

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

APRIL 3, 2013

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, Bosela, C. Bowen, W. Bowen, Bracken, Cory, Delatte, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Gelman, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, R. Henry, Holsinger, Horvath, Hrivnak, D. Jackson, M. D. Jones, Karem, Krebs, Liggett, Marino,

Al Bitar, Artbauer, R. Berkman, Boise, M. Bond, C. Brown, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, McHenry, Parry, Sadlek, Sawicki, Spademan, Stoll, G. Walker, B. White, Zachariah.

NT: T. I. Banks, Dixit, Jayanti, M. Kaufman, Majette for Sterio, Rashidi, Rickett.

Caspary, Drnek, Jain, Markovic, Percy, G. Thornton, Triplett, Vandemark, Zhu.

NT: Fodor,

II. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Goodell stated that the events about to unfold today have been a long time in the making. Dr. Goodell said, "As you know, when President Ronald Berkman arrived, he made student success his number one goal. What he may not have known at that time, was the faculty at CSU have always cared deeply about their students and their students' progress. That is why we have wholeheartedly supported the many initiatives undertaken over the past three years to improve student success. Most of these initiatives were recommended by the Faculty Senate *ad hoc* Student Success Committee. Some of these suggestions, such as intrusive advising and restricting enrollment of freshmen in online classes, have already borne considerable fruit with the freshmen results in this past fall, and the retention from fall 2012 to spring 2013. In addition, when the Senate was asked to consider adopting a cap on the number of credits to degree, we did so without reservation. Senate also agreed to a conversion of all general education courses to a 3-credit standard to make transferring into and out of CSU easier for students. However, the faculty know that the core of the student experience at CSU is the curriculum, and we are the ones who implement the curriculum, so when our advice on curriculum matters is either not sought or not listened to, we must respond accordingly. The decision to oppose the conversion of all courses at CSU to a three-credit standard at this time was supported by a 35-4 majority in the Senate at our February meeting. However, I do not think that this vote meant that faculty are unwilling to consider change, or that we are in any way turning our back on the administration. Quite the contrary; I have heard from many different sources across the university that there is some acceptance of the need to transform our curriculum where it makes sense to do so. Our biggest problem is the manner in which the process has unfolded, particularly the lack of communication to the entire campus community and the exclusion of faculty voices from development of a reasonable implementation timeline, the adop(c)4(om)-2(m)4(ve)-6(r)315(ac

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF

PAGE

5. If anyone wishes to call the question, he or she must be recognized by Dr. Goodell then must move the previous question. This motion must be seconded and adopted by a two-thirds majority of those voting.
6. Once debate appears to be over, someone may move to close debate, which is then voted on.
7. A motion to table the actions of the resolution may be made after the debate is closed and before the vote is taken.

At this point, Dr. Goodell thanked everyone for their attention to these matters.

Dr. Goodell then invited the members of the Academic Steering Committee who are representing the caucuses at the presentation of the resolution and to answer any questions from the floor after which time Dr. Norbert Delatte, from the College of Engineering, will present the motion and then the motion will be on the floor for discussion. She stated that there will be other members from the Senate who asked to be introduced as well.

III. Resolution regarding University Administration (Report No. 64, 2012-2013)

Senator Norbert Delatte reported that following their joint caucus meeting a week ago, the collective representatives of the College Caucuses drafted the following resolution. Senator Delatte then read the proposed resolution.

“WHEREAS, in April 2012 a joint Faculty and Administration committee recommended

Accepting the University Curriculum Committee's proposed timetable for action on credit hours without objection, and then announcing without warning in late Fall, 2012 that the Committee's schedule did not line up with the Board's and that the Trustees would likely act without even considering Faculty views;

Endorsing a January, 2013 Resolution implying that curricular decisions traditionally have been the responsibility of Provost Office officials, when in fact such decisions traditionally are made by Faculty, both at Cleveland State University and across the United States;

Adopting a too-rapid timetable for implementation that is likely to produce mistakes, harming students' education;

and

"WHEREAS, the actions of the Administration regarding credit hours comport with other recent actions and statements of the Administration, including:

informing the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in 2011 that Cleveland State University is no longer fully committed to being a research institution;

proposing in 2012 to vest the Provost with the unrestrained power to define, charge and adjudicate academic misconduct, leading to the dismissal of tenured law college faculty members and department chairs, all without any review of the Provost's definitions, charges or decisions;

claiming in 2013 that it and the Board of Trustees can change fundamental Bylaws of the Faculty, including provisions regarding tenure without ever consulting Faculty while acknowledging that no precedent exists for doing so;

and

"WHEREAS, the Administration unilaterally abandoned an understanding reached at a

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees shall formally present this Resolution, along with the Statement and attachments that accompany it, at the next full meeting of the Trustees.”

Senate President Goodell stated that the motion is now on the floor and any of the corresponding members or members of Senate may speak to or against the motion. She noted that for any people not seated around the table and who can't reach a microphone, there are multiple microphones around the room. If anyone wishes to be recognized, they should stand at a microphone or if they are seated, raise their hand.

Senator James Wilson stated that this is obviously a difficult day. There is no doubt that everybody here is committed to student success and education to develop student value. He noted that he worked with President Ronald Berkman frequently as the Faculty Senate President and all of us worked together to create the Student Success Committee that has been staffed by dedicated and competent people to move this school forward. So it is really a difficult moment for all of us to try to figure out what to do. He noted that his reaction, he didn't know how this fits in with all of the procedures, is that we should defer this motion until the next Faculty Senate meeting and allow another opportunity for the parties to meet and resolve their differences amicably as they almost did two months ago but unfortunately that deal fell apart. Professor Wilson said that he would like to revisit that and try to work this thing out without a formal discussion.

Professor Wilson stated that, in addition to that basic concern; there has not been an opportunity for us, as Faculty Senators, to fully discuss this with all of our colleagues. Given the gravity of the issue he would really like to have more opportunity to explore these concerns with his colleagues. He is willing to go into the issue and the merits and one reason to table it is that we don't have to go into all issues of the merits of deferring. He is opposed to the motion and he would rather deal with it later and see if this has any legs. He pointed out that, at the Caucus meeting, there was a minority of us that felt this motion should be deferred.

Senate President Goodell noted that Professor Wilson is not objecting to the motion but is just speaking to it.

Professor Wilson noted that he didn't want to say table it because if you say table it then there is supposed to be another discussion and that is just ridiculous.

Professor Goodell commented that you can't table the motion until after the discussion. You could object to the question and then it would not be discussed.

Professor Wilson said that he would like to have the discussion but he would like to have Senate consider not proceeding at this time. He thinks it would be nice to defer it for a month. Certainly there are people who are opposed to it and there would be a full discussion about that concern.

Professor Goodell noted that the motion is then not being objected to and we are still having a discussion.

Sen

Dr. Goodell asked if anyone else wished to speak.

Professor Wilson said that he will speak against the motion. He thi

President Berkman stated the following in terms of the issue of four credits to three credits: The Faculty Senate endorsed or accepted the report of the Student Success Committee in April of last year. The University Curriculum Committee made its first recommendation concerning two pieces of the curriculum proposal in November of 2012. So nine months went by between the time that the Faculty Senate accepted the report and we got a response from the University Curriculum Committee. Again, he understands and he knows the Senate President had trouble finding the chair of the Curriculum Committee; it was late in getting started, etc. President Berkman stated that he wanted to make the following two points: He noted that every document produced by the University Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, including its first recommendation, and Professor Kosteas was at that Board of Trustees meeting and its second recommendations were given in full to every member of the Board of Trustees. There was no attempt to interrupt the communication or the recommendation that the faculty was making. In addition, Professor Duffy and Professor Goodell are the faculty members of the Board of Trustees. They were at the Board of Trustees meeting and they had every opportunity to speak in terms of the recommendations that were being made by Faculty Senate. President Berkman stated that there are times in shared governance where Faculty Senate and the administration are not going to concur and he just does not accept the notion that faculty governance in its full maturity practiced at mature universities means that an administration and a Board of Trustees is obliged to accept every recommendation of a Faculty Senate committee. He noted that this was a case in terms of the four to three where the Provost and he did not agree with the recommendations of Faculty Senate in terms of the need to take more time to study the issue or the need to implement the policy.

President Berkman spoke about implementation which has been a major issue. He noted that he said this at least three times at the Faculty Senate. He was thinking this morning that he would donate money to the Faculty Senate so they can publish the transcripts of the minutes that were recorded here. Some of his previous comments could be recaptured. He said the following in terms of implementation: when he first introduced this, the changes we are talking about in terms of curriculum and the changes that we are talking about in terms improving student success and retention and graduation cannot be done through an administrative edict. Doing this from memory, President Berkman said that it will take the entire university village to make these changes. And what he asked at that time was that Senators, as the representatives of the faculty of that village, join him in trying to fashion a set of recommendations that would be helpful to move our students through the system and ultimately to graduate. President Berkman noted that he also repeatedly said he will not support any implementation plan that in any way shape or form puts students in peril and he came here and the thrust behind what we are doing is to take students out of peril. He believes, and he will say again, although there is a date in the resolution, the resolution indeed says the President shall make every reasonable effort to implement the plan by September 2014; not September 2013 like some Board members originally recommended; September 2014 – make every reasonable effort. He did not say, “will be implemented,” “will be fully implemented,” “will be in place” but that we will make every effort.

President B

credit hour lab classes which they figured out how to package for both curriculum and a lecture and a lab program. He noted that we are talking about a similar process right now but we are talking about doing it in a two week time limit. He stated that he is just giving everyone one example in one department in one college of the university but the point is

Senator Tebeau pointed out that Senate also needed to vote on Dr. Berlin Ray's withdrawal of her motion.

Senate President Goodell stated that we are not calling the question; we have voted to continue the debate and we have also voted to extend the option of proxy or absentee voting. Dr. Goodell added that if anyone is going to vote by proxy, they should raise their hands and Senate Secretary Duffy will give Senators ballots.

Senator Tebeau commented that Dr. Goodell initially pointed out that five minutes were allocated to each speaker and he would appreciate those five minutes since Senate gave thirty-five minutes to President Berkman. Senator Tebeau absolutely thinks it is important that we give everybody a chance to speak but we really must ask that we adhere to that time limit for speakers or we will be here for a very long time.

Dean Gregory Sadlek reported that he has been asked by his fellow academic Deans to read a statement on this serious occasion. His statement follows.

“The CSU Deans are fundamentally dedicated to the goal of student success for all CSU students. This is the heart of our professional commitment but we know we share this commitment with the President, the Provost and all the dedicated and hardworking faculty members on this campus. Although we are concerned with the current item of business, we are encouraged by the current university conversations about student success even though it is a passionate one. There would be no such conversation if no one cared whether our students were able to graduate until they completed 120 hours or whether our course schedule is flexible enough to accommodate the busy lives of students who must work while striving to earn their degrees.

“The Board of Trustees has voted to move that the undergraduate curriculum be changed to a model that is dominated by three credit hour courses with an allowance for appropriate exemptions. We, as Deans, have listened carefully to all the arguments on

last two Faculty Senate meetings, even when we didn't have the Board resolution, there were questions about how this would affect graduate programs because they have classes cross-listed with undergraduate. So she would propose that we have been having discussion of all of these issues all year long if not into previous years. She has great empathy and understanding with what the administration is doing to work on behalf of student success, and she does believe that there is a great deal of pressure from the State level for us to be a part of the three credit hour State system. She can report that in her department all year long her faculty have been actively working at the faculty Curriculum Committee level and the department level to consider revising voluntarily the Art Department's curriculum to three credit hours. However, too often this is being portrayed as faculty digging their feet in and saying, "No way; we are not going to three and that is not going to

Dr. Goodell stated that Senate now needs to do a ballot on whether we are going to table the resolution. She noted that before Senate votes let us continue discussion on the tabling of the motion.

An unidentified Senator asked, "If Senate votes yes, what does that mean and if we vote no what does that mean?" Dr. Goodell replied that if we vote yes to table the motion, then that means it can come back. If we do not vote on it today, it can come back at the next Senate meeting if someone votes to bring it back.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones asked if the motion of no confidence is tabled until the next meeting, does language need to be incorporated in the motion to table. She added that she didn't think Senate wanted to table it indefinitely.

An unidentified Senator asked if members should have a blank ballot. Dr. Goodell advised Senators to use the back of the printed paper ballot.

An unidentified Senator inquired if this vote is a fifty percent or two-thirds. Dr. Goodell replied that this is a fifty percent. Dr. Duffy replied that it is two-thirds. The unidentified Senator stated that he is asking the parliamentarian before the counting begins.

Dr. Goodell noted that if anyone writes yes or no, we will determine yes to be for and no to be against. So please write for tabling the motion or against tabling the motion. She added that this is a majority vote, not a two-thirds vote.

Senate Secretary Duffy announced that the vote is tied, 21 all. The motion failed.

An unidentified Senator inquired if the chair voted. Dr. Goodell noted that she did vote. So without her vote it is not a tie. She stated that for her it doesn't really matter. She will withdraw her vote or declare that the motion failed.

Dr. Sridhar stated that if it is a tie, the motion failed. Dr. Goodell said that he was correct. It doesn't matter if she withdraws her vote or not.

Senator Tebeau noted that it then failed so let's move on. He added that parliamentary procedure was established before the meeting so let's move on.

Dr. Goodell agreed that the parliamentary procedure was that we follow "Roberts EePffnso lo lo lo o

Dr. Goodell noted that this is a different ballot than the ballot Senators had before and it actually states what we are voting on. The other ballots were just blank pieces of paper that did not have titles on them.

Dr. Davis Jones said that she still had a question about what happened to the vote. An unidentified Senator replied that the vote was tied 21 to 21 with Dr. Goodell's vote. Dr. Goodell stated that if it is a tie, it is not a majority.

Dr. Bowen inquired if Dr. Goodell could choose not to withdraw her vote. Dr. Goodell replied that she is not withdrawing her vote.

An unidentified Senator inquired if the proxy votes were turned in. Dr. Goodell replied that if anyone left a proxy then those can be counted at this time.

An unidentified Senator inquired if this vote needs a majority or a two-thirds vote. Dr. Goodell replied that it is a simple majority.

At the conclusion of voting, Dr. Goodell reported that the vote is 31 votes in favor of passing the resolution of no confidence in the university administration, 11 votes against the resolution and one abstention. She noted that the motion of no confidence in the university administration as written has passed and this is the end of the discussion. She stated that a number of actions will occur as a result of the vote of no confidence. The resolution will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees and Dr. Duffy and she will discuss it in the upcoming Board meeting. Dr. Goodell stated that she is calling upon the administration to honor the agreements of February 28, 2013. The resolution will include the attachments and will be transmitted to the Board of Trustees and the faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees will present this resolution along with the statement at the next meeting of the Board of Trustees on May 20, 2013.

At this point, Dr. Goodell stated that Senate will take a short recess. She added that there is still business for the Senate. She asked Senators to be back at their seats in three minute.

[Upon reconvening the Senate meeting, the tape recorder refused to work; therefore, the remaining Minutes were recorded by hand.].

Dr. Joyce Mastboom, Associate Dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, pointed out that in the memo to Faculty Senate it states “Lake County Community College” and it should have stated “Lorain County Community College.” Dr. Marino apologized for the error and noted that his memo to Senate should have stated “Lorain County Community College.”

There being no further discussion, Senate President Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed an Addendum to the Existing Partnership Agreement between CSU and LCCC (Lorain County Community College) and asked Senators to vote. The proposed addendum was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Proposed revisions to International Admissions Requirements for MS in Chemical Engineering and MS in Electrical Engineering (Report No. 68, 2012-2013)

Dr. Marino next presented the Admissions and Standards Committee’s proposed revisions to International Admissions Requirements to the MS in Chemical Engineering and the MS in Electrical Engineering. He reported that the major points of the revisions are: to allow students with TOEFL scores below 550, but at or above the University minimum of 525, to be considered for admission on a case-by-case basis; and to permit the MS/CHE program and the MS/EE program to require students admitted with TOEFL scores under 550 to take additional ESL coursework as needed. Dr. Marino added that this permits the MS/CHE program and the MS/EE program additional flexibility in admitting students whose core technical qualifications are strong but whose English language skills requires further coursework.

Senator Chieh-Chen Bowen commented that it should have a different name – it is very old and not appropriate. It should state, “Use of 550 or equivalent.” Senator Sridhar said it should say, “Using equivalent score.”

Senator William Bowen noted that universities and colleges can raise standards on their own authority. The minimum standard university-wide would have to come to Faculty Senate which is a better practice to keep discussion of our curriculum.

There being no further discussion, Senate President Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed revisions to the International Admissions Requirements for the MS in Chemical Engineering and the MS in Electrical Engineering and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the International Admissions Requirements for the MS in Chemical Engineering and the MS in Electrical Engineering were approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Proposed Block Schedule (For Informational Purposes Only) (Report No. 69, 2012-2013)

Finally, Dr. Marino stated that the third item from the Admissions and Standards Committee, a proposed Block Schedule, is for Informational Purposes Only. He noted that the Admissions and Standards Committee was advised by the administration that this is an administrative policy matter.

Senator Tebeau commented that the administration's point of view leads to the conclusion that there will be a change in the schedule with no faculty input.

Dr. Marino pointed out that Vice Provost Carmen Brown said that this was approved in 1977 by Faculty Senate and that the administration will not be asking Senate to approve the block schedule.

An unidentified Senator inquired when this block schedule would go into effect. Senate President Goodell replied that it will be finalized by this year and will go into effect in fall 2014.

Senator Visocky-O'Grady stated that she would like the block schedule established by May since Department Chairs have to submit the AY 14-15 schedule early in the fall semester. Chairs will need time to work with the new system.

Senator Robert Krebs inquired if there were any options for fifteen minutes between classes.

Dr. Goodell stated that this is actually a different block schedule.

Dr. Marino noted that Admissions and Standards did forward the additional revised schedule to Senators.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady inquired if anyone was present at Senate to answer questions about this block schedule and to clarify this schedule on the percent of classes outside of the block schedule.

Dr. Goodell stated that allocation of rooms will now be taken over by Central Scheduling except for rooms they don't have control over.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady referred to the exceptions for different colleges and noted that Music and Communication have a priority in the Music & Communication Building.

Senator Sridhar commented on fifteen minute breaks between classes. If the University adheres to an hourly schedule, this will not fit the definition of credit hour which is 25 minutes.

Senator Ekelman stated that for the record, the revised block is how four credit hour courses are being scheduled. The way they are scheduled is that in the morning four days per week of 50 minutes are allocated. Five days per week of 50 minutes is not a

good way of teaching the material, and not convenient for our working students who are employed between 10/20 hours per week.

Dr. Marino commented that Tuesday/Thursday time blocks will also be scheduled similar to Monday/Thursday time blocks.

Senate President Goodell reported that the block schedule is currently being modeled based on Ohio State University's schedule with no modification.

Dr. Marino reported that he is meeting the week after next with the Registrar who has asked for one additional meeting.

Dr. Goodell stated that faculty should get back to their colleagues.

Senator Tebeau asked Senators to remind everybody that these guidelines are issues we should communicate with our colleagues.

VIII. Parking Rates and Citation Fees for 2013-2014 (Report No. 70, 2012-2013)

Senate President Goodell noted that the new Parking Rates and Citation Fees for 2013-2014 were provided to Senate for Informational Purposes Only because they have already been approved by the Board of Trustees. There was no discussion on the new rates and fees.

IX. Report of the President of the University

President Berkman left the meeting early; therefore, there was no report of the President of the University.

X. Report of the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Interim Provost George Walker left the meeting early; therefore, there was no report of the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer.

XI. Student Government Association Report

There was no report from the Student Government Association.

XII. New Business

Senate President Goodell inquired if there was any new business.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray indicated that she had a question on the process now that the vote of no confidence has passed. She asked, "How do faculty proceed – stay in panic mode?" Dr. Goodell replied that she didn't know the answer to Dr. Berlin Ray's question.

Dr. Bill Kosteas reported that he is trying to give President Berkman time to make changes – a good faith effort. He said that he is not hopeful. Initially, the administration came in with the proposed date of October 15 for all of the courses to be submitted to the College Committees and they would finish their work by December. He is trying to figure out a way to give the UCC and the departments and then the Provost time. He noted that he is not hopeful. We have to move forward – 2014 is the deadline.

Dr. Sridhar asked, “You mean after all approvals...?”

Dr. Kosteas noted that there may be a deadline for departments to submit all of their proposals. He doesn’t know what the compensation will be for the UCC to work throughout the summer.

Senator Delatte said that Colleges would be asked to delegate that to the Deans.

An unidentified Senator noted that there was an email from Dr. Teresa LaGrange.

Dr. Goodell stated that she doesn’t know what will happen. She is trying to figure out what the administration will do as a result of the vote of no confidence. She is in favor of

what kind of impact this will have. She went on to say that this will not help student success. This information needs to be shared with the students, emphasized and feedback provided.

Dr. Tebeau said he was wondering about whether we want forums with the students. SGA has not done an adequate job in advising the students. They have had untested elections and surveys that indicate a lot of mixed opinions. At yesterday's meeting, we may not have been impressed with their conduct but maybe this body should take some responsibility.

Dr. Goodell suggested that collectively, a few people should be asked to draft a reasonable timeline. She noted that she will take the responsibility of being the main architect saying this is what we like.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady asked, "Did not we have this conversation?" We may go to fall of 2015.

Dr. Goodell stated that she didn't understand what people were being asked to do.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady said that they are being asked to do the entire undergraduate curriculum by May 10 unless we want an exemption.

Dr. Goodell asked, "And the syllabi?"

Dr. Kosteas stated that if proposing a new course then, it also requires including the syllabus. If you are changing a course, you also need to change the relevant syllabus and explain how you are changing it. When converting to a WAC course, you will have to provide a new syllabus. For most courses, you just need to explain the changes.

Dr. Ekelman noted that you cannot divorce the elements of your courses.

Dr. Goodell stated that if the faculty have specific comments, they should please get them to her as soon as possible and she will try to put something together and present it.

Dr. Kosteas stated that anything the UCC does is advisory only. If you put a dominant model for something other than three credits, you will have a hard time selling that. We have no time to discuss it. It takes two weeks to plan and then have one day to present.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady stated that the

2015. We can do it in a reasonable fashion faster than Ohio State but this falls on deaf ears.

Dr. Goodell stated that if we propose something and it is not listened to, then we know everything is lost. Today was the last opportunity to discuss this issue. It will not be what we want – it will not be carefully considered.

Dr. Karem commented, moving forward and continuing this discussion, departments will provide by a certain date their version of what the department's dominant three credit hour programs are. He added that he is concerned about the time here.

Dr. Ekelman stated that if Dr. Goodell does draft something, she should please send it to all Senators.

Dr. Goodell said that she would work with Dr. Kosteas, consult with department chairs and put something together.

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business. There being no further business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel