

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

FEBRUARY 6, 2013

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, Bosela, C. Bowen, W. Bowen, Bracken, Cory, Delatte, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Gelman, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, R. Henry, Holsinger, Horvath, Hrivnak, D. Jackson, M. D. Jones, Karem, Krebs, Marino, Meier, Resnick, Rickett, Rutar, Sridhar, Steinberg, Strauss, Talu, Tebeau, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, Volk, Whitmer-Rich, Wolf, A. Zhou.

Artbauer, R. Berkman, C. Brown, Karlsson, Markovic, Percy, Sawicki, G. Thornton, Triplett, G. Walker, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: T. Banks, Dixit, Jayanti, M. Kaufman, Liggett, Niederriter, Rashidi, J. G. Wilson.

Al Bitar, Boise, M. Bond, Caspary, Drnek, E. Hill, C. Jain, B. LeVine, V. Lock, McHenry, Parry, Sadlek, Spademan, Stoll, Vandemark, B. White, Zachariah.

ALSO

PRESENT: Kosteas.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:04 P.M.

I. Eulogies

A. Joan E. Baker (Law)

Professor Susan Becker delivered the Eulogy for the late Joan E. Baker. Her remarks follow.

“Joan Elaine Baker was born in 1931 in Seattle, Washington and she developed a love of literature at a very early age. She always recalled with great fondness the hours and hours she spent lost in a library as a child. I am sure a lot of us in this room can relate to that due to our common love of learning.

“Joan did her undergraduate work at Reed College in Portland and that was an experience she described as one of the best and the worst of her life. It was one of the best because it allowed her to pursue her love of learning, and one of her worst because her professors, who were uniformly male, all tried to limit her career choices to homemaking. Joan would have none of that. So following her graduation from Reed in 1953, she held a series of jobs in political, environmental and anti-poverty organizations. This career path eventually took her to Washington, DC where she entered Law School at George Washington University and graduated with highest honors in 1967. Following a clerkship with a federal district judge, Joan pursued and obtained an advanced law degree, LLM, from Yale Law School. So by that time she had excellent academic and work credentials.

“Joan next set her sight on academia. Unfortunately academia was not nearly as enamored with Joan as she was with academia. Instead, this bold career choice lead her on a nomadic journey starting as a visitor professor of law at the University of Pittsburg, then the University of Akron, and finally to a tenure-track position at the University of Colorado. The problem was that the then-Dean of the University of Colorado, College of Law told Joan that he would have a tenured female on his faculty ‘over his dead body.’ Fortunately for Joan she did get tenure; unfortunately for Joan, the Dean survived this ordeal and continued to make her life hell. At that point, she escaped – and she did describe it routinely as an escape – to London where she held an academic position at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Due to a series of fortuitous events both Case Western and Cleveland State University recruited her the same year to teach at the Law School. Joan chose us; she chose CSU first of all because we already had several other female faculty members, three at the time, but also because she had such great respect for our urban mission.

“Joan taught here from 1975 to 1995 and I think she retired three times. She taught an incredibly wide range of courses, including Contracts, Labor Law, Civil Procedure, Remedies, Employment Law, and a host of others. After her first retirement she came back and worked with students who needed academic support; then she came back to work with recent law student graduates who were struggling to pass the Ohio Bar exam. In short, Joan was closely associated with the University long after her official retirement in 1995, and she did most of that post-retirement work either for free or what amounted to minimum wage when one considers the hours she put in.

“Throughout Joan’s association with CSU she continually inspired all of us with her enthusiasm for teaching, her unwavering support of our students, and more than anything else, her absolute refusal to accept any kind of inequality whether it was based on gender or race or economic status or other irrational factor. She was always the champion for the underdog. Joan also demonstrated a very special commitment to our students who struggled academically. She developed rigorous individualized programs that helped them succeed in Law School, helped them pass the Bar and become highly accomplished practitioners.

“She was also one of my very best friends and mentors and I will tell you just in a nutshell why that is. Until the day she died this past December, she always thought about others first. And when Joan thought about students, I know with absolute certainty that she had the same level of commitment to her students the first day she walked into her first class as a law professor as she did the last day she exited the classroom. As we all know, that level of commitment takes an incredible amount of dedication and perseverance and just an unbounded love of learning to accomplish that goal.

“So she died in December after a relatively brief illness and we are having a tribute to her, a celebration of her life on Friday at the Law School at 5:00 PM. All are welcome. Thank you.”

Senate President Goodell asked everyone to please observe a moment of silence for our colleague Joan Baker.

B. Ana Begovic-Juhant (Health Sciences)

Professor Mary Milidonis delivered the Eulogy for the late Ana Begovic-Juhant. Her remarks follow.

“Ana Begovic-Juhant was a scholar, mentor and leader. As a Croatian immigrant, Ana learned how to have courage, work hard, value relationships and have a keen awareness of politics. These qualities allowed her to pursue her dream of becoming a tenured University Professor. As a single mother of two children, Ana began her professional work in dentistry as an office manager and dental assistant with her cherished and supportive boss, Dr. Sonja Glavina. Working hard in the dentist’s office during the day she began her college education in the evenings and earned degrees first as an Experimental Research Psychologist and then a Cognitive Aging Psychologist.

“By an amazing chance, Ana Begovic-Juhant came to Cleveland State University as a research assistant for Dr. Phil Allen and graduate student of Dr. Boaz Kahana. She wrote her Masters thesis on *‘The Effects of War and Exile Stressors and Coping on the Manifestation of PTSD and Other Psychological Symptoms Among Croatian and Bosnian Refugees Living in Croatia, Germany, and the United States.’* She earned her PhD in applied cognitive aging. Her dissertation with Dr. Harvey Sterns and Dr. Karen Frye was on *‘Older Adult Residential Moves, Coping, and Adaptation.’* After graduation she became a part-time instructor in the CSU Department of Psychology where she taught Memory and Cognition, Psychology of Learning, Adolescence, Social Psychology, Health Psychology and Psychology Lab.

“I came to know Ana at a Gerontological Society of America meeting in 2007, when I was looking to recruit faculty for the School of Health Sciences. Dr. Katherine Judge told me about Ana’s important research and teaching in CSU’s Psychology Department.

“Ana enthusiastically agreed to interview for a Health Science faculty position. At her interview, I remember how sophisticated both her research and teaching skills were. I admired her attention to detail, relevant questions and sincere interest in working collaboratively with faculty and students. Collectively as a faculty and staff, we were delighted when she joined our Health Science faculty in September 2008.

“Dr. Begovic-Juhant ‘s personal philosophy was to be an excellent and inspirational teacher by providing students with a deeper understanding of how psychosocial, spiritual and cultural factors contribute to the overall well-being so that they may be more caring and empathic future health care providers. She taught a number of Health Science courses where she could instill this philosophy in students including Culture and Health Care, Gerontology, Women’s Health, Advanced Research and Writing, Capstone Research, and Research and Analysis.

“She had two main research areas that included quality of life for women with breast cancer and depression and anxiety in prison populations. She was always interested in examining the effects of stress on an individual’s well-being and quality of life and the coping process that medicates those effects. While on faculty in Health Sciences at CSU she completed manuscripts on ‘Age Difference in Depression among Different Prison Populations’, ‘Psychosocial Factors Related to Depressive Symptomology among Female Inmates,’ and ‘Impact of Body Image on Depression and Quality of Life among Women with Breast Cancer.’ At the time of her death, she had two research posters presented at the Gerontological Society of America. Ana struggled to publish her research on prison populations and it was exciting that her work finally received the attention it deserved with a reporter from Denver and many other professionals coming to review her analysis on age related coping in prisons.

“In between Ana’s hellos and goodbyes was her passion for research on aging, students, relationships, politics, mentoring, and her Croatian family. Ana had a large and diverse book collection that included Structural Equation Modeling, Learning and Behavior, Neuropsychology, Longitudinal Data Analysis, Theories on Aging, Adult Development and Aging, Jung’s Archetypes, Women’s Health, Understanding Global Cultures and Ethno medicine. Some of my best recollections of Ana are our walks through the hallways at CSU and coming across a student or colleague. To Ana relationships were paramount in importance. She would greet a colleague or student with a distinctive Hallo! And ask how are things going? And then remember what was important in their lives or how they saw the world. Ana had some distinct phrases that are unforgettable such as, ‘Oh well... I really have no clue.’ And then she would engage you in a wonderful flowing conversation. Her graduate student, Ed, will never forget how she took time to explain to an undergraduate student how to begin a paper that was due that day. When asked why, she spoke from her life experiences with a smile and said in a passionate voice, ‘you really don’t know what that student’s life is like, they need help!’ So she gave that help willingly no matter the circumstances. Her mentor Dr. Karen Frye describes Ana as steadfast worker, calm and focused until the day she tried one too many chocolate covered espresso beans and could not stop talking.

“Dr. Katie Pantano reminisces of Ana rolling her brief case down the hallway and stopping to talk. Ana had a wonderful skill to engage colleagues in meaningful conversations whether she was talking about the research, teaching, family, politics, or yoga classes. Dr. Stella Iwuagwu, a co-author of Ana’s, describes her as a cherished friend and mentor that helped with research and online courses.

“Ana lived her last days as she lived her life. Each day stretched out, full of presence of every moment, discovery of new things, and increasing depth of understanding. In the end, Ana embraced life, family, friends and visitors with humility, humor and honor. Given a miraculous extension of her life in September, she used the time to write three research papers, organize her courses and immerse herself in politics and religion. I will never forget sitting with Ana in her hospital room on a sunny day when she finally decided to leave her faculty position at CSU as her health was failing, it was not an easy decision and she felt she had so much more to contribute, but her body was giving out.

“Her colleague Dr. Sam Mathew wrote, ‘Ana was truly the best person one can come across. She was truly loving, extremely friendly and very distinctly appreciative. I still cannot forget her freely talking with me and so willingly sharing all the materials.’ Dr. Bette Bonder remembers, ‘she was a genuine and genuinely remarkable person.’ And, Dr. Sue Bazyk adds, ‘When I saw her last, while she was in ICU, she talked about how much she loved her work.’ Dr. Beth Ekelman noted that Ana was an exceptional teacher and strong contributor to the BSHS Program, in addition to being a warm and caring individual.

“Ana passed away on a Tuesday morning, November 13, 2012. Professor John Bazyk wrote, ‘As inevitable as this news is, it is still very hard to accept it.’ Dr. Glenn Goodman wrote: ‘Ana was well respected by her students and colleagues. Her teaching was thoughtful, and her Eastern European perspective always brought an additional strength. She had a wonderful sense of humor and an engaging laugh. Her work with the Gerontology Certificate in Health Sciences and her research interest in this area was a strength that the School of Health Sciences will dearly miss.’

“Ana’s ever loving and watchful husband, Dr. Frank Juhant, remembers Ana’s selflessness, always doing things for her family and friends; her will and determination in obtaining a PhD while being fully employed; her kindness in sending money and clothes to friends and relatives in Croatia; her love of nature and her openness and nonjudgmental style.

“Those of us in the School of Health Sciences, the Department of Psychology, and all who knew Ana lost a dear friend and colleague. No one could help but be taken in by Ana’s kindness and personal warmth. Her passing touched us deeply.

“Ana – Congratulations on a journey well taken.”

Senate President Goodell asked everyone to please observe a moment of silence for our colleague Ana Begovic-Juhant.

C. James T. Flaherty (Law)

Professor Stephen Lazarus delivered the Eulogy for James T. Flaherty. His remarks follow.

“Our colleague, James T. Flaherty, ‘Jim,’ died this past November 6th. We remember him with fondness and admiration.

“He came to Cleveland-Marshall College of Law in 1966, already a mature 38 year old and ready to make his influence felt. Raised in Arlington, Massachusetts, he had enlisted in the United States Army, served in Korea and occupied Japan, then taught and counseled high school students in the greater Boston area, urging higher education upon them and managing to greatly increase the number of his students who did go on to college. At night he attended Boston College and supplemented the Bachelor of Science degree he had earned there with a Masters degree in Education in 1953 and a Juris Doctor degree in 1964.

“Jim joined our faculty as an Assistant Professor, was promoted to Associate two years later and became Professor of Law in 1969. He served additionally as Bursar and then as Assistant Dean and Acting Dean. The Law School had been associated with Baldwin-Wallace College prior to 1967 and, with that relationship terminating, the Law School sought association with the recently-created Cleveland State University. Jim was instrumental in the 1969 merger with Cleveland State, and ensured in that merger the preservation of the endowment the Law School had obtained through the sale of its downtown headquarters (currently the site of the Justice Center). That endowment, the Cleveland-Marshall Fund, has been the source of numerous programs enhancing the educational experience of students in the Law School and throughout the University, and in providing vital scholarship assistance to many Law School students.

“Jim, an experienced teacher before he became a lawyer, was able to master many courses; among them Property, Future Interests, Estates and Trusts, Legal Profession, Trial Practice, Legal Problems in Education, and Domestic Relations. He published a treatise on Ohio Domestic Relations, established a Domestic Relations Law Review, and was regularly sought out by Ohio practitioners for assistance in their cases. In all the courses he taught, he brought his own distinctive sense of the realities of law practice. Law students, he knew (long before many of his colleagues) must understand not only legal theories and rules, but also how they are actually applied in real-world settings. He was a pioneer in using videotapes of trial court exercises in Law School classes.

“Jim, as Assistant Dean and Acting Dean, was a leader in recruiting women and minority students, as well as women and minority faculty. He established a summer preparatory program to assist incoming students in readying themselves for the rigors of Law School. The Legal Careers Opportunity Program still provides an entry into the

profession for students who would otherwise not have that chance and is one of Jim Flaherty's lasting legacies.

"Jim was our first Director of Continuing Legal Education and as such was able to create and maintain the school's abiding relationship with the greater legal community. He recruited more than 200 volunteer lawyers and judges to work with thousands of participants each year. He was continuously active not only in the university setting but in legal and political service in the city, state, and in foreign countries. He served as legal counsel to the Ohio branch of the American Association of University Professors, chaired the Chester Township Board of Zoning Appeals, and was an Acting Judge in the Mentor and Lake County courts. Jim, having served full time at full speed for 33 years, became Emeritus Professor in 1999.

"Jim Flaherty had a wonderful smile and great sense of humor. He often used that humor to enliven otherwise dry faculty discussions, and was not hesitant to use it to deflate pretension where he observed it. Jim did not favor overblown rhetoric; he saw a job to do, a problem to be resolved, and wanted to get at it and get it done. That's one of the things that made him the teacher, the scholar, and the administrator that he was, and the delightful colleague that we honor, as we still miss him today."

Dr. Goodell asked everyone to please observe a moment of silence for our colleague James Flaherty.

II. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of February 6, 2013

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Agenda for today's meeting. She noted that there is one change and that is the Minutes of the meeting of December 5, 2012 will not be approved because they are not ready. It was moved, seconded and the Agenda as amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of December 5, 2012

As noted above, approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of December 5, 2012 has been delayed because they are not quite complete.

IV. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Joanne Goodell reported that since our last meeting, the Board of Trustees met on January 16, 2013 and passed a resolution to approve the 120-credit standard for degree completion and a move toward a three-credit model for the General Education program. As everyone knows, this is not exactly the same as was recommended by the University Curriculum Committee as it did not exempt WAC, SPAC and capstone courses from the three-credit cap for general education courses. She noted that everyone should have a copy of the resolution which was in the packet of materials for today's meeting. The next meeting of the Board is March 18, 2013, and the final report from the UCC will be presented then. Dr. Goodell reported that the

Academic Steering Committee had an extra meeting to discuss the implications of the Board not agreeing with UCC's recommendations and mandating that the entire curriculum move to the three credit model by Fall 2014, and during that meeting it was decided that the first step in either scenario had to be the consideration of exemptions from the three credit GenEd course cap or the 120 credit cap for degree completion. To move this along, the Provost will direct Department Chairs and Associate Deans in the Colleges to submit to the UCC a document for every program and GenEd course in his or her departments that clearly states which courses and programs will be seeking exemptions along with the reasons for such requests by February 25, 2013. This date will allow the UCC to make its recommendations back to the Provost, and for the Provost to make his rulings so that new degree maps can be worked out with full knowledge of the General Education credit hours. The UCC will provide further clarity about the method of submission of program changes and will seek Senate's approval of these interim streamlined measures to ensure as smooth a process as possible. A timeline for implementing changes will be made available after the next Board of Trustees meeting.

Senate President Goodell informed Senate that a group of people have been working with Ms. Tommie Barclay and her colleagues from IS&T on designing an online curriculum approval process, and it is now ready for testing. She noted that she was rather hoping that we could use it for the upcoming onslaught of curriculum change proposals that will be submitted soon, but that may not happen. Once it is implemented, this will alleviate the current difficulty of tracking many documents through our overburdened email system, especially for the people who manage multiple proposals at once (i.e. the people in charge of curriculum change matters in each college) and the Registrar's and Provost's Offices. From submission to approval, all documents will be available to those who need to see them in one secure online website, and there will be mechanisms for tracking which stage of the process a proposal is at.

Dr. Goodell reported that one aspect of the credit hour changes being considered that has not received much attention is the impact of increasing the number of three-credit classes might have on scheduling four-credit classes, particularly graduate classes in the evening blocks. This is an item for discussion on today's agenda, and she noted that she invited Ms. Janet Stimple, the University Registrar, to help us with some of the more technical issues surrounding possible changes to the time block schedule.

Dr. Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) is feverishly working on Greenbook changes that will be presented at the next Senate meeting in time to go to the Board for their March 18, 2013 meeting. UFAC is continuing their review of the committee structure, and they are working on a proposal regarding this that can be brought to the March Steering Committee meeting and to the Senate thereafter.

Dr. Goodell noted that the Undergraduate Student Success Committee has taken up the review of the CCO (Complete College Ohio) report as well as considering the implications of CSU's retention plan that was prepared by Vice President Carmen Brown's Office this past summer. We will hopefully be getting a report from the

Undergraduate Student Success Committee about their deliberations in either the March or April Senate meeting.

Senate President Goodell stated that a new initiative to help us all do a better job of getting to know our students and keeping in contact with them during the semester is beginning to be rolled out across the campus and it is called Starfish. She took a quick look at it recently and it promises to make many processes much easier to manage. She completed a quick survey of her students' progress to date, and the students and advisors will get an email from the system giving them her feedback and many other features. Attendance can be recorded, and students who are absent more than a specified number of times will get an email, and their advisors will also be notified. She added that this will go a long way towards showing our students that we notice them when they are present or not, and have taken the time to record this. She asked everyone to please think about what they personally can do to improve students' attendance and improve our retention and graduation rates so that we can smooth the path from enrollment to graduation for as many of our students as possible.

Finally, Senate President Goodell noted that differentiated faculty workload policies have been submitted to Provost Walker by each Dean and everyone now has their workload allocation for next year. She commented that if anyone did not get a copy of their college's submission, she would encourage them to ask their Dean and Department Chair for it. She said that she is sure Provost Walker will be happy to answer any questions faculty might have about these issues after his report today.

Senate President Goodell noted that a couple of Senators have contacted her and asked that a secret ballot be prepared to vote on item V.A. Final Response on Credit Hours Proposals so those ballots will be distributed during Dr. Bill Kosteas' presentation.

V. University Curriculum Committee

A. Final Response on Credit Hours Proposals (Report No. 49, 2012-2013)

Professor Bill Kosteas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, commented that hopefully everyone had a chance to read the UCC's report and recommendations. Obviously, the bottom line of this is that the UCC did not endorse the proposal that they move to a general standardization of our undergraduate curriculum to three credit hours.

Dr. Kosteas gave a brief rundown of why the UCC came to its conclusion. He noted there really isn't any strong evidence to suggest that this conversion will have significant beneficial impact upon students. It may well have an impact but there is certainly no data to support this. There is no data either to support or refute the assertion. However, there are groups of students who might be harmed by this change. Students who are evening only students could see a delay in their ability to complete their programs because right now as it stands, you can take two four credit-hour classes, come down to campus two nights per week and get eight credit hours per semester done.

Depending upon how the new time blocks are going to be set up, you may only be able to get six credit hours done in the evenings coming to campus twice per week. That issue is particularly salient for graduate programs which are evening only or predominately evening programs and one of his fears is that a lot of graduate programs may be harmed to the extent that they shut down or at least see drastically reduced enrollments given the changes they will have make to those programs. He said those are the biggest salient issues.

Professor Kosteas noted that at the same time, as everyone can see from the report from the survey that UCC sent out to undergraduate students, there are a lot of other issues that students pointed out as being barriers to timely completion of their programs. In particular, scheduling of classes seemed to be a very big issue, the ability to get the courses the students need, and days of the week or times throughout the day that work for them. This is also a problem in terms of the sequence of courses; being able to complete a sequence of courses and fitting those into a student's schedule can easily be problematic. He noted one of the worries for departments is the requirement to offer more sections of courses because two-course sequences will get split up into three-course sequences.

At this point, Dr. Kosteas stated that he was happy to entertain any questions.

Senator Beth Ekelman thanked the University Curriculum Committee for doing such a thoughtful job in looking at this issue because she is sure the UCC was under quite a bit of stress to get the analysis done. She agrees with the UCC's conclusions and she just wanted to thank them for all of their efforts in writing such a good report.

Senator Norbert Delatte thanked the Committee as well. He noted that he is really concerned about the time line and being able to complete the work and being able to communicate to students and faculty in time that they are not severely disrupted given that Civil Engineering changed our curriculum in 2009, and it wasn't reflected in the catalog until 2010. To this day, there are changes and prerequisites that have still not been reflected. He thinks the date we were given to have this in place, number one, is completely unrealistic. Also, he is really concerned about some unintended consequences we might not have thought through. Currently in the Civil Engineering program, they require two calculus courses, four credit hours. If those courses change to a sequence of three three-credit calculus courses and if we only use two of them, then we are now below our minimum requirements for math and basic science and we would be out of compliance with our accreditation criteria. If we add a third course, then we have to actually increase the courses and we avoid what we really want to do in this entire process which is making students who are currently in the program take additional courses. He stated he just wanted to make sure that during implementation we think all of these things through.

Dr. Kosteas responded that he was avoiding talking about the time line at this point, but he does agree that 2014 would be nothing short of a miracle to pull it off without causing significant harm to students. He noted that what UCC did was dictated

by the Board of Trustees. He is hoping ultimately that they can be persuaded to be flexible because the idea is to do this right; to get this done correctly; to do it in such a way that it is going to benefit students and not harm them. It is not just the students; but it would cause shear and utter chaos for the Advising Offices as well. Everyone could imagine the flood of students at Advising Offices when the confusion sets in if we try to implement these things too quickly and do not have clear road maps for students who are trying to navigate under two different systems. Dr. Kosteas noted that he was invited yesterday to meet with the Associate Deans and Rosemary Sutton and Janet Stimple. They sat down and started to try to anticipate some of the big issues that are going to come up and push forward in as few meetings as possible what is the right way to move forward. Ultimately, implementation depends on what the Board of Trustees decides in March. He added that the planning has to start right away. The process is somewhat limited because the UCC can't fully begin the planning until they know exactly what the end game is going to be; whether it is going to be the entire curriculum or just the GenEds because that's going to effect how departments choose to change their programs. For some programs, it is going to make a very significant difference in how that change goes through. With the group they have pulling together, they should be able to at least anticipate all of the big issues and the question of finding the right way to move forward.

Senator Jeff Karem also thanked Dr. Kosteas and his Committee for their hard work. He noted he is an English professor and he finds the report to be very well written. He also shares Dr. Delatte's concerns about implementation. He supports the recommendation of the UCC and he doesn't need a secret ballot to fill out. He also mentioned some points for consideration. One of the facts that we know about the retention rate is the two most crucial years are the first two years with students and that's why he thinks it is imperative that we take time to implement the General Education program changes in an effective manner because that's where we stand to make the biggest impact on our students. He stated that as someone who teaches the largest GenEd course in his department, he has a stake in this, and will gladly submit his syllabus to whatever the process is when the time comes. From the other side, he shares Dr. Kosteas's concerns about graduate students because one of our crucial service areas to the Cleveland community is our graduate programs. If we do anything that jeopardizes those programs, that's going to be a real problem for us down the road. Many may not know this, but he believes that we have the third largest number of graduate students after Cincinnati and Ohio State; we have a huge cohort here and he wants to make sure that we take care of them as this conversion process unfolds.

Dr. Kosteas responded that he had a lot of editors on the draft so he is not going to take credit for the writing quality. He stated that from what he knows in terms of our graduate programs in the MA in Economics, the majority of the students in the program work full time; they work in the greater Cleveland area and they come downtown. If we have to discontinue that program, which has doubled its enrollment in the last decade roughly, those students have no where to go. The next two closest programs in Economics are at Kent State and Akron and those are day time programs. Given our job placements in the last few years, that would be a shame. For someone who has been a graduate director for five or six years, that prospect particularly weighs on him. He did

spend five minutes doing some calculations so he might as well share some numbers with everyone. He noted that a student asked Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange to look into how many course sections would be converted from fours to threes, just looking at the GenEd conversion for fall semester, because he did not have that information in the data set he received from the Registrar's; one hundred eleven course sections would go from four to three credit hours. So if you say two hundred courses would be converted between fall and spring roughly, because all of the numbers he gave in his report were across the two semesters, this would basically bring that percentage of courses which are four credit hours down from about 40% to 34.42%. The number of three credit hour courses would go up to 32.4%. So basically, if we just focus on lower level General Education courses, 51.5% would be fours and 48.5% would be threes. When the WAC, SPAC, and Capstone courses are included, this represents another two hundred sections in the fall semester. We don't know how many of these will receive exceptions so if you take the sum combined, say just double that number for fall and spring, then the four credit hour courses would represent 23% of all course sections offered and three credit hour courses would be close to 44%. Looking at a population of only three credit and four credit hour courses then the scenario just described would result in four credit hour courses representing less than 35% of the sections. It is an upper bound of the expected changes we could see depending upon exceptions. But just focusing on those GenEd courses would significantly impact the mix of three and four credit hour courses, and we will look more like Kent and Akron for whatever that's worth.

Senator Michael Horvath stated that one of his colleagues in his department asked him to raise a logistical issue – it's not necessarily a pedagogical issue but he was wondering if moving to an all three hour courses, whether there has been any consideration of the implications that will have on parking. He asked Dr. Kosteas if there has been any discussion about parking. He really hasn't had time to think this through as to whether there would be or not, but he was asked to raise that issue.

Professor Kosteas replied that it is not something that came up in their deliberations but again, that would depend ultimately on what the course schedule looks like. If it means having more students on campus at core times when we know that we have the biggest chunk of courses, which he thinks is around ninety-three taking a wild guess, it did not enter their deliberations at all. It didn't quite seem a curriculum matter.

Senate President Goodell stated that of course it does have implications. The time blocks and how they are set have implications in terms of university resources and rooms, etc., and that is an important consideration and that is one of the reasons why she wanted that item added to today's agenda so that we can raise any concerns as we move forward.

Senator Chieh-Chen Bowen thanked the UCC for their report. She said that she wanted to share her conversation with her students. Cleveland State serves a different kind of student; most of them are working full-time or at least part-time. A lot of them only have two or three days to take courses and changing the curriculum from a dominant four credit hour model to a dominant three credit hour model will delay the time for their graduation. It's not going to speed up their graduation. In addition, students were very,

very confused about this decision. Then ask, “What’s the value of making Cleveland State look like any other university when we are not.” Another question they ask, “Is the university benefiting financially by forcing these changes?” Her answer is that she doesn’t think so. So, her students ask, “Why are we even considering this?”

Senate President Goodell responded that perhaps the Provost or the President might want to comment on that later in the meeting.

At this point, Dr. Goodell noted that everyone has a ballot. She stated she wanted to make sure that it is clear what senators are voting for. We are voting to support the University Curriculum Committee’s recommendation to not endorse the standardization of the majority of undergraduate courses to three credit hours. So we are supporting the UCC’s recommendation. Dr. Goodell then asked everyone to vote.

Senator Mark Tebeau indicated he had a simple question about the vote. “So supporting the UCC’s recommendations means what and not supporting them means what?” He didn’t understand what precisely we are stating when we vote. Obviously we support the fine work done by the Committee. He asked, “What is it we are precisely saying when we say we do not endorse the standardization?”

Dr. Goodell replied that she will report the vote to the Board of Trustees that the Senate supports the University Curriculum Committee’s recommendation to not move forward with a full four/three credit conversion.

Dr. Tebeau referred to the Board’s resolution. He noted he has been reading the Board’s resolution and he can’t quite figure out what it says.

Professor Goodell said, to answer Dr. Tebeau’s concern perhaps, she is hoping that the Steering Committee will meet yet again to consider the implications of supporting this recommendation, and what kind of further discussions we, as a Senate, and faculty representatives on the Board, Dr. Duffy and herself, may want to present to the Board. She added that it’s undecided as to what will happen as a result of this vote but she wanted to take the vote and know the faculty’s level of support from the Senate. A couple of people have expressed concerns to her that some people may feel uncomfortable voting openly about that for various reasons so that’s why we will vote by ballot.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray asked for clarification. She said that as she is reading the Board’s resolution, when she reads it, she thinks it is saying it is a done deal; that we basically are going to a three credit hour model on all of our classes and some of us here are reading it that way and then we have one or two people reading it that says it’s not necessarily saying that it is a done deal; then this vote is in support of the Committee’s work. She asked for some specification on how to read the Board of Trustees’ resolution because she is just not clear.

Dr. Goodell replied that her reading of it was, and she is not a lawyer and she didn't write the resolution obviously, it's the Board's resolution, but her reading of it is that the Board was waiting for the final report from the Faculty Senate from the University Curriculum Committee and also for input from the Senate from today's meeting before they make the decision to say that we would have a full four to three credit hour conversion for all courses where possible other than accreditation and licensing issues. She stated that this was her reading of it and she believes that Provost George Walker is nodding his head and that is what it is. The Board has not voted. That Board resolution stated that we will adopt across the board the four to three credit hour conversion.

Professor Tebeau commented that he just read the fifth Whereas paragraph: "is consistent with the other state-assisted universities that offer a dominant three credit hour model;" but based on what Dr. Kostea just said, when the GenEd courses are converted to three credit hours, will we have essentially adopted the three credit hour model?

Provost George Walker commented that people have different opinions about what's more important – the number of sections or the number of courses. But, if you look at the number of courses and which courses are three credit at other institutions around the State, it's a different set of numbers than the numbers that would result if you were just looking at the number of sections, the very beginning level of courses, so that's where people with different perspectives could have a difference of opinion about whether it's gone as far and one would say that we are in alignment with other schools.

Dr. Tebeau stated that his question is, "Is it dominantly three credits?" He just wanted to make sure that he understands it clearly and that it doesn't mean all three credit courses. It strikes him that there is room for exception in this document unless he is misreading it.

Provost Walker replied that again, a rule of thumb could be neutral. As we look at other universities around the State, they have some four credit courses and some three credit courses, and you look at those general curricula and you say, "Are we reasonably consistent with that?" Others might say, "We are a different kind of institution" so that doesn't make a lot of sense. Provost Walker said he is not taking any stand on that right now but the idea is to be reasonably consistent with the other institutions around the State. He added that this was one of the trustees' models.

Senator William Bowen asked if it would be possible to see a break down of the structure of the other universities' programs and the way they are configured so that we could systematically compare ourselves to them rather than just taking an anecdotal kind of, "we are similar or we are different" and he is hearing all of these different comments.

Provost Walker noted that what Senator Bowen said makes a lot of sense. As we try to move ahead and do whatever it is we need to do to meet the schedule and to do the right thing, he would suggest that everybody look at what other people are doing just to get an idea, a guideline, of how other institutions work their curriculum with a so-called

dominant three-credit model. So he would expect that this is something that would be available to us all and that we would have a reference of what's happening at all of these different places. He added that the Provost's Office is already gathering that material and, in fact, Dr. LaGrange has a lot of it.

Senate Vice President Sheldon Gelman stated that he is speaking for himself. Some members of the Steering Committee have discussed, and he personally would favor, the drafting of a resolution which Dr. Stephen Duffy would present to the Board describing the faculty's position. The Board will vote. It is up to the Board to decide whether what we have done is consistent with other State assisted universities and whether it currently meets the description of a dominant three-credit model. He added that he didn't think anybody at this meeting could resolve that; that's a question for the Board and he would like the faculty position to be represented to the Board at the March meeting. He went on to say that he does think, given the data that Dr. Kosteas accumulated, with the help of the Provost's Office and other data that we will be collecting, a very persuasive case can be made especially when it is considered that about fifteen percent of our credits are evening students. Nobody has suggested that evening students would be better off. Professor Gelman stated, "As Dr. Kosteas said, I don't think anybody suggested a rationale for concluding that they wouldn't be worse off with three-credit courses in the evening. So, if you subtract that from the numbers Bill gave, we have a pretty fair argument that we already have the dominant three-credit model and I assume that when the departments go through the process of looking at their curriculum to reduce it to 120, there may be further changes so that just in the ordinary course of carrying out the measures that the faculty and the administration and the Board have agreed to already, we will have numbers that are more favorable than the ones Bill was able to describe today. But I think that is for next month."

Dr. Goodell thanked Professor Gelman noting that another Steering Committee meeting will be convened where we will discuss how we will represent our views to the Board.

At this point, Dr. Goodell announced the results of the vote on the University Curriculum Committee's recommendation to not endorse the standardization of the majority of undergraduate courses to three credit hours. Thirty-five votes were in favor and four votes against supporting the recommendations of the UCC. She stated that she will make sure that this information gets to the Board.

Senator Berlin Ray wondered, "Let's just say that the Board goes ahead and says we are switching everything to three credits. Then the next issue is the timeline for doing that and who argues strongly for us to have a reasonable timeline so that it's done in a thoughtful way."

Dr. Goodell replied that this would be part of a resolution or whatever we come up with to represent our views to the Board because she is in complete support of the idea that 2014 is too soon to do a proper job.

Dr. Kosteas noted that we are being given this 2014 deadline but as he said earlier, you can't really begin the process of moving forward until we know where we are going. We are ready to start right now if we knew exactly what we were working towards. Is it just going to be GenEds or is it going to be the full curriculum. We could sit down and start designing the process now but, as it stands, we have to wait another five/six weeks just to find out what the end game is going to be and, given the compressed timeline that we already have, that's a significant waste of time. He stated that he is very much against asking his colleagues to start drawing up plans for how to revise their programs with the cognizant to be ready to rip that up in six weeks just in case, or devise a plan A and a plan B. He stated he didn't think this is the best way for us to use our scarce resources – our time. We don't want to take that away from advising students, helping them through their course work, our research and everything else that we do around here. That is why he is so hesitant in terms of developing the timeline. We have the first step but even that first step is not complete. Certainly there are courses that are not in the General Education program for which departments are going to seek exceptions if the Board of Trustees does say in the end we are moving to a three credit hour model for the entire undergraduate curriculum with exceptions. Not knowing exactly what we are working towards makes it very difficult to even design the implementation process in an intelligent and fair manner.

Senator Delatte noted that September 2014 is when students would start taking those courses. That would mean that the course assignments would have to be made by chairs and the course scheduling would have to be done in October of this year based on a catalog that we should be in the process of publishing right now. He commented, "If that's the date to start taking courses, then September 2014 isn't our time line – it is a year earlier to get those scheduled."

Dr. Kosteas added that in fact there are some issues. This is something that has been discussed. The UCC is not sure exactly how long the process is going to take to modify TAGS courses and, in fact, it may be impossible. Having nothing to do with how fast we work through these issues, and depending on how long external reviews for accreditation agencies and licensing agencies take for TAGS courses, if they decide that you must submit all of the syllabi and get them individually approved so that you maintain that transferability, that may be well beyond our control. "When we are talking the middle of March what it is that we have to do, we need a little time to design the process. The TAGS process needs six months. Well, how does that impact things? We have to go through the approval process in two weeks." Dr. Kosteas noted that we have to factor these things in which hasn't been done.

Senator Visocky-O'Grady stated that she was just wondering, from a logistics standpoint because she has just had to plan schedules and have workload meetings and things like that, this is a huge amount of work on the faculty if it goes through and she is wondering if the Provost's Office is budgeted for course releases for a faculty member in each department to manage that and then additional releases for everyone who sits on UCC at the college level committees and then when we talk about advising for those transitional students who are figuring out how they juggle from four to three, would each

department get a course release for an advisor at an undergraduate level for the first two years potentially? She noted that she didn't mean to be pushing buttons, but we talked last time about how you can't squeeze blood from a stone. She stated that she didn't know where faculty would find the time so she is hoping that in any workload conversations this would be a part of the discussion.

Provost George Walker agreed with Dr. Visocky-O'Grady that this is a lot of work and he has sequestered a significant amount of resources that can be utilized in ways to accommodate and help the people that are going to have a major workload plus, with regard to future courses, there ought to be opportunities for people to like get points or something that they can use in future times. So, all of that and the details probably would be maddening but the point is that it is going to take a lot of time and some people are going to take a lot of time and they need to be compensated one way or another for that.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady stated her concern is that credit banking isn't a great deal when you have to get it done in a short amount of time. So we may need course releases for people who are already planned and scheduled for a full workload if it's going to happen by 2014.

Provost Walker noted there are also issues with regard to actual stipends for people who work at different times than they normally would, and not just trivial stipends. We need to put all of that together and he has been thinking about that since he saw the timeline about what we could do. So there is a whole lot of stuff. He noted that they are working very hard and the point Dr. Visocky-O'Grady made is well taken.

**B. Proposed Revisions to the Bio Medical Technology 4+1 Option
(Report No. 50, 2012-2013)**

Dr. Kosteas noted that the first item from the UCC is proposed revisions to the Biology Medical Technology 4+1 Program. He stated that predominantly the two programs are at Southwest General Hospital and the Cleveland Clinic Foundation. Those are the two primary places where these program students go to get their licensure after they have completed their degree here. These changes are being made as a result of consultation with those two organizations. Dr. Kosteas said to summarize, it is eliminating three required courses and replacing those three specifically required courses allowing those students to take twelve credit hours from a list of biology, chemistry and health sciences courses.

There being no questions, Senate President Goodell noted that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed changes to the Bio Medical Technology 4+1 option and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Biology Medical Technology 4+1 option were approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Proposed Revisions to the Social Work Major (Report No. 51, 2012-2013)

Dr. Kosteas next presented the second item from the UCC, proposed revisions to the BA in the Social Work Major. He noted that apparently the department is looking to remove what they call the liberal arts requirement for the program. This program consists currently of fifteen credit hours in at least three of the following fields: Anthropology, Communication, Economics, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology. The Social Work faculty feels that this requirement is adequately being met by our current General Education requirements. He added that this is a duplicate set of requirements.

Hearing no questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the University curriculum Committee has proposed revisions to the Social Work Major and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Social Work Major were approved unanimously by voice vote.

At this point, Dr. Kosteas thanked his committee personally for being willing to work over break so that they could turn around and get the credit hours document ready for the first week of classes. He thanked the faculty at Senate today and he thanked the faculty who were not at Senate today as well.

D. Suspension of the Ceramics Concentration in the ART Major (Report No. 52, 2012-2013)

Dr. Kosteas noted that the final item for Senate approval is the proposed suspension of the Ceramics Concentration in the Art Major. He said that this began under Provost Geoffrey Mearns and the department was instructed at that time to choose one of two concentrations to eliminate and the department chose this one. Several members on the UCC wanted him to indicate on UCC's memo that they approved this with sadness.

At this point, Senate President Goodell asked if there were any comments from the Art Department.

Senator Norbert Delatte stated that he realized that by the time these proposals come to Senate, most of the time it is pretty much a done deal and perhaps it is a program that has already been starved of resources and couldn't be kept around. But, he is wondering what questions we are looking at when we suspend programs. Are we looking at what are the costs of operating the program? How many courses do you have to offer for the program? What FTE it takes to run the program? Are some of the costs maybe due to special facilities and what happens to the students who are currently in the program? When we lose a program like this, what courses contributed to the diversity offerings at the university are being lost? What is the impact on student academic choices? What will our students not be able to do because the courses in this program aren't being offered any more? Professor Delatte said that he didn't know who to direct these questions to in terms of whether there are answers to those questions.

Dr. Goodell asked Professor Delatte if these were just general questions. Professor Delatte replied that he didn't know if the UCC can maybe answer his questions or maybe the chair of the program could answer his questions. Dr. Delatte said that it looks like we may be looking at some of these again. He asked, "Well, what is our process? I mean if I want to get a two credit hour GenEd approved, I have to put ten to fifteen pages of justification together and why we are doing this. What is the data that supports this decision?"

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady stated that she appreciates that the UCC proposed this with sadness. She can tell everyone that it felt like a Sophie's choice for the department. It wasn't something that the department initiated and she doesn't have answers to the technical questions that Dr. Delatte was asking but she believes they reside in the Provost's Office. She said she believes that Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange has numbers and statistics and she could better explain what the university needs to meet to keep something running. She thinks this particular closure was prompted by the move to the Middough Building in that some things physically fit into the space in Middough Building and some things didn't and so when they were moving the two departments across, they took a tight look at everything they could cut to make it happen. She stated that certainly they are very happy to be in the Middough Building, but this was very difficult. She can tell everyone that it created a tremendous amount of ill will for a huge number of our Project 60 students who were very involved in the ceramics concentration and so as a department, they have been walking the fine line of promoting all of the wonderful things that are happening over in Middough and still trying to make people understand that they value the experience they had in ceramics but we are just no longer offering the concentration. Dr. Visocky-O'Grady commented that for those who don't know the Art Department curriculum terribly well, she can tell them that they still offer course work in ceramics. The professor was a tenured professor and still teaches a ceramics course. She stated that they need the ceramics course specifically for their art education concentration. Students are going to work with kilns in high school and junior high classrooms and so the Department managed to save their ceramics production capabilities. They just no longer have a major in that area. Dr. Visocky-O'Grady noted that Dr. Delatte questioned how many students would be affected by it. She stated it was a small number of majors. Rather, it is disheartening to a department that has always embraced ceramics as one of the many art forms they choose to offer.

Senator Jeff Karem asked Dr. Visocky-O'Grady if there is another ceramics program in town. Dr. Visocky-O'Grady replied that she believed Tri-C does not have ceramics. She is not sure if the Cleveland Institute of Art (CIA) still does. Regardless, the financial difference between CSU and CIA credit hours would put the CIA option out of reach for most of our students.

Senator Karem commented that the reason he asked is in regards to mission differentiation and what we can do unique here that's not taught elsewhere. It is sort of sad to lose something where we could actually compete more effectively with other programs since they are not offered. As a son of pottery collectors from Ohio, which has

Cowan Pottery and Schrekengost Jazz Bowls, it is a real shame to lose this capability because that's part of our history here in Cleveland.

Hearing no further comments, Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed the suspension of the ceramics concentration in the Art major and asked Senators to vote. The proposed suspension of the ceramics concentration in the Art major was approved by voice vote with two nays and fourteen abstentions.

At this point, Dr. Goodell stated that there are also five items from the UCC for Informational Purposes Only which Professor Kosteas will not provide any information on but Senators can get information on those items from Ms. Violet Lunder if needed as noted in the meeting packets.

E. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 53, 2012-2013)

- 1. Proposed changes to GIS Courses, Track and Certificate**
- 2. Proposed changes to the BS CHM (ACS Track)**
- 3. Proposed changes to the Psychology Minor**
- 4. Proposed changes to the Physics Minor**
- 5. Change MUA 102 and MUA 103 to MUS 117 and MUS 118**

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

VI. Academic Steering Committee

The impact of increasing the number of three credit hour courses on scheduling four credit hour courses (Report No. 54, 2012-2013)

Senate President Goodell stated the next item is a discussion that was requested at the last Steering Committee meeting and that is to start to consider the impact of increasing the number of three-credit hour courses on scheduling four-credit hour courses. She stated that we know we are going to increase the number of three-credit hour courses because the GenEd courses are definitely all fraught with exceptions changing to three credits only so there will be significantly more three-credit hour courses. The University Curriculum Committee had asked, and they did have a couple of discussions briefly about what the time block schedule may look like so she asked the Registrar, Janet Stimple to be present at Senate today so she could provide some input.

Ms. Janet Stimple, Registrar, stated that she wasn't really prepared but she just wanted to hear what people had questions on.

Dr. Goodell noted that one of the first questions was, "What are some of the other models out there for three-credit and four-credit mixes in Ohio that you are aware of?"

Ms. Stimple replied that first of all, all schools have a standard time block schedule that they adhere to. In Ohio, there is no one common model necessarily. There are similarities and there are some themes that run throughout time blocks. She noted that first of all, all of these models do account for three, four, five, one and two credit hour courses. They are built so that different hour credit courses can be scheduled within those blocks. They are built with designations of when those courses and how those courses should be offered. They typically all start at 8:00 AM or earlier in the day for the standard model in Ohio; they tend to have either some rules or regulations about pushing things that take up extended periods of time during the day out of what we would consider prime time offerings and having those things either later in the day or prior to the start of prime time. Those are some common themes that are throughout. There is still a predominant Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Tuesday, Thursday model even with the varying credit hour options.

Senator Stephen Duffy asked, "If we went to one hour course scheduling, is there a problem with that?" He continued that it seems to him that one hour course scheduling would accommodate ones, twos, threes, fours, and fives. He asked if there is something wrong with moving to a one-hour system. After no comments, Dr. Duffy noted that this was the response he received at Steering.

Ms. Stimple said she would just add that this is certainly a way other schools accommodate some of the fours and fives. If the fours meet in the same time block as the threes, they would need more days per week. There are definitely schools that are doing things like that.

Senator Robert Krebs said that a question he did raise up in Steering was actually an opportunity if we are looking at changing this to bring one problem he has faced a few times and he is sure more people do, as we are bringing more and more technology into the classroom, if you do have classes with only a ten minute gap particularly when there are increasing enrollment numbers, it is virtually impossible to get your class started on time. He has had faculty get very upset with him because he is being too slow to get his computer off the podium and they are trying to get their video set turned on at the same time while shifts of over 150 students are going in and out the doors. So his hope is that whatever we come up with it has at least a fifteen minute break between the classes because we are using more technology and it takes a little bit of time to get things set up.

Senator Stephen Cory reported that they talked about this issue in their history department meeting. A lot of the faculty feel like if we are cutting down to fifty minute classes, that leaves them insufficient time to do a number of things that they have been doing and they are wondering if there is the possibility of rather than meeting three times per week, you meet two times per week for some of these classes if they are dropping down to three credits.

Ms. Stimple replied that absolutely there are models out there that have two day per week models for three credit hours.

Professor Cory commented, "In other words, could a Monday and Wednesday schedule be accommodated as well or does it have to be three days out of the week?" Ms. Stimple responded that most of the models across the State accommodate that on Tuesday and Thursday.

Professor Karem noted he had a question that is really more of a problem-solving question. "Looking at other State universities, a lot of them, and this would be in support of perhaps Professor Duffy's suggestion of one credit hour blocks, Kent has all of these one and one half credit hour courses and twos and how does that work? It seems like whatever dominant model we are moving towards, there is still a lot of variation and a lot of other places, although they don't have as many fours, they have a lot of variation too. How do they handle it? Are there best practices that we can learn from?"

Ms. Stimple responded that one of the best practices is that you have to stick with your model and you can't keep allowing it to blossom out of control in order to free-lance solutions to supposed problems. This is how students really get caught in problems of not being able to access courses that they want or things getting out of control when people start crossing over and doing other things outside of those standards. She added that more schools went to more defined rules about what you can do and what you can't do. She doesn't exactly know what Kent State does. You can look at their time blocks but how they distribute those time blocks again is not evident from just looking at their time blocks.

Senator Beth Ekelman noted that summer blocks have always been a problem for Health Sciences because there are only blocks right now for a six week and an eight week schedule but they offer courses for six, eight, ten, and twelve weeks. So, maybe when we are redoing these, if the Registrar could keep the summer schedule?

Ms. Stimple agreed with Dr. Ekelman that summer needs to be looked at.

Senator Ekelman commented that they are always coming back to them and they have to figure out a way to make it work within the times that it doesn't work.

Ms. Stimple commented that as long as she has been here, the time blocks that exist are for the sanctioned actual summer time periods and those other reiterations and eight and ten weeks again, have just grown up out of how departments want to offer classes.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray commented on what Senator Cory mentioned on the possible two days per week schedule and Ms. Stimple mentioned that the typical model is Tuesday, Thursday and she would just like to suggest that we not be limited by that even though that is the most common model and that we also take a serious look at Monday, Wednesday as well.

Senate President Goodell stated that she had actually asked Ms. Stimple a couple of questions ahead of time and one of them was, "What are some of the implications for students that she is aware of that we need to keep in mind while all of this is going on?"

Ms. Stimple replied that obviously many of our students have very complicated lives so again scheduling is inherently difficult. There is no one thing that works best for all of the students; they have different needs; so the thing that we really need to keep in mind is our willingness. We shouldn't make it inherently harder for them to get courses based on how we set up time blocks. So we need to be very conscious of time blocks overlapping and things of that nature which again are things that happen when you start trying to do longer periods of time on days. So those things need to be very carefully looked at because in no way should we be making it any more difficult for students to be able to get to the next time block when scheduling their courses.

At this point, Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Carmen Brown to speak about something that she was not aware of and that is that the whole time block is under consideration as part of the new scheduling software that Dr. Brown is trying to implement. She felt that many others may not have been aware of that either. She then asked Dr. Brown to tell the Senate what is going on with the Ad Astra Information Systems scheduling software implementation and how the time blocks fit into that.

Dr. Carmen Brown noted that she was glad to speak to Faculty Senate. Dr. Brown stated that the Ad Astra Information Systems project started one and one half years ago. They felt it was very important for the university to have a very efficient way of scheduling classes that will take into consideration students' priorities in terms of taking classes and also about maximizing the available space that we have. In order to do that, class time blocks need to be approved and in sync. She noted that as Dr. Goodell said, part of this process was a thorough review by the University Registrar. The existing class time block schedule that we have was last approved by Faculty Senate in 1977. When you see the grid in black and white, you will see what Senate approved in 1977 and then she can show everyone what they currently do. Dr. Brown stated that it is not working; it is insane. If you are feeling the pain, you can imagine when you are setting up your classes and we are arguing or accommodating your needs for space, and you can imagine the students when they are looking at our schedule. She noted that this whole process identified quite a bit. We are off schedule and we are only talking about undergraduate classes right now. We are off grid and looking at running some numbers during the last couple of weeks and what Senate approved back in 1977 is off twenty-eight percent.

Ms. Stimple added that this is for course offerings for this year in fall and spring and so far this year twenty-eight percent have been off the block.

Dr. Brown commented that what this means is, for example, the time block of 8:00 AM was one that is used by some departments more than others. There has to be uniformity. If Faculty Senate passed the policy or procedure in 1977 which says that class will begin at 8:00 AM, then we all need to start planning like that. She noted there

were also other irregularities in time blocks. There were six variations. Right now we have almost twenty-eight variations or thirty where within that same block we are trying to schedule a class that begins for example at 8:00 AM, another one starts at 8:15 AM, the other one starts at 8:20 AM – it is crazy. So they are hoping to give Senate a better perspective in terms of best business process. We really need to look at how it is being done elsewhere; give Senate what they professionally feel is best business practice; let Faculty Senate review it. They need to go to the Deans, to the Associate Deans, and Department Chairs; they need to go to the students as well so they can come back to Senate and get a really, really good class block. Dr. Brown commented that they are having a hard time naming a Schedule Time Grid that works for all of us but most importantly, they are trying to bring students in, get them through, and make sure they have enough classes within that time so that students can take courses sequentially. Dr. Brown went on to say that they also found a huge overlap between 3s and 4s and part of it is how they are scheduled. It is not whether they should be there; yes, there should be some 4s and there should be 3s and they need to look at them. She added that they can schedule them all correctly if they follow the grid. But when we are not following grids, everybody is in great harm, especially our students. Dr. Brown added that Cleveland State University is known as having the least utilized institutional classroom space. When people are reviewing our space allocation or how we are using our academic space, we are known as the university that uses the least amount of academic space and that's partly because of the way we are scheduling classes. So with this new Ad Astra Information Systems software we can maximize the utilization of our space so we will be able to improve that performance as well which is very important as the university moves forward for additional space allocation from the State.

Dr. Bill Kostead commented that the problem is that you can't just set aside graduate courses because even though all of these proposed changes are aimed at undergraduate courses, if we are going to give four hour blocks, especially in the evenings for these courses and find space, departments will be forced into revising their graduate programs to also be on a three credit hour schedule. Dr. Kostead said that he has been pushing to know at least at minimum what's going to happen to those evening time blocks.

Dr. Brown agreed with Dr. Kostead. She said that for the sake of the argument, there are two projects going on here. There is the moving us more closely to a semester conversion of semester hours where most of our curriculum is a predominant three credit hour model. The other issue, and she felt some would disagree with her, but she can tell from this argument that we need to look at the scheduling grid that we have and in the scheduling grid that Faculty Senate approved in 1977. That grid did call for the graduate programs to be at four credit hours starting at four o'clock. That scheduling grid is really important for a variety of reasons for us. As she was getting ready to submit to the Provost some of her recommendations, she noted that if we were just not to do anything except adhere to what Senate approved in 1977, we would be in better shape than we are today. But right now, the way we schedule classes is really very cumbersome, very inefficient and it puts a lot of people in harms way.

Professor Karem stated that he appreciated the report on the grid. He made two points for future consideration. One point is just for the record. In 1977 he didn't approve any grid because he was in pajamas watching Sesame Street but if those are good rules that were set up, then he thinks we should be following them. One thing that might be missing just as a matter of general knowledge, in terms of going outside of the grid, at least for most of us, he takes what's assigned to him by his department. Individually, faculty are not producing these outliers and he just doesn't want Dr. Brown to have the impression that we are insisting, "I can't wait to break up the time block."

Dr. Brown stated that they also found an irregularity at the university where they have around 55 class schedulers but the Registrar coordinates the general classroom space. When we are lacking that much coordination of academic space, all sorts of things happen. She is sure that often faculty members are frustrated. "Why is this being scheduled at this time without regards to what's happening university-wide?" With this new Ad Astra Information Systems software program faculty will be able to schedule classes and see what space is open. Right now we can't do that. So when classes are being scheduled it is just based on the space that is controlled by the academic department. Again, she stated that it's now the 21st century so there are better models out there, but the 1977 model worked better than what we did from 1977 to the present.

Professor Berlin Ray asked, "When will this new system be implemented?"

Dr. Brown replied that the Ad Astra Information System software was purchased last year and a lot of work has been done. Currently the Registrar put the existing classes in the Ad Astra Information System software and right now it is not working to its max. They will be able to identify some of the space and give more analogies and more forecasting of space but, until we have a very robust class time grid, it's not going to work efficiently. Dr. Brown stated that they are now going forward. She noted that while he was here, Provost Walker got an email from her office saying now it is time to begin this dialogue throughout the university and they are proposing additional recommendations. She agreed that with the conversations going on here today, we have to look at what's best for us but also what's best going forward and look at a classroom grid that will serve the needs of CSU today as we move forward. The University of Cincinnati has a very good classroom grid which is one of the best she has seen so far in her research and that's the one we have been moving toward with some modification. It doesn't mean that the way it has been submitted to the Provost for conversation is going to be the final end result. It is what we professionals feel will work for us.

Finally, Dr. Brown commented regarding the information she gave Senate today, and said that it would be nice if she could show Senate the design. "Here is your 1977 grid; here is what was said; here's the purpose." She noted it would be interesting to see the Minutes. She has enjoyed just looking in the archives at the Minutes and what the Senators at that time were asking of the administration. Many of the issues they were raising are things that we are raising today, but many are contradictions to what we actually ended up with by not following the 1977 grids.

Dr. Goodell stated that this issue will be discussed at the next Steering Committee Meeting and hopefully Dr. Brown will be able to come back and give Senate a full graphical presentation about the Ad Astra Information System software.

VII. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman stated that we first began this effort that spawned this discussion concerning the curricular alignment two years ago with the initiation of the Student Success Committee. While he doesn't want to debate the issues that have already been debated and voted on, he wanted to underline that this came from a committee whose charge was to look for means to improve the success rate of our students. And, everything he believes that we are doing is inspired by that goal. So, the notion that we would unilaterally change graduate courses from four credit courses to three credit courses and that we would force students to now come three days per week when they only came two days per week and would therefore be making it more difficult for students to get their degrees, or completion programs, is not what this has ever been about. He says that philosophically and the same goes for the overall paradigm. He said he said it here many times and he will say it one more time that we are not talking about every course, we are not talking about every program, we are not talking about every circumstance; we are talking about a model that, when customized, will help facilitate largely the progress of our undergraduate students. That is the motivation for it. President Berkman stated that the notion that we are going to engage in this mammoth exercise, which we didn't have to do, and we are going to do it and the result is going to be worse for the students, really, this is philosophically completely at odds of what we've talked about the last two years.

President Berkman stated that he is glad we've had these two years to discuss and talk about the issue. He respects the work of the University Curriculum Committee and he mentioned that at the last Board of Trustees meeting. Maybe what was not mentioned today was that the initial notion of the Board of Trustees was to implement this for 2013 and he believes there was strong sentiment to initiate this for 2013. He argued at the Board meeting for those faculty who were there that obviously it couldn't be done for 2013 and that's what led to the 2014 date. President Berkman stated that if it turns out the implementation in any way shape or form has the consequence of being detrimental to the students, he is not going to do it. He went on to say that this was never the intention of what we started out to do here. He said he believed that everyone should have the opportunity, as they had the opportunity at the last Board of Trustees meeting, to share their points of view with the Board of Trustees, and everyone can do that through their Board of Trustees representatives in consultation with the Board Chair and how he wants to structure it. But everyone should have the opportunity, as they did today, to express the reasons why they feel a move to the rest of the curriculum, or a more detailed examination of the rest of the curriculum to see symmetrically and logically what might convert from a four to a three credit course, is the wrong course for the university to take. Again, President Berkman encouraged everyone and noted that everyone will have that opportunity before the Board.

President Berkman reported that yesterday, we had the first Town Hall meeting for the Provost candidate. There are about 2,400 members of the CSU community but about 45 came to the Town Hall meeting. So if you, as a faculty are trying to convey the message that you are not interested in what a new Provost has to say, you did it successfully yesterday. President Berkman positively encouraged everyone to attend the Town Hall meetings or maybe we should pull the plug on the Town Hall meetings because we are trying to recruit people by demonstrating to them that there is an enthusiasm among this community for their candidacy. He encouraged Senators to encourage their colleagues to spend one and one half hours with what he regards is the most important decision that we, as an academic community, will make to attend those Town Hall meetings. This is everyone's opportunity to ask these candidates, and hear a short ten minute presentation by these candidates about their sense of place, the sense of this university, the sense of its mission, what they think the challenges are and why they feel they are prepared to undertake these challenges. The next Town Hall meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 7, 2013. President Berkman believes we have a very good pool of candidates for Provost and he believes when you have a very good pool, at the end of the day an institution has to be able to convince those candidates that it is the right institution for them at the right time and we all participate in that. Again, he encouraged everyone to come out and to provide the feedback through the mechanisms that have been set up.

President Berkman reported that the State budget is a work in progress. What we have now is a framework that has been proposed by the Governor. He noted that he is talking only about the higher education State budget – a framework has been proposed by the Governor, but a framework that must at the end of the day work its way through the Senate and work its way through the House. In that process, this is what political science refers to as the sausage-making process, the legislative process. In that process, it may taste good at the end but you wouldn't want to see how it was made. It is going to be a very difficult process and what the Governor proposes may not necessarily be what ultimately the legislature adopts. But, he just wanted to give Senate a few of the really important elements of the higher education piece.

President Berkman first characterized it by saying that he thinks this Governor has demonstrated a commitment to higher education. He believes he mentioned at Senate that at the first gathering of university presidents he felt that the most significant and salient and piercing thing the Governor said during that conference is that cutting higher education is the easiest thing for any governor in the United States to do. You have really no constituency; K-12 in terms of numbers dominates you in terms of voice, and every governor has found it an easy path to cut higher education. This Governor is not proposing cutting higher education. He is proposing a number of changes. He is proposing first of all to eliminate what is called the "stop-loss." The stop-loss was kind of a fail-safe which allowed for a provision that would have more than a standard impact on the university as a whole, those universities that would be most impacted would be immune from the law. So, as they have said, it's going to be based on graduation rates but the State is not going to penalize any university more than five percent if their graduation rates are low. That would be a stop-loss provision. There is no such

provision in any program in the state budget any longer. So any policy changes that will affect universities, and they always affect universities differentially, there will be no band-aid; there will be no governor; there will be no loss limit. President Berkman reported that the Governor has also proposed eliminating the historical set-a-sides for Shawnee State and for Stark Community College; that will happen over this next biennium. He has proposed for the first time that community colleges, in a manner similar to senior colleges, be funded in a formula that takes into account their graduation rates. Prior to this time, there was nothing in the formula that took into account graduation rates. Now, twenty-five percent of the community college funding will be based on their graduation rates.

President Berkman commented that fifty percent of our funding will be based on our graduation rates. And, there is not unfortunately any real degree implementation period. While we will not, in the short term be able to dramatically improve our graduation rate, because we are working with students who have been here historically five years, six years, four years, etc., we will still, as every other university, see fifty percent of our formula be based on that graduation rate. Does it mean that we will not and cannot make improvements? For those who noted the really dramatic and gratifying improvements in the performance of this years freshmen class, which is one class and one semester, President Berkman is not prepared to run up any flags of victory. We will be able to make some changes but they will be small and they will be incremental. Right now, although this game is far from over, the projection is that we will lose over \$2 million based on the graduation criteria in the biennium. President Berkman reported that there is some additional money added in the biennium. The Governor has actually increased the overall budget for higher education by just a little under two percent. How that two percent is going to get allocated, what are the criteria, how it's going to be used, is not specified in the budget or not specifically specified in the budget. He noted that the other feature in the budget is that the Governor has proposed, and this is going to be one of the toughest legislative sells in his opinion, the Governor has proposed that tuition and fees, including old fees, new fees, auxiliary fees, pseudo fees, fees on fees, be frozen at a maximum of two percent per year. So you cannot raise tuition and fees as an aggregate more than two percent per year.

President Berkman noted that there is a provision, however, for universities that are in the lower tier of the tuition table to be able to raise tuition using the medium college tuition as their base. Right now there is the provision for both years – two percent in year one, two percent in year two. Now some of these fees are just naturally escalating fees that a lot of universities are not going to be able to control just by virtue of how these fees have been rolled out over numbers of years. Whether fees related to housing, fees related to dorms, food, auxiliaries, etc., will all be included in this are still matters that will be debated. But two percent is a very small margin when we are talking about fees and tuition. President Berkman said he thinks that is going to be the toughest point to get through. He thinks we will have individuals in the legislature who will insist that no fee or no tuition be raised at any state university. He added that this will be a very strong coalition in the legislature and he is not sure it's one that the Governor will fall on his sword for. President Berkman stated that this is what we know so far. We know, at

least for those of us who journey to Columbus, the ugliest season of all is the lobbying season and the legislative season and this will go on for another four to five months before we produce a budget. But the good news is that we start on high ground and we are in a position where we are trying to protect some high ground. We don't start on ground similar to other states whose budgets are rolling out now which are seeing anywhere between five and twenty percent recommendations for reduction in the higher education budget. So, again, it is always very powerful to get a statement into the Governor's budget and to begin from this position but it is a position that we will have to defend.

VIII. Report of the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost George Walker encouraged everyone to be present at the Town Hall meetings of the Provost candidates to be sure we get an outstanding Provost in the very near future.

Provost Walker reported that there are three finalists coming to campus next week for the Dean of Business Administration position. He noted they are starting interviews for the Ahuja Endowed Chair. There is a chair for the search committee for the Vice President for Research. The search will be internal. He hopes to have that search completed by early spring.

Provost Walker said he wanted to give Senate some early statistics associated with the teaching assignment initiative. Roughly speaking what he has in front of him shows that approximately (he doesn't have all of the data), twenty to twenty-five percent of the faculty have increased teaching loads for next year compared to what they have this year and ten to fifteen percent of the faculty have had their teaching responsibilities decreased compared to what they had last year.

Provost Walker talked about the strategic investments competition. He gave a little background. These proposals were reviewed and rated by Deans and Vice Presidents using four criteria: alignment with university strategic goals, impact on student success, clear projection description and plan and reasonable budget. The final funding decision was made by taking into account all kinds of these ratings and the university's strategic needs. As everyone knows, this year we were really focused on student success and that was the comment from President Berkman. Some of the proposals that the President will be funding include:

Mathematics Emporium which establishes a computer lab in the Library with 130 computers and sophisticated software and the software will allow students to work on homework assignments and quizzes and provide instant outcome assessment. The President is funding this proposal and the Provost's Office is funding the infrastructure. In order to do this, some changes need to be made in the infrastructure of the Library.

Instructional Instrumentation Laboratory that will transform an unused stockroom in Chemistry into a state-of-the-art instructional instrumentation lab for sophomore, junior, and senior chemistry courses that will benefit over 400 students a year.

Meeting the challenges of Clinical Education in Nursing to strengthen Nursing clinical instruction/supervision to enhance CSU's signature theme of health and medical science.

Driving the Diversity Action Plan: Leveraging the President's Council on Diversity and the Deans' Diversity Councils to achieve results. To establish a consistent mechanism that will ensure substantive, measurable progress is made on an annual basis toward achieving the eight goals in the CSU Diversity Action Plan.

Provost Walker reported that in addition to those proposals that were funded, they are setting aside some money to think about starting a writing initiative that focuses on beginning undergraduate students and an initiative that might help to launch a new program in health informatics. He added that the Provost's Office is also helping to fund a proposal that will extend the Supplemental Instruction/Structured Learning Assistance Program. This program provides academic support for undergraduate students through special sessions led by peer leaders, with an emphasis on lower division gateway courses.

Provost Walker reported that his office is providing some resources to expand the Minority Retention Program through Camp Vike and the Freshman Class Council.

Finally, as he mentioned earlier, Provost Walker is also setting aside some resources and thinking about how we provide the compensation and the time that people are going to need. Some people will have unusually heavy loads starting now and through the summer associated with the four to three conversion and 120 credit hours – whatever it turns out to be. In addition, with regard to the four to three conversion, he wanted to reiterate that first of all, we will have a coordinating committee in the Provost's Office. They will send out the materials that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee has suggested in terms of the procedure for submitting proposals to the Faculty Senate. He noted the university will have a consultant; he is a fellow many may know; he is actually the Associate Provost at Ohio State, Randy Smith. Randy is in charge of curriculum and he is one of the people on the Higher Learning Commission. Provost Walker has served with him around the nation. He talks to people about how they are doing either in accreditation or when they are changing their curriculum. He was also the person who was in charge of making the change at Ohio State. He is very knowledgeable about what other people have done around the State. Dr. Walker said that we have been talking to him as one example of somebody who can help us learn some things. He will be coming up a week from this Friday to talk to a variety of folks including the Department Chairs, the Associate Deans, the Deans and the Provost's Office and some of the other senior leadership of the university. He has a lot of background material on what it is we believe we are going to have to do and he will help us both in terms of experience and insight and

maybe be a continuing outside person that can be useful in making sure that we know what's been done around the nation to the extent that he can be helpful to us here.

IX. 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 5:00 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel