

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

DECEMBER 3, 2014

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, W. Bowen, Delatte, Ekelman, Elkins, Engelking, Fodor, Galletta, Gross, Hampton, Henry, Holland, Holtzblatt, Kalafatis, Karem, S. Kaufman, Kostead, Krebs, Lazarus, Little, Liu, Lupton, Margolius, Marino, May, Mazumder, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Robichaud, Spicer, Sridhar, Talu, Visocky-O'Grady, W. Wang, Wolf.

Artbauer, Berkman, Dumski, J. Ford, Mageean, McHenry, Sadlek, Sawicki, Thornton, Yarbrough, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Delgado, Gorla, Granot for Jayanti, Hoffman, Holsinger, Inniss, D. Jackson, Majette, O'Neill, Rashidi, Shukla, Storroud-Barnes, Zingale.

Boise, M. Bond, Bowling, C. Brown, Halasah, E. Hill, Jadallah, Karlsson, LeVine, V. Lock, Mazzola, Novy, Parry, Ramos, Spademan, Triplett, B. White, Zachariah.

ALSO

PRESENT: A. Smith, J. Yin.

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

I. Eulogy for Judy I. Stahlman (Teacher Education)

Professor Jane Zaharias delivered the Eulogy for the late Judy I. Stahlman. Her remarks follow.

“The College of Education and Human Services invites the faculty of Cleveland State University to join us in remembering our friend and colleague Judy Stahlman whose untimely death on October 13, 2014 at the age of 63 has saddened us all.

“Today, we reach into our experiences and memories to draw a picture of the life we come here to honor – a life that touched many in ways that compel us to remember and to take some measure of what that life has meant to each of us: to Judy’s sister, Carol Noerr, and her family; to Judy’s students; to individuals with special needs; to her

special education colleagues in the Department of Teacher Education and across the country; and to her associates and friends at Cleveland State University.

“Judy Stahlman grew up in Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania. She received her baccalaureate degree from Indiana University of Pennsylvania and then went on to complete a Master’s degree in special education at Slippery Rock University. Her Ph.D. from the University of Virginia-Charlottesville focused on program evaluation and research. Judy was hired at Cleveland State in 1987 based on her expertise and interest in young children with special needs and of individuals with multiple handicaps. At that time, the field of early childhood special education was in its infancy and Judy played an instrumental role in the development of our Master’s degree program leading to Early Childhood Intervention Specialist licensure. In fact, I do not think it an exaggeration to say that Judy was our early childhood special education program for many years. In addition, she frequently taught our courses on educational interventions for individuals with moderate to intensive special needs, including those with medical disabilities.

Judy’s scholarly work was a part of her larger dedication to teacher preparation and the development, evaluation, and improvement of educational programs for individuals with special needs. This longstanding commitment is perhaps best exemplified by her work on two grant-funded projects that essentially bookended her career. The first involved her work with Dr. Philip Safford of Kent State University with whom she helped develop a systematic model for personnel preparation in Early Childhood Special Education. Under the title, Project Prepare, this grant resulted in the groundbreaking creation of nine competency-based personnel preparation modules designed to encourage professional educators’ adoption of best available practices to meet the needs of young children with disabilities. Judy served as a research coordinator and senior editor on the project. More recently, with Dr. Tachelle Banks, Judy was co-author of a federally-funded Special Education Pre-service program improvement Grant funded by the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs. The purpose of this ongoing grant is to further improve the current special education program for K-12 students with high-incidence disabilities by enhancing pre-service teachers’ preparation and to provide teacher induction support to foster collaborative partnerships between special education and general education teachers as well as the increased use of evidence-based teaching strategies.

“Judy is likewise remembered for her record of professional service. Beyond Cleveland State, Judy’s record of service evidenced a strong interest in the local educational community as demonstrated by her membership on Ohio’s Higher Education Collaborative Group on Early Childhood Special Education, the Governing Board for the Cuyahoga Special Education Services Center, and the Gund Education Center’s Advisory Committee for the Cleveland Achievement Center for Children. Within CSU, Judy was an active participant in faculty governance, readily agreeing to serve on a variety of university, college, and departmental committees. Also noteworthy in this regard was her coordination of our academic programs in special education.

“While Judy is certainly recognized here for her record of scholarship and the energy she brought to our special education programs, I think that she will best and most appropriately be remembered for her teaching and mentoring of students. Throughout her employment at Cleveland State, Judy successfully taught fifteen different courses, including both graduate and undergraduate offerings. She supervised doctoral candidates, practicum students, and student teachers, and also advised countless special education majors. She routinely devoted considerable time and attention to the preparation of her courses and approached all of her instructional responsibilities with interest, understanding, selflessness, and a friendly demeanor that immediately put students at ease. She willingly, patiently, and untiringly listened to students, sympathized with their dilemmas, and provided them with solid, caring, useful and accurate answers to their questions and concerns. Through her encouragement and high expectations for their performance, Judy motivated students to do their best, which often turned out to be much better than they thought they could do.

“During her life, as should be apparent, Judy accomplished a lot. She touched many lives – ours among them – and many are better for having known her or benefitted from her work. There is a maxim that says if you have talent and dedicate that talent with hard work, good things will come. And they did.

“Judy was a stalwart advocate for individuals with special needs and a respected teacher. She was a loyal friend – kind and generous and giving. In the twenty-eight years that I knew her, we shared many confidences and in all of our conversations, I never once heard her make an untoward or stereotypical comment about anyone. I found her totally without prejudice of any kind – except for her intolerance of intentional cruelty, social injustice, and discrimination. I continue to respect her enormously – both professionally and personally.

“The shock of Judy’s passing is that she was so alive, so full of the obvious enjoyment of life. That she should have died at such a relatively young age is a particular insult of fate. She was an uncommonly gracious and intelligent individual – one who was with us a much, much too short a time. We miss her dearly and respectfully ask that this resolution be included in the Minutes of Faculty Senate, and that a copy be sent to Dr. Stahlman’s sister, Carol Noerr.”

Dr. Nigamanth Sridhar asked for a moment of silence in memory of our colleague Professor Judy Stahlman.

II. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of December 3, 2014

Senate President Sridhar noted that he had a couple of changes to the Agenda for today’s meeting. He proposed adding another item as Item VIII. Election of At-Large Faculty Representative to the UPRC (University Peer Review Committee) right after Item VII. Report of Student Government Association and then renumbering Item VIII. University Curriculum Committee as Item IX on down through Item XIV. New Business that will now be Item XV. In addition, he reported that under Item VIII. University

Curriculum Committee, Item A. Proposed Modifications to M.Ed. in Community Health Education (contingent on receiving some additional information) is not ready to be voted upon as yet. He noted that this item needs to go to the Admissions and Standards Committee as well before coming to Senate for a vote. Dr. Sridhar then asked for a motion to approve the amended Agenda. Senator Jim Marino moved and Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady seconded the motion and the Agenda as amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of December 4, 2013, September 10, 2014 and October 15, 2014

Dr. Sridhar noted that Senate has three sets of meeting Minutes to approve today. He asked Senators if there were any corrections to any of the Minutes. There were no corrections. Dr. Sridhar then asked for a motion to approve the Minutes. Senator Allyson Robichaud moved and Senator Jeff Karem seconded the motion. Dr. Sridhar then asked for a vote. The Minutes of the meetings of December 4, 2013 September 10, 2014 and October 15, 2014 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

IV. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Dr. Sridhar stated that he would keep his remarks fairly brief – he didn't have too many items to talk about. He noted that he did want to spend a few minutes talking about one thing that has been going on this semester and that we haven't had too much discussion at Senate about and that is the Enrollment Task Force that the President convened at the beginning of the semester. He noted that he served on this committee as a faculty representative along with Bill Kosteas and Jordin Yin. The committee consists of about a dozen members with Dean Craig Boise as the chair. He said that this committee was charged by the President and the Board of Trustees to basically take a holistic view of enrollment at the university. He noted that some people may be aware that we draw 85% of our student population from a six-county region around us and that is a region that is facing a very drastic demographic shift – people are leaving the area, just not enough people staying back. Under that kind of situation, this Task Force was asked to look at enrollment as a broad picture and look for strategies to see how we would stay relevant and viable as a university. Dr. Sridhar reported that the committee has been fairly active. He noted that they have had several meetings, both the whole committee and also of subcommittees that the group is composed of – one focused on collecting data and another one focused on coming up with strategies. Dean Meredith Bond is chair of the Data Committee and Dean Jianping Zhu is chair of the Strategies Committee. He noted that they have been looking at a variety of different kinds of things. Vice Provost LaGrange has been providing the committee with lots of data from Institutional Research and so is Professor Barbara Margolius from the President's Office. They are looking at various ways to look at our student population and to think about the kinds of things we need to be doing with our students to ensure their success and graduation. Dr. Sridhar commented that one thing the committee has done quite successfully is to look at enrollment not just as a marketing strategy, not just as a matter of how many people we can bring in, but rather how we can actually keep those students

here and get them out successfully with a degree. He added that this has been a pretty strong theme in the discussions. Dean Boise has given two reports to the Board of Trustees, one at each of the Board of Trustees' meetings this semester. Both meetings have had quite lengthy discussions with the Trustees. Each of the Deans have also come and presented specific programs and initiatives that each college is undertaking with the goal of increasing enrollment as a whole. Dr. Sridhar stated that he would provide another update at the next Senate meeting or appropriate occasion at the Board and if the Steering Committee decides that maybe it might be that the chair of the Task Force is supposed to come and give a presentation to Senate.

Dr. Sridhar brought Senate's attention to Program Prioritization. He reported that the Provost has been making her rounds. She has had meetings with all of the college faculties and also two town-hall meetings with all faculty members. He noted that he had the distinct pleasure of attending every one of these meetings and it has been very informative. He said that he did miss one meeting in the College of Sciences and Health Professions because he had a conflict but he did go to every one of the other meetings. Dr. Sridhar noted that there were some really interesting and informative comments that the faculty have brought up and he hopes that Provost Mageean will talk during her remarks about what kinds of things have come up and what she and her team are doing with those remarks.

Dr. Sridhar stated that on the same topic of Program Prioritization, today we have Vice President Stephanie McHenry who will provide us with a status report on Program Prioritization first on the non-academic side of the university. He noted that faculty have had questions here in our past Senate meetings and it will be good to hear from her and discuss with her.

Dr. Sridhar noted that he has been informed that the pilot of the new system for student evaluation of instruction is going reasonably well. He said that there are a couple of minor glitches. Dr. Jeff Karem will give Senate an update as part of his UFAC report.

Finally, Dr. Sridhar commented that final exams are due next week and we will all be busy assigning final grades. He hopes that many remember the presentation that occurred at Senate last time. There could be substantial impacts on students if they don't receive their final grades on time so let's all make an effort to get the grades in on time. He commented that if anyone has still not informed the Book Store of which textbooks they are going to use for the next semester, please do so immediately, today if it can be done. This is a big, big issue. Dr. Sridhar stated that if anyone had any questions, he could take them now or later.

V. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman said, "I had the opportunity to go to the President's holiday party or come to the Faculty Senate and here I am. So you can draw reasonable conclusions from that." President Berkman commented that he would be brief and try to make it to the party as soon as he can.

President Berkman said, first and more importantly, he wanted to give Senate an update on the issues regarding the proposed revisions of the SSI formula. He noted that he had reported to Senate previously that as the formula had been re-calibrated based on a year-long consultation, based on a series of dissatisfactions that various universities had with the formula, the new iteration of the formula that appeared, and it appeared first during the summer, had Cleveland State University losing about \$5 million of its base budget. He noted that this was because in essence, our transfer students are at risk transfer students and were being treated differently than transfer students from the branch campuses or transfer students by wholly owned community colleges like Stark and Akron and it was a formula basically driven by assumption which its own data didn't support and that is that students who complete thirty hours credit when they transfer in from a community college, and only those community colleges were counted do nearly as well as students who have no risk. He stated that the data itself does not support the notion that they do nearly as well, particularly, students of color and particularly older students, particularly students with financial needs and clearly students who have all of those risk factors including an academic risk factor. He reported that he began a process really objecting to the way this was being formulated; he said that he was not going to go into all of the details. He reported that today, they finished the fourth meeting of the Executive Committee of Presidents of the IUC which is composed of presidents of Stark State, Miami of Ohio, OU, Wright State, and himself. They did this morning unanimously decide to recommend to the entire Council of Presidents that we don't choose that changes affecting transfer students who are at risk not be adopted this year; that we stay with the formula as constituted. He noted that there are two changes they will adopt. It will cost us a little bit of money but nowhere in the magnitude of the \$5.2 million that we stood to lose in the new formulation. President Berkman reported that in the first year of the biennium the recommendation is that we stay with the current formula with these two revisions. Then, in the next six months, this group from the Executive Committee of Presidents comes back to the group of the Council of Presidents with a recommendation on how at risk transfer students ought to be calibrated within the formula. Unless there is some mass uprising in Columbus on Tuesday with the remaining presidents, the fact is that five presidents in the Executive Committee are going to support this recommendation. President Berkman stated that we will get to live to fight another year. It was the most challenging and most vexing maybe save the first year that he was here when we took a thirteen percent budget cut, but this was basically a six percent cut for SSI which could not be redeemed even by enrollment growth. President Berkman noted that this, right now, is good news. Again, barring some revolt on Tuesday, we will not really have to deal with a new formula until 2017. He noted that this is good news for all of us.

President Berkman commented that as the chairman said, we all have our eye on enrollments – spring enrollments are not looking particularly robust at this juncture; we are behind where we were last year in spring so he does believe that we are beginning to see kind of a trend that is digging in more deeply. He hopes that the Task Force charged with finding a way forward or recommending ways forward on the enrollment side will be able to provide a pathway. But, as he said over and over again, the demographic is

one of the fastest high school demographics; it is one of the fastest next to the mix to the fastest shrinking high school demographic in the United States. That population cohort is 49th in terms of its drop in the United States; so we are in a particularly vulnerable position in Ohio not to mention the fact that in Ohio you have four universities who are fairly close-clustered together in a region that is particularly hard hit by this demographic decline. Cuyahoga County particularly is hard hit by this demographic decline. He noted that the numbers are not in our favor and it is obviously going to call for some different approaches, some different strategies, some different populations; it's probably going to call for us spending a little more money in terms of what we spend on marketing and advertising. We spend one tenth of what the University of Akron spends on marketing and advertising, but of course the University of Akron did poorly in enrollment also. As those who are in marketing and advertising may know, no matter how well thought out, no matter how well planned, it is still a crap shoot advertising. He stated that it is a crapshoot that we are going to have to take if we are going to try to continue to be competitive.

President Berkman reported that the bond issue which enables us to build a K-8 Campus International School on campus passed overwhelmingly; really interesting. He said that he doesn't know if there is another municipality or another state anywhere in the United States that has had six successive referendum all involving an additional levy or an additional tax increase that have passed. As many know, most of the school levies around the State, 70% of the school levies around the State, are failing these days. It is interesting and remarkable that this levy, particularly, which allows for the extension of the bonding authority by the municipal school district, which started out with bad polling numbers passed by almost twenty percent of the voters. It will cost us no dollars; indeed we will probably get some dollars for the leasing of the land that will go to build the school, but it is the realization, speaking for himself, he had hoped would happen. The good work and the incredible work that is being done at the Campus International School would find a home that reflects educationally and philosophically what path they have taken.

President Berkman stated that the STEM High School as well, for those who have been involved in that, he met with the principle yesterday and he also reported to Senate that every single graduate last year was admitted to a university and virtually all of them got full or nearly full scholarship packages. Nine of the graduates (out of 63) came to Cleveland State; it was never our intention to have them as a captive population. He noted that he always said that they ought to go where the opportunities take them and allow them to go. He stated that we would see what this year's class looks like.

Finally, President Berkman stated that there are other things obviously that he could cover. Clearly the SSI situation is by far the most important and if he is still standing here on Wednesday, everyone will know that they were able to prevail. On his way to Senate today, he was talking to Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange and it really was a very, very difficult process because they just looked at the pure numbers of the new formula; there were ten winners and three losers. He noted that typically, when there are ten winners and three losers in organizations or entities like this, the ten winners prevail

and the three losers lose. President Berkman said that it was really a triumph of reasonableness and he will say that our presidential colleagues around the State understood after many, many hours that we have to continue to support the mission of trying to provide the best opportunities for our at risk students to be successful. We have the highest proportion of at risk students, we have the highest proportion of transfer students, we have the highest proportion of Pell students, save Central State; we have one of the highest proportions of students of color; this is an urban university and it is very different than many of the other universities in the system and we have to fight for the preservation of justice for the mission of this university.

President Berkman suggested that Senate should just get through the Agenda real quick, adjourn and come and have some eggnog and cookies and good cheer. President Berkman wished everybody a great holiday. He reported that he has again asked the Board and the Board has agreed to allow the university to close between Christmas and New Year's so our staff, who have put in a lot of hours in a lot of places and provided extraordinary support, will have a couple of extra days of holiday. President Berkman again encouraged everyone to enjoy the holidays and asked everyone to come to the President's Christmas party and to come to commencement.

VI. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Deirdre Mageean commented that the President spoke to some of the large forces behind us, economic and demographic, and, as Dr. Sridhar mentioned, we have concluded our open meetings with respective colleges. She noted that we still have to do Nursing so that will be one more chance for faculty to sit in on a meeting and ask their favorite question. Provost Mageean stated that given that this is a really tough issue and may be emotional, everybody conducted himself or herself extraordinarily well and she stated that faculty had good questions and civility and a generally good tone. She noted that she is unable to answer data specific questions and she charged the Deans now with moving forward and engaging intensively with their colleges and the dialogue about how to move forward on these issues. Separately, Dr. Sridhar and she will meet to look at what a timetable would be for any potential mergers, closures, etc. so that they know what that will look like as they carry it forward. The goal is really to get as many of those faculty lines back by spring of next year.

Provost Mageean referred to enrollments, which don't look particularly good at the moment and stated that we are overall down by two percent head count as of now compared to this point in time last year. She noted that the one standout above that is actually the returning students at the undergraduate level which is still a carry-over of the intensive advising that was being done as a consequence of the four to three conversion. She thanked everybody who labored in that vineyard for hours and hours. It does speak to the return on touching these students many times in a mentoring way. It also speaks to the important task that we have. We graduate more students than we recruit. It's one of those perverse things about our population partly because of the very large number of transfer students that we have. The work of course is not just in recruitment but in retention. The whole emphasis on student success in Dr. Meiksins office and in all of the

faculty in their respective departments and colleges is absolutely critical because it doesn't matter how many you get in the door, it's the numbers you keep in and then out the door when they are graduating – that's really important. She noted they are still working very hard on that with all the Regents and our college completion plan that we submitted to the Board and we need to move forward on that. She noted that her understanding is there are a few hundred transfer students that have applied and indicated what department or degree they want to move into but have not registered for classes yet so she will be talking to the Deans about what we do over the break.

Provost Mageean reported that she is pleased to tell everyone that they have now assembled a search committee for finding the Dean of the Honors College and similarly Endowed Chair in Humanities. She noted that Dr. Gregory Sadlek is the chair of the committee. The other members of the committee are Dr. Peter Meiksins from Academic Affairs, the former director, Dr. Jorge Gatica from Chemical and Bio Engineering, Dr. Tama Engelking, Modern Languages, Dr. Laurie Peterson from Business, Dr. Leah Gold from Mathematics, and Dr. Valerie Wright from Sociology and one student. She noted that she would try to get one more student on the Search Committee. She stated that it is a good committee; they are going to meet hopefully before the break to look at the draft position description. She said that she agree with Dr. Sadlek that it is good to have the Search Committee have finishing touches on that and then we will get that out as soon as possible and move along.

Provost Mageean commented that she couldn't remember if she mentioned the appointment of the Ombudsperson at the last Senate meeting. She noted that they have been working with an Interim Ombudsperson, Dr. Valerie Hinton-Hannah, who very graciously took on that role for a while. Dr. Jill Rudd, who is well known to everyone, has agreed to be the Ombudsperson from the first of January. She is particularly well placed given her work in conflict resolution so hopefully she can take that good research and theory and apply it within the context of a university. Provost Mageean stated that this is a very important role and one that we hope she picks up on the first of January.

Provost Mageean mentioned textbooks. She stated that we are better than we were this time last year but it's still not really good enough compared to where we need to be. We are not getting those textbook orders in. Some faculty will not be using a book but they do need to let the bookstore know if they are not using a book. She asked faculty to please get that done and turn in the grades of course. Please don't slip into the habit and not complete that too because that can seriously disadvantage students with Financial Aid and those students wanting jobs in graduate education.

Provost Mageean thanked everyone for their hard work this semester and hopes that everyone has a great restful holiday. She noted that she printed out the 100 notable books from the "New York Times Book Review" and maybe she will get to a couple of them over the break now that she has a few extra days to read thanks to the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Sridhar stated that questions will be held for the Provost after we get through the business items because some faculty need to leave for class.

VII. Report of the Student Government Association (Report No. 20, 2014-2015)

SGA President Allie Dumski hoped that everyone had a nice Thanksgiving. Based on what Provost Mageean said earlier, she is happy to report on textbooks. At this point last year, we were at 79% of the information submitted and this year we are already at 83.7% so it is really good. But, that is still 354 classes without textbooks affecting 5,530 students. She asked if faculty could encourage their peers to get those in as soon as possible. She noted that December 5, 2014 is another critical day for students to turn in their textbooks and get money back at the Book Store so if faculty could get those in, it would be greatly appreciated by the students.

Ms. Dumski reported that besides textbooks, the Student Government is working on various other projects. She wanted to update everyone on some of the other things that they are working on during this last week before finals and the break. She noted that tomorrow SGA is having an open forum on dining in the Student Center and they will also be having an open house that encourages students to fill out the Financial Aid Survey that they have been working on with Professor Barbara Margolius. She asked faculty that have students in their class that are sophomores and juniors to encourage their students to stop by the Student Government Office to fill out that survey or they can fill it out via email. She noted that on Friday, two Senators will be hosting a meet and greet with Dean Sadlek in the Student Center and that will be followed by their Senate meeting at 3:30 PM, also in the Student Center.

Ms. Dumski stated that they are really working on transparency for the SGA organization and so they have developed a newsletter that they will be distributing. She noted that she brought some of the newsletters if anybody would like one. The newsletter is just to keep everybody updated on what SGA is doing and how to get involved and any other information that people may need.

Ms. Dumski reported that an issue that has come to SGA's attention recently has been sensitivity of international students. She noted that with the diverse population we have here at CSU, it is important to take into account the various backgrounds and cultures that we deal with. The SGA Board will be doing some research for their winter break to better knowledge themselves on the different and representative cultures on campus. SGA is also suggesting that perhaps faculty include some sort of training in the new faculty orientation so that everybody can treat our international students on the same level and same sensitivity.

Finally, Ms. Dumski commented that as the semester comes to a close, SGA encourages faculty to submit textbooks and grades on time. Ms. Dumski said she also hopes that everyone has a nice break and holiday season.

Dr. Fred Smith, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, asked about the December 5th date that Ms. Dumski had mentioned earlier.

Ms. Dumski responded that December 5th is another critical date to submit textbooks by because students get more money back for their textbooks when they turn them in. The sooner that the Book Store knows what textbooks are being used again for next year, that increases the amount of money students get back when they turn their textbooks back in.

Dr. Sridhar confirmed that Ms. Dumski is talking about the requests for textbooks for the semester; not turning the books back in.

Ms. Janet Stimple, Asst. Vice President, Registrar's Office, noted that if the Book Store knows that a certain book is going to be used in the spring, the students will get more money back from the Book Store when the students return their books.

Dr. Sridhar commented that books are not being returned before final exams.

VIII. Election of At-Large Member of the UPRC (University Peer Review Committee)

Dr. Sridhar mentioned the issue of the UPRC (University Peer Review Committee). He noted that Professor Lynn Deering, the At-Large member of the committee left the Bargaining Unit to become the Interim Chair of Theatre and Dance and is not eligible to continue so a replacement is needed to complete her term. He stated that there is urgency in filling this position on the committee. He noted that everyone just heard about this committee vacancy today. He received an email at eleven o'clock this morning asking if Faculty Senate could run a special election today. He commented that first of all, we couldn't do that because this election is not a Senate election – it is a faculty-wide election. He stated that in the last election, there were two other candidates. He is therefore asking for permission from Faculty Senate to appoint the candidate with the next highest number of votes to serve on the UPRC if he is willing and that person is present at Senate today. He then asked Professor Marsanjit Mazumder, the faculty member who received the next highest number of votes for election to the UPRC, if he would be willing to serve on the UPRC if elected. Professor Mazumder stated that he would be willing to serve on the UPRC. Dr. Sridhar asked if Faculty Senate would be willing to allow Professor Mazumder, the person with the next highest number of votes, to serve on the UPRC.

Dr. Sridhar then asked for a motion to elect Professor Mazumder to serve on the UPRC as the At-Large faculty member completing Professor Deering's term. It was moved and seconded to elect Dr. Mazumder to the UPRC. Dr. Sridhar then asked Senators to vote. Dr. Mazumder was unanimously elected by voice vote to complete Professor Dering's unexpired term on the UPRC.

Dr. Sridhar reported that there is one item on both the UCC list and the Admissions and Standards Committee list and that is the Honors College.

IX. University Curriculum Committee

Dr. Fred Smith, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that the first item on the UCC agenda is a Proposed Nursing Articulation Agreement with Cuyahoga County Community College for the RN BSN program.

A. Proposed Nursing Articulation Agreement with Cuyahoga County Community College (Report No. 21, 2014-2015)

Dr. Sridhar noted that Senate has already seen some of this before in the context of the Board of Trustees' approving a reduced tuition rate for those students because we are doing this on line. He stated that the Provost talked about this item at our September Senate meeting but this is the actual curriculum proposal that documents this. As he understands it, this has been around for a while. He stated that the UCC is asking for a vote to approve the Articulation Agreement with Cuyahoga County Community College for the RN to BSN program. There being no discussion, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The proposed Nursing Articulation Agreement with Cuyahoga County Community College for the RN to BSN program was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Proposed changes to Ph.D. in Urban Education (all tracks) (Report No. 22, 2014-2015)

Dr. Smith stated that the next item from the UCC is changes to the Ph.D. in Urban Education (all tracks). He noted that there are some changes that are proposed for all tracks; some changes specifically for Counseling Psychology. He stated that the changes are summarized in the memo that UCC prepared for Senate. He said that he can respond to questions if there are any.

Dr. Sridhar mentioned that all of these curriculum proposals are available for everybody to review on the On-line Curriculum Approval System.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar noted that the UCC is asking for approval of the changes to the Ph.D. program in Urban Education. He noted that some changes are being requested for all tracks, which include removing the foreign language requirement and making EDU 715 a required course and reducing the number of dissertation credit hours from 15 to 10. He added that some changes are specific to the Counseling Psychology program as detailed in the memo everyone received in their meeting packets. He then asked Senators to vote. The proposed changes to the Ph.D. in Urban Education (all tracks) were approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Honors College Proposal (contingent on addition of Nursing to Honors Council) (Report No. 23, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith stated that the next item is the proposal to transition the CSU Honors Program to the Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Honors College. He noted that the proposal was in the Senate meeting packet. He reported that essentially there are no curricular changes involved in changing the program from the Honors Program to an Honors College. The UCC asks that the proposal if approved be amended to include a member from the School of Nursing on the Honors Council that is included in the proposal.

Dr. Sridhar commented that perhaps we should hold back the report on the Honors College until we get to the Admissions and Standards Committee. Dr. Smith agreed.

D. Proposed ECE 515 – Mathematics Instruction and Assessment in Preschool and the Primary Grades – establishes Math Prerequisites (Report No. 24, 2014-2015)

Dr. Smith presented the final item from UCC, the implementation of math prerequisites for a course in Early Childhood Education ECE 515 (Mathematics Instruction and Assessment in Preschool and The Primary Grades course). He noted that it hasn't had a math prerequisite and the proposal is to implement one.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any questions about the proposal. He noted that the UCC is asking for a vote from Senate to implement math prerequisites for ECE 515 which is Math Instruction and Assessment in Preschool and The Primary Grades. He then asked Senators to vote on the proposal. The proposed ECE 515 – Mathematics Instruction and Assessment in Preschool and the Primary Grades establishing Math Prerequisites was approved unanimously by voice vote.

E. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 25, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith reported that UCC also provided a list in his memo to Senate of approved new GenEd courses "For Informational Purposes Only."

- 1. New Philosophy Honors course (US Diversity) (PHL 254H – Philosophy of "Gender and Race)**
- 2. Philosophy 175 Name change (from The meaning of Life to Philosophy of Happiness) (A&H breadth of knowledge)**
- 3. REL 331 (Medieval Christianity) approved as WAC**
- 4. Revisions to ART 372 (Art in the 20th Century: 1900-1945), Approved as WAC, and ART 373 (Art in the 20th Century: 1945-2000) approved as SPAC**
- 5. ENG 240, 241, 242 may no longer be used as alternatives to ENG 102 to satisfy the Writing/Composition requirement of the GenEd Basic Foundations**
- 6. New course SOC 306 (Urban Ethnography) approved as WAC**
- 7. ANT 353 (Cultures of Africa) approved as WAC**

Senate received the “For Informational Purposes Only” items.

X. Admissions and Standards Committee

Professor Jordin Yin, Chair of the Admissions and Standards Committee, reported that the committee had two items; one of them overlaps with the UCC and that happens to be item B, the proposed Honors College.

A. Proposed Revisions to Academic Standards Policy Language (Report No. 26, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin noted that item A is a proposed revision to the Academic Standards Policy Language. He stated that this is a cleanup of the new language that was approved last year covering Academic Warning, Academic Probation, Academic Suspension and Academic Separation including a somewhat revised process for handling Academic Suspension and Academic Separation. UCC recommends that students who fall into the two categories (Academic Suspension and Academic Separation) will be reviewed by a centralized committee of Associate Deans or (their designee) which seems appropriate. He noted that they were previously handled at the college level then they were handled centrally without a great deal of oversight and there was a request to revise that process accordingly. He mentioned that the complete memo was included in everyone’s Senate meeting packet.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is requesting a vote on the proposed revision of the Academic Standards Policy Language and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Revisions to the Academic Standards Policy Language was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Admissions and Retention Requirements in the Proposal for The Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Honors College (Report No. 23, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin stated that the second item the A&S Committee reviewed and approved is the transition of The Honors Program to The Mandel Honors College. In particular, the element that was examined by A&S was the Admission and Retention Requirements within the proposal, which did not actually propose any change. The A&S Committee agreed that the status quo seemed appropriate under Dr. Lehfeldt’s advisement and approved it as such. He commented that he didn’t know how Dr. Sridhar wanted to handle this proposal in concert with the UCC.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Curriculum Committee and the Admissions and Standards Committee together bring forward a proposal to transition the Honors Program to The Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Honors College. He then asked if there were any questions about the Honors College proposal that was included in everyone’s meeting packet.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Curriculum Committee and the Admissions and Standards Committee proposed that the Honors College be transitioned into The Jack, Joseph and Mortin Mandel Honors College and asked Senators to vote. The Proposal for The Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Honors College was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Sridhar remarked, “The Search Committee for the Dean of the Honors College that the Provost mentioned is actually legitimate since we now have an Honors College.”

Professor Yin noted that he had a quick announcement. The next Faculty Senate meeting is February 11, 2015 which starts to bring us into the timeline for changes for the next catalog year so for people who mentioned to colleagues and department chairs, things that would need to go through the Admissions and Standards Committee for the next catalog year, probably people need to get in touch with him by the first week of spring semester because the Committee’s rolling cycle gets backlogged very quickly. He just wanted people to keep that in mind. If people are kicking around ideas, now is the time to inform him.

XI. University Faculty Affairs Committee

Updates (Report No. 27, 2014-2015)

Dr. Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, reported that he has updates on various items just to keep things in people’s minds. There will certainly be action items in particular on Student Evaluations in the spring.

Title IX Training – Dr. Karem reminded faculty to do their Title IX training. If faculty members haven’t completed that yet, it should be completed by the end of the semester. He noted that he didn’t know how long our contract is open for completing that, but it is a very well done program and you learn a lot. If people follow the extra tabs, they can learn even more but people can also learn a lot compacted as well.

Electronic Pilot, Blue – Dr. Karem reported that our electronic pilot, Blue, has gone quite smoothly by all reports. UFAC is going to be consulting. He has questions for tomorrow for IS&T about what kind of assessment to do with the pilot but at the last Senate meeting, if everyone recalls, the faculty were concerned about how to administer this in class because of the apparent lack of a web link. He noted that there is a web link that has been distributed. There were various means for faculty to administer the Student Evaluation. He noted that he heard many faculty report that when it came time to offer an in-class opportunity, students had already completed a high enough response for it that they didn’t even want to do it in class. He added that this was the case in his class and he was pleasantly surprised.

Dr. Karem reported that there are some other logistical complexities that have arisen, not necessarily with the Blue Pilot, just the broader SEI reboot if you will. If

everyone recalls, the reordering of the new paper evaluations was delayed by bidding processes because of requirements to contract things out. He noted that there also are a lot more paper forms than anyone expected. He noted that there seems to be some question about how many forms to order. If we don't have enough, then if we never used the electronic on-line submissions, we would have paper for many years but he is not sure that is where we are headed necessarily. He commented that if anyone can think of any creative recycling uses for standard forms, please let him know.

Software – Dr. Karem stated that on a more substantive software note, one of the reasons of a transition, if the pilot proves successful, UFAC is considering bringing this back to Senate in the Spring. He noted that there are software issues in processing the existing forms. We have in-house software that was created in 2000 and he believes that the person who created it has since retired. If we are going to actually create a data-base or expand the data-base of the existing paper forms, we are going to have to rewrite the code ourselves as he understands it whereas, if we move forward with Blue, we can use that existing scaffolding so there is some interesting compatibility in occurring issues there.

Dr. Karem mentioned future work UFAC is engaged in which will be considering the assessment of the Blue Pilot or to adopt Blue more broadly as well as the other larger logistical question for student evaluations: administration timelines and Senate approval of a timeline for doing it. At the present, there is a start date of the twelfth week. Many people have questioned that this might be too early and UFAC may revise that. He commented that again, these things would come back to Senate.

Dr. Karem commented on the question of what to report, what comparators, what distributions to report and also the question of access to data. The SGA and the Board of Trustees have inquired about making the results of evaluations more available to other university members of the community and UFAC needs to consider that as well.

Dr. Karem stated that in the interim, if faculty members have questions or comments or suggestions about the Student Evaluation process, they can contribute to Dr. Karem's daily inbox about Student Evaluation questions – he welcomes them. Dr. Karem noted that also, on December 11, 2014 from Noon to 1:30 PM, a meeting will be held for those who have participated in the pilot, but he doesn't know the location offhand. He asked Dr. Lehfeltdt if she knew the location.

Dr. Elizabeth Lehfeltdt replied that it would be held in the Student Center on that date and they are hoping to get a good turnout because they want to get feedback from everyone. She noted that she would add to what Dr. Karem said and let people know that quite a few new courses participated in the pilot. They got response rates of 100% so it has actually been very successful. She added that they would be discussing the transition issues tomorrow.

Dr. Karem stated that for those who participate in the pilot in the Student Center, there would be a feedback luncheon where everyone can get feedback. Again, please feel free to send emails as well. He added that there are many things on the stove right now.

Senator Norbert Delatte reported that he had a conversation with a student that got him thinking. The student had a concern that you are logging in with your CSU ID and your information and wondered, "How does that information get stripped away on the way to the instructor?" He stated that he is not quite sure how we communicate to students that their data is separated from their personal information because it is something that we want to be sensitive to. He added that he doesn't think a student had actually done it but had heard about it and just mentioned this as a concern.

Professor Karem responded that this is really a good point. He stated that there are enumerable but extensive buffers in place but he agrees and he will communicate with IS&T about how can we explain how student data is safe.

Dr. LaGrange said she wanted to clarify the fact that when faculty members log in, they can't see anything at this point except response rates. When faculty members log in later when the data is collected, it will only be aggregate data. There is no way for faculty to look at individual students. It's just not there in their log in. That database is only available to people that have a different type of access, which for example, is Institutional Research.

Professor Delatte stated that his concern is the student.

Professor Karem noted that because students either access through email or log in with their Campus Net pass, they might have a concern about anonymity. He stated that it might be a help if we can give some succinct explanation of what happens to your evaluation, where does it go.

Professor Beth Ekelman stated that she knows in the old procedures there was a little paragraph that faculty had to read to students saying that the responses remain anonymous and are not given to faculty until after grades are submitted and that was supposed to be read while giving the exam and she was wondering if that could be revisited.

Professor Karem noted that using his English skills he crafted said paragraph for the pilot. It could be read for those administering it although if students simply completed it from email they would not have access to that reassurance. But, they must have thought it was okay because they went ahead and did it. But, with that said, he noted that there is another opportunity. Again, that is a statement that Senate will need to approve as well.

Professor Berlin Ray inquired if there is space for the students to write comments and is there a way for faculty to see the written comments.

Dr. Karem replied, "Yes. There are written comment boxes and there is even a separate box for comment within each individual question. At least, in terms of general recording, we've heard from Blue. Being able to type your response means that you get longer responses than handwritten ones so that should be a plus."

Dr. Sridhar reported that he is actually one of the people that volunteered for the pilot. He had a couple of people who finished it and he did read that paragraph in class. He noted that we should have a large paper plate competition for the people that we have.

XII. Electronic Learning Committee Report (Report No. 28, 2014-2015)

Professor Linda Wolf, chair of the Electronic Learning Committee, reported that this fall the committee has been reviewing all of the on-line courses that are currently being used by CSU for course design, plagiarism prevention, on-line exams, security, and proctoring options. She noted that the committee has also had the opportunity to receive hands on experience in using all of these tools. Currently, the Center for E-Learning is using "Quality Matters" for our course design. She noted that descriptions of these are in the handouts for today's meeting. The committee continues to support the use of this tool.

Professor Wolf noted that the Committee has "Turnitin" and "SafeAssign". "Turnitin" can now be accessed through "Blackboard" not just through the web site. The preference at this time still seems to be "Turnitin" as it seems to give a more comprehensive overview of the student papers.

Professor Wolf referred to "Online Exam Security" and "Proctoring Options" and noted that "Tegrity" can be used, but at this point, "Tegrity" is not being used for proctoring purposes. It is more for creating lectures and discussing the course content in that manner.

Professor Wolf stated that the "Proctor-U" is an online proctoring and it is available through an external contractor. She noted that as everyone can see from the handout, that does involve a cost but that is seldom used.

Dr. Wolf commented on "Respondus Lock-Down Browser" – when a student clicks the link, it shuts down any access to other web sites when they are taking an exam so they are not able to leave that site. She noted that "Respondus Lock-Down Browser" is used in Nursing and on I-Pads. Nursing gives the exams on "Blackboard". She stated that once that is activated, students are not able to leave the "Blackboard" site.

Professor Wolf mentioned the "Respondus Monitor" and stated that it can be used for non-proctor on-line exams. It is available here at CSU but it is not being used.

Dr. Wolf stated that the Committee supports the use of these current tools and will continue to monitor and review new tools as they become available.

Senator Robert Krebs stated that he had two comments and a question. First, he referred to “Turnitin.com” and noted that Dr. Wolf had made a notation about students’ original work. He noted that this is not available on “Turnitin.com”. Even if it said that there is complete plagiarism, it won’t show you the other papers. Students’ work is protected after upload. Professor Wolf replied that it would compare. She noted that if a student submits a draft and then submits a final paper, “Turnitin.com” would compare it to that draft paper.

Dr. Krebs stated that the other comment he wanted to make is with respect to “Tegrity” just to recognize that there is a bandwidth issue. It is so memory intensive. If somebody used that at a broad scale, it would slow down the whole university network. Professor Wolf responded that all she knows is that E-Learning prefers that we have them do the uploading of our “Tegrity”. She noted that there is a special way that they want them done and they do offer workshops as well. They really don’t want us doing them on our own computers at home because of that.

Dr. Krebs noted that his question was, does “Proctor-U” cost money for the students? Dr. Wolf replied, “Yes.” Dr. Krebs remarked that it seems that this would be a false sense of security because you can sit there with your computer locked up with your cell phone. Professor Wolf responded that she is just reporting on “Proctor-U”. She doesn’t know anything about “Proctor-U” except for what she reported to Senate. Dr. Wolf commented that if we do want it, if someone does want it done, if a student is outside of the area and they have to take an exam on line, it is monitored through an external site and there is a cost involved with it.

Dr. Glenda Thornton commented that she has been in touch with a part-time instructor on problems with “Turnitin.com”. You write comments back to the students and the students are able to open those comments and read them.

Professor Wolf replied that this is a new feature in “Turnitin.com” and she is really just reporting on the plagiarism that checks matching words and phrases and paragraphs. As far as that type of thing with the grading, she said that she knows you can do grading, you can do peer reviews, students can review each other’s papers and then turn it in. All of those features are new in “Turnitin.com” and she would suggest that Dr. Thornton contact them.

Senator Allyson Robichaud noted that she had a small possible answer. A guy had an I-Pad or some small thing and he wasn’t able to get the comments but as soon as he turned to his laptop he was able. So if students use a laptop or a desktop they should be able to see the comments because you could see them immediately in the laptop.

Senator Andrew Gross stated that he had a quick question and maybe a comment depending on how Professor Wolf answers. Dr. Gross referred to the “Respondus LockDown Browser” and using cell phones and asked if that is mandatory to have that apply to on-line classes. Professor Wolf replied that it is mandatory in Nursing and at this time, Nursing are the only ones using “Respondus LockDown Browser.”

Dr. Gross commented that his philosophy is completely the opposite. He noted that in the real world you can check anything and everything and he tells the students that they are welcome; this is an open notebook exam; he puts them in the computer lab and they can do anything. He noted that he monitors whether the students talk to each other or call their uncle in Chicago on the topic; he indicated that's all he does. Everything is available to the students on the web if they want to use it. Professor Wolf replied that that is a difference in philosophy because in Nursing their tests are not open book for the most part.

XIII. Program Prioritization (Report No. 29, 2014-2015)

Vice President Stephanie McHenry gave a PowerPoint presentation and reported that this program was labeled "Program Prioritization" but it is really the sister process to that on the administrative side of the house so she actually refers to it as "Administrative Efficiency Project." She noted that this is meant to share with the Faculty Senate process. She stated that she is not going to get into much of the data – she will give a couple of examples of what they think they are finding but it is really to share the process. There are several parts to the process and the basic philosophy is to figure out how we are doing and how we have been doing in the past and how we are doing compared to our peers so that there is some basis for which to figure out what areas to look at, what would we want to spend more time versus less time on, and to make recommendations about how to be more efficient. She remarked that obviously that is different from what the faculty is doing. Because of the enterprise and the fact that we are five million square feet in space, 85 acres, and 1,600 employees – this is an enterprise that has to have certain functions so we don't really have the luxury to stop doing anything that we are doing. We do have the option to figure out how to do it differently perhaps. She stated that in terms of the analysis, this is what we are looking at to try to get grounding in terms of where we are.

Vice President McHenry stated that the second thing to look at, you can be very efficient and save a bunch of money but if you are not effective in delivering whatever it is that you are supposed to deliver, that also won't cut the mustard. She stated that they are making sure that they look at the key services that have to be delivered to everyone in order to have everybody be able to do their job, which is a core function of the university; teaching students and helping them to be successful. They are looking at quality of service and they are looking at methods of delivery that could be examined to perhaps improve that effectiveness. She noted that in the third part, and she said this in Academic Steering and the Provost did agree, that even program prioritization is an ongoing process in some ways. Yes, we will go through this now but we also need tools to think about how we will always keep check of ourselves compared to our peers and in light of the technology that is available for us to efficiently run the organization.

Vice President McHenry stated that just to give everyone an example, some of the data that they have been able to see, and she knows that we could spend a half hour on this if people wanted to, but she is hoping that people don't feel that way today. She

noted that basically one of the things they wanted to look at in terms of how we have done over the years, there have been feelings and stories about, it seems like over time there has been this big imbalance or big change in balance between the academic side and the non-academic side so they wanted to take a look back five years just to see what the proportionality was by headcount. There are a million ways to look at it and they had to pick one. So, this data came out of Human Resources. She noted that as everyone can see on the PowerPoint presentation, the balance is roughly the same between academic support and university support if you look at 2010 versus 2014. The academic sector itself lost 2.1 with academic support and one went to university support. They have not seen through this data a huge change in the balance between those items so that doesn't make us think that that is really a rich field for them to dive into and figure out what is going on.

In terms of other ways that we operate and Human Resources is one, Vice President McHenry stated that they also are responsible for a lot of facilities and they wanted to see how they are doing in terms of their budget or their spending on facilities per square foot versus others in the universe and so they did a comparison to some of the Ohio universities as well as some other "peer" organizations. As everyone can see, we are skinny; we are skinny against the national average. She stated that she doesn't think there are huge amounts of money that they will re-capture from how they are managing their facilities.

Vice President McHenry reported that the other thing they looked at is IT spending per student. They did a comparison of that among Ohio public universities and everyone can see where we stand compared to the highest spending one that is Miami University and she would love to see what the heck they are buying for all that money per student. The lowest on her list would be the University of Akron. She added that we are kind of between Akron and Ohio State University. She noted that again, there may be some opportunities, but nothing jumped out at her as glaring: "Oh my gosh; we are spending tons of money or even underspending by tons of money."

Vice President McHenry noted that they are also just kind of using their common sense in terms of having operated the university on an administrative level for some period. Personally, she knows what she gets calls about; she knows what she hears about when she comes to meetings; she knows what she experiences from time to time in terms of things that feel like they are terribly inefficient. She asked how many people think that doing handwritten, triplicate, blue, pink and yellow purchase forms is the latest technology. She stated, "Obviously not. How many people spend how much time writing those out, then they go to Purchasing or she has to type it in once to get the requisition, Purchasing has to type it in twice to actually place the order and we are buying these forms with these little red numbers on the right hand side, not even mentioning the Small Order Forms." She noted that to her, this was a low hanging fruit. Obviously people are not doing business that way on a large scale anymore so she is happy to say that they have some good preliminary information about potential savings in terms of just going electronic; not only not chasing forms around, but also being able to

do real analysis on where people are spending; are you buying stuff from our approved vendors that give us preferential pricing or are you going somewhere else so she is very excited about that.

Vice President McHenry commented that similarly we have talked about automated hiring packages; we've had some modernization there and there may be more; she is predicting the death of red folders. She commented that she doesn't know what we are going to do with all of those red folders; hopefully we didn't buy so many. She stated that there has to be a better way than people running around the college with red folders with pieces of paper in them to get people on board and hired. She added that this was another low hanging fruit. Similarly, electronic Traveling Expenses and payment; there has to be a better way.

Vice President McHenry reported that they actually went to their cabinet which exists of the President, the V.P.'s, as well as the General Counsel's Office and a couple of Deans just to say, "All right, I think I know what we are experiencing. What else are you seeing?" She noted that out of a little analysis there, very briefly three things popped up as potential for undergoing business process improvement projects – that was the purchasing process, which we have talked about; the hiring process, we talked about part of that; and, IS&T project management. She reported that they are actually going to go through formal business process improvement processes for each of those and again that is an area where they have to keep going down the list every year and pick out a few that they can do.

In terms of ongoing assessment, Vice President McHenry stated that she knows less of that data than probably anyone in the meeting room in the sense of being able to capture and measure it in the future. She stated that she does think it is very important for us to capture where we are now in terms of our efficiencies for any process that we are going to change so we can look back on it. We can look back and say, "Did we actually take the time; did we actually save the dollars and have some integrity in those decisions?" She stated that we need to continue to compare ourselves to peers. We need to continue to know how we are doing as compared to those folks that are operating in our market or operating similar organizations.

Regarding the next steps, Vice President McHenry said they will continue to do the analysis, the trend analysis, and peer data analysis and have a written report for Faculty Senate and all of them and then maybe most important is to present specific recommendations for process improvements where we might see dollars actually being able to come out of processes and reallocate the dollars elsewhere and of course they will have an opportunity to share that with everyone.

Professor Krebs stated that he had a concern with the approach here. When it goes to the *Chronicle* and you look at the whole argument coming from the faculty now for years about the administrative bloat as a general trend, and then Vice President McHenry goes and argues paper universities with parasols, and as long as we are not increasing faster than them, then we are doing great. So in a sense, we are talking about

program prioritization – should each of us go back to our departments and say, if we are spending no more than another school, then we should give basically a pass, right? So if we compare to Akron and Miami, and we are in between, okay, he knows that this is not the case, right? Vice President McHenry replied that Dr. Krebs just needs some basis for knowing how you are doing.

Dr. Krebs said, “But then let’s compare everyone. I’m not saying that I know what is right. I have a list here of the number of different departments, since the task; we have a clearly defined set of units that stayed defined over a long period of time. I have a list of 122 directors – 32 of them hired in the last two to three years. I understand that it is impossible to actually go back and say, ‘What are you really judging?’ But what I also have, if I go into the financial reports for the university, not budgets, the financial reports audited from the State; and along that for a side issue, I know it has just been approved by the Board.” He inquired, “Is it possible to get my hands on a copy?” Vice President McHenry responded, “Absolutely.”

Dr. Krebs noted that when you go to the financial reports and look at the lines, it says educational expenses, the amount of money invested by this university for education; there is a separate line on the financial statements. It was around \$96 million in 2009. He added that in 2013, it is still around \$96 million. Tuition has gone up; enrollment has gone up. If you look at the tuition line on the financial reports, in 2009 it was about \$130 million, just the tuition side. In 2013, it was about \$175 million. Again, this is from the audited financial reports from the State. He stated that there is a \$45 million difference. He said he knows some of that is scholarship; some of that has been balanced by cuts from the State. He added that it is just very hard to convince the faculty that we are supposed to train more students than we have ever had before and he knows in the early 90s there were a lot more faculty in the 90s. We have had more students to educate than most of us in this room have ever faced and we are doing it with the same money. We are being told now to prioritize our programs. That’s where the morale kicks in; we go, “Huh? Because we don’t get it.”

Vice President McHenry replied that she would be happy to dig into some of the numbers that Professor Krebs is quoting. She said they could include detailed areas in the report. She noted that these are the decisions they have to make as a university and analyzing the debt is not going to necessarily change those decisions. If we figure out that we have a real problem there, we have to address it. She added that the key business we are in is education and any degree to which we can focus our resources on that, we should be doing it. But, we have to figure out how to do that, if there is a way to do that or what is it that is causing that trend and that is part of what we are trying to dig in here so that we have those answers instead of just feeling frustrated.

Senator William Bowen had a quick observation: “I bet if we look over time, the ratio of the salaries of the top administrators on average to faculty on average, you will find that it has been going up and up and up. We hire people for huge salaries and the salaries in many cases are the same as salaries of two faculty members or three faculty

members. We start hiring Chiefs of Staff for big amounts of money. How much of our total budget is going for that particular group of people?"

Vice President McHenry stated that this is another area. She noted that this was discussed at Steering so obviously it is not just headcount. We can look at total expenditures and see what that trend looks like as well.

Professor Karem referred to headcount and noted going back to Vice President McHenry's chart that shows 2010, if you look there for 2010-2014, there is a percentage change of 53% to 51% of the budget. He asked if those numbers are headcount. Vice President McHenry replied, "Yes."

Dr. Karem commented that this connects to what Professor Bowen is pointing out – going from 964 to 871 and the budget line, at least as presented here, isn't radically increasing but the number of people in the academic sector is; that's a huge attrition from 964 to 871, right? He noted that this is not two percent; this is a lot and this reflects another kind of challenge.

Vice President McHenry stated that she thought it was important to show the proportionality because of the story that it is really radically changing one side to the other; not true by headcount but maybe true by salaries or other things so we need to show it in different ways as well.

Senator Bill Kosteas stated that other things are masked that should be in these categories as well. He noted that this is one of the things we are talking about. We have the academic sector. If you lose any type of faculty member, he gets replaced with a lecturer. Maybe he goes in academic support and maybe gets some true support role that was helping students helping faculty and that line gets let go and then you get one of these upper-level positions which we don't even know if the market product of that person is positive or negative so this could be masking shifts in terms of what types of positions are there because it is at such an aggregated level that it doesn't really get to the heart of what we would see.

Vice President McHenry asked, "What is in academic support? It is Academic Planning, Academic Programs, Provost, Research and Graduate Studies, and Student Affairs." She noted that this was least clear to her about what would be in that category.

Provost Mageean asked if that could include advisors in the Student Success area. Vice President McHenry replied that that would be in the Provost's Office. She added that there is a lot of stuff around students in there too which is probably a legitimate reflection of our focus certainly in recent years on academic success or student success.

Professor Kosteas commented that within that category there could be shifts.

Dr. Sridhar suggested going along with Bill Kosteas' point, and redoing another chart along these same lines showing how much we are actually spending in these sectors for each college. Vice President McHenry noted that she wrote that down.

Dr. Berlin Ray agreed with what Dr. Sridhar had said. She noted that given all the talk about administrative bloat, she is interested in our upper administration and what the positions are and what their responsibilities are and are there overlap and are there people for example who might have more than one office and more than one staff and if there is extra money being spent there. She commented that she doesn't know if that is the case or not but that is something she would be interested in. She would like to see those. She noted that we talked about the fact that we need to see the whole picture. When we are talking about prioritization, the Provost said that when she met with us as well to get the global perspective and see where all of the money is, an aggregation of data does mask that. She added that she doesn't see the upper levels; she only sees it broken down in a way that we need to say, "You know what, this is duplication here"

Provost Mageean commented that this is public information. She asked where it would reside. Vice President McHenry replied that salaries are in the Budget Book along with titles; however, she believes what Dr. Berlin Ray is asking for is analysis and also a deeper dive into the responsibilities.

Professor Berlin Ray stated, responsibilities, how many staff, how many offices people have – all those kinds of things that take money.

Dr. Sridhar stated that this is the kind of analysis that has been performed on academic programs; actually programs have gone through that kind of analysis of looking at explicitly what kinds of things are being done in these programs.

Dr. Berlin Ray said that she would like to see it parallel, not just that it exists. She would like to see that in the tables. Provost Mageean commented that we could look at the old charts. Dr. Sridhar stated that old charts are not easy to find in this university. He noted that he could find the Provost's but he cannot find most of the old charts in the university.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady remarked that she is just building on comments that she hears and putting it into more plainspoken language that helps process it in her head. But, when she came into being chair, it was right when we had that last big round of budget cuts and she remembers Gregg Sadlek walked toward the door when she was talking to George about the transition and he was getting ready to let someone go in her office. So, she went from having a full-time administrative assistant, a part-time secretary and student workers (sometimes two student workers), and now she doesn't even have the student worker and lost the part-time secretary. She has a single administrative assistant serving 220 students and eleven faculty members and twenty part-timers. Professor Visocky-O'Grady stated that when her administrative assistant and she go to a meeting together, there is no one else in the department. She added that if her administrative assistant takes a vacation day, which is well earned, there is no other help

for her and it is really not her job as the chair of the department to be doing basic secretarial work too. She stated that she thinks that what the administration is hearing from the faculty and the people at that service to operational level is that as we hear about new big high-paying high-profile V.P. jobs being added, we feel how many student workers answering telephones have been cut over the years and we desperately need some of that support back. She went on to say that to see an analysis maybe on the administrative side of what we've lost versus what we've gained would be helpful.

Vice President McHenry stated that she would say that she was just coming in at the administrative level when that happened and those stories also happened in many other non-academic places. She added that she would be happy to provide the data. She commented that in fact the exercise that she thought was pretty good in terms of just saying that we are not ready to say X across the board; we had to do categories to basically demonstrate that you need this position versus that position where some might experience a bigger cut than others. She understands exactly what is needed. How many people are around there that get the work done?

Professor Gross stated that he had four points. First, Dr. Gross said that he has great respect for Vice President McHenry and her office based on a one on one conversation shortly after she came to CSU and that respect grew by the data she brings to Faculty Senate. Second, Dr. Gross stated that he still shares the reservations and comments made by his colleagues here, Professors Krebs, Karem, Bowen, and others. He shares that fully. Third, Dr. Gross stated that the highest line of expenditure at any university is HR, meaning not the HR Department but people, and sometimes somewhere, somehow we need some breakdown of this as suggested by others and specifically, tenure-track versus all of the adjuncts, term instructors, lecturers – call it what you will, and the movement on up. He went on to say, we know why it's done and we know it is being done. Fourth, Dr. Gross stated that when he sees, and he doesn't mean to say that faculty should be questioning each and every major expenditure over the Trustees, the top administration, etc., but when this university invites a former president who has cost us millions of dollars in good will, then all his sense of ethics and common sense are violated completely. He said that he went to the Board of Trustees Secretary and tried to get an answer and he got one, which may not be fit, for an event like this.

Vice President McHenry thanked Dr. Gross very much for his comments.

Professor Karem indicated that he wanted to say a little bit more about the headcount. He stated that what is happening across the university, across all of the sectors, and at risk of sounding like a classic warier, it is people at the base of the pyramid who are disappearing – it is secretaries, it is instructors who have been let go so when you see the headcount drop by 70, the reason the amount of money is staying relatively consistent is because more people at the top are getting paid more and that's what's making it harder to do our work. He said that he knows this is not fully within Vice President McHenry's control by any means, but he thinks that one of the reasons the faculty have such concerns about prioritization is that the academic service portion of the pie in terms of people has shrunk and we are trying to figure out how to make that more

efficient. But, there is a bigger picture where other folks are taking more of the pie and it's really hard to figure out how to help our students as we are being told that helping our students is our number one priority and he is sure that we could go through a bunch of lines, item by item, and ask, "Is this essential for student success?" and he is sure that many of the six figure salaries we see would be very hard to figure out the direct connection to student success whereas the administrative secretary is there to make sure that somebody gets registered for class and we can explain why they have to be there. He added that this is a report to be put on the record.

Vice President McHenry stated that she appreciated Dr. Karem's remarks. The only thing she would say is that it is a big enterprise. Everything is not tied directly to whether someone is able to register today or get into the classes that they want; that is extremely important. She noted that it is also important that we are in here with lights on and feel safe going to our car and we have somewhere to have lunch, so she understands Dr. Karem's point. The reason she is trying to dive into this side is to see if we can do that enterprise management the best we can because it has to be there. It can't not be there but can we do it more efficiently and have more resources go to our core mission. She added that she would love to see that outcome.

Dr. Krebs noted that he had one more question regarding the academic sector and who actually is part of that. He assumes that it is the instructors because bargaining unit faculty is 370, lecturers about 68, visitors about 26 and that's almost 464 even if we add and he doesn't know about this, but is an estimate of 45 reasonable for chairs? Dr. Krebs asked, "How many chairs do we have?" Dr. Sridhar noted that he would say 45. Dr. Krebs stated then that comes to 510 so who are the other 360?

Vice President McHenry replied that the 360 are everybody in the colleges; it is everyone in the colleges, not just the faculty.

Dr. Krebs remarked, "So we are counting the academic sector and thinking about teaching and 360 people who don't teach." Vice President McHenry remarked, "That's your math." She stated that what she has from Human Resources is these are the people that actually work in the colleges, everybody.

Dr. Krebs commented that he just wanted to know who they were, that's all.

Vice President McHenry stated that this information is giving faculty an eye into the process. There is a lot of data; a lot more to chew on.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the date is December 31st and he is hoping that Vice President McHenry can be back here at the next Senate meeting and then we can actually talk about what's in the report.

Professor Gross commented that the middle line then is support within each college and department and the bottom line is something like IS&T. Vice President McHenry replied that the academic sector is everybody that works in a college that is in

that grouping. The university support sector is Athletics, Budget and Financial Analysis, Business Affairs, Campus Safety, Enrollment, Facilities and Safety, President's Office, Advancement and Engagement.

Dr. Gross asked, "What is the third one?" Vice President McHenry responded, Academic Support is Academic Planning, Academic Programs, Provost's Office, Research and Graduate Studies and Student Affairs.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady stated that the general consensus is that we got this list by college and each department is color-coded. If she understood who all fell into that, because she had a list, it would help her understand and that is the clarity that the faculty is asking for. She asked, "Why is Engagement in a different sector than Academic? It just seemed how the university categorizes it helps us understand the context of things. Seeing staffing in those areas would be really helpful."

Senator Marius Boboc commented that derived from Professor Visocky-O'Grady's comment, it may be useful on the academic side. Right now, we have three outcomes: programs in which we invest, programs that are stable and programs that should be suspended or eliminated. He inquired if there is a similar structure for the administrative side. "What is the end result of this process?"

Vice President McHenry stated that she mentioned that at the beginning. It is not possible to say I love Building Grounds but I hate the Police so I'm going to eliminate the Police.

Professor Boboc said that he didn't quite mean that we use the same structure but there has to be an outcome out of all of this.

Vice President McHenry said that the real outcome will be the presentation. First of all, a strong look at where we really are that is based on data the best that we can put it together. "What is the trend? Again, how do we look against peers? You ought to be able to compare yourself to something and know how you are doing but the big deliverable will be the recommended changes in processes and how much we think we can save by doing that. At the end of the day, that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to figure out how to operate more efficiently so that more dollars are available to do what everyone does." She added, "That's the goal."

Dr. Sridhar stated that he actually thinks the large numbers of questions that have come up in this discussion would be better if there was another column added to the chart to show how much money actually gets spent in each of these lines. He went on to say that aggregate numbers are at the vaguest; aggregate numbers really break it down a little more to show what really is being spent.

Senator Robichaud stated that she heard that we might be getting lacrosse in women's track and field and wondered where Athletics is in their three spots. Vice

President McHenry responded that Athletics is in the University Support Sector, things that are not academic basically.

Professor Robichaud commented that she sees why it was put there.

Vice President McHenry stated that it is certainly an academic. She then said, "No, it is in University Support." She added that it is sort of like those things we do that aren't directly related to teaching and students but that holds other things.

Professor Gross inquired if it is line 3 or is it line 2, IS&T? Vice President McHenry replied that this would be University Support.

Dr. Sridhar stated that Senate would look forward for that report and then we will come back.

Provost Mageean noted that she had one piece of good news. Looking at our IPED's data, which is what we have to report centrally along with all kinds of things, when you look at the average salaries of all of the faculty members, when talking about the administrative salaries on the academic side, it is clear that we do it two ways. We compare it to our peers and we compare it to our sister institutions in Ohio. The bad news is that the full professor and the associate professor are behind our peers. She noted that the good news is that those we are hiring at the assistant professor rank, certainly over thirteen or fourteen, are on average \$8,000 per year higher than all of our peers so at least we are beginning to try to make some progress. Not much consolation perhaps for those who are already in there but at least we are starting.

Professor Karem commented that sometimes they are \$30,000 higher than associate professors. Provost Mageean replied that that's the standard problem in university wage compression. She added that there are certain particular areas within colleges or like Nursing where our faculty members are deplorably low and we are trying to address that.

At this point, Dr. Sridhar asked if anyone had any questions for the Provost.

XIV. Open Question Time

Professor Visocky-O'Grady wondered about the comparison data and asked if there is any comparison in how chairs are compensated with other universities.

Provost Mageean replied that she didn't believe so but this is something that they realize is an issue to address. She added that Dr. Sridhar has given them one of the toughest jobs in the university. She stated that our chairs are actually penalized and they are trying to work on that because when you step into that role, you become ineligible for some other raises and we need to make sure that chairs are not harmed in that regard. She stated that this is ongoing.

Senator Michael Spicer noted that Provost Mageean had stated that there was a two percent drop in headcount enrollment. He said that he was curious as to what was the corresponding change in credit hours. Provost Mageean replied that it was a six percent drop and that was what they had anticipated this year with the 4 to 3 conversion and we budgeted for that and we are within budget on that.

Mr. Tim Long, Associate Vice President for Finance and Technology, stated that we are running about 2.5% to three percent behind our budget for spring enrollment.

Provost Mageean remarked that we budgeted for the credit hour loss from the 4 to 3 conversion.

Dr. Sridhar commented that we are running behind the budgeted numbers. Mr. Long replied, "Yes. For summer and fall and for spring we are now running about 5.8% behind last year's spring enrollment at this time and we are running about 3.5% behind our budget because we pulled back on our budget and budgeted conservatively. So, that trend is what happened in the fall as well."

XV. New Business

Senate President Sridhar asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to adjourn. Senator Jim Marino moved and Senator Kathleen Little seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie K. Jackson
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel