

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

**DECEMBER 5, 2012**

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

Al Bitar, Artbauer, R. Berkman, C. Brown, Caspary, Karlsson, Markovic, S. McHenry, Percy, Sadlek, Sawicki, G. Thornton, Vandemark, G. Walker.

**ABSENT:** T. Banks, C. C. Bowen, Hrivnak, Liggett, Rashidi, B. Ray for Witmer-Rich.

Boise, M. Bond, Drnek, E. Hill, Jain, LeVine, Lock, Parry, Spademan, Stoll, B. White, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Gosselin, Kostea.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:07 P.M.

**I. Approval of the Agenda for the December 5, 2012 Meeting**

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Agenda for today's meeting. Senator James Marino moved and Senator Stephen Cory seconded the motion and the Agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of September 12, 2012, October 10, 2012 and November 7, 2012**

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the meetings of September 12, 2012, October 10, 2012 and November 7, 2012. Senator Paul Doerder moved and Senator Jeff Karem seconded the motion and the Minutes of the

meetings of September 12, 2012, October 10, 2012 and November 7, 2012 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

Senate President Goodell reported that since our last meeting, there have been two articles in the *Plain Dealer* and a response from President Ronald Berkman regarding the credit hour proposals that are under consideration by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) which, unfortunately, has shone a light on this issue before UCC has had sufficient time to carefully consider all of the implications for our students. As soon as she is done, Senate will hear from the UCC chair, Bill Kosteas, and be asked to vote on their preliminary recommendations. Dr. Goodell said that she wanted to take this opportunity to commend Bill Kosteas and the UCC for devoting a lot of meeting time and time outside their meetings to researching the issues from all sides and presenting this preliminary report today. There will be a follow up report at our next Senate meeting on February 6, 2013. The result of Senate's vote today will be taken to the Board of Trustees' meeting on January 16, 2013. She noted that the next meeting of the Board of Trustees is on March 18, 2013 so the final report of UCC will be presented then.

Dr. Goodell reported that the University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) is continuing the review of the committee structure, and they are working on a proposal that will be brought to the January or February Steering meeting and to the Senate thereafter. This might allow us to elect members to the new committees by the end of this academic year. Dr. Goodell asked Senators to contact Dr. Jeff Karem, UFAC chair, with any ideas they have in this area.

Dr. Goodell noted that the Complete College Ohio (CCO) Task Force recently released their report and it contains twenty major recommendations, many of which have implications for us as a faculty. She stated that the CSU Board of Trustees will be delving deeply into this and every Ohio institution has to present a plan for addressing the recommendations as early as December 2013. It is likely that legislation around this report will be drafted and voted on sometime next year, so we will certainly be hearing more about it. Fortunately for us, President Berkman was part of that Task Force, and some of the recommendations are things CSU has already done including more academic support for freshmen, clear degree maps and degree audit for all undergraduate programs, intrusive advising, year-long scheduling and automated wait-lists. We have yet to place much focus on supporting teaching broadly across the campus, and she noted that she is pleased that the Undergraduate Student Success Committee has taken up the review of the CCO report as well as considering the implications of CSU's retention plan that was prepared by Dr. Carmen Brown's office this past summer. We will hopefully be getting a report from that committee about their deliberations in either the February or March Senate meeting.

Senate President Goodell stated that the revised SSI funding formulas were released on November 30, 2012. There will be a significant shift in how we are funded in the future based much more on our graduation and course completion rates which mean

that it is likely we could lose in the order of \$2 million in the first round of implementation. We must all work together to find ways to improve our retention and six-year graduation rates which have shown improvement over the past two years but will likely not improve enough in the next two years to avoid this cut. Dr. Goodell said that she would propose that the most important thing faculty can do is be the best they can be in the classroom and when advising students. Showing your students that you care about their education through your professionalism, your prompt attention to their concerns and timely useful feedback on their work is a great start. She noted that as a teacher educator for almost twenty years now, this advice is always given to her pre-service teachers and, when implemented, makes a difference to their students. She asked faculty to please take some time themselves, and encourage their colleagues as well to think about what they personally can do to improve our retention and graduation rates. She noted that she is sure that the majority of our students come here with the intention of getting their degrees and she is certainly not suggesting that we lower our expectations – that would be doing our students a great disservice. But, the reason we are all here is to ensure that as many of our students as possible graduate and get to use their knowledge and skills to better their lives and communities.

Finally, Dr. Goodell stated that as most everyone now knows, Provost George Walker has had meetings with College Deans to discuss faculty workload policies and there have been mixed messages about the content of these talks being disseminated through the grapevine. She is sure that Provost Walker will be happy to answer any questions faculty might have about these issues after his report today. She said that she is aware that we still have not formed our faculty group to consider the data and workload topics as requested, but the end of the semester has been terribly frantic for many of us, so she hopes to take this up at the next Steering meeting. She added that if faculty have any suggestions or would like to volunteer to be part of such a group, to please contact their Steering representative.

Senate President Goodell moved on to item IV. She noted that everyone should have received documentation via email yesterday and Ms. Violet Lunder has extra copies of the preliminary report from the Committee on Undergraduate Student Success. She stated we will hear from the University Curriculum Committee about their recommendations on the Undergraduate Student Success report.

#### **IV. University Curriculum Committee Recommendations on the Undergraduate Student Success Committee Report (Report No. 37, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Bill Kostea, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, noted that everyone should have received a copy of the UCC's preliminary report yesterday afternoon and he hoped Senators had a chance to read it. Basically, the UCC took a vote on the first two components, that is, on the move to a 120 credit hour standard and then the second part is on the conversion to a standard of three credit hours for GenEd courses excluding WAC, SPAC and Capstone courses since those were intended to be part of the major and not part of the lower level general education curriculum.

**Proposal 1: Move to a 120 Credit Hour Standard for Degree Completion**

Dr. Kosteas noted that there are several reasons the UCC supported the 120 credit hour standard. First of all, if we look at the way the rules are now, the 120 credit hours is the current standard for the minimum credit hour requirement for degrees. There shouldn't be any significant opposition to this standard. Again, he reminded everyone that there will be exceptions to the 120 credit hour degree rule. If there is an accreditation or a licensing issue, and you can't get to 120 credit hours, there will be exceptions made for those programs. Dr. Kosteas stated that there didn't seem to be any significant negative curricular impact to adopting this policy and those were the primary reasons the UCC voted unanimously to endorse that recommendation.

Senator Doerder asked who grants the exceptions. Dr. Kosteas replied that the UCC envisioned this because this is not just a curricular issue; it is actually an Admissions and Standards issue as well. Then, in order to help break up the work load, an area representative from the UCC teamed with an area representative from Admissions and Standards and together they will review exceptions, make a recommendation, and take it back and possibly the broader committee will decide exactly how we are going to do it. The idea is that if the burden of proof rests with the department or school or whoever is administering the program, and if you can show that the dominant model for that program at other public universities in the State of Ohio is something other than 120 credit hours, then that exception would be granted. That is the idea now. The UCC hasn't fleshed out the mechanics of all of this yet – it is just a preliminary proposal but that's sort of the way the UCC sees going right now.

Senator Paul Doerder commented that the exception process appears to be a Faculty governance procedure or some modification thereof. Dr. Kosteas replied that Dr. Doerder was correct.

Senator Beth Ekelman commented that it would be important to insert that in the document so that this is not up for clarification later. She proposed the following: "The Faculty Governance process will be developed and followed" and that would have to be inserted in number II as well.

Senate President Goodell stated that Senator Ekelman has moved an amendment to the proposal that we add "Faculty Governance mechanisms be instituted to grant the exemptions."

Provost George Walker said that he would recommend that the Chief Academic Officer of the University will have the final say.

Dr. Ekelman commented that this is her concern. She thinks that we need to honor the Faculty Governance process.

Senate President Goodell noted that the process that exists right now is that the faculty makes recommendations to the Provost so that would not be changing the process.

We will go through the Faculty Governance procedures to make the amendments and to make the proposals and that legislation be passed to the senior academic officer and then to the Board of Trustees for their approval. She added that this is how it is currently.

Senate Vice President Sheldon Gelman stated that we all know there are time pressures and constraints and asked if we could just state, “through the usual processes,” and if it turns out there is disagreement about that later, we could resolve it later. He noted that his understanding is that a recommendation from the full Senate would go to the Provost and the President for transmission to the Board. It would not be that the Provost and the President formally could reject it but of course the Provost and the President will explain their views to the Board. This is something that has to be taken seriously but he doesn’t think that it is the Provost and the President that makes the decision as opposed to transmitting the decision to the Board and expressing their views as they must on university matters. The phrasing “usual processes” will get us over this hump.

Interim Provost George Walker stated that the usual process would be to handle that right now as well.

Senate Vice President Gelman asked Dr. Ekelman if that would be acceptable. Dr. Ekelman replied that it would be acceptable.

Senator Jeff Karem commented that Senate needs to vote to approve the proposed amendment.

Senate President Goodell stated that the amendment statement is as written with the addition of: “The granting of exceptions will be determined through normal faculty governance processes.”

Senator James Marino seconded the motion and Faculty Senate unanimously approved the amendment to recommendations I and II of the UCC’s proposals.

Senator Cheryl Bracken stated that she had a question about the 120 credits. She asked if full time is going to mean twelve credits then for our students at the university or will students be expected to take fifteen credits to be considered full-time.

Dr. Kosteas replied that he didn’t know if there would be a change in the definition of full time.

Dr. Bracken commented that if students take twelve credits per semester, they can’t get to 120 credits in eight semesters.

Professor Kosteas responded that he knows students can’t get to 120 credits in eight semesters; we are lowering the standards. Students can’t get there taking twelve credit hours per semester now. You can’t get to 120 and you can’t get to 128 in the same time frame taking the same number of credits. She stated that to her, some of this is

intertwined. Dr. Kosteas agreed that it is but it is actually part of the rationale of why UCC decided to support the second recommendation because in fact it would help several programs in getting to 120 credit hours. He doesn't see that this somehow makes it better. Some students cannot take eight fewer credit hours to complete a degree. He doesn't see any way, shape or form that this would delay graduation for anyone. But that should, in fact, help them to get there sooner. If you are taking fifteen credit hours per semester for eight semesters – if you are doing that right now, you need another half semester to get to 128 credit hours. That is why number II goes hand in hand. If you do those two together, it makes it easier.

Dr. Bracken commented, “Unless you are taking sixteen credits.” Dr. Kosteas agreed with Dr. Bracken. He noted that again, that is why these two go hand in hand, at least the way the UCC sees it. If you do move to 120, we have in common on the proposal to make a broader conversion to three credit hour standards. If you do those two together with a reduction to 120 credit hour degrees, this actually makes it a feasible matter to get there with fifteen credit hours.

Dr. Bracken noted that she understood Dr. Kosteas and that is why she wanted to make it evident to everybody. The two are much more intertwined. When you are taking four four-credit hour classes, that is sixteen credits over eight semesters, you should get to 120 regardless of whether they are doing that or not. When we move to 120, it is a different configuration of credits.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy commented that for the sake of Violet and the Secretary to the Faculty Senate, there are three microphones around and he asked members to pass them around to members speaking so that we can accurately reflect the discussion in the meeting minutes.

Senate President Goodell asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing no further comments or questions on Recommendation I, she stated that the UCC has proposed to endorse the move to a 120 credit hour standard for degree completion with exceptions as noted in the material Senators received with the amendment as voted on today. She then asked Senators to vote. The UCC's endorsement to move to a 120 credit hour standard for degree completion as amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**Proposal 2: Adopt a 3 credit hour standard for General Education Courses (excluding WAC, SPAC and Capstone)**

Dr. Kosteas moved to item II of the UCC which refers to the standardization of General Education course to the three credit hour model. He noted that he tried to make this clear from the very beginning that UCC is excluding WAC, SPAC and Capstone courses. We are talking about the natural sciences and social science requirements and here this was not a unanimous decision by the UCC but it was approved by a wide margin. Dr. Kosteas commented that some of the arguments in favor of this are that it does put us more in line with what our other peer institutions in the State are doing so this

is definitely going to help students in terms of transferring seamlessly between Cleveland State and other schools like Kent State, Akron, Toledo, etc. He continued by stating that this will facilitate transfers. He noted that as he alluded to earlier, another important consideration here is the fact that especially for the very highly structured majors, this will actually assist programs. This came out of the memos from department chairs and college deans; this wasn't just the UCC coming up with this. In some memos three credit hour GenEd courses will actually assist programs in reaching the 120 credit hour target. In addition, Dr. Kosteas noted that the way the General Education requirements are set up right now, the GenEd requirements can be satisfied with a minimum of 38 credit hours. But that is assuming students can actually find three credit hour classes to satisfy the natural sciences, social sciences and arts and humanities requirements. Dr. Kosteas noted that as it turns out, the reality is something quite different. If you look at the current configuration of courses, in the arts and humanities, out of the 87 courses that are certified as satisfying the Arts and Humanities General Education, 77 out of the 87 are four-credit hours. This makes it very difficult for students to find three credit-hour courses that actually fit into their schedule. Dr. Kosteas stated that there is a little bit more balance in social sciences. It is 18 courses of three credit-hours and 23 four-credit hour courses. In mathematics, it is two three-credit hour courses and nineteen four-credit hours. In writing, it is four and five. In the Social Diversity requirement there are eleven three-credit hour courses and 51 four-credit hour courses. In Natural Sciences, 18 out of 30 are three-credit hours. In several of these categories it can be very difficult for students to actually find three-credit hour courses. Dr. Kosteas stated that the General Education Requirements were written such that they can be satisfied with three-credit hour courses.

Dr. Kosteas reported that he did a little bit of research to find the General Education Requirements in other area public universities and we are definitely at the upper end; the stated requirements of 38 credit hours is at the upper end. He noted that likely, many of our students are taking well over forty credit hours in trying to satisfy those General Education Requirements which puts us very much at the upper end of that range. So, we are placing an additional burden on our students compared to what other institutions are doing. He noted that one of the over-riding themes here is the transferability of credits. There are some other issues. Dr. Kosteas commented that if you are taking a lower level class to satisfy a GenEd but it also satisfies a major requirement, there will be programmatic difficulties. The CSU program may or may not accept that three-credit hour class as being equivalent. It will satisfy the GenEd requirement but that doesn't mean the department will accept that course as satisfying the major requirement which might require that student to basically re-take that class now as a four-credit hour class. Even in cases where the department does not require the student to re-take the class, they may say they will accept the three-credit hour course as satisfying this major requirement even though ours is four-credit hours. It raises the issue of whether that student is then going to be adding to compare to students who took the course here in their freshman or sophomore year. Dr. Kosteas stated that those are the primary reasons for supporting this proposal. He noted that this is the same process in terms of acceptance. Except here, if the University Admissions and Standards

Committee would like to help take some of the workload off of the University Curriculum Committee, he would welcome their help.

Dr. James Marino, chair of the University Admissions and Standards Committee, stated that they would be happy to do so. He added that he would but he could not speak for the rest of the committee members.

Dr. Kosteas noted that exceptions would be resolved on a course by course basis. So if the dominant model in the State of Ohio is, for example, Calculus I are generally four-credit hour courses it would be allowed to remain as a four-credit hour course. He added that this is the right way of looking at it. We don't want to make changes that take us further out of alignment of what is going on at other universities and make it more difficult for students to be able to have a seamless transition between universities. The unit of analysis for us should always be the student. The funding formula is focusing on our freshmen graduation, retention and completion rates but what we really should care about as educators is the completion rates of students – whether they finish here or finish somewhere else. As he said half jokingly to some colleagues in the last few days, if every single one of our freshmen leaves here and they go to Ohio State, Harvard and Princeton, we should be applauded. We shouldn't be punished; we should be applauded for their success. He stated that these steps are definitely going to help students in terms of success.

Senator Beth Ekelman asked that the amendment be added to the recommendations. Dr. Goodell replied that it has already been added.

Senator Jeff Karem stated that he was in full support of this GenEd conversion and he wanted to add two other issues to the mix. Besides the total number of GenEd credit hours that are needed within the areas of subdivisions, Social Science, Human Diversity, etc., there are three-credit increments themselves so that you might need to complete nine credits of a particular requirement. Then you would have to take more four-credit courses to fulfill that because you can't make that up to nine so there is a compelling internal reason for accounting. As a former director of Undergraduate Studies for his department (English), regarding the transfer module, the lack of alignment at that level is an incredible pain for students and faculty alike. Even if a department is able to grant credit for a particular course as meeting that four-credit requirement, the students are still deficient a credit or two and both Dr. Kosteas and he served on the Petitions Committee and this means that you get odd proposals: the one-credit waiver, one-credit independent study, and it is just sort of an unnecessary run around for the students and faculty. So, if we have those standards aligned with our peer institutions, it is better for our students coming out and it's better for our students who are coming in and for the faculty and administrators. He went on to say that there is a really good compelling case internally and externally.

Senator Mark Tebeau indicated he was curious about the 38 credit hours and asked if that will change as a result of this.



Dr. Kosteas replied that there is no proposal on the table at this time to change the GenEd requirements system as it has been developed. It is simply that as it is now, the GenEd requirements are stated that you need a minimum of say six-credit hours of social sciences, so that is two courses. They are based on three-credit hour courses. They are not supporting any change in the system at this point in time; that is not on the table. If people think we need to revisit this in the future, that's another issue.

Dr. Tebeau pointed out that 38 is not divisible by three. He commented that this is his historian's math skills speaking. Dr. Kosteas added, plus one for introduction to university life; plus one for the lab.

Senator Visocky-O'Grady commented, if we move to the 120, that is what we just voted on, and we are not changing the 38 and that automatically comes out of the major areas?

Dr. Kosteas replied, not necessarily. He did an exercise at least running through many of the majors in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences; you can fulfill for Economics all of the GenEd requirements and the Economics major requirements, of course recognizing that some double counting of math courses would be required. You can do all of that, take a year of a foreign language and still come in well under one hundred. So there is going to be the question of how do colleges and how do programs get to the 120 credit hours. If it is something that has to be determined by the colleges and by the departments, his guess is that the majority of majors, especially in CLASS, aren't going to have to make any changes. He noted that some of the more structured programs where it is very rigid, you take these courses and there is a little bit of wiggle room here and there. Much tougher decisions will have to be made in terms of where to cut, and how to shave a credit hour here and there.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady asked if we are potentially continuing the conversation past today's vote that maybe it comes out of GenEd instead of the majors. Dr. Kosteas replied that he is more than willing to do so.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady noted that looking at the numbers from the comparison universities is one option. She just wanted to make sure that we aren't making blanket decisions and then revisiting some of them.

Dr. Kosteas replied that the UCC was not asked to look into that but that is something that occurred to him as he was gathering this information; they were really on the high end there in one area in particular. He is speaking for himself and not necessarily as UCC chair here for a moment since they did not actually discuss this in their meetings. Regarding the diversity requirement, we seem to be one of the few universities that requires both an African-American and a US Diversity course. A real simple fix would be to say, and this wouldn't require a lot of work, say instead of requiring one of each, just require one – pick which one you want. Then none of those courses would have to go through any further revisions in terms of a resubmission or anything like that. Dr. Kosteas added that this is just his own two cents but that would be

a very simple fix and we would definitely be open to looking at it. This would actually be a natural time to revisit GenEds. He added that we wouldn't need a major overhaul but a little bit of tinkering around the edges might actually really help in terms of getting the 120 credit hours.

Senator Robert Krebs noted that the College of Sciences and Health Professions' caucus met yesterday and discussed this issue at length and were able to work within the constructs of these 38 credits in the GenEd. He added that it looks like it will work for their majors. He was also asked to say that the College of Sciences and Health Professions' unanimous support for the current document doesn't in any way at this point in time change any of the concerns previously addressed if we try to take this as a general mandate across the entire curriculum. That still needs to be discussed but they wanted to put out their support for this document and then these changes are things they can work with.

Dr. Joel Lieske asked if we can wait for student input before we make decisions. He knows information is being gathered on what our students want. He commented that he queried two of his classes and the students were unanimously opposed to moving to the three-credit sequence. He noted that all of us are open to the issue but he would personally feel more comfortable if we had some data on what our students prefer.

Dr. Kosteas commented regarding Item III that this is why the UCC asked that they be given just a little bit more time. In fact there is a time line that he proposed a few weeks back where the UCC will finalize a full proposal in the first week of spring semester. He can tell Senate that as of last night, the UCC had a little over 800 responses to their student survey. Thanks in large part to the help of Dr. Teresa LaGrange's office, an email blast was sent out to 5,000 individuals and so they definitely well exceed the ten percent response rate that he was told to expect. He added that they may even get closer to a thousand responses which would give them closer to a twenty percent response rate which would be pretty fantastic. In that student survey, they are trying to get a sense of what do students perceive as really being the stumbling blocks for them in terms of their being able to graduate in a timely fashion. Is it this issue of three/four credit hour classes or how much is that an issue. How much of an issue is the timing of courses and the availability of courses. Dr. Kosteas commented that he should save some of this for after we vote on Item II here but he will spend a few minutes to outline what some of the major issues are and why UCC does need a few more weeks to deliver before they give any kind of recommendation on the proposal to make a broader conversion of three-credit hours.

Senator Norbert Delatte stated that he feels recommendation I and recommendation II are feasible but he also thinks, if we try to do recommendation III or try to make changes to the GenEds at the same time, it would make it much harder to do the first two so he is in favor of trying to do what we can and not overly conflating things. He noted that one option UCC may want to look at is if we are looking at trying to get 120, then in the Engineering College, of the six arts and humanities, social sciences and social diversity specified, instead you just take whatever six courses you want. They

have designated two particular courses that they really consider to be part of their program and those are two that the students take. So when you try to do that, look at either getting courses that you already have that you would want to take and meet those requirements or getting them to meet those requirements and in essence, getting double use out of some of the courses in the GenEd program.

Professor Adrienne Gosselin asked for clarification on the African American Experience. She noted that this requirement seems to be versus other cultural requirements. She doesn't quite understand that.

Dr. Kosteas replied that there is nothing on the table to touch the GenEd system. There was simply a question earlier about whether that is something we could consider. He noted this is a future discussion that we can have but there is nothing at this time on the table to change the current GenEd structure.

An unidentified Senator asked, "In the survey you sent the students, did you ask them about class size and whether that was an issue for them in terms of retention? The reason I ask that is, as a former program director and paying attention to enrollment, we really increased our enrollment sizes in our classes; it is easier for students to hide; it's less interaction with faculty; some courses have grown up to 200 students in a class for one faculty member to manage. I was just wondering if that was an issue that was even asked."

Dr. Kosteas responded that it was not an issue. When you start devising a survey of this type, it starts to grow like mushrooms out in your yard after a heavy rain. The UCC was really trying to scale the survey back because you always run into the issue of, if you make the survey too long, then the students are just going to glaze over and not read it. That would have been a good question to ask but there were other questions a little bit more central to these issues. He personally does believe that classroom size is very important in particular with the division of students that we have. If you are talking about students coming from the much higher end of ability and preparation or the preparation distribution, they can handle large class sizes much more readily than probably your typical CSU undergraduate student. So, he does think this is an issue and is something that will tie into our deliberations on Item III.

Professor Marino stated that the GenEd requirements have always been the part of the curriculum where we share our curricular authority with our colleagues at other Ohio institutions because we primarily teach transfer students where the curriculum within major programs is more properly ours and we do have a responsibility both to our students who are transferring into our program and transferring away to make this efficient for them. He said he believes implementing this proposal should clarify some of the issues involved in the larger proposal, which we have discussed so far largely necessarily in the abstract. The implementation will make it very concrete to us what would be involved and what the practical tradeoffs are in any larger conversion.

Hearing no further comments, Senate President Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has endorsed a proposal to adopt a three credit hour standard for GenEd courses as written in the proposal Senators received with an amendment from the chair stating that exceptions would be approved by regular faculty governance procedures. She then asked Senators to vote. The UCC's endorsement to adopt a three credit hour standard for GenEd courses as amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**Proposal 3:**

Professor Kosteas noted that the UCC didn't fully deliberate on the question of the broader conversion of our undergraduate curriculum from a predominantly four credit hour model to a predominantly three credit hour model. One of the reasons of course is that UCC is still collecting the student surveys and obviously we have not had time to look at that data yet. But, it goes much beyond that. There are a lot of issues with the conversion to three credit hours that we really need to take a serious long hard look at. Dr. Kosteas stated that we don't have a very homogenous student body. We have a very diverse student body in terms of their background and also in terms of when they take classes. Are they daytime students? Are they evening students? For example, some of the big questions that come up for him are: a student who works full time or mostly full time and comes to campus two nights per week – right now that student can take eight credit hours per semester. The big question is, "What will they do if these all become three credit hour classes? What are the time blocks going to look like in the evening?" If they can still only fit two time blocks in the evening, that same student is now going to be forced to take six credit hours per semester maintaining that two nights per week schedule. One alternative might be to add a third time block in the evening but now we are really talking about a major strain on departments. He noted that his department is a great example of this. They have a graduate program that is taught entirely in the evening which of course is another related issue and the UCC hasn't even discussed graduate programs but many graduate programs are going to be effected. Is this going to mean a de facto change to three credit hours for graduate programs in part because of the cross listing of many four and five hundred level classes? But, beyond that, again this goes back to the issue of time limits. If we can't schedule four credit hour classes even if they are not cross listed, if we can't schedule two of them in a night, we can't offer them and that is going to cause major problems. Dr. Kosteas stated that we have in the more general conversion issues related to graduate programs, issues related to how evening students are going to be able to fair with this. We also have additional concerns and this goes back to looking at how students might be taking four four-credit hour classes. We are now going to be asking them to take five three-credit hour classes and we are asking these students to buy five sets of books and other materials for classes; we are asking them to write five sets of exams and term papers and for less credit – for only fifteen credits instead of sixteen and so we have to ask, is there a way that we can insure that we don't actually harm our students with this transition?

Professor Kosteas commented that another related issue actually came up with something that happened recently and that is the removal of the cap on the credit ban. He

can see a lot of our students who are now taking sixteen credit hours saying, “Well, I can take eighteen credit hours and I don’t have to pay for that sixth class at all.” Dr. Kosteas noted that while that might sound great in theory to a student to say well I’ll take the sixth class and I’ll get out of here faster, made many of us realize that this really raises the likelihood of students not succeeding in individual courses and actually delaying their progress through their programs.

Dr. Kosteas noted that these are just some of the issues that the UCC needs a bit more time to deliberate on. The UCC doesn’t want to rush into action; we only want to rush into our recommendation. Again we have a very diverse student body. A large fraction of our students are graduate students. We always have to bear in mind that out of all of the public universities in the state of Ohio, we have the largest share of our students that are graduate students. We definitely don’t want to have any kind of negative impact on those very successful graduate programs.

Dr. Kosteas said that these are just a few things that the UCC would like to have a bit more time to address. At this point, Dr. Kosteas asked Senators if there were any other issues that UCC should also take into consideration. He stated that this is not an exhaustive list. He added that it doesn’t have to be now. Senators can email him at some other point in time and he would be happy to continue this dialogue. He added that it feels like this is all he talks about these days.

Senate President Goodell thanked Dr. Kosteas and the UCC for all of their hard work.

At this point, Dr. Kosteas thanked the members of the UCC for all of the hard work put in over the weekend. They set some pretty sharp timetables to get this report out and they did a great job. If he didn’t have the members on the committee that we have, he doesn’t think they would have been able to turn this around so quickly.

Senate President Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposals for Senate to consider.

## **V. University Curriculum Committee**

### **A. Proposed Revisions to the Leadership and Lifelong Learning Specialization in the PhD in Urban Education (Report No. 38, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Kosteas noted that the first item from the UCC is the proposed revisions to the PhD in Urban Education. He noted that everyone should have received an electronic copy of the summary of the changes. The first part is a change in the title to “Adult, Continuing and Higher Education” which in fact will be a better reflection of the program’s focus. The second change is to replace ALD 700 with ALD 606 because the material that is currently being taught in 700 is actually being taught in two other courses in the program.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed revisions to the Leadership and Lifelong Learning Specialization in the PhD in Urban Education and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Leadership and Lifelong Learning Specialization in the PhD in Urban Education were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B. Proposed Deletion of the Teaching Track from the Theatre Major (Report No. 39, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Kosteas stated that the second item from the UCC for Senate's consideration is the proposed deletion of the Teaching Track from the Theatre Major. He noted that the rationale here is that there are not many students in the program and that the consensus is not to continue to offer a program that is not in demand.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed deletion of the Teaching Track from the Theatre Major and asked Senators to vote. The proposed deletion of the Teaching Track from the Theatre Major was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**C. Proposed Revisions to the BA in Psychology (Report No. 40, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Kosteas stated that the third item from the UCC is the proposed revisions to the BA in Psychology. He noted that in addition of a core requirement and a change from three to four core areas and a reduction of one elective there is an increase in four credit hours in the major bringing it up to a total of 40 credit hours which is not too far out of line with what other majors have.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed revisions to the BA in Psychology and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the BA in Psychology were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**D. Proposed Revisions to the MA in School Psychology and the Psy.S. Degree Phase of the Psychology Specialist Degree Program (Report No. 41, 2012-2013)**

Professor Kosteas stated that the next proposal is actually two sets of proposed revisions to the MA in School Psychology and the Psy.S. Degree Phase of the Psychology Specialist Degree Program. He noted that these were sent in tandem in part because it is actually a shift of some of the content from the Psy.S. Degree to the MA Program. He added that the net effect is an increase in two credit hours for the MA Psychology Program and no net change in the total credit hours for the Psy.S. Degree.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed revisions to the MA in School Psychology and the Psy.S. Degree Phase of the Psychology Specialist Degree Program and asked Senators to vote. The proposed

revisions to the MA in School Psychology and the Psy.S.Degree Phase of the Psychology Specialist Degree Program were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**E. Proposed Deletion of ENF Courses (Report No. 42, 2012-2013)**

Professor Kosteas noted that finally we have the proposed deletion of ENF Courses because the department of Modern Languages has not offered courses with the ENF heading any more. Those courses are being offered under the MLA heading.

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

**F. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 43, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Kosteas noted that there are several items from the UCC for informational purposes only. They are predominantly GenEd submissions and a few other minor changes to degree programs.

1. Approval of PHL 313 as a WAC Course
2. Add HIS 332 as an Elective to the CLAM Major and Minor
3. Add HIS 385 as an Elective to the CLAM Major and Minor
4. Delete HIS 386 as an Elective to the CLAM Major and Minor
5. Renumber PSY 725 as PSY 626
6. Creation of IST 300 and CIS 300 as Co-Op Courses
7. Change in Spanish Major Course Prerequisite
8. Approval of HIS 327 as a WAC Course
9. Approval of HIS 328 as a WAC and African American GenEd Course
10. Approval of MUS 411 as a WAC Course

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

**VI. University Admissions and Standards Committee**

Dr. Marino stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has three proposals, two of which will be offered in tandem with Dr. Kosteas and the University Curriculum Committee.

**Proposed Changes to Academic Standards Language  
(Report No. 44, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Marino presented the first item which is a revision to the Academic Standards language and there are a number of proposals here that are relatively substantive. He stated that he would go through them quickly because everyone should have the summary. The first point is the creation of a new category called "Academic Warning"

preceding “Academic Probation.” He noted that an alarming number of our students go on Academic Probation during their first academic year meaning after one semester. It has been felt that immediate probation has been discouraging to the students. The warning category would be instituted to give students a chance to avoid probation. The Academic Warning category is also a temporary thing. It doesn’t go on your permanent record where probation remains on your transcript forever. The Academic Warning will melt like the winter snows sometime around June. The Academic Warning is also used later for another application.

Dr. Marino noted that the second major point is that the probation and dismissal policies across the university will be standardized across all colleges and removes the current category “Subject to Dismissal” a category for a student who may or may not be dismissed depending on the ruling of the Academic Standards Committee of that particular college which has lead to some apparently numerical glaring ink in the systems from college to college. This proposal would make one standard in place and require less decision about making it.

Dr. Marino stated that a third revision would create Academic Warnings and eventually, after the first time and after subsequent semesters, academic probation for students who are not failing their classes but are withdrawing from some classes and are not making satisfactory progress toward their degree. This was controversial in committee and they did send this back to the task force for more discussion. Part of the thinking here is that federal financial guidelines are now paying for progress to degree and do not make a distinction between unsatisfactory progress due to Fs and unsatisfactory progress because the student has withdrawn from classes. He noted that the federal financial guidelines do acknowledge that we have a large number of students in our population where life happens to them and do need to withdraw in the middle of the semester because of family emergencies, medical emergencies and other emergencies. For that purpose, the first such withdrawal may come with a warning, which is temporary and can simply be worked off. Students who are repeatedly withdrawing from a large number of their classes where they are not making satisfactory progress toward their degree, will start the semester as a full-time student and end it as a part-time student, and would be placed on Academic Probation and this will be aligned with the rules for financial aid eligibility.

Finally, Dr. Marino noted that there would be a requirement for specific tutoring or advising contacts for students placed on Academic Warning. The student would not simply receive an alarming letter. The student would receive an alarming letter and would then have to do something about it by meeting with a tutor and speaking to an advisor.

There being no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the University Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed revisions to Academic Standing Rules for undergraduate students and asked Senators to vote. The proposed changes to the Academic Standards Language were approved unanimously by voice vote.



**VII. University Curriculum Committee  
University Admissions and Standards Committee**

Dr. Marino noted that there are two additional matters from the Admissions and Standards Committee and the University Curriculum Committee.

**A. Proposed Revisions to Doctor of Physical Therapy Program (Report No. 45, 2012-2013)**

Professor Marino stated that the University Admissions and Standards Committee approved the revisions to the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program. He noted that there were a number of changes that moved requirements from course to course keeping the number of credit hours required constant. One class evolves from three to four credits, another from three to two credits. An 800 level course evolves from three to two credits and there is a new 800 level class which is a one credit class. These are designed to better support student passage of the comprehensive exam. Dr. Marino noted that a subject specialist is present to respond to questions.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the University Admissions and Standards Committee and the University Curriculum Committee have proposed revisions to the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B. Proposed Levin College of Urban Affairs Articulation Agreement with South China University of Technology (SCUT) (Report No. 46, 2012-2013)**

Finally, Dr. Marino stated that we have a proposal from the College of Urban Affairs for an Articulation Agreement with South China University of Technology for a collaborative BA program in the Urban Studies (Public Management) track. This is closely modeled on CSU and the Urban College's existing Articulation Agreements with local two-year colleges. He noted that they are quite reputable institutions in China. Students would take 66 credits at the South China University of Technology, come to CSU the last two years of their program and take 62 credits at CSU. Students would receive a BA from CSU and they would also receive a reciprocal BA from South China University of Technology which is actually not our purview but South China University's decision.

Dr. Marino stated that there are several content experts present at Senate to respond to questions.

There being no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the University Admissions and Standards Committee and the University Curriculum Committee have proposed an Articulation Agreement between the Levin College of Urban Affairs and South China University of Technology (SCUT) and asked Senators to vote. The

proposed Articulation Agreement between the Levin College of Urban Affairs and South China University of Technology was approved unanimously by voice vote.

### **VIII. Parking Rates for FY 14 (Report No. 47, 2012-2013)**

Ms. Clare Rahm, Assistant Vice President for Campus Support Services, stated that she comes to Senate today with preliminary financial information that represents the current thinking and goals related to any increase in parking fees CSU may be contemplating and she does that intentionally so that we can have a conversation about goals in the Faculty Senate before a discussion begins about changes. She drew attention to the materials that were provided. She stated that she first wanted to remind everyone that their opportunity to purchase spring hang tags, if needed, started on December 3, 2012 via CampusNet.

Ms. Rahm thanked everyone for participating in the implementation of the parking program this fall. She noted that those who have been able to purchase what they wished to purchase are very pleased with the program. Those who were unable to purchase the product that they desired view this situation as less favorable. She stated that they learned a lot through the fall and she is applying that knowledge to spring. There are more hang tags for sale in the spring semester as we get started with our inventory than there were in the fall because they no longer need to be as conservative. They have observed use for fall semester and so the need for a wait list for faculty, staff and students is less likely. It may still come to pass but they have taken steps to have a more seamless experience for students, faculty and staff. She added that she will be judged by numbers as the spring semester progresses but she wanted to let everyone know that they are learning as they are going and they are using data to make decisions, and she defers to her parking experts who will post data to the parking web site shortly that will identify the difference in inventory between fall and spring.

Ms. Rahm stated that the parking department will make a proposal for a rate increase. There are a couple of things that will be the motivating factors for that and she wanted to talk a little bit about it and how they might proceed. First, parking will continue with a student centric pricing structure, i.e., students pay less than others. In many cases, our students struggle to be here and so it was an acknowledgment in the early years that in order to have them be able to pay tuition we would give them more favorable rates for parking. That is not saying that they are any more or less important than everyone else; it is simply to say that this is our commitment that students pay less. She noted that they will continue to maintain our pre-paid products and are continuing to move students, faculty and staff to a pre-paid hangtag, either annual or semester and away from a cash purchase or a scratch off purchase. With technology, they will be able to offer a few more options. Moving forward in FY 14 they will continue to operate in a similar manner to what we have been doing this year.

Ms. Rahm stated that they would like the operating expenses funded by any increase to fund two specific purposes: the first would be to continue to improve customer service related to technology and communication. They would also like those

to be tied to more responsible support of our reserves so that we are better prepared to enhance and repair our physical plant.

Ms. Rahm noted that the current thinking on parking rate proposals is that students will continue to pay less than faculty and staff. The percentage on the green hangtag is likely to be a greater percentage than on the white hangtag. We continue to differentiate those two products and so people may see some difference there. She noted they are also looking at an increase on the scratch off product in both the green and the white category. Ms. Rahm noted that although not listed in the materials, she wanted to mention some success with our evening only product launched in October 2012 and that is an opportunity for students to purchase a hangtag that is just for evening classes and allows them access to those core parking lots and that has been quite popular with our evening students. They also look to maintain the visitor rate at \$10.00 maximum per day that has been established and seems to be what the market will bear and also seems not be too much of a hardship for those individuals who do come to us as visitors.

Finally, Ms. Rahm reported that they are looking in some key areas to increase citation fines and those key areas relate to behaviors that devalue the hangtag that you may have purchased. They will be working with the university administration advisory committee and the Trustees to take a look at certain behaviors that make it difficult for everyone to park in an area that you purchased rights to park in. She noted they have received an increase in students being creative and creating their own hangtags. They have more than twenty cases in the Student Judicial Office related to creative students who not only created but sold those hangtags and so that is an area where they believe we need to pay some attention. They also continue to have individuals who park in our parking locations with no hangtag and have decided not to purchase one and, as they say, play the odds and so they believe it is appropriate to consider an increase in that. Ms. Rahm said the new idea that we may be applying to a small group is that we have some repeat offenders who play the odds and report that financially it is still to their benefit to play the odds. She noted that we may add an escalator for someone that chooses to violate repeatedly so that your first violation may be A, the next violation is A+ and your third violation would be A++.

Ms. Rahm stated that these are the general ideas they are thinking about and working through a consultative process that will include a public forum on specific rates for FY 14. During the second week of spring semester there will be announcements out in a variety of ways. The goal is to have an understanding of what the parking department's final proposal will be to senior administration in a timely fashion so that we can then prepare for a proposal to the Board of Trustees in March 2013. She added that today's visit to Senate is to generally speak about parking and give everyone a chance more importantly to speak to her. At this point, Ms. Rahm stated that she would entertain questions and comments.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy asked Ms. Rahm if she knew what the current balance is in the reserve account. Ms. Rahm replied that she did not but she would be happy to give it to Violet so that she could put it in the Minutes.

Dr. Duffy also asked Mr. Timothy Long if he knew the balance in the reserve account. Mr. Long replied that he did not know the balance.

[As of October 31, 2012, the Parking Reserve account balance is \$2,629,500.]

Senator Beth Ekelman commented that she is not sure this issue has been resolved but she knows it was a problem for the speech and hearing clients that park in the Main Classroom right now. She stated that the \$10.00 fee is really high for them and asked if the parking department has worked on that or if they have a resolution to that issue.

Ms. Rahm responded that it is her recollection that Vice President Stephanie McHenry responded to a decision for the current academic year and that within the budget process there would be further conversation about how parking or another entity would best support those types of outreach services. It hasn't been resolved moving forward but it is her understanding that an interim arrangement was put in place.

Senator Robert Krebs asked if there are any plans to increase parking availability at CSU. Ms. Rahm replied that at this time, they are not in development of any specific new facilities. CSU continues to solicit the private area lots to let us know if they have capacity and how much it would cost for a student, faculty or staff person to purchase spaces because we would like to make sure that information is readily available to the campus. At this point, there are not any immediate plans to lease or to build anything new.

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

President Ronald Berkman stated that he had a fair amount to cover and would try to cover everything quickly. First, he is sure that Professor Kosteas and his committee know much more about their curriculum than they ever desired to know. He wanted to really commend the work they produced and the time they put in to bring these recommendations to the Faculty Senate today. He said it was a thoughtful and diligent process and he has every confidence we will continue to move on into the realm of recommendation number three and find modus operandi to make the rest of this work. President Berkman said he underlined that there is always a recognition going into this that all courses are not the same, all programs are not the same, all needs are not the same, all students are not the same so there was never a notion that everyone would march to the same music or conform to the same patterns. So when he talked about a three credit model as some may have noticed in the correspondence, he always refers to it as a dominant three credit model – not the inclusive three credit model.

President Berkman said that as he talked about student success, and he is sure everyone is tired of hearing him talk about student success, but he always said that it will only begin to take shape and move forward when we, as an academic community, engage as we have engaged today. Personally, he feels extraordinarily proud that we have had this statement of engagement today on the part of faculty governance. He also wanted to

underline what Professor Kosteas said and that is, this is no magic bullet and that all of the issues related to student success, and they are a complex of issues that run everywhere from parking to financial aid to scheduling to course size, to adjunct faculty, to a huge inventory of issues, are not all going to be solved by what we've done today or what Senate has done today. Today takes us one step forward and one major step forward he believes. It is also creating a culture that will allow us to systematically look over the administrative and the faculty side at the impediments that students have towards success. He added that it was an extraordinary piece. He also wanted to add that although they didn't get a lot of discussion, the recommendations of the University Admissions and Standards Committee really took us another step down the road in identifying signs and identifying interventions and identifying policies that are often detrimental or often construed by students to be signs or signals of something that they may not be; and also for the suggestion that there not be just warnings or signals to students but with that warning and signal there will be a specific intervention for students as well. Again, this takes us another important step in terms of understanding what we need to do to improve our graduation and retention rate.

President Berkman talked a little bit about the State funding formula. It is a formula worthy of an academic department or an academic thesis; it has 11.5 variables in it and it has weightings, some of which we know, weightings, some of which we don't know; policies attached to the weightings, some of which we know; policies attached to the weightings of which we don't know. Every time it's run, it comes out with different numbers and Associate Vice President Tim Long and he and Vice President Stephanie McHenry and many others, and Provost George Walker took a long time going through it as have many of the Presidents at other Ohio public universities. He noted that right now, in the set of projections that was last generated, interestingly there are many more losing institutions than there are winning institutions in terms of how money would be redistributed within the formula. He believes that last count was winners, three and losers, ten in terms of the dollar distribution. It is going to have an impact on lots of institutions but he also is sure that we still have negotiating space here because the decision was to implement a part of the variable, part of the formula in year number one of the biennium, but go back and have further discussions about some of the other variables where there was not clear agreement that the variables made sense in terms of the formula. But the big headlines are the big headlines and fifty percent of any formula weighted on one criterion which is graduation is an enormous weight. Then when that additional thirty percent is weighted on course completion, in essence retention, you have the word now graduation and retention, in essence eighty percent of the formula is weighted to measure retention and graduation. So however we slice it, and he hopes we will be able to slice it in ways that will mitigate some of the impact that it will have on the university, it is a sea change – it is a paradigm change and it's going to have long term consequences for the way universities are funded. The Governor, as many have seen, is extraordinarily supportive of the change and really he committed at the news conference on Friday, he actually committed publicly and some newspapers reported this so he is not talking out of school, that he was committed to hold higher education harmless in the next biennium. So higher education would at least get the allocation that it got in the last biennium and indeed, in the press conference, the Governor said,

somewhat conditionally, that as he puts the executive budget together and as he looks at the other demands on the budget, etc., he would really be inclined if he has the ability to increase funding to higher education. President Berkman said that he has never been in a State or in a meeting where any Governor has said anything close to that and particularly, since at one news conference before that the Governor said, and it was missed by a lot of people but it was one of the most important statements that he made in the news conference, and he said that for a Governor, cutting higher education is the easiest thing to do – much easier than cutting K-12, much easier than cutting services to the elderly, to the poor, to the disabled, much easier than confronting the public employee issues; the easiest thing to do is to cut funding for higher education. For right now, and in politics all we have is right now, for right now we are lucky to be in the State of Ohio. Although there will be a reshuffling of the budget, we won't face a ten, twelve, fifteen, eighteen, twenty percent reduction in our share of the State budget.

President Berkman said that there is a crosswalk between the Student Success Report and the formula. Our efforts in Columbus and what we have done in Columbus over the last six months, and what he hopes will be redemptive is to demonstrate to the Governor, and he had an opportunity to meet with the Governor for forty-five minutes after the news conference, and he was well briefed to actually demonstrate to the Governor, as we talked about the degree audit, as we talked about year-long scheduling, as we talked about block scheduling, as we talked about the measures that we have taken in a student success formula without any State mandate. As an institution, we've taken these because we felt they were right for our students. He went on to say that he hopes we are going to be able to go forward with that and support a request to the Governor that there be some bridge money in the formula. The bridge money will help us account and mitigate the effects of taking the negative impact from something that we had no role collectively in creating or that the previous model penalized us for. So the argument that he has made is that he supports the model but he thinks that universities are entitled to a reasonable amount of time given a new set of ground rules to adapt to those ground rules and to try to position the university to be able to meet those new requisites. Of course the Governor retorts, "Well, I thought that's what you were supposed to be doing all along." President Berkman said, "Be that as it may, I do. I think we had a very constructive discussion." He said that the Governor used the example of Cleveland State several times during the news conference as an institution that had moved ahead on this agenda. President Berkman said, "Again, it is going to be a challenge but I am increasingly, and I know that you are up to meeting the challenge, and to watching us increase the numbers in terms of increasing this graduation rate. When you look at the next cohort coming through, there are like eighty students left in this next cohort coming through that could conceivably change our graduation number." President Berkman said that he is using these numbers just hypothetically, but they are very close. If all eighty graduates, in this cohort we are watching, the 2006 cohort, we are talking about the next graduation year, we could go up two points – one point or two points if all eighty of them graduate. If forty of them graduate, we could stay where we are or go down and this made us track, through the departments, every one of these students. They are not wearing armbands yet, it's not a bad idea actually, we haven't put any wrist bands on them or tracking devices that we could use but that is how close some of these are in terms of this quest to

even raise it one percentage point or two percentage points because we are going back. The students who entered in 2006 – many of them are not recoverable. We have taken a major step, we are in a very strong position, and we just need to keep moving forward.

President Berkman noted that the people from the Urban College left but he wanted to emphasize that he met with the representatives from South China when they were here – South China is a tier one university in China. A tier one university in China takes, as its incoming class of students, the top one tenth of one percent of every Chinese student who took the national admissions exam in the country. So, Dean Edward Hill should get the credit for putting this collaboration together with an institution that has the reputation that South China has and the position that South China has is really extraordinary.

Finally, President Berkman stated that commencement is one week from Sunday (December 16, 2012) and we will be awarding two honorary degrees at commencement that came through the governance process, finally to the Board of Trustees and passed the Board of Trustees; we will be awarding an honorary degree to Steve Minter. Many know Steve Minter and the work he has done for twenty years as President of the Cleveland Foundation and the work he has done on behalf of this university for the last seven years as an Executive in Residence, and the respect he enjoys throughout this entire community and in many respects throughout the entire nation. He noted we will be awarding one to Steve Minter and awarding an honorary degree to Albert Ratner. Mr. Albert Ratner is the founder of Forest City Ratner, the former CEO of Forest City Ratner and has been, again, an incredible civic champion and really was one of the two or three people that was most responsible for the CMSD Reform Plan, the organization of the levy, the financing of the campaign for the levy, and the ultimate passage of the levy. He has never received an honorary degree from any institution in Northeast Ohio. He will be eighty-five years old on December 26, 2012. President Berkman said that in any event, these are really two fine appointments that symbolize civic, ethnic and a spirit of commitment and public service and service to the university as well. President Berkman went on to say that we have had great faculty turnouts at these last commencements, just really wonderful faculty turnouts; it adds a completely different and uplifting dimension to the commencement to see as many faculty come out as in the last year or year and one half. He hopes everyone will join him next Sunday as we process 932 students including fifty/sixty doctorates. It is a proud moment for the university.

President Berkman wished everyone a good holiday, a good respite and said he would see everyone in January 2013.

Senate President Goodell noted that she had a question from her staff: they have been asking if there will be a Christmas shutdown this year. President Berkman replied, “Yes. I announced yesterday at the Christmas party that except for essential services, the university would be closed between Christmas and New Years Day.” He added that Dr. Goodell can tell her staff that they can enjoy the holiday.

#### **X. Report of the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer**

Provost George Walker had two things to say. First of all, he noted that we have some new information, some new data, that should be very useful in comparing ourselves with other institutions, other like departments, and they are being distributed to the Deans and the Deans have been getting tutorials on how to use this data. The Deans were supposed to share the data with department chairs and the departments are to share it with the faculty. The first is the latest Delaware Model which allows us to compare various things associated with teaching and credit hours in comparison with other institutions. The second one is Academic Analytics which allows us to compare our level of scholarship in various areas – citations, papers, honorary awards, grants, books – with other departments around the country. There are a lot of good things for us at Cleveland State as you look at some of this information and we ought to use it in terms of talking with each other and improving our departments. Some of it is useful in that way and also externally. There are a lot of things we can talk about in terms of excellence both in meeting our teaching responsibilities and in meeting our research responsibilities.

Provost Walker said the third thing he wanted to talk about was to clarify a little bit the teaching differentiation exercise. He is motivated to do this because of the memo from Professor Jeff Karem that simply reflected what he had been told and simply reflected the information that he had and Provost Walker wanted to provide some additional information for clarification. Provost Walker stated that he has had a chance to have that discussion with Dr. Karem. Provost Walker said that first of all, he wanted to emphasize the whole idea of the discussion about the differential teaching responsibility that is not focused on increasing faculty teaching load. It is associated with differentiated teaching responsibilities. Everyone should know that when he first came to CSU, one of the things he heard most from the faculty, remember he was Vice President for Research, what he heard most from the faculty was, “Well, here we don’t really fairly distribute teaching responsibilities because they were doing a lot of scholarship of a certain type and they were teaching the same amount as somebody down the hall that wasn’t doing any of that.” Provost Walker said that typically we normalize that almost everybody feels they are probably working harder than other people, often because they don’t know what the other people are doing. They really don’t know the diversity of activities; it is just the human condition. He said he has been at many institutions so he kind of takes that a little bit that this is just the way human beings are. When he got into the Provost’s Office here about five months ago, he continued to hear that we weren’t really differentiating and so he asked the Deans how we were doing. Most of the Deans said they are making progress on that and they are doing that. He noted that some people said to him talking historically, “Well you know you have to be careful about allowing Chairs and Deans to have differential teaching responsibility power because they might do it based on politics or on their friends or things like that. You have to be very careful about that.” Provost Walker stated that this is also not wholly true here people say. So, he filed that away. He said that he kept hearing this so he decided to push the Deans a little bit and said, “What would you guess is the percent of your faculty that aren’t teaching maybe a typical 2/2 load. What do you think that is?” And, the Deans gave him a number. “Well you know fifty percent, forty-two percent, some number.” Provost Walker thought well let’s just go look at the data, as flawed as it may be, let’s just take a



look at it. He found that the data he had in front of him, for some schools, didn't reflect what the Deans told him with regard to where they were. As he looked at some of the data at that time, which was not too long ago, it looked like ninety to ninety-five percent of the faculty in some schools were teaching a 2/2, typically four credit responsibility. He said to himself, "Well you know that could be true; that could actually happen because although he knew people were very different in their scholarly productivity, because he has that information in general, it could be balanced by their service responsibilities which incidentally are very, very important, but just like the Faculty Senate, you should differentiate between committees that meet once per year and committees like the University Curriculum Committee that seems to meet every hour.

Provost Walker said he then had a meeting with the Deans. At the meeting, he told the Deans that he wanted them to go back and he wanted them to make sure they had a transparent fair teaching diversity set of guidelines and he wanted them to talk with various people in their area and see what would come from that. The Deans said to him, some of them, "You know this is a difficult discussion and some faculty are going to be unhappy or feel threatened if you do this." Provost Walker said, "Well there are other faculty that are already concerned because they see themselves as being treated unfairly because they are productive." Provost Walker noted that he sees several faculty around the room today that he has had these discussions with and so we have to be Deans and we have to be leaders and we have to look at that. Provost Walker commented that part of his job is to get blood out of every turnip in this university from faculty positions and he has been trying to do that very diligently for us but if it were to turn out that we weren't using the resources we already have in a reasonable way, that's going to undermine his ability to do that. He can get it from the Provost's Position Fund but he wants to get it from other sources. So he asked the Deans to carry out this exercise. The 2/2 is a simple way to look at it because you have to look at credit hours – it's a much more complicated calculus than that and each school has to look at it in that way. But, he could imagine that you would have more people teaching less and other people teaching more if there really were differences in research and service responsibilities that were being carried out by the faculty. Provost Walker said that when the Deans come back to him now, and he has already seen about three of the results and preliminary results, it looks pretty darn good; if people come back to him and they have a differential teaching set of responsibilities that looks pretty reasonable based on other things, that's okay. But, suppose somebody came back to him, and said ninety-five percent of the faculty had the same teaching responsibilities, suppose that were true? Then his job is to push back and say, "Well alright, now let's look at that. That could be true but I need to understand that a little better; it doesn't seem likely that that would be true to me but it could well be." So we are going to be in the process now when they come back, if things still look pretty undifferentiated, then he will have that discussion with them and press back. He noted that in individual schools or colleges there are significant differences over all in faculty productivity and scholarship. It is the human condition and so it would again seem very unlikely to him if you have whole departments that seem alike within certain classifications that differ significantly in their research productivity. One might wonder how it is that the service responsibilities are so different in those two departments that it still ends up that they have the same teaching responsibilities. He noted this is where

they are on that. Provost Walker added that he is trying to have differentiation, not increase. There may be arguments that he doesn't know about other data that may not be correct but this is something that deserves significant attention because for a few faculty that talk to him a lot, the main complaint they have is the lack of differential teaching responsibilities.

Senator Robert Krebs indicated that he had one question with respect to the Academic Analytics system. The system is punching out some number that he has been told are all the way down to like a faculty level with some across departments and some across colleges. He noted that there are already rumors out that these are being used by the Chairs to put workload recommendations together.

Provost Walker replied that this may be true but he doesn't know that the Chairs have even seen it yet because we haven't actually allowed the Deans yet to be stewards of that data because they have to be educated and all that. He noted it is a tool that can be misused but it is a tool that requires judgment along with the faculty tool that exists.

Professor Krebs said that several faculty have suggested they would like to see what their score is or how it corresponds with the view of their own accomplishments.

Provost Walker replied, "Absolutely." He then asked Dr. Teresa LaGrange what the time frame is for people to know about this.

Dr. LaGrange responded that they still have three or four Colleges to go in terms of allowing the Deans access to the database. Soon the Deans will have a demonstration which is a little bit more of a tutorial that they can access. After that, they would probably then want to work with their Chairs.

Provost Walker stated that it is important for each of us to make sure these things pass the sniff test – in other words, no matter how much we are reassured, the sense of stakes are very high for Academic Analytics. Some institutions might use this for very high stakes kinds of decisions. They better get it right or they could get sued very quickly. In those areas where we have been able to compare, and he worked with Academic Analytics historically, their data tends to be much better than our own data – in other words, their data is better than the institutional data because they don't get their data from the institution; they get it from all of this other stuff they have been doing. When he was the Chair of the physics department and somebody had data, the first thing he did was look at his own data and the next thing he did was look at the physics department. You are willing once in a while, although it bothers you a little bit, if they miss one out of a thousand items. But there are things you can just look at and they do this over a period of three or four years; the citations – they've been working with a lot of the institutions on it – the AAU institutions, which may be the ones that most naturally would fit into some of this kind of stuff. Most of them already have been utilizing this and in fact the AAU itself is considering adopting this approach. If you are in the AAU, this would be one of the things you would get without having to pay for it because it would be one of the things the AAU has. For institutions like ours, it could be better

developing this data. They don't have a lot of PhD programs for example. He does not see this as a gotcha tool. He sees this as a way for us to look at departments and for the departments themselves to look at themselves and say, "How come it is that out of fifty departments that plausibly are like us, how is it that we are out of step on this issue. I'll take a department where there might be external funding. How come it is in chemistry or biology that most of our funding comes from A and B and these other departments also receive funds from C and D?" Provost Walker said, "Well, the first answer usually is because of what we do and how we do it and that is where the funding it. But it is also possible that there are people who have ferreted things out in other departments that we could take advantage of and it may be, because we know which departments those are, then we can begin to collaborate with them and to make progress working into these other agencies in terms of funding by being co PIs or something so it is in that sense that this could be very useful." He noted that there are other ways it can be used that probably would not be something we would do right away but you can look at the assistant professors in your area, in your department, the people you have hired the last four/five years, and compare them in terms of research productivity with the assistant professors at other schools that are comparable to you and how they are doing it. He went on to say that from what he has seen, there is a lot of good news in this data for Cleveland State and he is encouraging our senior leadership and our folks in external relations to make use of that good news in promoting the quality of scholarship at Cleveland State.

Senator William Bowen mentioned research productivity is usually output per unit input so there are two ways of increasing. You can either have inputs constant and increase outputs or you can have outputs constant and decrease inputs so both the input side and the output side are critical components of research productivity. What he is wondering is does Academic Analytics include all of the inputs. If you go to research conferences more, you publish more. If you have more graduate assistants doing your research for you, you publish more. All those kinds of inputs are important in determining the relative value of the outputs.

Provost Walker said he is sure that we can find some we don't include or that we couldn't deduce from but if you look at your peer group, you do it both in terms of density and weight productivity and a variety of ways in terms per faculty member and in terms of just total output. You have the data, not just for yourself, but for your own department. You don't have the data for individual faculty members for other schools but you have all of their data per department so you can compare yourself with whoever you want to. You can look at these – two or three hundred schools – depends on the kind of department we are looking at and you can do bait and switch. You can figure out what it is you want to compare with; you can figure out what it is you want to weigh; you might be in the Anthropology Department that works in an area where there are not a lot of grants but there are a lot of publications of a particular part and it might be cultural anthropology as opposed to bio anthropology within a given area. So, you can do quite a bit of your own. This is a diagnostic tool primarily for a department to use to get a feeling for where they are. You should know that in terms of recruiting faculty, other departments around the United States will use this to their advantage when they can to

show that if you come to their department as a new faculty member you are likely to do very well because of the data they have.

Senator Bowen asked if they measure the inputs because if we are going to compare ourselves, which is sensible in some ways, then you want to compare yourself to other organizations, not just those that are superficially comparable but that are comparable in terms of tangible levels of input. If you are teaching three core classes, you have less time, energy and attention to put into research so you expect the research to go down. So if you compare one department in one university with a 2/2 teaching load to another department with a 3/2 teaching load then you are going to get different outputs.

Provost Walker stated that Dr. Bowen makes a very good point. He noted that's why it is very interesting. They don't have to know how many courses people have but there are other ways to get that. So you could, for example, determine whether a department here has a 2/2 load, if that was the way you want to characterize it, and compare with other departments that have a 2/3 load or a 3/3 load or visa versa. They don't have that. They give you a lot of the data then you can go and, by working with other provost's in the State of Ohio and other places, determine by asking well, "What is your load?" So, that's right. They don't have all of the data but it is like a lab test where you know how much vitamin D the person has but you don't if they have been exposed to light or not but at least you know where they are now and you know what other kinds of data you might want to get to complete the picture.

Senator Beth Ekelman mentioned the impact service has on research productivity. She knows in her school they have lots of professional programs and program directors. Once you become a program director, your research productivity takes a dive because you can't do it all and that's a really important activity to recognize and value. She has heard rumors that program directors aren't going to get course releases.

Provost Walker responded that that would depend on the department and the school. That wouldn't depend on Academic Analytics; it wouldn't depend on course differentiation. Those are priorities that would be made. He agreed with Dr. Ekelman that any of these kinds of activities and any kind of data can be misused but that doesn't mean there is an excuse for not to have that kind of information. He noted that what Dr. Ekelman is arguing is it's not nuance enough and we have to think about other things and that's exactly right.

Senator Mark Tebeau stated it is his understanding that some colleges such as his own (CLASS) are actually asking faculty to provide very detailed workload assessments right now but other faculty haven't been asked by their colleges yet to provide that detail. What he is curious about is, "What is the implementation plan and wouldn't it be wise that it be consistent across the university rather than piece meal, college by college?"

Provost Walker responded that it is much more nuanced than that. He does know that some schools and colleges already have, if you look at just the raw data, a fairly differentiated set of teaching responsibilities already. There are other schools that don't;

they have a sort of standard. He can imagine that those that don't right now, because they are in different places in their development of this, he can imagine that those who don't might be trying to gather data that the others may have already gathered or may have already taken into account in order to be able when they come and talk with the Provost to say, "Well the fact that we have it this way is perfectly justified because here's the information we have to back it up." Provost Walker stated that he didn't know that; he is delegating responsibility. He is telling the Deans the same thing. He is meeting with Deans collectively and he is meeting with Deans individually and he is telling them the same thing. There was a time when several of the Deans were here and they are not here now, but it seems to him that the Deans need to have a certain level of leadership and sophistication in communicating this. He noted that he talked with all of the Associate Deans today as a group. He has been talking with groups of faculty and he has to put out a general letter every once in a while, but Senators and he know that in the actual implementation in the trenches, even though the intention is this would be something that we do in a like way, we are in different places in our development of this model in different schools here and actually different academic units may have different ways that they implement this because of the things they value and the priorities they have in different ways. He wants it all to be the same. He would like to say, "Yes, everybody is out there asking these things." He said that he doesn't know that and he can see how it can be different.

Professor Tebeau commented that it is hard to respond to that information other than to say it seems reasonable as a faculty member that his colleagues elsewhere in the university would be reporting the same information given the common set of metrics. He guesses that's where he is a little bit confused and then hence his question which is apparently some faculty are being asked to provide some metrics.

Provost Walker stated that at the end of the day, the Chairs will come to the Deans and they will have a story they tell based upon the information that has been provided. Of course, as Jeff suggested, every faculty member wants to make sure that their productivity, in terms of their service, and scholarship and everything is up to date and presents an up-to-date story. So that's certainly true. Some department Chairs or some schools may already have that because they've already collected it. Others may not. At the end of the day what he (Provost Walker) is going to look at is do they have a defensible set of parameters and data to back it up that makes it plausible and that the differential teaching responsibilities they show him are reasonable and fair.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady stated that she is a Chair and a faculty member and she is a full professor so she is one of Dr. Walker's well squeezed turnips these days. She was heartened to hear that the President mentioned the idea of a bridge from the Governor that we have made big changes and big decisions and as these sea changes came forward we needed some time to implement them. She stated that mid November was when the Chairs received the memo from the Deans about workload conversations being different this year. She noted that as a Chair she has already been having workload interviews with her faculty members and was prepared, like she did last year, to have conversations with Dean Greg Sadlek. She said that she just came from a cabinet

meeting today and her understanding is that the Deans are asking the Chairs to come up with better, more accessible workload definitions to better make these decisions.

Provost Walker stated that some Deans may and other Deans may not. Some Deans may already have it in their schools.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady stated that her school is very diverse; they have a lot of different disciplines. What she is saying is, "It's now December and we have to have workloads to people in January, and we already have schedules made for a year in advance and so at this point to be making these new kinds of sea change decisions, while she respects where it is coming from and believes that we need to do it, she thinks we need a little bit more time to do a more thoughtful and then comparative process between the colleges. So, if some of the colleges have and some don't have, she would really like to see what her peers as Chairs and colleges don't have or colleges that do have so that they can compare. She feels a lot of pressure to come up with a good helpful recommendation to Greg in a two week turn-around time so that we can have proper meetings with faculty but she was already prepared to have meetings about workload for her faculty because that's part of her job on an annual basis.

Provost Walker asked Dr. Visocky-O'Grady if she has substantial differential teaching responsibilities in her department.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady said that her faculty are all pulling their weight.

Provost Walker commented that if Dr. Visocky-O'Grady can substantiate that in terms of their productivity and scholarship and service, then she would be in fine shape. He will be pushing that to see how it works out because in general, and it may be true in her department, but in general if she does that across the university, it doesn't turn out to be true because generally speaking some faculty enjoy teaching more, some faculty enjoy research more, etc. For it all to work out then everybody has the same teaching responsibilities across a broad group and it is possible but becomes less likely.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady said that she understands and respects that. She is just asking for the time to make accessible qualifiers so that they are fair across all the colleges. She added that right now going into having to have more assignments by January 31, 2013 according to the Contract, they do not have time to do that thoughtfully and she is a little concerned about it.

Provost Walker noted that he hears Dr. Visocky-O'Grady.

Senator Jeff Karem noted that Dr. Visocky-O'Grady made all of the points he wanted to make in a much more cogent fashion and he just wanted to give a suggestion. As much as we have asked Columbus to give us a reasonable time to adapt to ground rules, he thinks it is great that we are having this discussion and that is contractually acceptable. It is in the Contract. Workload is not guaranteed in a uniform way. This is why they sit on opposite sides of the room so we both couldn't be taken down at once but

he thinks it is important to have time for departments and colleges to really develop a clear sense of what those rules are and to implement them so that it works and so that it doesn't create the appearance of a rush process that just produces preordained outcomes. He would encourage Provost Walker to take a flexible approach as he has this feedback from the Deans to make sure that it is done right because he thinks that will be crucial.

Provost Walker stated that he does understand. If somebody isn't kind of frisky and pushing it ahead a little bit, then it might languish. What he is trying to do is play his role in moving it ahead in a way that some progress really occurs.

**XI. Student Government Association (Report No. 48, 2012-2013)**

Student Government Association President Moatasem Al Bitar said that he had a few updates from SGA and that Christopher Caspary, SGA representative will also help him with the SGA report.

Representative Caspary reported that SGA worked with Provost George Walker and Dr. Glenda Thornton, Director of the Library, and the Dean of Students, Dr. James Drnek on the late night study facility they are doing at the Michael Schwartz Library which is from December 3<sup>rd</sup> through December 6<sup>th</sup> and December 9<sup>th</sup> through December 13<sup>th</sup> from 10:00 PM to 3:00 AM. He encouraged everyone who has students who may want to study to attend. It is a nice environment.

SGA representative Caspary next reported on the Viking Card collaboration. It is an interesting issue with students being able to use the dining dollars at off-campus locations such as Subway, Pizza Pan and other places around campus. There are a lot of financial numbers involved in this so it is in an early stage to see if it is even feasible but this is something they will be working on during the spring semester.

Finally, SGA representative Caspary reported that they have been doing some work at conferences looking at how other student governments operate and they want to market themselves better and put themselves out there more so they are unveiling a new marketing plan to personalize themselves.

President Ronald Berkman asked SGA President Al Bitar to mention to Senate how the study hall works and how the hours work because he is not sure everybody knows how the exam study hours work.

SGA President Al Bitar responded that basically the study hall is open to CSU students only and they scan every student using their Viking Card. Free coffee and food is available all night long. Students can come in groups or individually. It is a designated quiet area. He noted that it is beneficial to students and they have been getting 200 students per night so far. It is definitely being utilized to the fullest.

Senator Robert Krebs asked for the location again. SGA President Al Bitar replied that the study hall is in the Michael Schwartz Library on the first floor. He added that the second, third and fourth floors are closed.

President Berkman noted that you have to get their early to get a seat. On Monday night there was not a seat available.

Provost Walker asked how long does the food last. SGA President Al Bitar noted that as soon as they make the announcement, the food is gone in five minutes.

Mr. Al Bitar commended the University Curriculum Committee for all of their efforts and all they are doing for the university. He noted that SGA passed a resolution at their last Senate meeting on November 30, 2012. The resolution follows.

### **RESOLUTION OF THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION**

WHEREAS, the academic interests of the student body at Cleveland State University being of primary importance to the Faculty, Administration and success of the University, this body, the Student Government Association hereby officially endorses the standardization of all General Education offerings to three credit hours (at maximum) and the standardization of all University course offerings to three credit hours. This body further endorses the recommendation of the University Curriculum Committee to limit the credit hour requirement for all undergraduate degrees to one hundred twenty credit hours (at maximum) except for those degrees with higher accreditation requirements.

Mr. Al Bitar noted that this resolution was passed unanimously by the Student Senate. He added that Provost Walker and Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange were at the meeting to respond to questions and to further clarify issues.

Mr. Al Bitar reiterated what Professor Bill Kosteas said that our student body is very diverse so it's really difficult to understand exactly what all students' needs are. For example, students are still against the RTA U-Pass even though this issue was on the ballot three or four years ago when the majority of students voted in favor of it.

Mr. Al Bitar noted that out of everyone at Senate today, they have the most contact with students every day so he believes SGA representatives can speak for the students. He does commend the efforts of the Student Survey. It was very beneficial and will really give us a very informed idea of what the students want.

Mr. Al Bitar reported that recently Student Government attended the Ohio Student Government Association fall conference held at Ohio State University. It took place on Friday, November 9, 2012. They also met with the Ohio Board of Regents and discussed House Bill 77. It is a bipartisan bill that basically allows students to have voting rights at Board of Trustee meetings and also the ability to attend executive sessions. Mr. Al Bitar then reported what he is proposing to this body. He believes that we should consider giving the student representatives of this committee a voting seat and more importantly,



they should seek their opinion on issues that pertain to students. He added that let us not be the kind of university who has students present at meetings as a requirement but rather a university that truly involves students in an engaged community. He understands the purpose of this body but he also believes that giving students a voting seat actually acknowledges their role and the decisions we are making as a university and administration and collaboration with the faculty. Mr. Al Bitar stated that this is for consideration of Faculty Senate.

Senate Vice President Sheldon Gelman asked if Student Government supported faculty members voting on the Board of Trustees or did he want faculty to remain as decorations.

SGA President Al Bitar replied that it would have to go to the Ohio House of Representatives. He added that the Ohio State Student Government Association really has been doing a lot of great work for two years now asking for the students' right to vote at Board of Trustees meetings.

Senate Vice President Gelman asked Mr. Al Bitar if the students would vote for the faculty representation on the CSU Board of Trustees. Mr. Al Bitar responded affirmatively.

Senate President Goodell noted that the Academic Steering Committee will take this issue up at its next meeting. She asked Senator Mark Tebeau, faculty representative to the Student Government Association, to perhaps bring something from the Student Government Association to the next Steering Committee meeting for discussion and this issue will then come to Senate.

## **XII. New Business**

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business.

Senator Visocky-O'Grady stated that she had minor business. She asked if Senate could get a better meeting room where she can get a chair when she comes in and she can see the people on the side she is sitting on. She added that she really misses the old amphitheater. She just feels like she can't see any of her colleagues and she can't hear anyone but in the amphitheater space she could. She added that we also have a lot of people coming in and out and there never seems to be enough chairs in the galley. Since she was carrying chairs on her way in, she would just love not to have to do that in the future. At this point, Senator Visocky-O'Grady stated, motion presented.

Senate President Goodell responded that we moved to our present room because many of us who were used to the old setting in the old Science and Research building didn't like the amphitheater setting because we could only see the back of each other's heads. She added that this was Senator Bill Bowen's suggestion and so we worked hard to get the room in the Student Center for the very opposite reason to Dr. Visocky-O'Grady's suggestion to move back to the amphitheater setting.

Senator Visocky-O'Grady suggested that perhaps Senate should vote on her motion.

Senate President Goodell suggested that perhaps this issue can be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting and a proposal will be brought back to the Senate. She added that we are now in this room (SC 311) for the rest of the year because, as everyone knows, big rooms around campus get booked up.

Senator Visocky-O'Grady asked if we could get more chairs. Senate President Goodell replied that we certainly have asked Conference Services to bring out more chairs and had she been here a little earlier today she would have requested that more chairs be set out so she certainly agrees with that.

Provost Walker noted that there are vacant chairs on the other side of the room.

Senate President Goodell again stated that she will put the Senate meeting room location on the Agenda of the next Steering Committee meeting. She added that perhaps Violet Lunder can work with the conference people to make it a little more conducive to a larger audience.

There being no further business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy  
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel