

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

**APRIL 9, 2014**

**PRESENT:** Boboc, Delatte, Delgado, Dixit, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, Gross, R. Henry, Hoffman, D. Jackson, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Kalafatis, Karem, Kent, Kosteas, Krebs, Lehfeldt, J. Lieske, Margolius, Marino, C. May, Meier, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Resnick, Rickett, Sridhar, Steinberg, Vogelsang-Coombs, Welfel, Wolf.

M. Bond, C. Brown, Dumski, Mageean, McHenry, Sadlek, Sawicki, Stoll, G. Thornton, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

**ABSENT:** Berlin Ray, Geier, Gorla, S. Kaufman, Liggett, Little, Majette, Rashidi, Talu, Visocky-O'Grady, M. Walton, J. G. Wilson, Witmer-Rich.

Artbauer, Berkman, Boise, J. Ford, Halasah, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, Novy, Parry, Spademan, Triplett, Ward, Wehner, B. White.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M.

**I. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of April 9, 2014**

Senate President Joanne Goodell reported that first we have a couple of requests to make changes to the Agenda. She noted that the first request is to move the University Curriculum Committee from Item VIII to Item II because Dr. Bill Kosteas needs to leave early to attend to other business. Then we have an addition to the University Faculty Affairs Committee report, which will now be Item VIII that will include the discussion of the new language of House Bill No. 484. She noted that there is also an additional item by Professor Rachel Carnell to discuss the Campus Master Plan. Finally, Dr. Goodell proposed removing Item II Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of October 16, 2013 that are not ready for approval. Dr. Goodell then asked for a motion to approve the Agenda as amended for the Meeting of April 9, 2014.

It was moved and seconded and the Agenda as amended for the Meeting of April 9, 2014 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

## II. University Curriculum Committee

### A. Contact Hours for different types of courses (Report No. 64, 2013-2014)

Professor Bill Kosteas stated that UCC only has one action item for Senate in the recommendations. The UCC has voted 9 to 0 to recommend that in the future, all course proposals adhere to OBOR's guidelines with respect to contact hours not in the traditional lecture format but for labs and for studios and anything you can imagine that are covered in those guidelines. We want to make sure that departments are adhering to those guidelines when they submit new courses and at the college level Curriculum Committees and that all of the appropriate Curriculum Committees and Faculty Governance bodies are taking these standards into account when reviewing these courses. His sense is that by and large everyone is following these guidelines but some questions did arise in terms of certain labs and what is the appropriate range that's allowed for contact hours per credit hour. He noted that some of these issues came up and UCC was unformed on the merits. He stated that there is a link in his memo to Senate. He added that he has been trying to locate that link and it wasn't very easy to find it because it was buried somewhere in OBOR's web site. He again stated that this is the only item UCC has for a vote.

Senator Beth Ekelman noted that there is an Appendix B in the document that UCC sent us and in this appendix a link is provided to OBOR where they are talking about guidelines that focus on laboratories and clinical labs. But this link is really looking at two-year associate degree programs. That's the title at the top of the linked page. She asked if that is part of the document that Professor Kosteas wants Senate to adopt.

Dr. Kosteas responded that UCC's understanding is that this is what OBOR is expecting us to apply to everything. He noted that when Eric Yeager forwarded this to UCC, this was the link that was sent to us saying to use this.

Professor Ekelman commented that Health Sciences offers lots of laboratories, clinical labs, and practicum. She said that she would think that laboratory experiences at the Master's level or Doctoral level are different than at an associate degree level in terms of what we are doing with our students in the learning outcomes and interactions. Lots of the definitions in that Attachment B are very problematic if we were asked to adhere to them like requiring our field work coordinator to do onsite visits with our students who might be doing clinicals in California, or in Maine, or in Florida.

Dr. Kosteas replied that he is thinking of this as defined toward undergraduate courses primarily. We all understand that graduate course work is a bit different in many respects. He noted that this is the idea – this is primarily to be applied with undergraduate courses and serve as a framework. Certainly, when somebody is submitting something, we should always be using a reason when we look at these things. If this is talking about Doctoral course work, it doesn't fit what we would normally think

of as a clinical experience at the undergraduate level and we should take that into account – that's the idea.

Professor Ekelman stated that she is sure that Nursing would have issues. She said that her question has to apply to what's done at an associate degree level. How would that impact our undergraduate programs? She wondered if Professor Kosteas had reached out to ask most departments and most programs that type of question.

Professor Kosteas replied that he presented this at Steering a few weeks ago and there was zero discussion. On UCC there was the sense that this all makes sense. He added that UCC really didn't hear much from anybody. Again, he thought he would bring this issue to Faculty Senate to see if there was additional feedback.

Senator Glenn Goodman stated that he is happy to hear Professor Kosteas say that there will be some flexibility. Certainly there is a concern that if we pass this and then UCC moves on and that these guidelines are adhered to strictly as Beth Ekelman mentioned. Our field coordinator places students to 180 sites in a year. All these sites would require more resources that we hope the University Curriculum Committee would provide for us if we had to adhere to those standards.

Professor Kosteas noted that Professor Goodman is specifically talking about the direct supervision aspect of that in off-site placement of students. He stated that he would be open to an amendment Professor Goodman made. We are not talking about off-site visits but some clinical experiences that are at a distance. There could be an amendment made to that effect to cover that scenario so that would cover moving forward and that would be part of the rules or the standards. Dr. Kosteas asked if there is an amendment to that motion or an addition. He asked if that would help.

Professor Goodman moved that Senate amend this motion to be applied to undergraduate programs and that professional graduate programs would be exempt from these criteria. An unidentified Senator seconded the motion. Dr. Goodell then asked for discussion.

Professor Ekelman stated that she was on a committee years ago that looked at courses and programs that were offered to working adults and they were not necessarily at a traditional fifteen week semester during a regular semester. These courses were offered in an accelerated format. She said that she is assuming that those types of programs are still offered. She indicated that she doesn't know who is offering them – perhaps Urban. She asked if anyone has looked into that.

Professor Kosteas commented that if we think about a traditional lecturer format, if you offer a course over five weeks instead of fifteen, this simply means that you should be meeting for three times as many minutes per week. It is not the notion of the minutes per week that are being met; it's the total minimal standard for the contact hours. He does believe that with traditional lecturer courses, that this is the standard in the State. This standard would apply to all of the levels. It is just a definition of a credit hour for

traditional lecturer types of classes, whether it is an Associate or Bachelor's. He added that we do apply that at all levels basically. We do treat seminars differently from traditional lecture courses even though that is still meeting physically in a classroom. Certainly you can do that. UCC has seen proposals recently where looking of Business analytic proposals coming out of the College of Business and they want to offer some courses at evening sessions which just means they will meet for twice as long per week over eight weeks. He noted that in his Economics Department they have an alternate schedule like that as well for a couple of their courses because that's what works best for the timing of the material for their Master's program. However, the minimum number of minutes and hours and contact time still are met.

Dr. Goodell asked Professor Goodman to restate his proposed amendment. Professor Goodman moved that Senate amend this proposal to exempt graduate level professional programs from these standards.

Dr. Goodell inquired if this applies to the supervision of clinical laboratory experiences or all of these standards. Professor Goodman replied that he can live with lab hours and lecture hours but we can't live with the definitions under practicum and field work in clinical experiences.

Dr. Goodell then stated that Professor Goodman moved that the graduate level professional programs should be exempt or may be exempt or would be exempt.

Senator Robert Krebs raised a broader question. He said that he would assume that in this room, very few of us have had the opportunity to read this document nor do we think we needed to because once some sort of an exception or real problem arises, it sort of highlights the problem for most departments. Those programs need to look at these more carefully than he is sure that we have done. He is concerned about trying to vote and pass a document now that we are trying to make up little tweaks on the fly here as if this is going to cover everything. He added that he is sorry. There have simply been too many demands on all of us to read every document that comes across the table. Now this one seems to have some serious problems to it that we need to look at more carefully rather than to try to vote on today.

Dr. Goodell asked Professor Robert Krebs if he was proposing to table the document until the next meeting. Professor Krebs said, "Yes." Dr. Goodell then asked for a second to the motion. Professor Beth Ekelman seconded the motion. Dr. Goodell then asked for a vote. The motion to table the UCC proposal to adhere to OBOR's guidelines with respect to contact hours was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell stated that the proposal will be sent back to Committee and then brought back to Senate after each department has had an opportunity to review it and have input and there is a timeline there too.

Professor Kosteas said that actually he would ask that people submit comments to him so that he can take it back to UCC for consideration. He stated that we are looking at

week twelve of the semester. UCC has a meeting scheduled for this Friday and he will add this proposal back to the UCC agenda. He noted that they also have a meeting two weeks from Friday. He said that in order for him to be able to incorporate those comments, then a deadline of two weeks from today is needed. He noted that if two weeks isn't enough time for everybody to look through about four pages of documentation then he would suggest that the proposal be tabled until next September. He added that this is the bottom line.

Professor Ekelman said that she guesses she would like programs to be able to really look at this proposal and be able to have time to respond. She added that she is not sure what the rush is to be honest.

Dr. Kosteas stated that if Senate wants this done by the end of this semester, he really needs feedback over the next couple of weeks because then you are getting into finals and that is just too much hassle for people to really – no one is going to pay attention to it. Again, if people want it done by the end of this semester, that's his proposed timeline otherwise we can wait until next year when he won't be doing this.

Dr. Goodell noted that if this proposal gets tabled until next year, then we will have a different committee and then they will basically start from scratch in terms of discussing this.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy reminded everyone that under the rules, this proposal becomes the first item of business at the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Goodell stated that the proposal will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting and then it may or may not appear on the next Senate Agenda.

Professor Kosteas pointed out that the wording isn't guidelines. If they were guidelines, if you want a straight definition, the rules absolutely must be met. He asked everyone to please bear that in mind that the proposal is not the wording. He said that he does understand the concern that as the committee changes from one academic year to the next some people may take a very different understanding of how guidelines are to be applied. These aren't guidelines.

Senate Vice President Nigamanth Sridhar commented that just to follow up the reason that the UCC chose to put this forward to the Faculty Senate was because there were several proposals that came to the UCC that were sent back. It sounded like we were just a bunch of grumps because we were sending things back. He said that UCC was sending the proposals back because there were reasons behind these things and that is the only point of putting this document in front of everybody else which is just to make sure that there are State guidelines. These are guidelines made up by other people. That's all it is.

Professor Ekelman said that the concern she has is that the UCC's motion said it "must apply guidelines" so that sort of indicates to her a different meaning than "should

apply the guidelines.” She stated that she also thinks that last year everybody was rushed so we probably were not getting the best work of everybody just because of the timeline. She added that she appreciates the suggestions on how to improve things.

Dr. Goodell stated that this proposal will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting depending on the feedback Bill Kosteas has received; we will decide at the next Steering meeting whether the proposal will appear at Senate or whether we put it off until the next year.

**B. Recommendations on the following items: (Report No. 65, 2013-2014)**

Professor Kosteas reported that these next items are just recommendations of items that the UCC felt we need to give more attention to in the future.

- 1. Ongoing review of General Education Courses**
- 2. Core requirement for syllabi**
- 3. Clear guidelines for course numbering**
- 4. Standardize the undergraduate and graduate catalog descriptions**
- 5. Curriculum software**

Dr. Kosteas said that there should be regular review of General Education courses. The details of courses may be worked out in the future but that is something that became very, very clear when UCC was reviewing the Gen Ed courses during this conversion process. He noted that it was clear that a lot of people inherit a course and bring it to UCC. The syllabi no longer look like the criteria or what we were expecting as usual in those categories. So regularly we should review most of the general education courses to make sure that those guidelines are met.

Professor Kosteas noted that numbers 2, 4 and 5 all go together in a sense and he will talk about them together. He stated that we really do need a good working system, something that can really handle the needs and make curriculum changes much simpler and more streamlined and there is software out there. He knows that Ms. Janet Stimple and Ms. Maribeth Kralik of Graduate Studies went and saw a demonstration of one particular software system entitled Curriculog. This software is produced by the same company that makes Tabulog which is the system that the Registrar’s Office uses. He noted that what is nice about a system like that is when you upload your curricular changes in the system, once it is approved, nobody then has to go in and manually update the catalog with the course descriptions – it automatically repopulates everything. There are hosts of other features that we were told are really nice. He added that we had something in place for 4 to 3 and it helped to get us through but we definitely need something more realistic – something that has a few more bells and whistles perhaps. The core requirements of syllabi play an important role because we can make core requirements a part of submissions of courses, and the basic template for syllabi must be filled in. And, then of course, you add whatever is appropriate to your discipline in your college; you add the additional pieces as necessary. He added that the reason UCC thinks some of these need to be looked into is because UCC saw some frightening things in

syllabi submitted. Faculty making comments like, “office hours, if you can find me.” He stated that in another course there may be a statement on their syllabus that they reserve the right to change anything in the course at any time. He stated that the vast majority of us understand that things like this are not appropriate but there are those occasions when certain things are missing. It would help if we just had a certain standard basic format of what is required to be on the syllabus along with maybe a set of guidelines as to those things you should not put on your syllabus. He noted that along those same lines, we really should standardize the catalog and it really should be written in one voice in some degree of uniformity. There is also some concern that when you look at the catalog, the catalog should be have a simple clear description of the program, e.g., these are the requirements; these are the expectations; not if you major in X, you will be the most marketable person on the face of the planet and you will get a thousand job offers and everybody will love you. He stated that it is not supposed to be a marketing tool for majors. The idea is that the catalog is supposed to clearly outline for students – this is what is going to be expected of you if you chose this major; these are the requirements. He added that it would really help to clean things up using simple language.

Dr. Kosteas stated that the other item UCC recommends for future discussion is developing some clear guidelines for course numbering. He noted that this came up in a context of seeing departments submitting new courses and saying, “Well, this is introductory level material but we are labeling it as a 400-level class.” Professor Kosteas said that this becomes important when you start thinking about the upper division requirements that we have. Also, as a graduate director, he gets a little worried when he sees that someone is saying I am going to propose this 400-level course that will be cross-listed with a 500-level course but it’s really basic introductory 100 or 200-level undergraduate material. How does that impact the graduate programs? We now have that the graduate college will no longer approve cross-listing beyond the one level like 400-500. He went on to say that if we had some clear guidelines, we can help to avoid some of these issues.

Dr. Goodell thanked Dr. Kosteas and UCC very much for all of their work. Everyone then gave a round of applause to Dr. Kosteas and the UCC.

### **III. Report of the Faculty Senate President**

Dr. Joanne Goodell, Faculty Senate President, said hello and welcomed everyone to the second to last meeting this year. Dr. Goodell noted that finally, some good weather is in our near future. The past month has been filled with travel to spring conferences for many of us, along with advising and all of our other faculty duties, so she said she only has a few things to say today.

Dr. Goodell reported that the campus master planning activity is proceeding very quickly, and the planning group has scheduled another meeting later this month. We will get an opportunity to express our views about the speed of the planning process, and the manner in which it has been conducted, later in this meeting.

Dr. Goodell stated that the Provost will hopefully give us an update on where the program prioritization process stands, and how the completion of certain rating and ranking processes are factoring into the approval of hiring positions for FY15-16. This was discussed at the last Steering meeting, which was chaired by Dr. Nigamanth Sridhar since Dr. Goodell was at a conference at UC Berkeley.

Dr. Goodell noted that everyone should have received an email from their caucus leader (the Steering representative) about two resolutions that are being discussed and finalized at the Ohio Faculty Council meeting this coming Friday. One is concerned with the workload language contained in HB 484 which has apparently passed the House and is now passing through the Senate in a different form. She added that Dr. Jeff Karem is going to discuss this with Senate later today. Dr. Goodell reported that the other is about the Complete College Ohio provisions (formally PSEOP) and that is contained in HB 487. She stated that if anyone has any comments, or needs another copy of these resolutions and would like one, to please let her know as soon as possible. She added that she can still propose minor changes to the leaders of the resolutions at the meeting on Friday.

Dr. Goodell reported that at the recent Board of Trustees meeting, the chair of the Academic sub-committee requested an update on our progress revising the student evaluation of teaching instrument, which she gladly gave them. The Board seemed pleased with the report, and requested that we provide them with the version of the student evaluation of teaching instrument that will be finalized at our last meeting, which of course, she agreed to do. As everyone knows, competition among universities, particularly in Northeast Ohio is intensifying, and it is the belief of some of the Board members, that having a completely open and transparent evaluation of teaching metric system available for outsiders to look at would be to our advantage. Dr. Goodell noted that her reply to that is that student evaluation of teaching is only one part of teaching evaluation. Peer and supervisor evaluations must also be included, which of course, they are in our tenure and promotion procedures. But it would be very challenging to find ways of representing and reporting these elements to the public, in other words, the prospective student body. Dr. Goodell noted that however we proceed with these discussions, there is bound to be controversy. However, we must acknowledge that we are in an era of increasing accountability, and it would behoove us to find ways of responding to these forces in ways that we choose, rather than having methods chosen for us.

#### **IV. Announcements of Coming Elections**

Dr. Goodell moved to the election notice and committee preference sheets. She stated that she will be suggesting that next year UFAC should work with the incoming Senate President to put the Committee Preference Sheet, ballot, and voting procedures online in the same way that the Graduate College does. As we all know, this year has been just way too difficult for many of us to consider a major change such as that to our procedures. However, this year we recently sent the Committee Preference Sheet via email and there was a problem because the email had “this is a test” in the subject line so



she fears that some people may have ignored it for that reason. She noted that she in fact thought it was a test but it wasn't, it was the real thing. Faculty should receive the paper-based Committee Preference Sheet by internal mail as last year. She noted that last year, there was a problem with some departments, her own department in particular, because Committee Preference Sheets did not get distributed for some inexplicable reason. So, we thought we would try and cover our bases this year and send the Committee Preference Sheet out by email as well as by paper. She stated that she emailed Tommie Barclay of IS&T and next year we will hopefully work through those procedures to change the process with the support of IS&T or Maribeth Kralik, who does the Graduate faculty election procedures so we can use the same method. She asked everyone to please complete their Committee Preference sheet, whether on paper or electronically, and to encourage their colleagues to complete theirs as well, and return them to Violet Lunder in the Senate Office as soon as possible, but not later than April 18, 2014. Dr. Goodell then noted that the open committee positions are listed on page 3 of today's Agenda. Dr. Goodell stated that our last Faculty Senate meeting of the year includes elections. She asked faculty to please talk to their colleagues and encourage them to volunteer because we generally have strong faculty governance when people are involved.

Senator Linda Wolf reported that she has three openings on the University Electronic Learning Committee and they are not listed on the upcoming Senate Elections. Dr. Goodell pointed out that members of the E-Learning Committee are appointed by the Academic Steering Committee and that is why that committee is not listed on the upcoming Senate Elections.

#### **V. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer**

Provost Deirdre Mageean first announced that President Ronald Berkman was unable to attend Senate today because he is on the road. In anticipation of his inability to attend this meeting, he did attend the last Academic Steering Committee meeting.

Provost Mageean stated that she would like to add her thanks to Bill Kostea for all of the work he has done this year and she wanted to assure him that she will be working with him and the University Curriculum Committee to try and address a number of the recommendations just mentioned. One item she wanted to mention in particular is this issue of software. She noted that they listened to what Professor Kostea had said at that meeting and they have also been exploring some additional software that might help us with student success implementation. She said that they also know that we have unfortunately at this time in a history of introducing software, don't tell anybody about it, but squeeze it into existing systems and then hoping the pilot sort of gets developed. She noted that Starfish is an example of something that could have been, and should have been done in a much better way. It is a system she is familiar with. It was done pretty well where she came from. A one hundred percent adoption led to the intrusive advising among other things. It could have been an enormous resource to us in the 4 to 3 conversion but as a consequence of some non-adoption, it was not. So she commits to Faculty Senate her resources and focus on making sure that this kind of thing doesn't

happen again. She noted that they did actually have a first meeting of a number of parties including IS&T to talk about helping better to do this kind of thing when we buy software. Better to test it, make sure people know what's going on, make sure that IS&T people know about it, make sure that the support is going to be there and that the users can get a chance to look at this software. She noted that there are plenty of lessons from the past to make sure we do this kind of thing better. The full range of software can be of use to us if it is adopted and it's used well. There is no shortage of these things and Lord knows we need plenty of help as we move forward.

Provost Mageean noted that Professor Goodell mentioned Master Planning. Professor Rachel Carnell is going to talk about this but she has requests from some of us and Rachel is the representative who has volunteered for that. The Provost appreciates her doing this. She reported that some additional meetings have been added to the schedule, namely, a focus group with some faculty from 10:30 to 11:30 AM on Thursday, April 24, 2014 and open meetings for faculty from 12:00 Noon to 1:00 PM on that same day. The first meeting will be in MC 105 and the second meeting will be in the MC Auditorium. She noted that this is then followed up with a meeting on Friday, April 25, 2014 from 10:30 to 11:30 AM which is a focus group of department chairs, program directors and associate deans. We are trying to get as many people as possible in those groups. She noted that Rachel will speak to those more substantively and in greater detail later.

Provost Mageean reported that we are now in the first week of full advising for seniors and juniors. We are keeping track of how those numbers are running. She anticipates that they are moving along fairly briskly. Some departments have seen a lot more students than others. We will keep reminding faculty of that pro-active advising. She stated that they also do appreciate of course that there are those students who for various reasons, some good and some not so good, will put off registration until August. Some of these reasons are very legitimate – they need to work – they have family obligations out there, day care, and they have to work these things out. It will be late so we can probably expect another increase in August. There are also those students who fall victim to procrastination. She knows that short of getting out and coming to their homes and dragging them out of bed and taking them to advising, it is hard to get some people just to come and make those appointments. She said that she appreciates all of the work that has been done in pro-active advising, setting up those appointments and meeting students. We need to get them in here. The students who get in trouble are those who self-advise. She said that she thinks that Cleveland State knows the situation.

Provost Mageean also wanted to applaud those departments who have this occasion to be reflective about the whole nature of advising. This is something that is critical to student success. This is something that we need to think much more about, i.e., how do we go about this business. She noted that one of the departments is being kind of a watershed, so to speak, helping advising.

Provost Mageean reported that there was a considerable discussion about Program Prioritization in the last Faculty Senate Academic Steering Committee meeting. At the

request of Dr. Duffy, she brought along and distributed to the entire team a set of metrics that we were going to use. First, they contextualized this a little bit as she did with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. She thinks we all know that as Dr. Goodell said, we are all under scrutiny and accountability. We certainly live in a very different budgetary environment than we did in the good old days. In the State of Ohio as in many other states we have seen a serious decline. She mentioned this to her colleagues in New England, and she referred to ourselves transcending from state universities, to state supported universities, to state assisted universities, and now they are really state located universities. We are fortunate in Ohio to retain the percentage that we have and how the Governor has continued to support higher education. Nevertheless, there are interesting pressures on that funding as evidenced by a total change in the funding formula. Some people may have attended the meeting that was administered by David Cannon who spent two hours explaining. It is very sophisticated and complex and they are still tweaking it now and then. She noted that the bottom line is there is a completely different way of determining subsidy. It's not based on inputs, it's based on outputs. It is on graduation. It's based on completion and we get penalized for attrition. That's the bottom line and that's the basic shift. This means a very different scenario for how we operate. Hence of course, the increased stress on the part of student success that is certainly something we have to be very cognizant of. If you start losing subsidy, it is much harder to recover than in the old budget formula. You can't recover that fast from a loss. Provost Mageean stated that it is a serious consequential domino-like effect.

Provost Mageean said that the Provost's Office worked with the colleges and Associate Vice President Tim Long and his office forecasting expected enrollment and the credit hours in particular and it is becoming evident that we are likely to experience an enrollment flattening or even a potential decline in our recent trend of credit hour growth. In FY 2015, a number of things contributed to a decrease in projected enrollment: the lowering of credit hours for graduation, the 4 to 3 credit hour conversion, and some loss from freezing the tuition – if you take the full twelve credit hours. So there are a number of factors playing into the projected decline. In addition, we are likely to remain flat at least this year in the allocation of subsidy and we are modeling scenarios with tuition increases that do not exceed the current State cap at 2%. That was reinforced at the IUC Presidents' meeting yesterday. That is still very much in the political arena and being discussed by the Governor and by the Chancellor. Provost Mageean noted that all of these things are certainly affecting us so it is going to be very challenging. She stated that the questions in all of these areas: “How do we position the university for long-term sustainability? How do we plan to situate ourselves so that we don't suddenly impose on ourselves draconian budget cuts in the way we did a few years ago?” She noted that those situations have very time dependent imperatives. Often across-the-board cuts are made which are the worst kind of cuts to impose on an institution because they totally decentralize strategic planning. All that does is result in misery across the institution.

Provost Mageean noted that a couple of years ago there was a subcommittee of the Budget Task Force that started looking at this and actually came up with many of the methods that we are currently planning to use. That was put on ice as we transitioned to

other large tasks like the 4 to 3 conversion and it is time to look these methods over again. To look at our programs and ask ourselves, “Which ones are growing; i.e., which ones are strong, which ones might need more resources, be they faculty positions, part-time faculty lecturers, assistantships, capital space, and, which ones are not doing well, which ones are struggling, which ones are weak, and which ones do we position in terms of responding to the skill sets and the training, and the general preparation that employers demonstrate in our region?” Provost Mageean stated that all of that requires that we are very careful when we review our programs and that is what we are doing.

Provost Mageean explained some of the steps. She noted that this has been discussed at the Provosts’ Council and we said, “Would you be able initially just tell us something quantitative at this stage? Tell us which ones you think look like strong programs, which ones look like they are positioned and are they going to have a future, and which ones look like they are stable and which ones are starving?” She commented that this was done not completely. She had some questions. She said, okay, let’s try this a little differently. Let’s go back and look at those metrics and she distributed those metrics to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee – they are not secret – and distributed them to the chairs. The deans have a copy and that copy was put on the Senate web page. Many of those are quantitative data – two-thirds are quantitative in nature. So we said to the deans that we will prepopulate those for you given the data that we have, the data that was in Institutional Research which was recently published in the Book of Facts using the Delaware Study. In addition data was given to us by Academic Analytics for computer programs. We are using three sources of data in a kind of triangulation because obviously each data-set could have certain short-comings and we are aware of that. But we think by doing this triangulation we have a fairly complete set of data. However, data takes you so far. Data does not determine, it informs our decisions. She said that there is often a reaction when we mention metrics. Metric data seems like a rather corporate approach to doing things in academia, but as she says, it informs. For other budgeting roles, we use things like our external funding, things that came from foundations. We go to the Music Department and they are on a set budget as is the Art Department. Similarly, she asked the Mechanical Engineering Department how many faculty they have. We know that this information is not always complete but we take all of that into consideration. Then the deans said, “Okay, there are other things that we need to fill in, e.g., how do we include the strategic plans. We then contextualize, of course; give us the background on some of these numbers; put it in context for us to interpret that.” Provost Mageean said that they gave that back to the deans. The deans then sent that back to us. Every dean did it a little differently. Some worked very much with the chairs. She noted that it depends on the size of the College to get things together. Provost Mageean stated that the team started reviewing that in a one-day meeting from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM and last week they had another meeting. She noted that this week, they are meeting with the deans, one on one. After that, we will provide the deans what we see as our first review of new resources – those that are stable and those that are in trouble in one way or another. She noted that this is done with the understanding that at the moment at least we are at best dealing with a zero sum game in the budgetary situation. To invest in new resources, to invest in new programs or growing programs, to strengthen some programs, money has to come from somewhere else. But there is no new injection of funds, there is

no money from Heaven, there is nothing coming to us. SGA President Allyson Dumski, wanted to let Senate know that this is an exercise not confined to the academic side of the University. The President has made it quite clear and said that this has been something that has been expected of all sides of the house. Units in all silos have got to be reviewed. What are they doing, how are they are spending their money, are there any efficiencies. We hope to get this back to the deans, very, very shortly. She believes that the discussion has to take place in the colleges. Frankly, we are running against certain deadlines that are coming up very quickly. She commented that you can say to somebody, I have been working for twelve months only for so long. She noted that she has encouraged the deans to conduct at least two open forums with the faculty when they get this information back so there is some opportunity for discussion.

Provost Mageean said that on a somewhat parallel track is the request for new faculty positions and we will be hearing from the deans on April 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup> or 23<sup>rd</sup> going forth on that. Clearly, some faculty positions have to be allocated. She stated that she thinks we understand all of this. We may not be able to resolve this completely in the next month but we can at least do some first quarter things and deal with them, i.e., faculty positions and there will be some delay in getting some of the others through.

Provost Mageean noted that this is where we are with the process thus far and, as she said, she is happy to make those metrics available. Finally, she said that at the appropriate time on the agenda she will take questions.

#### **VI. Report of the Student Government Association (Report No. 66, 2013-2014)**

Ms. Allie Dumski, SGA President, stated that it is good to see everybody today. She commented that as we get closer to the end of the semester there is increasing discussion about student evaluations. She would like to take some time to share SGA's perspective and update Senate on some issues that students have experienced in the past and their thoughts for the proposed new procedures. She stated that as some faculty may have seen, SGA officers have been sitting in the Student Center for the last three months gathering feedback from students. So it is her job to relay those messages to Faculty Senate. She noted that before she gets started, she wanted to acknowledge that she knows that this is not the case for all faculty, but these issues have happened and occurred and so she just wants to make everyone aware of them.

Ms. Dumski reported that some professors have handed out evaluations at inappropriate times such as right before the final exam. SGA would really appreciate it if it was consistent among all classes when the evaluations are being handed out. Some professors have told students that their evaluations do not matter and that they will never see the results. SGA hopes that this is not the case. Some professors do not leave the room and some take the results back themselves. Ms. Dumski noted that the biggest issue for the students is that if these are really being taken seriously and what is being done with the results? SGA is in full support of the results of the evaluations being posted for students to see. She stated that at the last meeting "Rate My Professor" was

discussed. However many students do use that but this system, and if it is implemented, this would need a lot more input. However it would hold professors accountable, and it would be a lot more professional and official than “Rate My Professor.”

Ms. Dumski stated that SGA commends the efforts of the Student Success Committee for researching alternatives and involving SGA. Some of us are a little bit hesitant on the electronic idea but we are confident in the committees’ recommendations. Ms. Dumski stated that they understand all of the benefits of an electronic version, but our students, and the thought of actually doing something online outside of the classroom, is a little concerning for them. With the new technology SGA is also concerned that some students and faculty may not be text-savvy enough to keep up. SGA believes that providing and passing around I-Pads for students to take the online version in class would be the most realistic option. SGA hopes to continue to be involved with the evaluation trials and appreciates the work of the committee.

Ms. Dumski said that SGA encourages faculty to tell their peers to submit their textbooks to the bookstore so that the students can get the best buy-back rate that they can.

Ms. Dumski stated that as we wind down, SGA asks faculty to please maintain their office hours. Students get very stressed out around this time and it is really frustrating for them when they go to their professors during their office hours and the professors are not there.

Ms. Dumski reported that SGA elections are next week and in addition to the SGA positions, the RTA U-Pass is also on the ballot which is a big issue for students so she is asking faculty to encourage their students to go out to vote.

Finally, Ms. Dumski reported that SGA is hosting a textbook forum on Friday, April 11, 2014 at noon. SGA will be discussing issues, alternatives and solutions. If anyone is interested in attending, lunch will be provided. Just email Ms. Dumski so she can add people to the list of those attending and provide additional information. SGA hopes to have a nice turnout of faculty, administration and students and receive a lot of great feedback.

## **VII. Budget and Finance Committee Informational Items (Report No. 67, 2013-2014)**

Senator Andrew Resnick, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, reported that right now, we are in the process of budget-building for next year. The numbers for the enrollment predictions will be provided to PBAC at the April 17th meeting. Across the institution CSU enrollment is projected to drop a little over two percent resulting in Instructional Fee Revenue of a little over \$151 million. Again, at the next Senate meeting, he will be able to report more refined numbers.

Professor Resnick stated that the other item he wanted to report on is his higher education funding presentation on March 26, 2014. He noted that he tried to distill down about three densely written scribbled pages that Senators should have in front of them. He said that he doesn't really know what to say. This is an informational item. He reported that it is no secret that the State Share of Instruction (SSI) is going down year after year and we have been getting less. Right now, the State Share of Instruction provides a little less than 30% of our total revenue. The allocation formula is sort of version 3.0.2, of a fairly odd set of calculations. There is an additional set-aside for MD/PhD programs and after that the allocation formula is broken down into Degree Completion and student retention. The State assigns a risk factor for students who complete a degree or who do not complete a degree. There is a matrix and depending on how many of the risk factors a student has, they adjust the amount of money associated with those students and thereby how much the State is going to give to CSU. Professor Resnick commented that along with all of this, there also is the claim that when students transfer from institution to institution, institutions are sort of given State Share of Instruction based on the percentage of time that the students spend at the institution. This sort of means that there is this giant data-base with every single student in the State of Ohio being tracked and where they are after graduation. Those that stay in Ohio or those that go somewhere else are tracked and all that goes back in some future year of funding allocations. Professor Resnick commented that he doesn't know if our Alumni Department has any record of students and if our Foundation has access to all of the students who graduate from CSU. He added that the amount of data that has been generated in this process is sort of mind-boggling.

Professor Resnick stated that this is all he has right now but he will have more to report on next month.

Senator Joel Lieske asked, "What are the consequences of moving to the new SSI allocation formula? In particular, what is going to be the consequence of SSI on the basis of course completion rates and on degree completion rates? One is rated at 30% and the other at 50%. I think the first year we will be held harmless; is that right?"

Professor Resnick noted that Dr. Lieske's question is a good question but he doesn't have a good answer for him. The only consequence he can think of is that the SSI is going to go down the same as it does every other year.

Professor Lieske asked, "How much down?" Professor Resnick replied, "That I cannot tell you. The hold harmless and stop loss provisions are going to have an impact. How much, I can't say."

Associate Vice President Tim Long stated that it is a little difficult to know exactly to the dollar what these changes would do to the allocation that we receive now. He noted that as Professor Resnick mentioned, the safety net or stop-loss as they call it has been eliminated from the formula. That means that we are all pretty much on our own with respect to the outcome performance that we exhibit for the model. The other important thing to know is that the formula is now based on a three-year average of data.

Before, the formula was based upon either a two or a five-year average of data whichever was better and that's what the institution got. So, this whole redo of the formula kind of cleaned up a lot of the things that were not only troublesome but were inconsistent and it will take a little bit of time. Even if we have a poor course completion year because of the three-year average or a poor graduation in numbers, it's important to know that the graduation performance in the formula is not the graduation rate but is the number of graduates that we produce in undergraduate and graduate courses. All of that now is based on a three-year average that started in FY 14, the current year we are in, and it will continue on in FY 15. He noted that the other variable, the big one, is that it is a fixed pot that the legislature allocates for SSI funding all over the State. So, we are dependent upon what the other institutions do with respect to their outcome performance. It is not, we did better, therefore there is new money and we will get more because we did better. It is a zero sum gain. We expect that our allocation will remain about flat, about 69.5%, \$70 million range. When we get to 16-17, there are going to be some more tweaks to the funding model that we are going to discuss over next year. We are going to clean up some of the things that a lot of us don't like about the new funding model and that will go for another year iteration in hopes that it will settle some of those things. But, if we perform the way we are performing right now with respect to our retention and our graduation performance, we should be stable. All of the things being equal, unless somebody else shoots way up there, it is still a three-year average. We should be about stable with our SSI allocation for 15 versus this year.

Senate President Goodell stated that we now have Professor Jeff Karem, who will talk about two things – a vote on the revised Harassment Policies which was held over from the last Steering meeting and the new language, House Bill 484 adopted by the House Finance Committee.

### **VIII. University Faculty Affairs Committee**

Senator Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, stated that he has two quick announcements before he gets to the committees items. He has moved from easy happy announcements to action items that are news to Columbus. Whatever is news to Columbus, we know that it is going to be complicated and not always happy.

Dr. Karem reported that the first pretty good news is that at 1:30 PM today, he received an email indicating that the Greenbook has been officially filed with the State. It has been accepted with the format and including guidelines. He wanted to make sure to thank Jesse Drucker, Asst. Vice President for Human Resources, Ms. Gale Fondren, Administrative Coordinator in the Provost's Office, the Office of Compliance with their wonderful help here so that's coming to a conclusion. Also, he wanted to mention briefly regarding the SGA President's promise. We have been previewing possible software for compiling electronic submissions of student evaluations. He noted that they saw a presentation two weeks ago on Friday, and there are two more scheduled for this Friday and he hopes to have a report soon. He will have a report for Steering. He reported that they have also been meeting with his Statistics and Calculation Subcommittee on the best ways to incorporate data so things are moving along there. He commented that if anyone



at Senate knows anyone on their college Faculty Affairs Committees, please make sure that they get their additional questions to the UFAC for their college specific instrument. He reported that UFAC has heard from three or four colleges.

**A. Revised Harassment Policies (Report No. 68, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Karem reported that the only action item he has today from UFAC is the revised Harassment Policies. As he indicated at the last Senate meeting, these are in a way a kind of fait accompli so it is already done. Because of Federal compliance, these had to be passed by this year and UFAC had just only two weeks. It is still vital to have Faculty Senate vote on this to show our support of this policy and our stand against harassment and discrimination and things of that nature. Dr. Karem stated that the Office of Compliance has been extremely helpful in working with UFAC taking feedback from the different groups here. UFAC has approved this policy as it has been amended in response to feedback and it was available for an open comment period as well. Dr. Karem reported that he is not the originator of the policy but we do have a representative from the Office of Institutional Equity at Senate today. He added that he is happy to answer questions from the UFAC standpoint and for other questions, perhaps he can invite Equity up here. He then asked if there were any questions.

Senator Vera Vogelsang-Coombs inquired if there will be a dissemination plan that will go with the policy because just having the policy in place doesn't mean people will abide by it. If they don't know about it then you can't do much.

Ms. Rachel King, Chief Compliance Officer, Office of General Counsel, responded that this is actually a very timely question. She noted that they are in discussion right now. They certainly are undertaking a pretty daunting task. Because of the compliance issues that Dr. Karem mentioned, they need to train all employees – faculty and students – on the new policy. The Office is currently in the process of working with a vendor to do training for students both incoming first-year students, transfers and graduate students. They are working with Human Resources to make sure that that's addressed. With new employees, it currently already is but they are also making sure that this new policy is disseminated that way. They also are considering to make this issue, this topic, part of new faculty training this year so that plan is in the works right now absolutely, but it is not finalized at this time.

Dr. Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed endorsement of the Revised Harassment Policies and asked for a vote. The UFAC's proposed endorsement of the Revised Harassment Policies was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B. Workload Amendment – House Bill 484 (Report No. 69, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Karem stated that the only thing he has for the moment with respect to the workload is some people may be aware that last year, imbedded in the budget bill, was a provision of increasing faculty workload by ten percent. It is interesting because we

don't like across-the-board things when it comes to workload. He noted that everybody is going to teach an additional course beyond their present workload. In addition to teaching an additional course the following year, which is the extent of his mathematical expertise. Our view is that it is inconsistent and it is a mess and it is not strategic. Dr. Karem stated that recently a new provision crept in. In the document he distributed, he noted that this is an amended version of a proposal. It is a point of information of what could be coming down the pipe from Columbus. There is a proposal in the House Budget to increase faculty productivity and workload by ten percent in research, teaching and advising. It is not clear how this would be implemented, operationalized or what this ten percent means. There has been considerable input from various bodies, the Ohio Faculty Council and the Inter-University Council and the State Board of Regents. He noted that he just got an update from Columbus to bring to Senate's attention here. Dr. Karem reported that the good news is that the Inter-University Council and other bodies have succeeded in eliminating the ten percent figure. What is present in his distribution is essentially a call for review of workload. What is concerning to him, and the reason this was sent his way, is that the proposal from the Inter-University Council, which represents the joint administrations and institutions in Ohio, is the proposed elimination of the language that said, "That review of the workload policy would be in conjunction with faculty members of the university and any organization that represents the faculty which suggests to him that there are significant forces in the State that believe that we are going to talk about workload and faculty shouldn't be involved. He stated that he doesn't understand the reason for that. Lastly, Dr. Karem stated that there is language there suggesting that policies would be under the section of non-appropriate subjects for collective bargaining. That was proposed not by the legislature but by the Inter-University Council of Ohio. So, this particular language added here by the IUC has not come out of a House committee but he was made to understand that it could come up in the Senate. So, all of which is to say that with respect to the State's understanding of the workload, things are going to get complicated. Dr. Karem said he didn't know if the Provost could enlighten us on this as well but she has been participating and has some insights as to what the changes will be.

Dr. Goodell commented that the Provost said that this was passed by the Finance Committee. Dr. Karem confirmed that it was passed by the House Finance Committee.

Asst. Vice President Jesse Drucker stated that as he read the bill just before he got to Senate today, there were a couple of provisions he didn't think were included in Dr. Karem's synopsis and he thinks that there are two very important reasons. First, Dr. Karem is absolutely correct where it says that faculty and the representatives of faculty were not to be included in the discussion but he thinks we will work with them. Also, there is a time limit and there is a report that is included in the Bill. The Board of Trustees will report, if he read it correctly, to OBOR on the status of the workload no later than December 31, 2014 of this fiscal year. He went on to say that this is a little different than Dr. Karem's synopsis. While it is all encompassing, it puts a fairly short time limit on that report.

Provost Mageean stated that Jesse Drucker is right. She has the full document and it does say that it requires the thirteen State universities to report to the Chancellor by December 31<sup>st</sup> on the institution's faculty workload policy and procedures. The report must be developed in conjunction with the institution's faculty members. When the ten percent is implemented you are going to specify in which areas. It was curious that they left out service which was one of the three standards, i.e., teaching, research and service. They did not propose anything certainly not about the course schedule. The faculty being included in the discussion wasn't even brought up. It was passed by the House Finance Committee but not yet by the full House. She added that we have a deadline and it will be done in conjunction with the institution's faculty members.

Professor Krebs remarked that when Provost Mageean turned towards Dr. Karem, the audience couldn't hear anything she said. Dr. Krebs asked, "Is this with faculty discussion or with no faculty?" Provost Mageean replied, "With faculty discussion; as stated in the Bill, as approved by the House Finance Committee but not yet by the full House, so who knows. It currently states that each of the thirteen State universities are to report to the Chancellor of the Board of Regents by December 31, 2014 of the institution's faculty workload policies and procedures. The report must be developed in conjunction with the institution's faculty members and any organization representing the faculty."

Dr. Karem commented that he appreciates the clarifications that Provost Mageean and Jesse Drucker provided.

Dr. Karem stated that the reason why he brought this to Senate's attention is that someone from the Inter-University Council proposed that language and he thinks that is significant to know. He said that someone from the State House sent that to him and everyone should know what is happening. Dr. Karem stated that he is glad that is no longer there, but it is not a done deal when it comes to the House or finds its way to the Senate. We need to be mindful presuming that what he is hearing from both the Human Resources expert and from the Provost, is that we want faculty to be involved in this process. Dr. Karem noted that he will try to track down where this offer came from. This was sent to him and it is a statement from the Inter-University Council. Dr. Karem apologized for the confusion and stated that it seems there is an ongoing question of what the ground rules will be between Columbus and the universities and we should be mindful of that.

Faculty Senate received Dr. Karem's report on House Bill 484 concerning the Workload Amendment.

## **IX. Open Question Time**

Senator Andrew Gross stated that he had questions. He noted that first of all, he believes that he made a suggestion or even a formal motion on this floor at the last Senate meeting that two key people be invited to Senate. He was hoping that it was made in time for this meeting because he knows that the May meeting is full of agenda items that

are important including elections. He said that he would still like to have Ms. Berinthia LeVine, Director of Advancement, and Mr. Brian Breitholz, Asst. Vice President for Alumni Relations, to be invited to the floor at Senate because in times of budgetary constraints, we really need to know how good is our alumni data-base and how much money is being raised in comparison to what has happened five years ago.

Dr. Gross said that second, he was hoping that President Berkman would be at Senate today but he is absent again. He noted that he really liked President Berkman's speech at the City Club Forum on March 28 but he had several questions including why the President mentioned students about a dozen times and faculty just once. He added that the Board of Trustees was also acknowledged.

Dr. Gross said, "I have two questions for the President which I'll convey to the Senate floor and the Provost and the members here. The first is on style and the second is on substance. With regard to style, I want to be proud of an institution that I have been serving for several decades and, in regard to that, I find that we are practicing inaccuracy in media with a sign on Carnegie which the President referred to in his speech at the City Club but it was not mentioned in the written version. We have a sign up there folks that says we are number two in Fulbrights. That is not so. I am proud to have brought two Fulbrights here in the past and others have done their share but I think that statement is wrong – it's out of date and we are not in the top ten. I would like that issue examined and I hope President Berkman will report back on that. Along those lines, when we tout ourselves as among the best colleges in America, I try to look up the ratings in *US News and World Report* and what you find is we are rated. Claims made by CSU are not written in the report. They are inferred. By extrapolation and interpolation we are probably around 245 so I don't know about best colleges. Now as to the substance. The substance has to do with engineering. The College of Engineering has been renamed. I protested that publicly and openly. I believe faculty was not consulted but the Board of Trustees' chairman conveyed to me his feeling that it had to be done the way it was done. Now I come to the final point. I do not like to learn by the water cooler or in the kitchen or in the printer room about the major change which would affect my college. When the university renamed the College of Engineering and then transfer Computer Science from Business to the College of Engineering it could be a good thing. It could be a bad thing. I do not know, but I don't wish to learn about these things from colleagues' informal remarks. I was hoping that this kind of change would be in the domain of both the President's and the Provost's Offices and also in the domain of the UCC. I communicated that to Bill Kostead and he didn't know really much about it. So I am hoping that can be clarified also. Thanks for your time."

Provost Mageean stated that she can't answer for the President about Dr. Gross's question on content analysis of his speech, but she can talk about Computer Science. She reported that there has been discussion for quite a number of years on where the appropriate place is now for the Computer Science degree. This is something that is also the subject of an external consult. This has been going on and lingering for a while. Talks have been ongoing as to where the appropriate place might be. They went through all of the details for rationale. They then consulted with Dr. Karem and Senate President

Goodell about if this was going to happen, what is the appropriate way in which this would happen. So we then made them aware of the background and context of what this was. We then said, as a first step, we should speak to the faculty. And, as the first step, we should speak to the faculty of the department that would be most affected, namely, the Information Science degree and the Computer Science. She reported that that step has taken place. Simultaneously she put together a faculty body of two members of the Business College, two members of the Engineering College, and two members of the Mathematics Department, because the faculty in the Math Department are critical to this as to what would potentially happen with the curriculum as some of the moves take place. That is where we are. She noted that it has not been a secret and certainly their first effort was immediately to talk to the faculty most affected. The engineering folks have also been made aware of this and this week there was an external review of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and they took that occasion to speak to the external reviewers about this as a possibility. So, that is where we are so far. They had a faculty meeting where they consulted with the Faculty Senate officers on what is the appropriate process to follow.

Provost Mageean commented, as to the sign on Fulbrights, she will check on the situation. She thinks that Dr. Gross might be right. She noted that there are a lot of billboards up at the moment. She said that she is more perplexed by the guarantees and that there a lot of claims up on the billboards.

Senator Claire Robinson May stated that her question is about the Sexual Harassment Policy. She noted that she read an article that was in *The Cleveland Stater* about a plan to have some kind of training experience for students in the first year course. A scenario that would train students on these issues would be included. She commented that she would like to hear more about that. She went on to say that it seems there would be a lot of sensitive things that would come. Certainly a good percentage of our student population coming to this university already have had an experience in this area. She is wondering if putting our students through that role-play experience would bring back those experiences.

Ms. Rachel King, Chief Compliance Officer, responded that there is currently discussion about do we need a module that is by an outside vendor that would be part of the ASC 101 course. The current discussions are that that would be required for the students prior to going to one of the ASC classes in which there would be further discussion about what they have learned in the module. The module from the outside vendor takes our policies and makes it campus-specific. The module would have a map of the Cleveland State campus, and different areas and places you can go are identified on the map. She stated that she doesn't believe there would be role-play. She does think that there would be scenarios in scenario discussions as part of an application of what had been learned in the module. However, she doesn't believe scenario role-play is what is being discussed.

Professor Robinson May stated that the article seemed to say that there were two phases of the training and one seemed to be more of informational and then some kind of immersive experience.

Ms. King responded that she certainly doesn't know that immersive experience would be included. It's an application. Actually she sat through the module and she thinks it's very engaged and interactive, much more so than just a PowerPoint presentation. She added that there are scenarios and there are different things that students have to do to show they actually are engaged with it. For example, slides will come up and students have to answer questions. It's about a forty-five minute module. She noted that this is one step. She added that we also want to make sure that students are able to apply the knowledge that they acquired and so that is the hope with the course.

Professor Robinson May asked it if it would be an opt-out or not because some students might have second thoughts. Ms. King replied that at this point, it is meant to be base information. Certainly there could be case by case situations, but it is not meant to be immersive or in some way traumatize students. It is meant to be very basic information.

Professor Ekelman indicated she had a question for the Provost. She referred to Academic Analytics and the Delaware Study and asked if faculty can have access to those data. Provost Mageean replied that the deans have all of those.

Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange reported that the deans have all of the data just mentioned. The Delaware Study was given to all of the deans and they should have it in their offices. Faculty can ask to look at it, not just for your department, but other departments. Academic Analytics is in each dean's office. There is a minimum of two and in some cases three people that have access to the data-base. So, if anyone is curious about their own department or college, she would suggest that they contact their associate dean.

Provost Mageean added that some departments have already looked at the data so it is available.

Senate Vice President Nigamanth Sridhar reported that the Engineering College dean did share that information with other departments in the college. Professor Duffy added that it was on a department by department basis.

Dr. Goodell stated that next, Professor Rachel Carnell is going to talk to us about what has been going on with the Master Plan and next month's plan and try to formulate some action for us in the next Senate meeting.

## **X. New Business**

### **Campus Master Plan (Report No. 70, 2013-2014)**

Professor Rachel Carnell stated that she was asked to be the faculty representative to the Master Planning Group but she has no prior knowledge of master planning and she was also told before she attended the first meeting that the Master Plan would be completed by the end of June 2014. She said she understands from people who work in this business that this is extremely unusual. It is more usual that there should be a one or two year timeline. She noted that she doesn't know why this process needs to be completed by the end of June and perhaps the Provost can enlighten us about the urgency of what we are doing. She added that she doesn't know where the deadline has come from but it is making the process accelerated to the point that it is hard to understand even for those of us who have been asked to have a stake in it. She reported that the first thing she was told was that the Smith Group JJR comes in from Ann Arbor about once a month and they seem extremely knowledgeable about making master plans. They seem extremely bright, extremely good with data, and extremely responsive. She can email them about anything and they email back to her quite quickly. So, she thinks that the people we have hired seem good as far as this process goes. She doesn't quite understand, and she doesn't think anyone else quite understands, what we are looking for as an end result of this process. Obviously, there is going to be massive funding. The Master Planning group tells her that there are different ways to approach a Master Plan and that the way they have been told to approach this is as an Academic Master Plan. So, that's good from a faculty point of view. What she doesn't understand, is why there is only one faculty member in a room full of people who are not involved in teaching or research as far as she can tell. They are all very nice people, all involved with space and the university and the fund-raising and the neighborhood and all important things and perfectly appropriate to have in the room.

Professor Carnell stated that what she asked for when she spoke with Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange is a faculty open forum which we had last month. We will have another next month. She said she also asked that we should have all department chairs and relevant program directors invited to a meeting because she feels like they know things such as, were faculty trying to schedule a class and there were no classrooms. She knows this sort of thing happen. Or do their instructors complain that the screens don't work or the light doesn't work or all of this little stuff. She noted that that is actually going to happen by the end of the month. She reported the third thing senior administration asked for was a select group of faculty. Some on the Master Planning Committee thought that she was the typical faculty. She decided that that wouldn't be her usual role and she feels that we kick this back to Dr. Joanne Goodell. Dr. Goodell, apparently somehow at some meeting in March, got a new faculty member. She noted that she was hoping to get additional faculty, one from at least each building. She said she doesn't know what the list was or who sent the invitation out, but only three units – nine people from three buildings – and none of those buildings have particular issues, she would say, showed up for that meeting. She commented that she can hear Joanne saying, "What is the group of selected faculty that you guys chose and to whom do we send a reminder notice?" Professor Carnell added that Joanne was a little vague about that so she wants to make sure that her initial reason for coming to Senate today was, okay, can I have the list of the selected faculty you guys chose? She said that she guesses what she is asking Faculty Senate for –she is not the person to choose a

representative faculty member from each building on campus but Faculty Senate could and Faculty Senate could let her know who should come to a meeting which will be scheduled on the 24<sup>th</sup> of April. Professor Carnell stated that this is a very concrete question. Also, Joanne said to her that since she was coming to Faculty Senate, she could give Faculty Senate a little update as to what she is trying to do and to get some sort of faculty input on this process. The fourth thing she is trying to do is switch/change what our group works on. It is a web site or mind mixer and you can kind of sort of get to it from the Cleveland State homepage. She has been trying to get there herself and the way she has managed to get there is to go to the bottom bit of the homepage where it says news. Sometimes those news streams shift about a little bit from day to day and hour to hour, but sometimes the news streams talk about planning Cleveland State's future. She noted that right now it says, "being part of the future of CSU" and if you click on that, you go to a page currently where you can link with the picture of the campus and then you can link to Campus Master Planning.mindmixer.com and you can link to that page and then there is a survey. And, this is what the Smith Group JJR wants people to get involved with. The survey, because she went there and looked at it recently, has something about signage because there is a separate consulting group simply involved in putting up better signage around the campus. She stated then there is a question about parking and then there is a question about how you get to campus.

Professor Carnell noted that she sent an email yesterday to the Smith Group and she said, "If you want faculty input, ought there be some mechanism on this survey page for faculty concerns about academic use of space" and they said, "Oh, that's a great idea." Professor Carnell said that when they put the question into the feedback group, the response was, "Can't Joanne email a link," which is hard to find, so that faculty can provide input across this curious mind/mixer website. She also noted that there was at the open forum for faculty at the end of last month a rather exhaustive set of slides. Several faculty from that meeting are here and at least one of you asked me to get hold of those slides. Those slides are now available if you can get to the mind/mixer website following the news at the bottom part and of the future link. She stated that you have to click a few times to get all these data slides. She was told you would have to go to the site which is below all of the questions about parking and your use of the link. If you go to nearly the very bottom, then you do get a link to a considerable amount of data. She noted that she is happy to have that sent to Faculty Senate.

Dr. Sridhar remarked that it is actually not that hard to find. He stated that if you just type in "CSU Master [Plan@mind.mixer.com](mailto:Plan@mind.mixer.com)" you get the website. Scroll to the bottom and there could be other things.

Professor Carnell added, don't forget to click on for data. If Senate wants input, she will get that back to Senate when there is something appropriate for faculty input. At this point, she said that she could take questions but she was not sure if she could answer them all. She noted that she has also emailed to the Smith Group saying, "If your deadline for this is the end of June – I don't know where that deadline is coming from – how are the faculty supposed to relay input since that is six weeks after the end of the semester." The Smith Group JJR said they are going to continue having open faculty



forums after the semester ends and that I should be the one to be a conduit to encourage faculty to participate. They also asked me to report back to them what you said when I came to you at this meeting. I can report back by email to any of these people at the Smith Group. You can tell me which group of faculty you would like included at the select group of faculty meeting that is scheduled for the morning of Thursday, April 24<sup>th</sup> which will be followed by a noon open forum for faculty on Thursday, the 24<sup>th</sup> and I will have this sent through Joanne to you.

Professor Karem thanked Professor Carnell for reporting to Senate. He said that he had just a bit of feedback to the consultants since there is another faculty forum coming up. He wonders if there is a delicate way to suggest to them that they actually need another forum because the first was very informative but it was an hour straight of PowerPoint slides. This meeting was not engaging or interactive and we had little time for comments and felt very rushed.

Professor Carnell replied that she was actually going to tell them that they needed to allow faculty to speak.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeldt stated that unless she missed it, which is entirely possible, could these dates be publicized to the faculty on the campus forum via email and as many ways as possible because the last forum, the first she heard about it was at the last Faculty Senate meeting when there was only a week to spare. Now she is hearing about another round of meetings with only a week to spare and she thinks her faculty colleagues would like as much notice as possible about this.

Dr. Goodell asked, "Along those lines, how do you think is the best way to get people to volunteer for these meetings. Is it appropriate or useful for faculty to partake in a survey and work with their own individual colleagues or would it be better for me to send a mass email to the entire faculty asking them to reply directly to me?" Professor Carnell replied, "Both." Professor Lehfeldt stated that you can't tell people too many times. Dr. Goodell replied that she is certainly willing to send an email. She then asked if they should reply directly to her. She also asked, "Should you be working with your own colleagues? Should you be asking certain people to do these things? I just don't know what the basic way is to get the word out and to get people to participate so I am looking for direction."

Professor Lehfeldt stated that she certainly thinks caucuses could drum up people from their colleges. That's a reasonable expectation. Professor Carnell stated that this was her hope the last time and no one showed up. Three people showed up from Law, three people showed up from Urban and someone showed up from the Senate which was great but there are lots of buildings with more troubling space needs and those people didn't show. She said that she didn't know who those people were.

Professor Lehfeldt commented that this is the end of the semester and people are being given less than a week's notice about attending these meetings. Again, as with so many things, people are willing to act in good faith and be participants in this process but

they are willing to do that with enough notice and without a rushed timetable. She said that she thinks that President Goodell should publicize it as much as she possibly can. We here at Senate take on the task of persuading our colleagues to attend if possible but, beyond that, at this late stage of the semester, guaranteeing wide-spread participation is probably a fool's error.

Professor Carnell, replied, "Absolutely. I was asked to do this but I have no control over this."

Senator Barbara Margolius said that she just wanted to confess to being guilty of not going to the Provost's group meeting. She knows that there were a couple of days of advance notice but she had already agreed to cover a colleague's class. She does intend to come the next time. She seems to remember that she got an email from the Committee on Space and she got an email from Professor Kathleen Little.

Dr. Goodell stated that there was communication to the chairs and there was some understanding from someone in the Architect's Office that either Professor Carnell or she was supposed to be doing the inviting for all of the chairs. Professor Carnell said that she will be inviting the chairs for next year.

Provost Mageean noted that she had not heard all this until yesterday. She was unaware of these faculty meetings but likewise asked for more of these meetings. She said that she will take it upon herself to do a blitzkrieg email to all of the faculty and send it out to encourage people to attend. Getting a joint email from both of them and several other communications that we will try to get faculty to do that. She added that she is not trying to dodge the question but she thinks Vice President Stephanie McHenry can say something about the things that are coming up very rapidly.

Vice President Stephanie McHenry thanked everyone for their participation. She will say that the Smith Group does have on its team academic specialists that are gathering data and also looking at data that we have had for a while. She noted that she mentioned this at the last Senate meeting. One of the reasons it could go faster is because we had a report from "Site Lines" about two or three years ago they spent many months around here gathering building condition information. So that information is already available and it has been forwarded to the Master Planning group. We also had a consulting group looking at classroom usage, scheduling and things like that. That was about six months ago. That report has also been provided. So, it is not correct to think that the Smith Group is starting with no information and that we are just trying to gather everything quickly from the faculty. She noted that the senior administration knew that this process would involve two trains running along similar tracks. One, the academic strategy work that the Provost is leading which really drives what needs to happen in the colleges as well as the physical Master Plan. There are two reasons that we are trying to move quickly. First, we are done with the last Master Plan. So right now, we do not have a context in which to think about what to do with various buildings and space. As everyone can imagine, demands come across on a daily basis on how to prioritize projects, how to figure out where to put scarce resources. The second driving force, if

people haven't noticed, is the real estate in downtown is heating up quite a bit. The vacancy rate downtown she understands now is less than five percent for available units and we have developers and people approaching us about what's going on around our campus, the space that we own, and can they be any part of it and can they do things. So it's becoming more and more important that we have a context in which we consider those requests and that's part of why this is going on so quickly. It will be a living document. We will have in theory at the end of June a draft Master Plan that will be very informed by all of the things discussed today as well as whatever else we gather in this process. But, that doesn't mean that we are going to start breaking ground all over campus and spending lots of money.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones commented that as far as people participating, she thinks that if people know what's going on, there might be some self-selection in terms of people who might want to go or we can identify appropriately which persons in our departments might participate most effectively. So, we need some sort of summary or statement. It seems like our colleague who might do the meeting found out something this year in terms of what they were doing without having a sense of the importance of this work. It's hard for people to prioritize and get in some of the other demands. Dr. Davis Jones asked, "With the request for the dates for the meetings, can we also obtain a data synopsis of what's going on?"

Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Davis Jones if she meant synopsis of what's going to happen at the next meeting or what has already happened at the previous meeting. Dr. Davis Jones replied, "Perhaps both or the function, the role; why is this going on and what is the importance of it?"

Professor Lehfeltdt noted that Vice President McHenry just said it would be great to contact the Smith Group and that request could be included in the email so that people sort of understood the whys and the wherefores, and the timetable. She added that that would get some people involved.

Dr. Goodell commented, "So, that would be included in the email that the Provost and she will jointly send out." Provost Mageean agreed and said, "What she just said pretty much."

Professor Lieske commented that what he senses here, Professor Carnell is saying that we have a token or symbolic representation on this Master Planning Committee. He said that he thinks that in an ideal world, we would like to see a faculty advisory committee to give our input to the Master Planning Committee because there are a lot of important decisions that are being made. One of the decisions that was made, that we had no input over, was the planned sale of the Heritage Building, the Y Building and our understanding he believes was that the university was going to try to move toward a more residential campus. He thinks that there are so many important issues that the faculty could give their input on and he doesn't see why faculty can't have an advisory faculty committee appointed to look over the shoulders of the Master Planning Committee to give our input. He asked, "Is it possible? Could we have an advisory committee

appointed by Dr. Goodell or the Senate Vice President or the Senate Secretary to represent our concerns with this?"

Dr. Goodell replied, "I am not sure. There are two issues – there is the Academic Space Committee of the Senate and then there is the Provost's Space Committee which Provost Mageean is going to talk about now."

Provost Mageean stated that she didn't think there would be a timeline for this pending the close of the semester of putting together an advisory committee right now. She said that she thinks, as Vice President McHenry said, this is a living document and in fact just having been on the phone with the Smith Group yesterday, and talking about enrollment and just the numbers we might be looking at in years to come, and what kind of students, they are going to present their scenarios to us. It is going to be a living document that will be interpreted and applied. And, obviously we know course corrections have been made. She reported that she has set up a Space Committee that includes three members from the Senate Academic Space Committee and all other people she could think who would have possible influence and something to say about space. We can look at that Space Committee, the limitation and the interpretation going forth. It has good representation from the faculty. The students have something to do with space. The committee will have one authority to talk about space at this university which is critical for all the reasons that Vice President McHenry said. We are not likely to bargain in any great process, but having just gone through this at her previous institution where it wasn't one or two years, it was a much bigger university with big campuses throughout. Provost Mageean added that interestingly, we are coming to a tipping point right now because of the whole enrollment scene with a huge adjustment so these things are really happening.

Senator Claire Robinson May stated that this has to do with the relationship between the University Strategic Plan and the University Master Plan. This is a comment that one of her colleagues from the Law School made. She added, it's a very good one and relating to faculty input. He suggested that once there is a preliminary version of what the academic and other priorities will be with respect to allocation of space, that, at that time, if that can be shared with faculty and faculty could give appropriate and timely input in context, that would probably be more useful than raw survey data. Because the Master Plan is really dependent upon the University Strategic Plan. However, they are running, as we heard with two trains on parallel tracks. If we get the preliminary report on one, then faculty will give useful input on the other. Professor Robinson May noted that suggestions for how to obtain more faculty input, the meetings and the forums sound like they have some utility but the input that would come from knowing what those priorities might be, again faculty input at that point could be useful.

Dr. Goodell said, "Yes, that would happen. For the University Space Committee, that is going to be really doing a lot more work. I would hopefully rather think of the plan as a draft plan or a beginning plan or something like that rather than the final plan. With structures in place, they are going to need to go forward but rest assured that the Senate is on pace."

Professor Carnell commented that she is gathering from Senate that people do not believe that timeframe is reasonable but she is hoping for as many people as can attend and she will be sure that they (planning committee) say less and listen more. She is gathering that this committee may not want to have a selected faculty by this group. If Senate does, then faculty should let Joanne Goodell know that they would like to do that. She noted that there are two separate meetings and faculty should let Joanne know if they would like to do that.

Dr. 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 4:55 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy  
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel