MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MAY 4, 2016

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Bleeke, Boboc, W. Bowen, Corrigan, Deering, Delatte, Delgado, Ekelman, Engelking, Fodor, V. Gallagher, Genovese, M. Gibson, Holland, Holtzblatt, D. Jackson, J. Jenkins, S. Kaufman, R. Krebs, Lazarus, Little, Lupton, Marino, C. C. May, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, O'Neill, B. Ray, Resnick, A. Smith, Sonstegard, Sridhar, Visocky-O'Grady, W. Wang, Xu, H. Zhou.

R. Berkman, Sawicki, G. Thornton, Yarbrough, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Duffy, Hampton, Henry, Inniss, Mazumder, Mead, Rashidi, Robichaud, Shukla, Zhao, and Zingale.

All, Bennett, Boise, Bond, Chesko, Gleeson, Grech, Halasah, Karlsson, Khawam, LeVine, Lehfeldt, V. Lock, McHenry, Novy, Parry, Ramos, R. Reed, Rushton, Sadlek, Schultheiss, Spademan, B. White, Zachariah.

ALSO PRESENT: Kothapalli.

Senate President Nigamanth Sridhar called the meeting to order at 3:07 P.M.

I.   Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of May 4, 2016

Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to approve the Agenda for today's meeting. Senator James Marino moved and Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady seconded the motion and the Agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

II.   Approval of Meeting Minutes

Senate President Sridhar reported that there are no Minutes to be approved today.

III.   Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman greeted everyone. He said that he would talk about a couple of events that are really important and that are certainly now part of the Cleveland State University tradition. He stated that a week from Friday, the night before commencement, we would have the annual Radiance event. He noted that it is a great event if people haven't been there before as faculty members. It is great for faculty to be there and to participate. He said that we typically have about 450 people and it really is a nice opportunity to showcase the university. He noted that each year we present one individual with the President's Medal, which is the highest non-academic level of recognition at the university and this year the medal will be presented to Steven Minter. Many people know that Steven Minter, who has been an Executive in Residence at the College of Urban Affairs and has been an extraordinary civic leader in Cleveland as the President of the Cleveland Foundation and has been a tremendous, strong and determined advocate for Cleveland State University and a debt of gratitude we owe. So, we will partially return it with the President's Medal in the evening of Radiance.

President Berkman reported that we have now raised about $1,100,000 in scholarship money for Radiance. Radiance is a scholarship event; it is focused on last mile students – students who have ninety credits or more, are in good academic standing, and for various reasons do not have the financial resources to walk that last mile. President Berkman reported that we now somewhere near 1,200 scholarships over the twenty years of Radiance that we have been able to award to this group of students. He added that Radiance is a wonderful evening where the community gets to see and touch CSU so he encourages everyone to attend. He added that there isn't any charge actually but of course people can make a contribution to the scholarship fund.

President Berkman stated that two commencements follow the day after Radiance. He noted that 2,000 student are eligible to graduate at this commencement. As of today, 1,650 have indicated that they will walk which he always takes as a really very good sign. Seven or eight years ago, we did not have that many students who walked at Graduation. And, also what has been tremendous, and he has applauded the faculty for this before, and he has certainly done it at every commencement, the faculty turnout at both commencements have been incredibly robust and incredibly appreciated and it is a wonderful day. We strive to keep the ceremony under two hours. There are about twenty-four PhDs so they may delay things a little bit, but again, he hopes that faculty can join them at commencement. President Berkman reported that at commencement they would award an Honorary Degree to Robert Rawson, Jr. who has been the chair of the Board of Trustees at CSU. As he likes to say, he is in the *Guinness Book of Records* as the only individual who has ever chaired the Board at Princeton University and Cleveland State University and it is probably a record that will stand up. He was indeed for nine years the chair of the Board of Trustees at Princeton University and has done four spectacular years here at Cleveland State. So he will be awarded an Honorary Degree in the afternoon and he will give the Commencement address in the afternoon. President Berkman noted that we will have two Commencement addresses which we typically don't have – one by Bob Rawson in the afternoon and one by one of our Alums, Andrew Puzder, who, if you read the *Wall Street Journal,* you will see is a regular contributor to the *Wall Street Journal* and is the CEO of the restaurant chain that

owns Hardees, Carl's Jr. and Dunkin Donuts. He is an extraordinarily interesting writer and thinker and again, if you want to look at his stuff, just goes to the *Wall Street Journal*. Every month he has a piece published in the *Wall Street Journal*. Mr. Rawson, in the afternoon, will be at the Law School Commencement. We will award an Honorary Degree to Mary Robinson, the former President of Ireland and she will give the Commencement address at the Law School Commencement. President Berkman stated that it is really an incredibly important weekend for our students, parents, faculty, alumni, etc. So, again, he appreciates everyone's attendance and he appreciates everyone's participation.

President Berkman stated that he has talked to Faculty Senate before about the capital bill. Of course the capital bill contains – we got the largest increase in the State of Ohio. But, interestingly and maybe a little unexpectedly, drew the wrath of some editorial writers from around the State. He noted that there was one in the Youngstown's paper which was really – he said he doesn't know who the editor is there – but they basically wrote a piece saying, "How could Cleveland State get this larger percentage, considerably larger allocation, in percentage terms then Youngstown State got after Jim Trestle stood with John Kasich and endorsed John Kasich for President of the United States. They put it in print. Of course the Governor's Office said that pay to play is against the law in Ohio. So, it went through the House Committee yesterday and it should go to the full House tomorrow. It contains a $7.9 million appropriation for a School of Television, Film, and Visual Media. Now, our goal really is to try not to use it on bricks and mortar. We obviously are going to need some space; we are going to need some renovation, but the idea would be to try to use as much of it as we can. He noted that it is capital money, remember, so it can only be used for equipment and for capital renovations or buildings. President Berkman said that his hope is that we will be able to devote the bulk of the dollars to building a technology platform and a film platform that will really be in Ohio and one of a kind. President Berkman said that he hopes by the end of the week that it will pass the House. It has already passed the Senate. It also contains our other appropriation for the completion of the Engineering School. President Berkman reported that he heard a rumor at CNN that John Kasich has withdrawn from the presidential race. An unidentified Senator stated that John Kasich would be announcing at 5:00 PM today that he would withdraw from the Presidential race. President Berkman stated that he is not sure whether that is good or bad at this particular moment but it is what it is. We have had an indication in the past that the Governor will sign and we will have done extraordinarily well in the capital cycle.

President Berkman reported that we are getting ready to bring to the Board in May a budget which we do every year. He noted that the good news in challenging times is that we will bring a balanced budget to the Board. If everyone remembers last year he reported that we brought to the Board a budget which at least had a contingency that would allow us to use $3.1 million in reserves to fill a potential budget gap. He noted that we did not use any reserves or will not use any reserves in this year and that next year we are not asking for any authorization for reserves because we believe that we have a structurally balanced budget.

President Berkman gave an enrollment update. He noted that it is obviously a work in progress, as enrollment will not roll out throughout the entire summer until the beginning of the semester. But today, we have 11,294 freshmen applications to Cleveland State University. At this point in time last year, we had just a little over 10,000 applications and at this time last year, we had 9,900 applications. So, we are up from 9,900 to 11,294 freshmen applications. Obviously, we continue to do well. There are a lot of factors that help us to excel and of course now an application has to be done and an admit has to become an enrollee, and has to become a student who is retained, etc. Overall, the headcount right now is up 4.1% and the student credit hours, which are really the metric, the coin of the realm, are up 7.1%. So, as he stands here today in May recognizing that we are only in the third quarter of a four quarter game, the enrollment signs are looking very, very positive.

President Berkman reported that he had meetings over the last two/three weeks, first with all of the Deans and then with the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate to get their input and discuss naming Dr. Jianping Zhu as our permanent Provost. He stated that in both venues, he has done an extraordinary job. We could spend a lot of money, a lot of time going out in the market and doing a national search and we will not find anyone who bring the set of skills, sensitivity, fairness, balance, and passion about the university that Dr. Zhu brings. He said that he could also assure the Senate that Dr. Zhu knows how to say no to him (President Berkman). He knows how to say, "I don't think this is a good idea, why don't we consider X, Y, and Z" and that is what you want in a Provost, a Provost who is a consultative partner. President Berkman said that he had consulted also by law with the Board of Trustees who unanimously agreed or affirmed that we ought to go ahead with the appointment of Dr. Zhu as our permanent Provost. President Berkman added that he feels that we are very lucky and very fortunate to have someone with the skills and passion and with the sense of fairness and really have not missed a beat in terms, which is often a very, very difficult transition for a university in bringing in a new Provost.

IV.   Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Nigamanth Sridhar noted that since we have elections and we have a long Agenda in front of us, he would only discuss two things. The first, almost exactly to the day a year ago was when we stood in this room and talked about administrative costs in the university and essentially at that meeting of the Faculty Senate was the first time we made references to what has now become the Path to 2020 Project that several of us have worked on. He said he wanted to extend sincere thanks to all faculty members and other people in the administration who have actually worked on the project. He noted that President Berkman reported as part of his report that we are presenting a balanced budget. He noted that he is standing here as the President of Faculty Senate as well as a member of the 2020 team who happily report that one of the things that made it possible for us to present the balanced budget to the Board of Trustees was because the administrative side of the University has taken off costs of about $3.5 million ($3,477,000). He noted that this number represents a reduction in administrative costs that have come from several units that have gone through the 2020 budget process.

For those units that haven't yet had a chance to finish the 2020 budget process, comes from just an upfront reduction in budgets. He noted this a solid recognition of where our priorities are and this has been an excellent collaborative exercise with all parts of the University being involved. He stated that this is the primary thing that has come out of the 2020 Project so far. We are in the process of preparing a comprehensive report for the Board later this month as well as a draft of the report that will be submitted to the Governor's Office for the Governor's Fast Track Task Force on Efficiency and Affordability. Senate President Sridhar stated that at the first meeting of Faculty Senate next fall, we would have a more detailed comprehensive presentation and a discussion about what we have done with 2020 and where things are.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the other thing he wanted to report on is one that is causing lots of issues for several of us on the academic side of things and that is MagnusMart. He noted that there are lots and lots of problems. In his conversations with at least a half dozen department chairs and similar kinds of people, it seems to work well for what we call straight forward budgets – ordering supplies or equipment on a one-on-one basis. That kind of stuff seems to work well but doesn't work so well for most other things that departments can do like paying people or paying people to work on grants, etc. There are still issues. He reported that he had a brief discussion with the Provost this morning and the Provost had a meeting with the Deans. He noted that the Provost would make some remarks as part of his report as well on where we are going and what kinds of things we can do in terms of moving forward.

Dr. Sridhar commented that he had one last thing: he wanted to thank and recognize Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange for her service to the University. She will retire at the end of this year. A round of applause ensued.

V.   Elections

Following procedures for nominating candidates for election to the various committees of the Faculty Senate and other posts, members of Senate elected faculty to the following positions:

University Faculty Affairs Committee
Beth Ekelman (Health Sciences), two-year term
Claire Robinson May (Law), two-year term
Yan Xu (Chemistry), two-year term

Minority Affairs Committee
Dana Hubbard (Criminology, Anthropology, Sociology), two-year term
Jacqueline Vitali (Physics), two-year term
Ye Zhu, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science), two-year term

Budget and Finance Committee
Brian Ray (Law), two-year term
Joel Lieske (Political Science), two-year term

Mary McDonald (English), one-year term

Board of Trustees
Mark Holtzblatt (Accounting), one-year term

Board Recognition Committee
Professor Mark Holtzblatt (Accounting), three-year term

Ohio Faculty Council – Alternate Faculty Representative
Stephen Taysom (Philosophy/Religion), two-year term

Copyright Review Committee
Jeffrey Dean (BGES), three-year term

Patent Review Committee
Christopher Wirth (Chemical & Biomedical Engineering), three-year term

Dr. Sridhar thanked everyone very much for serving on committees and noted that this is incredibly valuable for the University and for the faculty in keeping the University going.

VI.   University Faculty Affairs Committee

Dr. Sridhar reported that unfortunately Dr. Allyson Robichaud, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, is sick today so Dr. Beth Ekelman, a representative of the committee, will present the items from UFAC.

A.   Revisions to the Greenbook (Report No. 52, 2015-2016)

Dr. Beth Ekelman stated that UFAC has a couple of action items today. The committee recommends some revisions to the Greenbook. She noted that the first focus is on resolving the confusion between who is an adjunct faculty and who is a part-time instructor. When the Greenbook was revised, for some reason the old definition of adjunct was taken out and then the definition for part-time instructor was put in as adjunct and so UFAC wanted to clarify that because there are differences of those two terminologies. She noted that the proposed revisions clarify that so that adjuncts are those individuals who are reviewed by their department and then put in by the Provost for a specific term. And, part-time instructors are called single term instructors. They are to teach a couple of courses and it is determined on a semester-by-semester basis. She noted that the other detail for the part-time single term instructor is under the former Greenbook provision. They are limited to teach two courses, which under the four-credit system is eight credits so UFAC changed that to nine credits so they can teach nine credits instead of eight and that way it falls within the three-credit model. So the one main provision under section 3344-12-01 and 3344-12-03 has been revised to apply to part-time single term instructors. She asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

Dr. Ekelman noted that the second changes were about special faculty status. Again, UFAC is again trying to clean up the language in the Greenbook and we have the definition of the College of Law Clinical Professors and Legal Writing Professors and also added the definition of Professors of Practice, which were recently added to the AAUP Contract. UFAC removed the Special Status Clinical Faculty, Clinical Assistant, Associate and whole faculty because they are described in the AAUP Contract so they are no longer considered Special Status Faculty because they can get tenure. UFAC didn't want to create a hierarchy among our Tenure Track Faculty. We do have them under a provision just to define them because they are of a different special faculty status just to avoid confusion. So these are the second sections – 3344-12-01 and 3344-12-05. Dr. Ekelman asked if there were any questions on these revisions. There were no questions.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee in bringing forth a motion to make amendments to the Greenbook as presented in the materials provided in the meeting packets. He then asked if there were any questions.

Senator Fred Smith inquired why the Professors of Practice are in the Contract today and have to be in the Greenbook.

Dr. Ekelman responded because they don't have the AAUP protection like lecturers until they are reviewed. She added that they are treated very similar to the lecturers.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any further questions. There being no further questions, Dr. Sridhar asked for all in favor of approving these changes as presented by the University Faculty Affairs Committee, to please say aye. The UFAC's proposed revisions to the Greenbook were unanimously approved by voice vote.

B. Recommendation for more Data Sharing of Student Evaluations (Report No. 53, 2015-2016)

Professor Ekelman stated that the next recommendation is about sharing the data for the SEI Evaluations. She commented that if everyone recalls at our last Senate meeting, we were asked to explore the possibility of having and sharing more data. UFAC did consider that and as we were exploring that with Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange and her group, we found that we are not going to be able to get aggregated data so, in other words, as we get SEI reports we receive semester by semester, we are not going to have any aggregated means. She added that apparently the system couldn't do that. UFAC was originally thinking that we wait to hold that sharing more than just the overall means for instructor and course until we could make sure that the data was more reliable. Professor Ekelman noted that we are not going to be able to do that so it is not possible to get aggregated means. UFAC then looked at it a little bit more and we decided that we needed to filter the data a little bit more. Right now, as instructors, we get the data with at least five responses for our courses. But many are getting very low

response rates so what is considered a decent response rate? UFAC talked about that and in social science research, thirty percent is considered a decent response rate. In order to share the data beyond just the means (the overall means of the instructor and course) UFAC decided to recommend to Faculty Senate that further data won't be shared on all of the other questions unless five students or more respond and the response rate is at least thirty percent. Once those two filtered items are triggered, and then the student will be able to click on something so that they can see more information on the other more detailed questions under the Instructor and Course questions that are on the SEIQ. So, UFAC decided the filter should be five. UFAC had Vice Provost LaGrange and Tom Geaghan run numbers. If we had chosen ten as the number to filter, we would have lost 47% of the sections that were reported last fall. So, if we chose five as the cutoff, we keep 72% of the sections. So, UFAC decided that was better. If we cut off at ten, we would lose a lot of graduate courses since the minimum enrollment for graduate courses is five. We didn't want to cut off graduate courses either so UFAC thought that five was a reasonable number and that is the main rationale for that. Then Vice Provost LaGrange and Tom Geaghan wrote up a book that students would see which is the document titled "Evaluation Database Mock-Up" that basically explains the database. It reiterates that there is only one way to evaluate an instructor. It talks about that you can't use statistical analysis using this data and it talks about how to log in, etc. So, that is what the students would see and read to access the SEIQ.

Mr. Tom Geaghan pointed out that they used a two semester optic enrollment to work out all of the bugs. He said that this might be a real good idea to do this at this time as well. He went on to say that when you dump a bunch of data, you don't know what is going to show up or even finding some problems with others so maybe it needs to be phased in before we go full scale. We might even learn what problems it might have.

Professor Ekelman stated that it was piloted last year and she knows that a lot of problems were brought out last spring because Health Sciences decided to pilot and brought up a lot of the problems but a lot of those were addressed. Additional problems have been addressed. She noted that her understanding is that Institutional Research is getting a lot of complaints about problems. So UFAC would recommend that this start in the fall.

Senator Robert Krebs stated that he supports the proposal but he has a question. He asked, "How are we maintaining cross-listed courses? Does it give a 400 or a 500 or the odds of getting both of them qualifies and therefore you may have something that is a subset or one part of what are actually a large number of cross-listed courses?

Dr. Ekelman replied that that issue came up last spring because Health Sciences has a lot of cross-listed courses and her understanding is they are not separately recorded.

There being no further questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee is bringing forward a proposal on Student Evaluation of Instruction data sharing as outlined in the documents in the meeting packets. He then asked those in

favor of approving this proposal to say aye. The UFAC's proposal for more data sharing of Student Evaluations was unanimously approved by voice vote.

VII.   University Curriculum Committee

Senator Fred Smith, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that the first seven items from the UCC are Articulation Agreements between CSU and Tri-C and a partnership agreement between CSU LCCC. He noted that these are also items under the Admissions and Standards Committee. He suggested deferring voting on these seven agreements. The Admissions and Standards Committee will take care of them. The Articulation Agreements are for six different disciplines. They provide efficient pathways for degree completion. They are all the same except for what is particular to the different majors. The Urban Studies proposal augments an existing partnership agreement between the Urban College and LCCC. Dr. Smith stated that he would be happy to answer any questions about them. There were no questions.

A. Articulation Agreement – CSU/Tri-C – Psychology (Report No. 54, 2015-2016)

B.   Articulation Agreement – CSU/Tri-C – Math (Report No. 55, 2015-2016)

C. Articulation Agreement – CSU/Tri-C – Biology (Report No. 56, 2015-2016)

D. Articulation Agreement – CSU/Tri-C – History (Report No. 57, 2015-2016

E. Articulation Agreement – CSU/Tri-C – Philosophy (Report No. 58, 2015-2016

F. Articulation Agreement – CSU/Tri-C – Political Science (Report No. 59, 2015-2016

G. Urban Studies BA Organizational Leadership Partnership Agreement Addendum (Report No. 60, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith stated that UCC has three additional proposals.

H. Adopt NACE (National Association of Colleges and Employers) Criteria for an Experience to be defined as an Internship – Appendix A: NACE Criteria for an Experience to be defined as an Internship (Report No. 61, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith noted that the first is to adopt the National Association of Colleges and Employers criteria for an experience to be defined as an Internship. Those criteria are listed on the second page of the UCC's memo under "Appendix A: NACE Criteria for an

Experience to be defined as an Internship." They seem like reasonable criteria for the experience to be defined as an Internship and adopting these criteria is one step that is being proposed in the development of the more coherent system Internships that are both for credit and not for credit at CSU. He asked if there were any questions.

Professor Krebs asked if these were paid or not paid. Dr. Smith replied that these are not paid to complete. He added that he is not sure that they will be paid but what these criteria are for is an experience to be called an Internship. So whether it is paid or unpaid, credit or not for credit, if you want to call it an Internship, it has to be resentenced.

Dr. Sridhar commented that as he understands it, this is the first in a series of these things.

Dr. Smith reported that there was a Task Force on Internships that has proposed a variety of things concerning Internships. One of them, which we approved at the last Senate meeting, was the creation of a zero credit course so that there could be a transcript notation for a zero credit internship and we are defining an internship and additional matters concerning internships will come along during the next year.

There being no further questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Curriculum Committee is bringing forward a proposal to adopt criteria of the National Association of Colleges and Employers for an experience to be defined as an Internship and asked for a vote. The UCC's proposal to adopt the NACE (National Association of Colleges and Employers) criteria for an experience to be defined as an Internship was unanimously approved by voice vote.

I.   Require that certain information be on Course Syllabi – Appendix B: Proposal concerning Syllabus Content (Report No. 62, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith stated that next is a proposal that certain information be required on CSU course syllabi. He noted that the proposed requirements are listed on the second page of the UCC's memo in the packet of materials distributed for today's meeting under "Appendix B: Proposal concerning Syllabus Content." He noted that he is happy to read the list but he is guessing that people should have the list. He indicated that this does deviate from our current practice in which nothing is required to be on the CSU Syllabus. We have a list of recommended items for syllabi on the Senate website so we are now moving to the proposal that certain information be required. He noted that this originates apart from the experience that the UCC had during the 4 to 3 conversion and the opportunity to review every syllabus in the University and found that many of them lacked essential information that either a student or someone reviewing a course for transfer or a colleague or anyone who wanted to know about the course would expect to find. Dr. Smith stated that he is happy to answer questions about the list of required elements. He noted that UCC also has a list of desirable elements that would be required. He stated that nothing here precludes any instructor from adding other things to his or her

syllabus like the artwork that anthropologists often have. He then asked if anyone had any questions.

Senator Marian Bleeke stated that something scares her. She just had a question on the distinction about some of the things that appear on the "Required" list and then on some of the things that appear on the "Desirable" list. She noted that on the "Required" list it says, "Statement of the basis on which grades will be assigned, etc." and then down on the "Desirable" list it states, "List of particular assignments in which a grade will be based" and she doesn't see a difference between those two. And then the grading criteria and again, she doesn't see a difference between those two and then the grading scale – what makes an "A" in the class and what makes a "B" that is under "Desirable" and she is wondering why that is not listed on the "Required" list. So she just has a question about how things got sorted out on the two lists and overlapped between the two of them that she sees.

Professor Smith responded that concerning part of this, this is not an easy question to answer. He noted that first; the question is one that he hoped would not be asked. He stated he hoped that we would approve it or not approve it. If we approved it, we would get people to look at it and figure it out and over time the answers would follow. A statement on the basis of the grade under which grades would be assigned positioned it. He noted that it could be a simple statement like three equally graded mid-term exams equally spaced through a course. So a particular sentence on which to base, like if you have seven things, like that is desirable to us. This proposal is sort of linked to the next proposal and so part of the way that things got put where they are… Two things might be unclear, and could get clarified later, and this is because the next proposal, "Appendix C: Proposal concerning Syllabus Availability" is that the syllabi be made available to students at least one week before the semester starts. So, we appreciate sometimes that certain details get worked out later so the required things are what should be on the syllabus one week before the semester starts. He wondered if his response at least answered the Professor Bleeke's question in part.

Professor Bleeke replied that Dr. Smith's response does answer the sort of why but she still wonders about the second one – what makes an "A" and what makes a "B" and what makes a "C" being desirable because one of the things we need to have in our class curriculum is that it is not the same in every class. When we were going through the 4 to 3 conversion, Dr. Smith might think that a "C" starts at 75% and she might think that it is at 60%. While Dr. Smith might think it is 75% and if that is not stated somewhere, a student is coming in with an experience of, "Oh, 60% is a 'C' but now in your class it is '75%' and all of a sudden, 'Oh my God, it is not a 'C' so that might be an important thing to define up front."

Dr. Smith replied that what UCC thinks is that the advice of the instructor will make these things appear but UCC is not prepared to say you have to do this. So, nothing here says that you can't or shouldn't put things in that are not required. So, anyone can say they are willing to put all of these desirable things on or to put even more things on.

Dr. Smith stated that certain things should be on the syllabus but the advice of the instructor will make the criteria clear.

Professor Ekelman stated that she is still grappling with why objectives are not on the "Required" list because that seems to her to be pretty fundamental. She asked, "What is the rationale for why that is not on the 'Required' list – the objectives?"

Dr. Sridhar noted that the question is about course objectives and why that is on the "Desirable" list and not on the "Required" list.

Dr. Smith responded that one of the things that are on the "Required" list is the catalog information. Catalog information includes the catalog description of the course and maybe we should actually say that the catalog information includes the catalog description because one purpose of the syllabus is for the student who takes the course to be able take the syllabus to some other institution and say, "This is the course that I took." Dr. Smith stated that some people may think that the course objectives are captured in the catalog description, so that is the rationale for not saying you must break out the catalog description in some list of specific objectives.

Professor Ekelman asked Dr. Smith if he was worried if people started not putting them in. To her, it just doesn't … Professor Smith stated to Dr. Ekelman, "Here is what I think Beth. If we approve the next proposal, that is that syllabi be made available at least one week prior to the beginning of the semester, the whole business of syllabi will become more transparent and there will be pressures on people to produce a perfect syllabus. So, if objectives are in the perfect syllabus, people will put them on whether they are required or not. That's what I think."

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady indicated she had a question about information overload. She noted that when she looks at this list, she has kind of an "Uh feeling" because it is so long and there are so many bold points and she is a professor. She can only imagine if she handed this to one of her undergraduates and they have to read each of these things on her syllabus. So she is just suggesting that however this goes and at some point we distill them into some subsets before we hand them out to all the faculty and say you must put all of the grading stuff under one bullet point. There are probably seven things that need to be on there and right now this list is just… She feels that her students won't go through it.

Dr. Smith replied that UCC can try to reshape Professor Visocky-O'Grady's position on bullets but, without hurting the feelings of anyone from Social Work here, he asked, "Have you ever seen Social Work's syllabus?"

Senator Kathleen Little asked about the course meeting time and location and said that that seems like that might be important.

Dr. Smith replied that this is the kind of thing that you might know before the course starts. You might not know what semester before the course starts. If a student is

in a class getting a copy of the syllabus, he or she presumes to know where the class is, so this seems like something that a person might want to put on a syllabus but UCC is not saying that you have to put that on the syllabus. And, it doesn't seem like something that you have to put on the syllabus and that is why UCC didn't put that in the list of the things that you have to put on the syllabus.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady noted that she had a question about "Appendix C: Proposal concerning Syllabus Availability."

At this point, Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any other questions about Appendix B: Proposal concerning Syllabus Content. He noted that it is appropriate to talk about both of them together but he just wanted to make sure that we discuss the Agenda in order. He asked if there were any other questions about the content of the Syllabi before we move on to the next proposal.

Dr. Smith noted that he would say that if someone does have another question about Appendix B, we could still answer it.

J.   Make Syllabi available at least one week prior to the beginning of each Semester – Appendix C: Proposal concerning Syllabus Availability (Report No. 63, 2015-2016)

Professor Visocky-O'Grady said that her recollection is that we are back on contract as faculty the week before the semester begins. So, how can we have our syllabus ready one week before we start when we aren't paid in the summer to be on contract? She added that Dr. Smith didn't even have to answer that; she just wanted to drop that.

Dr. Smith said we could attempt to have a syllabus for courses available to students before we start the semester. He added that the actual proposal from the Student Success Committee was that we make the syllabus available three or four days before the start of the semester. Apparently, the institution at which Vice Provost Peter Meiksins previously worked, people had no problem preparing their syllabus at the end of the semester prior like in the spring and before the fall. Professor Smith said that we couldn't do that. Maybe a week is aspirational but two days is not.

Professor Ekelman noted that she raised this before. A lot of our courses are taught by part-timers whose contracts begin on day one of the term.

Dr. Smith asked if Professor Ekelman thinks on day one of the term part-timers come in and start working on the syllabus. Dr. Ekelman said no, but can you require them to do something before they are being paid to do it?

Dr. Smith stated that maybe we will fail when attempting to make those syllabi better. He noted that the goal here is to be as transparent as possible and make as much information available as early as possible – things like what is required and basically

what the pace in the course is. Dr. Smith commented that he, himself, didn't think that in this particular institutional environment that many decisions about course selection will be based on this information in this proposal but we can try. So, this is a proposal to try.

Senator Gregory Lupton asked whether this is one week before classes start or two weeks before classes start because, at least in the fall, the semester starts one week before classes start. Dr. Smith stated that it is one week before classes start.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray asked if this is in part so that students can look and get an idea of workload and try to figure things out. She said that she is assuming that that is part of it. Dr. Smith confirmed that that is part of it.

Dr. Berlin Ray then said so if that is part of it and the reality, she knows in her department, a lot of stuff we are doing the last minute because it is information we are updating the syllabi with, incoming new information, etc. and also in terms of when we are actually … She noted that if we have to post something in advance like this, chances are that it will be in a very general kind of way like there will be a retest, there will be a paper, or details to be discussed in class kinds of things so maybe that will help them figure that out as far as workload in general. But between these issues and between discriminatorily putting together a solid piece that says to the students, you are going to have a paper and this is what it is actually going to look like and these are all of the parts. She noted that probably that would be done, right, like a full week in advance? These are all of the parts that probably will not be done, but we are just going to try to do it.

Professor Smith stated that whatever place we can put these syllabi, there should be some disclaimer that says syllabi are our best guess and that they are subject to change. Both lists are to let perspective students know or students who have already registered for the course and who might think that maybe instead of taking this course, I'll take that course, know that the grade for this course will be based on one-third of the course and a paper and let's do it during finals week as opposed to during exams … for the course. But that is the kind of information that might help the student if he or she is already registered for some other course then that he or she is certain to take that has three different exams spaced equally through the course. So, one comment that he … is that I have four exams tomorrow, well my response says, well the one thing that every faculty member at this university knows is how to divide a term into three equal parts. So the first day of the fifth, tenth and fifteenth weeks, that's when the exams are. So, if you have a way of knowing that that is going to be the arrangement or a 30 page paper and if you would rather do a 30 page paper then have four exams on one day, that's what this is supposed to help address.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady stated that she understands the spirit to have better informed students, but this is pushing things onto the faculty and not allowing faculty the flexibility of the changes you make to make things current on the syllabus. So she would propose that instead of asking all faculty to have their syllabi a week ahead of time, when we have just come back on contract, why don't we make a repository and free the semester syllabi so students can see what has happened. She added that that sounds about

as accurate as to what Dr. Smith is suggesting that this "maybe version" that isn't quite filled in, and then it is no more work on the faculty members who are already working pretty hard to pull their semester together.

Professor Smith said that it is anticipated that these syllabi will accumulate until they dominate the contents of the Internet.

Professor Berlin Ray commented that she agrees to what Professor Visocky-O'Grady is saying and that is the idea of I can imagine putting up my best guess with an asterisk saying that this is an approximation and we will discuss it in further detail along with any possible changes the first day of class. She added that that is not going to be any better for them than the previous syllabi that say, oh, she usually has exams and a paper and a paper is due at the end of the period, whatever. So, she is not sure what is going to be gained except more pressure on faculty.

Dr. Sridhar noted that he was in the Student Success Committee meetings when this topic was discussed several months ago. One of the things that the committee discussed was the posting of past syllabi. The recommendation that the committee sent to the UCC was not that. They said, well let's just put down a list of things that must be there and if a faculty member wants to use last semester's syllabus that will already satisfy his requirement anyway. So this is sort of one manner of articulation that will work but you could use a previous semester's syllabus to satisfy this.

Dr. Smith asked if there were any other questions either for Proposal B or Proposal C of the Agenda, either item I. or J. There were no further questions.

Dr. Sridhar stated that at the Steering Committee meeting when this proposal was discussed there were several issues. One of the reasons this proposal comes to Faculty Senate for a vote today is because some of these issues would be easier to work out with faculty having approved this proposal in principle. If it has to go to IS&T, there has to be a request, it has to be reviewed by the Academic Technology Committee, etc. If the request came from a Faculty Senate approved proposal, then it stands a much larger chance of actually getting implemented in some real way. He added that this is the reason that this proposal comes to Senate even before it is created. The Steering Committee also had the same kinds of questions we are talking about today. Dr. Sridhar stated that he can clearly sense some discomfort in working on something that we are not clear with so once we have approved the proposal, there are two things we can talk about. We can essentially pass a resolution right here and say that the faculty will supply by September a clear way once recommended but IS&T should begin plans for actually implementing some way of supplying syllabi by spring 2017. So, we will actually work on this list and say here is what should be on the syllabus and this is the date by which it goes. We are not getting stuck with having gone through all of the work and then the IT department coming back and saying well it is going to take a year to implement all of this stuff. So, that is sort of a compromise so that we can review something and we are not forcing people to vote on something that is not clear yet. He then asked if this would be something someone would propose from the floor of Senate.

Senator James Marino moved that Faculty Senate will supply by September 2016 a clear recommendation to IS&T of what should be on the syllabi and by what date to supply syllabi by spring 2017.

Dr. Sridhar stated that at the September meeting of Faculty Senate, we will come with an actual proposal of what should be on the syllabi and by what date the syllabi will be posted before the semester begins. What we are doing here is for Senate to say that we will have something like this and for IS&T to begin preparations to basically schedule a list of projects so that when we actually approve the proposal in September, faculty will be ready early.

Senator William Bowen seconded the motion.

Professor Little stated that she would like to support what Professor Visocky-O'Grady said and add in addition to this proposal for UCC to consider that the previous semester's syllabus would be this requirement. Dr. Sridhar said that is correct. That is one of the recommendations that UCC will bring back in September.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady wanted one more thing to add to UCC. She noted that on faculty E-FAARs, have the opportunity to upload our syllabus. It is not required, but she believes that it is required that faculty turn them in to our chair at the beginning of the semester. So, she would love for UCC to pull them from work faculty have already done rather than asking faculty for yet another paperwork thing to do. Dr. Sridhar noted that this is another recommendation and this is the kind of thing we need to work out.

Professor Krebs stated that IS&T's memory is getting cheaper now, and these things do stay on now into perpetuity. Because what is important is sometimes when students transfer and undergraduates that meet fifteen years later, that they be able to get that syllabus and that would really help to transfer a course.

Dr. Sridhar asked if Senate could now have a vote on what he just proposed. Putting the job request essentially in to the IS&T Department, and making sure that whenever this passes in September, it gets acted on quickly. He then asked Senators to vote. The motion that Faculty Senate will supply by September 2016 a clear recommendation to IS&T to supply syllabi by spring 2017 was unanimously approved by voice vote.

K. For Information (Report No. 64, 2015-2016)

The UCC was tasked at the Senate meeting on March 9 with reviewing recommended class size limits for WAC courses

Dr. Smith noted that the only other thing that UCC has to say is that it has not yet had a chance to thoroughly address the question of class size limits for WAC courses.

The UCC will be meeting next week at which time that will have to be done. He then asked if there were any questions for the UCC. There were no questions.

At this point, Dr. Sridhar noted that Professor Fred Smith is concluding being the chair of the UCC and has done a great job. A round of applause ensued for Dr. Smith.

VIII.   Admissions and Standards Committee

Professor Chandra Kothapalli, chair of the Admissions and Standards Committee, stated that the committee has five proposals.

A. Six new 2+2 Articulation Agreement proposals with Tri-C (BIO, HIS, MATH, PHIL, POL SCI, PSY) and a proposal to add a new program (Urban Studies) to the Lorain Partnership (Reports No. 54 – 60, 2015-2016)

Professor Kothapalli stated that the first item is the proposal for six new Articulation Agreements with Tri-C that Dr. Smith just talked about and a proposal to add a new program to the Lorain Partnership. None of these are using the admissions standards default from the standard CSU admission requirements. We will follow the State regulations, which we use to approve programs in this category. He asked if anyone had any questions about these seven proposals. There were no questions.

Dr. Sridhar stated that we would take the proposed six Articulation Agreements with Tri-C and the proposed Partnership Agreement with Lorain community College from the University Curriculum Committee and the Admissions and Standards Committee and vote on them together. He then asked for a vote on the seven proposals. The proposed six new 2+2 Articulation Agreements with Tri-C and the proposal to add a new program (Urban Studies) to the Lorain Partnership were approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Proposal to strengthen Provisional Undergraduate Student Admission Process and Student Service Support (Report No. 65, 2015-2016)

Dr. Kothapalli stated that the next item is the proposal to strengthen the provisional undergraduate student admission processes and student services support. He noted that the idea is for processes and conditions for these students to remain at CSU and become fully matriculated. He referred to the proposed list of changes to our existing provisional admission structure included in today's meeting packet. He then asked if there were any questions.

Dr. Sridhar inquired, "What is the idea of that?" Professor Kothapalli replied that the idea is to make sure that these students become more successful and they are more prepared for the conditions of the programs on par with the students admitted directly. We don't want to lose any of these students because they are not successful in their GPA or because of any other unforeseen circumstances.

Senator William Bowen inquired if the provisional admits count when the State starts measuring our success rate in retaining first-time full-time freshmen. Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange replied, "Yes." Vice Provost Peter Meiksins stated that if they are freshmen. He added that most provisional students are transfers.

Dr. Sridhar stated that this is an important point because if they transfer here and then if they don't succeed, then it does count against the university. So if a student joins us as a first-time full-time freshman as a provisional admit, that student is counted as part of the freshmen cohort but then, if the student doesn't succeed and doesn't graduate, that does count against the university.

There being no further questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has brought forth a proposal to strength the undergraduate student admission process and student support services and asked for a vote. The Proposal to strengthen the undergraduate student admission process and student support services was approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Proposal for changes to the Admissions Requirements for some programs in the College of Education (Report No. 66, 2015-2016)

Dr. Kothapalli presented the next proposal for changes to the admissions requirements for some programs in the College of Education. He noted that the action behind this is to comply with the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) that has changed its rule regarding issuance of principal licensure. So the College of Education expects that more applicants will be applying for these programs and wants to make these revisions. He noted that pretty much all of the other colleges in Ohio have been included in this so this is just a procedural change. He then asked if anyone had any questions.

Being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked for a vote. The Admissions and Standards Committee's proposal for changes to the admissions requirements for some programs in the College of Education was approved unanimously by voice vote.

D. Proposal to abolish the X-Grade (Report No. 67, 2015-2016)

Dr. Kothapalli next presented the Admissions and Standards Committee's proposal to abolish the "X" Grade at the undergraduate level only, not at the graduate level. He noted that the A&S Committee received new data from Fall 2010 to Fall 2015 shared by the Registrar's office that suggest that a vast majority (78%) of the "X" grades ended up in "F" grades in undergraduate level courses. The data was broken down in different colleges and different departments within colleges and it seems that awarding the "X" Grade at the undergraduate level isn't fulfilling its original intended goal. He stated that we don't have such concrete evidence at the graduate level.

Senator Jeremy Genovese asked if what is happening here is that "I" is becoming the new "X." He noted that right now, there is a list of criteria. He asked if those criteria

are going to be changed so that students who don't show up the last week get an "I" now or are we just failing the students who don't show up the last week of classes.

Professor Kothapalli replied that it becomes the discretion of the faculty member. The A&S Committee is not recommending awarding an "I" or an "F" grade. Again, it is up to the discretion of the faculty member as it stands now.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the "I" grade is not changing. The requirements for awarding an incomplete grade still require the contact of the faculty member by the student. If the student fails to show up the last couple of weeks of class and up to that point has not accumulated enough points for a letter grade, the student does in fact receive an "F" grade.

Professor Bowen stated that he is against the proposal too. It seems to him that it works in some cases. He has listened to Professor Kothapalli's rationale to get rid of it. So if it works every now and then, and even gets abused sometimes, we now abuse the "I" instead of the "X." He added that he just hasn't heard any convincing rationale to approve the proposal so he is against it.

Professor Ekelman stated that she agrees with Professor Bowen. It gives the instructor some flexibility. People she has talked to who have used it, use it with students who sort of disappear but they may be really good students. They have disappeared, we are concerned about them, faculty have reached out and it has ended up that those students have had medical crises or some other personal crises, and it just gives them a little more wiggle room to give them a little more time. And, then if they need to change the grade from an "X" to an "A", they don't have to jump through a million hoops. If you do a "Change of Grade" form, you have to go through the Dean's Office for approval and things like that. Dr. Ekelman stated that it has been working and there may be a delay, but she is okay with that. She noted that the only issue is the prerequisite issue. Students shouldn't be able to take the next course. If the student is taking CHEM 1 and gets an "F" the student shouldn't take CHEM 2.

Dr. Sridhar stated that there is actually a strong curricular argument about that. He reported that he had a discussion with Asst. Vice President Janet Stimple of the Registrar's Office about this as well. He noted that the problem is that the bulk of the "X" grades that are assigned are actually assigned administratively by the Registrar's Office. So if a faculty member hasn't submitted grades on time, then the Registrar's Office goes in and assigns "X" grades and when the grades are actually turned in, they are transferred. So the problem is, are we willing to say when a student has an "X" grade, they cannot enroll in the course that follows? If a student has an "X" in CHEM 1, the student cannot take CHEM 2. If I make a decision at the time the students are enrolling because if they get a letter from the Registrar's Office, I certainly don't want a student to be dropped from the following course because it is just an administrative thing, right? But at the beginning of the next semester, that's too late. So the issue is there.

Professor Ekelman stated that if she were a student and her instructor didn't get her grade in on time, she would freak out if she got an "F" but if she has an "X" she asks, what is going on?

Dr. Sridhar noted that the proposal does not get rid of the Registrar's Office from assigning "X" grades. So what happens is, if this proposal is passed, then the situation will be that the early "X" grades are situations where a faculty member has not yet turned in grades and the Registrar's office is assigning grades.

Senator Vickie Gallagher stated that 22% of the students have to go through the petition and all of the other paperwork so it seems like that amount of work may not be applied. The Registrar's Office can give the "X" grade but I cannot and I don't know how helpful giving them an "F" is if they stop showing up. I would leave it blank and the Registrar's Office would give an "X" then. She asked if that is a technical solution.

Professor Krebs stated that he couldn't believe that the faculty won't be able to submit the course grades.

Professor Smith asked, "Why can't the Registrar give a 'Z' for grades that aren't assigned and let the faculty assign it? Why can't there be a distinction between the grade that is assigned administratively and one that the faculty member assigns?"

Dr. Sridhar noted that that is a different proposal; that is not the proposal that is on the table. He added that this is a good proposal that can come forward but that is not the proposal we are talking about right now. That could be a good suggestion. At this point, Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any other questions about the proposal. He then asked if Senate is comfortable putting this proposal to a vote.

Senate Secretary Debbie Jackson noted that we are way far away from where we started with the reason for this proposal. She asked if it is one reason to support this proposal that the percentage of students would get "X's" in a semester and go on to pay tuition for another semester and then fail out or don't do well or don't leave. So there is something about that. She said that she is all for the small percent of students that make it but then what are we doing to the students who don't make it; they are incurring more debt in that next semester.

Vice Provost Peter Meiksins reported that the data Vice Provost LaGrange's office prepared for us gave us semester by semester. What was raised was students getting an "X" and most students who get an "X" also get an "I" in the same semester or get an "F" in the semester or get both in the semester. Essentially what is happening is it appears that a very high percentage of the "X" grades are simply a different way of saying what other instructors call an incomplete or call a failure. So the proposal to remove the "X" from the undergraduate grade is essentially to simplify calling this what it is, right? A student who gets an "X" in a vast majority of cases is someone who is not going to continue the course and the data say that clearly.

Professor Smith asked Vice Provost Meiksins if it is the case that nothing would be gained if instead of assigning an "X", an instructor assigned an "I". Vice Provost Meiksins replied that nothing would be gained.

Professor Krebs remarked that he agreed with Vice Provost Meiksins. He noted that where he talks with a student and he gives the student an "I", the student finishes. If he doesn't see the student, he gives the student an "X" and the student never finishes. It is just easier on him so he doesn't end up giving the student an "F".

Professor Kothapalli stated that a lot of people support the motion so that they don't have to give a failing grade. And, this proposal is to stop it in the first place. We can use a different angle but that is the idea.

Dr. Sridhar then stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is bringing forward a proposal to abolish the use of the "X" grade by faculty. It will still be used by the Registrar's Office as an administrative function if a faculty member fails to submit grades on time. He then asked for a vote. The Admissions and Standards Committee's proposal to abolish the use of the "X" grade at the undergraduate level was approved with seven no votes and three abstentions.

E. Security Features for E-Learning Courses (Report No. 39, 2015-2016)

Professor Kothapalli presented the last item on the agenda from the Admissions and Standards Committee - Required Procedures and Recommended Practices to Address Security and Quality of E-Learning courses. He noted that the goal is to establish campus-wide guidelines on academic integrity and quality of E-Learning courses that articulates the responsibilities of all parties involved (faculty, staff, students and administration) at Cleveland State University. This draft also affirms the University's commitment to enforce such procedures and practices and support faculty and staff in handling academic integrity matters pertaining to E-Learning courses. He noted that the draft procedures and practices to address security and quality of e-learning have been developed based on recommendations from the E-Learning Committee, our review of the literature, best practices, consultation with the Director of E-Learning, and experiences of faculty members teaching online courses. He noted that a new set of guidelines is included for the operation of a plan on how to conduct high-stakes testing in e-learning courses. Dr. Kothapalli directed members to the last paragraph on page 7 of the document that states, "A pilot version of this plan should be tested in spring 2017, with active participation of several instructors. If no significant changes need to be made based on the pilot program, large-scale implementation should occur in fall 2017."

Dr. Sridhar noted that nothing would change in fall 2016. The earliest anything will take place is as a pilot in spring 2017 and if the pilot works out, then large-scale implementation will take place in fall 2017. He then inquired if there were any questions about the proposal.

Being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is bringing forward Required Procedures and Recommended Practices to Address Security and Quality of E-Learning Courses and asked for a vote. The proposed Required Procedures and Recommended Practices to Address Security and Quality of E-Learning Courses were approved with one abstention.

Dr. Sridhar stated that Professor Kothapalli is completing his term as chair of the Admissions and Standards Committee. A round of applause ensued for Dr. Kothapalli.

IX.   Student Life Committee

Suggested revisions to Student Conduct Code's Academic Regulations and Procedures, 3.1.2 Policy on Academic Misconduct (pages 53-55 of the Student Conduct Code booklet) (Report No. 68, 2015-2016)

Senator Adam Sonstegard, chair of the Student Life Committee, stated that the committee is bringing to Faculty Senate proposed revisions to the Student Conduct Code's Academic regulations and procedures, 3.1.2 Policy on Academic Misconduct. He reported that Assistant Professor Joseph Mead of the College of Urban Affairs conducted a survey of Academic Misconduct Policies at peer universities in October 2015 finding that CSU's policy provides the most lenient minimum and maximum sanctions of the sample universities when considering a first time offenses and "minor" offenses (a project worth less than 25% of the course grade) in which the infraction occurs. The committee felt that faculty should be aware of this.

Professor Sonstegard noted that Policy 3.1.2A (2) b (page 55 in the Student Conduct Code booklet) addresses student records in light of major infractions, but makes no mention of minor infractions. The Student Affairs Committee would like to propose an added clause, Policy 3.1.2B (2) c patterned after the existing clause on major offenses, 3.1.2A (2) b:

> "For infractions deemed to be "minor," the professor of the course has the option of placing a warning and a narrative describing the offense(s) in the student's file, so as to alert the student's future professors of possible patterns in academic misconduct. The College Dean and University Registrar shall receive copies of these warnings, and the registrar shall make an entry on the student's permanent record. This notation shall remain on the permanent record for a period of three years from the date of entry or until the student's graduation, whichever comes earlier. Thereafter, the entry is to be removed from all of the student's records and files, provided that the student has not been found guilty of a consistent pattern of minor infractions, or of a major infraction, of academic misconduct."

Dr. Sridhar inquired if there were any questions about this proposal.

Professor Bowen stated that it is his understanding that the Student Life Committee looked into possibilities for bringing CSU's practices more in line with other universities and this is the recommendation of the Student Life Committee.

Professor Sonstegard replied that this is the recommendation as far as student conduct code is concerned. He noted that if other committees want to take this issue up at another level, as to how it would affect departments, colleges could do that as well. He believes the only jurisdiction the Student Life Committee would have is in the language of the actual policies.

Professor Bowen commented that the changes Professor Sonstegard is talking about here are the ones having considered what other universities do and what our university does and these are the changes the Student Life Committee is recommending.

Professor Sonstegard stated that Dr. Bowen is correct that this is within the Student Life Committee's jurisdiction.

Dr. Krebs indicated that he had two comments. One is that we have tried this for years in BGES as an example and found that very, very few faculty members ever reported what was going on, so a lot of this we have to get us (faculty) to do. Just filling out the report and getting information out, that is not a difficult thing to do. He noted that the other comment he has for the Student Life Committee is, it is a disappointment to see that we are that low and it is so embarrassing. He stated that it is not easy as it has been set up for but one way to clearly raise the bar is to get more students involved and set up some sort of student court. He asked if that has ever even been discussed here at Senate.

Professor Sonstegard replied, "Not to my knowledge." He noted that there is the Student Judicial Board when it comes to an infraction or expulsion. There are also students involved from the Student Government Association of that year or that semester. Professor Krebs remarked that that is not doable.

Professor Sonstegard stated that he could pass it on to the successor. Professor Krebs stated that we have students on the Appeals Board and that is not the same thing as having something like a Student Court where you … He added that times have changed but students are far less lenient than we are.

Senator Maria Gibson asked if this is a warning and asked what would happen the second time. She added, "What happens when there is a warning?"

Professor Sonstegard responded that the professor would know this the second time because of records. And, if we are getting up to a major infraction, then that provision already entered into the student's file will apply leading to a hearing towards suspension or eventually expulsion as an option. … We are providing for the previous case the student already has so the second time this happens, we will know this the second time because of the mechanism.

Professor Gibson asked, "How will professors know that there was a warning?" Professor Sonstegard replied that the professor would know by looking at the student's record available through registration.

Dr. Sridhar commented that this would actually be a second item that will probably come from the Admissions and Standards Committee that talks about how it will actually get implemented in the system. He added that at the last Steering Committee meeting, there was a short discussion that perhaps StarFish could be a possibility to handle something like this and that is a step. But, before that can happen, this goes to the Student Conduct Code and they can actually come up with a recommendation on where it would go.

Professor Bowen stated that he felt that Professor Kreb's suggestion is right – some kind of best practice, some kind of document that we (faculty) could use for ourselves would really be useful. Best practices and how to respond would be when we run across this problem.

Dr. Sridhar reported that his department actually does this. The Electrical Engineering Department has a file for every student in the department office and every minor infraction goes in there and there is actually a piece of paper that goes in the files of the students. But again, this is tracking courses inside the department. There is no way to track this outside of the department. Actually there is now a proposal in the College of Engineering to go across the colleges as well, but this proposal essentially takes it across the university.

Professor Gibson stated that she is concerned with FERPA pertaining to exposure of the privacy of the student.

Dr. Sridhar noted that the question has to do with whether this would violate FERPA. He stated that as long as we maintain this in the same way as we maintain all of the other students' records we should be okay. He went on to say that this would be part of the student's record just the same way as any other information with respect to advising and grading and things like that. So as long as we maintain that in the same way as we maintain all other information, we will be okay.

Professor Fred Smith stated that he is puzzled. As he understands it, this is to alert subsequent or contemporaneous faculty of minor infractions and he is wondering whether that is absolutely necessary or whether some information aggregator should be notified so that when the number of minor infractions exceeds some threshold, then some action will be triggered. For example, he noted that he doesn't like to be able to actually know the prior performance of his students in various courses before they take his course because when he has access to their transcripts he can look and see what fraction of the students have gotten "Ds" in this course. Speaking to Professor Sonstegard, Dr. Smith said that he would prefer not to know that actually so what are your thoughts about that – information aggregator rather than providing access to other faculty?

Professor Sonstegard replied that if an aggregator is preferable to this registration system, he is totally open to that as an alternative. The professor has the option if he or she desires to create the warning in the first place and you also have the option to look at the student's record or not to look at the student's record. So it is the faculty's selection if he/she wants but if an aggregator would be a better option to entertain that as opposed to having to go to the Registrar's Office. It is just an option versus a requirement – a legal record or an existing record.

Professor Ekelman asked, "Where does the major infraction go, on the student's transcript?" Professor Sonstegard replied that it goes on the student's permanent file as an existing paragraph only in the student's permanent file.

Professor Ekelman asked if that is the student's transcript.

Dr. Sridhar asked Janet Stimple, Asst. Vice President in the Registrar's Office, "Where does this major infraction go? When we say that it goes on the student's file, where does it actually go?" Asst. V.P. Stimple replied that it is noted on the student's transcript but then it is removed after a certain period of time.

Dr. Sridhar noted that Ms. Stimple means a special transcript

Professor Ekelman inquired, "Is that 'degree audit' then too?" Dr. Sridhar replied that it is not a "degree audit."

Dr. Sridhar then asked if there were any further questions. There being no further questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the Student Life Committee has brought forward a proposal to revise the Student Conduct Code to include language about minor infractions with respect to academic dishonesty and asked for a vote. The Student Life Committee's Proposal to revise the Student Conduct Code's Academic Regulations and Procedures, 3.1.2 Policy on Academic Misconduct (pages 53-55 of the Student Conduct Code booklet) was approved by voice vote with one no and one abstention.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the next items are Annual Reports from various committees that were included in today's meeting packets. He asked if there were any questions for any of these reports. Hearing no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that we would note that Senate receives these reports.

X.   **Annual Reports**

   A. **University Faculty Affairs Committee (Report No. 69, 2015-2016)**
   B. **Student Life Committee (Report No. 70, 2015-2016)**
   C. **Committee on Athletics (Report No. 71, 2015-2016)**
   D. **Committee on Academic Space (Report No. 72, 2015-2016)**
   E. **University Petitions Committee (Report No. 73, 2015-2016)**
   F. **Budget and Finance Committee (Report No. 74, 2015-2016**
   G. **Electronic Learning Committee (Report No. 75, 2015-2016)**

H. Ad Hoc Committee on Student Success (Report No. 76, 2015-2016)

XI.   Report of the Interim Provost

Interim Provost Jianping Zhu stated that he just has a few updates for Senate. He first reported on faculty searches. He said that as everyone knows, we have for the beginning of the next academic year, sixty-two active searches going on and have actually completed fifty-six by now at different stages. At the end of the semester, most of those positions will be filled. Also, those positions that came open during this academic year that were due to resignations and retirements and other reasons have been allocated back to the colleges based on the program prioritization categories. Some of the colleges have already set up meetings and are working on advertisements and plan to post them before faculty leave for the summer. In that way, when the faculty members return in the fall, the search can continue and somehow the colleges plan to finish the searches by the end of the year. Provost Zhu encouraged faculty to participate in those searches because as he always says, the university can be only as good as the faculty we have. He added that it is a really important undertaking.

Interim Provost Zhu noted that the second item concerns the Dean searches. He reported that some people have approached him from various colleges asking about the searches. He noted that the search for the Urban College Dean was successfully completed and we have a fantastic candidate to fill that position and we are very satisfied about that. He reported that there are currently two searches going on for a permanent Dean of the College of Business and for a permanent Dean for the School of Nursing. It is hoped that we can place most of those in the next two or three weeks. A search is going to begin for the Interim Dean of the Cleveland Marshall College of Law and the Faculty Senate caucus of that college will select the Interim Dean. It is also hoped that we will finish that process before the process is started for searching for a permanent Dean. In addition, there is an ongoing search for the Vice Provost for Academic Planning to replace Teresa LaGrange who served with outstanding distinction in that capacity. It is hoped that this search will also begin within the next two weeks and we finish that search before the end of the semester. Interim Provost Zhu assured everyone that we are working very diligently to ensure that we have the best possible candidates for these positions to ensure the continuing momentum at the University here in terms of enhancing student success and to carry forward our project 2020 of the strategic planning process. Dr. Zhu noted that this is an update for the Dean searches and the Vice Provost search.

Interim Provost Zhu turned to the 2020 project. The academic support units have just started their planning process to bolster the 2020 exercise. That includes the Office of Research, the Office of Academic Planning, the Office of Academic Programs and Auditing and also the main Office of the Provost's operations. He noted that all of these offices are going through an exercise over the summer with the goal of improving their efficiency by at least five percent to reduce the operating budget by five percent. Dr. Zhu said that he is pleased to report that the university, starting with President Berkman and other members of the Executive Committee including Vice President McHenry, Vice

President Yarbrough, and Vice President Cindy Skaruppa and Jim Bennett, are working on an exercise to come up with a five percent budget reduction. They are already beginning the process that the university plans to possibly take off five percent as part of the exercise and instead, bring the funds back into the colleges to support our teaching and research activities. So that is a very positive step to support and enhance our academic mission and our student success initiative. Interim Provost Zhu noted that he is very confident that we are well on our way in terms of the following year's continuing efforts to improve efficiency from the supporting units, those units of the academic sector to support our core academic mission. Interim Provost Zhu stated that this is an update on our 2020 project.

Interim Provost Zhu reported that a very active discussion was recently held about the MagnusMart. He stated that various faculty members also have been involved in this discussion to some extent. Some of the faculty members manage their own grants and they use grant funds for purchasing so they also come into contact with MagnusMart. Provost Zhu said he wanted to assure everyone that we have been working with the Controller's Office, with Purchasing, and with the Business and Finance division of the university to improve the situation and use of MagnusMart. He noted that just this morning at the Provost's Council meeting with the Controller's Office, represented by Kathleen Murphy, our consultant visited with us and summarized the four major particular points for them to basically get to work on.

1) Improve the work flow to reduce the steps involved in the use of MagnusMart to avoid the shifting of work from the Purchasing Office on to staff and faculty members and to ensure that the process can be done as quickly as possible.
2) Identify a list of tasks that apparently are not suitable for the current setup of MagnusMart; for example, travel paperwork and other tasks. We will make it explicit that for those tasks a learning process is needed in the system until the future when we have a better setup of the system.
3) The consultant and the Purchasing Office continue to work with the individual units to pinpoint and identify specific issues that may not be across the board with specific units and to address them in a timely manner.
4) Enhance the training. We certainly have a very protective unit in the Math department but we have forty plus departments. We need to make sure that we provide by phone information and tips to be shared among different departments in a much timelier manner. We need a working method hopefully to address that and to make sure that the latest experience is relayed and communicated to the faculty in a timely manner.

Finally, Interim Provost Zhu stated that he has truly enjoyed working with everyone over the past year and he feels that we have accomplished quite a few items that will benefit our student success. He noted that the key to that is verbal communication and transparent operations and he intends to continue that. He added that if anyone has any items or issues or information that they need to bring to his attention, please feel free to email him or call his office or just stop by on their way to see him. He said that he

looks forward to continuing to work with everyone and continuing in the university's operations. He then wished everyone a very productive and enjoyable summer.

XII.   Report of the Student Government Association

Dr. Sridhar reported that the President of Student Government, Emily Halasah, had notified him that she might not be able to attend Senate today. He noted that he doesn't see her in the audience today so there is no report from the Student Government Association.

XIII.   Open Question Time

Dr. Sridhar then inquired if there were any questions from anyone at Senate today. There were no questions.

XIV.   New Business

Senate President Sridhar asked if there was any new business. There was no new business. Dr. Sridhar stated that before he asks for a motion to adjourn, he wanted to thank everybody that served on Faculty Senate and that are stepping off of Senate this year for his or her service. He then wished everyone a fantastic and restful summer.

President Sridhar then asked for a motion to adjourn. Senator James Marino moved, the motion was seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie K. Jackson
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel