

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 Stern, Marino, Niederriter, Rickett, Rutar, Sridhar, Steinberg, Strauss, Tebeau, Vogelsang, Volk, Witmer-Rich, J. G. Wilson.

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

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

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

ALSO

PRESENT: Iwuagwu, J. Jenkins, Kosteas.

Senate President Joanne Goodell led the meeting on May 1, 2013. The meeting was held in the Senate Chamber, Room 2400, at 10:00 AM. The meeting was open to all faculty members. The meeting was presided over by Senate President Joanne Goodell. The meeting was held in the Senate Chamber, Room 2400, at 10:00 AM. The meeting was open to all faculty members. The meeting was presided over by Senate President Joanne Goodell.

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

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. Kostea 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

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 instructor'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. 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

MINUTES OF THE

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

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 ~~the~~ Provost LaGrange's office has already put out some

many of his concerns about what might go wrong revolve around – not the mechanics 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 here 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 contric2due

heyeon-4(c)4(2)3(t)-2(k)-1(us)-1(t)-2(g)10(e)4(l)-22(y)2(i)-2(t)-2omecbod(y)20(a)4((o g)10dope)4

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~~ 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, 20122013)

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~~ G 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~~ 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 ~~rising~~ 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 ~~organizing~~ bargaining faculty but he worked on it and UFAC worked on it ~~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 ~~organizing~~ bargaining unit faculty, administrators with faculty rank. So this whole process marks a convergence of ~~interest~~ 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 ~~things~~ since the document was sent to Senators.

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 28 & 29. 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's provisions to be

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 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 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 basic common ground to all of the evaluations. Most of them have (1) a brief 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 stated 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 development of concepts and use of (i)-g.

- 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 cents 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 up to 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 was inconsistent 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 t

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 ~~is~~ for and what developers are paying for property in and around Cleveland State University now. That’s how the appraisals are done.

Senator Cheryl Bracker 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.

Representative for Stark State University; but he is a ~~long~~ 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 error or ree

reasons why they were able to do that much hiring 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 for 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 position and so they did convert several of those from long-term visitors to faculty positions. Provost Walker gave an update of our hiring for this year. He noted that there were twenty 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 advertised and they are still recruiting. They haven't sent out a Letter of Intent yet; they haven't gotten to 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 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, other 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 when a position is created, it should be a regular tenure track position. He noted 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 when a position is created, it should be a regular tenure track position.

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 Kosteas, Chairman of the Liberty 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 2014 deadline for General Education co-2(o r)3(e)]TJ(he)4(F)en6d0ve6(r)3(-7)]TJ /T108 0 Td [(n;-2(on c-1(a)4(pnt)-2(he)4(

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 followed in approving their constitution.

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 the 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, S

