

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

APRIL 1, 2015

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, W. Bowen, Delatte, Delgado, Ekelman, Elkins, Engelking, Fodor, Galletta, Genovese, Gross, Hampton, R. Henry, Holland, Holsinger, Holtzblatt, Jayanti, Kalafatis, Kareem, Krebs, Lazarus Little, Lupton, Majette, Margolius, C. May, Mazumder, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Robichaud, Shukla, Spicer, Sridhar, Storrud-Barnes, Talu, Visocky-O'Grady, W. Wang, Wolf, Zingale.

R. Berkman, Dumski, J. Ford, Halasah, Karlsson, LeVine, Mageean, J. Novy, Sawicki.

ABSENT: Gorla, Hoffman, Inness, D. Jackson, S. Kaufman, Kostas, Marino, K. O'Neill, Rashidi.

Artbauer, Boise, M. Bond, Bowling, C. Brown, E. Hill, Jadallah, Lock, Mazzola, McHenry, Parry, D. Ramos, Sadlek, Spademan, G. Thornton, Triplett, B. White, Yarbrough, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

ALSO

PRESENT: A. F. Smith, J. Yin.

Senate President Nigamanth Sridhar called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of April 1, 2015

Dr. Sridhar stated that he has one change to today's Agenda. Unfortunately, we do not have Minutes ready for Senate to review and approve so we will strike Item II from the Agenda. He then asked if there were any other changes that anyone would like to propose for the Agenda. Hearing no changes, Dr. Sridhar asked for a motion to approve the Agenda as amended. It was move, seconded and the April 1, 2015 Agenda as amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of February 12, 2014 and February 11, 2015

As noted above, the Minutes of the Meetings of February 12, 2014 and February 11, 2015 are not yet ready for approval.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Nigamanth Sridhar stated that he has a few items. He noted that we had a question at the last several meetings asking for an Organizational Chart of the administrative side of the university. He reported that when he met with President Berkman a couple of weeks ago, they talked about a chart and he has been given a chart but he didn't have a chance to make copies in advance of today's meeting but he will share that chart with everybody. He added that some of what is in the chart will tie in well with the presentation that we will receive from the Budget and Finance Committee today but more importantly, also the follow-up stuff that will come through PBAC (Planning and Budget Advisory Committee) as well. He noted that this document will be a good reference sheet as we follow the next presentation.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the other big item that we have been looking at from the Senate and shared governance perspective is our Program Alternation Procedures. He noted that at every one of the last several meetings, we have been talking about program alterations. A lot of program alterations are stemming from other ideas created from the Program Prioritization Process. In addition, there are some holes in the way the current procedure is written down. He noted that Dr. Jeff Karem and he took the liberty last week of making some edits and they have actually presented it to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) to review and go through the process. They did actually suggest changes to the process itself, only some fine language in terms of how the different steps in the process are followed. He said that we will wait to hear from the UCC with recommendations for Senate to consider.

Dr. Sridhar noted that the other item that we, as faculty, should be thinking about right now is advising. Registration has opened or is in the process of being opened for students and students are now looking for classes for the next academic year. He added that we should all be focused on making sure that students are taking enough credit hours, that we sort of work with them when they have been taking four courses instead taking five, etc. He noted that this actually leads in well to the discussions he wanted to report on from the Enrollment Task Force. The Task Force has been working hard and they have been looking at a variety of things. There are two different subcommittees to the Task Force: Data Subcommittee which is in charge of assembling any data that the Strategies Committee would like to see in order to come up with strategies to essentially keep up enrollment for the university. In addition, the Strategies Committee has come up with thirty different actions which are of varying magnitude and varying substance. He noted that there are things that we can address right away. For example, this thing of taking five courses or advising students to take fifteen credit hours and so on which are in fact immediate actions that can be implemented right away with no cost all the way to items that have recruiting implications, long-term planning, and those sorts of things. Dr. Sridhar stated that these strategies are under development. He noted that there are a few things that came out of the Enrollment Task Force that also gave suggestions to shared

governance and Faculty Senate. Dr. Sridhar noted that there are a couple of things from there – the mid-term grade change item that came through that is on today’s Agenda. He noted that this item came from the Student Success Committee. This item is formed a little bit in terms of the retention status. He noted that the one vigilant eye he is keeping is to make sure that any items that do in fact fall under the purview of shared governance do in fact go through those things as opposed to getting written down and published without that process. He noted that so far, it has been going well.

Dr. Sridhar noted that along with the Enrollment Task Force item, there is also a search that has been announced for a new Vice President for Enrollment Services. Our current Vice President, Carmen Brown, is retiring in the middle of the summer. He noted that we will have somebody filling in in that position. He reported that there is a search committee of five members; he sits on that committee along with four other individuals – Vice President Boyd Yarbrough is chair of the committee. It will be a fast acting committee because we do have to produce somebody good to start in July. Dr. Sridhar noted that he will be reaching out to faculty colleagues to ask for volunteers who might take a few hours of summer time in the month of June to help out with some of the interviewing activities. He added that this is going to be an important position so he will reach out to a few Senators to volunteer a few hours of their time here and there.

Dr. Sridhar stated that there was the open house event last weekend. He didn’t actually staff the open house but he was here on campus on Saturday running another workshop of one of his grants and there was a flurry of activity on campus. He added that it looked nice to see all these people walking through his building on campus tours, etc. He said that those who did stop in during the open hours, thank you very much for devoting a Saturday coming out helping the university.

Finally, Dr. Sridhar reminded faculty that if they haven’t picked textbooks for fall semester purchase, please make sure that you do that and the students will be happy if we do in fact have all of these things taken care of.

IV. Announcements of Coming Elections

Senate President Sridhar referred to the attachment to today’s Agenda and announced the coming elections that will take place either at Faculty Senate on May 6, 2015 or by a campus-wide election for the Academic Misconduct Review Committee in the fall. He noted that all faculty should have received a survey for Committee Preference – telling us how you are going to volunteer and devote your energies to helping with governance and work on committees for service credit. He encouraged everyone to please participate and express interest in serving on committees. He also asked faculty to encourage their colleagues to volunteer to serve and put forward their names as well for these posts.

V. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman commented that he just noticed the new high-tech stationery for the CSU UCC (University Curriculum Committee) and said that it is a nice break from what we commonly see. So, whoever has the artistic and graphic eye to have re-designed this letterhead, he gave his congratulations.

President Berkman noted that he wanted to start by sharing what he thinks is the best news of the day and that is that on Monday, the Board voted unanimously to ratify the contract between Cleveland State University and AAUP. He noted that they were able in these last two contract rounds to reach agreement without arbitration, without mediation, without going to deadlock and he really wanted to express his appreciation to Professor Krebs, Professor Karem, the other members of the negotiating team who on all of the faculty's behalf put in literally hundreds of hours into this process. He feels very gratified. President Berkman said that he would truly like to be able to do more financially, but they did as much financially as the university could do for the faculty recognizing that no one has gotten richer in the last five years. So he feels good that they were able to do more than most of our peer universities have done in terms of faculty salaries and that we are on the right track with this. One again, President Berkman stated that that is the most important piece and he thinks we will sign after this meeting and we will have a contract. He added that of course the dynamics of this is that one year of the contract is already over or just about over. He said, "The good news to that is that you get a big check for that one year that will be retroactive but the bad news is that one year from now we have to start thinking about negotiating again – actually two years from now; one year before the closure." He noted that in any event, he thinks it is really, really good news.

President Berkman reported that they had the fourth in the series of anniversary symposium this morning. He noted that we had Eric Gordon, the CEO of the Cleveland Municipal School District; we had David Purse, the President and CEO of St. Vincent's Medical Center; interestingly both a mechanical engineer and a surgeon could be a lethal combination actually. He noted that we had J. B. Ireland, the Vice President for Innovations from General Electric, and we had the director of the Science Center. President Berkman said that with each of these panels, this is our fourth panel, he noted that he saw Professor Andrew Gross there but with each of these panels he keeps expecting that we will have really some fall-off in the quality of discourse but it is just not happening. Each of them have kind of found their own stride, their own rhythm and each of these dialogues have been incredibly interesting, incredibly provocative and what we are going to try to do, this was Rob Spademan's ideas as we finish off number five, and he believes that the last one is April 27, 2015 which will be the last day of the symposium series and the day that marks the fiftieth anniversary of the election of the first African American native in the United States. He stated that we will have a panel on African American leadership in urban areas led by Louis Stokes standing in for his brother Carl Stokes. He stated that we also have the mayor of Columbus, the mayor of Columbia, South Carolina and the mayor of Oxford Mississippi who will be on the panel. He believes that those are the three African American mayors who will be on the panel. President Berkman added that Cleveland Mayor Jackson will also be on the panel. He stated that this will be the concluding symposium. He noted that it should be

extraordinary. He doesn't think that anywhere there has been this kind of examination of fifty years of African American leadership in some of America's major cities and what it has changed and what it hasn't changed.

President Berkman noted that this will run up to the Radiance Event which will be held the night before Commencement. We are honoring with the presidential medal Mr. Albert Ratner and really a cameo appearance for Albert Ratner who, at least he tells President Berkman for thirty years, has not accepted this sort of designation or has not been willing to be a singular recipient for this kind of recognition. So, we will honor Albert Ratner that evening and that will kind of be the capstone event for our fiftieth anniversary celebration. He added that of course the real capstone event is the next day and commencement. President Berkman stated that once again, we expect as we did in December to have a record number of graduates. The great news is that we have a record number of graduates. He noted that he just looked through this data the other day and we are one or two ticks off of a forty percent graduation rate for FTICs. We actually have a better rate for graduation of transfer students than we have for FTICs. He noted that they looked back seven years and saw that we started at twenty-three percent seven years ago. The whole community should take pride that we have raised the graduation rate seventeen points in this period. He noted that this also is just extraordinary news for the university. He added that the good news is that more graduate; the bad news is that you have to get more in to fill the places for the more who graduate. So, it ramps up what we need to do in recruitment each semester.

President Berkman reported that we have concluded over six months, and he has been keeping Senate up to date, concerning the consultation on the SSI two, the mother of SSI one, the formula that he has talked to Senate about and how we stood by virtue of what could have only been either a freak of nature or a well-planned conspiracy to singularly penalize CSU for taking the number of traditional transfer students that we take. He noted that this is really kind of an enlightening experience for him; it is really kind of interesting and gives you pause that educated people can sit around the table and look at data which does not at all support the claim that is being made by the individuals presenting the data. It was never the case for example that students who were at-risk students and transferred with thirty credits or more did as well as students who had no at-risk factors. It just was never the case that data never supported it but it got a life of its own. He added that it is kind of like, "How do you change the IPEDS formula for measuring the graduation rate; that forty percent that I am talking about, only singularly represents students who started at Cleveland State University, never went any place else. If they stopped at a semester and went back to Tri-C or stopped at a semester and went to Akron, they fell out of the calculation. So that forty percent represents only students who started at Cleveland State University and uninterrupted got their degree at Cleveland State University." President Berkman stated that this is a totally flawed measure for any calibration of the university's success particularly for us since FTICs are the smallest cohort of all in the university. President Berkman noted that without all of the pyrotechnics sharing all of the pyrotechnics, he had reported to Senate that after three months we succeeded in getting the group to agree to make no changes for the 2016

budget so all of the at-risk dividends, whether you are a transfer student or an FTIC, or whatever, will all stay the same so we would not be penalized in 2016.

President Berkman reported that in 2017 the agreement was, and he thinks it is a fair and just agreement, is that at-risk transfer students will not be treated differently than all other at-risk students. All other at-risk students, whether they start at a community college, whether they start at another university, whether they start at a branch campus, whether they start at a main campus, will all be treated exactly the same in terms of how those at-risk factors will be balanced and how universities will be compensated for servicing those populations. President Berkman reported that we have not seen the numbers. He thinks that it is fair to assume that we are going to still lose some money – we are not going to lose \$4.3 million as we were in revisit number one. He noted that Associate Vice President Tim Long is the best at this and Tim’s best guess is that we will probably lose between \$1 million and \$1.3 million in the 2017 budget because what will happen now is that the pool of at-risk students will get bigger. So, with the same number of dollars and a bigger pool of at-risk students... President Berkman said that he thinks it is an egalitarian solution; it’s not one that differentially punishes our students. He said that he is happy although it was six months of a lot of activity that could have been really resolved equitably in two hours but that’s the way these systems work at times and he is happy the way it came out.

President Berkman stated that we need to make a decision about what we are going to do. He noted that we have a little bit of time but he just wanted to give everyone a heads up on what we are going to do during the week that the RNC (Republican National Convention) will be here next summer. So you will not be able to either get in at all or will find it extremely difficult to get in within the perimeter beginning at East 30th Street and going all the way down to the “Q.” Again, this is one of the final security quadrants that will be released forty-five days before the convention; however, it has become kind of a local sport in Cleveland to try to handicap who is going to be in which zone. There will be two zones – there will be a hot zone which people think will probably extend no further than East 9th Street and then there will be a medium zone, still within the security perimeter which will end at East 30th Street. So, once you are inside there, you will be able to move between those two perimeters but you will not be able to get in past East 30th Street or through East 30th Street. So, we will have a week of classes that will probably be impossible to give. Mr. Eric Gordon suggested today that we could use the high schools out of the perimeter if we wanted to not miss the week, but he just wanted to make everyone aware and maybe also the Senate could have some discussions about what we might do during that week. President Berkman said that he doesn’t think it is going to be possible to have classes during that week. So, we either need to redo the calendar or we need to find alternative facilities and we can’t do it too quickly. Really, it has to be done pretty quickly. President Berkman went on to say that there will be a tremendous presence here on campus for those who can get to campus or want to get to campus or want to get anywhere near this. We are renting or providing 900 dormitory rooms for the RNC and they have booked every single venue on campus where parties can be thrown. He reported that last Friday, there was a session with Charlotte, Minneapolis that did the recent conventions and the projection here is that in the six days

in which the convention will run there will be 2,000 events around in those six days. Every single venue and every single part particularly of the inner perimeter has been put on hold for these events including the Student Center that we are in today plus the Waetjen Auditorium, any of the atriums, the panel rooms – all of the venues. President Berkman noted that we have time but believe him, it is going to happen fast.

President Berkman talked a little bit about Columbus. He reported that we still have Senate Bill 4 – that has life. He said he reported this to Senate last time but he wanted to reiterate it because he wants Senate to understand what it meant when it said, “Senate Bill 4 is sponsored solely and exclusively by the President of the Senate.” The fact that it is sponsored exclusively with no co-sponsors by the President of the Senate is an indication of the Senators’ conviction that this bill will be passed. Senate Bill 4, among the top five priorities for the Republican Caucus in the Senate, calls for a five percent reduction across-the-board, not in tuition, in the cost of attendance. So the differential, he doesn’t know exactly the numbers, but the differential between tuition, which is in the \$9,000 range and cost of attendance which is in the \$18,000 range, he is talking about a five percent reduction of the \$18,000 number. So, that’s still alive. It is more than the custom “Wild West” up in Columbus in this session. He added that he didn’t have to go into all of the political dynamics but there are a lot of political dynamics that are playing out both in the House and the Senate, a new Speaker, etc. and a Governor who may not want to be Governor for that much longer. But, there are an awful lot of things going on and because of it, an awful lot of things not going on. President Berkman stated that the Task Force that he mentioned at the last Senate meeting, has not been announced. The individual leader who was going to lead it is leaving Ohio State and going on to the private sector so we have not heard more on the Task Force. He also wanted to say that he thinks that in terms of that he will not be surprised if we see, just a crazy suggestion, but he wouldn’t be surprised, because there has been a buzz, if we see another version of something like Senate Bill 5 without police and fire. Another version of Senate Bill 5 and we know that Senate Bill 5 constrained the collective bargaining rights; another version of it with firemen and police excluded. He stated that everyone can figure out why they would decide that they could exclude police and fire and be successful and he thinks that they are right. They could conceivably exclude police and fire and be successful. President Berkman went on to say that this is one of the many things that are flying around in the higher education states. It is going to require a lot of vigilance and a lot of attention. While the winds are not nearly as nasty as they are in Wisconsin or Louisiana or Illinois or in Michigan for that matter, there are winds. If anything, they are picking up as the result of Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois and Louisiana.

President Berkman stated that this is his report. He said he was sorry to take a few more minutes than customary and he will reserve any questions for our traditional question and answer session.

VI. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Deirdre Mageean announced that she would give Senate some good news. She reported that she had the first of two meetings of this week to do the distribution of faculty lines. We have something in the order of fifty positions to distribute; that is quite a lot of positions but remember it is two years' worth – it may be slightly more than that. It all depends on how the average salaries work out. Now of those fifty positions, twenty are already active or authorized; in other words, the ones we released with high priority, accreditation issues, and emergencies. Those are in process which leaves another thirty or plus two or so to be distributed. She noted that the Deans don't hold back so they requested ninety positions so we are following the prioritization categories, ones, twos and threes and also at the same time honoring replacements for where there were tenure denials or any of those issues. Provost Mageean said that this was not an easy task but they are pretty much done the first wave through and she doesn't think it will take them too much longer to wrap up on Friday. The goal is to get them all out to the Deans, to the Colleges because she thinks the goal we all should be working towards is getting those search committees formed by mid to late April. If we can get that done before we all break, then that would be before we all get caught up in finals and those things and that would be good. Provost Mageean stated that what this is going to mean is a lot more searches going on. She thinks that in some colleges, people may want to think about having maybe one committee doing maybe two or three searches for the purposes of economy if they can manage that and satisfy the disciplinary departmental requirements. Provost Mageean noted that one thing she anticipated was of course that we are having these many searches so we are going to keep Yulanda McCarty-Harris very busy coming to brief every single committee. She noted that what one may have agreed tentatively to do is to come and do a college-wide briefing and diversity in hiring requirements and that way, if departments have their committees formed, then try to hold one big meeting and in that way we will get through those otherwise they would have to be moving their way through and that would just hold things up. She stated that we don't want to hold things up anymore. We want to get the positions out there, get them advertised and get the new people in here. She added that this is where we are.

Provost Mageean reported that they have also had this year some additional thirty retirements and resignations so they are just checking on how many of those came in before March. Some of them came in after March and they will become positions available for the following year. So, these fifty will be followed by another number. Provost Mageean stated this is where we are. Obviously, everybody is waiting for these positions because they are badly needed in many, many departments.

Provost Mageean reported that she is happy to say that the search for the Honors Dean is progressing extremely well. They have four finalists and all four will be here on campus this month. She commented that she can't remember if Dean Sadlek is chairing the search. She added that there may be opportunities for open sessions for people to meet at the seminars. She noted that Peter Meiksins said yes. She added that they would welcome, as always, all of the faculty input. This is an important position; this is the founding Dean of the new Honors College. It also carries an Endowed Chair in Humanities so it is a very important position in the university and they look forward to

welcoming four very good candidates and then finding one who will emerge amongst all of those.

Provost Mageean stated that the summer session clearly is a tricky one. They have been trying to get information on this for some time knowing full well that registration was opening which means that students actually now can register for summer of next year. They really hope to get a definitive answer on the security issues before that happens. She reported that she talked to our police chief and she still needs to talk to the folks down in Cleveland. She noted that as everyone heard from President Berkman, it is still not finally resolved. The first session will be over but we may have to move or make some modification to the other sessions but they will work very closely with Senate and see if they can minimize disruption to both registration and to the teaching schedule during the summer.

Finally, Provost Mageean mentioned housekeeping. She reported that the faculty survey of Student Engagement was launched yesterday. This complements the student one which has just wrapped up. She stated that so far, actually nineteen percent of the faculty completed it and another two percent have partially completed it. She said she really urges faculty to do this. This is actually a very important survey. We get good participation rates from the students. It is important for how we are perceived and compared to other universities. She urged faculty to respond. She said she knows that we are all bombarded by surveys these days finding them in our mailboxes every day but this one is an important one. The important thing is everybody these days thinks they can do a survey; most people can't but this is an important one so if people have one to choose, please do this one.

At this point, Senate President Sridhar stated that one thing he forgot to say in his report is that the Board of Trustees yesterday did approve tenure and promotion recommendations so congratulations to all of our colleagues who were tenured and promoted or promoted to full professor as well.

VII. Report of the Student Government Association

SGA President Allie Dumski greeted everyone stating that she can't believe it is April already and next month she will be introducing the new SGA President to Faculty Senate. She reported that SGA elections are next week, April 6th through the 9th and she really encourages everyone to ask their students to vote – it is very important so please help SGA out.

SGA President Dumski stated that as faculty are assigning their textbooks for summer and fall, please make sure you are meeting the Bookstore deadlines if not earlier than those deadlines. It is really helpful for students and cost savings for them. Also, please only assign books that faculty plan to use for the full value of the textbook.

SGA President Dumski reported on other projects they have been working on that include the midterm grades and professor evaluations which everyone will hear about

later today. She noted that there are two easy ways that faculty can easily address the needs of students. Posting the midterm grades were solely a student initiative that SGA is glad the Student Success Committee supported and negotiated with SGA. Posting the midterm grades at all levels but specifically 100 and 200-level courses allow students to better gauge where they are at in the course. The transparency of allowing the results from the Blue evaluations to be public will help student success because they will have a better understanding of what to expect in the class. Again, these were solely student initiatives and SGA is glad that faculty have been able to work with them in figuring out the best methods to go forward with these to help students succeed.

Ms. Dumski stated that today she wanted to focus on scheduling and course offerings. As we know, our students here are unique and often coming to class while working, some raising families and even more. But often these students are unable to take all of the courses that they are eligible for because the offerings overlap. She noted that this results in pushing the class off to a later semester and sometimes pushing off graduation. So, SGA hopes that faculty and departments can work together to space out offerings to make sure that the classes are available morning, noon and night. For example, instead of having all of the electives for a major during the hours of 10 AM to 2 PM, maybe some of the offerings can be later in the evening like 4 PM and 6 PM. SGA realizes that this is easier said than done but SGA is bringing this issue to Faculty Senate's attention so that maybe when faculty are offering their courses, they keep that in mind.

Ms. Dumski commented that she had a couple of reminders. On April 7th, SGA is hosting its first major fair and that will be in the Student Center from 10 AM till 2 PM and that is where different departments will be setting up tables to talk to students who are maybe changing majors, undecided on their major, or perhaps wanting to pick up a double major. She noted that on that same day here in SC 311, there will be a Q&A Panel regarding the new Center for Innovation and Medical Professions hosted by one of SGA's senators. She noted that SGA has senator projects and this is one of the senator's projects. In addition, on April 8th, a couple of other senators are hosting the Liberal Arts Talent Show at 11:30 AM in the Student Center Atrium. So, if anyone is interested in attending any of those, SGA welcomes everyone and would love to see everyone there.

Finally, Ms. Dumski thanked Senate for its time. She added that she would be happy to respond to questions.

VIII. Budget and Finance Committee (Report No. 64, 2014-2015)

Professor David Elkins, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, greeted everyone at Senate. His report follows.

A. Analysis of Enrollment Trends

B. Comparative Analysis of 2011 and 2015 Budgets

“I have presented you with two reports. One is on the long-term enrollment projections and the other is related to staffing and personnel issues. While members of the Faculty Senate’s Budget and Finance Committee, the Steering Committee, and Associate Vice President Tim Long have had the opportunity to read these reports and comment on them, they largely represent my work and I take responsibility for any error. I, of course, praise my colleagues in their efforts to correct my mistakes. If only I would listen.

“The reports started out as two separate issues I have experienced as a member and chair of the Budget and Finance Committee. First, on many occasions I have heard about the concerns of long-term decline of Northeast Ohio’s high school student populations and its likely impact on CSU. However, I have not seen any indication of what this decline might actually look like. I realize that an Enrollment Task Force is examining these issues quite closely, and like you, I look forward to its report. This report before you today is independent of their efforts. Its purpose is primarily informational.

“The second report addresses an issue that has frequently cropped up when discussing faculty and administrative positions. We know that some faculty hold administrative postings, but sometimes the aggregate data we are presented with masks this fact. Stated differently, those of us who review these materials sometimes cannot tell when a faculty member is being linked to administrative functions or instructional functions. Examining this issue was the primary motivation of the second report. As I delved further into this material ‘scope creep’ set in. The scope expanded to include an examination of all administrative positions with a focus on CSU’s vice presidents.

“Quite frankly, the motivation for both reports is to help us understand a bit more about program prioritization. We know that academic units have been actively engaged throughout this academic year in the execution of program prioritization and charting a path to implementation. By contrast, we have seen little of this effort on the administrative side. I hope these reports shed light on the need for program prioritization among the administrative units.

“The first report is on enrollment projections. Using data from Cleveland State University, U.S. Census Bureau, and Ohio’s Development Services Agency I made some simple estimations of changes in the size of Northeast Ohio’s high school student population and its implications for Cleveland State University. Between 2000 and 2013, there was about a 2% decline of high school students. Projecting to 2015 Northeast Ohio may see about a 12.5% decline in the number of high school students. Just to be clear Northeast Ohio is Cuyahoga County and the seven county continuous area. Using previous years’ CSU fall headcounts an estimate is established to represent CSU’s ‘capture’ rate of Northeast Ohio high school students. The best case scenario estimate reflects a nearly 7% decline in fall headcount enrollment by 2025. If this decline were to have happened in the FY2015 budget, the Student Instructional Fee revenue would have been down over budget projections by about \$10 million.

“The second report is about staffing. This report compares the Fiscal Year 2011 and Fiscal Year 2015 budgets, specifically examining position numbers. These data are available as PDFs on the university’s website. I merely moved the reports from PDFs to Excel for further analysis. I looked at the position numbers recorded in each budget. I collapsed positions into four categories: (1) faculty positions with no administrative posts, (2) faculty positions identified as having an administrative post, (3) position numbers with administrative posts including some faculty and (4) others. The report explores the size and change of these groups over the two budgets. It also examined the growth and change in the number of CSU’s vice presidents.

“The report finds that the number of positions has contracted by about 8% since 2011. The category with faculty members having no administrative postings declined the most between FY11 and FY15 (with 63 fewer faculty) and the largest category loss was among Assistant Professors (44 fewer Assistant Professors). By contrast, faculty with administrative postings stayed the same and ten were added to the overall administrative category. Between FY11 and FY15 the university added five vice president positions. Some of these positions were redefined from lower ranked positions and others were newly created. Compared to six other Ohio public universities, CSU has about the median number of vice presidents. However, when controlling for student population size, CSU might be overstaffed with vice presidents.

“The upshot and takeaway from these reports is that CSU is confronting a serious issue regarding resource availability. The declining high school population represents a meaningful challenge. This enrollment task force’s recommendations hopefully will help us identify future students and opportunities. However, the staffing report suggests that the university has slimmed down in key areas, most notably among faculty members whose primary responsibility is research and instruction. However, according to the data presented here, the number of positions associated with administrative responsibilities has grown. In the face of declining resources and the prioritizing and shrinking of personnel at the university, particularly among its faculty, the current size of the administration needs to meet its obligation for program prioritization.

“Thank you. Any questions?” There were no questions.

IX. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Fred Smith, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, noted that UCC has six items this afternoon which require a Senate vote and they are described in UCC’s memo and in addition, five are for informational purposes only. Dr. Smith stated that he really can’t describe these items any better than he described them in his memo to Senate. He will call Senate’s attention to them and if there are any questions about them, he will be happy to try to answer them.

A. Change references to PSEO Program in the Catalog to College Credit Plus (Report No. 65, 2014-2015)

Dr. Smith noted that the first item is to change references to the PSEO program in the Catalog to College Credit Plus.

B. Change in credits required for the graduate Advanced Study in Bioethics from 12 credits to 9 credits (Report No. 66, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith stated that the second item is a change in credits for graduate advanced study in Bioethics from 12 to 9. This is a Certificate program and changing the number of credits is part of the 4 to 3 conversion.

C. Proposal to rename and modify the Physical Education Major (Report No. 67, 2014-2015)

Next, Professor Smith stated that this proposal is to rename and modify the Physical Education Major with licensure in both Health Education and Physical Education. This proposal requires approving an exception from the 120 credit standard which the UCC recommends.

D. Proposal to make dormant the Undergraduate and Post-bac Programs in Art Education (Report No. 68, 2014-2015)

This is a proposal to make dormant the undergraduate and post-bac programs in Art Education.

E. Proposal for a 2+2 Articulation Agreement for Social Work with Cuyahoga Community College (Report No. 69, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith stated that this is a proposal for a 2+2 Articulation Agreement for Social Work and Cuyahoga Community College.

F. Program revisions and name change for the Consumer-Industrial Specialization of the MA in Psychology (Report No. 70, 2014-2015)

Finally, Dr. Smith stated that this item calls for program revisions and a name change for the Consumer-Industrial Specialization of the MA in Psychology.

Senate President Sridhar asked if there were any objections to taking all of these six items and voting on them all in one. He then asked if anyone would like to take any one of the proposals out. Dr. Sridhar asked if Senate could do all six of these proposals together. Senate agreed to vote on all six proposals together.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is presenting six items for Senate's consideration and asked if there were any questions about any of the proposals.

Senator Petru Fodor asked if there is a type-o for the Physical Education Major being 127 credit hours. Professor Smith replied that it should be 137 credit hours. Dr.

Smith stated that this is a major that has dual licensure in both health education and physical education and that is the rationale for all of these credits.

Dr. Sridhar then asked if there were any other questions. There being no further questions on any of the six proposals, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The UCC's six proposals (A to F) were unanimously approved by voice vote.

G. For Information: Approved new or modified GenEd courses and 4-3 Conversions (Report No. 71, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith stated that in addition, UCC has a list of approved new or modified GenEd courses and 4 to 3 conversions as stated in his memo. He asked if there were any questions for UCC on the following five items.

1. **REL 268 approved as GenEd (Arts & Humanities ALAAME emphasizing Writing and critical thinking)**
2. **Approved 4-3 conversion of HIS 316H (accompanied by a notice that syllabus should conform to GenEd rules that require that GenEd criteria be on the syllabus)**
3. **Approved 4-3 conversions of the following Psychology courses: PSY 512 (also name change from "Field Research Methods" to "Research Methods in Psychology"); PSY 518, PSY 519; PSY 522; PSY 590; and PSY 631**
4. **Approved CVE 426 as SPAC**
5. **Approved SWK 305 as QL Intensive**

There were no questions or comments on the five informational items and Faculty Senate received the informational items from the University Curriculum Committee.

X. University Admissions and Standards Committee

Professor Jordan Yin, chair of the University Admissions and Standards Committee, stated that the committee has three items for Senate's approval today.

A. Proposal to require Midterm Grades for students in all 100- and 200-level courses and optional Midterm Grading for students in all Undergraduate Courses (at the discretion of the instructor) (Report No. 72, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin presented the first item and noted that as SGA President Allie Dumski mentioned, this is a proposal to require midterm grades for students in all 100- and 200-level courses. He noted that there is a bit of a typo omission here. Also included would be developmental classes, math 087, 0 classes; some 0, 100- and 200-level courses and optional midterm grading for all students in all other undergraduate courses at the discretion of the instructor. He stated that for those who are not familiar with midterm grades, and some people may not teach classes that currently have students affected by this, the current policy is that midterm grades are collected for all students with less than

thirty earned credit hours, new first-year students and students registered for developmental or 100-level courses. It is a student basis for whether or not you have to file midterm grades. For example, he teaches a 200-level Urban Studies course and sometimes he has students that need midterm grades in their class and sometimes they don't. It simply depends on whether or not qualified students are present on your roster. Dr. Yin noted that aside from adding 200-level courses into this mix, it would also switch it over. This policy would in effect replace the previous policy and switch it over to a course-based system where all 0, 100- and 200-level courses would submit midterm grades. He noted that if you teach a 200-level course or 100-level course, you always know that you are going to be asked to submit midterm grades for your students. Professor Yin noted that this is a proposal that originated with the Student Success Committee at the recommendation of the Student Government Association. In addition, this was discussed by the Admissions and Standards Committee and the rationale for this was sort of two-fold. One, it was obviously the student success issue. He noted that as the Memo by Barbara Margolius indicates, we have a lot of ways to provide feedback to students. This is sort of one more tool in that tool kit; we have StarFish, we have our own interactions with students and many people who do give out grade reports at or around midterm or on a more frequent basis. But one element here that was mentioned in some of the earlier points was that there is a feeling that this would be a student success motivator that students would actually pay special attention to. It is one more tool in the toolkit but perhaps a special useful one and also it is relatively easy to do. There will be a minimum disproportionate burden. Certainly people who do teach large classes at the 100- 200-level may have several dozen or several hundred more grades to file midterm than some of the rest of us but it is a relatively predictable system at that level. There is also the notion of adding the optional midterm grade that could be administered to students in 300- to 400-level courses that was suggested by the Office of the Registrar. Partly this would be optional. You could submit a midterm grade if you wish to do so for your students and from the Registrar's point of view it is simply a matter of flipping a switch. Professor Yin added that this is nothing complicated for them and is sort of a matter of, "Well, if we are going to flip it on for 0, 100s and 200s, we might as well turn it on for everyone else." He went on to say that it is almost like a package deal. It is easier to do but this was something technically that is very user friendly and was added to the SGA recommendations. So the proposal is then to add these midterm grades for all 0, 100- and 200-level courses as well as optional for higher level undergraduate students.

Senator Robert Krebs stated that there is a concern for laboratory courses and one credit courses that have a feature of not having a high percentage of the grade when you get to the midterms because it is the nature of the course. The other aspect is the disproportionate burden that you are dealing with courses that you may have a couple of hundred students in a large class. He noted for example that we have in sciences sometimes you will have a college lecturer with four courses and you are dealing with these big sections, we are not talking about several hundred, we are talking literally seven hundred grades to do for somebody who is already teaching four courses.

Professor Yin replied that it is a bit imperfect in coming up with a standard that can be applied to all 100- and 200-level courses that range from small intensive writing all

the way up to very large lecture courses. A substantial number of these already fall under that. All of the 100-level courses which include some lab sciences already fall under this so there is a bit of an impact that is going on and it is a bit of an issue that it is going to need to be dealt with on a case by case basis. He stated that it is a uniform policy with non-uniform outcomes and that is really a challenge. He noted that certainly we don't want this kind of policy driving instruction or driving pedagogy. There are situations where it is appropriate to balance most of the course grade at the end of the semester or the front load at the beginning of the semester. It is going to require some judiciousness in how it is presented to the students, what the meaning of that midterm grade is. Some of them may be very significant; there may be a good measure of your progress; some of them may need to be coached with a little bit of a grain of salt that, "Well, you are getting an A right now but we still have seventy-five percent of the grade left because we have a big final to take care of." So there is going to be some lines of communication that are opened up and also within reasonable boundaries we may need to change how we teach a little bit and try to make the middle of the semester, where possible, a little bit more meaningful as a point of observation. Dr. Yin stated that one size fits all is not what any of us certainly want to approve of but there seems to be a policy that should have a benefit but is going to need a little bit of evolution as instructors and students get used to using it. He noted that Dr. Krebs is right; it has some challenges but presumably they can be managed.

Senator Michael Spicer commented that he may take a general point and generalize a little bit. He asked, "What evidence is that providing midterm grades will in fact help students in terms of their final performance in the course? Is there is any data behind that feeling?"

Professor Yin replied that the committee did not have any data specifically to go with. There was a fairly communicative argument that came out of the Student Success Committee that this would be useful. The data is reviewed by Advising and it falls into a family of information sources like StarFish where there has been some further analysis. He noted that it was not specifically a data-driven decision. Also, there is a bit of inconsistency at the moment with how midterm grades are being used, for whom they are being used and also, what the intent is in the sense that this provides another tool – what he was trying to say is that for one portion of this policy, there is some data-testing if possible. For another, it is still a little bit more hypothetical, especially 200-level courses that have previously not widely had midterm grades handed in and one thing that gets to it is the attrition rate after the first year. So, it does add sort of a new dimension to the student success issues. Professor Yin said that on one hand this was not necessarily a data-driven decision but also it is addressing the application of this to a new group for which there really is not any existing data to go off of. He then asked if Vice Provost Peter Meiksins would like to add anything to this.

Vice Provost Peter Meiksins stated that he can't address Professor Spicer's question systematically but he pointed out one practical thing which is that we have clear evidence from research we have done on students who seek tutoring. Students who seek tutoring late in the semester get no benefit at all from that tutoring whereas students who seek

tutoring somewhere towards the middle of the semester actually do benefit from seeking tutoring. So, one purpose of alerting students to their status in the course is that it might encourage them or it might encourage you as an instructor to encourage that student to go seek tutoring which might actually encourage them to pass the course. So, just as a practical reason for this, it is an opportunity for you to intervene or for the student to engage a little self-help. He went on to say that students have a tendency to wait till the end and they go, "Oh my God, I'm in trouble" and they are right.

SGA President Allie Dumski stated that this was solely a student initiative that SGA took to the Student Success Committee and so the students came to Student Government and said that this is what they wanted because it helps them better to predict if they are going to be successful in the class or if perhaps, we don't like to hear but maybe if it is financially okay to withdraw from the class it is easier to know before that withdrawal date approaches for the drop deadline. She noted that again, this was a student issue not necessarily driven from data or anything like that.

Senator Susan Storrud-Barnes commented that she understands the need for the grades but the question relates to the students, when they get this midterm grade and they still have seventy-five percent of their coursework because there is a massive final at the end. So then you are going to have the issue, the students will say, "Well I was passing at the midterm, now all of a sudden not so." She asked, "In the Registrar's, do we have something that says this is how much of the coursework that a student still has to go?"

Vice Provost Meiksins replied that Professor Storrud-Barnes would have to ask the Registrar. He added that she does have that at her disposal, StarFish, which would allow you to communicate to any student you want about whom you have this concern that that grade has the following meaning. You are also standing in front of the class and so you can take a few minutes out of the class and explain to the student what the midterm grades they received mean. So there are various ways by which you can communicate this information to students. He added that it is not something that is impossible to manage. What the reality is right now, he can give the example he always uses is that there was an honors student who he worked with a few years ago who showed up in her advisor's office having received a grade on a physics exam which was in the forties; she was in tears; she was ready to drop out of school and we suggested to her that, well, do you know what the forty means and she didn't. So, we found the instructor and he said, "Oh, that was the best grade in the class." and it was a better grade than the student who is currently at Carnegie-Mellon as an NSF fellow received when she took this exam. So, the students often don't receive interpretable information about the grades they are getting and so the midterm grades at least give them some kind of a benchmark.

Senator Allyson Robichaud said that she is sort of puzzled by one thing; syllabi are supposed to have on them ?? for every assignment. So, if this is generated by the students who aren't sure what their midterm grade is, it is easily calculable by each and every student. It is not clear to her, if they are not willing to sort of do that work, that they would look on line to find out. She is sensitive to the idea that advisors could see

this and somehow flag it, but she is not really clear why students can't already, with their syllabi, calculate their own grades to know their standing in a class.

Vice Provost Meiksins remarked that not all students understand the concept of a weighted average. He added that he can show everyone a student that he had to explain it to the other day.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray reported that she knows a couple of faculty in her department who turned in midterm grades and heard from students who were panicked, "Oh my God, what does this mean, etc., etc." and it ended up causing a lot of problems. She stated that she appreciated the example that Vice Provost Meiksins gave but the reality of it is she stands in front of her class and she tells the students, "This is your assignment, these are your grades, we are heading toward the midterm, we are a quarter through, if your grades are here or below, you need to come see me, you need to do something about it, you need to go see whomever, etc."

Vice Provost Meiksins commented that this is great but not everybody does that.

Professor Berlin Ray remarked that if we went around this table, you would find that most faculty would do that. She commented that she would say to that student, "Get your butt over to the faculty office and ask that faculty member what that means

Vice Provost Meiksins reported that we have a forty percent graduation rate at this school, right, which is terrible, and we can pretend that we are doing a good job of intervening with our students and we can pretend that it is the students' fault entirely, right? He noted that it is not and this is a simple thing that we can do that many schools across the country actually do that would actually respond to something the students themselves tell us that they are encountering in a number of classes, not all. And, Professor Berlin Ray's is probably an exception and he is sure that many people in this room also do a better job of communicating, but there are some faculty who don't and this is simply a way of making sure that there is uniform communication with students in first and second year classes about where they stand in those classes. He added that it doesn't require us to do an enormous amount of work really. He noted that he has taught large classes, too, and he has entered the final grades for those classes of 100 and it doesn't take hours and hours and hours.

Professor Sridhar stated that he doesn't think the discussion is about whether it takes hours and hours or what kind of feedback. This is a specific kind of feedback that the students want and that is what we are discussing here.

Senator Barbara Margolius commented that over the course of the last year, one thing she has learned is that there is a lot that she doesn't know and she doesn't have the same perspective that a department chair has or that the President of the Student Government has. So, when the SGA came and first spoke to the Board of Trustees, and then came to speak to the Student Success Committee, they actually knew things that we as faculty members of the committee didn't know. So they have the perspective and see

what our colleagues do that we don't always see. While it may be the case that every single one of us here provides the syllabus that follows the syllabus guidelines that gives the student the information to compute their grade at any point during the semester, there are faculty that don't do that. Dr. Margolius went on to say that it may be the case that everyone here clearly communicates to the students where they are throughout the course of the semester and what they need to do to improve or to maintain where they are but not everybody does that. This is just a request that came from SGA and SGA President Allie Dumski was modest, but they really do have the data because they talk to one another, they talk to the students, they have periodic open question periods where students can bring concerns and so this was one of the concerns that they brought. The students didn't exactly ask for this, but they said what we want is better feedback throughout the course of the term with how they are doing. Professor Margolius reported that one of the points that the students made that made her nervous was to have better information to withdraw which is really not something that we want. But, providing students with better information is something that we want. And, Dr. Meiksins didn't mention it but he has actually shared a fair number of articles that document that providing and communicating more effectively to the students on how they are doing does result in better success rates for the students.

Professor Berlin Ray remarked that she is sure that this is true but it is how.

Professor Margolius stated that this wouldn't preclude you from any other sources of communications; it just provides another one. Under the current system, we can't, even if we choose to, enter into CampusNet what the midterm grades are for students who aren't designated. Dr. Margolius noted that this would do two things. It would require it for the 100- and 200- and 0-level courses and it would permit it for the other courses.

Senator Jeff Karem stated that he supports this proposal in part because of two policy concerns. He noted that he has often wanted to give students midterm grades but has not been able because they need them but because they are above the 30 credit mark so he thinks that it is important to lift that restriction. He also thinks that even if it does scare some students, sometimes that is a good thing. He said, "Okay, yes, you still have 75% of your grade left but if right now you are earning a D in the course, something official on campus that will inform you of that might get you in my office more than just a general statement." Dr. Karem noted that the last point, and this is just because of UFAC, we do nothing but review policy statements. Technically, in your email, you are not supposed to be sharing information on grades with students because that is potentially in violation of FERPA if our servers aren't secure. So, he is grateful to have an electronic means to transmit things. Not everybody looks at Blackboard but they do check CampusNet. He noted that when students email him and say, "What is my midterm grade?" he says, come to my office. I am not supposed to tell you because of university policy. But if he can post it on CampusNet, then that will help the student.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady stated that she had one suggestion that might make this easier on everyone because what she is hearing is that if you have a great

number of students, it is just another onerous task to calculate midterms. She said that she uses an “AP” for attendance and to record her grades. She noted that it is called “Great Book Pro” and it is widely used. She said that she bets there are a bunch of them but she bets that some are more used than others. It doesn’t interface with StarFish. If we had software or if we paid somebody to make my AP interface with Starfish, she can do grade reports for the group with “Great Book Pro” and then she just presses a button and it does it with StarFish too. She noted that she talked to Heike Heinrich about this but if we can find the tools that we are all using and connect them to the tools the university purchases, it might make everybody’s life a little easier.

Professor Jordan Yin stated that obviously there is some significance to this recommendation. He noted that the Admissions and Standards Committee has discussed everything from technology to ethics and a couple of other things. He guesses that the question is, “Is there a reasonable chance that this will improve student success in a significant way?” Dr. Yin noted that if implemented with the right kind of support, it seems like there is a good chance that will happen. There needs to be some guide to students or an interpretation of what to do with that information. There needs to be some guidance to instructors on how to provide that information and what it means. It may result in some very positive interactions and may result in some confusing interactions but it does address one of our key issues which is retention and graduation in a very direct and perhaps... He noted, if we had a finer surgical tool to use, I am sure that we would use it. This is not exactly blunt force but we may have to make some adjustments and, unfortunately, it is one of those policies that is going to have a learning curve on all sides around. Professor Yin noted that many of these issues were discussed by the Admission sand Standards Committee and on that basis, there was a rationale to recommend it to Faculty Senate.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any other questions.

Dr. Kareem commented that he is old enough now that he feels generational change alarms him. He thinks that many incoming students, if they have had the experience at their school that his sons have had, are used to a lot of electronic posting of their progress on a six week or twelve week basis so it may be that this kind of vacuum, when you start and you don’t get updates, is a big cultural shift from what people were getting in high school and it might be that something like this could help ease that transition.

Dr. Sridhar reported that the first thing the students did ask for was for midterm grades for all courses. He noted that he believes they were talked down from the ledge. He then asked if there were any other questions about the proposal. Dr. Sridhar then stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is bringing forward a proposal to Faculty Senate to require midterm grades for all students in all 0 courses, 100-level courses and 200-level courses and make available the option of providing midterm grades for all undergraduate courses at the discretion of the instructor. There being no further questions, Dr. Sridhar then asked for the vote. The proposal to require midterm grades for students in all 100- and 200-level courses and optional midterm grading for students

in all undergraduate courses at the discretion of the instructor was approved by voice vote with six abstentions.

B. Proposed removal of Credit Limits for students in Poor Academic Standing (Report No. 73, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin presented the Admissions and Standards Committee's next item which is the proposed removal of credit hour limits for students not in good academic standing. He noted that this would include the current limit that students on academic probation or warning may only take 13 credit hours. This would still have an advising hold but they would be allowed to take 15 or more credit hours up to the usual top of 18 credit hour ban. He noted that there seems to be no evidence that the current lower number benefits students and that increasing the credit hour limit allows them to take advantage of some of our financial incentives as well as to stay on course for normal time towards graduation.

C. College Credit Plus (Report No. 65, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin stated that the third item has to do with admissions standards for College Credit Plus. It is sort of the companion measure to UCC's item A. He noted that it was discussed last month and sets a standard for admission to Cleveland State under College Credit Plus at the State mandated level assuming college level readiness by Ohio students in grades 7 through 12.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any questions about either of these two proposals.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is proposing the removal of credit limits for students in poor academic standing. He noted that currently it is at 13 and that limit gets removed so the students can take the regular number of credits hours as any other student would. He asked one last time if there were any questions about this proposal. He then asked for a vote. The proposed removal of credit limits for students in Poor Academic Standing was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Sridhar then stated that the next proposal is to change the admissions standards for College Credit Plus for the State mandated levels with the proviso that the students have to be college ready as well. Dr. Sridhar then asked for a vote. The proposed change to the admissions standards for College Credit Plus was approved with two abstentions.

XI. University Faculty Affairs Committee

Proposed SEI Policies and Procedures (Report No. 62, 2014-2015)

Professor Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, stated that he had a couple of quick updates. He reported that Scan trons in Testing Services

have been reprogrammed. Now we just need someone to write archaic SBSS codes so that we can interpret that data. Dr. Karem stated that UFAC is half way there but they are working with some folks in CIS to see perhaps an engaged learning opportunity for graduate students and one that will benefit us all. Dr. Karem noted that he is sorry to disappoint everyone because he doesn't have a sheaf of Bylaws changes but everyone will probably have them at the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Karem noted that the key and important item on the Agenda from UFAC today is revised Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Principles and Policies. He stated that at the suggestion at the last Senate meeting and at Steering, UFAC reached out not just to Senators but to every faculty member. He thanked Nigamanth and stated that his inbox has been suitably full. He stated that it has been very productive. He noted that essentially, the only part where UFAC received pretty much any feedback was on the question of accessing SEI data by students. He noted that if everyone recalls, the original proposal had a very fine-grained specific vision of how this could be implemented. UFAC has revised that considerably on the basis of feedback from faculty as well as IS&T and Institutional Research. Dr. Karem said that he would say a little bit about that and then just kind of speak a little more broadly about why UFAC is so committed to giving some access to this data up to students.

Dr. Karem reported that in terms of what UFAC heard about their particular proposal, many faculty were concerned that using CampusNet as the window – and he uses this word carefully, brand faculty with their scores. And you can decide if that is a consumer model or a live-stock model but either way, that got concerns under both metaphors. UFAC also learned from IR and IS&T that they do need to work with UFAC to figure out what is technically possible period if we are working in this direction of access based on our resources and systems. So, in the revised policy, he said that he would spell everyone through the glamorous points in a minute, UFAC is proposing a policy commitment to access with specifics to be determined by appropriate shared governance. In effect, UFAC is asking for pre-approval to pursue access options with the expectation that UFAC will report back to Senate with proposed scenarios for Senate's approval once UFAC has figured out technically what they can do.

Dr. Karem noted that in terms of the principles guiding the access, he would read through the document. UFAC is still committed to the principle that all access must pass through the appropriate secure authentication. He noted that he shouldn't use the word "CampusNet" because that could change. So the authentication may be under a different name. Resources permitting, IR and IS&T will work with the appropriate faculty and student governance mechanisms including UFAC, Faculty Senate, and Student Government Association to determine the data to be shared and the implementation method for sharing. These governance and administrative units will monitor the data to ensure its validity and determine when a sufficient data set has been gathered for that data to be statistically reliable. Dr. Karem noted that the rest of the proposal is essentially unchanged in the document distributed to Senate.

Dr. Karem explained why UFAC believes this is so important to move towards a commitment to access. First of all, the good news is that student access has already occurred in one of our colleges. The College of Law has all this data in their Library and students can go and access it and that has not produced any conflagration. No one has been opposed to it and it seems to have worked well there. More broadly, key State and national peers offer such access down the street, the Health Line, and at Case they offer this access. Student Governments at Kent, Ohio State, and Cincinnati are working to secure such access. The legislature supports these ideas of access. Many states mandate access with two mouse clicks, if you are in Louisiana – it is that precise. You don't have to have a lapel pin but it is sort of pretty close down there. As Dr. Karem said, SGA and the Board are concerned with this access. He noted that we are a public university and these data are subject to public records disclosure requirements and in terms of what people look towards, UFAC believes that it is better for students to use responsibly source data as compared to say, "Great white professors." He noted that in fifteen years, he has twenty ratings – that's more than most of his peers. He doesn't think that is really representative of anything. If we actually have data that is better, he thinks we want that to be a good source. Dr. Karem stated that given the spectrum of concerns and the fact that these are public records, UFAC believe it is better for Senate to be proactive in fostering access in a careful way rather than retreating from this issue which realistically is not a tenable strategy that will work and it will simply force other parties to put in place something without us that may be less responsive to our concerns. He said he thinks it probably would be. Dr. Karem stated that in the aggregate, these principles and policies UFAC feels will strike a balance for improving the SEI for all parties and defining appropriate use of this data. He noted that prior to this policy, there has not been any language explaining what the use of this data means or any sort of cautionary language. So, UFAC thinks there is a fair combination here of increased protection, indicating that this data is not the sole indicator of teaching competence or excellence. But then at the same time, increased transparency so that this could be something that could be shared with parties who rightly want to see it.

Dr. Karem stated that the last point he wants to make, and he feels fairly strongly about this one – he just wants to kind of put it out there. As Faculty Senate, we have militated for transparency from the administration on all sorts of fronts and rightly so, and he thinks particularly this year, there has been a lot of responsiveness there, as to how can we take that stance and not be committed to transparency ourselves. So, there would be a really serious breach of our own internal code of ethics if we aren't committed to exploring access to this for students.

Senator Claire May stated that she is in favor of this proposal. She referred to page 2, 1.b. of the document where it says, "resources permitting," and asked, "What is resources permitting?" She noted that the reason she asks is just that "resources permitting" could be a governance consideration.

Dr. Karem responded that "resources permitting" there, the good and bad news as a Senate, we don't have any resources, right? So, the question is simply, "Can this be done?" He noted that whatever we propose in working it out with IS&T and IR, is it

technically possible and resources there also means human resources. They have a lot of things going on so we can't just say make it so. It won't just instantly happen. There will need to be a timeline to complete this. He added that this was put in and he did send it to Senator May. IR and IS&T asked, "Could you please indicate that it is a policy development" – we don't have unlimited resources.

Senator May commented that they could consult with us if they want.

Dr. Karem stated that this makes clear that they will have to work with us. He added that if they don't have the resources too, then nothing is going to happen, right? The resources permitting is modifying Institutional Research and Information Services and Technology. Dr. Karem went on to say that having spoken with various administrative units, they are not railroading this forward. They wanted this in there as a cautionary to indicate, look, we can't just pull the switch tomorrow the way we can with midterm grades.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any other questions. There being no further questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed SEI Policies and Procedures and asked Senators to vote. The proposed SEI Policies and Procedures were approved with two abstentions.

XII. Updates from University Advancement (Report No. 74, 2014-2015)

Vice President Berinthia LeVine thanked Senate for allowing her to give an update on where they are in University Advancement. She said that she appreciates the time that she spent with Senate in the fall. She gave a fundraising update. She noted that last year she mentioned to Senate that 2014 was a record for Cleveland State University - \$20.4 million which was the largest ever in the history of the university. She added that we are on the path for another record-setting year and she is really pleased to be able to report that to Senate both for attainment which is our pledges and gifts and for cash. She said that we are also hoping to exceed our goals for donors. She noted that she has been told that the alumni donor year-to-date number has now surpassed last year. She said that they are really focused on creating a culture of philanthropy here and she wants to thank everyone for their support in so many different ways.

Vice President LeVine reported that a lot of our progress in fundraising as she mentioned to Senate is at the transformational gift level. Those gifts are at the \$1 million plus level and those are generally presidential solicited gifts and we have a great fundraising President. She noted that they are also trying very hard to grow the middle of the pipeline – the leadership gifts; the six-figure gifts, the \$100,000 plus gifts and of course our major gifts which are \$25,000. Those gifts are generally payable over five years. It is the rare donor who comes to us and will write us a check outright. She noted that she did want Senate to know where we stood and also that we are considering and have been in the planning stages for a comprehensive campaign for the university. What that means is that we have been focused on creating a situation which focuses all of our advancement energies on raising a substantial amount of money from the university.

Vice President LeVine stated that the President has been out soliciting and she has been out soliciting. She stated that her goal is that before the end of the year she will have met with every single foundation director and she is also meeting with all members of the senior staff and our Deans to get their commitment. She said that she thinks that Senate heard her say that when we talk to our faculty and staff we say it is not what you give; it is that you give because we are trying to create a culture of philanthropy. She said that she wanted Senate to know that they recently received the largest gift ever she believes for a class from a former faculty member – it is a bequest and is close to \$300,000 and she will be announcing that use soon. They just also closed a gift at the Law School from a faculty member in the amount of \$500,000. She said that these things do happen. The focus of the campaign will be around student success. She noted that we hear that a lot. There are a lot of components to student success. There is scholarship support; there is faculty development; there is creating facilities that really enhance the learning experience. We have a proposal out for a \$350,000 lab improvement. Vice President LeVine stated the purpose of her speaking with Senate today is to really just let members know that they are really focused on improving through philanthropy the work and the ability of our students to succeed here at CSU. She stated, this is co-incidental because she had hoped to come to Senate last month; the faculty/staff campaign kicked off this month. She noted that last year we had a record-setting year for a faculty and staff campaign; we had over 600 people who contributed – a record setting amount of money for the campaign that was over \$323,000 contributed. She report that we have our Radiance Fund-raiser coming up in May and the goal is \$1 million. She noted that we are about \$840,000 toward that goal right now. Those dollars come in and they are last dollars in primarily for students who are juniors and seniors and come to the university and say, “Look, I want to continue but I have gotten all of my gifts, I’ve gotten all of my grants, I have gotten all of my scholarships and I am going to have to drop out for now; I just don’t have that extra \$1,000 or \$2,000.” Vice President LeVine reported that since its inception in 2011, Radiance has helped almost a thousand students stay in school. She stated that we are very proud of that and she wanted Senate to be aware of that. She also wanted everyone to be aware of the significant increase in the number of alumni events. Part of creating a culture of philanthropy is engaging our alumni and we have our Alumni Association in conjunction with Student Affairs that is hosting its first even women’s philanthropy luncheon. In the first day the invitation went out, we had one hundred RSVPs and we are now over 250 who are planning to attend on April 15. Vice President LeVine noted that she just wanted everyone to know that there are a lot of good things going on in Alumni Affairs fundraising in the Foundation. A leadership summit will be held tomorrow where they are calling together our Alumni Association Board, our visiting committees and other leadership to really learn more about the functioning of the university.

Vice President LeVine stated that she is happy to take any questions. She really wanted to thank everyone for their support and continued guidance. She added that she appreciates when faculty send her suggestions and hopes that she is being responsive to everyone. She then thanked Senate for its time.

XIII. Open Question Time

Dr. Sridhar commented that next month everyone should plan to stay here longer because we will have elections. He stated that we do have time for questions and asked if anyone had any questions.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady stated that she had two easy questions and they are both related to communication. Her first question is for herself because our galleries were thinking about having a show in conjunction with the Republican National Convention that would be open to such a public face of CSU and she needs to know who she needs to talk to because will we be able to stack up with people and should we be doing that or not. She then asked, "Who is the contact person?"

President Berkman responded that Bill Napier, Senior Advisor to the President and Secretary to the Board of Trustees and or Clare Rahm, Associate Vice President, Campus Support Services will be the contact persons in terms of convention logistics.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady asked if they will coordinate with the convention services people as well. President Berkman replied, "Yes." President Berkman remarked that Dr. Visocky-O'Grady had a great idea. He commented that there will be 55,000 people here for the convention so it will dwarf what we saw for the Sweet Sixteen and the Cleveland International Film Festival that were extraordinary but it will dwarf that in terms of the number of people who will be here for five concentrated days. He added that our goal is to get as many of them to come to campus for as many events we can have on campus. And then they can see Cleveland State University again because it is in the second ring so anybody staying will be able, without a problem, move out to the university.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady said her second question is, and this might be a question for the SGA representatives, "When you guys have questions when the students come to you with concerns, who do you go to, to get the answers?"

SGA President Allie Dumski replied that it really depends on what the question is. She noted that Dr. Boyd Yarbrough, Vice President for Student Affairs, is a great resource person and that is where SGA goes first and he would direct SGA. She noted that many of those at SGA have created relationships with the right people.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady inquired if it is possible to get another link in there somewhere because there was a question Ms. Dumski had asked about scheduling and she can tell her that there is a really elaborate system to get classes in the right places. There is the sixty percent rule. Wow, it really takes her a long time to do this. She is absolutely thinking about everything she brought up but she is not sure that we, as department chairs, can communicate to individual students. But, if Ms. Dumski had a way to connect with the faculty, faculty could explain to her so that she could explain to the students.

Ms. Dumski replied that this is why SGA came to Faculty Senate and SGA hopes that faculty here will communicate with department chairs and that is our link instead of reaching out to every single department chair.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady stated that it is being done – department chairs communicate back to the students.

Senator Robert Krebs commented that fifty faculty positions sounds exciting. He asked if Provost Mageean could give Senate a quick breakdown just of the three major categories: tenure-track positions, lecturers, visiting.

Provost Mageean replied that they are not there yet and they are still playing around with the numbers a little bit. She noted that this year with the new contract going forward it is like changing the percentage of lecturers. She is talking to some departments about adjuncts. She said, "So, that is part of what we hope to complete by Friday night to get a more complete report. Most of those positions will be tenure-track."

Senator Beth Ekelman turned back to the Republican Convention. She noted that she is concerned that some of our courses – in Health Sciences we have an anatomy lab and we can't exactly relocate that lab for a week. For the Neuroscience Lab, the same thing. She said she is concerned about that. Those courses that go for ten weeks are already depressed. Dr. Ekelman asked, "How is the decision going to be made about other accommodations for this week because this is a significant chunk?"

President Berkman replied that we are going to have to ask the Provost to communicate with the Registrar. We look at what is the span and which flexibility we do or do not have and how many days we might offer those courses and what exceptions there may be. He understands that it is hard to move an anatomy lab. He noted that it will be equally hard to move anatomy students into the anatomy lab. He commented that he wishes it wasn't so. He said that we will do everything we can – whether we need to stretch it out a week longer than we normally would, that one week kind of being a break week in the middle of the summer term, or whether we can start earlier. President Berkman noted that we need to explore the options right now with the Registrar.

Provost Mageean commented that it is not just the summer sessions. We have the OTs and PTs in Health Sciences that run twelve or more programs and Nursing. It would be worth convening a small working group especially with some of the people that would be particularly affected like Professor Ekelman's group. She added that we need to put our heads together.

Senator Andrew Gross commented that he is sorry that he missed the last Senate meeting – he was teaching off campus. He stated that in the light of what Dr. Jeff Karem had said on transparency and others, and being encouraged by other faculty both in and out of his college, he will ask this ticklish but important question. Dr. Gross inquired if there is any evidence, just correlation, between the big switch of 4 to 3 and current transient enrollment and budget shortfall.

President Berkman responded that he thinks there is a relationship. He noted that we were told by Ohio State, he doesn't know how many faculty spoke at the Faculty Senate, the individual we had from Ohio State was responsible for their 4 to 3 conversion, and Ohio State saw a ten percent reduction in student credit hours in the first year of the switch. He stated that A) it is difficult to communicate with students and B) it is relatively more difficult to change student behavior and student patterns. He noted that Ohio State saw it inch back up after the first year. He added that this is why the President has talked so much about all of us encouraging students to take the courses they need to get the fifteen credits; take five courses. So yes, there is definitely a relationship.

XIV. New Business

Senate President Sridhar asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie K. Jackson
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel