

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

MARCH 19, 2014

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, Delatte, Delgado, Duffy, Ekelman, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, Gross, R. Henry, Hoffman, M. D. Jones, Karem, S. Kaufman, Kosteas, Krebs, Lehfeltd, J. Lieske, Little, Majette, Margolius, Marino, C. May, Meier, Nawalaniec, Resnick, Rickett, Sridhar, Steinberg, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, Wolf.

M. Bond, Dumski, J. Ford, Mageean, McHenry, Sawicki, G. Thornton, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Dixit, Doerder, Geier, Gorla, D. Jackson, Jayanti, Kalafatis, Kent, Liggett, Niederriter, Rashidi, Talu, M. Walton, Welfel, J. G. Wilson, Witmer-Rich.

Artbauer, R. Berkman, Boise, C. Brown, Halasah, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, Novy, Parry, Sadlek, Spademan, Stoll, Triplett, Ward, Wehner, B. White, Zachariah.

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

I. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of March 19, 2014

Senate President Goodell stated that Senate needs to approve the Agenda for today's meeting. She asked if there were any amendments to the Agenda. Dr. Bill Kosteas, Chair of UCC, stated that Item VIII. A. 6. Bachelor of Music in Composition, needs to be removed from the Agenda since apparently there are mistakes in the proposal.

Dr. Goodell then asked for a motion to approve the Agenda. It was moved and seconded by Senator Visocky-O'Grady and the Agenda as amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of September 11, 2013

Dr. Goodell moved to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of September 11, 2013. She asked if there were any amendments to the September Minutes. There were no

amendments to the Minutes. She then asked for a motion to approve the Minutes. It was moved and seconded and the Minutes of the meeting of September 11, 2013 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Goodell stated that her report will be short. She welcomed everyone to Senate's second official meeting of the semester. She said she hoped that everyone had a great spring break including the four plus inches of snow we got. She noted that she did manage to get caught up a little bit and hopefully everyone did too.

Dr. Goodell reported that first of all, the Admissions and Standards Committee will not be presenting the proposal on Academic Milestones since there isn't really a proposal at this stage. The Admissions and Standards Committee was asked by the Undergraduate Student Success Committee to comment on the possibility of introducing milestones across the board in undergraduate programs as a way of helping students chart a pathway to graduation.

Professor James Marino, chair of the Admissions and Standards Committee, reported that he will speak for information purposes but there won't be an action item.

Dr. Goodell stated that this is one strategy, along with prescriptive degree maps and what-if degree maps that are suggested by the report "Hardwiring Student Success" published in 2009 by the Advisory Board Company for the University Leadership Council. The Undergraduate Student Success Committee is considering other recommendations from that report as well, so if anyone is interested in reading that report, they can download a pdf and read it. If anyone wants to know the exact details, they should see Dr. Goodell at the end of today's meeting or they can send an email to her and she will send them the link.

Dr. Goodell continued stating that as everyone probably knows, the metrics by which our success as a university are judged have recently changed to include more of a focus on graduation rates for all students, not just first-time full-time freshmen as was the case just a few years ago. If anyone wants to know more about this, she would encourage people to go to a presentation by David Cannon from OBOR on Wednesday, March 26 at 12:00 PM in the Student Center Ballroom. She noted that this was organized by Senate's OFC (Ohio Faculty Council) representative Dr. Mekki Bayachou. She thanked Professor Bayachou very much for doing that. Dr. Goodell noted that David Cannon will give an overview of the new State funding formula for Higher Education and the implications of this for CSU. She encouraged everyone to attend if they can.

Dr. Goodell reported that the 4-3 conversion is almost done from a Senate perspective. There are far fewer proposals on the Agenda to approve this time, so now the faculty focus will shift to advising. She stated that "The Big Switch" signage and related communication methods seem to be working well for most programs. The Registrar's Office keeps the transition team up-to-date on the progress with advising, and

for the most part, advising is well underway. The 2014-2015 schedule is already up on Campus Net and so the next big deadline is March 31, 2014 when registration opens. Hopefully, the staggered opening dates and the advanced schedule of advising will avoid a last-minute rush to register in August. She asked everyone to please keep on encouraging their students to complete the transition advising and register for Fall as soon as possible.

Dr. Goodell stated another plea from her to everyone to comment on the email policy that the university is considering adopting. The Academic Technology Committee will be bringing its feedback to Senate at the next meeting. Everyone can also provide input on the university General Counsel Feedback for the draft policies page. She added that if people can't find it, just google General Counsel CSU Ohio draft policies and they will find it or just go to the General Counsel page and it is right on that page.

Dr. Goodell stated that this takes on more importance now, given that the new email system has not turned out to be better than the old one, at least from her perspective as a Mac user. The email policy contains a proposal that would disallow faculty to forward all mail to another account without first going through the Exchange server as we can now. She said that she would urge everyone if they are having email issues, such as messages disappearing from their inbox as she has had, to please contact the IS&T helpline to report the issue and get help. She noted that she did and was advised that the Mac mail client does not synchronize correctly with the Microsoft exchange server that we now use so thanks to the long-standing feud between Bill Gates (Microsoft) and Steve Jobs (Apple), she has had to switch to the Apple mail client which is certainly less functional for her than Outlook. Dr. Goodell asked everyone to please make their comments on that policy.

Dr. Goodell reminded everyone that we now have an Office of University Compliance and a Chief Compliance Officer, Rachel King. Dr. Goodell noted that she is still looking for someone to take her place at the Institutional Compliance Committee's first meeting on March 26, 2014 because she unfortunately will be out of town on that day. Dr. Goodell asked that if there is anyone who is willing to be the Senate representative and go to that first meeting of the committee, please let her know. She added that she will be doing some arm twisting if she gets no volunteers! She will be the representative for the remaining meetings this year.

Dr. Goodell noted that the Provost is going to do both the President's and the Provost's report.

IV. Report of the President of the University

President Berkman was not present and there was no President's report.

V. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Deirdre Mageean commented that she is not really pretending to be the President or actually giving his report. She noted that she would like to use the President's time allocation for is actually to speak a little bit about the master planning process. She stated that the President has mentioned to people and some might be aware that the university put out the bids for firms who will work with us on the master planning process – these are all the firms that are experienced working with universities on these issues. The Smith Group, JJR was awarded the contract to work with us. They have been to campus and visited us and actually had meetings with a number of people. She reported that she was asked to nominate a faculty representative, which she did, but she thinks that it was quickly brought to their attention that they needed more than one faculty representative so there are plans to take the plans and timeline to tie meetings with the faculty. She noted that in the short time she has, she wanted to try to give Senate an overview. At this point, Provost Mageean distributed a flier on the master plan and where people can go to get more information and who to contact, etc.

Provost Mageean stated that obviously the planning is academically driven. The focus is on the academic buildings and on innovation and collaboration. Given the changing pedagogies or focusing on the kinds of resources that we have, how we can improve learning and classroom space. We have to align the physical campus with the university's missions and its values and expectations. These efforts have to be inclusive of both the internal constituencies and the faculty, staff and students but also external constituencies, communities in which we live, folks that we interact with. It has to be based on analysis of existing and future campus systems and has to represent a long range vision that defines opportunities for change. Most importantly, it has to be fundable to be implemented. She added that our plan produces what we call a living document in a sense that these plans must change because you have to constantly re-visit them given changes in enrollment and shifts and where the students are going and classroom needs and technology needs. Provost Mageean stated that additional components would involve things like sustainability, circulation, transportation, land use, acquisition planning, infrastructure capacity, facility condition consideration, open space and land scape improvements, signage, way-finding, phasing.

Provost Mageean noted that the Smith Group was actually founded back in 1863 so they precede the university by at least 100 years and they are the oldest continuously operating architecture, planning, engineering firm with 800 employees and ten offices. She noted that she had absolutely no involvement in the choice of this firm but in the interest of full disclosure, she has worked with them at her previous institution and found them to be an exceptionally good firm to work with. They listen and they are one of the few groups that she knows that have people who have expertise and academic pedagogy and understands the notion of pedagogy to physical space so that is good for us. They have recently worked with universities like Memphis, the University of Toledo, Temple University and Las Vegas and Arizona State. She knows that it is on a pretty quick timeline. At this point, Provost Mageean asked Vice President Stephanie McHenry if she knows what the timeline is on this. Vice President McHenry replied that they will be done by June 30, 2014.

Provost Mageean stated that they have developed what we call a five-step planning process. The schedule is six campus visits as they progress from discovery and listening to analysis to generation and finance. So, there will be regular monthly meetings on campus with the executive team. The process includes regularly scheduled open houses, focus group meetings and on line portals for those unable to attend physical planning meetings. She noted that the web site detailed on the handout she just distributed has been open for two weeks. She added that in case people have some time on their hands, there are 750 page views and we have had 200 visitors so far. Provost Mageean reported that the next visit is March 26 – 28 so that is coming right up. That has open times for students on March 26 in the atrium in the Student Center from 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM. Then March 27 is open house for faculty in the Main Classroom auditorium from 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM. In addition, there are one on one meetings with deans and different groups. So some of the questions they are looking at the faculty might be thinking about. They are planning to attend the meetings or look at the web site, what should be looked at in ten years or thirty years from now, how can the master plan address changes in the things like curriculum, technology, pedagogy that are reshaping the learning environment here at CSU.

Provost Mageean asked, “What is the optimum enrollment size for us; what is the mix – the ratio of undergraduate, graduate, professional cohorts knowledge in the future and also the demographic makeup our students might be in the future.” Provost Mageean noted, “And what does it mean to be an urban campus and specifically one that wants to be an urban commuter campus and how can we further enhance the student experience both for our residence student population and for the commuter students? How do we count connections to the city, strengthen that partnership with the city and campus? What is the future of Rhodes Tower, and how can we enhance a beautiful urban campus that fosters pleasant memories?” Provost Mageean stated that those are the touch points; those are some of the things that can be expected to be covered in these open forums. She added that hopefully there will be plenty of time for inputs. If people can’t attend the meetings, they can still use the conduits through their departments and through their deans and colleges or direct questions to some of the people involved on the web site. Provost Mageean stated that this is all of the information that she has at hand at the moment. She went on to say that they are going to be very heavily involved working with us very closely from now right through to the end. She then asked if anyone had any specific questions.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones commented that Professor Robert Simons in the College of Urban Affairs is working with some students on something that is called the master plan and asked if that plan is related at all to the master plan Provost Mageean talked about. Provost Mageean replied, “Yes, they are actually working with the group.”

Vice President Stephanie McHenry commented that is why we can get this done so quickly; we have done some work in advance and part of that was to commission Dr. Simons to look at the plan, the external variables around real estate in our area, the demand for housing, the demand for retail and all of that information will be fed into the process.

Provost Mageean noted that we have an excellent College of Urban Affairs and they will use some of our external expertise.

Senator Beth Ekelman inquired if there will be other opportunities for faculty to provide input other than the one focus group. Provost Mageean replied, "None that are currently scheduled." She added that if the demand exists, they could probably accommodate that; it is important that we hear from all of the constituents.

Senate President Goodell reported that Professor Rachel Carnell is the Senate's representative chosen by the Provost and she had included Dr. Goodell on a couple of emails between her and someone from the architect's office and asked Senate to choose faculty to attend a focused group meeting and Dr. Goodell replied immediately and said, "Please give me the details of when and where the meeting will be, date time and location and we will convene some faculty but I have not heard back from her. So as soon as she gets back, she will ask and send an email to the entire Senate and each caucus will be requested to choose faculty from people who represent all the different kinds of teaching settings that your college occupies. So the College of Sciences, you have a big job to get lots of people from different settings. Education, we might not have such a big job but in fact very few of us teach in that building; it is mostly office space. That will be coming if and when I get any reply back from the architect's office on that."

Senator Jeff Karem indicated that he had a question about the timeline probably because he is presenting a timeline later on regarding the SEI. He stated that he is curious what's driving the need to complete this by July 2014 which, he understands, this is a fiscal year but it is not at the end of an academic year. He noted that he is somewhat of an urban planner and master plans usually take longer than this and it is wonderful coming from Urban. He asked if there is some State mandate or some budget or is there a grant that we are applying for. He commented that it just seems like this is pretty fast-track to him.

Provost Mageean responded that we have done a lot of the building that we are going to do for a while, unlike her previous institution where they were expanding on two different campuses. She noted that there is less scope for further growth or expansion but she would let Vice President McHenry speak to that.

Vice President McHenry noted that Provost Mageean is right. She stated that a couple of other factors are clearly the real estate market around us is heating up things in case people haven't noticed. She said that we need a context in which to consider many requests that come our way in terms of would you like to buy this building, would you like to sell that building, and can I build this on the last piece of land that you have left to the North. So it is imperative that we get the context in place as soon as possible. She noted that the other reason they are moving quickly is because not only do we have the work that Dr. Simons did, we also have the site line report. She added that in the last three years, they actually have gone through all of the buildings and assessed their condition. That can be fed into this and that is the reason they took so long but they

already have that information. Vice President McHenry stated that in addition they went through the rigorous process of selling bonds in 2012 and so there are some projects that we do have to get done from a basic facilities perspective. This will allow us to focus the time we have on our academic space and that will complete some of the other information they already had.

Senator Robert Krebs noted that as Vice President McHenry had commented, we have been doing a lot of building and his question is, "Is that outside of the master plan then or just a matter of filling in space?" The word just came out yesterday that CSU is selling the YMCA building but most people probably don't realize that we own it. He asked Vice president McHenry to comment on this.

Vice President McHenry stated that the last formally approved master plan by the Board of Trustees was done in about 2004. Much of what people see that has happened in the last ten years came from that plan. Now it is time to look again at the next five to ten years. She stated that in terms of the YMCA Building, that is owned by the Euclid Avenue Development Corporation which is a non-profit affiliate of CSU that owns the dorms and a couple of parking garages. This is going on to the market because it doesn't exactly fit with the rest of our housing portfolio. CSU bought that building in a defensive move because it came on the market in a foreclosure. We wanted to make sure that the use wasn't something that was inconsistent with what we want to have near our campus so we bought it a few years ago. She noted that it has proven to be a successful student housing option. It has been over 90% occupied its entire time. She added that by demonstrating the market, it would be better to have a private development come in and operate it so that we can focus on our core buildings.

Provost Mageean stated that it is indicative of how the market is. One of the things CSU is very proud of is being part of the revitalization of the downtown area and that speaks well of our partnership with the City. She commented that the flip side of that of course is the real estate market is heating up and very soon opportunities the university might have for expansion or redesign start closing in on us. She added that we are kind of victims of our success. Provost Mageean stated that perhaps in the interest of time, if there are any additional questions, we can get into them later on during the open question time.

Provost Mageean commented that she wanted to add to efforts Professor Jeff Karem has on student evaluation. She noted that it struck her that given all of the good work that he had done and the team had done, we are still stuck with a rather arcane system of administering the evaluation, namely the forms that you have to fill in in pencil and then send them to the scantron and it struck her that during this technological age there are better ways of doing this. There may be ways of actually using things like our smart phones and other platforms to do this. She reported that we actually looked into that and found that there were at least three or four vendors of platforms that allow these things to be done, not just for online courses but in classrooms and would actually be supported by smart phones and the like. Provost Mageean stated that according to Jeff Karem, nobody has made any moves on anything but we have been doing some

investigation long before we actually bought a license for one of them. Many of our sister institutions are using these so we are having good conversations and so the administration is committed in working with Jeff Karem and helping to support their good work. Evaluations can still be done in classroom while you have students there but if it can be done electronically, it bypasses all that scantron stuff, the use of paper, carrying things over to and from a department and also better archive data-basing. She added that it may or may not work for us. That is why we are involved in discussions at this early stage but she just wanted to alert everyone to the fact that there are some opportunities to enhance the good work of the committee. Hopefully the design of the questionnaire will make us better at completion, better at data storage, and better archiving of our information.

Senator Joel Lieske commented that he thought that one of our strategic agendas of the university was to move toward a more residential housing for our students so he doesn't fully understand our giving up a piece of our real estate for private development when we are trying to get more student housing. The central principle of urban planning is that you don't give up land particularly in a central city location where we depend upon that land for future development and so he is wondering what the rationale is for giving up the land.

Provost Mageean replied that it is not giving up. She noted that one of the things most universities are finding out is that rather than building dorms and residences themselves, there are many parties that will build these things at their expense and then provide accommodations for students and then we can interact and plan and have agreements with them. It is actually much more cost efficient for the university to provide residential accommodation and that is what is going on. There are plans for the old Jewish Federation building downtown and others where there are private vendors interested in doing these kind of things. Provost Mageean stated that obviously the market dictates in many ways by cost of being a residential student how many will come and how many can afford to live downtown and results of the attractiveness of it and most universities are doing what we are doing which is engaging third party vendors to build these things. She added that it certainly would be her experience and CSU's to be completely normative in that way. She stated that again, in the interest of time, perhaps we can leave any further questions on this to the on campus meetings

Provost Mageean said that she wanted to speak a little bit about advising and this is really bouncing off the four to three conversion. We are moving along and we are tracking very carefully with what departments have made in the way of student appointments and where the files are being reviewed. Some departments are doing an excellent job; some need to get going. The departments we would be worried about are the very large departments for whom, if the advising appointments are not staggered, they certainly in fact create quite a tsunami when the registration opens. She said that she would, along with Senate President Goodell, encourage everyone to keep up the effort to be proactive and get the students in. She said that she knows that we can't always get students to come in when we want them to come in but every effort will be made to be proactive and reach out and get them in for advising. Provost Mageean noted that one of

the side effects or consequences of all of this exercise (and she is sure there are many), but a very positive one is this has caused many departments to really ask those questions about how they do advising and what is the ultimate way of doing it. It certainly has revealed to her the many and varied ways in which it is done, done well and not done very well, across the university. Some colleges have a centralized system and in some colleges it very much falls on the faculty and we know increasingly that the role of the advisor is an absolutely critical one in student success. It is one of the many things that contribute toward student success and it is part of our mission. The university should be focused on advising and it takes on an added importance now that we are going to be budget controlled by the attrition rates and the graduation rates and completion rates. Gordon Gee said many things and many that people wished that he hadn't said, but one of the sound things that he did say was that access and affordability are no bargain without completion. Provost Mageean commented that this is a great thing to remember. Access and affordability is no bargain without completion. All universities struggle with this. Interestingly, over the last ten years, public universities that manage to shift the first year attrition rate from 29% to just above 26% that is not moving the needle a whole lot in ten years. Ironically, as they have focused on the first year attrition, upper class attrition has actually risen in the same period from 29.1% to 30.6% so they have one step forward and two back instead of two steps forward and one step back.

Provost Mageean said that she really does applaud the work of the Student Success Committee headed by Professor Barbara Margolius and she thinks it is again another good example as the transition team of faculty and administrators working together to address a very uncommon concern. The reports that Dr. Goodell referred to which now the team has a current revised version is produced by the Education Advisory Boards and they have done some very interesting work in this area. She stated that we all are now committed to really moving forward – the administration working with the Faculty Senate and others to move forward on such things as better degree maps, milestone courses, gateway courses, strategic kinds of advising and maybe better software or better assistance to help advisors in their job. This has to be our number one focus as we move forward. Provost Mageean stated that she really looks forward to working on implementation. Often universities have created task forces and we spend a lot of precious time in the Senate to produce recommendations and then the reports kind of sit there and nothing ever happens. But, everyone really has her commitment that this is going to be a prime focus and she looks forward to continuing to work with the Student Success Committee and with the other committees of the Faculty Senate to move forward. We want to implement those things that will ensure success for our students – not just in their first year, but the second and all the way through to graduation. Provost Mageean stated that we will start to hear more of this as we move forward and look at what things we can start implementing in the short term, the mid-term and the long term. She said that she thinks probably there is a remarkable consensus for what we can do and that is appropriate given that we are all chasing the same target.

**VI. Report of the Student Government Association
(Report No. 55, 2013-2014)**

Ms. Allie Dumski, President of the Student Government Association, thanked everybody on Faculty Senate for the discussion and feedback that SGA had after the last meeting. She stated that SGA much appreciated the candid and productive feedback that they received from numerous faculty and administration on various issues. It has been extremely helpful for the different projects that SGA is working on. She stated that this communication is definitely necessary for both of us to achieve our goals in serving the students.

Ms. Dumski stated that unlike some of the previous SGA updates, she did not plan to come up in front of Senate and tell everyone what they have been doing for the last month. Instead, she is really taking the whole advocacy thing to a new level and she plans to present a different issue every month that she attends Senate and hopefully that faculty can help the students with.

Ms. Dumski brought up a couple of issue that SGA has seen with the new schedules. SGA has received a lot of complaints from the Business students on scheduling and the lack of evening courses that are available for them. Ms. Dumski stated that if there is any feedback that she can answer questions for these students, it would be very helpful.

Ms. Dumski announced that SGA elections are coming up – April 14th or 17th – and there is competition this year for the Executive Board and she knows it is exciting. In addition, the U-Pass is going to be on the ballot which is a huge issue for students. A lot of people are in favor and a lot of people are also against it and it is up to the students to vote and she asked everyone to encourage their students to vote that week in April.

Ms. Dumski reported that the conversation with textbooks is not over. She commented that SGA is continuing to do research to create some sort of reserve on campus. They are talking to other universities right now about how they handle their reserves comparing and seeing what SGA can do to accommodate and do something similar. She went on to say that a reserve would be useless unless we explore the idea of standardizing some textbooks. She stated that she is suggesting that we standardize textbooks for courses at the 200 level and below as well as text books for general education courses. In addition, the books should remain the required text for a specific length of time which is three years. She commented that everyone should look for more information on that.

Finally, Ms. Dumski said that today she would like to discuss the utilization of Black Board. She noted that it was down last night and she is sure that some faculty might have received emails from upset students but that is not what she wanted to talk about. She realizes that many professors do use it to the fullest but there are still some that don't use it very much at all so that is why she is asking for everyone's help. There are many functions that are available to students through Black Board such as posting homework problems, quizzes, tests, submitting assignments and of course posting grades. She noted that many courses are requiring computer applications that students have to purchase to complete homework problems, quizzes, etc. She noted that the big thing is

posting grades. Yes, the students should know their grades from their assignments that they receive back but it gives the students the ability to take some ownership of their progress and have accurate up-to-date knowledge of their grade if it is posted on Black Board. She noted that students already pay for Black Board in their tuition so the students are encouraging faculty to tell their colleagues to use it as much as possible and help the students save a couple of dollars here and there.

Ms. Dumski thanked everyone.

Senate President Goodell commented that this is a welcome change in our focus. She added that she agrees about posting grades on Black Board.

VII. Budget and Finance Committee Informational Items (Report No. 56, 2013-2014)

Senator Andrew Resnick, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, stated that he had three items to present to Faculty Senate this month: 1) Standard Reporting Items, 2) Initial estimate of the financial impact of the 4-3 conversion and related Graduation Incentive Plan, 3) Miscellaneous Fees.

1. Standard Reporting Items. Dr. Resnick stated that the State Legislature issued a new Higher Education Chairman's Report for this year. He noted that two of the charges that are related to our committee are to identify opportunities to improve the quality of higher education while reducing cost and examine policy issues affecting higher education. Professor Resnick reminded Senate that he had mentioned at the beginning of this year that there are a lot of financial stressors acting on higher education and one of these stressors is the increase in tuition back to 2003. He noted that clearly it is higher than the rate of inflation. But the next two charts in the material in the Senate meeting packet are of more interest especially when we start talking about miscellaneous fees which are related to financial aid and student debt. For the State of Ohio at four-year campuses, 39% of the students receive federal financial aid in an amount on average of approximately \$5,000. At the institutional level, approximately 60% of students receive financial aid. The result of all of this financial aid is the increase in student debt. Nationally, that has been tagged as a major problem. In the State of Ohio, almost 70% of our students graduate with on average \$30,000 in debt while graduating with a Bachelor's Degree. That puts Ohio well above the national average for student debt. CSU, in particular, is below the State average. Professor Resnick commented that he didn't see what the national average is and so he is not sure how we can compare nationally, but even so, almost 60% of our students are graduating with approximately \$25,000 worth of debt. Professor Resnick noted that these facts are going to play into a concern our Budget Committee has about miscellaneous fees.

Professor Resnick stated that in terms of general budget building activities for the upcoming year, these activities will take place with a budget being projected at the end of FY 14. The Budget and Planning Committee is going through detailed meetings with

colleges to determine the enrollment projections for next year. He noted that we do have a 2% limit on an undergraduate tuition increase and there are ongoing salary negotiations.

2. Financial Impact of 4-3 Conversion to the Budget. Dr. Resnick reported that there are two parts to this: one is the actual conversion itself and the next is the graduation incentive plan. The initial estimate for the 4-3 conversion was, as they use in physics, done in the spirit of approximation. The administration viewed total enrollment under the students, how many credit hours they are currently enrolled in, and then use the assumption that those students will enroll in the same number of courses. So the credit hours per course decreases resulting in fewer student credit hour tuition revenue hits. He noted that running the numbers through using fall 2013 as a base line and assuming typical attrition losses from fall to spring semester, the initial projection is for approximately a \$2 million reduction in tuition revenue from the 4-3 conversion. The Committee wants to point out that this current estimate is likely to be optimistic because it does not take into account the change to the graduate programs and the impact of the graduation waivers. Every time the students graduate with fewer than 120 credit hours, CSU losses \$337.8 per credit hour.

Dr. Resnick noted that there are also issues related to the tuition band and we are not sure how that will affect the bottom line. The main point Dr. Resnick wanted to make is that we feel that a \$2 million decrease in revenue is likely to be optimistic. He reported that in terms of the graduation incentive plan, he wanted to remind everybody that there are six major criteria required for undergraduate students to receive a rebate on the tuition increase and the textbook credit. Students have to be in good standing, show initial progress to their degree and Dr. Resnick believes there is a grade point average as well. Again, the Committee estimates approximately 3,500 students will qualify for this benefit with a total expense of \$1.3 million per year. The committee notes that taken together, the \$2 million and \$1.3 million losses in revenue is almost exactly equal to the surplus revenue that CSU has enjoyed the past year or two. He went on to say that that revenue is typically returned to the colleges in a fashion so we are just pointing out that this 4-3 conversion and graduation incentive plan has a possibility of eliminating that surplus revenue.

Senator Krebs stated he had a question concerning the first category. He noted that if you take 15 credits or 18 credits, the fee is the same. Dr. Resnick noted that this relates to a line item in the fall so 85% of students rely on this tuition band. If a student took 18 credit hours and then reduced to 15 credit hours, there is no impact to the tuition revenue. However, it is possible for a student to be currently enrolled in 13 credit hours and then as a result of conversion enrolls for only 11 credit hours, then there is going to be a loss of tuition revenue. He added that he doesn't know how often that is going to happen, that was not accounted for in this projection.

Senator Barbara Margolius asked, "Why would we be assuming that the credit hours necessarily are going to go down if the student would still like to graduate in a reasonable period of time?"

Professor Resnick replied that again, the assumption of this projection is that students would remain enrolled in the same number of courses and those undergraduate courses have been converted from four credit hours to three credit hours.

Professor Margolius stated that she is aware of several things. She knows that four is four thirds of three and three is three fourths of four. If students still need to take 120 credit hours to graduate, don't they need to take like four thirds of many courses? She said she knows we are dropping from 128 to 120 credit hours. Professor Resnick replied that he understands but again that is a limitation model.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltd commented that it is a limitation of the model but it is also a limitation of how we have been advising students because she is not sure of the message that the students need to take more courses in order to stay on track for a timely graduation has been part of what we have been telling them.

Professor Resnick noted that that is a legitimate point. We don't really know the impacts on enrollment that this change is going to have so that is one reason why the current budget building process is happening in a much finer resolution because we honestly don't know how the overall response will play out.

Senator Bill Kosteas stated that he is worried about students who try to take on too many credit hours now. What he envisions is that students who are currently taking say 16 credit hours reason, "Well, I can take 15 or 18 for the same amount of money." Dr. Kosteas commented that he can see that students wouldn't want to take 20 credit hours. He is worried about those students. It's less a revenue issue but becomes more of a student success issue when too many students try to bite off more than they can chew. They will try to bump up to 18 credit hours which is not an immediate but a longer term budget ramification because they will be in that five part tuition band a year longer. He went on to say that he really worries that what the students are going to do is try to jump up to 18 credit hours and not be able to handle the workload and then they will start withdrawing. This is compounded by the fact that students don't seem to understand that withdrawals hurt their financial aid prospects in the future. He feels that we haven't really addressed that issue sufficiently. He added that hopefully we will be able to communicate that during advising but, again, because of the rushed process the 4 to 3 conversion has been from the beginning, there hasn't been enough time to address all these issues. Professor Kosteas noted that students are receiving information. Cards that were distributed said "Take Five" courses per semester to graduate but he still does worry that some students are going to be overly ambitious. He doesn't know what safe-guards we have in place or we could consider putting some safe-guards in place.

Dr. Resnick replied that Dr. Kosteas made a fair point. He further stated that this is our zero order of approximation of next year's budget. We don't quite know how the students are going to respond.

3. Miscellaneous Fee Schedule. Dr. Resnick noted that the last point is in regards to miscellaneous fees. They are financial stressors. The notion of miscellaneous

fees being sort of a bunch of sundries and the Provost used the phrase “death of a thousand cuts” is a very accurate representation. Miscellaneous fees are determined by specific courses the students enroll in and their fees are designed to offset the costs of those particular courses. He noted that the issue that we raise is that the miscellaneous fees schedule is not subject to Board of Trustee approval or State tuition increase limits. It is outside of the normal tuition approval process. He noted that it does not really appear to be a longitudinal record of miscellaneous fees so the committee is just mentioning this in the event that the President or the Provost are called to task on using miscellaneous fees as an additional source of revenue. It would be nice for them to have the information on the use of miscellaneous fees, and right now, those records do not exist. Dr. Resnick noted that this concludes his report.

Professor Lieske commented that in regards to the technology fees his understanding is that one-third of the technology fees we collect are directed toward eLearning or directed to other uses in the university. Dr. Resnick replied that he can't speak to that. The miscellaneous fees schedule he has is massive.

Professor Lieske asked if it is possible that some of the technology money could go to defray the cost of books for students.

Provost Mageean reported that she has had requests come to her for things that are non-technology and they ask to charge them to the technology fee budget and she has flatly refused. Things that are not in any way legitimately related to the technology fee won't be subsidized by this money. So, she has seen those requests and she has refused to authorize them.

Mr. Tim Long, Associate Vice President for Finance and Technology, said that he wanted to add to what was presented regarding the miscellaneous fees. There is quite a number of years' worth of history as to what those fees are. He noted that Professor Lieske is correct in saying that our Board, many years ago, gave the authority of approval of miscellaneous fees to the President and a fee schedule was then presented to the Board as information for review. It is not subject to any State tuition cap. Dr. Napier, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, will attest to the rumblings in Columbus over the past couple of years to include miscellaneous class fees under the two percent cap. Right now, the cap only applies towards our instructional class fee, our general fee, and our technology fee which makes up our full tuition. Mr. Long added that with respect to the longitudinal data Professor Resnick is correct. Professor Resnick stated that just having that information more easily available for reference would be a good thing.

Senator Barbara Hoffman stated that she had a question about the tuition and fees increase in Dr. Resnick's very first table that he noted from the State Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education Chairman's report. Professor Hoffman inquired if there was anything in that report that indicated why there is a 42% increase across the 2-year and technical colleges. She asked if there was any explanation of why the tuition fees have gone up. Dr. Resnick replied, “No, it was just a very dry numerical reporting.”

Dr. Goodell remarked that the State subsidy has gone down considerably in that time period. That certainly contributes a lot. She stated that the State subsidy has decreased and currently tuition and fees have gone up. She added that the money has to come from somewhere.

Dr. Hoffman commented that it is interesting to have that information to see how it is balancing out.

Dr. Goodell commented, how about how State subsidy has declined as our fees have increased? She commented that Mr. Long had that right on the tip of his tongue.

Mr. Long reported that as far as we are concerned here, State subsidy now makes up approximately 29% of our total revenue or 29% of our total operating budget. He noted that just maybe seven or eight years ago, that number was up around 37% and if we go back fifteen years, it was over 50%. He went on to say that our most recent decline was in FY 12 of the State budget. We lost roughly \$11 million of State subsidy going from \$74 million annually to about \$63 million.

Professor Resnick mentioned that there is no causal link between those two that has been established. There is a correlation, not a causation. Dr. Resnick added that this is from the numbers that he has and is just correlation, not causation.

Professor Hoffman asked, "How do we get that data?" Professor Resnick responded that in regards to a causal link he couldn't tell her.

Dr. Goodell stated that Mr. Tim Long has some information. Mr. Long stated that the report is from the House of Representatives Education Committee and the chair is Representative Rosenberger. The Committee spent nearly a year collecting information from individual universities and colleges around the State of Ohio. He stated that he has information regarding campus interviews by Committee staff so if anyone would like to get in touch with him he could give the names of those people. Those individuals can give background information.

Senator Claire Robinson May reported that she attended the Recreation Center Advisory Committee meeting this morning and one thing that was mentioned there is that the 4 to 3 conversion also has an impact on the general fee revenue so those units are also going to be feeling an impact in their budgets.

VIII. University Curriculum Committee

Dr. Bill Kosteas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, noted that there is the one proposal that can be removed, A.6. Bachelor of Music in Composition, that is 4 to 3 related and then he can present the four proposals separately.

Dr. Goodell stated that UCC has reported eighteen undergraduate changes in the 4 to 3 conversion. She then asked if there were any comments or questions on the eighteen

changes under VIII. A. apart from the fact that 13. Bachelor of Music – Music Therapy, has conditional approval.

Professor Kosteas reported that for item 12. Bachelor of Music – Music Therapy, it is conditional only that UCC is waiting on Music to submit a revised degree map. UCC has actually approved the program requirements, so any change that comes to UCC, the program requirements are not going to be different. UCC is just asking for some revisions to the degree map because they figure this is the right time to get the degree maps correct.

- A. Undergraduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:
(Report No. 57, 2013-2014)**
- 1. BA in History Major and Minor**
 - 2. Foreign Language Education – French**
 - 3. Foreign Language Education – Spanish**
 - 4. BA in Music**
 - 5. Bachelor of Music in Music Education**
 - 6. BA in Comparative Religion**
 - 7. Classical and Medieval Studies**
 - a. Eliminate the CLAM Major and Minor**
 - b. Replace the Minor with a Minor in Classical Studies and a Minor in Medieval Studies**
 - 8. BA in Liberal Studies**
 - 9. Chemistry**
 - a. BS in Chemistry Major and Minor, Honors Program**
 - b. Certificate in forensic Chemistry**
 - c. BS in Chemistry for Pre-medical, Pre-dental and Pre-veterinary Students**
 - d. BS in Chemistry for Pre-medical, Pre-dental, and pre-veterinary Students with Concentration in Pharmaceutical Sciences**
 - 10. Secondary English Teaching Licensure (CASAL)**
 - 11. Social Studies BA (approved) and Social Studies BA with Teaching Licensure**
 - 12. Business Biotechnology and Global Business Certificates**
 - 13. Bachelor of Music – Music Therapy***
 - 14. Bachelor of Music – Performance**
 - 15. BS in Allied Sport Professions: Sport Management**
 - 16. BS in Allied Sport Professions: Exercise Fitness Specialist**
 - 17. BS in Physical Education**
 - 18. Middle Eastern Studies Minor**

There being no further comments or questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed eighteen Undergraduate program revisions A.1 through A.18 and asked Senators to vote. The UCC's proposed Undergraduate program revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion were approved unanimously by voice vote.

Next Dr. Kosteas presented the following changes to graduate programs.

B. Graduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion: (Report No. 58, 2013-2014)

- 1. MA in English: Literature and Creative Writing concentrations**
- 2. MA in History: Non-thesis, thesis, Museum Studies, Art History thesis and non-thesis tracks**
- 3. M.Ed. in Exercise Science**

Dr. Kosteas reported that these changes are basically changes to Graduate programs as a result of the Undergraduate curriculum conversion. He added that in many cases, departments felt it was much better for their programs to go ahead and change the Graduate courses as well.

There being no comments or questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed Graduate program revisions B.1 through 3 and asked Senators to vote. The UCC's proposed Graduate program revisions were approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Kosteas next presented three proposals related to the Entrepreneurship Program: Undergraduate Entrepreneurship Minor, Graduate Entrepreneurship Concentration and Graduate Entrepreneurship Certificate.

C. Other Proposals: (Report No. 59, 2013-214)

- 1. Undergraduate Entrepreneurship Minor**
- 2. Graduate Entrepreneurship Concentration**
- 3. Graduate Entrepreneurship Certificate**

He noted that all three programs are fairly similar. The Undergraduate program and the two Graduate programs include the creation of two new courses. For the Undergraduate program: BUS 315 Entrepreneurship Tool Kit and FIN 374 Entrepreneurship Finance. He stated that this program is designed for students of all backgrounds and so the two courses BUS 315 and FIN 374, while they are 300-level courses, they are actually introductory level. Basically the idea is, and actually looking at the elective course listing, you will see ART 495, MUS 310, and students in those disciplines who may want to open up their own studio or something like that will have some of the basic tools necessary to do that. Dr. Kosteas noted that for the graduate program, the first item "Graduate Entrepreneurship Concentration" is actually part of the MBA program. The second graduate item is intended to be available to any graduate students. Dr. Kosteas asked if there were any questions on the specific details of the proposed programs. There were no questions.

Dr. Goodell stated that the UCC has proposed an Undergraduate Entrepreneurship Minor, a Graduate Entrepreneurship Concentration and a Graduate Entrepreneurship Certificate and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Undergraduate Entrepreneurship Minor, the proposed Graduate Entrepreneurship Concentration and the proposed Graduate Entrepreneurship Certificate were unanimously approved by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell stated that finally Item D is for informational purposes only.

D. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 60, 2013-2014)

- 1. Undergraduate Course Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:
Course submission (THE)**
- 2. Graduate Course Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:**
 - a. DTE Graduate Proposal 3 (ECE 502, EDL 503, EDL 504, ESE 530 converted to 3 credit hours)**
 - b. MED Exercise Sci New course Syllabi (PED 592, PED 595, PED 672 – new electives)**
 - c. EDB 305 conversion from 4 to 3 credits**
- 3. EUT 302 submitted for WAC designation**

There were no questions on the “For Informational Purposes Only” items and they were received by Faculty Senate.

Professor Kosteas said that he had initially planned to give a summary of what has happened the whole year for the 4 to 3 conversion. He is going to wait until the April meeting at which point he will be presenting, on behalf of UCC, a list of recommendations as part of what they have experienced throughout the year.

IX. Admissions and Standards Committee (Report No. 61, 2013-2014)

A. Information – 120 Credit Hours

Professor James Marino, chair, Admissions and Standards Committee, stated that he had two quick public service announcements. One quick reminder – as we go into the transition, the 120 credit hour requirement for degrees is a State mandated minimum so when you are talking about the way of doing transition planning, remember you can't waive the students below 120 credits to graduate. He noted that it is not up to us. This is a State requirement. In essence, don't promise the students things that we can't do for them.

B. Information on Academic Milestones Proposal

Dr. Marino reported that Dr. Barbara Margolius and the Student Success Committee are working on a proposal for academic milestones. He noted that they are going to pilot a few departments first. He said that this is a recommended best practice and it involves identifying traditional stumbling blocks for students where if they are not getting past this particular milestone, they are not on track for success in the degree map and that should trigger some very intrusive advising to try to redirect them back either to a better version of that degree map or to another degree plan. He stated that exactly how we will do this is still up in the air. Some prospective models are extremely intrusive and

some are more about persuasion. Professor Marino stated that Barbara Margolius will be coming around to ask departments if they want to sign up for a pilot and then it will be brought back to Faculty Senate for a vote.

The two “Information Only” items from the Admissions and Standards Committee were received by Faculty Senate.

X. University Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, reported that he has two important items for Senate today

A. Overview of discussions regarding the New University Harassment and Non-discrimination Policies and Procedures (Report No. 51, 2013-2014)

Dr. Karem stated that the first item is an information update on the Office for Institutional Equity’s new Discrimination and Harassment Policies. He noted that these were presented at the last Senate meeting and were circulated for a thirty day comment period. They are not on the Agenda as an action item today simply because of the timing. The compliance mandated thirty-day window just closed very recently and it wasn’t until yesterday that the Office for Institutional Equity had a chance to incorporate the suggestions. Professor Karem wanted to let Senate know that that process and feedback has been recursive. The Office for Institutional Equity has met with UFAC on several occasions to discuss the proposals with the revisions that have occurred already. He stated that one issue that he needed to alert Senate to is that because of Federal compliance issues, this proposal is going to go to the Board of Trustees at the next Board meeting because we are already overdue. This was supposed to be in place by March 4, 2014. He said that while Senate is not able to take official action at Senate right now, it is expected to be able to come to us for our next Senate meeting so that Senate can endorse it and voice our approval for it. He added that he has been assured by the Office for Institutional Equity that further amendments are possible of a technical nature before they can file with the State. In the event that there is a major substantive problem, this could be something that could be amended and resubmitted back to the Board. He went on to say that although for federal law things have to get in place very promptly but there still is an opportunity for refinement. With that said, having been through the policy specifically in response to all of the faculty feedback that he has seen (he just had a chance to look at the responses this morning) he does not want to bring something to Senate to vote on without having a chance to go through Steering. Dr. Karem asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

Senate received the update report on the New University Harassment and Non-discrimination Policies and Procedures.

B. Proposed Timeline for implementation of the New SEI Instrument (Report No. 62, 2013-2014)

Professor Karem stated that the item he hopes Senate can take action on today is the proposed timeline for implementation of the new SEI (Student Evaluation Instrument). As everyone may recall, back in January, Senate approved a core instrument and the core instrument has been distributed to colleges. The colleges should be adding potential possible questions and this is encompassed within the timeline. He wanted to say a few quick words to follow up on Provost Mageean's mention about electronic submission and he will go through the timeline and answer questions and then hopefully get Senate's blessing of the proposed timeline.

Professor Karem reported that at the most recent Steering Committee meeting, Provost Mageean had indicated that there would be support from the Provost's Office to consider piloting electronic submission methods. This is a subject that has come up in Senate discussion and it has come up in UFAC discussion. He reported that we are at the stage now where all we have done is approve a core set of questions. Many faculty are interested in what are the best ways to deliver these and allow students to give their feedback. He stated that within this timeline, there is room for contemplation of these methods. He wanted to be very clear that UFAC doesn't have a recommendation. They talked about software programs and initial processes. These are contemporary practice issues that have some advantages. He noted that UFAC is aware of questions about the digital divide and the completion rates, so there are real issues to balance here. With that said, Dr. Karem noted that he has had conversations with Institutional Research and with IS&T. All of the vendors allow multiple kinds of user input so that student evaluations can be conducted on a smart phone, or on your laptop. One could print out a stack of hard copy forms to bring but that would slow down the calculation process. Most software programs don't appear to mandate any one kind of submission – it's just software. He stated that he just wanted to put that out there because he has already heard a few folks say, "You are all going to be forced to do your evaluations online." Professor Karem stated that UFAC is just thinking about a supplemental plan. He stated that in terms of what is being contemplated right now, UFAC is going to be meeting with IS&T tomorrow to just talk about essentially how is this going to work, where might the data go, and who are the vendors. One of the potential vendors, Blackboard, is going to present to UFAC and SGA leaders Friday. Dr. Karem stated that there are concrete steps ahead in order to evaluate at these things. UFAC will consider all aspects and then report back to Senate. He added that everything is simply in a contemplative stage right now.

Dr. Karem stated that he would go through the timeline to see if anyone has specific questions. He added that he would like, if possible, to get a vote of approval for UFAC to move forward with this timeline bearing in mind that timelines only work if things can change. He noted that at present, spring of 2014, colleges and the eLearning Committee developed and approved additional questions to add to the core instrument. UFAC is convening a calculation data sub-committee to assess and develop laws for calculating and comparing core evaluation data. This is the committee that will think about such things as: are we reporting means; what are the comparators; are we using medians; are we using a distribution chart; and he is trusting in several statistical experts across the university to work on that. He reported that we have a potential representative from Education and someone from Psychology. He noted that if there are any

mathematicians out there, they are welcome. He said that he has talked to Mathematics but no one has stepped forward. He noted that those kinds of sub-committees are willing to present a report to UFAC on suggestive practices which UFAC will bring to Senate. One of the biggest sources of dissatisfaction has been a quartile system that state inaccurate means and statistical metrics of that nature. We need to think about what we are going to approve while moving forward. Dr. Karem stated that if we do end up piloting or using electronic submission formats, one thing that is advantageous is customizing. We don't want to worry that we are going to be a victim or a prisoner of technology, which as a humanist and as somebody who has watched the entire Terminator franchise, is always of concern.

Professor Karem reported that UFAC will continue to review other SEI procedures to synchronize the timing and method of administering evaluations. He noted that several years ago, Senate approved the use of these in the twelfth week. That was intended actually to spur and expedite the calculations at the end. As it turns out, that's not working partly because the colleges hold on to them until the fifteenth week. The Student Government Association has viewed the twelfth week as problematic. UFAC is going to think about timing and, as he mentioned, possible electronic submission methods. UFAC hopes to report to Senate on procedural improvements by the end of the semester.

Dr. Karem noted that in terms of action items, by the end of the semester the college instruments need to be submitted to UFAC for their review by the end of April. UFAC expects to present these to Faculty Senate for approval and he is hoping that it is a pro forma process. They already have the core approved as long as colleges aren't adding offensive questions that are in violation of university policies but he doesn't anticipate problems there. Once those are approved, Testing Services can order the new forms and whatever piloting we do, we still are going to need hard copy next year. The online evaluations can be revised in line with the core as well and they will run tests to check the processing of the new instruments. He has spoken with Testing Services and they have assured that they can do that over the summer. He went on to say that timing is crucial because the head of Testing Services is going to be retiring so we need to make use of that expertise before it disappears.

Professor Karem reported that by the fall, we should be able to launch the new student evaluation forms university-wide for use at the end of the semester. He is expecting that the calculation data sub-committee will report back to UFAC and perhaps a proposed model can be presented to Senate by the end of the semester. People will always have concerns about how the data is going to be reported – what are we doing in terms of means or medium – that's the kind of thing that we can get back to by fall of 2014. Dr. Karem noted that in terms of building a database, it will still take some time to compile the older data so that it is actually accessible. Keep in mind that the numbers will be different from the current ones. In fall 2014, if we find a good program and vendor, then UFAC would recommend that we do some possible piloting of an electronic submission.

Professor Karem stated that a year from now, UFAC should have feedback from colleges, SGA, and Testing Services about the new instrument. The evaluation of an electronic submission pilot by UFAC will be in our report to Senate. By the end of 2015 spring semester, UFAC hopes to be able to present calculation and data model to Senate for final approval and reporting procedures as well. He noted that one of the issues that has come up is who has access to this data? Can you look at what your department's means are? Can you look at your college? This is a Senate discussion that we need to have. Dr. Karem said that he knows there is some driving interest on the Board of Trustees to make this data more assessable to students so we need to be mindful to that. Dr. Karem stated that his hope is that by fall 2015, we will be able to launch the new data reporting system. He noted that one thing he thinks we should all feel reassured about is that as challenging as this will be, whatever we do will be, and he bears in mind that this is an historical phrase, and he greatly looks forward compared to where we have been with our evaluation procedures really since 1999 which was the last time we did something with it.

Professor Lieske asked if UFAC gave any thought to linking the data measures we are collecting with "Rate My Professor". He thinks there are only five measures that are collected by way of "Rate My Professor". Has UFAC thought about calibrating or cross-relating our data on faculty performance with the kinds of data that are released by "Rate My Professor"?

Dr. Karem replied that it depends on how you want to phrase the answer to that. If, in terms of actually having a tangible linkage between what they ask for in a grade, he doesn't think we are going to approve a "Chili Pepper" system but he can report that in speaking with SGA, if there were a system, and if we are going to make data more available to students for contemplation, he does think it would need to be a simpler interface. Not because our students are simple but because a breakdown of twenty questions with statistical calculations is not good – it's a summary kind of report. So, he doesn't think we are really going to adopt any model from "Rate My Professor". As a Senate, we can talk about best practices but it is going to be really difficult to dig in our heels and simply say, "No one can ever see our evaluation data." Dr. Karem added that we need to make it potentially user friendly. This is a discussion for way down the road but he does know when these discussions come up, quite honestly it is usually the butt of a joke. When you get seventeen reviews over fifteen years, not that he is counting, that is not the best data set but that is a good question to think about.

Professor Ekelman noted that she is on a university committee that looked at promotion and tenure and stated that was one of the things that came up when they were looking at this. Yes, the inconsistency of the actual instrument itself and language that is supposed to be read to the student, that information is confidential and the professor will not see the results until after grades are submitted. She asked, "Are you guys going to put language like that on the forms?"

Dr. Karem replied, "Yes," that falls under the purview of what he hopes we will achieve this spring which is timing and method of administering in the class. He noted

that there are Senate documents that specify what is supposed to happen. They haven't been revisited for a while and reports from students indicate some variations of practice so it would be good to revisit these issues and clarify them. He said that he does remember that in the Task Force report – it's right at the beginning.

There being no further questions or discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed a timeline for implementation of the new SEI instrument and asked Senators to vote. The UFAC's proposed timeline for implementation of the new SEI instrument was unanimously approved by voice vote.

XI. Electronic Learning Committee

A. Proposed E-Learning Definitions (Report No. 53, 2013-2014)

Professor Linda Wolf, chair, Electronic Learning Committee, presented the eLearning Committee's proposed definitions.

- 1. Fully online courses** - meet online 100% of the time including instruction and testing. Fully online courses that are part of a course sequence for a fully online program would require the approval by the Center for eLearning in addition to appropriate departmental, university and accreditation boards.
- 2. Blended courses** – contain a mixture of face-to-face classes and sessions conducted online.

Professor Wolf noted that the university lacks consistency in how they address blended courses. Sometimes they are identified as a hybrid and in other places they are stated as blended. The committee chose the term blended because this is what it states in the campus catalog when students register for courses.

- 3. Online components** – may involve any or all of two types of student engagement:
 - a. Synchronous courses** – courses that meet online at a specific time.
 - b. Asynchronous courses** – do not require any specified meeting time in the online environment. Students may login to the course at any time to complete requirements within the instructor/university specified time frames.

Professor Wolf noted that these are the definitions that the committee is recommending.

Dr. Goodell inquired if there were any comments or questions for the Electronic Learning Committee about the proposed definitions.

Senator Vera Vogelsang-Coombs stated that she is curious about the approval by the Center for eLearning and asked if that is a new standard. She noted that it is only for

fully online classes and asked if those faculty who teach only online are being held to a higher standard.

Professor Wolf replied, “No. This involves the mobile programs because the eLearning Center is closely involved with the mobile programs. She noted that her graduate program in Nursing is fully online and the Center for eLearning helps Nursing as they are developing their programs.

Professor Vogelsang-Coombs said that she understands that the Center is a resource but the way it reads, at least to her untrained eye, she might have been online too long, that this is a new standard and that it could be a standard for one set group of faculty and not others. This might hinder some faculty from going from a blended course to a fully online course.

Professor Wolf remarked that she can take this issue back to committee to discuss.

Dr. Davis Jones stated that she was just thinking about implications and changes. She asked if any determination was made as to how the technology fee that the committee proposes would affect incoming freshmen enrollment.

Professor Wolf remarked that she would get to those in just a minute. We are just looking at the definitions right now.

Dr. Goodell added that these are a separate discussion. We are not proposing any changes to these – they are really for informational purposes only.

Dr. Davis Jones stated that she doesn’t know if it is a change but in terms of the 60% and the 40%, she doesn’t know if that is currently implemented.

Dr. Goodell noted that Professor Wolf will talk about that once we have had the discussion about the acceptance or not of the definitions.

Senate Vice President Sridhar stated that the definition of fully online courses says that they have to be 100% full instruction and testing. Going back to Professor Vogelsang-Coombs’ question of saying that this has to go to the Center for eLearning approval as well as a faculty member, if he doesn’t want to go through the hassle of it, all he would do is schedule a one day face-to-face meeting.

Professor Wolf responded that if you schedule a one face-to-face meeting then that is a blended course.

Professor Ekelman asked if the approval of the Center for eLearning is required for an individual online course or just online courses that are part of an online program. Professor Wolf replied that it is required just for the courses that are part of the course sequence for a fully online program.

Professor Ekelman commented that the Masters of Science and Health Sciences is a fully online program. Most of the courses that are within that program have been developed with the help of E-Learning but some haven't. She asked, "Do those currently existing courses have to go back to get approval?"

Dr. Goodell asked, "Is this retroactive?" Professor Wolf replied that she would have to check with Ms. Caryn Lanzo, Director of the Center for eLearning.

Dr. Goodell stated that this would be up to Senate to decide whether we wish that it would be retroactive or not.

Professor Hoffman noted that she would like to propose that we strike that language requiring approval by the Center for E-Learning. She stated that it is not defined well enough to know how it would apply in every situation. She added, not the other terms like course sequence or fully online program – that could be defined in a number of ways but she thinks this issue would be ameliorated if we just strike the language that would require approval by the Center for eLearning. She added that we already have bodies in place to approve courses. She stated that she didn't know that we even had an ample discussion of what role the Center for eLearning should have that we can make a truly important decision at this time.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltd seconded Professor Hoffman's motion.

Dr. Goodell asked for discussion on Professor Hoffman's motion.

Senator Marius Boboc stated that he thinks being a "quality matters" peer evaluator, the reference to the Center for eLearning comes from the perspective that entirely online programs that have all of the course sequences delivered online have to have a particular structure and they are all consistent across the board in which case the Center for E-Learning is a lot more invested in managing that look. He added that it has nothing to do with electronic content of the classes. It is just the appearance of the courses so that they are in sync so to speak.

Professor Lehfeltd said that it seems to her that including this in the definition blends two issues. She noted that we are just looking for definitions and this adds an assessment component to those definitions. She indicated that she likes Professor Hoffman's amendment because it makes it clean. We all agree what constitutes an online course, a blended course, etc. and the various components of what it is to be online and we can leave the assessment issue, who evaluates these courses and why, to a later discussion.

Senator Glenn Goodman noted that he has a course that is almost completely on site and he has one unit that has an online component with graphs. He is using a flipped classroom concept and asked if this, by definition, makes that a blended course. Would we have to change the designation for the CampusNet and PeopleSoft for a course where we do some creative things like flipped classroom or a one unit that is online.

Professor Wolf replied that this would fall under the fee issue where it defines how the fees are assessed for these types of classes. Blended courses that are less than 60% online, are defined by the percentage of total course hours minus actual face to face contact hours. The ones that aren't, are not subject to the \$25.00 per credit hour eLearning fee.

Professor Krebs remarked that we are discussing a motion right now and asked to get back to Professor Goodman's point. Dr. Goodell added that Professor Goodman's point is not really what we are discussing. We are discussing whether or not to strike that language and separate out the assessment of the course from the definitions of online blended, sequence, etc. She added that we will come back to that.

Ms. Janet Stimple, Registrar, stated that we are talking about definitions in general and it is hard to separate the two because how we define how the fees are charged is on the same page. Dr. Goodell agreed and said that this is why she wanted to have a discussion of fees but the discussion of fees is not part of what we are discussing now. We are discussing just striking out language requiring approval by the Center for eLearning

Ms. Stimple added, to strike out of the blended definition if we are discussing definitions. Dr. Goodell stated that we are discussing whether to strike the second sentence in Fully Online Courses – "Fully online courses that are part of a course sequence for a fully online program would require the approval by the Center for eLearning in addition to appropriate departmental, university and accreditation boards." Again Dr. Goodell stated that we are discussing whether to strike the second sentence. She asked if this is everyone's understanding. Dr. Goodell then asked if there were any other comments on whether to strike that sentence.

Professor Krebs stated that his comment is that we have all this course approval that goes through all the ranks already but he would certainly recommend that whoever is doing these courses would like an "eLearning stamp of approval" but they shouldn't really be the accrediting or approving body.

Professor Wolf stated that what the Center for eLearning is doing is they have a template that they would like all online courses to follow. She noted that this is something that she is not prepared to discuss today because the committee hasn't begun discussion on it since it has to do with course design. She added that many of our courses are "quality matters" approved. She went on to say that this is discussion for another time but the template that the Center for eLearning has developed for online courses is based on the recommendations of "quality matters." She noted that this is why this piece was put in there so that we do have some standardizations of courses so that when students are in a program, they don't take one course that is set up one way and then another course in the sequence that is set up in another way so that students will know where to go to find the information they need in a similar manner.

Dr. Goodell stated that this is again part of the discussion which we are not actually having. We are discussing, right now, whether we are going to strike the second sentence, "Fully online courses that are part of a course sequence for a fully online program would require the approval by the Center for eLearning in addition to appropriate departmental, university and accreditation board." from the definition of Fully Online Courses. She noted that this sentence is not part of the definition of Fully Online Courses. She added that Professor Lehfeldt is absolutely correct. That sentence is not part of a definition; it is part of the assessment or accreditation mechanism which we are not discussing now. So, if anyone has any further comment about striking that sentence or not, say it right now. There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that Senate will now vote.

Dr. Goodell then asked that all those in favor of striking the sentence that she just read a moment ago from the definitions and leaving only the first sentence of Fully Online Courses in this proposal to please say aye. Dr. Goodell stated that the motion to strike the sentence, "Fully online courses that are part of a course sequence for a fully online program would require the approval by the Center for eLearning in addition to appropriate departmental, university and accreditation boards." was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell noted that Senate can now go back to the definitions and have a discussion about those.

Professor Boboc asked Professor Wolf to elaborate a little bit on how she identified the percentage bands because there is a gap between 60% and 100%. He said that he knows of cases where people deliver instruction online but because of privacy issues, they want to administer the assessment face to face on the last day of class or during finals week. That bumps it down below 100% so just for one test that would fall under 100% but still above 60%. He asked, "How do we account for that again?"

Dr. Goodell said that she believes these are the actual fees that are currently being charged. Professor Wolf stated that the eLearning Committee is not recommending these fees; they are already in place.

Professor Boboc remarked that he is not talking about the fees; he is talking about the definitions. He asked, "Are the definitions informed by the fees and how they apply to different bands?"

Professor Wolf responded that what the committee is working on is that a Fully Online Course is online for 100%; there are no face to face meetings whatsoever; no initial meetings; no coming in for testing. A Fully Online Course is all online. She continued and stated that the definition for Blended Courses has been taken from reports that have been published regarding the definitions for online courses. They say that when the courses are identified as being online at least 60% of the time, then they are 40% face to face. The committee did not look at above 60%. She noted that the committee can

revisit this, but, if you go and you look up definitions of online courses, this is the percentage that you are going to see pretty much across-the-board.

Professor Ekelman asked, “Shouldn’t the percentages that you just said, 60% and 40% be in the definition? I don’t see that in the definition.” Professor Wolf replied that the committee took the percentages out of the definitions but they can put them back in the definitions if Senate wants them.

Professor Ekelman commented that this gets to what Professor Goodman was saying. For example, she has a class – she does a flipped class where students have to watch a video and they do other activities; she does online testing then she does in classroom testing. But it is a course that is a mixture of lecture and lab courses and according to this definition, that would be Blended because she does a full classroom and she does online testing, but if you use the 60%, 40%, it’s a Blended class which is what it really should be.

Dr. Goodell responded that she doesn’t think that is what it means. She added that the definition is the definition but Professor Ekelman is offering a Blended Course. Whether or not Professor Ekelman charges fees for a Blended Course is the question.

Professor Ekelman remarked, “Then that gets to Professor Goodman’s question about how that is in the system which gets to Ms. Stimple.

Ms. Stimple commented that having a definition that doesn’t fit would be extremely confusing to students because when people schedule these courses, they pick these attributes and that is what drives the fees right now. By calling my class Blended because it fits this definition, and then if a student is charged for this one and then not charged for that one, would be confusing. Blended would have the definition that it is 60% or more but less than 100% of its content is not in the classroom; it’s online. Ms. Stimple noted that the others are Online Components. That is the definition if you have less than 60%; you fall into this Online Component which doesn’t have a fee attached to it at all. Ms. Stimple stated that she believes we will have two definitions of Blended.

Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange suggested that it might be worthwhile for the eLearning Committee to reconsider the definitions and make sure that they are consistent with both practices that we are currently using and restructure what we are using through the Registrar’s Office and Budget and Finance so that we do have consistent definitions, the Committee needs to explicitly spell out what is meant, for example, by Blended in the definition itself. She is making that suggestion from the floor.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy asked Professor Wolf if there is someone from the Registrar’s Office as an ex officio on the committee. Professor Wolf replied, “No, and that has made it more difficult finding out how these fees are scheduled.” She stated that she has been told that when these different courses are set up by the instructors, that the director or someone in that particular school inputs all of the information and then that is how it is determined whether it is Online, Fully Online, Blended and it is all based

on the information that is provided by the faculty who is teaching that course. She added that there is inconsistency there too.

Professor Duffy stated that when Senate finishes the discussion on the question, and we get outside of this question, he will offer a motion to put somebody from the Registrar's Office on the committee.

Senator Claire May commented that she was reading this differently and then somebody's comment made her look at it again. So the heading, Levels of online learning with related definitions, 1) Fully Online, 2) Blended Courses, 3) Online Components but Online Components to her is not a different level of online learning. That is like a sub definition of what an Online Component is. It's a definition but it is a combination of the numbering and the heading that are creating a little bit of confusion.

Dr. Goodell asked Professor May if she would like to suggest an amendment or should we work on it and bring it back. She added that Senate could just table it and bring it back to the next meeting.

Professor May stated that we may not address all of the issues here but just what she has raised, she would say number 3) is more like a note. Dr. Goodell asked if Professor May would suggest to table the motion then. Professor May said, "Yes."

Professor Karem said that wherever we are headed with this, it seems like we are adding more work to the committee's hard work. He stated that the question moving forward is, "What's driving the purpose of the definition? If it is for clarity with respect to what's happening online for registration, then we need to think about the fee structure. If it is how we are defining it for internal purposes and best practices, that's a different matter." He stated that he can't tell what precisely the definitions are going to be in service which might be why some of us are sort of asking things across two pages at the same time. He doesn't know if that is something we can speak to or just something for the committee to think about which is, "What do we do with the definitions? Is it so the students know which courses they are taking in which case we could probably follow Ms. Janet Stimple's lead, or is this a more philosophical definition for how we talk about online learning? Then we need a separate set of definitions for online."

Professor Wolf noted that part of this came about because courses have been listed and stated as being totally online yet there are face to face classes included in them. These were set so the faculty would know that the online course is totally online and there are no face to face classes. Then even if you have one face to face class, it is considered a blended course and that is why these came about. It has to provide clarity so that they are consistent across the university.

Senator Raymond Henry stated that even in what is considered regular classes, there is an eLearning component that we have and whatever definitions we are going to put forward, if these are definitions that are defining eLearning even in regular classes, that would be considered traditional classes, there is an eLearning component. When you

talk about flipped classes, somebody posted a video that they want someone to watch online as part of the assignment. Now there is an eLearning component to it. So, however we are defining this, it needs to be consistent with the gamut of the ways that eLearning is part of twenty-first century education and that includes both the administrative part of it and how it relates to the Registrar's Office as well as just generally accepted meanings of what eLearning is. Right now, eLearning is just part of learning. Professor Henry stated that these definitions need to be more thoroughly thought through.

Professor Boboc had a question for Ms. Stimple. He stated that right now we have this system – could we tell if a blended course is above or under 60%?

Ms. Stimple replied, “No.” There are cases where in the note section they put in the time that they would be on campus and she would say that that is their free time. Referring to Blended, Ms. Stimple stated that right now the way it is in the system it just doesn't have a meaning of a definition. She added that every course that is Blended is getting charged a fee.

Professor Boboc commented that within the label we discriminate in terms of the percentage of instruction online versus face to face. Maybe we should be careful in what words we use to be clear to students that they pay a fee because most of the instruction is delivered web-based. So, if you call all of them Blended that are less than 100%, that's not very helpful especially when it comes to the Registrar's Office trying to figure out where to collect fees and where not to collect fees. He would recommend that maybe the third category could be “Web-enhanced” which is a term or phrase used in literature on all online instruction which is the lessor of the three.

Dr. Goodell asked Professor Boboc if he was proposing an amendment. Professor Boboc replied, “Just food for thought.”

Professor Hoffman moved that Senate table this and send it back to committee and then bring it back for discussion at our next meeting. The motion was seconded by Professor Duffy.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell asked Senate for a vote. The motion to table the eLearning Committee's proposed eLearning Definitions was tabled unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell stated that the eLearning Definitions will be taken back to committee. She added that a few things will need to be sorted out.

Professor Duffy moved to add a representative from the Registrar's Office to the Electronic Learning Committee. The motion was seconded by Professor Krebs.

Professor Jeff Karem indicated that he had a friendly amendment to Professor Duffy's motion. He might want to add, "ex officio" representative to the eLearning Committee from the Registrar's Office.

Professor Goodman commented that having served on the eLearning Committee, having lots of suggestions for ex officio members had existed for a while and now with the new construction of the committee ex officious don't exist. He is hesitant to just start throwing extra people on the committee when the committee can easily confer with the Registrar's Office as they need to, to define these terms.

Professor Duffy commented that he would simply say that the UCC (University Curriculum Committee) has the Registrar as the ex officio for similar types of reasons.

Professor Karem asked Professor Duffy if Senate is proposing a revision of our Bylaws or is he on an ad hoc basis with a fixed timeframe suggesting an ex officio representative. Dr. Goodell added that this would actually be a change to the Greenbook.

Professor Karem inquired if Professor Duffy is proposing an ex officio member to the committee for the remainder of the semester. Professor Duffy then asked if Professor Karem was offering that as a friendly amendment. Professor Karem replied that he is offering that as a counsel to Professor Duffy's motion. Professor Duffy agreed to accept the friendly counsel which is to put a time limit for addition of an ex officio member to spring of 2015.

Dr. Goodell stated that the proposal is to add an ex officio member from the Registrar's Office to the E-Learning Committee for a short period until the end of spring of 2015. She then asked if there was any further discussion. There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell asked Senate for a vote. The motion to add an ex officio member from the Registrar's Office to the eLearning Committee to spring of 2015 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Technology Fees (Report No. 63, 2013-2014)

The topic of Technology Fees was omitted in Senate deliberations.

VIII. Open Question Time

Senator Andrew Gross requested that the Provost or the President invite Mr. Brian Breittholz and Vice President Berinthia LeVine to bring a summary statement to this body at the April or May meeting on two items in summary form. One, the status and condition of the Alumni Database and two, a rough idea of Alumni donations to the university. Provost Mageean replied that she will convey Professor Gross' request to Vice President LeVine and said that she is sure that Berinthia will be happy to respond.

Professor Lieske remarked that he had a "What if" question. The question here is what would happen if we raised academic standards for remedial students in remedial

Mathematics and remedial English? He stated that we know under the new State Subsidy Formula, subsidy will be based upon retention and graduation rates. So, the more remedial students, the worse we come out on these standards. On the other hand, by not admitting remedial students, they don't come to the university and there is going to be a loss of revenue. The question he has for Stephanie McHenry, and for Provost Mageean is, "What are the implications of raising academic standards so that we do not admit students who need remedial Math or remedial English? Clearly, if we want to raise our academic reputation, we have to raise academic standards. It seems that the predictor of the reputation of the university and how it is ranked in *U.S. News and World Report* as colleges are their admissions standards."

Provost Mageean responded that if we stopped admitting students, these students are about fifty percent of our population – that's the order of people coming in who need remedial Math or English. Having said that, Provost Mageean stated that we obviously do things like look at our academic standards but there is a lot of concern about what happens when you do that. It tends to hit certain populations disproportionately. She added that the last time it was attempted or proposed there was considerable outcry from certain constituencies about that. She stated that this is something we always look at – the scores to success. Yes, the scores do indicate success but having all of that, the whole purpose of things like the Student Success Committee and the hard work going on there and the other committees, given the population that we have, we will never be changing that dramatically anytime soon. It would be better to work with that population to better ensure success and completion. She went on to say that there are a lot of things we can do. Clearly some of the things were mentioned today. There are pathways to success, i.e., targeted courses, better advising, better tracking, all kinds of things that will help us move that along. Provost Mageean added that as long as we don't exceed a certain percentage of remedial classes, we are not penalized.

Associate Vice President Timothy Long reported that we receive funds from the State identified as a share of instruction. If our remedial courses, which are primarily Math and English developmental courses, if those SCHs or FTEs do not exceed three percent of our total credit hours or FTEs at the university, then we still can count that enrollment in our count for purposes of subsidy.

Dr. Goodell remarked that at the moment, we are well below that, right?
Associate Vice President Tim Long replied we are at 1.9.

Senator Andrew Gross stated that he would just like to add to Professor Lieske's comments at the other end which is based on his experience at this university for four and one half decades. Recently he has seen a drop in quality at the other end and he noted that he was talking about senior undergraduates and first year masters level students. He went on to say that some of them really need remedial assistance both foreign students and domestic students. He said that he is trying desperately to rescue some of them but some of them he just can't help.

Professor Davis Jones noted that she had a question. At the last Senate meeting, the Provost and Dr. Goodell and she talked about the number of part-time faculty that we use and she assumes most of them teach part-time classes. As far as trying to attract and/or retain part-time faculty she is wondering what, if anything, has been decided about compensation for part-time faculty who may have been accustomed to teaching four credits and would now be teaching three credits and asked if there will be a corresponding decrease in what they should be paid or has the President even decided on that matter?

Provost Mageean responded that nothing has been decided on that as yet. She noted that what they were primarily concerned about up to now is that the hours and benefits are going to be entirely impacted. She said she doesn't think that there has been any discussion or a decision on compensation.

Professor Davis Jones commented that that would be helpful. Provost Mageean replied that she certainly will get back to Professor Davis Jones on that.

Provost Mageean asked to go back to the question on quality issues. She said that one of the reasons why a lot of our students are struggling is because they find themselves in tracks that might not be the best suited for them. We have a lot of what we call "churn" through the disciplines here – we have a lot of students taking courses trying to find the right place and making choices that may not be the best ones for them; sometimes it is because they self-advise and don't go to advising; sometimes they get pretty good at advising and career tracking. We have huge numbers of students sitting in pre-engineering, pre-nursing, pre-music and many of them will never get into engineering or nursing or music. She stated that there is a lot we can do to improve what we do with our students in guiding them towards success. She added that if you do it well and do it soon, this will actually bring us back better returns in completion and going into attrition.

Professor Margolius stated that she is on a complete different topic, the master plan. She noted that there is a tension for about half of our students that are PELL eligible which means that their families are incapable of contributing anything whatsoever to the cost of their education. She noted that we are building these wonderful, beautiful residence halls that we have students tour when they come here for orientation or when they just come here considering to enroll and she is hoping that in the master planning process we will think about maybe less costly alternatives or how we are going to fill these buildings up without putting the students in a financial box because they can't afford the residence hall with the financial aid that we are able to give them which they are eligible to receive.

Vice President McHenry stated that Professor Margolius had a very good point bringing that up. She reported that in fact they are already starting to advise families even at orientation that a student can have a perfectly fine CSU experience without living on campus. She stated that we agree that a student is not able to graduate because of the consequence of living on campus and they are able to do it without living on campus. That is what they should do so we are already in that process. She stated that again, this

plan is going to be largely focused on academic space. She noted that they will take a look at some of the work that Dr. Simons has done that does speak to the demand of residential options for students but not necessarily those that CSU would provide. She added that certainly this is not the center of the focus here; it's really only what happens in the academic space.

Professor Hoffman reported that it has just recently come to the attention of a number of faculty that there is a process of program prioritization going on and that there have already been several stages in this process including a rejection of the suggestions of the deans of how to prioritize our programs. She stated that faculty are asking her when faculty are going to be brought into that process. She wondered if Provost Mageean could give Senate a sense of what the process is, what the timetable is, what role faculty in general will have in the process, and what role the Faculty Senate will have so we can attempt to allay some of the concerns.

Provost Mageean replied that yes, they have begun looking at programs; as with most universities, we are looking at how we ensure the sustainability of the university going forward given the budgetary situation we are all facing which is a decrease in State support. She noted that one of the things they started doing is to look at where the growth areas are, where programs are growing strongly, and where some are declining and how we might reallocate resources. She stated that this is on the premise that there will be no new money for new program additions. She used Joel Lieske's department, Political Science, as an example, but she has talked with faculty in CLASS and they said for instance, for those in a relatively young Master's program in Political Science that is doing really well, if it is to survive and grow and we put new faculty in there and new resources, where do we get those resources given that we haven't received any new resources. Or we might look to see if there is a program that is not doing well or has declined over the years, maybe when retirements come up, and there might be some reallocation of resources. She noted that this is the premise of what is being looked at, at the moment. She went on to say that each college is being asked to look at where they see growth, where they see things happening, where they might see the need for the development of new courses to meet new demands for careers and options like we have seen big growth in Health Sciences because that is a sector that is growing and trying to keep up with things like Nursing and OTPT and all of those areas and similarly in Engineering. She asked, "Where do those resources come from?" She stated that this is really a question of reallocation so they asked each of the deans to take sort of an initial look and of course as is human nature, often there are plenty of suggestions where we can get those new resources but strangely enough no opening up of new courses. She said that we need to start going back and let the administration help the deans in making those decisions by giving deans data to look at. Provost Mageean report that she took ten metrics that she will give the deans information on and most of it is in the Greenbook – trends, credit hours, costs and to that she added such things as publications, research awards, and in addition, the deans were given the Delaware Study data. She added that she can also condense that down to what is called the 21 Urban Peers and also data from academic analytic studies that provides data on our peers and have given that information back to the deans. In fact, they just received the most recent data yesterday. The

administration is asking the deans now to provide the textural information and narrative around those numbers and then to provide some narrative and context. Provost Mageean stated that when they get all that information in, then they will take a look at those areas that might be prime to receive some reallocation of resources. At that point, they will again go back to the colleges and to the departments. She said that she is not sure how long that will take. It takes a while to get the data up to the colleges. She went on to say that of course it is understandable that there is no one size fits all metric. Any of us who have been in this business long enough know that you don't measure the Music Department by the same metric as you measure the Physics Department or the same metric that you measure the History Department. So publications are good for one place but we might be looking at adjudicated exhibits and performances in another. We don't look for budget dollars in the English or History Departments. So it is also allowing the deans in the colleges to come back and say here is the appropriate metric for this kind of department. She added that they are not trying to impose any one size fits all. They will use the metrics where they are appropriate and then ask the deans to texturize that.

Professor Hoffman asked if it is true that there will be no new positions authorized until this process has been completed.

Provost Mageean replied that the President has asked that we not reallocate new positions until we have gone through that process because clearly we don't know what positions should be aligned with the programs yet. She stated that now we have an issue to deal with because clearly there are classes to teach in the fall and it will be very hard to fill those faculty positions this year. There is a reality bite to this in the sense that depending on the progress that we make, clearly we need people in the classrooms to teach the students so that is something we really have to work on.

Senator Vera Vogelsang-Coombs stated that her question to Provost Mageean has to do with what a university stands for so in the program prioritization are there other criteria besides the market criteria where programs are growing and where programs are not growing? For example, the Philosophy Department – there isn't a big demand for a philosopher that she can see on line. But she can't imagine the university not having a Philosophy Department so she wants to make sure that we are remembering what a university stands for and is not solely driven by marketing.

Provost Mageean stated that it has to be consistent with the mission of this university. Of course, nobody can ever imagine any university without certain departments. She noted that somebody once said, "Universities can't afford to be the things that they have become." She added that the glory days of the sixties and the seventies when they expanded and now we are in this terrible situation. She appreciates that and so do members of Philosophy and certainly those core areas because we are not just in the business of occupations or in the business of creating decisions – informed decisions, moral decisions and that has to be part of the decision-making. In the end the reality is you have to look at where things are going. All of the universities have started to become all things to everybody. We have grown beyond our ability to sustain this approach in those cases. We wish it was otherwise. Provost Mageean noted that this is

not just happening on the academic front in case people think the academic area is being targeted. We are looking for reallocation of efficiencies on the administrative front as well. There are many things that make a university as well as all of the support services that go along – IS&T; all the student services that go along. This is a university in the current environment. It manages to sustain while being true to its mission.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray stated that she would appreciate some clarification because she is confused. Cleveland State seems to be doing this great PR campaign that we are trying to go more residential. We are building more dorms and more students are living on campus and that experience helps with retention and those are all positive things. She noted that now we are saying or at least what she has heard is because a lot of our students cannot afford what it would cost to live in the dorms that we are in fact telling their parents when they are here, “You know, they can still get a really good education here and a great experience here and it doesn’t matter if they live in the dorms or not. If you can’t afford to help them live in the dorms, they can still live off campus and get a great experience.” Dr. Berlin Ray again stated that she is really confused. She asked, “Are we doing a great let’s be residential PR campaign, since working in the community, hey they think they hear all that, or are we building buildings that our students can’t afford to live in in which case I don’t know what we are going to do when they are empty or partially empty. I don’t get it. Then why are we then telling parents on the other side of our mouth that you don’t have to live on campus to get this education.”

Vice President Stephanie McHenry stated that there was a point in time where CSU was trying to change its image of being a 100% commuter school to one that has options and it has a campus. That’s what we can contribute the last probably half a billion dollars’ worth of building over the last ten years. We have gotten to a point where we have been 95% consistent over the last two years and close to that for the last three so we have achieved some of what that campaign was about. She stated that it is only responsible of us to point out to people that if students can’t afford to stay in the dorms they should not and so we will continue to do that. She went on to say that she wouldn’t be surprised if we continue building a lot more dorms in the near future. What we have done is create a market place that the private sector will come in and fill that role and we don’t have to borrow more money to get that done if the market figures out how to do it and how to finance it so she thinks it’s both things. It’s both yes to create the image that we have and we must also behave responsibly with respect to our own budgets and our students’ budgets.

Dr. Berlin Ray commented that we have to be careful to say that to students living on campus that experience counts maybe to a possible link to other things like retention. She stated that she heard repeatedly over the last several years that there was a big push to get students on campus and when we keep our students they are going to do better. She commented that she doesn’t know if they do or not. But, we should be careful about making any comments because a community hears it one way and we implement it another.

Dr. Krebs stated that the original question on program prioritization was just really asking when faculty are going to get a chance to have a voice. His perception of the answer as he is sitting here is that Provost Mageean went through a great variety of metrics which will judge faculty, particularly, in some of the units and sub-units that have been starved for fifteen years or more. Those units are going to look bad and we know they look bad because those units are just doing teaching now – they don't have time to do research. So, if they are coming in and don't have a voice until it's coming at the end, they are worse than if they are going to continue to be starved and they are going to feel like they weren't even given an opportunity. Without that faculty voice early, this is a morale issue on top of the necessary evils that come with the issue itself.

Provost Mageean stated that faculty believe in programs in their departments and she knows that sounds like splitting hairs – it's either departments, or programs, or faculty. She stated that when the data goes back, she was open to the chairs and the deans. That's where the conversations take place at the college level with the department chairs and the deans. Again, this information given the necessary texture, is that we have a number of faculty and of course one of the things that can be addressed is we could say, "This department is a great little department; with another couple of faculty in there, we could really do well." She stated this is the kind of thing we are looking to hear. The experience of departments does vary. There are different workload issues and different activities going on in all different departments but that is the kind of context in the environment that we are looking to the deans and department chairs to help through.

IX. New Business

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

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel