

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

MAY 7, 2014

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, Delatte, Delgado, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, Gross, R. Henry, Jayanti, M. D. Jones, Kalafatis, Kareem, Kent, Kosteas, Krebs, J. Lieske, Little, Majette, Marino, C. May, Meier, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Rashidi, Resnick, Rickett, Sridhar, Talu, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, J. G. Wilson, Witmer-Rich, Wolf.

R. Berkman, M. Bond, C. Brown, Dumski, J. Ford, Mageean, Novy, Sawicki, G. Thornton, B. White, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Dixit, Gorla, Hoffman, D. Jackson, S. Kaufman, Lehfeldt, Liggett, Margolius, Steinberg, M. Walton, Welfel.

Artbauer, Boise, Boychuk, Halasah, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, McHenry, Parry, Sadlek, Spademan, Stoll, Triplett, Ward, Zachariah.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:08 P.M.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of May 7, 2014

Senate President Joanne Goodell stated that first of all we need to approve the Agenda for today. She noted that she had a couple of minor additions. The Committee on Academic Space will present their Annual Report which would be Item XV. H. Dr. Goodell noted that Violet has copies of that report and two others that were not in the Senate meeting packets – the Annual Reports from the Committee on Athletics and the Academic Technology Committee.

Dr. Goodell then asked for a motion to approve the Agenda. Senator Paul Doerder moved and Senator Majid Rashidi seconded the motion and the Agenda as amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of October 16, 2013

Senate President Joanne Goodell asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the meeting of October 16, 2013. It was moved and seconded and the Minutes of the meeting of October 16, 2013 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Dr. Goodell welcomed everyone to the end of a very long semester. She stated that we have a slate of elections today and of course in the fall for the next President and the next Secretary of the Senate. Dr. Goodell noted that if anyone has anyone in mind who would be a good candidate, please contact the Senate Nominating Committee which consists of Professor Stephen Duffy, Professor Kathleen Little and Professor Jeff Karem. Dr. Goodell again stated that if anyone has any suggestions for Senate President or Senate Secretary, please talk to a member of the Nominating Committee.

Dr. Goodell reported that she was very saddened at the close of the Child Care Center effective this year. She noted that it was originally designed for the students to ensure academic success, but that goal was never really fulfilled since what most students wanted was a more flexible system of drop in care and that is not how the Center operated. The Board of Trustees received a letter which identified money as the main issue in the budget, however, there were other reasons for the closure that the Board was not apprised of in that letter. In addition, families in the Center were not consulted about the decision and people of course are now faced with having to find alternate care which is very challenging when you have young children. She added that eight of the families were from the faculty and staff, twenty-three from the student body, and eleven from Alumni families and seventeen families from outside of CSU. Dr. Goodell stated that over half of the families have already found alternate arrangements for next year and CSU is helping others to identify opportunities. Of course, particularly in this population are our graduate students many of whom are international students and really don't know the child care system in the US so we are concerned for those students and she knows that Ms. Claire Rahm, Campus Support Service, and others are helping and really trying to ensure that those families are taken care of.

Dr. Goodell stated that moving forward, Bryon White, Vice President for University Engagement, has had some preliminary discussions with the Central Neighborhood Initiative about a future child care center in the Central neighborhood but there doesn't appear, from what Ms. Rahm and Dr. Goodell discussed today at least, that there will be any plans to have a Center at CSU again. Dr. Goodell noted that she will be meeting with the Provost and a few others around this issue in the next couple of weeks. She added that she will keep Senate apprised of any things as they occur.

Dr. Goodell reported that some of the Graduation, Convocation and Assembly Committee members will be meeting with the President's Office during the summer to review their recommendations in light of the outcomes of the commencement ceremonies

that we have had this year particularly in relation to the Doctoral hooding processes and procedures. Professor Lynn Deering is the chair of that committee so if anyone has any feedback about the hooding procedures, or anyone has been part of another university where they do things differently than us and have some suggestions, we would really love to hear those so please contact Professor Lynn Deering, the chair of the Senate Graduation, Convocation and Assembly Committee.

Dr. Goodell stated that as everyone knows, the university is undertaking a campus master planning exercise and there have been a number of on campus meetings over the past two months. She thanked our faculty representative, Professor Rachel Carnell from the English Department, who has been very active ensuring that our voices have been heard. She reported that the planning consultants, the Smith Group JJR have been very responsive. They were originally going to present their report at the end of June but Provost Deirdre Mageean has intervened and the report will now be concluded at the end of September she believes ensuring that there is adequate time for faculty input into the final product. She thanked Provost Mageean for her efforts in this regard.

Dr. Goodell reported that another initiative of the Provost is the University Space Committee which has been meeting with representatives from the Senate Committee on Academic Space as part of that process. The University Space Committee has now drafted some space allocation policies that are out for the thirty day comment period on the Policy Review Page of the General Counsel. She stated that if anyone has any comments about these policies, please provide them as soon as possible. The Board of Trustees will vote on these recommendations at the June meeting she believes. The web address is all of the usual stuff, General-Counsel/draft-policies, which will be in her report when that is requested. But, everyone needs to search for General Counsel Policies and it will come up on their web site.

Dr. Goodell stated that the Steering Committee was recently treated to a demonstration of the Academic Analytic Data Base that the university subscribes to. For issues of confidentiality and use of priority data, the university administration has decided not to give login access to individual faculty. However, if individuals want to see what data is in the system about themselves, every department chair does have access and should be able to show the individual data request. Departments and colleges are being encouraged to discuss the collective data and to use it to inform decision-making and planning. She encouraged everyone to become part of that process and to discuss this with their chair and their dean if they have not already had those conversations in their college.

Dr. Goodell stated that in case no one has read the Student Employment Handbook for a while, there is a new ruling regarding the number of hours any student can work during the summer. Apparently, due to the new Health Care Regulations, the maximum any student can now work is thirty hours, down from the previous forty hours the past many years. If people are like her and don't read the fine print in many documents including the Student Employment Handbook, especially when she has been hiring students with their own grants over many years, to find this out at the last minute is

putting some faculty in a very difficult position particularly with the funding agencies and with the students who were expecting forty hours of work this summer and must now be told that they can only get thirty. Many of these students will now seek alternative employment this summer compounding the problems for faculty who have grants. She added that perhaps the Research Office can help in this regard.

Finally, Dr. Goodell noted that this is the end of her report. She hopes everyone has a fantastic summer. Her term as Senate President runs through the summer so she will be around during May, not much in June, but again in July and August and then for the first Steering and Senate meetings. She commented that for those who are retiring from the Senate, she wished them well. For those who are continuing, they will have to put up with her for one more meeting. After that, she hopes to be going to Canada and Australia to do some research with schools researching indigenous populations as well as a long list of other projects that have been pushed aside by her presidential responsibilities over the last three years. She stated that she sincerely thanks everyone for their support especially Violet who is there at every moment for her every wish and the officers who are always so very supportive and the Steering Committee who have to come to meetings plus the rest of the Senate and they have been a great group of people to work with. She thanked everyone very much.

IV. Elections

Dr. Goodell stated that the process for elections is as follows. She noted that in everyone's meeting packet there is a sheet that lists all of the preferences of faculty who reply to the Committee Preference sheet that was sent around to all faculty. Dr. Goodell noted that it is not expected that every person who volunteers for a committee will go on to the slate for elections. Nominations are taken from the floor of Senate for each of the positions. She stated that Professor Stephen Duffy, the Senate Secretary, will be managing counting of the votes.

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

Professor Jeff Karem (English) two-year term
Professor Beth Ekelman (Health Sciences) two-year term
Professor Claire Robinson May (Law) two-year term
Professor Allyson Robichaud (Philosophy) one-year term

Minority Affairs Committee

Professor Dana Hubbard (Sociology)
Professor Carol Phillips-Bey (Mathematics)
Professor Hanz Richter (Mechanical Engineering)

Budget and Finance Committee

Professor Joel Lieske (Political Science)

Professor Brian Ray (Law)

Board of Trustees

Professor Sheldon Gelman (Law)

Board Recognition Committee

Professor Nigamanth Sridhar (Electrical Engineering)

Ohio Faculty Council

Professor Joel Lieske (Political Science)

Copyright Review Committee

Professor Thomas Humphrey (History)

Patent Review Committee

Professor Nolan Holland (Chemical Engineering)

Equal Opportunity Hearing Panel

Professor Heba El-Attar (Modern Languages)

Professor Browne Lewis (Law)

Professor Hanz Richter (Mechanical Engineering)

Professor Jacqueline Vitali (Physics)

Dr. Goodell reported that the next item was added to the Agenda regarding the 50th Anniversary preparations.

V. 50th Anniversary

Dr. Stephen Duffy stated that Dr. Julian Earls had asked to be on the Agenda but unfortunately he is not present at Senate today.

Dr. Goodell noted that perhaps President Berkman will have something to say about the anniversary.

VI. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman greeted everyone. He stated that he was surprised not to see Dr. Earls. Perhaps he is buying a new suit or new wardrobe since he will receive an Honorary Degree from Cleveland State University at the morning commencement. He will receive really a much deserved Honorary Degree. It isn't so much for his length of service but he most recently was just incredibly instrumental in the development of the Campus International School and people may not know that he lead and co-chaired a Task Force with Christine Fowler Mack from the Cleveland Municipal School District. It was really their brain child to recommend an International Baccalaureate School for the

Campus International School. He noted that the rest of it is history or it is evolving history as we look for a space to accommodate an ever increasing demand for entrance into the Campus International School. President Berkman stated that this would be one of the challenges of the coming year. He stated that President Michael Schwartz and he are honorary co-chairs of the 50th Anniversary Committee which means that he has a reason for not knowing anything about it or very little about it but he knows the following about it. To his knowledge there are four projects that are well underway and it has begun already with Professor Visocky-O'Grady's class engaged in design. There are students in her graphic design class engaged in designing a new banner that will replace the current banners on Euclid and Chester advertising the 50th Anniversary of the University. What we will have is a graphic conceived in a competitive environment by one of our students that will represent for the University the symbol of our 50th Anniversary. President Berkman stated that it really couldn't have worked out better than to have a student conceive it. He thanked Professor Visocky-O'Grady for engaging with it.

President Berkman reported that there is a block party or a multiple block party that will kick off this celebration. The block party is kind of an opening celebration. We are going to close down four blocks of Euclid Avenue and we are going to invite alums, we are going to invite students and faculty. So the planning for that piece is under way. He noted that there is a 50th Anniversary publication that is being put together. It is both in narrative and in pictures, a walk-through of the first 50 years or a read-through of the first 50 years of the Cleveland State University that will be distributed during the year.

President Berkman stated that the other piece he is aware of is that we were trying to assemble a group of distinguished speakers to come in from hither and yon to celebrate the Anniversary. He noted that it has evolved now into having a series of panels that will be put on throughout the year involving largely local folks. There may be folks from the national scene that participate but we will do one on arts and culture, we will do one on politics, we will do one on technology, we will do one on education. We will try to strive to engage the whole community – students, faculty etc. in these panel discussions. He remarked that he hopes he didn't botch it too badly. He stated that is where we are with the anniversary celebration. He reported that he corresponded with Dr. Michael Schwartz yesterday and they will meet with the committee over the summer and hopefully they will put in place the rest of the plan. He added that things are moving along.

President Berkman turned to Commencement. He stated that for those folks who may have forgotten, Commencement is Saturday, May 10, 2014. Really, in many ways, a monumental commencement. It happens to be the commencement on the 50th Anniversary but in this spring ceremony as of yesterday, 1,460 baccalaureate students have registered to walk and 825 master's and doctoral students have registered to walk. He noted that this is by far the biggest Spring Commencement that we've ever had. Over two thousand students receiving their degrees is just a great moment for the University. That there are so many students who are moving through and moving towards graduation is wonderful. So 2,000 students is more lightbulbs and more handshakes than we've done ever before so it might take a little bit longer. He said that he has modified his

typical half hour speech to three and one half minutes. Again, he stated that he looks forward to seeing everyone on Saturday and seeing as many faculty as can make it to Radiance on Friday night. He commented that he can't give a preemptive number but we've had an extraordinarily successful scholarship fund raising campaign that has gone on all year that will culminate on Friday night with the Radiance celebration.

President Berkman stated that he thought he was going to miss this Senate meeting but in fact it did not conflict with the trip that he took to Israel last week in which there was really a two-track endeavor; on the one hand we had twenty-five, twenty-six students from the Executive MBA Program who went to Israel to get a sense of the starved nation and they visited, he believes, ten companies in the eight days they were there. President Berkman reported that he also had the opportunity to visit four universities in Israel – Tel Aviv University, Haifa University, Ben Gurion University in and Hebrew University in Jerusalem. To summarize, President Berkman stated that he had actually heard from the Counsel General of Israel before he went, that at each of these universities there was incredible enthusiasm for collaborative programs with Cleveland, i.e., collaborative programs that would be study abroad opportunities, that would be faculty exchange opportunities and we know a lot of these emerge in the course of time but his sense is that these are real possibilities. He added that there is a real enthusiasm for doing it. There is actually a very interesting natural connection between Israel and Cleveland, Ohio. Cleveland, Ohio, as some may know, has per capita the third largest Jewish Federation in the United States. The Mandel Foundation has done, as everyone knows, a philanthropic work throughout Cleveland and has also done incredible philanthropic work throughout Israel. So, there really is a synergy there and his hope is that we try to expand study abroad opportunities for our students and opportunities for our faculty. We will define two or three ports of opportunity, not one hundred and twelve ports of opportunity that we have MOUs with now, but three or four ports of opportunity in which we could really build some strong collaborative activities and he thinks we have one in Israel. President Berkman noted that the group was in Israel for seven days and he thought it was an incredibly productive trip. He added that right now, we continue to collaborate with China and hoped we could add this to our repertoire. He stated that other reasons he thought that Israel was a very important target of opportunity for us was as many understand, or most of us do, a very large number of our students are not in a position financially to do a semester of study abroad. He believes that in the Cleveland community, we can raise scholarship dollars throughout the Cleveland community to fund students to go to Israel for study abroad. He added that this is the second layer of the strategy to identify university partners to raise dollars and his expectation is that the students will come after that.

President Berkman turned to the budget situation. He reported that the budget situation is going to remain fluid until probably early June when we really know where the enrollment numbers are. As he mentioned on other occasions, enrollment and the competition for students; and we have talked about the battalion of advertisements, the arms war at every sea around the Cleveland State campus, in terms of requests for students, is getting ever more intense as the high school and college age demographic in Ohio gets ever smaller. Indeed, Ohio now is forty-ninth in terms of the stake of the

actual percentage decline in high school graduates. So, the demographic is right at the bottom of the population that would obviously typically transition to the university is declining dramatically.

President Berkman noted that on the other end of the scale in our master's program, there is another kind of challenge that he has spoken about, an unfortunate and pernicious one with the elimination of the graduate student subsidy loan program. So, students who now want to get a master's degree in any discipline, must get a bank loan at prevailing interest rates and they have no grace period. The subsidy program used to allow you to finish your master's degree before you needed to begin to pay back the loan. The new program requires you to pay back the loan as soon as you execute the loan. So, you would have to pay whatever the prevailing going rate is – 6.5% - 7.5% which is of course a lot less interest than banks pay when they borrow from the Federal Reserve or borrow overnight to lend to public customers, etc., and so students would have to pay 6.5% - 7% and they would have to pay from the time that they execute the loan and they would have to do the master's degree while doing that. He noted that it has put a drag on master's enrollments. President Berkman stated that in his estimation, we are a little bit steadier than he thought we would be given this new impediment, but it is a significant challenge and it is not going to go away. The budget situation is an easy calculation. In essence twenty-five percent of your budget comes from the State and seventy-five percent of your budget comes from the tuition that a student pays. We did really well in the fall to spring retention numbers but the real test is the fall to fall retention numbers. President Berkman commented, that if we retained seventy-five percent of our students, twenty-five percent of tuition paying students would leave the university. This is a challenge. This is what makes it very, very difficult to understand where we will end up with the budget. On top of that, there is a new State formula which maybe three people in Ohio understand. The challenge is the complexity and each time we run the budget, it comes up with a set of different numbers with the same assumptions. It really is a challenge to understand. We understand that the two main elements of the model now are the number of course completions, the number of students you bring in the door in terms of your SSI is not material; the only thing that is material in the funding formula is not just the number of courses that students enroll for any given semester, it is the number of courses that they complete with a passing grade in any single semester. Every student who enrolls in a course and drops out of the course is less revenue for the university. President Berkman again stated that it is a very challenging and vexing formula and not everyone understands that for universities it is probably the most challenging funding formula there is in the country right now in terms of its productivity base and its output base. So, if you add that ingredient to the other ingredients, the budget is going to remain a moving target. President Berkman went on to say that one thing for sure is that the budget situation is going to be significantly tighter than it has been in previous years both because of the formula, because of the enrollment challenges and just because of some of the general flows in terms of the dollars. He added that Professor Andrew Resnick, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, will probably say more about that in his report.

President Berkman turned to the Wolstein Center. He noted that he received the same memo that Professor Resnick wrote to all of the Faculty Senate about Wolstein. He stated that firstly, there is nothing imminent that is going to happen with Wolstein. We are not next year going to transfer Wolstein Center from the auxiliary budget to the academic side of the budget. But, everyone needs to recognize, that it is an issue and a problem for the university. He went on to say that someone decided some number of years ago to build a 14,000 seat arena with the notion that they will come and they never really came. And, the year after that, even fewer of them came. And, then when the Q was built, almost none of them came. So the whole funding assumption behind Wolstein that events, concerts, the circus, Disney on Ice, Justin Beaver, J-Z and all of these fellows dying to come to Cleveland to perform with the revenue base for Wolstein would provide the needed revenue for Wolstein. That is why we hired a management company that manages five hundred arenas around the United State because they said, "Well you had the wrong management company. If you had us, they would have come." President Berkman remarked, well we have had them for five years and they have not come. They can tell you lots of reasons why they have not come and they will tell you lots of reasons why they probably will never come. But, for us, it doesn't solve the problem. The problem is that it is way outsized for anything that we do. It costs a fortune to turn on the lights; it costs a fortune to turn off the lights; its infrastructure is deteriorating and we have to find some sort of comprehensive solution for the building. In terms of whether the building becomes a state building, and again, even if we consider that option, we are not talking about a transition to the State budget until the next biennium so that would be the 16-17 biennium that we are talking about. If we were going to do that, at least the initial plan he has seen, he doesn't know if that plan has been shared with Professor Resnick. Even if we were to do that, it calls for auxiliaries for the first two years to fund fifty percent of the deficit of the building. One of the reasons that we need to consider transferring it to an academic budget as opposed to the auxiliary budget is that as an auxiliary we cannot invest any State capital dollars in the building. The only thing that can be invested in the building are dollars that are raised as an auxiliary. So, we have health and safety issues in that building which are going to have to be addressed which we cannot address from the deferred maintenance dollars, for example, that we went out and bonded or any of the State capital dollars that we have. President Berkman said that he wishes it wasn't there; he wishes that we had a neat clean 5,000 seat arena or 6,000 seat arena that we manage and we use for student purposes and we use for commencement and we use for other things but that is not the case. The building is there and, in terms of deferred maintenance, the costs will only accelerate in the years to come. President Berkman stated that we are not going to do anything now. Again, this biennium, things will remain the same. He just wanted to make everyone aware that the proposition or the idea of moving Wolstein off of the auxiliaries into a State building which, by the way, we will have it to use for other student activities as a State building rather than an auxiliary. He reported that he had a meeting this morning with the President of Tri-C and eight or nine administrators. They rent the building once a year for commencement and they pay \$47,000 to a management company to rent it for that one day. For us to change over and put the basketball floor down after this event, it is our arena, it costs us \$18,000 to change over from the regular floor to the basketball floor. That doesn't count running the basketball game; that's just for changing the floor.

President Berkman remarked that this was a bad deal from the beginning and it was a six-year deal and we are counting down the last year. He added that he can assure everyone that we are not going to reel so that is where we are with the Wolstein Center.

President Berkman apologized for taking more time for his report than his allotted time. He noted that everything was important. President Berkman remarked that he had one observation. He actually feels like there is a moment of connectivity with every student who comes across the stage – some walk right past him of course but there really is for each of those students a moment and a point of connectivity and he thinks that it is an important part of the ceremony. He added, “It is a lot of students, but it is their day.”

VII. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Deirdre Mageean remarked that first of all she like everyone is running pretty ragged this last few weeks. She commented that she has gotten home for a few hours every day and she has just about reached her tolerance level but it really has been a great opportunity to join in a lot of celebrations with students. They are coming to the end of their careers and their studies are part of that whether it be Trio, Honors Scholars, honors students, etc. She noted that there was a rather nice party for all of the faculty who have just been promoted and tenured or both and with their chairs, and it was really nice to see. She added that it was a good opportunity for faculty to get to know one another. It is amazing how few opportunities we have for that so it was nice to join in that particular kind of celebration.

Provost Mageean stated that President Goodell had mentioned a couple of things that she was going to mention so that will cut things down. The Space Policy is on the web so faculty should please have a look at it – it’s going to be pretty important and it does give the faculty a really good voice in those important decisions and increasingly important as we reach space crunches in various centers about the proper allocation and use of space. She hopes that in the spirit of the Transition Team and the Student Success Team, it will be a good example of faculty and administrators working together to get things done for the university.

Provost Mageean noted that everyone got the emails on Master Planning. She knows it is coming to summer and everyone is tired for various reasons, but it is the opportunity to provide feedback and the pace will pick up again in the fall. One of the reasons, of course, it makes sense to delay it beyond the obvious fact that if we yield more time to provide an opportunity for input, the fact is that if we have the budget determined while working our program prioritization, it makes sense to have these things working in sync; while commitment of a Master Plan, some different decisions and then finding the ideal alignment. Really, we are trying to make these things run in parallel with one informing the other.

Provost Mageean stated that she has explained the process of Program Prioritization to most people and she explained where we were. The Deans did provide their narrative contextual feedbacks to the central academic team when they gave them

their data. Some Deans worked with their Chairs on this and others worked in different ways. Every College did it a little differently. They had all the Deans over two days walking us all through this explaining it even more, contextualizing things and they also had at the same time the Deans presenting their faculty requests. Provost Mageean said that she will tell Senate where things are and what will and what will not be happening over the course of the summer. People will not be coming back to find a different university in the fall. We are going to use the time to look at some of the things that we really want to look at and make sure we are doing the right kind of analysis – that we are running the numbers, and making sure we don't have unintended consequences and that we don't try to make a right decision in one area and find that we are doing exactly the opposite somewhere else. So, there is a lot of analysis to be done in terms of fiscal impact, human resources impact, student impact and that takes time. Provost Mageean mentioned some of the things they will look at. For instance, she has mentioned before that we maybe need to look at our GenEd offerings and make sure what we have is not a duplicate. There is no point of duplicate courses with small enrollments across the university. If we can do things to save money like that, if we can look at very low enrollment master's programs that perhaps shouldn't exist at all, then we have an opportunity to release monies to be used somewhere else. She noted that they will be doing that kind of thing over the summer and then the discussion picks up again when they come back in the fall. And also this hiatus allows the other side of the house, the President as everyone knows is stressed that it is just not the academic side of the house but the academic support and the administrative side of the house, and all have to go through similar exercises. Provost Mageean stated that this gives them a little chance to catch up with us because we have been running pretty fast on this. It is a different process and they will be able to work, as they are, over twelve months, and work through that kind of thing through the summer. She said that they will pick a lot of that up. They will be working hard running the numbers. They are properly informed of this discussion and they will pick up the debates in the fall.

Provost Mageean turned to textbooks. Provost Mageean stated that Allie Dumski, SGA President, made an interim report on textbooks. The issue of textbooks is going to continue to be a very, very serious and challenging one for students. We have got to find some resolution. When everyone comes back in the fall, people will find that this is going to be a serious issue as costs go up and as our students work hard to try and stay enrolled. We talked about completion and retention and the importance of the budgeting formula. We know that students who can't afford textbooks do not do well and in many cases they drop out and that is going to continue being an issue that we have to work on.

Finally, Provost Mageean said she wanted to thank the Library for responding to an increased demand for some space for students to work their finals. This is a stressful and strenuous time for students and they need quiet space and places to work so she just wanted to thank the Library for responding to what looked like some pressure on space. She said she knows there are a lot of challenges in providing adequate space, not the least is security and supervision. But it's good to know that people are responding to the needs of our students.

At this point, Provost Mageean wished everyone all the best for a productive summer and said that she will see everyone at graduation on Saturday.

**VIII. Report of the Student Government Association
(Report No. 71-, 2013-2014)**

Ms. Allie Dumski, SGA President, wished everyone happy finals and hoped that everyone got more sleep than she has. She noted that SGA will continue to work on textbooks and they are in a good position and have a plan for next year. She said she thought that she would give Senate a break from hearing about that today. She noted that she will be back as SGA President next year.

Ms. Dumski reported that the RTA U-Pass passed with 97% of the votes. In addition, her party was also re-elected for the Executive Board of Student Government. The competition among candidate positions and the Board turnout increased significantly with two parties running for the Executive Board and over 2,300 votes cast compared to the 200 last year. The Board consists of herself as President, Hazem Jadallah the previous speaker as Vice President, Emily Halasah returning as Secretary and Kyle Kubovcik as Treasurer. She added that they are all going to be around this summer and in between classes and internships, they will be working on some SGA projects. She noted that they are dedicated to their slogan which is focused on fifty which represents the fifty goals that they have for CSU's fiftieth year. She added that the list is posted outside of the SGA Office and is currently hanging in the Student Center if anybody is interested in checking out the list.

Finally, Ms. Dumski stated that if anyone wants student input, please don't hesitate to ask. SGA hopes to continue to build a relationship between faculty and SGA to work together to serve the students.

Ms. Dumski thanked Senate for giving her the opportunity to speak at Senate meetings this year and involving SGA. She said she appreciates Senate's time and dedication to students. She then wished everyone a good summer and looks forward to seeing everyone again in the fall. A round of applause ensued.

**IX. Budget and Finance Committee
Annual Report (Report No. 72, 2013-2014)**

Senator Andrew Resnick, chair, Budget and Finance Committee, said that first he would like to thank PBAC (Planning and Budget Advisory Committee) for a fantastic year. He noted that it has been very interesting watching how the sausage is made. PBAC consisted of Associate Vice President Tim Long, Provost Deirdre Mageean, Vice President Stephanie McHenry, Vice President Carmen Brown, Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange, Teri Kocevar, Bonnie Kalnasy, Bill Wilson, Kathleen Murphy, Dean Meredith Bond, Vera Vogelsang-Coombs, David Elkins, David Ball, Stephen Duffy, himself, SGA President Allie Dumski, SGA Treasurer Jake Wehner and SGA Vice President Monica Ward.

Professor Resnick referred to the Budget and Finance Committee annual report provided to Senate. He said that hopefully, the committee has done a reasonable job of taking the numbers and generating a coherent narrative to Senate to understand where the money goes. He added that it is pretty easy to understand where the money comes from but watching where the money flows is very tricky and difficult to really understand when digging into all of the numbers.

Dr. Resnick stated that rather than going through all of the different items the committee discussed, he would just like to push ahead to the committee's recommendations at the end. The committee has put together a statement that he would like to read to Senate. He noted that unfortunately, it is going to come off as a rebuttal to President Berkman but that is not the intent here.

Professor Resnick stated that during several recent PBAC meetings, the possibility of eliminating the Wolstein Center as an Auxiliary business unit and transferring the operational expenses of Wolstein into the CSU Main Operating Budget has been suggested. PBAC strongly opposes this suggestion. The ongoing annual operating deficit of the Wolstein Center has so far been confined to non-academic budgets and has been adequately covered by Parking's ongoing revenue margin. For the years 2010 to date, Wolstein's actual losses exceeded projected losses by an additional \$550,000 per year on average. In real times, the Wolstein Center's annual operating losses are approximately \$1 million. While the transfer of the Wolstein business unit from Auxiliary into the Main Operating Budget may facilitate CSU's ability to obtain State funds for building repair, Wolstein's annual \$1 million operating deficit would have to be absorbed by academic programs to their detriment. Dr. Resnick commented that there are numerous ways CSU could spend \$1 million per year to better serve our students and generate increased tuition revenue including hiring additional faculty. However, it is useless, for example in his own department, to consider introductory physics labs. Nearly all science and engineering majors, approximately 3,000 undergraduates or 25% of the CSU undergraduate body are required to successfully complete two five credit-hour introductory physics courses each containing a laboratory component. Based on a four-year time to graduation, each semester 750 students should be enrolled in a lab introductory physics course. In actuality, enrollment is approximately 550 students per semester. The primary discrepancy is that enrollment is primarily ruled by available laboratory space which has been operating at or even over capacity for several years. Over a one year period if the student instructional lab were constructed instead of giving Wolstein \$1million, CSU could easily accommodate those additional 200 students each semester resulting in an additional 2,000 student credit hours or \$660,000 of annual tuition revenue. Operating at maximum capacity, one additional laboratory could accommodate up to 350 students per semester corresponding to nearly \$1.2 million in annual tuition revenue. If academic programs are forced to subsidize Wolstein operations, CSU will forego significant tuition revenue. More broadly, PBAC wishes to note that as is the case with other buildings on campus, Wolstein's individual budget line might cease to exist upon incorporation into the Main Operating Budget. While CSU has an ongoing budget problem associated with the underperforming

Wolstein Center, as long as Wolstein remains an Auxiliary business unit, CSU members can actively monitor the scope and magnitude of the budget problem and calculate its ongoing revenue margins shortfall needed to subsidize the Wolstein's budget. Moving Wolstein to the Main Operating Budget could remove the ability to monitor Wolstein's budget problem offering nothing to remedy Wolstein's budget problem. Wolstein Center should be considered in functional terms to the university and not only as a stand-alone business enterprise.

The Budget and Finance Committee recommends that Wolstein's budget continues to be individually tracked at least until Wolstein is no longer operating in a deficit for example by creating a Wolstein Center department line in the budget which would correspond to more than a \$2.5 million department budget. In addition, the Faculty Senate should play an active role in any discussion regarding how Wolstein Center functionally integrates into CSU and how Wolstein can be better utilized for our students. Because of the urgent nature of these planning activities, this committee hereby informs Faculty Senate that the Senate Budget and Finance Committee will continue meeting during the summer months, and further, respectfully asks to continue regular meetings with PBAC during the summer months. The Senate Budget and Finance Committee invites newly elected members to participate during the summer meetings as well.

Senator Joel Lieske asked if Professor Resnick would be making a resolution or just saying that he will be continuing with this study. Professor Resnick replied that he would like to make a motion or resolution that the Budget and Finance Committee is empowered to meet during the summer. He noted that the committee would like to meet in early June when the budget goes to the Board of Trustees and a couple of time in July and in early August.

Senator Jeff Karem commented by thanking Professor Resnick and the Committee for their work. He noted that he has been here fifteen years and learned more about the budget through the work Professor Resnick presented this year than he has ever before. Professor Resnick stated that he appreciated that and really it is the whole PBAC; there really are fantastic meetings.

Dr. Goodell noted that she speaks for everyone and thanked Professor Resnick once again for an excellent report.

Faculty Senate received the Annual Report of the Budget and Finance Committee.

X. University Curriculum Committee

Senator Bill Kostas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, noted that he would present the UCC's proposals and would have a couple of quick comments after that.

A. Graduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion: Proposed changes to MSBME Program (New Track)

(Report No. 73, 2013-2014)

Professor Kosteas referred to the first proposal, changes to the MSBME program. He noted that the big change here is adding a third track to the design tracks that are there. This is a course that is geared toward students who are working full-time, not full-time in the program, and therefore may not have big blocks of time to devote to writing a thesis within their entire project and that comes in at 36 credit hours.

Dr. Goodell inquired if a representative of the program was present at Senate.

There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed revisions to the MSBME program with a new track and asked for a vote. The UCC's proposed revisions to the MSBME program was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B. Proposed Business Analytics Certificates and new courses
(Report No. 74, 2013-2014)**

Professor Kosteas stated that the second item includes two Graduate Certificates in Business Analytics. The goal ultimately is to build these Certificates into a Graduate program in Business Analytics: twelve credit hours for the first Certificate (four courses) and then the second Certificate is more advanced. The Certificate has twelve or thirteen credit hours depending on the fourth course. There is an optional elective with three or four credit hours. He noted that these are intended to be interdisciplinary certificates offered by the College of Business and are not housed in a particular department but to be administered and staffed by various departments.

There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed two Business Analytics Certificates and new courses as detailed on UCC's handout and asked for a vote. The UCC's proposal for two Business Analytics Certificates and new courses was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**C. Undergraduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:
Music – Composition Fix (Report No. 75, 2013-2014)**

Professor Kosteas then presented the UCC's final business item and stated he believes this was presented to Faculty Senate conditionally two meetings ago. He noted this is an undergraduate program revision as part of the 4 to 3 conversion so we weren't technically quite done yet. He stated that this proposal is for Music Composition and this actually is a degree that came down significantly in terms of total credit hours.

Dr. Goodell asked if there were any questions about the proposal. There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed revisions to the Undergraduate program in Music as part of the 4 to 3 conversion and asked Senators to vote. The UCC's proposed revision to the Undergraduate program in Music was unanimously approved by voice vote.

D. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 76, 2013-2014)

Professor Kosteas then presented two items from the University Curriculum Committee for “Informational Purposes Only.”

- 1. Undergraduate course revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:
Capstone LIN 494 – March 19, 2014**
- 2. Graduate course revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:
Civil Engineering Graduate**

Faculty Senate received the two For Informational Purposes Only items from the University Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Kosteas stated that he wanted to thank everybody on the University Curriculum Committee and commented that if anyone sees their college representative on the UCC to please say thank you to that individual. He noted that Nigamanth Sridhar was the only new member this past year. The fact that everybody was willing to continue in spite of last year with all of the work we did, that says a lot – not just about the individuals but about the way they all got along. As much as the work was grinding and brutal at times, the committee somehow managed to have a good time through it all. He noted that their meetings were not just productive but they learned a lot from each other and the committee really functioned well. He added that he is going to miss it, sort of. He is going to miss the interactions with his colleagues on the committee and he does want to thank everybody here for all of their work in reviewing the committee’s proposals and, also the representatives of the Graduate College here at Senate who put up with him. Finally, Dr. Kosteas wished everyone a good summer.

XI. University Admissions and Standards Committee

Senator James Marino, chair of the University Admissions and Standards Committee stated that he has three action items from the committee and a brief report.

**A. Change in Residency Requirements for Majors and Minors
(Report No. 77, 2013-2014)**

Professor Marino presented the Admissions and Standards Committee’s first action item, proposed revision to the Residency Requirements for Majors and stated that we could call this the last stray sheep of the 4 to 3 conversion. He noted that our residency requirements for majors have always been 16 credits or fifty percent of those required for the major, whichever was lower. He stated that it occurred to the committee that 16 does not divide by three evenly. He was told by his committee, “Of course it does,” but he said that he likes to stick to inches. The problem here would be that with the 16 credit requirement some students would feel that they were being forced to take two extra courses and this could only lead to discontent, etc. so the A&S Committee unanimously proposes that we move to an easy multiple of three, 18 credits within a

major or fifty percent of required hours in the major, whichever is lower. This means that in many instances they were made 15 rather than 18. Dr. Marino added that this is part of the overall 30 residency requirement and a 24 credit hour requirement for upper division classes. The Committee felt that six three-credit classes in the major at Cleveland State helps gives us a degree of quality control or the degrees that we will have.

Senator Beth Ekelman noted that she mentioned this to the Committee before the Senate meeting. The College of Sciences and Health Professions have 2+2 agreements that specifically state 16 credits so she guesses they just need to figure out how to manage that because she thinks it is a contract. She added that she didn't know who would make that decision but it is with Tri-C.

Professor Marino suggested two things. First of all, any students who already have catalog rights, this wouldn't become so – those students in the program would be fine. Second, the Admissions and Standards Committee has led him to learn new things about the university and every month he learns another. He commented that he will not learn before he is done. Whether or not these kinds of 2+2 agreements over-ride our requirements could be the case or it could be that the final option is if none of this works, in that case you can just put something else into Admissions and Standards.

Professor Ekelman replied that her college may very well be able to modify the agreement but she is not sure because she hasn't talked to her Dean but it just dawned on her that this is an issue. She added that she has no problem with the credits.

Professor Marino stated that every rule runs into some exception so Professor Ekelman needs to talk to someone.

Dr. Goodell inquired if there was any further discussion. There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed changes in the Residency Requirements for Majors and Minors and asked for a vote. The proposed changes in the Residency Requirements for Majors and Minors were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B. Proposed Admissions Revisions for Master's Degree in Computer & Information Sciences
(Report No. 78, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Marino next presented the A&S Committee's proposed Admissions Revisions for the Master's degree in Computer & Information Science. He noted that essentially this is where Computer Science has been doing a point system where somebody with a low GPA but a high test score can get in because of an aggregate point system. This has led to some trouble with students who are having difficulty succeeding in the classroom because they are low in one or the other metric. The Committee proposes a change to holistic admission procedures using minimum cutoffs for test scores and GPAs that should increase the chance that admitted students will complete the MCIS program successfully. Dr. Marino then asked if Senators had any questions.

An unidentified Senator stated that the requirements in the verbal section of GRE must be a type-o. Dr. Marino replied, “No, it is not.” Dr. Marino commented that he did ask the department why they felt that was a cutoff but they apparently feel that 95% of the students who take this test are going to be fine in Computer Science. It is that half of a tenth where their English language skills are going to be a problem.

Senator Raymond Henry stated that this is not actually a change. He noted that this is what was currently in the standards and is not actually a change. He added that they didn’t sit in a meeting last year and go, “Oh, let’s say five percent.”

Senator Orhan Talu stated that five percent are those students that can’t communicate at all. Dr. Marino commented that the other 95% are communicating probably through various programming languages.

Senate Vice President Sridhar commented that this issue came up at Graduate Council as well. This is not specific to the Computer & Information Sciences Department. The Business College uses the GRE as their admission requirements for all of their students and he recalls other departments and programs in the university use the GRE as well – this is not unique with this program.

Dr. Marino remarked that this is a terribly onerous requirement. Professor Talu commented that you can’t control the five percent.

Professor Marino stated that Senate is not voting on that unless someone would like to propose an amendment to the proposal.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones asked Dr. Marino to clarify what is being changed in the proposal.

Dr. Marino replied that what is being changed is the fact that now your GRE can’t offset a low GRA or vis-a-versa. What’s been happening is students with low GPAs have been testing and then would get sky high GRE scores. Those students struggle in the coursework and do not succeed. He added that what will happen now is there will be a cut-off point both for GPA and for test scores and then there will be holistic review including looking at the transcript and seeing where the GPA really comes from. Concerning the low GPA – there are students who can put together the right aggregate amount of points but the weaknesses in their GPA are exactly in the courses that are the most relative to the graduate program. Their GPA is being played up by saying, “They are GenEds and they really shouldn’t be pursuing graduate work in Computer Science.”

Dr. Goodell inquired if there were any further questions. There being no further questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed revisions to the Admissions Requirements for the Master’s Degree in Computer and Information Science and asked Senators to vote. The A&S Committee’s proposed Admissions Requirements for the MCIS were approved with two abstentions.

C. College to College Transfers (Report No. 79, 2013-2014)

Dr. Marino moved to the A&S Committee's third action item, proposed rule for College to College Transfers. He noted that we have not previously had this type of rule. He stated that the last academic year, we created a new set of rules for academic standing and academic warning and probation. There is now a new category for students on warning or probation. Students whose GPAs are fine but who are not making adequate progress towards the degree. These are students who repeatedly withdraw from courses. So a student who enrolls for five courses for 15 credits gets two As and three Ws, (i.e., a full house of sorts) and a 4.0 GPA. So they really are not moving forward towards their degree and this change was made partly to be in line with Federal financial aid requirements. As a student continues to get that kind of full house, the student will go on Academic Warning and then Academic Probation.

Dr. Marino stated that herein lies the problem. College to college transfers have always been allowed for students in good academic standing, meaning GPA. Now we have a new category of students who's GPAs are falling but are in good academic standing and colleges need guidance as to whether or not they were allowed to deny such students continued enrollment. Dr. Marino noted that there are tiers to the process. First there is a warning, then there is probation, then suspension and there is something else beyond that. A student under academic warning or academic probation solely because of the failure to meet satisfactory academic progress, a serial withdrawer, but his GPA is sufficient for good academic standing, should not be prevented from transferring to another college because of that fact. If the student is admissible, they should be admitted. If they do not meet the college's admissions standards in other respects, the college is free to deny them admission.

President Berkman asked Dr. Goodell if anyone had talked to the Financial Aid people about this because there are Federal regulations regarding the disbursement of financial aid. The subject of withdrawal of courses and then the student and/or university's responsibility to refund those dollars that were given to the students based on financial need.

Professor Marino asked if the college is required to refund financial aid. President Berkman replied that the university is required to refund those dollars.

Professor Marino noted that President Berkman has a question about financial aid. Dr. Marino, speaking to President Berkman stated, "Mr. President, we initially created the academic warning system to get us in compliance with those financial aid items so in effect we are stopping students from enrolling at a certain point. They are not allowed to keep taking classes. The real question here is internal transfers within the institution. So actually, there won't be any. We are not asking like the College of Engineering to take on Health Sciences." President Berkman commented, "You don't think you are."

Senator Vera Vogelsang-Coombs inquired if the Admissions and Standards Committee has an estimate of how many students might be affected by this rule and if there is variation across any of the colleges.

Dr. Marino replied that he considers there is a slight variation across the colleges but a minority of the colleges have already been refusing these transfers. He noted that as for numbers, he would ask Vice Provost Peter Meiksins if he had numbers.

Dr. Meiksins responded that the Registrar's Office has estimated eight percent of our undergraduate student population is either on warning or probation solely with regard to making good progress – a tiny fraction of students actually.

Dr. Marino stated that this is good to hear. He noted again that an estimated eight percent of our undergraduate population is on warning or probation simply because of the failure to progress. Only a small amount of them are seeking transfers. Dr. Marino noted that the committee's thinking was for many students who are having trouble making progress one of the best remedies is for them to change majors. So we should not erect internal roadblocks between programs for people who might be better suited for another program.

There being no further questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed a Rule for College to College Transfers and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Rule for College to College Transfers was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Marino stated that he had two quick items to bring up. He noted that first, one word about waivers and degree requirements. We have traditionally had a university where our degree requirements were somewhat in excess of the State minimum and we have a culture of waiving credit hour requirements here and there due to students' needs. We are now, starting in August, going to be a university where many of our degree programs are really at the State minimum standards for credit hours. In this situation, we have to be very careful in how we use waivers. We are not allowed to waive students below State minimum requirements. No program can; not you, not me, not your favorite Trustee; really, nobody. So, the State minimum for undergraduates is 120 which means that it really has to be 120, not 118. We can hold students harmless but then again a student enrolled with 128 credits and graduates with 122 credits I think has been held substantially harmless.

Dr. Marino noted that the second item is that this semester there have been two potentially very embarrassing situations in two different colleges that will go unnamed. He doesn't want to embarrass the colleges or the university because both colleges now seem to be in compliance. One involves the change of a large number of student grades without the normal process of instructor involvement or instructor acknowledgment; that's embarrassing. He reported that he occasionally had to go to his committee and kind of do some exposition to get them to watch their colleagues.

Dr. Marino stated that another item, there are so many things, but let's just keep it at this. One of our colleges was advertising a degree program to applicants and the phrasing of the advertisement seemed to obligate us to give out degrees where we are not actually meeting certain State requirements. Again, the problem of giving students things that we are not lawfully allowed to deliver is a serious problem. We need to make student success our priority but we also need to protect the value of our degree. Our problem as a university has never been that our degrees are over-valued or that our students are over-estimating. We need to provide a service to our graduates and to our institution's long-term future by maintaining the perception of the reality of a strong degree program. The main way to not have scandals about issues like this is by not to handle issues like this. Dr. Marino went on to say that if we have more issues like this, he doesn't foresee them, but he has to talk about this, eventually one of them will become a scandal and we can't afford to damage the value of our degree. Yes, student success should be first but we can't afford to do it in a way that tarnishes the perceived value of our degree in the community. We just have to do it the hard way. And, that means the faculty needs to step up and take a strong leadership role and part of it is traditional of the faculty to oversee standards.

A round of applause ensued for Dr. Marino.

XII. University Faculty Affairs Committee

Dr. Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, reported that UFAC has four action items which means that for the first time ever, UFAC has a greater presence than UCC. He added that this is not necessarily enviable. He again stated that UFAC has four action items – two are endorsements and two are matters of explicit approval.

A. Conflict of Interest Policy (Report No. 80, 2013-2014)

B. Whistleblower Policy (Report No. 81, 2013-2014)

Professor Karem noted that the first two are policy statements from the Office of Compliance. We do have Rachel King of Legal Counsel as the content expert from the Office of Compliance. These are two policies that are required by State regulations. One pertains to Conflict of Interest and the other is Whistleblower protection. Dr. Karem commended the Office of Compliance and UFAC for extensive dialogue for both of these policies. These both have received endorsements from UFAC at our most recent meeting. They both have strong elements to protect the university and the faculty. These are important protections. These policies don't conflict with collective bargaining agreements or other provisions of the contract. He noted that he can go into more detail about these but he simply will leave it to faculty senators to ask if people have questions. Dr. Karem stated that the first policy discussed is the Conflict of Interest Policy.

There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed endorsing the university's Conflict of Interest Policy and asked

Senators to vote. The proposed endorsement of the Conflict of Interest Policy was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones stated that she just noticed an error in the first sentence of the Conflict of Interest Statement and that is capitalization. It reads, "Trustees, faculty and staff of Cleveland state university" and it should read, "Trustees, faculty and staff of Cleveland State University." She asked if this is the final version or is it still to be edited.

Dr. Karem replied that this is the State format and requirement. Only place names can be capitalized in State policies. The Office of Compliance and UFAC and the Provost's Office spent the better part of this year revising the Greenbook in accordance with such important and complex details. All policies also have to have gender neutral language which does not mean his or her, it means that you cannot use a possessive pronoun with the gender. So his English degree was put to extreme use in removing the language of what we understand as best and normal English. So, it is not a typo, it's the fault of Columbus.

Dr. Karem referred to the next policy, the Whistleblower Protection Policy and asked if anyone had any questions. He noted that this will have the same unique formatting guidelines as well. Dr. Karem thanked everybody involved because the Greenbook was just recently launched so that's a great thing too.

Senator James Wilson commented, just to clarify, there was recently at North Carolina somebody was purged because she revealed the corruption in the grading of athletes. She was put in the basement as retaliation. He noted that he assumes if we are being put under pressure in any way to inflate our grades that would be considered a serious violation of university policy rule. He noted that he is just not quite sure what the university policy rule means.

Dr. Goodell inquired if Ms. Rachel King could respond to Professor Wilson's question.

Ms. King replied that if somebody was pressured to change a grade or change their research, there is an academic freedom component to the Whistleblower policy. She stated that if there is a serious violation of university policy to the extent that the policy protecting academic freedom is violated or a circumstance like that, it would be a serious violation of the Whistleblower policy to try to influence or otherwise retaliate against somebody.

Dr. Goodell remarked that we have to have a policy and that's why we have to have a policy office. We have policies and review periods on policies, right?

There being no further questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee proposes endorsing the University Whistleblower Policy and asked

Senators to vote. The proposed endorsement of the University Whistleblower Policy was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Karem again thanked Rachel King from the Office of Compliance for working with UFAC and thanks to UFAC. He added that UFAC received legal training on the fly here.

Dr. Karem stated that the next two items pertain to the ongoing revision of the Student Evaluation of Instruction Instrument and process. He noted that UFAC has convened a Data Reporting Subcommittee that will attend to issues of how to execute calculations and report this data. Recommendations are coming on this issue in the fall.

C. College SEI Questions (Report No. 82, 2013-2014)

Dr. Karem noted that as everyone will recall back in January Senate approved a core instrument set of questions and this was then sent out to colleges to add their discipline specific questions. He noted that on a two-page handout UFAC reports the questions that have been presented by the various colleges and approved. Some of them were open-ended, some of them were not, and some of them have slightly different scales. UFAC tries to respect local governance in our colleges and do what was appropriate for their disciplines. UFAC did have a cursive dialogue with several colleges; we sent questions back; we didn't simply agree with things without looking at them. Faculty Senate has oversight of the Student Evaluation process so before the evaluations can be put into place, the college specific forms must be approved. He added that UFAC and Sharon Smith of Testing Services need approval of Faculty Senate for these additional questions. Dr. Karem then asked if anyone had any questions.

There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed the addition of questions from each of the colleges to the Student Evaluation Instrument and asked Senators to vote. The University Faculty Affairs Committee's proposed addition of College SEI Questions was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell commented that this has been a very long process and extremely well managed.

Dr. Karem thanked all members of the college FACs and Deans' Offices for getting the promised feedback to this process. It really was not a down to the wire process that he expected.

D. Report on Software for SEI Electronic Pilot (Report No. 83, 2013-2014)

Dr. Karem stated that the last item is a follow up on the Pilot of electronic software that was approved at the last Faculty Senate meeting. He noted that with the guidance and assistance of the Provost's Office, UFAC was contemplating a pilot of an electronic software option for the fall 2014. He said that four different software packages

have been reviewed and UFAC has presented the findings here in Senate. He would doubt that neither he nor UFAC has a budget to purchase a software so the budgetary decision ultimately is in the hands of the Provost. He added that there has been strong consensus among all parties about the best software and currently that is Blue. He would be happy to answer questions about this and he would like to obtain a Faculty Senate endorsement or approval for plotting the software. Professor Karem believes we should go forward with this having the blessing of Faculty Senate. UFAC is recommending a fully voluntary pilot on an individual faculty member basis. UFAC is also recommending that faculty volunteering for the pilot be held harmless for the results. He commented, for instance, if there is some confusion about paperwork or something gets lost, that we don't suddenly say, "Where are your evaluations for fall 2014 – shame on you." Dr. Karem stated that the fact that it is voluntary also means that faculty who were perhaps going up for promotion and feel nervous, they may want to wait until we are out of the pilot stage. Dr. Karem noted that the process of reviewing the software products has occurred in IS&T with representatives from SGA, and it has been a very thorough process. He said he wanted to thank everybody for their feedback. He has learned a lot about integration of the systems but not enough to qualify for a CIS degree. He knows a lot more than he used to. He asked if there were any questions.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady wondered if we should make it mandatory that untenured faculty, since they are required to have those evaluations, aren't a part of the pilot program because we have lots of junior faculty who are willing volunteers and would be glad to be a part of this but if Dr. Karem is concerned that there may be some bumps, we may want to do more than just warn them that it could affect their tenure.

Dr. Karem replied that he is open to that. He will be frank and always anticipates bumps. One of the advantages of this is that you have a much faster response time to get your data. It is much easier to calculate and look at this data longitudinally so there would be certain advantages to an untenured faculty member to use it to make their case more effectively. Dr. Karem asked if Dr. Visocky-O'Grady was speaking simply to the electronic pilot. Dr. Visocky-O'Grady responded, "Yes, just the pilot."

Dr. Karem commented that if other people have different opinions, we could make an amendment. He said that we need to respect local governance and decision-making in this a matter. If we think we are opening up faculty governance issues, he doesn't want to create problems.

Senator Marius Boboc asked, "What does paper capable mean for the chosen software? Does that mean that they could have the paper version of the instrument?"

Dr. Karem replied that Professor Boboc had a good question. He noted that he didn't want to eke out all of the different details here but one of the best things about the product Blue is that the paper capability is extremely easy to use. What happens is if one can opt in or out to using paper instead of the electronic submission. You simply print out the evaluation and then any ACR software optical character recognition can read it in and it will go into the same data base as the other calculations. This was the only product

that really had a fully robust paper capability – and that was one of our minimum requirements.

Senator Robert Krebs stated that he is not big on blanket rules and opposes that proposal because he thinks that if somebody is just coming in new, they might actually be better off if they just stuck with the new software through their term of probationary appointment. He would recommend anyone at the third and fourth year review stick with something they could still keep a trend line.

Dr. Karem commented to Professor Krebs, “Bob, you are speaking to a proposed amendment that would say that untenured faculty wouldn’t use that, is that correct?”

Professor Krebs stated that he just needs a volunteer.

Professor Marino noted that what we are concerned about here is not a changing statistical trend line but the idea that the program might eke out the evaluations. Yes, faculty be held harmless. He stated that in that case, he thinks that Jeff’s rule does make a certain amount of sense because even if we are holding a junior faculty member harmless, she may have lost particularly good evaluations in a particular semester because of whichever the software will be. He agrees that you don’t anticipate bumps but, the nature of bumps is to be unanticipated.

Senator Teresa Nawalaniec referred back to the SEI Instrument under CLASS noting that Business is listed twice. Dr. Karem thanked Teresa for that technical correction. He presumes that they can eliminate the second Business. He commented that UFAC likes the Business College so much in CLASS they wanted to give them double representation in hopes that they will donate to CLASS.

Dr. Karem asked if there is an amendment on the floor regarding the Pilot study or if someone wants to make an amendment.

Professor Visocky-O’Grady commented that to clarify, she is just looking to protect junior faculty members. So she asked in a more informational way if we had a Greenbook policy on this issue. There is nothing exact in the language of the Greenbook on for example if the machine eats the data? The time period we are looking at is probably like a year so if a junior faculty member, say volunteers for this and one year of data is eaten, is that going to affect their ability to go up for tenure and promotion.

Dr. Karem replied that it is only a one semester pilot in fall 2014.

Dr. Visocky-O’Grady noted that they would be truly held harmless.

Provost Mageean responded that it is hoped to pilot it over the summer, but with the purchasing requirements, we can’t get it through in time for summer. So we did fall semester.

Dr. Visocky-O'Grady stated that she will waive any kind of an implied amendment.

Dr. Karem stated that Blue is used by our peer institutions – the University of Louisville, Cincinnati, Kentucky – it's been around for ten years. He added that we are not piloting an alpha or beta version. We would never do that at Cleveland State, say something like PeopleSoft, or something like that.

Dr. Goodell asked if there was any further discussion. She stated that Dr. Karem would like Senate to vote on approving a pilot using the Blue software in the fall. There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell then stated that the University Faculty Affairs Committee has proposed piloting the electronic software to collect the SEI data in the fall and asked for a vote. The UFAC's proposal to approve a pilot using the Blue software to collect SEI data in the fall was approved unanimously by voice vote.

XIII. Academic Technology Committee Recommendations on draft Email Policy (Report No. 84, 2013-2014)

Dr. Regennia Williams, Chair of the Academic Technology Committee, reported that all of the members of the committee are listed on the Annual Report so she won't repeat their names now. But she does want to say that when they sat down as a committee on April 11, 2014 to review the recommended changes for the email policy for the university, there were a number of recurring themes. First and foremost, the committee is concerned about avoiding violations of Federal law related to student rights and privacy. Certainly, they were also concerned about public records, a state law. And then they were reminded also that there is a contract with the AAUP so they were concerned about existing policies related to correspondence and the privacy of faculty members. Dr. Williams stated that these are some of the things that came up. Certainly, university policy as it relates to the StarFish system and discussion of student grades using email is a concern because there is some of that going on already at certain levels. Dr. Williams noted this is the backdrop against which the committee came up with these particular recommendations.

Dr. Williams stated that the committee recommends first and foremost that section 3344-07-03 be deleted from the policy because the university cannot guarantee that all messages have been delivered to every user's account. The university could use a receipt system and still there is no guarantee that if we get the receipt saying that the email was read that that was actually the faculty member who read it. Again, it is mostly faculty concerns about that. Regarding information about FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) and then the Gramm Leach Bliley Act (GLBA) the Committee recommends that the language in this section be revised so that it is consistent with existing policy suggested earlier. Again this relates to some of the things that are being discussed by way of StarFish.

Dr. Williams discussed section 3344-07-04 concerning the CSU email accounts. The committee strongly feels that forwarding to an outside provider should be allowed

because they understand that some faculty members lack faith in the university's current system. Dr. Williams stated that beyond that, policies within the proposed document that the committee reviewed, and the committee understood that the discussions of the draft policy were ongoing, there was some contradictory language saying that you can't have a blanket forwarding system but you can forward individual emails. The committee's concern for this section is that we have consistency across-the-board within the document of the proposed changes and also with existing federal and state laws and also university policies and practices.

Dr. Williams moved to section 3344-07-05, the use of email for organized political activity or political solicitation. Dr. Williams stated that the committee felt that the language was sufficiently vague that the committee wanted to say several things here. This one concerns the use of email for non-partisan political activity or external organized political activity beyond matters concerning the university. It was called to the committee's attention that there were certain things that faculty members should be concerned about. Union representatives especially have an obligation to members of the campus community especially faculty to be engaged very actively in advocating on behalf of faculty members and that engagement can be very political. It was also suggested that the phrase "Non-partisan political communication is permitted by authorized collective bargaining agencies" should be added to this section of the policy. Finally, Dr. Williams stated that email privacy for bargaining unit employees is governed by the appropriate collective bargaining agreement.

Dr. Goodell noted that this is a lot of information to digest. She stated that she is very happy that Dr. Williams had an opportunity to discuss these issues with the committee and that she came to Senate with these recommendations. If Faculty Senate endorses these recommendations, they will be forwarded to the university administration that is considering the changes or considering the implementation of this policy. Dr. Goodell commented that she doesn't know where this policy stands in terms of it being half way through the policy implementation phase. She knows that it has gone through its thirty-day review period. Perhaps Ms. Rachel King, Chief Compliance Officer, can give Senate an update.

Ms. Rachel King stated that her understanding is that this item is on the Board of Trustees Agenda for the May meeting. She noted that she believes that there have been changes since the version that was posted. She does not know if these concerns interest us or not.

Mr. Bill Wilson, Chief Information Officer, reported that he is afraid that he does not have more information with regard to the edits that have been made to the final version of the policy. He noted that it is in the hands of General Counsel and they are the ones that are truly the author of this policy. He added that he and IS&T did participate in putting the initial policy together, however, it is not a technology policy. It deals with the open records request laws and so it is being authored by General Counsel.

Dr. Goodell commented that if Senate has recommendations or feedback from the Academic Technology Committee perhaps we should send those directly to General Counsel. Mr. Wilson replied that was a good idea.

President Berkman stated that as a member of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Goodell obviously will have an opportunity at the Board meeting to suggest these amendments and the rationale but the Board Policy on Policies stipulates that there be a thirty day review period. When the thirty day review period goes out, those comments are collected, they are delivered to the Board with the policy and then the Board deliberates whether they want to make amendments to the policy based on the written comments. President Berkman noted that this is his understanding of the process.

Dr. Williams noted that she should say also that a lot of the information that came to her committee had already been sent to the General Counsel's Office in response to the information that was on General Counsel's web site.

Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Williams if the Academic Technology Committee would like Faculty Senate to approve the committee's recommendations and have them sent to General Counsel as a record of Senate's feelings on the matter. Dr. Williams replied, "Yes." Dr. Goodell then asked if there was any further discussion.

Senator Duffy inquired if Faculty Senate forwards those comments to General Counsel will those comments be forwarded to the Board of Trustees. President Berkman stated that those comments should go to the Board. Dr. Goodell also stated that the comments from the policy review period will go to the Board. She then asked Ms. King if that was correct. Mr. King replied that either way that is fine. She added that she suspects that some of the comments will cross with some of the edits. Some of the things that we are concerned about have already been fixed because she thinks that they have already done one edit.

President Berkman stated that again, it is the responsibility of the General Counsel to make the determination of what is and what is not in compliance with the laws and regulations we are talking about here.

Dr. Goodell stated that perhaps we should send these to General Counsel and ask them for some feedback about which of these issues have already been addressed in the policy and she will just ask General Counsel for a response to the Academic Technology Committee. She asked if this would be acceptable.

Senator James G. Wilson stated that this policy raises some serious first amendment problems and he is not sure what the solution is and he doesn't know the difference between partisan political activity or external organized political activity. He thinks we should at least indicate what the overall purpose of the rule is, something like external organized partisan political activity that seems to be aimed at not dealing with Democrats and Republicans being advocates. Political activity is a broad concept frankly so he just doesn't know what it means and he would suggest that maybe we

should narrow it down to one narrower concept of external organized partisan political activity. At least it seems a little bit narrower than these two great phrases that sort of co-exist.

Dr. Goodell stated that she appreciated what Professor Wilson is saying. She noted that actually we are not here to make further amendments or suggestions. The comment period is up and the committee has made its suggestions based on the policy as it was posted. She added that all Senate can do at this stage is pass on the committee's recommendations and then get a response from General Counsel – that's about it.

Dr. Goodell asked if there were any further comments or questions. There being no further comments or questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the Academic Technology Committee has recommendations and feedback on the proposed Email Policy that will be sent to General Counsel for their comment and asked Senators to vote. The Academic Technology Committee's recommendations on the draft Email Policy were approved unanimously by voice vote.

**XIV. Electronic Learning Committee
Proposed E-Learning Definitions (Report No. 53, 2013-2014 – 3/19/14
Meeting)**

Dr. Goodell noted that Senate is coming back to this item (proposed E-Learning Definitions) from two Senate meetings ago.

Senator Linda Wolf, chair of the Electronic Learning Committee, stated that the committee is recommending the following definitions for on-line courses.

- 1) Fully online courses. Dr. Wolf stated that fully online courses meet online for 100% of the classes. Dr. Wolf noted the rationale for this is that the students consider an online course to be totally online with no need to travel to some physical space to meet for a class.
- 2) Blended courses. Professor Wolf stated that she had mentioned this before. Blended and hybrid are used interchangeably throughout our websites and we are using blended because that is what is listed in CampusNet when students register for classes. These courses contain a mixture of face to face classes and sessions which are conducted online with no more that 40% of class meetings held in assigned on-campus classroom locations. She added that 60% of the class sessions are held on line. Blended courses include an e-learning per credit hour fee for students as determined by the university administration.

Professor Wolf stated that the fully online classes include an e-learning fee per credit hour and that too is determined by the administration. The committee included here a calculation of percentage of course hours, class to online, so that it can be calculated. Professor Wolf added that we do have to note that the definition by the Ohio Board of Regents is that e-learning classes are conducted at greater than 80% plus of the

contents delivered online and typically there are no face to face meetings. The Electronic Learning Committee is proposing that the definitions of online and blended as internal definitions for Cleveland State.

Dr. Goodell asked if there were any comments or questions. There being no further comments or questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the Electronic Learning Committee has proposed definitions of online and blended courses as noted in the handout and asked for a vote. The proposed definitions of online and blended courses was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell noted that the next items on the Agenda are the Annual Reports. She stated that the Annual Reports are not read unless we have specific feedback from those but if anyone has any comments or questions for the office of those reports or for the Senate officers, then please feel free to send them to the reporters or herself and Violet. Those reports will be handed to the next incoming committee so if there are ongoing issues that need to be dealt with, it would be assumed that the new committee will take up those issues as their first order of business. Dr. Goodell then asked if there were any comments or questions about that process. She added that we don't actually do anything with the reports but if there were any action items in any of those reports, Senate has heard them already. Not all committees are required to give Annual Reports. The Graduation, Convocation and Assembly Committee is one of those and so they are actually giving a report at the first meeting in the fall or perhaps the second meeting which will be enough time to make any changes to graduation ceremonies for the fall.

XV. Annual Reports

- A. University Curriculum Committee (Report No. 85, 2013-2014)**
- B. University Faculty Affairs Committee (Report No. 86, 2013-2014)**
- C. Committee on Athletics (Report No. 87, 2013-2014)**
- D. Library Committee (Report No. 88, 2013-2014)**
- E. Academic Technology Committee (Report No. 89, 2013-2014)**
- F. University Petitions Committee (Report No. 90, 2013-2014)**
- G. Electronic Learning Committee (Report No. 91, 2013-2014)**
- H. Committee on Academic Space (Report No. 92, 2013-2014)**
- I. Ad Hoc Committee on Student Success (Report No. 93, 2013-2014)**

Faculty Senate received all of the Annual Reports listed.

XVI. Open Question Time

Dr. Goodell stated that we now have a period of open question time and asked if there were any questions for anyone about anything.

Senator Robert Krebs commented that his feeling is that Wolstein Center is going to be what it is – we are going to have to deal with it one way or the other. He noted that what he would really love to hear some time in the near future is what are the

opportunities we get as it switches over to an academic building? It seems to be a pretty neat building for the university to have and there has to be some good things about it.

President Berkman responded that there is going to be a comprehensive discussion about whether it can be re-purposed, whether it can be used for student recreation facilities, whether it can be used for other university functions. Precisely the issue is that given that we have the building and given that no one is going to magically take it off the campus for us, what is the best way that we can repurpose the building to use it. He noted that the Master Planning group is also going to be making recommendations about Wolstein and about potential repurposing of Wolstein. President Berkman stated that it is not a financial decision. It is a semester planning utilization decision in terms of a campus building.

Senator Andrew Gross commented that following up that point and President Berkman's statement and others he is hoping that the Senate would honor a request made three meetings ago and invite for the first meeting in the fall or the second in the worst scenario, the Director of Alumni and the Director of Advancement.

Dr. Goodell responded that Steering did discuss this and Steering felt that this meeting today was just too long to listen to one more thing so Steering asked and Senate will take that up and it will be on the Agenda for the first Senate meeting of the year.

Senator Karem commented that the people in Rhodes Tower can move to Wolstein Center. He stated that he did have a quick question. "Do we have an estimated date of arrival for the new Vice Provost for faculty?"

Provost Mageean replied that an announcement will be made by next week.

Senate Vice President Nigamanth Sridhar stated that he had a question about the thirty hour per week limitation on student employment for the summer. He noted that there are people, at least a couple of people in his college, who have student employees for this summer working on research projects. For example, he knows of one faculty member working on a research project who needs to have students working with construction workers. The students and construction workers have work rules stipulates forty hours. Something needs to be done to allow those kinds of projects to go forward and not be limited by the other requirements.

Dr. Goodell commented that she tried to figure out who is responsible for that decision and the communication of it to affected faculty but other than that she is fine.

Dr. Jerzy Sawicki, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, remarked that he just learned about this student employment issue today.

Provost Mageean stated that she just heard about the student employment issue and it came out of Career Services but it is an HR mandate that was sent from there. She

noted that her understanding is that HR is telling us that when you reach that limit, you have to pay benefits.

Dr. Goodell asked, “Why was this issue buried in the student employment handbook and nobody who actually employs students was informed of this?” She remarked, “Whoever you are out there, you are in my sites and I shall find you at some point.” Dr. Goodell went on to say that this is a serious issue for those faculty and for the students. The students are going to lose ten hours per week of employment that they are expecting and now we are just telling them, “Sorry, bad luck.”

Provost Mageean stated that first of all, let’s find out how many people are actually affected by it and find a solution. She added that the Research Office should be able to find out how many students are affected through grants. She said that she will talk with HR about it and see exactly what sum of money we are talking about.

Dr. Sridhar noted that as he understands it, the Health Care requirement is basically for people that work thirty hours per week average over the course of the year. So if a student is working forty hours per week during the summer and has a cap at twenty hours per week in the academic year, the student cannot make up to thirty hours anyway.

Provost Mageean noted that Dr. Jianping Zhu, Dean, College of Graduate Studies, is a little bit more familiar with the Health Care requirements. She stated that they had to look at this issue for the Adjuncts. She was wondering if a little more light could be cast on that average question: “If it is not thirty hours in a specific period, but it is thirty hours over the course of a year.”

Dr. Goodell inquired, “Is it over the course of 52 weeks?” Dr. Zhu, stated that it is over two semesters.

Dr. Goodell remarked, “No, that’s not the question.” She stated that the Health Care rule doesn’t apply just to graduate assistants. The rule applies to the entire community – to everyone in the USA. So, is the average that’s calculated for thirty hours per week over 52 weeks per year? It has to be. If that’s the rule, it has to be that.

Dr. Zhu stated that for our university, the graduate students are not really covered by the rule because we require them to work only up to twenty hours. So that’s not really the issue. What is at issue is the Adjunct faculty.

Dr. Sridhar commented, “But then if that is true, then this whole thirty hour requirement for students is just artificial that somebody just came up with.”

Provost Mageean said that the first thing is to find out whether the memo that came from Career Services is actually valid. We will check with HR. We will send out a correct one. If it is, then we will figure out how to deal with the issues.

XVII. New Business

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:15 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel