

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

**SEPTEMBER 12, 2012**

**PRESENT:** T. Banks, Bosela, W. Bowen, Bracken, Cory, Delatte, Dixit, Doerder,  
Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Gelman, Genovese, Goodell, Goodman, R. Henry,  
Horvath, Hrivnak, D. Jackson, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Karem, M. Kaufman,

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

“He taught Spanish language and literature, all of CSU’s foreign-language education classes, and supervised student teachers until he retired in 1995. As one of his



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

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

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

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

Senate President Goodell reported that the Program Prioritization process that wae-8(or)3(ki)-2b3-6(l

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

Senate President Goodell thanked everyone for their attention.

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

Senator Jeff Karem stated that the Senate Nominating Committee is tasked with soliciting nominees for the open Senate Offices, in this case, Faculty Senate President and Secretary. As a matter of procedure, the Senate Nominating Committee solicits nominations over the summer and there is both a process by which the Senate Nominating Committee solicits them and then any member of the Faculty Senate can also gather a petition with five names and send that to the Senate Office to add an individual's name to the ballot. Dr. Karem reported that no petitions went

to the Senate Office. Dr. Karem reported that no petitions went



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

Finally, Professor Gelman briefly described a proposal that he made himself and said this is just him – he is not speaking for anyone else. This is not the kind of committee he would have favored. If this committee had been announced, he would have opposed it but it seems to him that there is a substantial improvement over what we had and he thinks the proposal would allow the work of the committee to go on so we didn't lose time and he thinks it would deal with the obvious objections of having a committee that is too large to be workable. He went on to say that what he had suggested was that a faculty member from each college be chosen by the Academic Steering Committee and added to the existing committee and that to deal with the too large group issue, our Provost Search Committee do what some Provost Search Committees do – Kent State had a Provost Search Committee of twenty-



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

President Berkman stated that historically, there is no one who wants a competent creative faculty and an academic leader as Provost more than he does. So clearly and unequivocally his interest is in finding absolutely the best candidate to lead what are some very significant and important academic challenges and later on he is going to talk a little bit about what he has talked about a lot. Some Senators may have seen in the Plain Dealertoday and that is the very, very swift paradigm change that is now underway in Columbus. President Berkman went on to say that he takes responsibility himself for really not engaging in the kind of consultation that he should have engaged in, in terms of constituting the committee, and seeking faculty nominations and faculty input. He noted that that was his misstep and it happened over the summer in late July, early August. There was, he felt, an advantage to trying to get it out there fast. He was bmo ge eu.ndht outa2(g)2(e)4(en, ic

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

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

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

Senator Brian Ray thanked President Berkman for agreeing to work with the Senate and the Steering Committee on the P



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING

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

1. **New Graduate Certificate in Advance Fundraising (Levin College of Urban Affairs) (Report No. 9, 2012-2013)**
2. **New Graduate Certificate in Health Care Compliance (Cleveland-Marshall College of Law) (Report No. 10, 2012-2013)**
3. **Health Sciences Course Revisions (Report No. 11, 2012-2013)**
4. **CLASS Multimedia advertising Certificate Revision (Report No. 12, 2012-2013)**
5. **Revisions to the Philosophy Minor (8 credits must be taken at CSU) (Report No. 13, 2012-2013)**
6. **New Elective for the Women's Studies Minor (8 credits must be taken at CSU) (Report No. 14, 2012-2013)**

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













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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dr. Karem stated that that is useful. So his question is, over the summer what was the involvement of the Faculty Senate Strategic Planning Committee? He (m)-tolve-2(tc)6((y)G((y)G((y)G((





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

President Berkman noted that the other subject that emerged here, and he is glad it emerged; he just wanted to bring it back home. He said, when he first became President, we are not a publicly financed institution. We are in essence a private enterprise that gets a public subsidy and an enterprise that gets a decreasing public subsidy. We are down between 29% and 27% depending on how you calculate it. That means, as Mr. Tim Long said, about 70% of our revenue has to come from sources other than the State. All that everyone heard about the bond issue, all that everyone heard about assumptions, all that everyone heard about that aspect of university operations is the nature of the enterprise that we are in. We could not exist on 27% SSI so we would not have an institution. The rest of it is an enterprise and the enterprise has to be financed and important pieces of it are things we have talked about and the best we can do is try to make reasonable projections about how we will perform in those enterprises. When we went into the bond exercise, and Professor Duffy did an amazingly good job on a very, very complex issue in terms of summarizing it, there are actually other savings that we realized from the bond issue but when we went into it, the instruction that he gave, as Mr. Long knows to Vice President Stephanie McHenry, is to use the most conservative assumptions – to go in and with really, in many ways, what we think are the most conservative role of assumptions so we would not, in the projections, be stretching what our capacity is.



Governor has given the commission a set of



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

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

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

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

President Berkman replied that at least in his future, he doesn't think that we are going to have a buildingless university without classrooms, without labs, without instruction and we are all going to operate out of a hub. He doesn't think that is going to happen. He does think if we do it creatively portl resha ls1oe -2(por5e pe)4( t)-2Td [(ba)0(f)3(e)4(e)4(l)-li

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

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

Provost Walker said that he also wanted to talk about the retention plan, the success plan, but that is a fifteen or twenty minute discussion. It is really crucial that we have a plan. We have some benchmarks, but as everyone pointed out, at the end of the day, dayb pla0(ng)4(bod), 4( a)410(g)10( on. T)1f ou0( on.h (s)-1d( )]TJ 0.(e)4(, t)-2(hd3(i)-2a)4(s)-1a)4(r

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

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



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

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

Finally, Provost Walker stated that there are three or four other frisky things everyone wants him to talk about and he will be back, but he doesn't think we should call it program prioritization. He is supposed to implement lots of the recommendations to save the Budget Task Force. The idea of program prioritization is just too pea-brained to call it that. We should have a series of data – and he is collecting it like mad because he wants the Provost to make as little mistakes as possible. Program Classification – "What is it? What are the strengths that each program does?" He said he will need input and advice of what those should be but he is already moving ahead on that. He is looking at everything he possibly can that can help us in that regard. He thinks we should talk about program classification, and it is happening very quickly because he has to make another series of decisions in March, so he needs to move ahead on that but he doesn't believe he has all the judgment or reflective things he should have to do that and he needs faculty help but he is moving ahead on it. He stated that it seems to him that the way to do this is

number two, it won't be him, but he believes that we want somebody that's the Chief Operating Officer of the university that's got a real strong academic background in academic priorities. Because then that person can say, well you know maybe we should cut into our reserves as opposed to doing this or maybe even though this is an important thing, we need to do it over here on the administrative side; it's not nearly as important as other things we need to do on the academic side. Provost Walker said that he welcomes the idea, even though it may seem like it takes the Provost away from just being an

S-1( wn)-6(h)-4(aer)n9 -1

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

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

#### **XIV. Student Government Association**

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

#### **XV. New Business**

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

Stephen F. Duffy  
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel

Attachments