

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

MAY 1, 2013

PRESENT: T. Banks, Berlin Ray, Boboc, Bosela, Bracken, Cory, Delatte, Dixit, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Gelman, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, R. Henry, Horvath, Hrivnak, D. Jackson M. D. Jones, Karem, Krebs, Liggett, Majette for Sterio, Marino, Niederriter, Rickett, Rutar, Sridhar, Steinberg, Strauss, Tebeau, Vogelsang, Volk, Witmer-Rich, J. G. Wilson.

Al Bitar, R. Berkman, C. Brown, Caspary, Jain, McHenry, Sawicki, G. Thornton, G. Walker, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: C. C. Bowen, W. Bowen, Holsinger, Jayanti, M. Kaufman, Meier, Rashidi, Resnick, Talu, Visocky-O'Grady, Wolf, A. Zhou.

Artbauer, Boise, M. Bond, Drnek, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Markovic, Parry, Percy, Sadlek, Spademan, Stoll, Triplett, Vandemark, B. White, Zachariah.

ALSO

PRESENT: Iwuagwu, J. Jenkins, Kosteas.

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

I. Approval of the Agenda for the May 1, 2013 Meeting

Senate President Goodell stated that the first item is approval of the Agenda for the May 1, 2013 meeting with the exception that we will not be approving the Minutes of the Meeting of March 6, 2013. She then asked for a motion to approve the Agenda. It was moved, seconded and the Agenda was unanimously approved by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of March 6, 2013

As stated above, the Minutes of the March 6, 2013 meeting are not yet ready for approval.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Dr. Goodell noted that this month has been the month of many interactions for us. There have been reports in the "Call and Post," the "Cleveland Stater" and in the Cleveland Plain Dealer regarding the vote of no confidence that was passed at the last Senate meeting. She also had the unfortunate pleasure of receiving two other media reports which were unrelated to the four to three conversion. She added that she certainly has had her share of media attention which she could do without anymore for a long time.

In addition to these media reports the report on the curriculum conversion and the resolution will be posted on the Faculty Senate web site as soon as that can be arranged.

Dr. Goodell mentioned that a number of reports regarding the four to three conversion reflects the concerns she and many other faculty hold that there is not sufficient time to thoroughly consider all of the implications of such changes throughout our undergraduate programming and as a result many mistakes may be made. She truly hopes this is not the case. She knows that all of her colleagues do as well. And she also knows that at this busy time of year we are all working as diligently as possible to make the deadlines necessitated by the adopted timeline. Dr. Goodell stated that Professor Bill Kosteas will address the meeting later and give Senate an update of the conversion process. As she stated in an email she sent to all faculty after the last Senate meeting, it is vital that faculty and the Provost will work directly with any information about significant roadblocks that will prevent adherence to the stated timelines. People only know about these specific details or such roadblocks if we tell them. She regularly hears and receives emails from faculty on the subject.

Dr. Goodell stated that on another matter, the Ohio Faculty Council passed a resolution regarding faculty workloads and she will send that to each Senator for their information. This is mostly in response to the situation in Toledo. The resolution was sent to the Chancellor and there has not been any response to it so far from the Chancellor yet to her knowledge, but she will keep everyone posted on that.

Dr. Goodell noted that with such a long agenda she had nothing else to report on today. She wished everyone a wonderful summer. She added that for those members not returning to Senate next year, thank you so much for your service. She added that she looks forward to a productive year again next year.

IV. Elections

Following procedures for nominating candidates for election to the various committees of the Faculty Senate and other posts, members of Senate elected faculty to the following positions:

University Faculty Affairs Committee
Professor Raymond Henry (Computer and Information Science)

Professor Constance Hollinger (Psychology)
Professor Rama Jayanti (Marketing)

Minority Affairs Committee

Professor April Cherry (Law)
Professor Antonio Medina-Rivera (Modern Languages)

Budget and Finance Committee

Professor David Elkins (Political Science)
Professor Andrew Resnick (Physics)
Professor Vera Vogelsang-Coombs (Urban Studies)

Board of Trustees

Professor Stephen Duffy (Civil Engineering)

Board Recognition Committee

Professor Elad Granot (Marketing)

Ohio Faculty Council

Professor Mekki Bayachou (Chemistry)

Copyright Review Committee

Professor Jeffrey Dean

Patent Review Committee

Professor Antonie van den Bogert (Mechanical Engineering)

Equal Opportunity Hearing Panel

Professor Mary Hrivnak (Management)
Professor Irina Koukhanova (Art)
Professor Colleen McMahon (Psychology)
Professor Valerie Wright (Sociology & Criminology)

V. University Curriculum Committee

Dr. Bill Kosteas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that in terms of our run of the mill curriculum proposals this time around the UCC just has eight For Informational Purposes Only items. He noted that there is a mix of minor program changes and individual course revisions

Senator Beth Ekelman inquired about the Master's of Education target population

Dr. Kosteas replied that they are aiming the program for medical professionals. The sense he got seems to be medical professionals who may wish to move into a role of becoming educators. He added that this was the UCC's understanding of the program.

Dr. Ekelman stated that it might be useful to make sure that it doesn't overlap with the Master's of Science in Health Sciences. She noted that it may not but she knows that her chair...

Dr. Kosteas noted that this is just a PDP at this point. Basically we are saying that they can go ahead and start developing the full proposal, at which point, we will require letters of support for all departments/programs that are affected.

- A. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 71, 2012-2013)**
- 1. Proposed PDP for new M.Ed. for Medical and Health Professions**
 - 2. Proposed changes to the Historical Preservation Certificate**
 - 3. Proposed changes to the Historic Preservation Specialization in the MUPDD Program**
 - 4. Course prefix changes for MLR courses to MGT**
 - 5. Proposed addition of THE 102 as a requirement for the THE Major**
 - 6. Proposal to change CNS 604 (a core course in the School Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling Programs) from 2-3 Credit Hours**
 - 7. Proposed addition of MTH 161 as a Quantitative Literacy General Education course**
 - 8. Proposed changes to CIS course prerequisites**

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

B. Update regarding the Conversion Process (Report No. 72, 2012-2013)

Dr. Kosteas stated that everyone here is pretty well aware that the task we have before us is fairly monumental and the timeline... He noted that to put things into perspective... From the *Columbus Dispatch*, they reported on March 13, 2009 the University Center voted overwhelming last night to recommend the Ohio State's semester schedule... Basically to put this into context, we are talking about three years and roughly five months from when faculty voted on the implementation date and if you take a look at the quarter semester curriculum conversion guide, which is posted on Ohio State's web site, the first version of that document was posted on January 14, 2010. So from when the faculty voted to adopt this change, until the first set of guidelines as to how they were going to go about that process, it was about ten months just to plan how to move forward with that undertaking. If you look through that guideline basically they called for all of the approvals to be done through summer of 2011. So from the preliminary, they have to put a plan in place, follow the implementation process and to get everything approved, and get everything approved and the approval process was another year and four to five months. Dr. Kosteas stated that we have to do all of this simultaneously planned, make the revisions, get everything through the approval process in about one year. From March 18, 2013, when the Board of Trustees made the resolution, we have go from that point in the fall to have everything in and approved and

through the system, through the Registrar and other offices, get all of the systems updated and the catalogue, etc. so that is what we are facing. He noted that this is going to require a lot of work to get it done in that compressed time frame. Dr. Kosteas asked that half of the UCC and others who are on curriculum committees who have to work through this a little bit of indulgence that because we are trying to step by step plan the next step in the process while working through the concept to give consideration to... We are trying to find out the best way to move forward. How do we do convince protecting program integrity and also trying to make the process as simplified as possible for the faculty to making this conversion and making the changes for the programs and also for all of our colleagues who are sitting on the college and University Curriculum Committees that have to deal with all of this. Dr. Kosteas added that we are talking about a process of three years and five months versus a little over one year and five months for us to really get the whole process up and running.

Dr. Kosteas gave an update as to what has been done up to this point. He noted that the UCC has entertained two rounds of exemption requests. The first round of exemption requests was for departments seeking an exemption from the 120 credit hour degree standard and also the departments seeking exemptions requests for general education courses. UCC received ten exemption requests for programs from the 120 standard; seven were approved and three were returned for more information and another one with an outright denial that was sent back for more information. He noted that one of those three requests has since been withdrawn. Actually, as that request came in, the department was saying that we are going to try to get 120; we are not sure if we can get it and now as they have more time to look at it, they feel more confident that they can get that one right. Dr. Kosteas reported that the UCC also received 45 exemption requests for General Education courses; 19 were approved and 26 of those were denied. He noted that those were all of the UCC recommendations and the Provost's Office didn't have any further comments on those. They have accepted the UCC's recommendations.

Dr. Kosteas reported that a couple of weeks ago the UCC entertained the second round of exemptions requests which predominantly for non GenEd courses although there were a few GenEd courses that either somehow got missed or in a couple of cases where it was the Honor's version of the course that they forgot to submit and it was approved. He noted they had a total of 109 course exemption requests. He noted that 67 were approved by the UCC and the remaining 42 were either denied or returned for more information. There were several cases where the UCC couldn't fully make a determination so they are waiting for more information from those departments. Regarding the exemptions, there are many inquiries about whether the UCC will still entertain exemption requests and his response has been, "You can submit them but I can't guarantee you a turn around time." He noted that he has given that response to several departments that are facing deadlines and are submitting their course conversions within the next few weeks.

Dr. Kosteas stated that he has been meeting every other week with the Associate Deans for the curriculum, Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange, Janet Stimple of the Registrar's Office and some others who are also involved to try to figure out this process and the best

way to move forward. They have the online curriculum approval process up to date and running. He doesn't know if any things have actually been submitted yet to the online system but it is up and running and he knows that several faculty here at Senate have attended the demonstration sessions. He added that it is a very basic system and there are not a lot of bells and whistles to it. The goal was to get something up and running that would simplify the process so that we are not dealing with a thousand proposals flying around all over campus and trying to get physical signatures and emailing. He added that he hopes this will work out for us. He said that it should work. The Registrar's Office tested it out a few times to see if it would break and it seems like it is ready to go.

Dr. Kosteas reminded everyone that the online system is just for undergraduate changes. There wasn't enough time for IS&T to program the next and other levels and other approvals. Any Graduate changes have to go to the Graduate College. He stated that if any department is submitting graduate revisions as a result of the conversion of the undergraduate program those have to go through the old fashioned method. So those still have to be submitted. Paper doesn't have to be sent up the chain but pdf's can be emailed as they happen.

At this point, Dr. Kosteas offered to respond to questions.

Senator Beth Ekelman asked if there is any kind of appeal process to these exceptions. She knows that some people in some departments have been told that they were denied the exceptions and they don't why. They weren't given reasons why they were denied. Someone wants to know if it is possible to make the case again.

Dr. Kosteas replied that he made sure to give reasons definitely in the second round. He noted that in the first round all of the exemption requests that were denied were basically because there was nothing provided. Nothing followed the guidelines that were set up. They just made comparisons to other institutions and so in those cases, there really wasn't much to say. A lot of these requests were along the lines of, "These courses are special and they need an exemption." Dr. Kosteas said that every one of those liked to make that argument and so they are the ones that didn't really have much to say in that case. People didn't follow the guide lines that were set up and that was it. He noted that for the second round of exemption requests that information was provided. He sent a memo at least to the relevant Associate Deans and then asked them to please pass on that information. UCC has sent some of these back. They weren't even necessarily denied. We said: "Could you please provide us with more information?" Dr. Kosteas said that the UCC is certainly entertaining those requests.

Dr. Ekelman stated that her department is among that group. The other question she had, from what she has seen, faculty are really making a good faith effort to adhere to this plan and it is really challenging because it is the end of the semester and everyone is busy with grading, etc. She is a little concerned because they were told to contact someone if there were roadblocks. She is concerned that people might be hesitant to do that. If there is a hesitancy, what is the consequence of that and she thinks Chairs may be sensitive as well so she thinks that the administration needs to know that there is that

hesitancy. She added that people are really trying to do their best. Some departments have a large number of courses they have to deal with.

Dr. Kosteas stated that some departments have programmed their courses successfully for exemptions. The problem of course is that there is a limit to that. The timeline is not the UCCs. This was a time line

Dr. Ekelman stated that they are trying to act in good faith. She knows the hesitancy to change this time line but she thinks it is a problematic timeline to do a good job.

Dr. Kosteas said that he doesn't think it surprises anyone that he agrees with Dr. Ekelman. He has been vocal about that. He added that we have some harsh realities. In order for this to be ready to go live in the fall of 2014, it really means that we have to have the first sets of the courses into the Registrar's Office so that they can begin to do that work. They need to begin updates to the Catalogue. The course descriptions can get updated once. All that information is provided to the Registrar. Then throughout the fall we have to move on to the next step of actually getting through the program revisions. He knows that several people have raised concerns as he has as well. You don't revise your courses separately from your program. If it is done properly it is a holistic approach so really all we have done is push paperwork for the program revisions to the fall. In reality, most departments are trying to do everything in basically, a matter of a month or six weeks. It is easier for some departments and programs than it is for others. He noted that in his case, it is pretty easy and straight forward just because all of our courses were already ... It is just the matter of revising the lab... That is not as difficult a choice to figure out what to do as it is if you have a core content that you have to now figure out how to repackage and to move around. He said that he didn't have a good answer for Dr. Ekelman in terms of... He has had some feedback into the timeline but it has been more of a push back in terms of trying to take care of the faculty with as much time as possible with the recognition that we are coming up on some of the great... But we do have those hard constraints of, certain things have to be done by a certain point otherwise it is just not going to happen. We also might want to put hard working staff that we have in the Registrar's and other offices under this horrible situation where under normal circumstances they might have four or five months to make X number of changes in the system. Now they are going to be asked to make five times as many changes and we are asking them to do it in much less time. We have to be mindful of the constraints that everybody faces with the staff that they have.

Senator Norbert Delatte stated that he notices that there is information on the web site about the conversion which is nice for a lot of people but he does have some serious concerns about two of the items. He noted that the second question from the end specifically stated, "With more classes, do I need to purchase text books?" He noted that the answer just says, "No." Dr. Delatte said that he wonders what our basis for saying that is and how it can be held at this point that we are going to add 33% more classes with 25% more classes of curriculum and whose class will not be allowed to have a textbook. He stated that we need to be very careful about what is communicated to the students.

Dr. Delatte noted that his other concern is we stated it won't affect graduate programs. But given how many graduate programs have cross-listed courses and that there are no exemptions for having the courses that are cross-listed, he doesn't see any circumstances under which that could be true. So he is really glad information is being put out but he has serious concerns about not putting out correct information.

Provost George Walker stated that it would be very useful to have in writing a couple of these points so that we can respond and put something up. He said that he agreed with Dr. Delatte that we want to put out good information and complete information. Information can not be wrong or right but it can be incomplete or misleading. He said that he would like to have as much as possible for people to send them something and then they will respond to it and presumably in those cases where there needs to be, they will change the answers or amend the answers.

Dr. Kosteas stated that the issue with this is that several of us have actually raised concerns about that specific point. It has been several weeks now and he has been told that it has been folded into the appropriate place and he checked it a couple of times and it is still there. He added that this is where a lot of concern from the faculty is coming but we actually have been actually sending emails. But none of those concerns have been incorporated in those responses.

Dr. Delatte commented that in this case the proper answer would have been maybe or probably we will have this in once the program comes out. But to say, "No, you won't have to buy any more textbooks..." He said that he didn't know how anybody could come up with that.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray commented, given the concerns that were just raised and the desired feedback, she was going to suggest that the site, because of possible inaccuracies coming down, until those things can be addressed, that the information out there... be absolutely certain and has been checked by the faculty as well as the administration, ... students to be looking on this longer than they have and getting information that is potentially inaccurate, especially on the feedback, given that concern for our students, she would like to be sure that there is no chance that there is any information that we have is not correct at all.

Senator Ekelman agreed and said that the cost issue is of concern. Students will have to take ten more courses and it flatly says, "No, this is not going to cost you any more." She noted that it will cost full time students more and it is a very misleading statement. You know how you take a certain number of credit hours for a certain flat fee, so it is going to cost them more. She added that she knows that Bill has no control over that.

Senator Jeff Karem said that he had a question but he didn't know if the Registrar or the Provost would know or be involved but it would really be helpful to student advising if we could get some guidance about what catalogue rights are going to look like under this because he has a number of students who have some courses that are four

credits that are going to have to be split into two three-credit courses and students are saying, “Well how do I surf the four-credit catalogue right if you don’t have that course. If you do take the six credit courses then number one there is a case because they will be taking additional credits and obviously, he wants to make sure that they graduate as fast as possible and we all do. But, he can’t figure out how we are implementing that under the current arrangement. He asked if we could have a Catalogue Rights Czar. But if there is someone who could give direction to faculty the sooner the better because he thinks it is going to be very difficult to advise students in this kind of nebulous situation.

Dr. Kosteas noted that he could say things from the UCC’s perspective that we haven’t even had time to think about that or whether that comes under their purview or is there another faculty committee that has to figure that out. Again, the UCC just doesn’t have the time. Right now what they are trying to do is stay maybe a quarter step ahead of where we are in the actual process because of realities. We just can’t get any further ahead than that. Now, hopefully this summer, we will be able to plan the next stages fully through. He has already shared this information with some but he didn’t know if everybody was aware of this but President Berkman had a meeting with Joanne Goodell, Vice Provost LaGrange and himself and he agreed to basically give up his summer and organize the process at least the internal part of it like the curriculum part of this. Dr. Goodell reported what had happened at this meeting. Vice Provost LaGrange’s office will be taking care of the external – dealing with OBOR and our accrediting agencies – all of the external stuff that has to go through her office. Dr. Kosteas said that he will be working on trying to figure out all of the next steps although they haven’t done that yet.

Senator James Marino stated that one of the things that is crucial for the success of this conversion is to create transition degree maps. There is no time in the central UCC process to do that and it hasn’t been scheduled. He noted that the departments need to begin doing it before we are officially asked to do it. We need to go back to our departments and our colleges and urge everybody to start thinking through what the degree map will look like on the three credit model for all of our programs before we are officially tasked to do that in the fall. But most importantly, what a transitional degree map looks like for a student to start the three credit model because we need this to go right for our students.

Senator Nigamanth Sridhar stated that his question had to do with course conversions especially exemptions and things like that across the different departments. For example, Engineering programs depend on several other departments and without the information about which courses are going to be converted, it becomes difficult for them to plan the process. He understands that there will be further revisions in the fall but several of their department faculty will be working over the summer in preparing for the program revisions. In the fall other departments will also be doing the same thing so it would be nice if the UCC could make a list of courses that are being exempted and will stay four credit hours and a list of courses that will be converted so that we can over to one place and get that information.

Dr. Kosteas replied that this is something the UCC will be working on in the next few weeks. Hopefully they will have an administrative assistant who will be assisting him and the UCC on a part-time basis and also assisting Vice Provost LaGrange and some others in her office with what they have to do. In terms of the exemption requests, that is a list they have to get up there. It hasn't been fully determined again because they are still waiting for some of the departments to re-submit some of their requests. Again, he just hasn't had time to do it yet because of teaching two classes, going to conferences, revising papers – the stuff that we all do. He does plan to get that information out there, hopefully by mid to late May; using that first week of summer session to get that out there.

Dr. Kosteas noted that once departments have actually submitted their revision packets, all of that information will be available for anybody to access on that on-line system. Any faculty member can go in with his CSU ID and log in the way you log into any other system. You can log into the four to three online conversion that we have going and you can see every single department's submission packets. So, from that you will be able to know exactly what Chemistry did or what Mathematics did with their courses.

Dr. Sridhar stated that those submission packets aren't due until late in the fall. Dr. Kosteas replied that it depends on your college but he knows that for CLASS the first ones are basically due in the next couple of weeks. Remember when you look at the timeline that has been circulated, that is the timeline that came down to us from the Provost's Office that is the deadline for these courses to be submitted to UCC which means it has already gone through College Curriculum Committee. So, you will be able to see those packets as soon as they are submitted by the departments. You don't have to wait for anything in the approval process. As soon as they are submitted, you can pull them up. It will take a few minutes for them to appear but once those are submitted, you will be able to go in and check those. He added that it depends on when particular departments have their deadlines in order to submit them but it will definitely be before the fall – some point in May or June when they have to get those first submissions in.

Professor Barbara Hoffman noted that the Department of Anthropology they have been told that any course that has not been submitted for conversion by May 17 may disappear from the Catalogue and not be available for offering in the future. She asked Dr. Kosteas if this is the case.

Dr. Kosteas replied that he believes what happened is... He is not sure if it disappears entirely from the Catalogue but it can't be offered. It basically won't go into the system for fall 2015 or spring 2015. He is not sure exactly if it disappears completely; it goes inactive. He would have to check that out with the Registrar's Office. He again stated that it doesn't disappear; it just becomes inactive.

Professor Hoffman stated that it would be very nice if we could get accurate information about what is happening and what has happened and what is due in and what the consequences are, and when we can take up the question of accurately redoing our

programs and really truly having the time to consider which courses need to be exempted and which courses don't. She asked if anyone has asked the administration once again, please consider revising the timeline.

Dr. Kosteas responded that those requests have been given.

Dr. Hoffman stated that they need to be given again. She went on to say that the faculty and the students are relying on everyone to press for this time line to be revised.

Dr. Kosteas noted that Vice Provost LaGrange's office has already put out some information so any of the guidelines, any of the information the UCC has put out there, they have two documents, are posted there so any of the guidelines we have put out there along with information... Actually the Registrar's Office put together a nice packet of information that incorporates all of the UCC's guidelines plus the Registrar's guidelines for how to submit the information they need in order to update their systems. All of that is going to be on line on the web site. Actually, he believes that it is already on the web site. If not, it should be there soon.

Senate President Goodell asked Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange if she could tell the Senate where that web site is so she can bring it up now. She asked how she would navigate to the web site.

Vice Provost LaGrange stated that it is under the Academic Planning web site in yellow on the right hand side. It says, course conversion. She noted that everything that has been produced so far, including the instructions for on line...

Senator Ekelman noted that when Dr. Kosteas asked for the extension, what was the reason for the denial and what burden of proof do we need to meet in order to actually get an extension? Dr. Kosteas asked if Dr. Ekelman meant for the whole timeline. Professor Ekelman responded any part of it because people work until the end of the semester but we don't work in the summer; we aren't paid to work in the summer. Some people are doing that but she believes they are getting compensated but that is hit or miss by department to be honest. She wondered at what point the Board will be asked for an extension.

Dr. Kosteas replied that he didn't want to misrepresent anything. He noted that President Berkman can actually answer that better than he can. He went on to say that the Board wants to see some effort before we go back. He stated that we have to recognize one thing: the Board of Trustees is comprised of people who are very successful in what they do but maybe they don't understand academia and they approach things from a very different perspective and so the sense he gets is that if you were to tell the Board of Trustees right off the bat that it can't be done that quickly, their response is going to be that we are just dragging our feet not understanding that this is an insane pace to push for and if we actually pull this off by fall 2014, probably faculty in every other university around the country are going to hate us for setting a standard for just how rapidly this might get done. Professor Kosteas noted that he has said many times that

many of his concerns about what might go wrong revolve around – not the mechanics. It is very easy mechanistically to just go through it and say, okay, just convert this to three and we will just shove this here and that there. It is very easy to actually get it done by a rapid time line incorrectly. His fear is that the redesign of the programs will not be done in the proper fashion. Unfortunately, we won't know that for several years and we won't know that until we are under the new curriculum shuffling out to the job market until employers have had time to assess the students who are coming out under these new programs. He asked, "How long does it take for employers to see if there has been any change in the quality of the students that were trained?" Dr. Kosteas said that he agrees what we do here not just giving students pieces of paper – justification for education. He really thinks that we are building human capital where our goal is to give our students the skills they need to be successful in the labor market as it is today and as it will be or as we can see it in the near future. He added that this is his concern. Faculty are not under contract during the summer and you can't just tell somebody to drop everything else that you are doing and get this done for me by Monday because as you know we can't just drop all of our classes. Professor Kosteas commented that we all could have actually done a good job of rewriting all of our programs if we just quit teaching all of our classes, quit doing all of our research, quit doing all of our committee work – we could have gone and done three hours, but we can't do that because these things come first.

Senator Mark Tebeau noted that his question is actually generated by his experience in one of his classes on Tuesday. His students actually wondered if they will know and when they will know what... He noted that Dr. Marino talked about degree maps. His students want to know what their degree progression is going to look like and they register a year in advance; they have no clue. We owe it to our students, and he knows that we apparently can't do anything about it, but somebody at this university owes to our students to let them know. We have a place we can go and get information. He noted that his students are flailing in the dark. In fact they asked him on Tuesday to ask today if there is a place they can go to learn what the actual impact will be on their progression towards graduation. They would like that because it would help them plan the future. And, our students plan; not just for next year, but for the year following. He would plead with the administration and all of us to try to help them in some way or we will lose them; we will not retain them.

Professor Kosteas replied that unfortunately, we can't give them that information until we know what the programs look like. He noted that Professor Marino's recommendation is well taken in that you have to start working on those transition plans or degree maps, but of course you can't do that until you have decided on what your program is going to look like. He said that as we work through this, we also have to be mindful that you can't just come up with "a transition plan." You have to consider different scenarios. What happens when you have a student who entering fall of 2014 is coming in as sophomore standing, junior standing, senior standing, or somewhere in between in all of these. You have to have a way to get students through this transition process, hopefully without harming them, but you have to figure out how to do it and budget for different scenarios. Again, once we do have that information, we should definitely have a central place, or maybe actually one site that would be the place to put

all of this information but, of course, we don't have that yet; we can't have that yet because departments still haven't fully figured out what they are doing with their programs or at least many have not yet done that.

Senator Robert Krebs commented regarding timelines. He believes he has a handle on the proceedings assuming that everything we get in the department is approved all the way along the line. But with the timeline, when it gets to the college committee and then someone says, no, maybe that's not the right way to revise this course and it's the first week of August.

Dr. Kosteas replied that the best answer he can give Dr. Krebs, with the timeline the way it is, if it gets turned back to the college level, then obviously it has to go back to the faculty members and the faculty members, if they are around, they have to get that back. Of course the question is, can you get that turn around done quickly enough to get it to the UCC by that deadline? As far as the first stage goes, he has said this before: for the courses themselves, he doesn't really see a lot of rejections coming down at the UCC level. The biggest thing that we are concerned with is that making sure that when faculty are revising a WAC course from four to three credit hours, that they don't say, almost going to cut ??? by 33% and all of a sudden you are writing six pages and totally calling it a WAC course. Well I am going to cut my presentations in the WAC course from two to one so then you run afoul; or someone says one of my skill areas is going to take literacy but we are not handling mathematics anymore. Those issues are likely, he hopes and prays, to be minimal. As long as the faculty understand that we still have to maintain the standards of those GenEd categories, he doesn't foresee a lot of those courses getting turned back. What he is more concerned about are departments changing courses in a way that has a negative impact on other programs and that we don't have time to address those interactions. That is actually, he believes, potentially a much greater concern than stuff getting kicked back at least at the UCC level. As far as non GenEd courses go, we are not really going to be taking a very deep look at those.

Senate President Goodell noted that Senate would probably like to discuss this issue for the rest of the afternoon, however, we have other items on the Agenda which are important as well.

VI. University Admissions and Standards Committee

Block Scheduling Issues (Report No. 73, 2012-2013)

Professor Jim Marino, chair of the University Admissions and Standards Committee, thanked everyone for their feedback on the draft schedules that have been circulating. He stated that if anyone has not given their feedback to him yet, he welcomes it and he is eager for it. He encouraged everyone to please distribute those draft schedules far and wide. He said that the more feedback the better.

Dr. Marino stated that he is working on the new scheduling grid which, of course, is another element of the extraordinarily complex undertaking we are doing fairly

quickly. He confessed that he has no strong personal opinions about what the final schedule should look like nor will he pretend any special expertise in what it will look like. His role is as a conduit of information. He wants to provide the decision making process with fullest and broadest based information as possible. The more faculty feedback the better and that becomes more effective early in the existing process which means over the next four to six weeks. Professor Marino reported that the administration has asked the Admissions and Standards Committee to write a report on the existing draft schedules listing both strengths and weaknesses. He will be drafting that and getting input from whatever committee members are willing to give him, but hopefully by the very beginning of June.

Dr. Marino reported that in other news, the Committee is planning to have a survey going out fairly soon which they are in the process of designing to ask for specific faculty feedback on the draft schedules. Again, this is something where they would like faculty response sometime in May because the more time there is to digest the feedback the better. Feedback on Labor Day weekend is probably not going to be helpful or in being effective in shaping the final result. The administration has recently suggested that they would like to collaborate with us and our negotiations are continuing but they certainly welcome the administration offers of extra resources to help the survey and collaborating with us on this process where it is important to all of us and we all stand to gain by getting as much information as possible.

Senator Berlin Ray commented that in terms of giving Dr. Marino feedback, could faculty please ask that the various schedules coming around be dated and timed so that we know exactly what schedule is that we are giving the feedback on.

Dr. Marino replied, "Yes, it is a very good suggestion." At this point, Dr. Marino asked Ms. Janet Stimple, University Registrar, if there has been an update on the schedule since April 8.

Ms. Janet Stimple, University Registrar, stated that the current schedule has fifteen minutes in between classes. There was a time that that may not have been...

Dr. Marino noted that there might then be a third draft out there. Dr. Marino said that he would look for three drafts coming to Senate.

Senator Krebs raised an issue, not with the block schedule per se, but with the academic calendar that was noticed at the last Steering Committee meeting. He stated that he has only been at CSU sixteen years and fifteen of them, Veteran's Day cancel classes on a Tuesday or a Thursday. The only time it was on a Wednesday was because of a typographical error. For the first time, he noticed that in Steering there was a handout that came around that shows that three times in the next five years we are planning on having Veteran's Day knock out the Monday, Wednesday, or Friday class. He stated that maybe Fridays are okay, but this upcoming fall people don't realize that we have for the first time ever it is a Monday which makes three Monday cancellations in the same semester. He knows that this is awfully short notice, but is that possible to change?

Dr. Krebs responded that this issue is worth exploring. He thinks that Veteran's Day is the hardest day to move because it is a statutory one. He thanked Dr. Krebs for his very good suggestion.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones commented that this is also not the first time. She remembers another time.

Senate President Goodell stated that at the end of Item VI, she is going to request that we hold off on the Annual Reports until we have had the President and the Provost report because she feels that they have some important things to respond to.

VII. University Faculty Affairs Committee

A. Proposed Revisions to the Personnel Policies and Bylaws, Section 8.0 (Report No. 74, 2012-2013)

Senator Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, stated that the Green Book is finished. First, Dr. Karem thanked the UFAC committee members who dedicated many afternoons reviewing the finer points of policy and procedure when they could have been doing probably almost anything more fun than reviewing the Green Book. He added that his wife has described herself as the Green Book widow this semester which is something he wasn't familiar with prior to this process. He also thanked Vice Provost Jianping Zhu and Jess Drucker of Human Resources who worked closely with UFAC. He reported that they have reached consensus on these changes. It has been a lot of collaboration and collegial discussion throughout and for him a model of what we can do as a university when we work together and all of our voices are heard at the table in a shared government situation and this marks a fine success story at the end of a very turbulent year.

Dr. Karem said that he would say a few preparatory words and then go over the summary. He added that there are some action items pertaining to our Bylaws emerging from that. He knows that is about as glamorous as it sounds but he will talk everyone through it.

Senator Karem stated that most of the Greenbook applies to non-bargaining faculty but he worked on it and UFAC worked on it as if this were something we would all live under because if you have us divided in this, we would be uncomfortable. The administration worked with due diligence on this as it were a contract for them because it is because this is something pertinent for non-bargaining unit faculty, administrators with faculty rank. So this whole process marks a convergence of interests and willingness to work together that has produced a document with improvements for all of us and it really is a mutual success. Dr. Karem said he would go over summaries of revisions to give a quick update because everybody has been working on this with such diligence and they have done a few tweaks since the document was sent to Senators.

1. Proposed Greenbook Revisions

Dr. Karem noted that he included some Greenbook revisions and he will go through them giving everyone an update and then have time for questions. He stated that this revision completes significant and ongoing housekeeping matters including changing quarters to semesters, correcting institutional names and titles and proofing for typographical errors. He noted that Senators will actually see one of those in the Bylaws changing an error professors love to change because it involves correcting misuse of the words insure and ensure. He added that it made it all worth it to have his Ph.D. come to bear on that sentence.

Dr. Karem reported that the first revision updates the definitions of faculty in section 8.3.1 and he can recall that off the top of his head which is terrifying. It includes all new categories of full-time faculty that have emerged since the first Green Book including clinical faculty, research faculty, college lecturers, clinical legal faculty and legal writing faculty; this is on page 1. This is in keeping with the on-going expansion of the definition of faculty throughout our history – whatever new full-time faculty category has emerged it has been put in the Green Book to reflect our colleagues here.

Dr. Karem reported that the next revision includes as appendices all of the material removed from the Collective Bargaining Agreement by mutual consent and converted to standalone policies after the last negotiation. This includes items like parking, postage, Emeritus status – things of that nature and the language has been imported almost exactly but in brief format so that the articles fit the Green Book ordering and references to CSU-AAUP and/or the Collective Bargaining Agreement have been changed to refer to relevant Faculty Senate entities and that means that those are things that he doesn't have to answer questions about in his capacity as AAUP President but he still has to answer them as Chair of UFAC so this didn't work out the way he had expected, pages 113-122.

Dr. Karem stated that this revision strengthens protections and impartiality of dismissal procedures by providing for a three-person panel for dismissal proceedings for non-bargaining unit faculty (one will be a member from Faculty Senate, one an administrator with tenured faculty status, one an impartial arbitrator from the Federal Mediation and Reconciliation Service, who is charged with chairing proceedings, pages 24-25. He noted that he can say more about that if people are interested but that is a very strong procedure development by Jess Drucker of Human Resources and he is going to provide a lot of protection for faculty and the university alike. He can tell everyone that the Federal Mediation and Reconciliation Service is brought in for almost every significant kind of labor dispute. In fact, somebody from the FMR itself has a great track record.

Dr. Karem noted that this revision provides a more thorough and transparent process for involuntary medical separation. That is the situation where a faculty member cannot perform given functions because of an extended disability or medical situation.

The new procedure includes a medical/disability evaluation at the university's expense, an opportunity for the faculty member to secure his or her own evaluation, and the opportunity for a third evaluation if there is conflict between the first two. In addition to accrued sick leave and MMLA, this procedure provides for a nine month involuntary leave for recovery prior to separation if there is medical evidence to substantiate it. These provisions are entirely separate from any STRS provisions with the right to return to a state employee position upon completion of disability leave, pages 26-28. Dr. Karem noted that he can say more about this if people are interested. He added that the old procedures were so vague as to simply entail a series of hearings without even clear guidelines to what was considered good evidence or clear timelines so this is a marked improvement.

This revision completes the provision for unpaid military leave for active duty military personnel, which was previously blank, page 43. UFAC felt that was a troubling omission and he doesn't know how that happened; not on his watch.

The next revision corrects crucial contradictions in previous Green Books regarding crediting years of service as a visitor towards the tenure probationary period if the appointment becomes tenure track, pages 12 and 65 which he is sure people will be flipping through right now.

This revision extends the Equal Opportunity Hearing Panel's provisions to be available to all faculty. Although the Panel is rarely used, UFAC believes that if we are going to have this Panel, we need to continue our embrace of equal opportunity and means to address that ideal for all faculty, particularly we are developing University-wide, page 60.

The next revision adds research faculty promotion criteria and procedures negotiated by the Contract Implementation Committee and the administration which are referenced in the Greenbook but were not yet included, page 70. These are faculty who come as full-time faculty as part of a research grant or soft money. If they stay here long enough they have opportunities for promotion. There were not any procedures or standards for that and that would make promotion ambiguous.

The final revision also incorporates recent Bylaws revisions that update the Faculty Senate committees as recommended in light of last semester's comprehensive examination of the Senate committee structure. This was also done by UFAC including the development of an Electronic Learning Committee, the deletion of the Environmental Safety and Health Safety Committee (whose mission is actually effectuated by the General Safety Committee), and the melding of two Computational/Media Services committees into one Academic Technology Committee, pages 81 to 93.

Dr. Karem reported two quick updates on recent revisions and said that he would then respond to any questions members may have. In the interim of discussing having reached some consensus about the separation for medical reasons section, their consultation with the Law School, which currently is being... several suggestions were

made and accepted by all parties and one was that the amount of notice for a separation hearing has been changed from three days to ten university working days and lastly, another provision was added to make clear that nothing in these provisions affect a faculty member's eligibility for sick leave and FMLA. Everything within this is in addition to, not concurrent with or substituting for; he just wanted to make that clear.

At this point, Dr. Karem asked if anyone had any questions.

Senate Vice President Sheldon Gelman stated that he just wanted to echo what Dr. Karem said about the process and point out that many people know, but not everybody knows, that the proposal regarding separation for cause which UFAC inherited from the previous Provost was horrific. It was that the Provost decides what the grounds for dismissal are, the Provost brings the charges, the Provost decides what the Provost's charges are, grounded, warranted, investigated, etc. Professor Gelman stated that he is very grateful to everybody for taking another look at those provisions.

Senator Davis Jones inquired when this process is going forward for approval and adoption. Dr. Karem replied that he would like Senate to approve the proposed revised Green Book and send it on its happy way to the Board of Trustees and then it should be effectuated as of May 20, 2013.

There being no further discussion, Senate President Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed Green Book revisions and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Green Book were approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell gave her personal note of thanks for an incredible amount of work. A round of applause ensued.

Dr. Karem commented that he had actually tried to find the greenish shirt that he could wear. He was attempting to accessorize with a bright neon green shirt but he just wasn't able to do that.

2. Proposed Senate Bylaws Revision Re: Faculty Definitions

Professor Karem stated that in keeping with the extension of definitions of faculty membership within the Green Book in 8.3.1 A) this necessitates a change of our Bylaws about membership of the colleges. He noted that this item was sent under separate cover. He read part of the proposed addition in this section.

"Each College, except the College of Graduate Studies, shall have a College Faculty constituted as follows: the President of the University; the chief academic officer; the Dean, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans of the College; and all persons assigned to the College with the faculty rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Instructor, College Lecturer, College Associate Lecturer, College Senior Lecturer, Research Assistant

Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, College of Law Clinical Professor, College of Law Legal Writing Professor, and Emeritus.”

Dr. Karem stated that this is the full list now. He pointed out another change on the sheet that was circulated in advance is: “Each College shall establish a procedure for insuring student participation in College committees.” which would suggest that we believe we are at liability or risk to have students participate on committees. His guess is that what we seek is merely to encourage student participation on college committees with the full awareness that there is no risk for liability there so UFAC proposes changing the ‘i’ to an ‘e.’ He added that this is also an action item which was circulated in advance.

Senator Ekelman stated that the Greenbook revision is missing the School of Nursing.

Dr. Karem responded that actually in Article 8.1.1 A) UFAC specified that for purposes of the Greenbook policies and procedures and Bylaws a stand alone School is equivalent to a College. He added that this was done because actually the alternative was to find every place where College was mentioned and say “plus the School of Nursing.” So the School of Nursing was put in at the beginning.

Hearing no further questions, Senate President Goodell stated that the UFAC proposed changes to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Bylaws were approved unanimously by voice vote.

Professor Karem stated that UFAC had two more information items.

3. Graduate Faculty Bylaws Changes (For Informational Purposes Only)

Dr. Karem noted that the first item is revisions to the Graduate Faculty Bylaws. He noted that these revisions came to UFAC already approved. He stated that if faculty wishes to second that approval that would be fine but these are already approved as well as changes to the University Research Council. These were voted on by the respective faculties of those bodies. The most important thing that occurred structurally is the University Research Council has had an amicable separation from the Graduate College which was previously buried in the Bylaws. He stated that if there is anyone from the Graduate College at Senate today or if people have any questions he would pass them along. He added that the Dean of the Graduate College is present as a content expert.

There being no questions, Senate received the Graduate Faculty Bylaws Changes.

B. Draft Proposal for New Student Evaluation of Instruction Instrument (Report No. 75, 2012-2013)

Professor Karem reported that the last item is not an action item right now but he just wanted to draw everyone’s attention to it and this was circulated in advance. Early in

this semester, UFAC was asked by the Promotion, Procedures and Processes Task Force to develop a more unified Student Evaluation of Instruction Instrument for consideration by Faculty Senate. After extensive review of extant documents and instruments, UFAC has the following report to be submitted to Senate. Dr. Karem stated that in general he would make a few quick comments and give Senate a sampling of what they are proposing. Knowing that this is always a very substantial issue, they want this to be distributed to each of the College Faculty Affairs Committees. They notice that there is variation in how in the physical form of these documents – there are some Colleges like Engineering and Education that actually have the questions on the form with ??? which seems to facilitate accurate information whereas with others there have been separate sheets of questions and separate forms. Dr. Karem stated that UFAC does agree with the Task Force that it is preferable having a common core of questions to which College faculty and departments can add additional ones, but say questions one through 15 would be the same across the University and then they can vary within Colleges. He added this is apparently what Education and Engineering have both done. Conceptually the questions range from technocratic (“Was a syllabus handed out in the first week of class?”) to philosophical (“Classify the instructor’s teaching method as follows.”), with many variations in between. UFAC found that there is a three-part common ground to all of the evaluations. Most of them have (1) a brief self-assessment of the student’s standing and reason for taking the course; (2) an assessment of the effectiveness of the instructor’s teaching; (3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the course. Because the questions regarding student self-assessment are so discipline-specific and show great variation across colleges – students in the Law School are not ?? and there are certain programs they may want to do, or they may want to know one Engineering major event, etc., we recommend that those not be part of a common instrument, but that those be things added by Colleges according to their needs. Dr. Karem noted that they actually recommended core questions towards evaluation of the instructor and evaluation of the course. Dr. Karem read the fourteen questions and noted that these are evaluated on a scale of 1 from strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree.

“Assessment of Instructor

- 1) The instructor was well prepared for class.
- 2) The instructor presented the course material clearly.
- 3) The instructor gave clear information about course expectations and assignments.
- 4) The instructor responded well to students’ comments and questions in class.
- 5) The instructor was available outside of class to help students during office hours or other appointments.
- 6) The instructor provided timely and useful feedback on student assignments and examinations.
- 7) The instructor made the course material interesting.”

“Assessment of Course

- 8) The required course texts and materials were useful.
- 9) The course assignments were useful in developing my knowledge/skills.
- 10) The pace and organization of the course worked well for me.

- 11) This course advanced my knowledge/skills.
- 12) This course fulfilled by expectations.”
- 13) What is your overall evaluation of this instructor?
(a) Excellent, (b) Good, (c) Fair, (d) Poor, (e) Unacceptable
- 14) What is your overall evaluation of this course?
(a) Excellent, (b) Good, (c) Fair, (d) Poor, (e) Unacceptable”

“Student Self-Assessment questions to be added by the College.

“Additional Questions to be added by College/Department/Instructor.”

Professor Karem stated that two more points he would make about this: the College means has not been updated since maybe 1995 so there is a real need for reassessment of those means. Of course when we have a new instrument those previous means won't really match up to it so we need to prepare for that. He noted that something else that was pointed out is that under the current mini colleges under the five point rating scale, item three is neutral and they found that produced a problem which is that statistically if you are averaging a rating of neutral with ratings that are good, fair, excellent or poor, it ?? the whole thing so UFAC actually recommends three as fair, in other words, because that way you are really assessing and not having an opt out in the middle of a question but then how it counts... Dr. Karem stated that he suggested to Steering that centers be distributed this proposal. He said he does think there is a recognition when we look through the material. He noted that there is a spread sheet and there is not a lot of common ground so it is good to work towards something that is a little smoother and more streamlined.

Senator Deborah Geier referred to the 1 through 12, and noted that one is the lowest score and five is the highest and then when you get to 13 and 14 it is exactly the opposite. She has seen students with low ?? getting used to going all high, high, and then you get to the end and they say, you love this course and how did you get to rate the professor unacceptable? She noted that whichever way we go, make sure ??? for all questions.

Dr. Karem said that his overall evaluation of Professor Geier's point is "A" or maybe he should say "E." He said that he did not notice that and thanked Professor Geier. He added that this is why we bring items to Faculty Senate.

Senate President Goodell asked Dr. Karem if UFAC is acting on this. Dr. Karem replied that no, they are not acting on this; he stated that it is good to have feedback and now people have it just briefly.

Senator Helen Liggett noted that Professor Karem had said that he had dropped out the student part because it wasn't consistent but the a lot of it isn't consistent and she was thinking in particular about whether the course is required or not as a legitimate question for students to ask.

Professor Karem replied that when we say we are dropping out we don't mean we shouldn't be there but we don't recommend the Senate specify what each College does in other words, the College could amend this. For example, question 15 could be "What is your class standing? What is your reason for taking the course?" Because when we survey different Colleges, people want different information so we couldn't create a one size fits all set of answers. So there would be room for that to be developed by College to actually address precisely what Dr. Liggett is saying.

Dr. Liggett noted that that was fine but she was just thinking the rationale... the other colleges have a lot of deviation...

Professor Karem replied that we will have more conversations about this. It is just out there as an initial RFP.

Dr. Goodell stated that College Caucuses will be asked to gather feedback for the Faculty Affairs Committees and bring that back to UFAC hopefully by the middle of fall semester so that any actions that need to be taken thereafter can conclude in a timely fashion.

At this point, Dr. Goodell asked that Senate consider moving the Annual Reports until after the Report of the President and the Report of the Provost and the Student Government. Given the shortness of time, she said she will indulge the people to give their reports at the end of the meeting. She added that as everyone knows, she has to leave to pick up her child so we will not be here beyond 5:30 PM.

VIII. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman stated that maybe some didn't notice or had not had the opportunity to meet the new Provost who, with the consent of the Senate President, she asked to attend this meeting today. He noted that Deirdre Mageean is here. Everyone applauded. President Berkman noted that she has been coming every couple of weeks both looking for a place to roost as well as meeting with Deans, other leadership of the University, faculty, and really beginning to dig in and get a sense of the University. When she comes in July, she will have had really a two and one half month ramp up which obviously is not going to provide a comprehensive understanding of all that is going on here at Cleveland State but at least some clues.

President Berkman said that everyone knows that commencement is a week from Saturday. There are just a little over 2,000 graduate students, transfer students, and FTIC students who are eligible to graduate. As of today when he left the office, 1,750 student indicated that they would walk on Saturday; that's of course in two commencements but still, is a lot of students to process through into commencement. The beginning of next year, he will ask the leadership of Faculty Senate to ponder how they would like to participate. He believes Faculty Senate will have to consider some changes in the graduation structure. We now, in this graduation, have a real challenge to be able to turn the room around in time to get from the morning commencement to the afternoon

commencement. He noted that given the length of commencements, we had strived and we are succeeding in keeping them until about two hours but in the last round they went two hours and forty minutes and two hours and thirty-seven minutes so we will engage in a discussion about whether there are other modalities that we can use to solve the problem. Again, particularly in the semester when we have two gradations of not being able to get people out, get the room cleaned, process them back in, etc. so we may look at doing a convocation for graduate students or Ph.D. students apart from regular students. At the first commencement the hooding now of course is a good thing; we had sixty students in the last graduation who got doctorates and who were hooded and that took about forty-five minutes to do that. He went on to say that in any event, it's a wonderful exercise and he hopes that faculty will all be there. Again, for him the turnout of students is always a signal about how they feel about the University; their willingness to come out and be part of it and bring their families out and be part of it is a vote of allegiance to the University.

President Berkman reported that he hadn't read today's newspaper but he has been told that there is an article on Rascal House in today's newspaper which will be relocated. It is not going away for those who are pizza junkies or frequent Rascal House for beer and the merriment. It will not go away; it is going down to 1836 Euclid Avenue which is the old site of Johnnies, the cheeseburger place. In any event it is going to locate there. It will give us an opportunity as you look at that site but the ability for us to acquire the rest of that site will give us an opportunity to utilize that footprint and build a building that really will be he believes, first of all a much more efficient building around. Rascal House had really inefficiencies to it; it did not give us the ability to easily expand the building if later on we wanted to expand the building. It took on some strange forms in terms of bridging that gap; in any event, it will provide a much more aesthetically and efficient site for the Center for Innovations and Health Professions. He noted that for those people in terms of the acquisition it is all done by a State process. The State mandates that you get free appraisals from a lot of appraisers approved by the Department of Administrative Services; you get those three appraisals; you get the average of those three appraisals and you are permitted to give, if circumstances warrant, ten percent above the average of the three appraisals. So, it was not a "Let's make a deal" or "The Price is Right." In this case, it was a good State process that limited what we could do in terms of what we could offer for the building. It ultimately had to be approved by the Controlling Board which is really the highest legislative authority in the State of Ohio. For a university to purchase property, it must be approved by the Controlling Board and it was approved by the Controlling Board two weeks ago.

President Berkman noted that we will finish this year with a balanced budget. Indeed we will finish this year with a slight surplus in the budget and he thinks that there are a lot of people who deserve lots of credit – Tim Long, Stephanie MacHenry, the Provost, the Deans, the Associate Deans for allowing us to finish this year the way we want to finish this. His hope is that we will also see actual revenue growth next year. The revenue growth will be determined really at this juncture by two factors: where we finally land in terms of enrollment and we are still going through a process in which students are still making decisions; particularly, FTIC students are making decisions

about where they want to enroll. Financial Aid packages offer letters went out about three weeks ago or a month ago and students are still filtering through and making decisions. President Berkman reported that our target, and it was a very ambitious target, when he came here we had 937 FTICs, first time college admits – our target for this year was 1,750 first time college admits. He noted that it is a very ambitious target and he is hopeful that we will get as close as we possibly can. That target translates into revenue so where we get in terms of that target will determine what revenue we will have next year and will also determine whether we will have revenue obviously to continue to invest in the academic enterprise.

President Berkman noted that last year we were able to invest and this is a pretty place to be considering the play that is in the State of Ohio right now. We invested \$1 million as everyone knows; recurring dollars in new faculty and we invested \$1.25 million in academic strategic initiatives. These are initiatives that could be brought forth by any college, designed to optimize one of the strategic goals of the university – research, retention, graduation, instructional enhancement and infrastructure. There were several proposals that dealt with building some additional lab infrastructure for science students so we have more efficient utilization of the science curriculum. President Berkman stated that we put out about \$2.5 million last year. He noted that the Provost will talk about the picture this year. When we know where we are with revenue this year, we will make a decision whether we can go forward and continue to add permanent faculty lines to the university. He stated that this is something we have been committed to do for a couple of years. Again, \$1 million produced about eleven or twelve faculty positions last year. He stated that the Provost will give Senate the data on this year – this year's results in terms of searches and where we are with the positions that went out. The Provost will also talk about where we are on additional positions as a result largely of retirements and faculty who have moved. At this point, President Berkman said that he would take a couple of questions.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy asked if decisions have been made on the size of the tuition increase for next year.

President Berkman replied that decisions have not been made yet. He noted that in part, there are several Northeastern Ohio universities who are waiting for the first Northeastern university to make a move. Decisions that have been made is that Toledo has frozen their tuition. He noted that some people saw Toledo today reported a \$15 million budget deficit even with the imposition of a mandatory four course teaching load for all faculty members. They froze their tuition. Cincinnati has indicated that they will freeze their tuition. Ohio University has indicated that they will raise their tuition but they will guarantee that tuition for students through four years. And, the Ohio State University, in a moment of grandeur and empathy indicated that they would freeze their tuition for their one billion four hundred twenty three million students and alums.

Senator Robert Krebs asked about the cost of Rascal House and Peabody's. President Berkman replied that the cost was \$3.3 million. He stated that there are people who paused in Columbus truly and said, "You know the property in Cleveland on Euclid

Avenue is worth \$3.3 million” and we said, “These are your appraisers.” President Berkman stated that he really does think that we, in this one sense, were a victim of our own success in terms of what property is selling for and what developers are paying for property in and around Cleveland State University now. That’s how the appraisals are done.

Senator Cheryl Bracken stated that in the article it states that payment for ??? is \$3.3 million and there is also another \$1.9 million for renovation of the Rascal House in the new building. She asked President Berkman to please also address the extended fifteen year free lease for the restaurant. She noted that the second part of the article talks about an additional \$1.9 million for renovation for Rascal House in the new Union Building location and additionally that there is a fifteen year free lease through the university for the restaurant and a seven year free lease for their headquarters.

President Berkman responded that we have this retail space at 1836 Euclid Avenue which no matter what we were going to do, we were going to need to renovate if we were going to try to rent the property out. He said that we were going to make a recommendation and we may rent the property out and we may not rent the property out. He noted that the decision was really this: A) these were resources that the university has right now that are not being utilized. For example, we gave them office space in 1836 which is now completely empty but we told them that in the lease if there is another tenant that we find for that property, they have to move to a different space. He noted that Rascal House has been there for 38 years and it is a family and a commercial establishment that is really, he has been told, iconic in Cleveland State. The Frangos money has given money to the university, it has been a good patron to the university and we wanted to keep them – we wanted to keep them in the campus district. If we wouldn’t keep them in the campus district, we probably couldn’t make the deal. We tried to interest them in other properties but probably couldn’t make the deal. He asked Vice President Stephanie McHenry if she wanted to add anything to his report.

Vice President Stephanie McHenry stated that the other aspect of the \$1.9 million investment is in a building that we are going to end up owning. So those improvements actually improve CSU over time and if they like the spot they will renew and start to pay rent after that first year. Part of the matter also is they are going to have less dining space in the new facility then they have now so we had to compensate for that loss of potential revenue.

Senate Vice President Sheldon Gelman asked President Berkman if he could say something about the appointment of a new Chancellor, whether we can come to a conclusion from it and, if he is not mistaken, his last service was at a university which had graduation and retention problems if that means anything.

President Berkman noted that this doesn’t mean we are not going to be concerned; the State’s not concerned about graduation and retention problems. Truthfully, he stated that he didn’t know a lot about the new Chancellor save that he has had no experience what-so-ever in higher education; save the year that he was the Government Affairs

Representative for Stark State University; but he is a long-time legislator, he had a twenty year career in the House and in the Senate, so he understands the legislative process, he understands the budget process, etc. and it is really one of these wait and see's and was obviously an appointment that really is hard to believe but really, no one expected this particular appointment as the Chancellor. Again, President Berkman stated that his role is to meet him, his role is to talk to him about what we are doing here at CSU, but he can't predict in what direction he will go or for that matter how he will act as Chancellor. It is a very ??? office now, the Chancellor's Office in Ohio. There is not a huge amount of statutory power built into the office. Where power gets approved, if it gets approved, is by the holder of the office and the way the holder can structure an arrangement.

Associate Vice President Timothy Long added that John Carry ??, who is the Chancellor, when he served in the Ohio House and the Ohio Senate, he was a member of the Finance Committee and he chaired one of those Finance Committees in the Legislature as well as serving on both Education Committees in both houses of the Legislature, so maybe no administrative experience but he is pretty familiar with budgetary matters as they relate to higher education.

IX. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost George Walker started by first thanking UFAC and Professor Karem for working with the administration in a very expeditious manner doing a lot of work getting the Greenbook done. He is hopeful as he leaves the Provost's Office as we look to the future that there will be many examples of cooperative effort between the administration and the faculty governance that will benefit students, faculty, and the whole university. With regard to that, he noted that the Admissions and Standards Committee and the Provost's Office has had some discussion. The basic idea is that they were very interested in gaining information from both faculty and students about the block scheduling and it just seems that if it is possible, if anybody is feeling appropriately compromised or anything like that, if we can have a single addition and work together and get the information that could be useful and that could be another example if it works out of working well together.

Provost Walker stated that he wanted to give Senate a little bit of background of the faculty searches and where we are at now and faculty hiring for next year. This is one of the most important kinds of decisions that we make in the Provost's Office during the year. On May 16th and 17th there will be a meeting like there was last year with the new Provost and attendants where each of the Deans of the schools will come in having conferred with their Chairs and faculty the way they do with their requests for new faculty hires based upon their priorities, based upon their needs for research, for student success, for working in the strategic initiatives – all of the things that they do and they will present this to all of the other Deans and to the Provost's Office and we will have a long discussion about each of those requests. Provost Walker noted that last year was the first year that we had actually done that in depth and in that form and everyone may remember that last year we had something like twenty-five faculty hiring authorizations and ten lecturer authorizations after the dust had cleared. He stated that there were two

reasons why they were able to do that much hiring: one was last year the President's Office did add \$1 million of continuing funding for faculty lines and the other reason was that after conferring with the Deans, it was decided they wouldn't have so many forever visitors. In other words, if you had a visitor that was going to be here year in and year out, then you ought to be thinking about whether that position, if it was being treated like a faculty position, really should be a tenure track faculty or lecturer and so they did convert several of those from long-time visitors to faculty positions. Provost Walker gave an update of our hiring for this year. He noted that there were twenty-five authorizations that he had in front of him for tenure track faculty; fifteen either had the Letter of Intent or actually the signed return Letter of Intent so he would say up to twenty-five and we have already gotten fifteen faculty in those positions. We have seven positions that are advertized and they are still recruiting. They haven't sent out a Letter of Intent yet; they haven't gotten to the finish but everybody is hopeful. Dr. Walker noted that there was one that was a failed search and his policy has been, which he assumes continues a policy, that if you have a failed search you don't lose the position. You get another chance to fill that position just like if you were to turn down somebody for tenure, that position would be one that is returned to the unit also so that people have the right incentives with regard to quality.

Provost Walker stated that there were two Nursing positions that were posted on line. There is a difficult situation and the reason he is pointing that out is that there is in Nursing, as there may be in other professional schools, a problem with regard to the pipeline of people who find coming to the academy, financially, another reason, attractive comparing to just going on to being nurses and doing other things professionally. He noted that one of the things that Nursing may have to do is to think more carefully about their balance with regard to clinical faculty and regular tenure track without the clinical word in there.

Provost Walker went on to say that in all of the universities he has worked at is to have as many people as possible be regular tenure track. There are obviously going to be situations where it is extremely appropriate to have clinical faculty but he knows that in this university historically, he is told, there has been kind of a move or push to keep that to a minimum and he would say just as he goes out the door that in some of these areas that are very competitive we may have to rethink that position in order to serve well the students and the City in which we are in. Nursing as an example or the only example may have to think more carefully about whether they are trying to hire clinical faculty or tenure track faculty without the word clinical. That will be something that they and others will have to decide. He added that this is a real problem because we have a significant number of students and a significant number of jobs listed and a significant amount of revenue and all of those things require more faculty that can teach these folks that are going to be health care givers in various ways so that is something we will think about in the future. If we look at the ten lecturer positions, there is a Letter of Intent that is going out and we are still advertising for seven of them so there is no fail search there and things look pretty good. He said that he is a little surprised in general; he is more used to the fact that we would have a higher percentage, generally speaking, and that our

searches would be completed by now but he hasn't been here long enough and involved with the process here to know how that would play out but he is optimistic.

Provost Walker stated that one of our problems has been, from his perspective because he thinks of a variety of reasons but one being the \$10 or \$11 million base budget cut, but we have had increases in enrollment in some units and we have not been able to keep up in terms of the pace with additional faculty positions. We just don't have the resources to do that. When he first came on board, he said his job is to get tenure track positions out of every turn around and try to make sure that we have the resources to do that. He of course has been lobbying the President again, but it depends on the budget to add additional resources so that next year we are not just holding even by replacing the faculty that have left. You could say, "Well, you know we ought to be able to increase the number of faculty because the people retiring will have significantly higher salaries than the people we are hiring but we know in many areas there is a compression of salaries so that doesn't work so well.

Provost Walker reported that the news he has right now is that we have allowed the Provost's position fund which is the one thing he has really protected. Nothing goes out of that fund for anything because we've got to protect that fund for hiring more faculty. He noted that has about \$3.2 million in it right for new hires that we can authorize. Now that is just based on faculty resignations, deaths or retirements and that's not enough. We have to figure out ways to do a variety of things to increase that. He stated that everyone may remember that we have a twenty percent lecturer to faculty ratio that we have agreed to and we are at that twenty percent point. So, if we do hire lecturers, it will be at most of the twenty percent level because we have already agreed to limit.

Provost Walker mentioned that there is also the issue he saw this year, in looking at the budget, of unfunded mandates. For example, we have all agreed that we should have a faculty development fund to allow faculty to travel to scholarly meetings and all of that but in the process of agreeing to that, there was no money set aside that was passed on to the school but there wasn't additional money given to the school. Well, that's an agreement – that's a contractual agreement that we have made that many in this room benefit from. So his position is that we need to put that money in the department and the school budgets and we are going to do that and put that in the base funding but that again, competes with other things. That is part of treating the faculty that we have here in a way that they need to be treated in order to make development and continue in their scholarly activity. He noted that there are other things that are competing as we move along with the idea of having more faculty and making sure that we have more of the appropriate attributes and things that faculty who are already here have.

Provost Walker stated that the two worries he has about the process we have right now for hiring additional faculty, where as he said, people come together and there is a priority set and it is the Provost's Office that makes the decision but his experience is that by the time he gives the input from all of the competing needs who aren't voting or talking about their areas and their group, there is a consensus in terms of the priorities

and it is very interesting. He noted that there are two things that bother him about our system now that do not seem to be handled quite right. One is, you need to be able to plan more than year by year – you need to have a plan for a period of years where you look at how you want to develop your department and set your priorities. Although that is always in principle possible, it's not being utilized as much and so he thinks that we need to find mechanisms if possible where we plan for a longer period of time knowing that we will have a certain amount of retirements in certain areas so that it is not just the immediacy of the immediate that gets in the way of planning.

Provost Walker stated that the other worry is that in some areas it really will be important to have cluster hiring. While that sounds really terrific in principle, what happens in the system that we have now with the process is that there really hasn't yet been the kind of cluster strategy hiring that we will get in the future. He commented that everyone knows that we have a lot of new Deans who have been here two years or less and so he is hopeful that as those Deans gain more experience and work more closely together that those two things will take care of themselves but we may need to think or you may need to think about policies that make it more likely that we will have cluster hiring in various ways and that can mean many different things but you just are not thinking one person at a time and that you don't just think one year at a time; you think over a period of years.

Provost Walker said that this is his last Faculty Senate meeting as the Interim Provost. He thanked everyone and noted that it has been a pleasure working with everyone and he looks forward to having much less power and maybe a little more influence. At this point, everyone applauded.

X. Report of the Student Government Association

Student Government President, Moatasem Al Bitar stated that he started to wonder if Cleveland somehow lost a son but today he got his faith back. He noted that Student Government Vice President Christopher Caspary, who usually presents with him at Senate had to leave to class. He stated that he asked him, since this is the last time we are reporting at the SGA Executive Board, if he wanted to say anything today and he said, "I'm going to miss these meetings." Student Al Bitar said that he will too.

SGA President Al Bitar commented that he is glad that CSU is keeping Rascal House because it is the only place that is open until two in the morning. He added that whenever he is hungry at night, it is the place to go to.

SGA President Al Bitar reported that the SGA Government met with Professor Karem, Professor Gelman and Professor Duffy to talk about the credit conversion and it was very beneficial to hear more from the faculty at Student Government. He noted that as a follow-up to that, they had Professors Karem and Gelman and Professor Billy Kostea to come to their senate meeting. He stated that they presented a lot of issues that the faculty had and helped SGA with things that weren't very clear about what the

concerns are from the faculty. As a result of that meeting, the Student Government Association updated their resolution and he read the April 19, 2013 resolution.

“Whereas, in response to considerable debate within the university community, SGA is reconsidering the November 30, 2012 resolution discussing the credit conversion issue at Cleveland State University.

“Whereas, the SGA Senate considered feedback from President Ronald Berkman, Provost George Walker, Teresa LaGrange, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, and Dr. Zhu, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs representing the administration; considered feedback from Dr. Billy Kostea, Chairman of the University curriculum Committee, and Professor Sheldon Gelman, Vice President of the Faculty Senate during the 2012/2013 school year; and also considered the Board of Trustees resolution in approval of the general credit conversion as well as the Faculty Senate resolution stating ‘No Confidence in the Administration of Cleveland State University.’

“Whereas, CSU Administration has guaranteed that all current students would have the ability to retain their catalog rights, that adjustments would be made to ensure that degree seeking progress would not be delayed, and that student success is a priority of the administration and the Board of Trustees.

“Be It Resolved, the SGA Senate finds that a Fall 2014 deadline for General Education course conversions and the standardization of all degree credit requirements to 120 hours absent specific accreditation requirements is in the best interests of students.

“Be It Resolved, the SGA Senate finds that the timetable for converting courses that are not within the General Education curriculum may prove problematic in some instances and urge the deadline to be extended by the administration in those instances when necessary.

“Be It Resolved, the SGA Senate finds that the Office of the Provost should work with the University Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate to solidify the exemption process and deadline for upper level courses.

“Therefore, this motion was passed through general consent by the SGA Senate.”

SGA President Al Bitar added that the new Executive Board that was elected will take office on May 11, 2013 and they are willing to continue to monitor the conversion process very closely to ensure that the students will be held harmless throughout the process. They intend to continue to have an open line of communication with President Berkman and the CSU administration, the CSU faculty represented by the Faculty Senate as well as all interested parties in the CSU community at large.

SGA President Al Bitar said that he mentioned the last time he was at Faculty Senate regarding the proposal that they are submitting to the University Faculty Affairs Committee that pertains to approving student organizations and involving Student

Government Association throughout that process. They have been working with UFAC as well as the Faculty Senate Student Life Committee to come up with a compromise involving Student Government yet at the same time keeping the faculty involved throughout that process. He added that hopefully, Faculty Senate will see a proposal soon from UFAC.

SGA President Al Bitar reported that SGA is having their last event of the semester which is the Late Night Study Facility which, basically through negotiations with the Office of the Provost and the Library they will be having the Library open until three in the morning starting May 5, 2013, the week of finals. Free food and coffee will be available to students and there will also be a raffle to give people the incentive to show up and to have group study. There will also be a silent study corner which is very useful facility. Every semester students literally line up to go to the Library and it is a good thing to have at our university.

Finally, SGA President Al Bitar stated that it has been a pleasure to serve as Student Government President for two years and he thanked Senate for allowing him to report. Everyone applauded.

Senate President Goodell thanked SGA President Al Bitar and commented that he always waits so patiently to give his report.

Senate President Goodell noted that last on the Senate Agenda are Annual Reports. She stated that she had requested the Academic Steering Committee to indulge her in having verbal reports and they all say, "Well, they probably will be tired and it is a long meeting and I said well, I think its really important to try to hear at least something from the committee chairs if they so wish to give a report. She noted that the main reason she wanted that is because it is useful for everyone to hear about what goes on in each of these committees.

XI. Annual Reports

A. University Curriculum Committee (Report No. 76, 2012-2013)

Senate President Goodell noted that Senate obviously knows what goes on in the University Curriculum Committee because Bill Kostas, the Chair, comes to every meeting telling us what they have done so she is not going to ask him to give an oral Annual Report since a paper report has been provided.

B. Student Life Committee (Report No. 77, 2012-2013)

Senate President Goodell asked Professor Stella Iwuagwu, Chair of the Student Life Committee, if she would like to say a few words about the Student Life Committee.

Professor Iwuagwu noted that she is a faculty member in the School of Health Sciences and is the chair of the Student Life Committee. She reported that the committee

met about five times during the academic year. The Committee spent a great deal of time actually reviewing the student constitution to make sure that guidelines are followed in approving their constitutions. The Student Life Committee approved 27 petitions for student organizations this year. They also reviewed each revision to the Student Government Association constitution to bring it up to what is actually in practice because sometimes the current practice and what is on paper often are different so they wanted to bring it up to date in order to reduce any conflict of interest.

Professor Iwuagwu reported that one of the contentious issues they had this semester was that the Student Government Association had submitted a proposal to the Senate regarding the review and approval of new student organizations and issues related to supervision of student media. The Committee discussed this issue in detail and some members thought, “Who wants more work; why don’t they just have the responsibility of approving the student organizations. That would be something less for the Committee to do.” Dr. Iwuagwu reported that the Committee felt this is the time to be thinking about engagement. We want to engage more students, not less. The Committee wants to be part of the process. SGA also made a good case of why the Student Government should also be part of the approval process and it is hoped that consensus can be reached through joint decision-making, and, that the Student Government could start the process and they would be able to engage with the students because some times Student Government knows more of what is happening and in that way they would engage with the students in positions and would not just approve the money. The Committee agreed that the Student Government Association would review the proposals first and then make recommendations to the Student Life Committee and the Student Life Committee would then make the final decision on this process.

Professor Iwuagwu noted that they also made some changes in the terms in the guidelines. For example, there is the issue of the student hourly rate. The original wording of the student hourly rate was \$8.00 but sometimes they had difficulty finding students during the summer who would work for \$8.00 so they consented that students would be paid \$12.00 per hour but they kept the salary range of \$8.00 to \$12.00 per hour and the final decision will be made by the Dean of Students. The Committee also revised the Student Enrollment Policies to bring them up to date because there were a lot of things that were not in the original document. In addition, they discussed the issue of monitoring and supervising the student media. Originally it was written in the student constitution that the Student Life Committee would supervise student publications. She noted that this runs counter to the fact that they are not supposed to supervise what the students do but rather monitoring student publications was the intent. The language was amended in the Media Supervision from “To supervise student publications” to “To monitor student publications.”

Finally, Professor Iwuagwu reported that it was a very interactive year and the Committee accomplished quite a lot.

C. Library Committee (Report No. 78, 2012-2013)

Senate President Goodell noted that Professor Petru Fodor, Chair of the Library Committee was unable to be at Senate and she asked Dr. Glenda Thornton, Director of the Michael Schwartz Library, a member of the committee, if she had any comments. Dr. Thornton stated that while the Senate Library Committee is not currently very active, she feels that it is critical to have this official link to a Faculty Senate Committee to ensure that the faculty have a formal voice in the development of library services and in the future of the Library and she would try to keep everyone involved.

D. Environmental Safety and Health Advisory Committee (Report No. 79, 2012-2013)

Professor Jacqueline Jenkins, Chair of the Environmental Safety and Health Advisory Committee, stated that this is the Committee's final report. She noted that the functions of the ESHA Committee were reviewed and compared to that of the General Safety Committee and the ESHA Committee was advised to attend the meetings of the General Safety Committee. The obvious duplication of functions was brought to the attention of Faculty Senate President Joanne Goodell and Dr. Jeff Karem, Chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee. Subsequently, the elimination of the Committee was proposed by the UFAC and approved by Faculty Senate on March 6, 2013.

E. University Petitions Committee (Report No. 80, 2012-2013)

Mr. Kevin Neal, Office of the University Registrar, presented the University Petitions Committee Report. He reported that 439 petitions were submitted and dealt with over the year. He referred to the written report and noted that there is a breakdown of different categories that were the most frequent and there is a more specific breakdown on the back of the paper copy of the report provided to everyone.

Dr. Goodell commented that it seems like a very small number of petitions compared to what we were dealing with before the GenEd curriculum was revised so that's good.

At this point, Senate President Goodell moved to the last two reports.

F. E-Learning Update (Report No. 81, 2012-2013)

Dr. Goodell stated that she knows it would be really great to hear a lot more from Dr. Glenn Goodman, Chair of the E-Learning Committee, but we really don't have time particularly with the realization of the inclusion of E-Learning which is now a Senate standing committee. She then asked Dr. Goodman if he would like to be on the Agenda of the first Senate meeting in the fall semester or would he just like to say a few words.

Dr. Glenn Goodman, Chair of the E-Learning Committee, stated that he would be happy to be on the Agenda of the first meeting in the fall semester. Therefore, the update from the E-Learning Committee will be on the Agenda of the September 11, 2013 meeting.

G. Undergraduate Student Success Committee Update (Report No. 82, 2012-2013)

Dr. Goodell then asked Dr. Mittie Davis Jones, Chair of the Undergraduate Student Success Committee if she wanted to give a few words now or postpone her committee's report until the fall.

Dr. Jones, Chair of the Undergraduate Student Success Committee, stated that fall sounds wonderful. Therefore, an update from the Undergraduate Student Success Committee will be on the Agenda of the first fall meeting on September 11, 2013.

Faculty Senate received the following Annual Reports of Senate standing committees:

- University Curriculum Committee
- Student Life Committee
- Library Committee
- Environmental Safety and Health Advisory Committee
- University Petitions Committee

The following reports were postponed and will be placed on the Agenda of the first fall Senate meeting on September 11, 2013:

- E-Learning Update
- Undergraduate Student Success Committee Update

XII. 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 5:30 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel