the crux of the issue – how the students are going to react to that. She added that the College of Sciences is welcome to do whatever it wishes in terms of its own compliance, as is any college. To grant a blanket waiver across the entire university, she feels is not a good policy from her perspective.

Senator Bill Kosteas stated that UCC also discussed the idea. Dr. Kosteas commented, because if it’s called a blanket waiver, is that a de facto change in curriculum? If it is, then it would have to be made a formal curricular change and the college would have to vote on that. Otherwise, you get into this issue of departments and colleges then start changing their curriculum and not going through the proper channels and saying, “Oh, it’s just a blanket waiver.” Senator Kosteas felt that this was part of their discussion and he just wanted to make sure everybody is clear that’s what really came up at Steering, i.e., this idea of if you are granting calling it a blanket waiver, then that does become de facto a curricular change without having necessarily gone through all of the appropriate steps.

Professor Ekelman inquired if it does need further approval.

Professor Kosteas responded that with something like this, it would probably have to come to the UCC. He said that UCC wouldn’t take too terribly long to address it. He is assuming it would have to come back to the Senate.

Senator Jim Marino asked Dr. Kosteas what steps it would have to take before it got to UCC.

Dr. Kostas replied that before it got to UCC he is guessing in this case it is something that could be proposed by a college curriculum committee, because it’s not a department requirement. It’s not something specific to a major, it’s a college requirement. So it’s something that could come out of a college curriculum committee as a proposal to the college faculty to be voted upon by the college faculty and then sent up the rest of the steps. He added, that’s his reading of it.

Dr. Margolius asked, “Why would it have to go to the UCC?”

Dr. Kostas replied, “Because it is a significant change in curriculum and also if it is a change in the curriculum, then it ends up going to the UCC.” He added that he didn’t write the procedures; that’s just the way the procedures are.

Professor Margolius commented that it would be the whole college faculty acting as the Petitions Committee on how to handle petitions.

Dr. Kosteas replied that he thinks it is a difference of if you want to handle every petition on a one on one basis that's just handling petitions. It's granting a blanket waiver that says you don't even have to review these petitions but just grant them automatically which is a de facto change in the curriculum.

Dr. Goodell commented that you can't choose to set up a special Petitions Committee to deal with petitions of that nature.

Senator Paul Doerder said that he doesn't see that this is a major curricular change. If all the students have to do is take basket weaving and guitar to satisfy the extra credits...

Senate Vice President Sridhar said that he disagreed with that. The curriculum was put together with those slots and if you intended those students to never have taken those courses, those shouldn't have been in the curriculum in the first place. But, having those slots in there means that the department and the college intended students to take something there, then that's what the curriculum is. So if you remove them quietly, then you are in fact making a curricular change. It's either a curricular change or a graduation requirement change. If it is a curricular change, it has to go to the UCC; if it's a graduation requirement change, it has to go to Admissions and Standards. But, it has to be approved. It is not a college issue of changing a requirement for graduation or the curriculum. It is a college issue to grant petitions, yes.

Professor Krebs said, "There is something misplaced in place of terms of logic because yes, speaking for the College of Science, we set up and voted on 128 credit hours as the original graduation requirement. But the same college has also accepted and voted for, as recommended last year, 120 so both decisions have been made and both were made with logic. Now we are sitting here and talking about moving forward to the new decision six months earlier.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones noted that she had a question about the transition guides. She asked, "Will the transition guides from each college need to be approved by somebody? So, this sounds like it is a part of what should be in the transition guide; it's like a piecemeal effort to begin the transition process without it being a part of the whole. I'm thinking that it shouldn't be done; it shouldn't even be considered right now outside of the totality of transition guides. It doesn't make sense. You have to look at the whole thing."

Dr. Goodell said, this is going back to the original premise as to what guidance should be provided to the advisors and the Petitions Committees to handle this. She said she thinks that is where it came from, to get ahead of the curve, so to speak, and try to get some consistency and decisions that are going to be made anyway because the students



are going to submit these kinds of petitions unless there is a blanket waiver. Dr. Goodell stated that she can understand where it is coming from for all of the reasons we have already argued about. She said she doesn't think it is a good idea to have a blanket waiver and she completely agrees with Professor Kosteas. It amounts to either a standards change or a curriculum change, both of which have to come through the Senate which is ignoring our own rules. Professor Goodell stated that the College of Sciences is welcome to deal with its own petitions in its own way.

Professor Ekelman stated that she understands this issue with spring but we do need to answer this question for fall. She noted that she is working on the College of Sciences transition plans and you have to create a transition plan for students who are under the current standards and then the new standards. Students are going to be graduating in fall 2014 and spring 2015 and the same issue is going to come up. They are going to be shy of the 128 credits so it is still an issue that has to be decided. She went on to say that her college (College of Sciences) will do what they have to do to make this as easy for the students to get this through.

Dr. Sridhar commented, that is what the transition plans are for, right? The transition plans that the Transition Team has requested from departments are exactly supposed to answer that particular question. What's a student going to do; what's a freshman that entered this fall going to do; what's a freshmen that entered a few years ago going to do with respect to graduation? So the transition plans need to outline what a reasonable cohort of students, or every single student, if it comes to that, will do in order to graduate. As long as it is written down and you go through the process, that's fine. This memo didn't go through the process. This memo says that there will be a blanket waiver for all students who have met those major requirements and have attained the 120 credit hours. He noted that there are two separate issues here. So, as long as we have a transition plan here for those students, we are good. Right now, we don't have a transition plan; right now we don't have most programs approved so without these two things written down, it does sound like a curricular change that we just have to get approved.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltdt stated that it seems to her that this issue is a time table question. If this question has come to Senate because people want guidance, it seems that the statement that Dr. Goodell read from the Registrar provides exactly that guidance. It creates a system that ensures the consistency among the colleges through spring 2014 and then in fall 2014 we all take out the new program, the new transition guides, which will deal with the nitty-gritty details on what will happen to students who continue under the old plan or under the new plan and so the question of guidance, we have been given exactly the guidance we need.

Dr. Meiksins said that it may appear that he is arguing both sides of the question but he will agree with Professor Ekelman on this one. He thinks that it will be useful to the Transition Team to have some guidance from the faculty as to how they feel about what should happen next fall. He added that he thinks there are various opinions out there about what should happen but we all need to be on the same page about that.

Again, because if Business does one thing and Sciences does a totally different thing that contradicts what Business did, we are going to have petitions and somebody's going to wind up doing a lot of work that could be avoided. Dr. Meiksins commented, maybe this is a matter for Admissions and Standards to go back and look at it or maybe the whole group can consider at some point that if somebody could tell the Transition Team, this is what we think that students should be allowed to do 120 whether they go for the old or the new curriculum, or that if you go to the old curriculum, you keep the 128, if you go to the new curriculum, you do the 120. Dr. Meiksins said that one of those two options needs to be described so that we can tell the individual units what the overall standards should be.

Dr. Goodell stated, "With all due respect, that's not what we are discussing right now, but that definitely needs to be discussed and she is not putting it off by any means." Dr. Goodell said that she would like to this issue come to Steering and she would like feedback and input and then to have a full discussion of that issue, perhaps at the next Senate meeting. She said that she would put this issue on the next Steering Agenda so that it comes to the next Senate meeting so we will have that then.

Dr. Lehfeldt stated that there are a lot of competing issues on the floor right now and it seems to her that the most pressing one is what happens to students who are graduating in the spring 2014 and then we can take up the other question. Dr. Lehfeldt commented that she thought part of why have this Transition Team approving our transition guides was to do exactly what Dr. Meiksins just said which is to see what everybody is proposing and make sure that there is a degree of consistency.

Professor Ekelman said that she thinks it needs to be decided because we are working on the transition guides now. So, if we put the discussion off on how we are dealing with fall or next year, in February a lot of people are going to have their transition guides in so they need to know the answer. And, maybe we should just... She stated that she personally thinks it is a college issue still and we need to go through the proper process perhaps for fall.

Dr. Goodell read the statement once again that concerns students graduating this coming spring and summer. We will take a vote on whether we want to endorse the statement that provides the guidance for spring and fall. Then we can take up this issue of 120 versus 128 for fall 2014 going forward.

Senator Debbie Jackson stated that she is in the College of Education where students graduate after they student teach typically so they don't have courses left to take. She noted that the original question was about students who are going to have to register in the fall for eight electives. She asked, "How many students is that? How many students just have electives left to take their last semester?"

Dr. Goodell responded, "Quite a few including general education."

Senator Jackson stated that this is just the point. They don't just have their elective stuff to take.

Dr. Goodell stated that they better see this criteria because they still have GenEd requirements.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady stated that she would guess that it's mostly transfer students; they need more upper division credits and that's where they need a certain number of hours.

It is Dr. Goodell's understanding that it's only students who met all other requirements – upper division, GenEd, degree, everything else. At this point, Dr. Goodell asked to read the statement one more time.

Professor Jordan Yin, Director of Undergraduate Programs in Urban Studies, stated that quite a few transfer students will take a course from GenEd and in addition transfer others from a community college. Transfer courses might be three credits or four credit hours and then the transfer students wind up short at the end. We get some of those every semester although it's usually very small and very minor but we do get petitions.

Dr. Goodell stated, "This is not what this is all about." At this point, Dr. Goodell read the statement one more time.

"The modified curriculum requirements implemented as part of the conversion from 4 to 3 credit hours will become effective the beginning of fall 2014. To ensure fairness to students graduating in academic year 2013-2014, college and university requirements regarding credit hour totals major and minor requirements, etc., established for the fall credit hour curriculum remain in effect until the end of summer 2014 semester. As in the past, colleges may consider requests for waiver of credit hours or other graduation requirements by petition on a student by student basis. Decisions should be determined by the individual circumstances of each student. The 4 to 3 conversion should not be used as a basis for waiver of credit hours or other requirements prior to fall 2014."

Dr. Goodell said that she is asking Senate to vote on and approve or not approve that particular statement. Dr. Goodell then asked for a motion on the Credit Waivers for Graduation.

The motion on the Credit Waivers for Graduation was moved and seconded. Dr. Goodell then asked Senators to vote on the motion. The motion on the Credit Waivers for Graduation was approved by voice vote with four nays and two abstentions.

Dr. Goodell said that she would forward the approved motion in an email to the Registrar and anyone else who needs that statement so that she will have the actual statement.

Dr. Goodell said that now we can, if Senate decides, move to the discussion of 120 versus 128 for fall 2014 and beyond. She asked for discussion.

Professor Sridhar stated that some of that decision has sort of already taken place. There will be issues regarding those four credit hour courses aren't around anymore as fall 2014 so there will be students that are missing a few credit hours because of those changes. He said that he thinks it is a problem up to the departments and the programs to decide whether they will stick with the 128 credit hours. But, he thinks that is exactly what needs to be in the transition plans. The old curriculum should be clearly outlines. The new curriculum should delineate what the changes will be and here is how students can transition from one to the other. Most of us have already done most of that work when we did our new programs and mapped out how the old program fits into the new ones. So, now it is the matter of spelling out, year by year. And, as a direct answer to the question of whether we should stay with 128 or 120, if the department feels 120 is appropriate, that's what should be in the transition guide. But it needs to be in the transition guide so that it can be consistently applied for all students across the university.

Dr. Karem stated that he feels many departments aren't in a position to answer that question yet. In his department, because they are not going to have their programs approved until February 2014, he wouldn't want to speak at Senate and make a declaration about what's the general principle for transition guides. He believes it needs to come from the ground up. Otherwise, we would be preempting programs that are already in the process of being approved.

Professor Ekelman said that she thinks that we could say that we can give colleges or programs discretion on what to decide between 120 and 128 because there will be some people that can move forward. Rather than hold everybody back in their transition planning, till everybody's approved, we need to do something.

Dr. Goodell asked Professor Ekelman if she is asking Senate to make a decision.

Dr. Ekelman stated that her suggestion would be to let the colleges make the decision about whether to allow the 120 or 128 variance for the students near graduation. She personally feels it should be 120. That's part of her college discussion. She went on to say that she can't say what would work best for Engineering. She can't say what would work best for Business or Education. She doesn't know those programs.

Senator Barbara Hoffman said that it seems to her that again, we are looking at an issue of consistency. If a student elects to retain graduation rights under the former curriculum, then they need to be held to that curriculum – they need to fulfill those requirements and we need to make it possible for them to fulfill those requirements. That's part of holding the students harmless. She said, again, we run the risk if we start modifying one part of the curriculum change and not another, we run the risk of students asking for exceptions. She added that we should take that into very serious consideration.

Senator Vera Vogelsang-Coombs said that she agrees on holding students harmless. For example, if a student opts for the 128 hour curriculum, takes the courses as prescribed, but as of fall 2014 those prescribed courses have fewer credit hours, then they won't meet the 128 requirement but they will have met the course work so therefore, she would propose, and she thinks the Transition Committee has done so, to hold students harmless between the 120 and the 128 hours because the courses now are three credits rather than four; so they've met the content of the curriculum. The students have met the spirit of the curriculum not necessarily the exact credit hours.

Dr. Meiksins stated that he is concerned about this and he knows that we are going to get transition guides from units that differ on this point. It may be that the faculty's feeling that there doesn't need to be consistency on that issue. He is a little concerned about that because, as he said, that is going to create a lot of petition work for somebody somewhere.

Dr. Meiksins noted that the Registrar has pointed out in more than one college meeting that an option that exists is that students who are in this situation can be told to choose the new curriculum and then waive various requirements. That might encourage them to graduate. So, that is an option. It would be cleaner if we could come to some kind of decision.

Dr. Goodell stated that this is kind of early to be discussing this because we don't actually have any real examples or very few.

Professor Meiksins replied that we actually do – Business has transition guides and wants to make the waiver five hours.

Dr. Goodell said that what she is talking about is in actual students who have been advised only in transition in terms of real examples as well as to what Dr. Meiksins is referring to.

Dr. Lehfeltdt stated that rather than asking the Senate to come up with a principle at this point when, as Dr. Karem says, a lot of us are still in the process of having our converted curriculum approved, she is going to reiterate what she said before and suggest that this is actually the work of the Transition Team who will be seeing all of these proposals. And, if you are seeing inconsistency, then she would assume that part of what you will try to rectify in conversation with colleges, departments, programs is some of that inconsistency, she said that she understood that to be part of why everything is going to a central body and then bringing it back out.

Dr. Goodell said that just because a plan is submitted doesn't mean that it is final, right? So, you can submit a plan, if we as the Transition Team see that this program is way out over the hill in comparison to the rest of the university or the rest of the college then we can negotiate with that particular program.

Dr. Karem seconded Dr. Lehfeldt's point and said that this, as an issue, giving guidance to the Transition Team, this is on the agenda, it wasn't discussed in Steering. He said that he hasn't seen what has come out of Business. He thinks these are really good questions being posed here but no one here is equipped to give a good answer right now because we haven't seen what approaches people are taking. It would hamstring the Transition Team if we insist on something without even knowing what colleges are proposing.

Professor Ekelman commented that perhaps the colleges should give the Transition Team some suggestions on what they think would work for their programs. She added that the reason she is alarmed to say the least is we have over 950 active majors that we have to advise in the spring – that's why she is alarmed. We are working on our transition plans and part of that is how many credits you need for the degree and we need a solution. The variance works because it gives flexibility within the colleges. Perhaps the colleges should give some suggestions to the Transition Team and then decisions need to be made.

Dr. Goodell stated that she thought those suggestions were actually the transition guides that were prepared, but maybe she is wrong. She asked, "Isn't that in the transition guide that we got all of the programs versus the new programs and this course counts for this and then if they get so many credits for graduation then we will consider that a done deal? Is that not in the transition guide? I thought it was."

Dr. Ekelman noted that the total number of credits needed for the degree has to be in the transition. She asked, "How are you going to manage that? You have to have a solution."

Senator Norbert Delatte stated that this is something that he saw in a visit to a well-respected university. He thinks that what we have done, is tie ourselves to, the program requirements and minimum hours. When he was doing transcript evaluation he actually saw that although they declared 120 hours as a minimum, you could not actually get a degree in 120 hours. So the potential principle we could adopt for graduates in September 2014 and going forward is adopt 120 as your minimum. All other degree requirements must be met and then it becomes a non-issue. The actual number for the minimum is created by things like the 4 to 3 conversion because we have students who are trying to graduate a credit short where if the actual minimum were lower than the program you would never have to petition those. It would mean that the program requirements are the minimum simultaneously, if that makes any sense.

Dr. Sridhar commented that the number of students we have is the reason why some of us asked this question three months ago saying that you better start having a plan for transition. Each program needs to articulate when the program changes from old to new, how the students will be effected; how will students actually navigate this thing. If we had an extra year, we would have a different type of conversation, but we don't. So it is up to the departments to clearly say, well if a student is a sophomore at the end of spring 2014 and is starting to get near fall of 2014, here is what they will do and then in

their senior year this is what they will do and so on. So, that's what the transition plan should articulate. If a major went from 32 credit hours to 38 or the other way around which is probably more likely, how do those changes actually impact individual students? So it's departments providing guidance to Transition Teams. The transition plan is the guidance that we are providing to the Transition Team. We need to review these plans and make sure that we have a consistent way of looking at how this changes credits. It doesn't have to be a single number that everybody gets attached to, it has to be a principle that we attach ourselves to.

Professor Ekelman noted that what is missing in this step is the college, the consistency within the college. We are saying that the departments need to do this, the departments need to do that and then the Transition Teams can see if it looks good. She said that she thinks that within a college is where the questions are going to arise. She said that there needs to be an overview, but she really thinks the college input is critical because that looks at consistency within the college.

Dr. Goodell stated that Senate is not forbidding that. There is no rule that says you can't consider it in any college so go ahead and consider it across your college.

Dr. Ekelman noted that this is not part of the approval process that she was given and she thinks it is important.

Dr. Goodell commented that it wasn't built into the process but it's not precluded. If the College of Sciences wishes to do that then the College of Sciences is free to do that. She added that at this point, she didn't know what else to say. She does know that there are still an extreme number of items on our agenda and it's already 4:30 PM. She went on to say that she hates to do this, but she has to because otherwise we will not get to approve the programs that are ready to be approved. Directing her comments to Dr. Meiksins, Dr. Goodell said that Senate doesn't have any guidance for him at this point. We will hopefully see some of these issues as we start to review the transition plans, maybe on Christmas Eve or right after Christmas which happens to be her birthday. Dr. Goodell stated that Senate is not going to make any kind of ruling because we have to air out some of these issues. It will be taken up again at the next Steering Committee meeting and it will be an item on the next Agenda when we actually have some transition plans that we have reviewed and at least some comments that we would want to make.

## **VII. University Curriculum Committee**

Dr. Bill Kosteas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that the only revisions that are now conditional are numbers 12 and 13. Psychology submitted their numbers and made those minor changes. He is asking for suspension of the Admission to the Geology program. Items number 12 and 13 under A are conditionally approved and everything else is approved.

Dr. Kosteas stated that UCC has approved certain programs and sent them on to the Admissions and Standards Committee. These program changes also included a

change in the admission to the program. So if some people wondered, the 4+1 program for mathematics has been sent on to Admissions and Standards.

- A. Proposed Undergraduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion (Report No. 27, 2013-2014)**
- 1. BS in Computer Engineering**
  - 2. BS in Electrical Engineering**
  - 3. BS in Mechanical Engineering**
  - 4. BS in Chemical Engineering**
  - 5. Physics: BS in Physics, BA in Physics, BS Honors in Physics and Physics Minor**
  - 6. BS in Biology Major and Minor; BS in Biology – Medical Technology Major**
  - 7. Suspension of the BS of Podiatric Medicine**
  - 8. BA in International Business Major and Minor**
  - 9. Business Economics Major**
  - 10. Business Certificate Proposals**
    - a. Certificate in Health Informatics (New)**
    - b. Minor in Health Care Management**
    - c. Certificate in Manufacturing Management**
  - 11. Geospatial Certificate**
  - 12. Electronics Engineering Technology Major\* (Provisional)**
  - 13. Mechanical Engineering Technology Major \* (Provisional)**
  - 14. BA in Organizational Leadership**
  - 15. BA in Economic Development**
  - 16. BA in Nonprofit Administration Major and Minor and 4+1 program**
  - 17. BA in Urban Studies Major and Minor and 4+1 BA/MPA program, Minor in Sustainable Urban Development**
  - 18. Urban College Certificates:**
    - a. Public Management**
    - b. Sustainable Urban Development**
    - c. Urban Geographic Systems**
  - 19. BA in Public Safety Management**
  - 20. BA in Environmental Studies Major and Minor and 4+1 BA/MAES**
  - 21. BA in Psychology**
  - 22. BA in Psychology Honors Program**
  - 23. BS in Environmental Studies Major and Minor**
  - 24. BA in Mathematics, BS in Mathematics, Mathematics Minor, Statistics Minor**
  - 25. Suspension of Admission to the Geology program**

**\*Conditionally approved; awaiting minor changes to the proposals for final approval.**

**\*\*For additional information, log in to the online curriculum system at:  
<https://fourtothree.csuohio.edu/ochc/index.cfm>**



It was then moved and seconded to approve the 25 proposed Undergraduate Program Revisions of the University Curriculum Committee as part of the 4 to 3 conversion.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed 23 Undergraduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion and two Provisional Undergraduate Program Revisions pending a change in the number of credit hours for the Electronics Engineering Technology Major and for the Mechanical Engineering Technology Major.

Senator Ekelman stated that she had one clarification. Dr. Ekelman asked Dr. Kosteas if the suspension of the BS for the Podiatric Medicine was the one from Biology or Health Sciences because there are two separate tracks. One is a pre Podiatry Track for Health Sciences. Dr. Kosteas replied that it is the program that came from Biology.

There being no further questions or comments, Dr. Goodell asked Senators to vote. The 23 program revisions and the two provisional program revisions with a change in the number of credit hours for the Electronics Engineering Technology Major and for the Mechanical Engineering Technology Major were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B. Proposed Suspension of the MS in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering (Report No. 28, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Kosteas reported that UCC had two other items that came up which are not in the 4 to 3 system and for those he did provide a traditional memo/description. The first is the proposed Suspension of the MS in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering. He noted that currently there is one faculty member in Industrial Engineering and senior administration was unwilling to staff that program anymore

There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed the Suspension of the MS in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Suspension of the MS in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**C. Additional Proposals: Proposed Graduate Certificate in Organizational Change (Report No. 29, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Kosteas stated that there is also a proposal for the new Graduate Certificate in Organizational Change. He noted that the Suspension of the MS in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering and the Proposed Graduate Certificate in Organizational Change were not part of the 4 to 3 conversion so these are separate. Everything else is for the 4 to 3 conversion.

Hearing no questions or comments, Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed a new Graduate Certificate in Organizational Change and asked Senators to vote. The

proposed Graduate Certificate in Organizational Change was approved by voice vote with one nay.

**D. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 30, 2013-2014)**

**1. Undergraduate Course Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion:**

- a. **PHY 416 – 10-28**
- b. **GEOEVS Remote Sensing GIS Courses 10-6-13**
- c. **EVS 300 – 302 Course Prerequisite Change 10-24-13**
- d. **Psychology Honors Course Changes 11OCT 13**
- e. **HSC Non GenEd New Revised Courses**
- f. **MTH – Additional Course Submissions**
- g. **Art Courses 10-15-13**
- h. **French 4 to 3 course proposal 10-16-13**
- i. **The and DAN course proposal 10-16-13**
- j. **ANT 304 – course revision WAC**
- k. **HIS 29 Nov 15, 2013**
- l. **MYS 324 – Research Methods in Music Therapy**
- m. **THE & DAN Course Revisions 11-15-13**
- n. **CSU Teach Program Course Revisions**

**2. Graduate Course Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion:**

- a. **Psychology Graduate Courses – Revised 27 September**
- b. **DTE GRAD Dept. of TE (Excluding: ECE 502, EDC 510, EDL 503, EDL 504, and ESE 530)**
- c. **HSC SPH Grad Courses (Excluding SPH)**
- d. **Physics Grad Courses 11-6-13**
- e. **Grad Course 4 to 3**
- f. **HHP New Courses Exer Sci**
- g. **New Course HHP Sports Management**

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

Dr. Kosteas noted that we are obviously well into the program revisions. He reported that at last count, the total number of courses converted, created, inactivated, graduate and undergraduate combined, at this point stands at around 1,700. He said that we could add the programs we had the last time to the ones we looked at today and noted that UCC does have somewhere around thirty something proposals on their agenda for the next two meetings. He reported that UCC will begin meeting the first week of spring semester hoping to get as many things done as possible. He stated that at this point, UCC has seen material from every college. The last group that is to come in will be Arts and Humanities from CLASS. Social Sciences has also submitted material. Dr. Kosteas reported that the UCC is making good progress. He reiterated his appreciation for the college curriculum committees and the work that they have done in doing some of the weeding out of the problems early on.

Finally, Dr. Kosteas wished everybody a great break during the holidays.

### **VIII. Admissions and Standards Committee**

Dr. James Marino, chair of the University Admissions and Standards Committee, commented, let's try to do this in order of simplicity.

#### **A. Proposed Admission Standards for Pre-Physical and Pre-Occupational Therapy Tracks (Report No. 31, 2013-2014)**

Professor Marino presented the proposed revisions to Admissions Standards for two programs in Health Sciences. We are proposing revisions to the Admissions Standards for the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences Pre Therapy Track within the Health Sciences Major. At this point, Dr. Marino asked Dr. Beth Ekelman what would be the language for the Masters of Therapy, and also for the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences for the Pre-Physical Major.

Dr. Ekelman stated that it is the Pre Therapy Track within the Health Sciences Major, Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences Major.

Dr. Marino asked Dr. Ekelman, "In these two tracks, is there anything for the Pre Masters Therapy Track or are there two tracks?"

Dr. Ekelman stated that it is one track and students can focus in on Physical Therapy or Occupational Therapy.

Professor Marino stated that what is happening here is this is a dual track within majors that is designed specifically to prepare students for a professional school in those programs. He noted that the College of Sciences and Health Professions has proposed creating admissions standards for those two main students to ensure the students in these majors are eligible to apply for the graduate programs and majors designed to prepare them for. He noted that there will be three ways in this proposal that students can be admitted to this track. 1) First year students can be admitted with either an ACT score of 24 or a combined SAT score of 1100 or acceptance into either the Honors or Scholars programs. 2) Students who complete 30 hours of post-secondary education at Cleveland State may be accepted into the pre-Physical Therapy or pre-Occupational Therapy tracks with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher. 3) Transfer students who have completed the minimum 30 hours of post-secondary education at another institution may be accepted into the pre-Physical Therapy or pre-Occupational Therapy tracks with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher. Dr. Marino noted that we have a content specialist present, Dr. Ekelman, to respond to questions.

Dr. Meiksins wonders if there has been any discussion of potential consequences of this for the retention of students who don't meet the standard. We know that students were a pre something and do not get admitted to the program that they aspire to are quite

likely not to graduate from CSU at all. He wonders if we are imposing a restriction on who may actually enter the program in the first place. He then asked if we have another place that they can go and be happy rather than just completing the program and perhaps they can get to graduate school and at least they can get their Bachelor's Degree.

Professor Ekelman replied that students can do our general interest track if they want to. That's a very flexible track; it's very similar to the liberal studies track that CLASS has where they can design their own major. First of all we have over 400 students interested in this track. Not everybody that is interested has a good academic record. She noted that they like to catch them early so that the students are not disappointed. In order to really be eligible to apply to any graduate program nationally, they have to have a minimum GPA of 3.0. That's a national standard. Dr. Ekelman said that they are just trying to help guide the students better. If they are not meant academically to go through this track and be successful, they can then choose a different program.

Dr. Meiksins stated that he understands the motivation and he shares the instinct but it is important that the college and probably the advisors in the program have a good plan B conversation with the students who are not going to make it. Dr. Meiksins is quite concerned that these students will drop out and that will come down on all of us because if a student doesn't graduate from CSU, we lose State Subsidy. Our completion rates are low so we need to think about the consequences imposing admissions standards which block students from their intended path. We need to tell them what the options would be for them.

Dr. Marino stated that he believes this is an advising issue where students in their first two years who are in their own minds in pre-physical therapy need to be given an alternate plan early. But, now we are talking to people who have conceived of themselves as a major in their minds but not actually in time.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Marino stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed revisions to the Admissions Standards for the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences Pre-Therapy Track and asked Senators to vote. He stated he is repeating it loudly because it is amended for Violet to write the Minutes. The proposed revisions to the Admissions Standards for the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences Pre-Therapy Track was approved unanimously by voice vote.

#### **B. Exceptions to Dismissal Policy (Report No. 32, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Marino stated that we also have a proposed appeals process for Academic Suspension and Separation with a related change in nomenclature. He noted that last year, Senate passed a revised set of academic suspension and dismissal policies. A new track was created of graduated warnings, temporary suspensions and more or less final dismissal. At the time there was a thought that anything can be petitioned. An important point, those new rules covered not only students who had failed courses, but who had failed to complete courses. So, students could eventually trigger suspension and the

dismissal policy by simply repeatedly withdrawing from too many courses. This was about satisfactory progress towards a degree. We did not at that time create a second set of standard exemptions for students who might have very good reasons for withdrawing from all of their classes late in semester. This proposal is to remedy that. It creates a normative set of exceptions such as death, serious illness, death of a family member or someone in their charge, serious illness or injury to the student or someone in their care, significant change in employment, military deployment or comparable circumstances. Yes, this will be a catch-all; yes, everything is petitionable but these normative exceptions give you a sense of what the magnitude of the elastic clause should be and how other things will qualify. It creates a formal application process including a standardized form and requirements for supplementary documents. This proposal standardizes probation and dismissal policies and it allows the Registrar's Office to decide appeals as the University Petitions Committee sees fit to delegate that authority. The proposal allows denied appeals to be reviewed by the full Committee.

Dr. Marino noted that in a separate matter, it turns out when we changed the dismissal policies, we changed the meaning of the word "dismissal" last year. "Dismissal," under the previous catalogs had meant something like "suspension;" now it means something like "dismissal." This has led to confusion. He noted that the Registrar's Office has dealt with this by simply using a new word, "separation." Dr. Marino stated that he would like as a separate vote that Senate formally endorse the phrase "separation" because it hasn't been used before and it is more or less what it sounds like.

There being no questions or discussion, Dr. Marino asked Senators to vote. The Admissions and Standards Committee's proposed Exceptions to the Dismissal Policy, were approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Marino then stated that he would like, as a separate vote by Senate, changing "dismissal" to "separation." The Admissions and Standards Committee's proposal to change "dismissal" to "separation" was approved unanimously by voice vote.

#### **IX. University Faculty Affairs Committee Student Evaluation Instrument (Report No. 33, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Jeff Karem, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that first of all he wanted to thank Dr. Joanne Goodell and Dr. Stephen Duffy for explaining the hard work that UFAC has engaged in to the Board because student evaluations are an object of considerable interest. It is our responsibility in the Senate under the Greenbook to have oversight of this. He also thanked UFAC for assisting taking this process seriously.

Professor Karem stated, just as a reminder, UFAC was charged last spring on the basis of the Promotion, Processes and Procedures Task Force and then Provost Walker's implementation of it to review existing student evaluation of instruction instruments and to develop a common core instrument. UFAC surveyed and reviewed those from all of the colleges last spring and presented an initial proposal at the end of last semester to

Senate. UFAC was asked to solicit feedback from colleges, faculty and other sources, incorporate it and report back which Dr. Karem is pleased to say they are able to do now. Professor Karem noted that in terms of actual items, only the instrument itself is up for a vote at this point. But, he would like to introduce the policy considerations to be addressed moving forward and it will likely be a subject for future Senate action. Dr. Karem stated that he wants to have a lot of discussion.

Dr. Karem thanked all of the colleges who responded; he has actually heard back from all but one, no name, as well as the individual faculty who provided thorough feedback. He also especially appreciated the colleagues with social sciences and statistical training who helped in this process in giving feedback. He reported that UFAC consulted with an expert faculty member in psychometrics and psychology who studies survey mechanisms and statistics and they also reached out to Testing Services and Student Government as well. He noted that the last two offices will be especially important moving forward and thinking about how to implement a smoother and better calculations and administrative procedures.

Dr. Karem stated that he would give Senate some feedback on what changes UFAC has made. Enough changes were made from last year's instrument that he didn't even incorporate track changes because they were comprehensive. He wanted to present a fresh document here. He noted that some of these are fairly small and technical but he thinks make sense. UFAC separated out questions so none are asking for answers to multiple components. Someone pointed out asking, "Does the faculty member find useful and timely feedback?" Dr. Karem said, well those are two different things and if we are thinking about being precise, we should separate those out. They have added a question about the expected grade; that is the only student self-assessment question that we think has to be in the common core instrument because there is often a strong correlation of an expected grade and student evaluation of instruction and if we are really going to have apples to apples comparisons across the university, that needs to be in there. Dr. Karem said that they tried to eliminate what one colleague questioned, "black box questions" where the recorded data doesn't let you know what's in the box. He noted, if we don't know what the expectations are, or is the pace appropriate, (is it too fast or too slow) it is questions like that that are not really precise. You can't use that information. So, we tried to make the questions descriptive rather than summative so that they can provide constructive feedback for continuous improvements so that faculty will know it's a problem that students want more qualitative feedback. Or, it's a problem that students don't feel you are encouraging discussion or you are doing it really well with providing timely feedback.

Dr. Karem went on to say that for the ratings of course instructors' effectiveness, UFAC has established a more balanced range for statistical clarity. Many people pointed out that our previous range of unacceptable to excellent is not evenly balanced so UFAC opted for something that seems more reasonable for below average, average, above average or excellent so that you don't have something unacceptable that applies to a statistical outlier. And, at any point people, can correct or ridicule him for his attempt to explain statistics to people who know much more about it.

Dr. Karem said that one issue he does want to propose has been proposed. The issue is that we might want to use the four point scale for the agree/disagree questions, not the ratings of course and instructor. He noted that the reason is that in our previous five point scale the answer of number three, which is no opinion, is effectively not actually part of the continuing of answers/agreements, effectively opting out. As a committee, UFAC proposes using the term “neutral” but that may not be sufficient so if we are thinking about what can be statistically reliable, we may want to consider changing that scale and he welcomes discussion about this. UFAC also wants to emphasize that the core is just that – it’s a core and the colleges, departments, individual faculty, we will customize these survey instruments to varying degrees.

Professor Karem noted that at this point, he is happy to talk about the instrument or he could also talk about the future policy considerations, whatever people would like to do.

Professor Hoffman said that first of all she would like to congratulate Dr. Karem on arriving at a consensus in UFAC about this set of questions because it really addresses most of what we need to address across the university. Her sole question really is, “Why have you ordered the responses in the way so that they have started with the most negative response and ending with the most positive?” She said that she believes if memory serves her well that on our current calculation we begin with the most positive and end with the most negative.

Professor Karem responded that with our current instruments they actually go in different directions. Someone pointed out that in some cases on a particular college instrument one will indicate the best on one question and one will indicate the worst on the other. He said that he is not wedded to one versus five except that in general our past evaluations have privileged the higher numbers as better. But, our goal is just to have them rely on symmetrical so that you don’t suddenly think, “This instructor is great in all these respects – one, one, one, one then you unwittingly say, four at the end.”

Dr. Hoffman noted that she just wanted to say that from a social science perspective, starting it with positive then going down to the negative offers the respondent the opportunity of responding positively without having to consider multiple steps. Do I think this person was poor, no; what about average maybe and by the time they get up to excellent, they are taking more time than they really want to. Most students want to come in and mark it quickly.

Professor Sanda Kaufman stated that she objects to the order. She is not objecting to the value, just the order.

Senator Helen Liggett noted that actually Dr. Kaufman’s point was the point she wanted to raise. She said that on three occurrences the instrument begins with a negative and ends with the positive. She stated that it would be much better to have the same scale

but to begin with the most positive and be consistent throughout the whole instrument and then go to the most negative for all of the reasons that Professor Hoffman mentioned.

Dr. Kaufman stated that she has additional questions. One, is related to 10) “The instructor encourages engagement with the course material.” She said that she is not sure what the statement means. So either one might be specific or objective in some way. She noted that she also has an issue with 12) “The required course materials are useful.” Teaching classes for many years, she knows that the student is sometimes not incredibly good at assessing that. So, if you want to ask something about the materials, we are usually the judge on whether it is useful. Dr. Kaufman noted a third issue regarding 13) “The course assignments effectively reinforce the course material.” That is problematic.

Dr. Karem said that he would yield to the President.

Senate President Goodell stated that it seems like we are trying to wordsmith. Dr. Goodell said that this is not the kind of purpose of what we were asked to do.

Professor Kaufman said that she doesn’t understand what it means. She is puzzled.

Dr. Goodell said that her understanding is that is not what was intended.

Dr. Karem noted that he is an English Professor and he doesn’t mind words. He is speaking to the policy and questions that Dr. Kaufman is posing today. One of the things that UFAC is trying to deal with in the assessment of courses is essentially the interface of the materials and assignments with the core purposes of the course and it is less of a “black box” question.

Dr. Kaufman said that Dr. Karem was correct. Referring to question 12) Dr. Kaufman said, “It does not get to that matter for me.”

Professor Karem responded that the reason they use materials is they are trying to make this instrument work. There are some courses that don’t have a textbook for instance and the materials might be laboratory materials.

Professor Kaufman stated that it is useful to learning or useful to us.

Dr. Karem commented that the required course materials are useful for learning in the course? He said that he thinks it is kind of implied that it is not useful as a door stop or something like that.

Professor Kaufman said that if she could take one out, it would be question 10) “The instructor encourages engagement with the course material.” because she really doesn’t know what it means.



Senator Rama Jayanti said that she wanted to go back to Professor Hoffman's question about why start with the negative and then go towards the positive. She noted that in Business, one always starts with "Strongly Disagree" and they always go up to five, "Strongly Agree." She added that the Business students are extremely proficient in filling out these evaluations and she feels that one of the things we are trying to avoid is that critique and that apathy of students. She doesn't know whether we can suggest that every college can amend this progression based on what your students are used to but in Business, she can say every single survey that students do or we do with market research and student research and student evaluations always go from one to five, negative to positive.

Senator Robert Krebs noted, speaking for the College of Sciences Caucus, and they discussed this yesterday, one term that the group is not really happy with is neutral. They had an alternative term. On the other issue, he agrees with Dr. Jayanti but he actually realized he is going to disagree in the sense of the outcome in terms of reversing. The one thing that we in the caucus really wanted to see happen is that we reset our expectations and the fear that if we keep this order, these questions should give us lower numbers because it should move in towards the averages and that means fours and threes. Turning it around will get everyone to reset; we won't have this automatic mental idea of trying to pare back to what your scores used to be; they will be all new scores.

Senator Joel Lieske said that he would second that. He noted that he wanted to compliment Dr. Karem and the UFAC for their great work. He said that he agreed with Dr. Karem on the ambiguity of the neutral term. When you are basically responding to the assessment of instructor, he would say instead of neutral, "no opinion" or "don't know." That is not in surveys. He noted that he also likes the fact that Dr. Karem included item 17) "What grade do you expect to earn in this course?" because as he pointed out in the Steering Committee and other meetings is that response is the best predictor of instructors' evaluations. He hopes that this is universal across the colleges because he doesn't think a survey instrument like this is truly going to be worth anything to the Provost and the Deans, etc., unless there is uniformity.

Professor Liggett commented that she doesn't understand why a marketing example would work here. It seems to her that again, it would make sense to begin with the positive and though the negative be the assumption. The finality that she thought of was, sometimes if you over test students for whether or not there is plagiarism, it's as if you were beginning with the assumption that there will be plagiarism, rather than beginning with the assumption that people will be engaged and enjoying their class. Dr. Liggett said that it seems to her that if you begin with "the instructor is knowledgeable in the subject matter", and then you have "Strongly Disagree" you are making a suggestion. It's a presumption in a sense and it would make much more sense from the faculty point of view to begin with the assumption that people are knowledgeable and that people will answer questions effectively.

Dr. Karem stated that it sounds to him like there are at least two potential friendly amendments from the comments on the floor. One is to eliminate "Neutral" as an

answering option from the numeric scale and the other is to reverse the orders of the scale of ratings to go from Positive to Negative. He then asked if he is correctly summarizing what people are describing.

Dr. Hoffman replied, "Yes."

Dr. Karem commented that at a certain point, if people wish to make those amendments, he is sure that they can be voted upon.

Professor Ekelman noted that she just wanted to reiterate if we are going to be using means, and we know that is what is probably going to happen, having a "no opinion" or a "neutral" is going to impact the interpretation of the mean. She would support an amendment getting rid of the "no opinion." It could be added. She stated that the College of Sciences and Health Professions had recommended that a separate box without any merit value be added.

Senator Marius Boboc stated that he would connect item 10) to amend item 12). He would go back to Dr. Kaufman's point, 10) reads, "The instructor encourages engagement with the course material" but for 12) he would add the adjective "required." He noted that in some cases the instructors have the ability to use supplemental or recommended material. Item 12) could read, "The course materials are relevant" as opposed to "useful." Professor Boboc said, going back to Dr. Liggett's idea, if we were to change the sequence of the categories, should that apply to 17) and start with the grade of (A). Finally, Dr. Boboc said that there is no item here about on-line classes. He asked, "Would this be used for on-line classes as well?"

Professor Karem replied that UFAC is recommending that this be a core for all forms of instruction.

Professor Boboc noted that there is no dynamic in on-line classes sufficiently different to require at least one item.

Dr. Karem responded that there would be an expectation because this is a core. That's why we actually waited using words like "student discussion", or "in the classroom" because we wanted it to be kind of space neutral. Again, UFAC's expectation is that this is a core instrument to be expanded upon like a manifold to blooming flowers.

Professor Kaufman said that she liked what Dr. Boboc has proposed and that is wonderful but now, she is looking at 15) "I learned a lot in this course." She would actually formulate it more as, "The course did what it promised." Did the course do what it promised in syllabus, which is nowhere here and it is much more important than how the student assesses what they learned. Make sure what the course promises that they accomplished.

Dr. Karem replied that this is one of the concerns that UFAC had with that kind of question. These questions are trying to be assertive and as value-neutral as possible in some ways to say what the course promised to do. Professor Karem stated that he had an excellent suggestion which is, "The course meets its stated objectives."

Professor Kaufman commented, "Yes, that's much better, wonderful."

Dr. Jayanti noted that she had a small concern with that. She said one of the reasons UFAC wanted that question was because of the feelings of students that there was nothing I learned so UFAC wanted an item that says that. There might be a situation where the instructors feel that the student feels that he or she has done enough. So we won't have the students saying that the course met the objectives, but I didn't learn anything in this course.

Dr. Goodell stated, "That is not an assessment of the course." That is an assessment of the student. She would suggest, "That is a student self-assessment; it's not assessment of the course."

Dr. Karem stated that an advantage is that if any proposal regarding changing a question or dropping of a question is limited within your college structure, this can always be re-incorporated. He added that the goal is to enable that kind of flexibility because in Engineering's instrument there is a question on the use of technology and in Education there are questions about diverse pedagogical methods. These are sort of core competencies that we are trying to assess.

Dr. Kaufman commented, instead of "no opinion," we might say "not applicable."

Dr. Karem noted that UFAC didn't include that because of the point that this disrupted the statistics, so that was taken off and we tried to use "Neutral" but he is guessing or hoping that someone may want to make a friendly amendment to delete the "Neutral" option.

Professor Kaufman said that that is unrelated. She is saying that there should be the possibility for the student and she doesn't see where this happens.

Senate President Goodell stated that she is aware of the time here so she will take two more comments and then she will ask for someone to make a motion on any of the amendments that they have proposed.

Dr. Berlin Ray commented on the scale. The typical scale in the middle is going to be either agree or disagree. Neutral on a five-point scale then we should be either agreeing or disagreeing. It is better to have a box to the side that says "not applicable"

Professor Karem replied that a number of committees suggested a need for a "disagree." Here "disagree" means that a rating of three doesn't mean anything because

that doesn't mean that you are agreeing or disagreeing with the assessment so it gives a sense of a false average to do that.

Professor Berlin Ray commented, "Take that out and just have a four point scale."

Dr. Karem pointed out that this is what has been suggested.

Professor Berlin Ray said that there are going to be some cases where you may not go through step by step but you may sometimes say, "Well, that really doesn't apply. I didn't try to see the professor outside of class. I can't honestly say that they were available or not." Dr. Berlin Ray said that she would be forced to make a choice here but it really doesn't apply to things like that so I think we need to provide that. You start getting false means.

Dr. Hoffman, commenting to Dr. Karem, said that the last time he addressed Faculty Senate about this instrument, he told Senate that this was intended to apply only to face to face classes; that there was another committee working on an instrument for on-line classes.

Dr. Karem replied, "Yes, and our UFAC actually decided at its last meeting that we would revise the core so that it could be applicable to all forms of instruction.

Professor Hoffman said, "I don't think you've done that." Referring to 2) "The instructor is well prepared for class." Dr. Hoffman said, "You don't have class in an on-line course."

An unidentified Senator said, "Well that varies. You could have an on-line chat."

Professor Hoffman noted that some people do but a lot of people don't so this is not going to apply to many on-line courses. She added that that needs to be revisited. The proper instrument for evaluating on-line courses needs to be revisited and developed separately because this is not the form.

Dr. Goodell commented that the chair of the E-Learning Committee is at Senate today. She noted that Professor Linda Wolf, the chair, is working on that issue and asked Professor Wolf if she wanted to say anything.

Professor Wolf reported that the committee is working on a lot of things and that is just one of many. The issue will be coming to Senate eventually but she can't say how soon at this point.

Dr. Berlin Ray stated that her concern is that it's late and everybody wants to leave. This is important and so we end up rushing the discussion because we all want to get out of here. She went on to say that these evaluations are really important because it impacts a lot of decisions for faculty and that's critical. She really feels we need to either

stop the discussion and put it on the next agenda or do something because this is what happens every time we run late. We are better off not pushing it just to get it done.

Dr. Goodell noted that one thing that did not happen she thinks is firstly not all of the Faculty Affairs Committees in all of the colleges responded. She said that she knows that the notice from Dr. Karem got caught up in certain email in-boxes and was not sent out. She is not going to say any more than that. She completely absolves Dr. Karem of any blame on that. She doesn't feel that Senate is absolutely ready to make a decision on this issue and it's late. What she proposes at this point is that Dr. Karem make some minor adjustments given today's feedback and bring it to the next Steering and Senate meetings. She added that when faculty get an email regarding this issue, please flood Dr. Karem's inbox with replies because that has not happened yet. She went on to say that it's a long process and we need to do it right. For those suggestions that were made today, Dr. Goodell asked Senators to please check the Minutes that Violet will prepare for us if Senators want to be sure that their suggestion is taken into account. We've heard some great suggestions. Please send them to Dr. Karem and he will try to incorporate them and bring it back to us at the next meeting.

Dr. Karem reported that a UFAC meeting is scheduled for tomorrow, December 16, 2013 because somehow he had anticipated that this issue might be referred back.

Dr. Goodell noted that it is a very difficult thing to get an agreement on. We have at least some agreement. We are further down the road then when we started.

#### **X. Budget and Finance Committee Report (Report No. 34, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Goodell noted that Professor Andrew Resnick, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, had to leave early so for the next Senate meeting, we will put Dr. Resnick's report from the Budget and Finance Committee higher up in the Agenda.

Dr. Hoffman stated that she didn't know if this was the appropriate procedure but she would like to suggest that we table the rest of the Agenda and take it up at our next meeting and that we schedule another meeting a week from today.

Professor Goodell noted that she agrees that we had way too many things on the Agenda for today but we are not going to be able to schedule a meeting for next week because there are just too many things on her calendar and everybody else's calendar for next week. We could perhaps schedule a meeting during the first week of classes if people were amenable to that to take up the rest of these issues.

Dr. Marino inquired if we can split this up into two motions.

Dr. Goodell replied that we certainly can.

Professor Liggett stated that she feels this is a good idea to have a meeting at the beginning of the next term and also she wondered if it would be possible to finish up the

Agenda for this meeting first at the next meeting. Do this Agenda first and then we can go on to new reports.

Dr. Marino proposed that the rest of today's Agenda be tabled until our next meeting. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Marino then proposed that an additional meeting of the Senate be scheduled on Wednesday, January 15, 2014. Professor Boboc seconded the motion.

Professor Krebs pointed out that we don't need another Steering meeting; just an additional Senate meeting. Dr. Goodell agreed that we will not have an additional Steering meeting; we will complete the Agenda that we have not completed today.

Senate President Goodell stated that because of the lateness of the hour and because additional items need to be discussed and voted on, it has been moved and seconded that today's meeting be recessed to Wednesday, January 15, 2014 in order to complete the December 4, 2013 Senate Agenda. She then asked Senators to vote. The motion to recess today's meeting to Wednesday, January 15, 2014 in order to complete today's Agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy  
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel