

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

SEPTEMBER 12, 2012

PRESENT: T. Banks, Bosela, W. Bowen, Bracken, Cory, Delatte, Dixit, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Gelman, Genovese, Goodell, Goodman, R. Henry, Horvath, Hrivnak, D. Jackson, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Karem, M. Kaufman, Krebs, Marino, Niederriter, Rashidi, B. Ray for Whitmer-Rich, Resnick, Rickett, N. Sridhar, Steinberg, Strauss, Talu, Tebeau, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, J. G. Wilson, Wolf, Zhou

Berkman, Al Bitar, Drnek, Lock, Markovic, Sadlek, Sawicki, G. Thornton, G. E. Walker, B. White, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, C. Bowen, Holsinger, Liggett, Meier, Rutar, Sterio, Volk.

Artbauer, Boise, M. Bond, C. Brown, E. Hill, Jain, Karlsson, LeVine, McHenry, Parry, Percy, Spademan, Stoll, Zachariah.

ALSO

PRESENT: Jeziorowski.

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

I. Eulogies

A. Eulogy for Robert F. Hartley (Marketing)

Dr. Andrew Gross delivered the Eulogy for the late Robert F. Hartley. His remarks follow.

“Robert Frank Hartley died early in August of this year. He served on the faculty of the College of Business Administration at Cleveland State University from 1972 to 1998. He came to CSU as a full professor from George Washington University in Washington, D.C.

“He leaves behind his beloved wife Dorothy, son Matt, daughter Connie, four grandchildren and several nieces and nephews and two sisters. He was buried from Our Lady of the Peace Church near Shaker Square on August 9, 2012.

“Bob Hartley was a distinguished member of this university. He was popular in the best and positive sense of that word. He has written many books, especially *Marketing Successes, Marketing Failures, Management Successes, and Management Failures*. He then combined those books and renamed them *Bull’s-eyes and Blunders*. While he had much success in this country, Wiley was his publisher, his books have also been translated to dozens of other languages and he was known from Asia to Europe to Latin America. So he has carried the CSU banner around the globe.

“Bob held a Fulbright to Eastern Europe in the 80s or 90s and he also authored and self-published a medical novel titled *Odyssey at Antietam* of which there is a copy in the CSU Library. But he was best known for his multiple editions of marketing and management successes and failures and they were also translated into many languages.

“Bob was also a runner – he participated in the Boston Marathon at age forty and did well. He was a solid member of our faculty and he will be missed by all of those who knew him and his spirit lives on among those who knew him.

“Thank you for allowing me to share the life of Bob Hartley.”

B. Eulogy for John M. Purcell (Modern Languages)

Professor Emeritus Bruce Beatie delivered the Eulogy for the late Professor Emeritus John M. Purcell. His remarks follow.

“As a person in part responsible for bringing John Purcell to Cleveland State University, I am proud and honored to remember him formally before this body.

“John was born in Cincinnati, the eldest of three children. By 1955 he had earned both a B.A. and a B.Ed. at the University of Cincinnati and in 1962, an M.A. at Middlebury College. After service in the U. S. Army (1956-58), he taught and was department chair in Cincinnati high schools until 1970; having then earned his Ph.D. at Ohio State University with a dissertation on ‘Role Definition of the State Foreign Language Supervisor,’ he applied for a position in Spanish and Foreign Language Education at CSU. At the time I had been appointed as Chair of Modern Languages for the fall of 1970, and was in Cleveland consulting with Professor Dick Small on new appointments for the fall. John was clearly the best of the three finalists for the position, and I have never regretted for a moment recommending his joint appointment in our department and the College of Education. He earned the Associate Professorship with tenure in 1973, and the rank of Professor in 1985 – not the easiest task when two colleges have to agree.

“He taught Spanish language and literature, all of CSU’s foreign-language education classes, and supervised student teachers until he retired in 1995. As one of his students wrote at his death, he was ‘a consummate professional, and I greatly enjoyed his Spanish language classes.’ Another student he mentored who is now a teacher commented that he ‘made a profound impact on the way I structure my classes and the methods I use. He made a tremendous impact upon foreign language teaching in Ohio, and he was a kind and caring person.’ His colleagues over the 25 years he taught at CSU could not have said it better.

“John delivered 45 papers at professional conferences – many of them invited, published 16 articles in his field, and edited or co-edited two published collections of essays; many of his articles have been cited by other scholars. Of one collection (co-edited with Donna Sutton), Howard Altman of the University of Louisville wrote: ‘This book is unique; the first book-length publication in foreign language education to focus on advanced levels of language learning.’ John served three times as Acting or Interim Chair of Modern Languages, and one year as Chair, and worked frequently on committees in his two departments and colleges and for the university. He also held many statewide positions, including the presidency of the Ohio Foreign Language Association of which he was a charter member; about the OFLA, Altman wrote in 1981 that the Association ‘has long been one of the strongest and most forward-looking state associations of foreign language teachers...’ From 1972 until his retirement, John served on the Advisory Council of the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. After his retirement in 1995, he was an active participant in the Retired Faculty Association.

“Few of his students, and perhaps few of his colleagues, knew that John’s extra-academic devotion was to vexillology, the study of flags. He published a number of articles on flags, was an active member of the North American Vexillological Association, served a term as its president, and participated in many of its annual conferences around the world; he designed and created flags, both for himself and for others. Over 40 years, with many colleagues, he worked on a reference book that was published in 2003 under his editorship as *American City Flags, 150 Flags from Akron to Yonkers*; it is as solid a work of scholarship as his academic publications, and perhaps more fascinating.

“John was devoted to his family, especially to his many nieces and nephews. He was respected and admired by all who knew him. One of his departmental colleagues for most of 25 years wrote: ‘He always looked for the best in others and, I believe, brought out the best in them. ... I have never heard of his being anything but humane, fair, thoughtful and creative.’ In a department with faculty speaking a variety of native languages and with often widely differing cultural values, John was always a voice of reason and uncommon good sense. John became a close friend to me and my wife, someone with whom it was always a pleasure to talk about anything and everything. He was a good man whom we all will miss.”

Senate President Joanne Goodell asked for a moment of silence in memory of our colleagues Dr. Robert Hartley and Dr. John Purcell.

II. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of September 12, 2012

Senate President Goodell asked for approval of the Agenda for today's meeting. Senator Majid Rashidi moved and Senator James Marino seconded the motion and the Agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of April 4, 2012 and May 2, 2012

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the meetings of April 4, 2012 and May 2, 2012. Approval of the Minutes of the meetings of April 4, 2012 and May 2, 2012 was moved by Senator Jeff Karem and seconded by Senator Andrew Resnick and approved unanimously by voice vote.

IV. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Goodell welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the year in a great new venue. She said that she hoped this will prove to be a better place for our meetings than a large lecture hall.

Senate President Goodell said that it was certainly a very busy summer for her and many others as well and this year promises to be just the same. She noted that there are a number of issues we will be facing going forward, so she will try to keep on top of things and report as best she can.

Senate President Goodell reported that the state of the number of full-time, both tenure track and non-tenure track, has been the subject of a great deal of discussion over the past few weeks as new faculty searches for 2013 hiring were approved by Interim Provost George Walker right before the start of the semester. She obtained a very brief update on the report that Dr. Teresa LaGrange produced for Provost Geoffrey Mearns last year, which indicated that the decline in faculty numbers has not stopped, and we started this year with the smallest number of tenure track faculty since 2002 (which is the extent of the data she has). She referred to the handout she provided. Dr. LaGrange has promised to get a full update to the report as soon as the census date for enrollment is past, and all of the part-time contracts have been entered in PeopleSoft. Dr. Goodell noted that the AAUP newsletter spoke directly to this issue as well, and she can assure everyone that both Dr. Jeff Karem and she will be following up vigorously with this.

Dr. Goodell reported that at the first Academic Steering Committee meeting last week, she asked the University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) to be prepared this year to undertake a complete review of the committees of the Faculty Senate. Our NCA visitors commented on the large number of faculty committees at CSU. Given our shrinking numbers, and her observation that some committees seem to have a lot more to do than some others, she felt it was time to take a look at the committee structure in more

detail. She will be convening a meeting of all Senate committee chairs as soon as possible (once we have all the chairs in place, something she hopes to achieve by next week) to discuss how each committee can contribute to this process. She noted that if anyone has any insights on this, please discuss them with a member of UFAC as soon as possible.

Senate President Goodell reported that at its last meeting in June, the Board of Trustees approved a bond issuance that went through in August. \$152 million is a lot of money to borrow, and the debt service on this will be significant for years to come. The chair of our Budget and Finance Committee, Dr. Stephen Duffy, will give a complete update on this later in our meeting.

Senate President Goodell commented that during the summer, a group of administrators and Dr. Duffy were convened to synthesize strategic initiative activities that the university has engaged in over the past three years. A succinct document was produced that the Provost and the President will be presenting to the Board of Trustees and the university constituents at large over the coming months. Dr. Duffy will also give a report on his experiences later in this meeting.

Dr. Goodell stated that as everyone knows, the push to shorten the time and requirements for undergraduate degrees and increase the number of students who graduate is coming from multiple sources. Last year, our own Student Success Committee recommended that all general education classes be a maximum of three credits, and it recommended that all undergraduate programs consider the implications of moving their entire curriculum to a 120 credit maximum with all courses at three credits. She said she knows that Provost Walker has asked all of the Deans to examine this issue as well and so she is adding her support for this initiative. CSU's mix of 3 and 4 credit classes at the undergraduate level is adding an unnecessary level of complexity for our students, especially our transfer students. This mix also means that there are many minutes of downtime during each day when faculty, students and our facilities are not being utilized in the best possible way. For these and other educational reasons, she strongly supports examining and redesigning our curriculum. She will be working with the Provost and senior staff to suggest a timeline for possible changes over the coming weeks. Dr. Goodell asked everyone to please give their full support to these initiatives, and encourage their colleagues to do as well.

Senate President Goodell reported that the Program Prioritization process that was recommended by the budget Task Force last year has not moved forward yet. The Task Force report was received by President Ronald Berkman, and she knows he has discussed this with Interim Provost George Walker, who will be talking about his priorities later in this meeting. The Provost has made it clear to her that he would like resource allocation decisions to be based on a set of criteria that we are all at least aware of, whether or not we agree with those criteria. Categorizing (or prioritizing) programs is one part of this puzzle, one that CSU has never undertaken before. She certainly recognizes that it is uncomfortable to be judged by criteria you feel you have no control over, or to be judged by your colleagues, and she has conveyed these feelings to both President Berkman and

Provost Walker. Dr. Goodell added that she remains hopeful and urges the President and the Provost to ensure that whatever direction these deliberations take, that faculty will play a central role in the process.

Senate President Goodell thanked everyone for their attention.

**V. Senate Nominating Committee
Election of Faculty Senate President and Secretary**

Senator Jeff Karem stated that the Senate Nominating Committee is tasked with soliciting nominees for the open Senate Offices, in this case, Faculty Senate President and Secretary. As a matter of procedure, the Senate Nominating Committee solicits nominations over the summer and there is both a process by which the Senate Nominating Committee solicits them and then any member of the Faculty Senate can also gather a petition with five names and send that to the Senate Office to add an individual's name to the ballot. Dr. Karem reported that no petitions were received but they were successful in soliciting two highly qualified nominees, in the opinion of the Nominating Committee, and that would be Senator Joanne Goodell for President who is eligible to be re-elected and Senator Stephen Duffy who is eligible to be elected as Faculty Senate Secretary. Dr. Karem stated that this is the official presentation of the Nominating Committee. He noted that because there is not a contested office on the ballot, it is a tradition to move to approve the slate in an election by acclamation. He stated that if there is no objection, as chair of the Nominating Committee, he moves to elect the two candidates by acclamation. Senator Mittie Davis Jones seconded the motion and the Faculty Senate unanimously approved by acclamation the election of Senator Joanne E. Goodell (Teacher Education) as Faculty Senate President for a two-year term and Senator Stephen F. Duffy (Civil and Environmental Engineering) as Faculty Senate Secretary for a two-year term.

VI. Provost Search Update (Report No. 1, 2012-2013)

Senate President Goodell said that everyone knows we are currently engaged in searching for a new Provost. Provost George Walker is our Interim Provost. He heroically stepped into the breach and is feeling the way to being Provost and he is all too keen as he told the committee yesterday to do whatever he can to get the search going and completed satisfactorily and successfully as soon as possible. Dr. Goodell noted that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee as well as all of the Senators was not very pleased with the composition of the Search Committee and so there was quite a discussion about this at the recent Steering Committee meeting. She noted that Senator Sheldon Gelman had prepared a Resolution about the composition of the Search Committee at the Steering Committee meeting and he will briefly talk to Senate about what happened with that. Dr. Goodell said that after Professor Gelman's report, she will invite President Ronald Berkman to make some remarks.

Senator Gelman first congratulated the new Senate Officers.

Professor Gelman stated that over the summer like everyone here at Senate today, he opened his email to find an announcement by President Ronald Berkman regarding the Provost Search Committee. He noted that he is speaking for himself only now. He was stunned with the committee which was announced and that bore no relationship to committees that were constituted at Cleveland State in the recent past and departed, he thought, very dramatically from the prevailing practice at academic research universities like Cleveland State. He noted that as one Steering Committee member said, the committee was totally unlike what we are and what we aspire to be. While past committees at Cleveland State have varied in composition, to his knowledge there has always been formal consultation between the university administration and the Faculty Senate. On this occasion there was none. This came to Academic Steering as a result of concerns that he had and other members of Steering had; it did not come from the administration. Professor Gelman stated that he thought this is a notable and regrettable departure from our practice and, he assumes, the practices of other universities. Regarding recent committees at Cleveland State and, again they have varied, in general there has been a majority of faculty members on the committee which makes a lot of sense since a chief academic officer is being selected. He noted that on this committee there were two faculty members and the chair on a committee of twelve or fourteen and it did not look like an academic committee or a committee that was choosing an academic officer, no less, the chief academic officer. What is more, on a number of Cleveland State committees, every college had been represented and the college representatives had been chosen by either the Academic Steering Committee or the full Senate. He noted that this obviously did not happen. There were two faculty representatives chosen by the administration without a consultation with Faculty Senate at all.

Professor Gelman commented that the draft Resolution, which we are not going to circulate today unless Steering members change their minds about it, would simply recite the facts about our university traditions and about national academic practice and urge President Berkman and the Board of Trustees to reconsider and reconstitute the Search Committee. On a personal note, Professor Gelman said that there are a number of things wrong with the committee constituted this way. For one thing, he doesn't think it is well positioned to make the best choice because it won't be informed by faculty expertise. Beyond that, it sends the wrong message to Provost Candidates and to the person who is chosen as the Provost. He stated that he didn't believe there could be a serious candidate at this university or any university unless you are reasonably savvy about academic politics and alert to your environment, and, the message Provost Candidates will get from seeing this committee, is that the faculty is marginal in governance matters at Cleveland State. He thinks it sends the same message to why our community at Cleveland State will be a leader in removing academic matters from faculty and academic control and it sets a terrible precedent for our business here on Faculty Senate. If this committee, the kind of committee Cleveland State has formed after close consultation with the faculty and with faculty participation and with the majority of faculty members, if this committee is going to have two faculty out of a group of twelve, what committee should have more than two. The argument is there for continuing a University Faculty Affairs Committee with a majority of faculty members. He added that he didn't know how this committee came about but he has a sense that it was happenstance and perhaps there was not really a

decision made to depart from our own practices or to send the messages that he sees, but acts are acts. He added that he does hope that the ongoing discussions with President Berkman and Provost Walker, which are underway and in which he has very high hopes for, will result in a very different committee.

Finally, Professor Gelman briefly described a proposal that he made himself and said this is just him – he is not speaking for anyone else. This is not the kind of committee he would have favored. If this committee had been announced, he would have opposed it but it seems to him that there is a substantial improvement over what we had and he thinks the proposal would allow the work of the committee to go on so we didn't lose time and he thinks it would deal with the obvious objections of having a committee that is too large to be workable. He went on to say that what he had suggested was that a faculty member from each college be chosen by the Academic Steering Committee and added to the existing committee and that to deal with the too large group issue, our Provost Search Committee do what some Provost Search Committees do – Kent State had a Provost Search Committee of twenty-four and he assumed that not all twenty-four took part in every single decision. It is very common in presidential searches to have a broadly representative committee and then a smaller working group. He noted that his suggestion was first, that we augment the Committee's membership with faculty members from each college, and second, that the Committee itself create a working group this time with adequate faculty representation and that that working group carry on the work of the Committee without interruption. Whether this suggestion or some other one is adopted, he deeply hopes that we can work the situation out.

Senate President Goodell stated that she had one additional comment and that is after the Steering Committee meeting, Provost Walker set up the meeting between herself, President Berkman and Provost Walker at which time an offer was made to have an additional two faculty on the committee which the Steering Committee rejected. An additional meeting will be occurring hopefully either tomorrow or Friday, September 7, 2012 with President Berkman and Provost Walker to discuss what the actual committee makeup might be. She noted that President Berkman wanted to speak about that now.

President Ronald Berkman welcomed everyone back. He stated that he will be meeting with the Steering Committee and he has indicated that he is prepared to engage in a discussion concerning the composition of the Provost Search Committee and to that with dispatch. He noted that nothing has happened. The committee has met twice. He charged the Committee but it will be at least sixty days before any candidates would actually be cued up for a search committee to begin to review. He didn't want to have a debate but he did want to give Senate some of the thinking that went in to the composition of the committee. They did go back and look and there is no language in the Greenbook concerning the composition of a committee for the Provost search. They then looked at the last Provost search that occurred, which was in 2006 – seven years ago, and it had two iterations. The first iteration had Vice President Jack Boyle as the chair of the committee and no representative from Engineering. There was then a reconstitution of the committee and Dr. Teresa LaGrange was added as a co-chair of the committee and an Engineering faculty and a member of Continuing Education were added to the committee

as well. That committee also did go through an iterative process he assumed with President Michael Schwartz. Interestingly, which he had not known at all, maybe some Senators had participated on it; the Deans' representative on that committee was Dr. M. J. Saunders. President Berkman said that he didn't know the story exactly about how Senate went to the committee but that was what historically was put together for him.

President Berkman stated that historically, there is no one who wants a competent creative faculty and an academic leader as Provost more than he does. So clearly and unequivocally his interest is in finding absolutely the best candidate to lead what are some very significant and important academic challenges and later on he is going to talk a little bit about what he has talked about a lot. Some Senators may have seen in the *Plain Dealer* today and that is the very, very swift paradigm change that is now underway in Columbus. President Berkman went on to say that he takes responsibility himself for really not engaging in the kind of consultation that he should have engaged in, in terms of constituting the committee, and seeking faculty nominations and faculty input. He noted that that was his misstep and it happened over the summer in late July, early August. There was, he felt, an advantage to trying to get it out there fast. He was being candid in terms of the academic representation on the committee and he didn't think that there was a fire wall between faculty members who held an administrative position at one point in time and faculty members who did not hold an administrative position. He thought shared governance and shared academic enterprise meant that everybody who was in the academic enterprise had a legitimate place and a legitimate interest at the table. Without making a distinction or creating that fire wall, Dean Gregory Sadlek was appointed, Dean Craig Boise was appointed, Dr. Teresa LaGrange was appointed, one chair was appointed and two faculty members were appointed. There were six members of the committee who held academic rank, who were faculty members in administrative positions. His thinking at the time was that the Deans as well as the faculty really have an important role in making this selection. Again, he was making all these comments within the context that they are going to meet in a couple of days and reconsider the composition, but he is giving Senate a little bit of context.

President Berkman noted that the other thing he wanted to bring to everyone's attention was the Provost position; this has been going on for at least four or five years, and is an evolving position within the university. And more and more, the Provost, as he did during his tenure – his five years as Provost at Florida International University – has also become a chief operating officer, by and large for the university. When the President is not here, the Provost should be and is charged with making all of the operational decisions of the university. Also, the Provost has a role, as he explained to the committee in the charge with the Board of Trustees, has a role in leadership in the research enterprise, has a role in leadership in the admissions and enrollment enterprise and has a very, very significant role in the budgetary process. He wanted to create a committee, and he still thinks it would serve us all well as a university to create a committee that included all of those constituencies that a successful Provost will have to work with to be successful. We have one non-voting community member of the Board of Trustees, and we are very lucky to have Paul DiCorleto who is the director of the Lerner Research Institute at the Cleveland Clinic on the committee. We have students on the

committee, we have a staff member on the committee, we have a Foundation Board member on the committee and all of this was done to try to bring to the table the various constituencies to work with the Provost's needs to be effective and interactive.

President Berkman stated that the Provost's position has become really such an important position that actually, the first year that he was at Cleveland State, they went through a process with the Board of Trustees, of revising the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees. The one position which needed to be approved by the Board of Trustees, independent of the President's recommendation, was the Provost position. He noted that the President and the Provost have authority in all hiring matters. The Board of Trustees has final authority in the hiring of a Provost. In part, it was a function of the importance and the elevation of this position within the university. Once again, President Berkman said that it was his lack of diligence for not coming to the Senate and seeking a broader and more robust dialogue, and they will do it before the committee moves forward. He is just happy that he was given the opportunity to explain that it was not a random sort of individuals that he put together; he didn't think about voting blocks or coalitions; he thought about who were the individuals that would best inform this decision. Again, he noted that they will take a look at the search committee and he is sure that the Steering Committee, by the next go-around, will have a report on how the committee has been reconstituted. He promised Senate that there will be ample opportunities, for not only the Faculty Senate, but for all faculty to participate in this decision. He said that he will ask every final candidate who comes to be at a town hall meeting for all faculty and for all students and give all faculty and all students the opportunity to ask those candidates that they want to ask those candidates. President Berkman said that they need to make it as inclusive a process as they can – inclusive in terms of recognizing the Senate governance responsibilities but all inclusive in recognizing the influence that a Provost has over student affairs and has over other domains within the university. As part of the search process, they will have a two-hour town hall meeting for every single candidate in which they will invite the entire university community.

President Berkman offered to take any questions about the Provost search if Senators wanted to do it now.

Senator Brian Ray thanked President Berkman for agreeing to work with the Senate and the Steering Committee on the Provost search. He feels the President has great ideas to include various constituencies and maybe reshape how we do this but the Steering Committee maybe could have provided an important perspective in addition to just representing the faculty's interest – there are a lot of really talented people who could have maybe offered additional constituencies. Professor Ray stated that he had two questions. One, has President Berkman's thinking evolved in terms of the constituencies because he assumes that the President's initial thinking based on the composition was that the faculty constituency was roughly two representatives. He asked if President Berkman's thinking evolved that the committee should be larger or is it too early to say.

President Berkman replied that he thinks we could have a larger faculty contingency on the committee. He hasn't thought about what that number is; he hasn't

thought about whether that would involve a shrinking or re-changing of the existing committee, because if we get to twenty or twenty-two or twenty-four, he thinks the efficiency and the effectiveness of the Search Committee's role is going to diminish. He stated that we have to keep it at a manageable number in terms of making it most effective. But, he doesn't know what that manageable number is and he is openly prepared to reconstitute this committee if he has to reconstitute this committee and take some people off the committee to make it small.

Professor Ray said that his second comment is just a suggestion. He noted that President Berkman had mentioned past history and it sounds like we had a couple of false starts with the last search process and now we are having a false start here. Maybe it would be a good idea for Senate to adopt a more formal set of guidelines maybe in the specific recommendations about what a Provost Search Committee ought to look like.

President Berkman stated that some of it could have been avoided probably if over the summer he had asked the Academic Steering Committee to convene and have a discussion about it. He said that it is the Faculty Senate's decision if they want to go ahead and formulate a piece of it. It is a hiring policy, but certainly in terms of the Faculty Senate producing a set of recommendations, and let's hope we won't have another Provost search in the near future after this one. It is extraordinarily important as he said to the committee that we get a Provost who is willing to commit five years to this enterprise. He really thinks that is extraordinarily important. There have been, by his count, four Provosts in the last six years. It is not healthy for the institution. He added that if that is something the Steering Committee wants to do; we can go ahead and try to put something together.

Senate President Goodell had one final follow-up on the Provost Search Committee. She asked Senators, given that we are going to be discussing the constitution of the committee, please give some thought as to members of your constituency and your colleges that you may consider nominating. Obviously we want someone who is going to work hard and be a good representative and has some institutional knowledge and things to add so please consider who you might nominate for that committee. She added that if Senators have to work on them to soften them up a little bit, start it now. It is going to be a very long and difficult process to find the right person. Dr. Goodell stated second, the committee that is now constituted has already begun plans to hold some faculty forums and student forums seeking from the faculty a whole about the qualities and kinds of things we would like to see in a Provost. She presumes that they will probably go ahead. She reported that a student forum is planned for next week or the week after and asked SGA President Moatasem Al Bitar to confirm it.

SGA President Al Bitar replied that the forum is scheduled for the week of September 24, 2012.

Dr. Goodell stated that she didn't pursue the faculty forum until the membership issues were settled. She noted that she will pursue that once we have the membership

issue settled and she will inform faculty through Faculty Senate and through the normal means of when those forums will be scheduled.

VII. Election of one Faculty Representative to the Board Recognition Committee

Senate President Goodell moved to the election of one faculty representative to the Board Recognition Committee to replace Dr. Carol Phillips-Bey who resigned from the committee during the past academic year. The Board Recognition Committee works with the Board of Trustees to look at people who may be receiving special awards such as Honorary Doctorates from the university. She noted there is also the Senate Graduation, Convocation and Assembly Committee which provides equally into that process as well. This particular election is for one faculty representative. There are already two faculty representatives on the Board Recognition Committee and the chair of the Graduation, Convocation and Assembly Committee also represents the faculty on the Board Committee – so there is a faculty committee and a Board of Trustees committee on which there are faculty. Dr. Goodell added that this is one of the committees she will be looking at the structure of how it works. Hopefully, the University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) will be considering how this works actually works. But for now, we have this particular vacancy.

Senate President Goodell then called for nominations from the floor. Professor Nigamanth Sridhar (Electrical Engineering) was nominated. Senator Stephen Duffy moved to close the nominations. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. Dr. Nigamanth Sridhar was unanimously elected to the Board Recognition Committee by acclamation for a two-year term.

VIII. University Curriculum Committee

Dr. John Jeziorowski, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, reported that the Committee has seven items for Senate's consideration and vote this afternoon. He noted that UCC has an additional twenty-two items for informational purposes only. These items were addressed at the last two UCC meetings of the 2011-2012 academic year but did not get on the Faculty Senate Agenda for the last meeting of the past academic year so they are being presented to Faculty Senate today.

A. Proposed Revisions to the Doctor of Engineering Degree (DRE) (Report No. 2, 2012-2013)

Dr. Jeziorowski stated that the first item are the proposed revisions to the Doctor of Engineering Degree program which previously was approved and these are specialization requirements. He noted that Dr. Orhan Talu is present as a content expert to respond to questions.

Senate President Goodell mentioned that everyone should have received summaries of the proposal via email and Ms. Violet Lunder invited everyone to request the full proposal if necessary.

There being no questions or discussion on the proposal, Senate President Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed revisions to the Doctor of Engineering Degree program and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Doctor of Engineering Degree program were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B. Proposed Master of Accountancy Tax Track Revisions
(Report No. 3, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Jeziorowski presented the second item from UCC which are the proposed Master of Accountancy Tax Track Revisions. He noted that Dr. Peter Poznanski and Dr. Daniel Kaminski, content experts, are available if there are any questions.

There being no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed revisions to the Master of Accountancy Tax Track and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Master of Accountancy Tax Track were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**C. Proposed Revisions to the Master of Education – Educational Research
(Report No. 4, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Jeziorowski presented the third item from UCC which are the proposed Revisions to the Master of Education in Educational Research. He noted that content experts, Dean Brian Yusko, Dr. Karla Hamlen and Dr. Marius Boboc were present to respond to questions.

There being no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed revisions to the Master of Education in Educational Research and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Revisions to the Master of Education – Educational Research were approved unanimously by voice vote.

D. Proposed Revisions to the Master's of Education – Gifted and Talented Learners (Report No. 5, 2012-2013)

Dr. Jeziorowski next presented the proposed Revisions to the Master's of Education in the Gifted and Talented Learners program. He noted that Associate Dean Yusko is present as the content expert to respond to questions.

There being no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed revisions to the Master's of Education – Gifted and Talented Learners and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Master's of Education – Gifted and Talented Learners were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**E. Proposed new Interdisciplinary Minor in International Film Studies in
Modern Languages (Report No. 6, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Jeziorowski next presented the proposed new Interdisciplinary Minor in International Film Studies in Modern Languages. He noted that Senator Beth Ekelman brought to his attention that the rationale is incorrect for this and this is his error. Dr. Jeziorowski said that he wanted to take this opportunity to briefly describe to Senate the rationale that was provided in the original proposal. The minor in international film studies would take advantage of the film expertise of CSU faculty as well as a variety of film courses already being offered. It also builds on the relationship CSU has with CIFF. The minor brings together interdisciplinary and international perspectives on the study of film that will compliment a variety of majors including the film and digital media major. Dr. Jeziorowski stated that Dr. Tama Engelking and Associate Dean Joyce Mastboom are present as a content expert in case there are any questions.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed a new Interdisciplinary Minor in International Film Studies in Modern Languages and asked Senators to vote. The proposed new Interdisciplinary Minor in International Film Studies in Modern Languages was approved unanimously by voice vote.

F. Proposed Revisions to the Philosophy Major (Ethics Track & Traditional and Ethics Tracks) (Report No. 7, 2012-2013)

Dr. Jeziorowski next presented the proposed revisions to the Philosophy Major (Ethics Track & Traditional and Ethics Tracks). He noted that Dr. Mary Ellen Waithe is present as a content expert to respond to questions.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed revisions to the Philosophy Major (Ethics Track & Traditional and Ethics Tracks and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Philosophy Major (Ethics Track & Traditional and Ethics Tracks) were approved unanimously by voice vote.

G. Proposed Changes to the Requirements for the Accounting Minor (Report No. 8, 2012-2013)

Dr. Jeziorowski presented the UCC's last item for a vote and that is the proposed changes to the Requirements for the Accounting Minor. He noted that Dr. Peter Poznanski and Dr. Kaminski are present as content experts to respond to questions.

There being no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed Changes to the Requirements for the Accounting Minor and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Changes to the Requirements for the Accounting Minor were unanimously approved by voice vote.

H. For Informational Purposes Only

Dr. Jeziorowski stated that the University Curriculum Committee has also listed an additional twenty-two items for Informational Purposes Only with decisions that were

voted on by the UCC. He noted that he had included summaries of those items in the meeting packets as well.

1. **New Graduate Certificate in Advance Fundraising (Levin College of Urban Affairs) (Report No. 9, 2012-2013)**
2. **New Graduate Certificate in Health Care Compliance (Cleveland-Marshall College of Law) (Report No. 10, 2012-2013)**
3. **Health Sciences Course Revisions (Report No. 11, 2012-2013)**
4. **CLASS Multimedia advertising Certificate Revision (Report No. 12, 2012-2013)**
5. **Revisions to the Philosophy Minor (8 credits must be taken at CSU) (Report No. 13, 2012-2013)**
6. **New Elective for the Women's Studies Major & Minor Adding REL 363 (Report No. 14, 2012-2013)**
7. **New Elective for the OSM Major (OSM 416) (Report No. 15, 2012-2013)**
8. **Revisions to the CSU Teach Program (Report No. 16, 2012-2013)**
9. **Proposed Revisions to the A.A. Degree Program in Psychology – Part 2 (MTH 347 counted as satisfying the PSY 311 Requirement) (Report No. 17, 2012-2013)**
10. **Suspension of the BGES Biotechnology Certificate (Report No. 18, 2012-2013)**
11. **Specification of GenEd08 WAC Requirements in the Biology Major (Report No. 19, 2012-2013)**
12. **Revisions to the BS in Pharmaceutical Sciences – Medicinal and Biological Chemistry Track (Report No. 20, 2012-2013)**
13. **Revisions to the BS in Chemistry (all Tracks) (Catalog Description Change noting Majors may not receive credit for both BIO 306 and CHM 402 (Report No. 21, 2012-2013)**

There were no questions or comments and Faculty Senate received the twenty-two items for Informational Purposes Only from the University Curriculum Committee.

Senate President Goodell noted that the Senate would like to give Dr. Jeziorowski a round of applause for his work with the UCC.

Senate President Goodell stated that the next item on the Agenda is a report by Dr. Stephen Duffy, the chair of the Budget and Finance Committee.

IX. Budget and Finance Committee Report (Report No. 22, 2012-2013)

Dr. Stephen Duffy, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, distributed handouts for his report. He noted that he had the distinction of discussing the university's bond issuance this past summer. Dr. Duffy reported that at the June 25, 2012 meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Board approved the issuance of \$80 million of new bonds and the refinancing of approximately \$78 million of old debt service at an interest rate not to exceed four percent. He reported that he is doing this from memory. He will revise his

remarks when the Board of Trustees approve their meeting minutes and asked if he will see the minutes after the Board approves them or before their approval.

Senator Duffy stated that he has been asked on numerous occasions about how the Board justified taking on this step. His personal view is the fact that the money was cheap which drove everything. The senior administration will present reasons based on arguably the legitimate needs of the university but in the end, money was on sale. At two Board meetings, budget scenarios and the impact of the bond issuances were discussed. He has information on two of the scenarios. One scenario was titled "Base Case" that modeled the university's finances with no borrowing and preverbal balloon payments included. The second scenario included a new debt issuance of \$65 to \$70 million plus refinancing the old debt. As far as he can tell, both scenarios have the following assumptions built into the models and those assumptions are on the handout he distributed (see attached). The assumptions are pretty well defined. Tuition Growth Rate, Enrollment Growth Rate, SSI Growth Rate, Auxiliary Services Growth Rate, Faculty & Staff Average Salary Growth Rate, Additional Faculty Budget Salary Growth Rate.

Dr. Duffy explained the two Growth Rates as he understands them. Faculty & Staff Average Salary Growth Rates are drawn from the contracts that were in place. The additional Faculty Budget Salary Growth Rate is a result of faculty moving up in rank and getting their commensurate bumps in salary from changing ranks. So those are two distinct pots of money. And, finally, there is everything else which is Non-Personnel Expense Growth Rate.

Dr. Duffy focused on the second scenario where the University refinanced the old debt and took on the new debt. The financial ratios were adversely affected after the scenario that included borrowing but they did not fall under the Senate Bill 6 requirements. The ratios are not good but they were not atrocious. Later in August, the university went into the bottom of the market and secured the following debt obligations: A little over \$75 million of new debt and a little over \$77.5 million to retire old debt. Complete details of the bond issuance, maturity schedule and interest rates can be found in a document titled "Official Statement" authored by the University as their due diligence to potential bond holders. He noted that he placed this document on the Senate web pages; he didn't want to try to duplicate the whole thing for the Senate meeting today. The Steering Committee has a copy of the document, and the Senate Budget Committee has a copy of the document. He strongly suggested that everyone go to the Senate web pages and download the pdf so if he doesn't answer questions correctly or if he doesn't answer Senators' questions, the answers are in the document. It is a down payment of what he promised Senate last year as a report on university borrowing. It is a thorough document. It is a good document and he strongly recommends it to the Senate and to the rest of the faculty. Dr. Duffy noted that thanks for the document go to Vice President Stephanie McHenry's office.

Dr. Duffy talked about several new things. A little over \$46 million of debt issuance is designated to construct and furnish the new Health Sciences building. In

addition, NEOMED has agreed that they will make lease payments to CSU that will be the equivalent to \$10 million in principal of the current bond issuance. He commented that he doesn't have a good feel for whether that means we can build a \$56 million building or whether the price of the building came down from \$46 million to \$36 million. He noted that he sees Associate Vice President Tim Long sitting in the back of the room and said he forgot to ask Mr. Long about that yesterday. He asked Tim Long, "What does that mean?"

Mr. Timothy Long, Associate Vice President, Finance and Technology, responded that it means that these will help to defray some of the borrowing costs of the building. It will be a payer of the debt but in a lease arrangement with the university for \$10 million. The cost estimate right now for the building that went into the bond issued was what Dr. Duffy said which was \$46 million so that basically brings down that \$46 million because of the implications of the \$10 million coming from the lease arrangement.

Dr. Duffy reported that the remainder of a little over \$75 million of new bond issuance must be used to improve existing facilities. The university saved approximately \$5 million targeted for balloon payments in FY 2013 associated with the old debt. Because a new debt issuance was obtained in a short amount of time, the university now has an additional debt service payment of nearly \$5.7 million that is due in June 2013; that is, it is due in this fiscal year.

Finally, relative to borrowing, Senator Duffy noted that the university incurred approximately \$3.5 to \$4 million of debt service due to the bond issuance. This will be an obligation in this fiscal year. The operation budget this year, fiscal year 2013, was tight. Carryover was swept from departments and colleges over the summer. As a result of increasing our debt service payments, the operation budget became tighter. Operation budgets for fiscal year 2014 will be worse. Based on the budget model assumptions there are several critical issues we all need to be cognizant of.

- 1) The key fundamental assumption is the tuition growth rate. If for political reasons the university cannot increase tuition, we have severe financial problems.
- 2) The enrollment growth rate was modeled as essentially flat. If enrollment tanks over the next five years, we will have severe financial problems.

Dr. Duffy commented that these are personal observations. He stated that there is good news though. In five years, the Brewer-Garrett lease payment that a number of us on the Budget Committee, Senator William Bowen especially, took a serious look at will come off and save \$5 million per year in debt service payments. One also has to keep in mind that the projected operating budgets are just that – projections. In any given semester, the university can come in under projected expenses and/or generate more revenues than projected. Currently the university is ahead of the budget for summer 2012

by \$500,000 and again, in discussion with Tim Long, Tim has estimated that in the current semester we will come in about a plus \$1 million.

Dr. Duffy stated that we now look at receipts and expenses from spring semester to help out again in balancing the university checkbook this fiscal year. Because of the required political clairvoyance, he doesn't have a feel for the assumptions made on SSI. He can't say whether those were good assumptions or bad assumptions. He will say, and he doesn't quite know how this is going to fit into the overall capital budget picture, but his sense is that the State will, some time in the next biennium, have a state capital budget. He knows there are people who will disagree with him, but he feels strongly that there is enough political will power from the construction industry to see that universities invest in their capital stock. At this point, Dr. Duffy stated that he would entertain questions.

Senator William Bowen noted that his personal theory is that the Board of Trustees was induced to take more risks than might be in the long term best interests of the university by the low interest rates. He is kind of concerned and asked, "What are the contingency plans that we have as a university in case some things in this model don't pan out?" He also wanted to say that he shares Professor Duffy's concern with the assumptions about tuition and enrollment but he also has concerns about budget cuts because a couple of years ago we laid off an awful lot of good people that were doing good jobs around here because of the state budget cuts. He just read in the newspaper this morning that they are making more cuts and SSI is another concern he has. When he came here in 1990, state share of instruction, we called it subsidy, was 48% of the university budget. Now last year, it was down to something like 27%. So it has been going consistently down. When he sees assumptions that it is not going to grow or it's going to grow at 1.5% - 2.5% to keep up investing in the future of the university, what is going to happen if these assumptions don't pan out?

Dr. Duffy responded that as to contingency plans, he is not privy to any... He noted that these assumptions went into a modeling process that was used to assess the financial ratios on a yearly basis for the university to see if we would violate the Senate Bill 6 ratios. He noted that no ratios were violated. The values of the financial ratios weren't something you would take home and tape to your refrigerator but they did not violate state law.

Senator Ray commented that they went through a pretty elaborate and extensive process to trim the budget and to do it in a strategic way for the President's Budget Task Force. That Task Force issued a series of recommendations including recommendations for cuts across three different sectors, including the administrative sector and the administrative sector encompasses debt service. Senator Ray asked if there was any discussion at the Board level about how this additional debt service interacted with that strategic planning process.

Dr. Duffy replied that he didn't recall any. Senate President Goodell also did not recall any.

Professor Ray noted that Dr. Duffy had said that it is an additional \$5.7 million of debt service and asked if this is the yearly number. Dr. Duffy replied, “No. The yearly number increases to \$7.6 million the following year.” He added that he believes this is the peak number. He asked Assoc. V.P. Long if this was correct. He should qualify that this \$5.7 million is additional not total.

Professor Ray suggested that it would be useful to map this number back on to the projections that the Budget Task Force put forth. He stated that he knows the Provost is tracking how well the colleges meet their targets and the targets continue to this year. It would be useful to get an accounting of how this additional debt service affects the commitment on the administrative side to reduce their total budget by \$6 to \$9 million.

Dr. Duffy stated that to be fair though, you would also have to include the \$5 million that was saved in the balloon service, right? He still has a hard time getting his arms around the \$3.5 to \$4 million that the university recouped.

Professor Ray noted that it would just be useful to get, first of all, how well those cut affects the final numbers and how that compares to what the Budget Task Force recommended which was a \$6 to \$9 million cut. Professor Ray noted that Dr. Duffy had mentioned in passing that carry-over was swept this year. Dr. Duffy stated that he believed so because we have enough administrators in the room...

Professor Ray stated that the Budget Task Force issued a separate recommendation which included a new resource allocation model that recommended returning all carry-over from the colleges.

Associate Vice President Tim Long commented that at the Budget Task Force meetings, they were going over the resource allocation model. He knows they said on repeated occasions, although it is something none of us like to hear, that carry-over unfortunately is not a guaranteed item. And, rule number one is first and foremost in the university budget, revenues and expenses has to balance at the end of each year. That’s the situation they found themselves in. Subsequent to that, the Task Force said, if available, we recommend that the following things occur, meaning that the academic areas receive a hundred percent of their carry-over if it can be afforded. We passed back about \$14.4 million in carry-over and then were able to balance the budget with what were called carry-over commitments. This doesn’t make very many people happy because there are things that have to be set aside that includes grants, faculty development costs, other things in the budget such as research startups and Graduate Studies and things like that. That totaled \$14.4 million – those are things that have to go back; you have to meet your costs and expenses. Once that \$14.4 million came out of the mix at the end of 2012, we were left with about \$100,000 in carry over for the entire university. Then, the discretionary carryover, which is what we are really talking about here, which got swept, we just didn’t have it. We couldn’t afford to pass that discretionary – supplies, marketing, travel, meals, the type of stuff that was the carryover – we were not able to distribute this year at the end of 2012-13. But we did meet and

had to meet the \$14.4 million commitments that are contractual. That's not pre-discretionary money from the units; that's not pre-discretionary carryover money from the colleges. Understand that a few people were upset saying, "Where is my carryover?" You have to meet rule number one which is we have to balance the university budget at the end of the line and we couldn't do it after we passed that \$14.4 million.

Professor Ray followed up saying that this connects with his first point which is he suspects, he hasn't seen the numbers – we violated or were forced to invoke rule number one because we didn't meet the targets that the Budget Task Force recommended.

Mr. Long replied that we were about 9,000 to 10,000 credit hours below what was forecast in the 2012 budget. We finished with about 411,000 credit hours and we forecast 420,000 and that led to a \$2.1 million shortage in instructional fees.

Professor Ray asked if we know or have we gone back and mapped out expenses by colleges and administration? He knows that the Provost has been working with the colleges... It would be useful to see how well we are doing in meeting our strategic planning proposals.

Mr. Long replied that all of the cuts on the administrative side are in the barn, so to speak; they have been made. In the colleges, the previous Provost, Geoffrey Mearns, had basically agreed with the different colleges on a combination of hard dollar cuts or revenue enhancements to additional revenue. He noted that there are two colleges out of the whole mix that are still in the process of working through meeting that cut. He noted that this can be provided in the Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC).

Senator Jeff Karem inquired if there was any discussion either in the Budget Committee or with the Board of Trustees about the effects of the debt service on the operating budget in terms of promoting the student success and retention by having faculty to teach here because that's where the money seemed to disappear from. What he thinks is we should be dependent upon success in terms of student enrollment, growth and retention. But, if we have to spend all of that money on debt service, it seems that enrollment, growth and retention will be short-changed.

Dr. Duffy responded that to his knowledge, there was no discussion along those lines. He said he sure wishes, in the June Board meeting, that the operations budget was discussed before the bond issuance. It was not and quite frankly, you have to know how much you are going to go into the markets and borrow before you can do the operations budget. If he had control of that agenda and if he could go back and change history, he would definitely move the operations budget before the discussion of the bond issuance. He noted that he can't do that but...

Senator Mark Tebeau commented that as a point of information, it would help to know what percentage of the totals are expected on tuition growth rate and enrollment growth rate – what does it account for? So if we miss, how much are we going to miss

by and by the same token, it looks to him that the faculty and staff, faculty in particular, is the saving grace. If things go south, that's the only place...

Dr. Duffy stated that you have to stop and think; these are specified as percentages and the question becomes percentages of what. Throughout this whole process he is assuming, and Mr. Tim Long can correct him, that these percentages were percentages of budget numbers not overall budget. He asked Mr. Long if this was correct. When you talk in terms of three and one half percent tuition increases that means just what it means – three and one half percent tuition increase. He noted that they are all pretty clear. It is not a percentage of the overall budget; it is chunks inside the budget.

Dr. Mark Tebeau asked what percentages those chunks were. Dr. Duffy asked if Dr. Tebeau was asking for the hard numbers. Dr. Tebeau responded, “Yes, something like that.” He stated that it is hard for him to judge... Dr. Duffy said that he could answer that question by showing some histograms that Vice President McHenry's office generated; that information is in those histograms.

Associate V.P. Long asked Dr. Tebeau if he wanted to know the percentages of revenue sources. Dr. Tebeau stated that this would give him a sense of how big a hole will we see. Mr. Long responded that the subsidy right now is about 29% of our revenue source in the university. About four percent is other revenue which adds up to 33%. So 67% is basically tuition and fees by students. Dr. Tebeau asked, “In reverse on the other side, what percent of the budget does that constitute?” Mr. Long replied that this is a separate budget from the operating budget – auxiliaries, our food service, residence halls, Wolstein Center, etc. The reason why that had to be placed in this analysis is that the bond rating agencies want to see the entire picture of your revenue sources for whether or not you have the wherewithal to pay back the principle and interest. So the operating budget of course is the biggest budget we have; auxiliaries is about \$27 million and that is not operating budget, not supported by tuition or subsidies, but they still want to see so we have to give them some substance because the bond rating agencies and the bond holders and the underwriters, they are not stupid. They are saying, lay it all on the table Cleveland State; we want to see what your revenue is because we want to see what you have and so the auxiliary revenue does count in the calculation for whether or not you are going to have the wherewithal to pay it back which effects your credit rating. Don't confuse auxiliaries with operating which is academic and administrative.

Dr. Duffy stated that we cannot use subsidy to pay off bonds. Mr. Long replied that subsidy is only funding the operating budget.

Professor Ray asked, “If the assumptions about faculty and staff salaries assume flat size – there is no growth in faculty size and were there projections made either about growth or reduction in faculty size?” Mr. Long replied that in the item “additional faculty budget salary” growth rate is 14% and the reason that percentage is so high is that is where we introduced \$1 million of new money for tenure-track faculty hires. Professor Ray noted that after that, it is flat. Mr. Long replied that after that the \$1 million is flat; the \$1 million just carries out and then the rates are increases per the contract.

An unidentified person inquired how much of our projected growth is already allocated to the debt service. Dr. Duffy replied that it is roughly about \$14 million in total debt service payments. Assoc. Vice President Long stated that it is more like \$15 million on the total debt and capital lease payments from the university. We have a couple of capital leases for about ten years and we have bond issues that go for twenty-five to thirty years; all that combined, the annual debt service is about \$15 million out of a budget of \$220 million.

X. Synthesis of CSU Strategic Priorities (Report No. 23, 2012-2013)

Dr. Duffy reported that earlier this summer he was asked to serve on a strategic priorities committee. He noted that there are four items in his handout. One is a memo from Provost Geoffrey Mearns to the President laying out an expedited strategic planning process and timeline. The subject is a little bit disconcerting with the word “planning” in there and he will tell everyone that the committee struggled with that issue. The committee finally soft landed on calling this “The Strategic Initiatives Effort.” Dr. Duffy commented that when you go through the report, Provost Mearns was very particular on timelines and what was to be done. The Committee is at number 4. A draft was submitted to the President and Board of Trustees for review. His understanding is that the President used the documents which are at the back end of the handout. There is a Synthesis of CSU Strategic Priorities with subheadings under each strategy and then on the last page are just the strategies themselves. To his understanding, he believes that the last page was used when President Berkman was in a meeting with the Deans, the Deans’ retreat. He added that he assumes we are going to see this again next week at the Board of Trustees Retreat.

Dr. Duffy commented that he hasn’t heard one way or another but if everyone looks at number 5, a draft circulated to faculty for review, on page 2, he is assuming that this is coming to the faculty. He added that this is where things stand right now. If people look at the memo that the committee drafted to the President and the Interim Provost dated July 9, 2012, the makeup of the Ad Hoc Task Force on Strategic Priorities is given on the second page of the memo and he is the only faculty member on the committee.

Senator James Wilson asked if there is any reference to either the ends or the means to increasing the number of faculty members full-time. Dr. Duffy responded that there is one more subheading that they have and he would have to back into that document in order to answer Professor Wilson’s question. Professor Wilson stated that it doesn’t appear in the handout as far as he can tell and asked Dr. Duffy if he was correct. Dr. Duffy responded that if Professor Wilson is reading it like he (Dr. Duffy) is reading it, then he is correct.

Senator Karem first thanked Senator Duffy for so much service having two items on today’s Agenda. Dr. Karem noted that we have a Strategic Planning Committee and he was wondering what the role of this committee was. Dr. Duffy replied that Dr.

Karem should ask the question, “Is this coming back to the faculty?” During the summer the committee did not talk in terms of it coming back to the faculty. He asked Dr. LaGrange if this is true.

Dr. LaGrange replied that it was certainly articulated in the Provost’s memo and it was replicated in our recommendation to President Berkman. These documents will be widely circulated and disseminated to our faculty. Faculty Senate wasn’t in session during the summer and this meant that the first meeting wouldn’t be until the fall. So, the semester has just begun and she thinks the second process related to this document will commence.

Dr. Karem stated that that is useful. So his question is, over the summer what was the involvement of the Faculty Senate Strategic Planning Committee? He noted that the University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) does sometimes meet over the summer when they are called upon to do things. Dr. Duffy responded that they just met as a group and hashed things out. He was not there officially as a representative of the Senate; he was there as a faculty member of the group.

Senate Vice President Sheldon Gelman stated that he doesn’t compare this in importance to the Provost Search because it is much less clear how universities should adopt strategic plans. To answer Dr. Karem’s question though, Professor Gelman said that in the second line of Provost Mearns’ memo to President Berkman, Provost Mearns said, “The University’s current strategic plan, Vision Unlimited, is not presently guiding our decisions,...” which he thinks means that the old strategic planning apparatus is really caput. He went on to say that there is nothing particularly wrong with that though the idea was the strategic planning process would go on forever. It just might not work. Professor Gelman said that he is not faulting anybody for not being guided by “Vision Unlimited” but it is worth pointing out that the Strategic Planning Committee consisted of half faculty and half administrators and its recommendations had to be formally approved, not we will consult with you, but the Faculty Senate had to vote on it and the Provost had to formally accept it. The committee that Professor Duffy served on had one faculty member so there has been a dramatic change in strategic planning for whatever it’s worth. One caution he would offer at this point, and it’s too early to know what’s been recommended, we shouldn’t act as though there was a faculty process if there wasn’t. Maybe there doesn’t have to be and maybe there won’t be, but if there wasn’t, we shouldn’t pretend that there was.

Dr. Duffy stated that he is expressing his personal view. This is a strategic initiative that represents the senior administration’s views.

Senate President Goodell thanked Dr. Duffy for his service. She knows that the document Dr. Duffy received in draft form is being circulated to the Board of Trustees in the next couple of weeks for their next meeting. She hopes that the President and or the Provost will keep us informed of where this is going.

Dr. Goodell stated that the next item on the Agenda is the receiving of three Committee Annual Reports. She noted that there won't be any discussion about these reports but she does want to reiterate her desire for all of the committees to look at their mission and purpose and, as she said earlier, she will be meeting with all of the chairs of the committees. She said that she will communicate with the chairs via email. But those reports will be a valuable source of information especially for new committee chairs for them to try to determine if their committee is meeting its intended purpose and, if not, how the committee's role could be redefined or could that particular committee be eliminated. That report will go to the University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) for their consideration. We will have a report from UFAC hopefully at our second to last Faculty Senate meeting this academic year, sometime in March. She noted that it's a pretty tight timeline with everything else we have going on this year. She thanked the committee chairs who provided those reports.

XI. 2011-2012 Annual Reports

- A. Student Life Committee (Report No. 24, 2012-2013)**
- B. Committee on Academic Space (Report No. 25, 2012-2013)**
- C. University Strategic Planning Committee (Report No. 26, 2012-2013)**

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to accept the committee's annual reports. It was moved and seconded and the Annual Reports were received unanimously by voice vote.

XII. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman commented about the strategic exercise. He noted this was something that was proposed to him by the Academic Steering Committee. With the notion that there are a number of documents and a number of new initiatives, there are a number of activities that the university has engaged in and we have no single point of reference or single point of identification for them. He stated that they had a discussion and Professor Gelman actually made the suggestion. We had a discussion to do in essence what he called a bounded strategic index or identification of strategic priorities. He noted that in the Provost's memorandum, he says, "To rectify this situation, the one the Academic Steering Committee identified to me, the Provost's Office convened an Ad Hoc Task Force to review campus planning documents. The Task Force had two principal objectives: (1) to sift through the text of these documents and statements; identify strategies, tactics and priorities; and to reconcile them with *Vision Unlimited*; and (2) to condense the resulting master document into a cohesive, focused synthesis of current campus priorities."

President Berkman said that he understood and the Provost translated this to be the charge or the recommendation of the Academic Steering Committee. This is an initial draft of the document and they will discuss with the Steering Committee what its will is in terms of the dissemination of the document and comment on the document. It is not a new strategic plan; indeed at the Steering Committee there was dissatisfaction with

the current Strategic Planning Committee and the multitude of metrics that existed out there for the supposed measurement of the goals in *Vision Unlimited*. He said they tried to put this into a more workable instrument so everyone would be able to identify those things that we continue to pursue. He said at the meeting that most of the goals or many of the goals in *Vision Unlimited* have not been realized, are still to be realized, as well as to mix those with the initiatives that have been undertaken in the last three years or so. He stated that this is the beginning of a process they will discuss with the Academic Steering Committee and what its will is in terms of having the faculty take a look at this. He noted that one of the important things this document is, if you have seen *Vision Unlimited*, there are fifty – sixty metrics for the measurement of each of these goals. And no one was really keeping any metric on these points. It is a subject for discussion because it identifies a much smaller set of metrics attached to each of the goals which we can now measure, which we can now report, which will be quantifiable and will be there for the faculty and the university community to see. Again, he doesn't know what to call it – the current initiative index – or whatever its title is.

President Berkman noted that the other subject that emerged here, and he is glad it emerged; he just wanted to bring it back home. He said, when he first became President, we are not a publicly financed institution. We are in essence a private enterprise that gets a public subsidy and an enterprise that gets a decreasing public subsidy. We are down between 29% and 27% depending on how you calculate it. That means, as Mr. Tim Long said, about 70% of our revenue has to come from sources other than the State. All that everyone heard about the bond issue, all that everyone heard about assumptions, all that everyone heard about that aspect of university operations is the nature of the enterprise that we are in. We could not exist on 27% SSI so we would not have an institution. The rest of it is an enterprise and the enterprise has to be financed and important pieces of it are things we have talked about and the best we can do is try to make reasonable projections about how we will perform in those enterprises. When we went into the bond exercise, and Professor Duffy did an amazingly good job on a very, very complex issue in terms of summarizing it, there are actually other savings that we realized from the bond issue but when we went into it, the instruction that he gave, as Mr. Long knows to Vice President Stephanie McHenry, is to use the most conservative assumptions – to go in and with really, in many ways, what we think are the most conservative role of assumptions so we would not, in the projections, be stretching what our capacity is. President Berkman stated that is why we went in with zero enrollment growth. He said to the Board of Trustees at the time that we will not expect we will have zero enrollment growth but for the purposes of the modeling exercise, we should use zero enrollments. He noted that is the nature of what we have here; we no longer have public institutions that finance 60%, 70%, sometimes 80%; we have a public subsidy that we will get and that public subsidy rationale is about to change.

President Berkman reported that the news this year in terms of enrollment and maybe the greatest take-a-way from this exercise ought to be how critical enrollment is to the future of the university and how critical student loan and student aid is to enrollment. This year, so far, we've had a very, very good run in terms of our fall enrollment. But, the picture is changing in a way that some people might remember he talked about and

that is we are seeing significant losses in graduate students particularly returning graduate students; he believes the number is six percent of the graduate students who were here did not return; that is, those who still matriculated did not return this year. Overall graduate enrollment went down 2.5%; graduate student credit hours went down almost three percent. The real currency here is student credit hours, not headcount. The real currency is student credit hours. That's what the State funds the university as the currency. President Berkman noted that we were able to make up that loss in graduate enrollment by having a historically large freshmen class, almost 1,600 and by doing better in terms of retention, we did lose three percent of the existing undergraduate class. That is a lot less than we have lost in previous years. Interestingly, and this is talking about the changing dynamic of how our students' course taking power, although we lost three percent of returning students, we only lost .54% in terms of student credit hours. So we lost headcount, but we held on to most of the student credit hours. Overall, the university grew by 1.5%. At the end of the day, we will see only one other university in the State that grows this year – Kent State. As everyone knows, they have twenty-three convenience stores all around the State in which you can enroll and that's where most of their enrollment is generated. President Berkman again said that we increased 1.5% but the student credit hours actually increased by almost three percent. Again, this is part of this very complex change in enrollment mix that we are going to have to transition to. He believes that next year graduate enrollment will be worse and he thinks every subsequent year it will be worse. There are just not many graduate students, particularly in professional programs, who can borrow the money they need to pay current prevailing interest rates and have to pay their loan the day that they sign their loan papers. It is a very complex difficult situation. The fact that we began to devote more attention to undergraduate enrollment and undergraduate recruitment has kind of been a just in time piece for us. Had we not enrolled 1,600 freshmen, we would have lost student credit hours, we would have lost the revenue, and most importantly, we would have lost the tuition dollars attached to those.

President Berkman commented that he spent yesterday in beautiful Columbus; he recommends it for those who have yet not traveled south. All of the college presidents first met together and then met with the Governor, first in a closed session and then in a session that was open to the media. He said that he will go into this in detail at another meeting. President Berkman remarked, here is the bottom line – everyone can read the article in the *Plain Dealer* today and it kind of explains the bottom line. The bottom line is that the Governor is absolutely intent on switching the funding formula from an enrollment formula to a progress formula – he calls it a graduation formula. Hopefully at the end, it will turn out to be a progress formula – that students are making satisfactory progress as they enter the university. The Governor is in favor of eliminating remediation; he doesn't tell us what we do with students who are not necessarily prepared for college work but eliminating remediation for cutting costs, for privatizing assets on the university campuses, etc.

President Berkman focused on the formula. He said that the good news about the formula is that the Governor has charged a commission of senior college presidents to make a recommendation concerning how the formula should be re-crafted. The

Governor has given the commission a set of rules of the road in terms of what he is looking for, but he has given us liberty or at least an initial grant of liberty to make a set of recommendations about how to recast the SSI formula and he has asked that they be completed in the next eight weeks in time for the preparation of the Governor's biennial budget. It is a very, very tight timeframe. President Berkman noted that he will have the opportunity to participate in the deliberations in his role as one of two presidents on the Governor's Completion Task Force and he truly believes that we have an opportunity. It is not many states that the legislature turns over to a group of college presidents the additional drafting responsibility for how universities ought to be funded. It is a really important opportunity – we will use it or we will squander it. It is clear from the Governor's message that if he doesn't have something by the time he puts his budget together, he will insert the new budget formula. Again, it is an opportunity and it is a challenge, but it is emblematic of this paradigm change that he has been talking about for the last couple of years and this is not going to be a little nibble; this is not going to be five percent of your budget is going to be determined by the students who make progress or your retention rate or your graduation rate; this is going to be more like in year one, 35% of your budget is going to be determined by the number of students you retain, the number of credits they made, the progress that they make, your graduation rate, etc. In the Governor's view, it will ultimately ratchet up to what we've just seen in the State of Nevada in which by 2015, the entire formula for funding higher education will be performance based; there will be no enrollment money. President Berkman went on to say that the Governor did not say this was the goal here, but that is definitely the way the traffic arrows are pointing. This is going to happen very quickly; within eight weeks we will have a brand new funding formula for all universities and community colleges. It will have to go before the legislature; it will be part of the Governor's budget request and, if we do it well, we can emerge in a strong position. If we do it poorly, there is an enormous amount of jeopardy for us.

President Berkman stated that the Governor gave us six goals that he wants to see imbedded in a new formula and, at our next meeting, he will take the time and go over and explain how the Governor explained those six goals. At this point, President Berkman offered to take questions.

Senator William Bowen asked President Berkman if he had done contingency planning. He commented that the way to approach things is you know what the best is and hope for it and know what the worst is and how you are going to deal with it and expect something in between. He asked if there are thoughts being given or are there ideas about how we collectively as a university will respond to that.

President Berkman replied that there is actually lots of worst's; there is not just one worst. For example, we have this year been dealing with contingency planning for what would happen if Pell was eliminated. Right now, Pell is scheduled to be eliminated. Unless there is an agreement in congress, Pell will be eliminated and the subsidized student loan program will shrink dramatically. We have a tremendous number of Pell students here so we are trying to do some contingency planning about that immediate threat. Have we done contingency planning for every possible contingency? The answer

really is no. President Berkman noted that a lot of it has to happen on line. We could obviously game out some of it in terms of tuition, in terms of enrollment, in terms of mix of enrollment, in terms of other revenue sources, in terms of the development of online learning and revenue from online learning, and a lot of those strategies are in here, in the section on maintaining a viable economic model, but no, we haven't contingency planned for all of the possible contingencies. Do we still have lots of time to do that? President Berkman stated that we do have time to do that and we will do that. He recommended that Senate invite Vice President Stephanie McHenry really if members want to continue to pursue this discussion. He added that Professor Duffy did a good job but there are other savings that were captured in this bond issue – \$8 million of savings in refinancing the debt was captured in this bond issue. Again, it would be prudent and wise if Senate wanted to have Vice President McHenry here to explain all of the assumptions. We really funded it at a historically low level, 3.7% was the all in clause of the financing and this was not frivolity. All of this money is dedicated to one of three things: the refinancing of existing debt to generate savings, \$25 million of deferred maintenance that have now been health and safety issues for the university. He stated that this was not a popular and enjoyable thing for a president to spend \$25 million on deferred maintenance since he didn't defer it. But, it is deferred maintenance and it has to be done and the rest of it is for the destruction of Viking Hall and the building of the Center for Innovations and Health Professions. Those are the three exclusive uses of the dollars.

Senator Karem said he hears what President Berkman is saying about the importance of student retention and he supports that fully. He just feels there is an enormous amount of difference between what is said about our mission and what we need to do to support ourselves and the paucity of hiring money available for faculty and so he wondered if President Berkman could speak to that because we are low in tenure track faculty and full-time faculty with lecturers included yet at the same time we have peak enrollment. He noted that if you go around the room, he is sure that every program can tell him about an obstacle to fall graduation because there are not enough faculty here to staff those classes. With that in mind, he just cannot get his head around why the promises last year should have led to about \$4 million in faculty hiring that has not come about.

President Berkman responded that Provost George Walker can probably give more detail but here is the short story of why it didn't come through. Vice President Tim Long spoke about the budget plans of many of the colleges and the savings plan when we took a thirteen percent budget reduction two years ago – that is not a small reduction to the operating budget, just speaking of contingencies. A lot of that money by the units was recovered by putting up vacant lines. He said he would get the exact numbers for Dr. Karem at some juncture if he wants to do it, but that really is what happened with a good number of vacant positions. President Berkman said he hears Dr. Karem and he absolutely agrees that we need to hire more faculty if the answer or part of the answer to increasing retention and increasing success of our students is hiring more faculty, particularly at the gateway courses. By the way, these gateway courses predict success, and these gateway courses occur in the freshmen and sophomore years. Once they get to the junior year, students are retained and they mostly graduate; the vast majority of

students are lost in their freshmen and sophomore years. So, if the answer to that is we need to get more faculty, particularly at those junctures, then we will devote dollars to get more faculty. Or, if the answer is that overall we need more faculty... We are devoting \$1 million. We didn't say this was the end; we said this was the beginning of an investment to try to rebuild the faculty. As he looks at the chart, faculty numbers started going down in 2006. So this has not happened in the last couple of years; actually we had a little rebound in 2008 and then the budget cuts hit and they go down a little bit again. President Berkman stated that the answer is, if faculty are definitely part of the solution, we will have to look at investing more money.

Senator Mark Tebeau referred back to the budget numbers. He commented that President Berkman asked Vice President Stephanie McHenry to be conservative in our tuition growth and our enrollment growth. But at the same token, and presuming that the faculty budget salary growth and staff growth would be the most optimistic guidelines..., he would shoot high by the same token.

President Berkman remarked, "So you are good with 2%?" Senator Tebeau replied, "No." President Berkman said this was conservative and commented that this would be the lower threshold of the salary. Dr. Tebeau stated that he would think in terms of the contingency plan which you would be budgeting; your staff costs are going up a lot so make sure you come in under that. He commented that it is not just about the faculty, it is about retaining our talent here. Dr. Tebeau next stated that we are investing in the Science Building and he thinks it would be nice to have some more discussion about the particulars of that and he would be interested in knowing more about that. But he currently works in classrooms that are shoddy, that when students come in it looks like they are in second grade institutions and he worries about not his ability to retain them, but they come into a room that says we don't care about you. How do we deal with situations like that and improving those is not even in this deferred maintenance. He works in an office in Rhodes Tower where a large portion of faculty work and it is an embarrassment to bring external constituencies in for meetings. He went on to say that these speak to the bottom line priorities and these he believes are some of our concerns. We want the university to succeed but some of the apparent priorities don't necessarily hit what we see is real and pressing bottom line needs for students. Dr. Tebeau asked President Berkman how we deal with those issues.

President Berkman replied that we borrowed \$50 million to rehab Rhodes Tower. Dr. Tebeau stated that he was talking about Main Classroom where all of the classrooms are like these boxcar rooms full of students and one screen projector on the side where half of the students can't see it; where they sit in desks that look like they are out of high school from the 1930s, not from a modern university building. He added that those are meaningful.

President Berkman agreed that those things are meaningful and the only choice is to take money out of the operations budget and use it for those upgrades. He asked Dr. Tebeau, "Where would you think the money would come from?" Dr. Tebeau replied that he wasn't sure. President Berkman again stated that the money would come from

operations. He agrees that the classrooms should be modern, should be crisp, should feel good but it costs money to do all that. We do have it in the maintenance plan; it's not in the first year, but actually one of the options is, in a year or two years, go out and conceivably, we will see how we do financially, for a second round of money to do the non health and safety items. But \$25 million is a big price tag and that accumulated over a number of years. Those were identified by the State as health and safety issues. Dr. Tebeau is right that the aesthetic issues are not unimportant but they pale a little bit to the façade of Stillwell Hall falling down from the building.

Senator Ashutosh Dixit referred to online education because President Berkman had mentioned online education and wondered what the vision is in the future because education is going to drastically change in the next fifteen years or so. We are building all of these new buildings and spending a lot of money on new buildings so how does that balance with the online education growth. He feels that we don't need to build the buildings; maybe just improve the facilities inside the buildings so we can just have regular desks and chairs and stuff inside the classrooms.

President Berkman replied that at least in his future, he doesn't think that we are going to have a buildingless university without classrooms, without labs, without instruction and we are all going to operate out of a hub. He doesn't think that is going to happen. He does think if we do it creatively and aggressively, there are opportunities to increase revenues through online education. But the opportunity to increase revenue through online education is not cannibalizing our students by offering them the option of getting in their car and driving in the snow to come to class or staying in their bedroom and taking the course. The revenues are bringing in students from other places that would not otherwise enroll in the university and enroll in online classes. He stated that we need to look at that and we need to look at programs that are potentially competitive, that we know there are national and international markets for, and we need to use those programs like, for example, the Mobile MBA Program which we now have signed a marketing agreement with a national eLearning marketing firm and the hope is that they will grow the program and revenue substantially.

Senate President Goodell noted that it is nearly five o'clock and she doesn't want to silence any voices but she is pretty aware of the time so she asked Provost George Walker if he could give Senate a short report today and perhaps come back to the next meeting and give us a much fuller report of what he was going to say.

Dr. Goodell commented to SGA President Moatasem Al Bitar that there would still be five minutes left for him at the end. SGA President Al Bitar stated that he would report at the next Senate meeting.

XIII. Report of the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost George Walker mentioned that there are six major items he would have talked about had there been time today. The first is the report of the Promotion and Tenure Task Force. Dr. William Morgan chaired the Task Force. Dr. Morgan provided a

great committee report and Provost Walker is in the process of writing a draft in response. He noted that ninety-five percent of it is yes, let's do that but it is a question of how do we do it because it has to do with the standards and the written materials they used to make sure that our faculty that are coming up for promotion and tenure are treated equivalently across the campus. He stated that he will talk about this another time but it is really important to note that the Task Force did a great job.

Provost Walker commented that you can imagine when you are brand new that there are a lot of different pieces of information you would like to have. He noted that the information he wanted to have isn't so much different than the information faculty would like to have. So, one of the questions he had in the beginning was, "What are we actually doing – I don't care whether it is good or bad, I just want to know what we are doing across campus that has to do with the strategic investments. I want to know what's the cost of it; what are we doing associated with the International School; the STEM School; the new building; the Parker Hannifin cooperation; the working with the Cleveland Clinic; Playhouse Square, etc.?" He noted that there are a lot of things, whether we like it or not, we are doing. He would like to know what all of those are because he is sure that there are some that he doesn't know and then he would like to understand, in a frisky debate, the extent to which they really are crucial and make a strong connection with our strategic priorities. He has asked people to give him an environmental scan and he is asking the Deans. He will send it out and say, "Here is as far as I know what we are really doing that is wrong in the university. Let's figure out what those are and what's going on. Then it falls to somebody to make a connection or not of those in a crucial way with things that we could argue about in terms of strategic priorities."

Provost Walker said that he also wanted to talk about the retention plan, the success plan, but that is a fifteen or twenty minute discussion. It is really crucial that we have a plan. We have some benchmarks, but as everyone pointed out, at the end of the day, it's not a bunch of administrators that put together a plan; it's having faculty in the classroom, having enough dedicated faculty that have the time and are inspired to work with students – that's the way he remembers student success.

Provost Walker next turned to the Instructional Resource Allocation. He noted that if faculty are concerned about program prioritization, there is almost a Darwinian ranking that's taking place when we have fifty requests for faculty positions and we only have the resources available to hire about fourteen. We go through an incredible process and it is relatively data driven and relatively transparent. There is a ranking process with a lot of parameters in it; it is sort of the classification of what each program has to fill out if they are asking for a position; the impact with regard to teaching, research, alignment with strategic priorities, etc., and there is a lot of ranking scale that goes on with a variety of different people – the Deans and some of the administrators – that independently rank all these kinds of things having come from the individual schools already prioritized. The process is rather extraordinary. It looked to him like there was a group sort of arguing before a supreme court. You go in, you have a Dean that has made seven requests, has a set of arguments and data of what he wants and he appears before all of

the other Deans – people like himself and Provost Geoffrey Mearns and some of the Vice Provosts like Teresa LaGrange and they answer questions. People cross-examine them and ask, “What is the job opportunity? Why is this important in your school? Why did you make this a higher priority than that?” He said that it is pretty rigorous and they spend a whole day doing this. Provost Walker noted that the process is very educational. Every Dean takes a turn while the other Deans and folks like me and Provost Mearns examined them. Then at the end of the day after everyone has thought about it and had all this kind of frisky discussion, people go off and, using a variety of criteria that were outlined in the Instructional Resource Model, they rank all these priorities. They do it separately and independently. The Deans do it and he (Provost Walker) gets to make the choice at the end of the day. The rule is that at the end of the day it is his decision. He noted that the interesting thing is when all these numbers and votes come in, there is extraordinary consensus. The Deans don’t rank their own priorities but they rank every other Dean’s in terms of order of the priority for their hiring request. He went on to say that people who are thinking primarily about teaching and meeting the teaching requirements, set priorities. There is the research and the academic scholarly productivity. You could have a Rube Goldberg machine that has all these numbers and all this data and all these things in it and at the end of the day you can still be not quite right somehow. We all understand the judgments involved. Provost Walker noted that after having spent a day there, he thinks that the ranking they did was the right way to go. But, what it means is out of fifty requests, and they were all pretty good requests, they could only hire fourteen faculty. And of the last two years as everyone knows, in terms of faculty resignations, we have had eighty-one that he counts and we have hired twenty-four tenure track faculty and thirty-five lecturers over the last two years according to his numbers. That is a decrease of forty positions.

Provost Walker commented that when he came into the office, he had a sort of a Provost Position Fund with money in it, and you can see how the money comes and goes, and at the end of the day, we are limited by how much money is available. The question is, with all those resignations over the last couple of years, how is it that we don’t have more resources in order to hire faculty. It is not true that somebody has siphoned off money from that Position Fund to do some strategic direction kind of activity. It is sitting there. But, what has happened is, there are five or six perfect storm situations that have occurred. He said he had two examples that he finds interesting. One is, because of the budget cuts, suppose you had a Dean retiring and as part of your budget cut you strip that line of funding knowing full well you are going to hire a Dean three months later – a new Dean from outside. That means that the money wasn’t there. You took it as a budget cut but the money had to come from the Provost Position Fund. That happened more times than not. He noted that there were also Deans trying to do the right thing that said there is good news around the corner. We are going to have lots of enhancements but a lot of that didn’t materialize. Provost Walker commented that he has been told by Associate Vice President Tim Long that at one point, because of the \$8 million budget cut, because of the State cut that had to come from the academic part of the house, that \$1.8 million, eighteen positions right there, were subtracted from the Provost Position Fund. You put all of that together because what we did was really not take the budget cuts. In one way, we eliminated staff, we stripped faculty lines in some cases, but we didn’t do it in a

strategic way; the schools were trying to survive and trying to meet these cuts and so now still we are having these kinds of cuts that he predicts will result in having only maybe ten lines that we can hire starting next March or April. So his first comment as Provost is, he is just dying to be for a little while the Chief Operating Officer so he can get into everybody's budget in the university, not just in the academic side. When people lose their carryover, that carryover doesn't come to the Provost; that carryover goes to balance the budget that is somewhere else. So his argument to the President and to the senior administration is, one way or another, hiring additional faculty in selected areas – he is not saying across the board, we have to have priorities and it is still going to be tough and we are going to move significant amounts of money around in programs. We are already doing that in a way that far exceeds what he thinks we understood what was going on and that will continue and has been going on. So, if anybody is worried that there might be program prioritization that could result in winners and losers, that train has not only left the station, it has made several stops.

Provost Walker stated that he believes we have to have data. When he was with the Carnegie Foundation, they didn't call it the Carnegie Ranking – it's the Carnegie Classification. You recognize that different institutions have different wonderful things that they need to do and they have different niches. So as Provost, every day he has to make extremely difficult decisions of who gets money and who doesn't. He commented, "It depends on what I am talking about. If it has to do with space, if it has to do with equipment, if it has to do with student advisors, there are many different buckets of prioritization and issues that one needs to do. It needs to be a much more nuance narrative than one would think about if you just sort of had this Program Prioritization."

Finally, Provost Walker stated that there are three or four other frisky things everyone wants him to talk about and he will be back, but he doesn't think we should call it program prioritization. He is supposed to implement lots of the recommendations to save the Budget Task Force. The idea of program prioritization is just too pea-brained to call it that. We should have a series of data – and he is collecting it like mad because he wants the Provost to make as little mistakes as possible. Program Classification – "What is it? What are the strengths that each program does?" He said he will need input and advice of what those should be but he is already moving ahead on that. He is looking at everything he possibly can that can help us in that regard. He thinks we should talk about program classification, and it is happening very quickly because he has to make another series of decisions in March, so he needs to move ahead on that but he doesn't believe he has all the judgment or reflective things he should have to do that and he needs faculty help but he is moving ahead on it. He stated that it seems to him that the way to do this is to take off the table the idea of a ten percent cut or anything like that; that there is some sort of thing that is going to happen at the end of the day as a result of this classification. That's already happening. If the administration wanted to carry out a process, they have all the data and in fact they are doing it. People aren't individually losing their jobs, but programs are shrinking and other programs are growing and that's already happening. He thinks the Provost needs the kind of data and information and advice, still his call, that will allow him to make as few mistakes as possible in that and the good news about being the Chief Operating Officer is that he can go over to the whole university, and as the

number two, it won't be him, but he believes that we want somebody that's the Chief Operating Officer of the university that's got a real strong academic background in academic priorities. Because then that person can say, well you know maybe we should cut into our reserves as opposed to doing this or maybe even though this is an important thing, we need to do it over here on the administrative side; it's not nearly as important as other things we need to do on the academic side. Provost Walker said that he welcomes the idea, even though it may seem like it takes the Provost away from just being an advocate for academic quality, not an advocate for the faculty, not an advocate for the students, but an advocate for learning and quality and research throughout the university. In addition to that, it is very useful to have a Chief Operating Officer that can look at everybody else's budget and keep them honest and be there as a senior partner with the President. Provost Walker added that he will talk about some of these issues next time.

An unidentified Senator asked Provost Walker if perhaps he could give Senate a specific account of why he supports one position. Provost Walker replied, if you have a specific situation... The unidentified Senator asked Provost Walker to give Senate some examples. Provost Walker stated he wasn't going to go into any details. He noted there are programs that are expanding, and they are very well aligned with the mission of the university. He is happy to go into more detail but it is that kind of situation that we have. We need to do this over more than one year. You do this each year and you have this kind of competition; it is not the kind of thing you want to do if you are really trying to have a strategic development. You need to have cluster hiring; you need to think about it as a plan over several years – all of those kinds of things. Individual Deans can tell you in their school exactly why they got something or not. He can talk to Senate about the winners and he could give Senate an example, but he is not prepared to do it right this moment.

Senator Ray noted that Provost Walker pointed out some reasons for the reductions in overall faculty lines but of course that is internal to the academic side of the budget. And, if we take a picture as Provost Walker suggested of the larger budget, the budget overall is bigger and, if we then take a snapshot of debt service, debt service has expanded exponentially in the last five or six years but it will have expanded even more now which begs the question given that budgets are zero sum gain. If the budget is larger but the faculty lines are smaller and we know debt service is bigger, it strikes him that there is a siphoning off or there may be a siphoning off.

Provost Walker replied that the siphoning is indirect. It is not coming from the very small budget that the Provost has. We have to have more. The Provost has to be the Chief Operating Officer so we can look at other things. But the fact is, when you talk about being an advocate for faculty, you need to have appropriate space. You need to invest in infrastructure. We emasculated the staff in the operating budgets in many of our departments and schools in order to take these budget cuts in ways that were more palatable to people and that's just unconscionable; that doesn't work. People came back to him and said, "I need those staff back or I can't run the courses" and I can't give it to them. That was their budget cut. He stated that we have to address the situation, at least within the academic side, and he doesn't think we did the kind of job we should have.

“Now, when you talk about the other side, the question is, ‘If you’ve got a rapidly changing environmental situation in higher education, do you invest in some new things? Do you reallocate resources? Do you do things that are associated with new buildings and all that?’ The answer is yes. The question is, why do you do it; what’s the theology; what’s the rhetoric that tells one that one should do that? I think the administration always needs to do a much better job in that and I will, this year, try to do as much as I can to bring that story alive whether you like it or not.”

Senate President Goodell thanked Provost Walker for his report and said that Senate will definitely invite him again; he is always on the Agenda to give a report and hopefully we will have a bit more time next time.

XIV. Student Government Association

Due to time limits, SGA President Moatasem Al Bitar will report at the next Senate meeting.

XV. New Business

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:20 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel

Attachments