

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

FEBRUARY 12, 2014

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, Delatte, Dixit, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, Gross, R. Henry, Hoffman, D. Jackson, M. D. Jones, Karem, Kent, Krebs, J. Lieske, Little, Margolius, Marino, C. May, Meier, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Resnick, Sridhar, Steinberg, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, M. Walton, J. G. Wilson, Witmer-Rich, Wolf.

Artbauer, Berkman, Dumski, J. Ford, Mageean, Sadlek, Sawicki, G. Thornton, Ward.

ABSENT: Delgado, Gorla, Jayanti, Kalafatis, S. Kaufman, Kostead, Lehfeldt, Liggett, Majette, Rashidi, Rickett, Talu, Welfel.

Boise, M. Bond, Boychuk, C. Brown, Halasah, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, McHenry, Novy, Parry, Spademan, Stoll, Triplett, B. White, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

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

I. Eulogy for Richard D. Bingham (Urban Studies)

Professor William Bowen delivered the Eulogy for the late Professor Emeritus Richard D. Bingham. His remarks follows:

“Dick Bingham came to CSU in 1988 with his beloved wife, Claire Felbinger. Together they made an immediate impact on the scope and quality of the research and teaching activities in the Levin College of Urban Affairs, especially in the area of program evaluation and research methods.

“Dick was quiet, and seldom spoke, but when he spoke people listened. He was a gentle soul, intensely private. He had a great sense of humor, and was quick to laugh. I am sure he would forgive me for saying that I am honored to feel as bad as I do here and

now talking about him, since I would not feel this way if he had not been such an integral part of developing who I am today, both professionally and personally.

“Dick devoted himself to both the study of economic development and to the creation of a vibrant intellectual environment in the Levin College. He was a consummate scholar. Before coming to CSU, he wrote about critical and timely issues from homelessness to the march of American Nazis on Skokie, Illinois and its meaning for free speech. At CSU he took a deep dive into the then-nascent field of economic development. He co-founded the journal *Economic Development Quarterly* and brought it to the College. He and a wide variety of collaborators launched a series of edited monographs on economic development such as: *Global Perspectives on Economic Development*, *Financing Economic Development* in three different editions, *Dilemmas of Urban Economic Development and Industrial Policy American Style: From Hamilton to HDTV*. The list of his research and writings goes on and on.

“But Dick was more than a prolific scholar. He was also one of the best men I’ve ever known. Before returning to academic life he had spent several years flying airplanes in Vietnam as an officer in the US Air Force. He spoke to me at length about his thoughts and feelings about the war, and his role in it. The violence profoundly affected him. But rather than responding to it with a sense of helplessness, worthlessness, dejection, anger, or depression, Dick came through it with an almost uncanny integrity and sense of his own identity. If anything, he was strengthened and liberated by it, and he carried this strength and self-mastery with him through everything he did.

“Dick was an inspiration and mentor. He was a passionate teacher who deeply valued science, scientific methods, and scholarship. His natural curiosity and love of learning were infectious. His students found his classes to be exceedingly valuable, and they deeply respected him. His colleagues greatly valued his tremendous interest and enthusiasm for collaborative projects, and the huge encouragement he so generously gave. He opened professional doors for faculty members and students alike, and shaped many careers and lives. My life was changed and immeasurably enriched by knowing him.

“The circumstances of Dick’s death are a testimony to the intentional way he lived his life. After complications from surgery, and about a month in the hospital, he was told that he could go home, but that he would have to live with a respirator. He was told that if he did not use a respirator, he would soon die. Dick did not want a respirator so he checked himself into Hospice and left the hospital without one. Two days later, after final visits with his son, Paul, and his daughter, Connie, he was dead. His was a life well lived.”

Dr. Goodell asked for a moment of silence in memory of our colleague Professor Richard Bingham.

II. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of February 12, 2014

Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to approve today's Agenda. It was moved and seconded by Professor James Marino and the Agenda was unanimously approved by voice vote.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Goodell greeted everyone to our first official meeting of this semester, although with the extra meetings and our days off with the terrible weather, she feels like it has been a really long semester already and she feels like she is so far behind with things.

Dr. Goodell stated that when we get to the agenda item from the eLearning Committee, Linda Wolf, the committee chair, will not be discussing the definitions that were included in everyone's packet. She noted that these were discussed at Steering and Steering asked for some further clarification around the issue of fees and blended courses, so the committee is going to gather that information and come back to the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Goodell reported that the 4 to 3 conversion planning is going quite well, and UCC will have an update later in this meeting. She noted that she was not sure if Bill Kosteas would be here today – his wife had a baby this week, but Nigamanth Sridhar will stand in for him.

Senate President Goodell stated that advising students is going to be the next big push across campus. Everyone should have seen the signage and other materials informing students of "The Big Switch", referring to the 4 to 3 conversion. All active undergrads received information in the mail this week about how to contact their advisor, and advisors have had multiple training opportunities to learn about the process of transition advising. Ms. Jennifer Stoneking, Degree Audit Coordinator in the Registrar's Office, is the contact person for this. Dr. Teresa LaGrange, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, contacted associate deans and departments to identify these individuals so everyone should know if they are in this group or not. Dr. Goodell commented that it would not hurt to check with your program, department or college about the progress of transition advising. She encouraged everyone to please contact Dr. Peter Meiksins, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, if they have any concerns.

Dr. Goodell stated that the transition team is requesting that all transition advisors be proactive now in reviewing student records and contacting students to set up appointments, so that we don't get 6,000 requests for updates to their graduation plans in degree audit all at once – the system will not be able to cope with that.

Professor Goodell reported that over the past year, CSU faculty, administrators and students have been involved in a series of conversations and activities about the role of civic engagement in academic research and teaching. These activities have included a speaker series last spring of national leaders in engaged scholarship, a campus-wide

survey of faculty civic engagement initiatives, and the awarding of twenty grants to faculty involved in these efforts.

Dr. Goodell stated that recently, Provost Deirdre Mageean and faculty leaders from Faculty Senate and the AAUP, spurred by the expressed interests of many faculty members, agreed that the momentum of civic engagement has warranted a discussion about the way engaged scholarship is recognized including its impact in promotion and tenure decisions. Such a discussion is essential to CSU's application to the Carnegie Foundation for designation as a community-engaged university. To that end, the Office of Civic Engagement is hosting a series of brown bag lunch events. The dates and topics for these events are:

Thursday, February 13, 2014, 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM:
Foundational Principles of Engaged Scholarship

Thursday, February 20, 2014, 1:00 PM to 1:00 PM:
Best Practices from Other Universities

Tuesday, February 25, 2014, 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM:
Potential Impact on Promotion and Tenure

Thursday, March 6, 2014, 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM:
Strategizing with the Provost, who will be in attendance that day

Dr. Goodell noted that all of these discussions will take place in the Office of Civic Engagement, 2254 Euclid Avenue (in the Trinity Commons storefront space, just East of Subway and Café Ah Roma). Please RSVP one week prior to each session to assist in planning, by contacting Jessica Colombi, j.colombi@csuohio.edu or (216) 687-9283.

Dr. Goodell stated that in addition, the Office of Civic Engagement (OCE) is exploring the feasibility of bringing the Public Sphere pedagogy model to CSU as a means of introducing first-year students to civic life in Cleveland, and they are looking to recruit several key faculty to help lead this endeavor. Faculty received an email about this on February 10, with some fairly short deadlines for expressing interest. Julian Rogers, the director of Community Partnership is coordinating this effort, so please contact him at j.a.rogers@csuohio.edu if you have any further questions about this program. Dr. Goodell stated that she thinks it involves a trip to Cal State Chico where the program will be originating sometime in the week of March 3rd, right before our spring break.

Dr. Goodell commented that as everyone will notice from our agenda today, there are some significant policy revisions currently taking place in various areas of the university. And, as everyone knows, we undertook a lengthy revision of the Personnel Policies and Procedures last year, otherwise known as the Greenbook Policies, which, by the way, are not yet approved by the State due to formatting issues. It seems that we are

increasingly being held to some pretty rigorous standards of compliance, with attendant consequences for non-compliance with Federal and State policies, as well as accreditation and other issues. To that end, the Board of Trustees passed a Policy on Policies last year, and we now have an Office of University Compliance and a Chief Compliance Officer, Rachel King, who comes to us from New Mexico. Dr. Goodell said that she met with her recently to discuss how Faculty Senate can be of assistance with compliance, and she informed Dr. Goodell of a new committee, the Institutional Compliance Committee, (the ICC – an unfortunate acronym) which she is convening for its first meeting on March 26, 2014. Dr. Goodell stated that unfortunately she will be out of town that day, so if there is anyone who is willing to be the Senate representative and go to that meeting, please let Dr. Goodell know. She will be doing some arm twisting if she doesn't get any volunteers.

Finally, Dr. Goodell wished everyone a great President's Day long weekend.

IV. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman commented that it sounds like two great opportunities – an opportunity to participate in ICC and a potential trip to beautiful Chico, California and he is sure that everyone will rush out afterwards.

President Berkman commented about what Professor Goodell had mentioned about the engaged learning initiative. He stated that we started – he said he didn't think Byron White is at Senate today, but he definitely gets a shout out for all of the work that he has done in really putting this together and also moving the university into a much more comprehensive paradigm. He noted that from the time he came, he always is asked "Can you explain what engaged learning is to me?" He noted that he has been made aware of examples of engaged learning but those examples that he has of engaged learning often did not involve an engagement that was inclusive of faculty, of students and of community and he thinks that Byron is doing a great job in pushing that in that direction.

President Berkman reported that CSU received a grant from the Mandel Foundation to initiate this program. Michael White, the former Mayor of the City of Cleveland, who is now in charge of all of the urban programs at the Mendel Foundation was at the ceremony at which we recognized those who received awards and he has really been an enthusiastic champion of what is going on here. What was really surprising and refreshing to President Berkman is that these were not "get rich" grant awards; they were \$2,500 and there were a few \$5,000 grant awards but there were over 110 applications for those awards of which twenty were selected. President Berkman noted that interestingly, although he originally thought we would see the majority of applications coming from faculty in the social sciences, indeed it was an incredible interdisciplinary mix of applications from Law, from Business, and from Engineering. Dance received one of these awards so it really was a wonderful demonstration that every college had interest in moving forward and taking this step and beginning to look at how we can more actively involve and engage. He noted that the piece that Professor Goodell also mentioned

concerning what he likes to call semester in the city – an opportunity for us to introduce the City of Cleveland to students who go to Cleveland State but don't necessarily know the City of Cleveland and to begin to create some civic interest and some civic spark between students who live somewhere in Cuyahoga County but are now going to school in Cleveland. This is sort of the next stage in this effort to build this engagement to GenEd. He stated that we have an initial grant from the Gund Foundation for this program and Byron White has spear-headed this program so he really is excited that we have among faculty seen so much engagement around engagement.

President Berkman stated that he is worried about the capital budget. He noted that Professor Duffy asked him the last time about it. The Presidential Commission met with the Governor maybe three weeks ago and made a series of recommendations for all of the senior colleges and for all of the community colleges; this was after an accelerated two-month process. He stated that the Governor added \$50 million to the allocation that was given in the capital budget from the last time so we went from an allocation of in essence \$400 million to an allocation from the Governor of \$450 million which means that all universities including Cleveland State actually received an increase in our capital budgets in this cycle. President Berkman reported that we requested, as everybody else did, more money than we received. He commented that he didn't think there was anybody that requested less money than they ultimately received. We requested \$15,875,000; we received \$14,680,000. He noted that \$13 million of this \$15,875,000 is devoted to rebuilding, restoring, reinvesting lab and classroom space throughout the university. This is all really dedicated to dramatically improving the learning environment, the laboratory environment, the pedagogical environments of the university and giving the students a place and the faculty a place that they feel comfortable and proud to teach in and learn in which, as we all know, is not at all the case right now either in laboratories or in classrooms. President Berkman noted that \$13 million sounds like a big number if you say it quick but, if you start looking at what you are able to renovate for \$13 million, and what you are able to restore for \$13 million, it is not all we would want to do but it will take us a major step forward.

President Berkman said he had some marginally good news on the retention front and the best news on the retention front is that from fall to spring this year the retention rate was 89.7% (this is freshmen) so we held on really to a very, very significant number of students who came in September. The less than happy news is that when you look at fall retention from 2012 to 2013, the retention rate is 67.3%. So, in essence, we lost one-third. We recruited about 1,500 freshmen and in one year we lost about one-third of those freshmen but, it is marginally better than we did the year before. The year before we retained 67% of the students. The year before we retained 64.8% of the freshmen who came in. It is a small incremental step forward but when you stop and consider for a moment the time, faculty resources, teaching resources, academic infrastructure resources, all of the front-end dollars that are spent on advertising, that are spent on recruitment, that are spent on orientation, that are spent on all the services provided to freshmen, it is an incredible bleed of dollars. Probably more tragic really is what happens to those one-third of the freshmen who do not make it through their first year. Again, President Berkman stated that it is a step forward. We are trying to look at it as

analytically as we can given the data-limitations there may be at the university to determine how many students did not continue because they were academically unprepared to continue. Some did not continue because of financial reasons, some did not continue because there is a first-year tradition of transfer, not only here but in other Ohio universities. He said he had hoped that this year we would reach the 70% retention rate for freshmen which would have put us at the average for the senior colleges in the state of Ohio. So, we still have a way to go. President Berkman went on to say that average is a little skewed because in there you have Miami, you have the OUs, you have the Ohio States, you have the universities that are traditional residential universities that are drawing more than sixty percent of their students from outside of Ohio. It is just logical that the retention rates at those campuses are going to be higher. But just looking at the four in Northeast Ohio – Kent, Akron, Youngstown and Cleveland State – save for Youngstown, we still lag in terms of freshmen retention. He noted that there is a lot being done on every front and he has every hope that we are going to continue to see this number rise.

President Berkman stated that we have a Fiftieth Anniversary Committee chaired by Michael Schwartz and himself with the addition of the new co-chair, Julian Earls. The committee meets every other week and is beginning to put together a commemorative program for the fiftieth anniversary. He noted that it will get a little more organized – he knows that Jennifer’s group is working on it. Dr. Jennifer Visocky-O’Grady commented that she hasn’t started yet; she has it on her schedule. They plan to do a kind of a “Coffee Book” of Cleveland State, fifty years, similar to the ones people may have seen. Tri-C had its Fiftieth Anniversary last year and they did a very, very nice edition that combined really kind of historical text and historical photos of the college. President Berkman stated that we are going to do that. He noted that Radiance this year will mark the fiftieth anniversary and we will have a special ceremony at the Radiance event. He noted that Julian Earls wants to have a block party and close down Euclid Avenue for the length of the campus to kick off the fiftieth. President Berkman added that he likes that idea. He reported that there is a lot going on. There are students on the committee; there are faculty on the committee; there are administrators on the committee and as he stated earlier, it is co-chaired by President Michael Schwartz and himself.

President Berkman commented that he hoped in the next couple of months that we will announce a couple more multi-million dollar gifts. He noted that one of those gifts will endow and name the ballroom that Senate is sitting in today – actually, it will be the entire ballroom so everyone keep your fingers crossed and keep your eyes on the radar screen and again. The President hopes within a couple of months that we will be able to add to the \$10 million that Don Washkewicz donated several months ago with several other significant gifts to the university. All of these gifts to the university continue to, in his estimation, build the university’s stock. He noted that what we hear from people and from donors is an interesting phrase. If you think about it we are also in the process of interviewing perspective donors or donors who have given in the past and may likely give again. We hear this interesting phrase that Cleveland State has now “earned the right to ask.” He added that he thinks this is an interesting phrase and says

something he believes about the communities' perception about the maturity, the growth, and the foundation that the university is now upon.

Finally, President Berkman referred to the President's State of the Union address, the other President, the one who lives in Washington, D.C. – the other President had two versions of the State of the Union address: one version was the version watched on television. Another version was an online version that as you went to parts of the speech, and he talked about a particular initiative or a program, there were a series of slides that were shown to further elaborate or illustrate what he was describing. In the section of his speech in which he talked about the need for more collaboration between high schools and higher education, there was a slide that said MC2 STEM High School, Cleveland State, Cleveland, Ohio and said, we need more of these high schools. President Berkman added that it was a nice shout-out from the President of the United States to what he continues to think is and will continue to be an incredibly exciting opportunity for the university.

President Berkman stated that that is his report and he is sticking to it.

V. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Deirdre Mageean said that she wanted to talk a little bit about a group of folks that are critical for this university and she knows many faculty work with and she is concerned about our part-time faculty. She reported that two Saturdays ago, the Center for Teaching Excellence with Dr. Peter Meiksins, had a forum or gathering of all of the adjunct faculty and noted that this was the first time that we reached out to the Center for Excellence concerning adjunct faculty to help them do the critical job that they do. She stated that they had no idea how many adjuncts would turn up. People felt that maybe a good estimate on a cold Saturday would be thirty or forty but we were close to eighty or ninety adjuncts who turned up for this meeting. She said that she was there to welcome them. We had a good exchange with the adjunct faculty and there are some very useful programs put on for them like StarFish and other general areas that they are involved in. She noted that she found it to be very interesting because she got a lot of very good feedback. These are troops in the trenches, particularly in a lot of our freshmen and GenEd courses, and she heard from the adjuncts on a variety of things from textbooks, parking, and curriculum. For those who were there, she took a quick survey and it is amazing how many of them have been working with us for several years. She commented that she felt like the rookie in the room. She noted that there is a great wisdom there and knowledge and she was very interested in their feedback. She has taken them the information that we promised and we will stick to it. We will put on more sessions for them because they told us what was needed to do the job. She is certainly taking into consideration a lot of the things she heard from the adjuncts in terms of issues around textbooks, curriculum and other things. She said she was very impressed with the quality of people who were at the meeting and their dedication to the university and we are very fortunate to have that many of them in our employment. She commented that as everyone knows, the university granted a five percent pay raise for that group which hasn't received a pay raise in almost a decade. Provost Mageean stated that obviously as

a group we are looking at them very carefully to make sure that they are not adversely effected by the 4 to 3 conversion or by the whole issue around health benefits.

Provost Mageean said that she had spoken to Senate President Goodell about just checking on exactly how many part-time folks we have. She noted that we actually had this past year, taking into account fall of 2012 and for 2013 spring 784 adjunct faculty working for us teaching 2,112 sessions. She remarked that that is an incredible number. We actually have about 1,300 at any one time; some are teaching, some are not. Some of those people teach one semester, some of those people teach two semesters, or two semesters in a summer. She stated that as everyone might imagine, the number varies enormously from a small number of twenty in Engineering all the way up to 208 in CLASS. So, there are a significant number of people here and a significant number of sessions that they teach so it is clearly a very important role that they play. Provost Mageean noted that this is the first time it has been tracked in her office – just knowing what courses are being taught and who is doing what. She went on to say that with that number of people who are important to the university, we certainly owe them a kind of help that they provided at that meeting.

Provost Mageean commented that speaking of adjuncts, some of them are not teaching classes – some are clinical advisors in Nursing and there is supervision in Education and they play many varied roles. But, a lot of the adjuncts are teaching some of our big freshmen sections along with teaching GenEd courses. She noted that this has prompted her to also look at our GenEd courses. She remarked, “Take a deep breath. I am not suggesting that this is the moment to start doing a major overhaul with GenEd. I think the energy levels once we are finished with the 4 to 3 stuff, is not quite ready for another major effort.” Provost Mageean said that having looked at some of these sections, she does think we have considerable areas of overlap and duplication in a small number of some of these courses where they are offered, very, very similar courses in a number of places, so one of the things she wants to do is to look at this area where there might be unnecessary duplication. She said that she will be approaching some faculty who may be co-opted to work with them in Academic Affairs to help work on identifying duplication and overlap. She added that everyone should stand by for more on that issue.

Provost Mageean mentioned another issue that the President was talking about earlier and that is retention. This is very closely aligned with our freshmen courses and GenEd courses. She noted that a big area in this as the President mentioned is that there are multiple efforts to improve our retention rates, everything from our intrusive advising where we identify people, StarFish, the general advising office, and the college advisors. But clearly one of the important things is advising. We have seen this year in the 4 to 3 conversion how important advising is. It is very important in terms of guiding the students appropriately, not giving them a pass, making sure they are in the right area. So many of our students come to us with a major in mind and they declare that major. But there are many, many students who come in without a declared major and these are routinely assigned to a college advising office upon entry. There is not necessarily any rhyme or reason to the assignment. It is more like spreading a load. Even if the students have no intention of declaring a major in a particular college, they are assigned there and

actually more often than not, that ends up in CLASS. As a result, CLASS carries a disproportionate burden of advising. She added that they do it very well but it is still a very heavy burden. Provost Mageean noted that everyone will hear more about this. She will be working with Dr. Meiksins. It really doesn't make a lot of sense if a student doesn't have a clear academic direction or selects a major to which they cannot immediately enter. Why should these students end up in another college? She went on to say that we have to do more for these kinds of students. At the moment, we are really looking at taking this more into general advising. She noted that the President used the term, "Many of our folks come in with not a clear map of possible careers, possible tracks, and possible areas of study." She stated that many of the students flounder. The Provost commented that when she was in advising she used to have what she called the forty years in the desert students. They were students who just wandered around academically taking course after course after course with no direction and nobody helping them steer. They really had no idea and were trying a little of this and a little of that and suddenly they had many credits and a lot of debt and still no clear path forward. She added that there is a lot of work to do and everyone will hear more from her and Dr. Meiksins about how they want to address that issue and working with the Registrar to develop plan codes for students who have not yet selected a major for college.

Provost Mageean said that she wanted to take this opportunity to thank Professor Barbara Margolius, chair of the Committee on Student Success. They have been working very hard and very diligently looking at this whole issue of student success and she is glad that Professor Margolius is going to be joining them. She noted that she and Dr. Meiksins try to attend Professor Margolius' meetings although she has not been very good at attending because of her schedule but she knows that others like Dr. Meiksins and others do attend. The Provost is glad that they are joining in this larger conversation about how we deal with this retention and advising. She added that she did want to thank the committee members. She has had the good fortune of attending a couple of their meetings and she knows they have worked very, very diligently in that area.

Provost Mageean reported that one other group that she has heard from (a good thing about her office is that they get to hear from everybody, like it or not) are the students. They had a good opportunity. Actually the President heard from the students today and they have a lot of issues and good suggestions to make. She said that she will be coming back about some of those issues. Textbooks – this is clearly an issue we have to deal with and she mentioned this once before. She noted that textbooks were always expensive and now are becoming prohibitively expensive. She reported that Dr. Teresa LaGrange's office has just completed a fall survey of our students about their attitudes and specifically about textbooks; Teresa will probably make that survey available to faculty. She noted that it is really trying to see what the students' attitudes are towards textbooks – whether they buy them, whether it gets in the way of taking a course, and whether they cut back on a number of courses. But she really wants to start working with faculty on ways forward to reduce these costs of textbooks and also to explore other options besides published textbooks – something that will help bring this burden of costs down for our students.

Finally, Provost Mageean talked about our policy on policies. She said that she knows that this sounds like another committee on committees – the policy on policies. She remarked that she used to snicker at those things too, but they are necessary and she thinks if anyone like she arrived at a place like this keeps asking questions like, “Do we have a policy on that? Where do I find that policy on that or somebody tells you there is a policy on that but you can’t find it anywhere other than their head.” The whole idea is, as we move forward, we will need to have a clear website with clearly articulated policies, what the problems of those policies are, when were the policies changed, who you contact, and how effective to when it was last updated. Provost Mageean said that this is going to be a long process but certainly working with Legal, working with the new Compliance Office, we will get something researched – all of us – faculty, students and administrators as well. She noted that it is going to take time. At her previous institution, it took two years; a lot of hours and a lot of sweat but in the end, you have something where you can clearly see where we have the policies of the university.

Provost Mageean said she looks forward to questions later.

**VI. Report of the Student Government Association
(Report No. 42, 2013-2014)**

Ms. Allie Dumski, President of the Student Government Association, reported that SGA’s former President Jon Fedor recently resigned. She noted that the SGA Constitution offers the position to the Vice President and then if he or she accepts, he or she is appointed as the President and the new President then appoints a new Vice President. Ms. Dumski introduced Ms. Monica Ward, a senior international relations major, and noted that she is the new Vice President of SGA. Ms. Dumski stated that if anyone needs information from either of them, their emails are almost the same: president@csusga.com or vicepresident@csusga.com. She encouraged people to feel free to reach out to them.

Ms. Dumski commented that the Provost warmed everyone up a little bit for what she is going to talk about but it is an issue that is very important to many, many students and that is textbooks. She has spoken to the Book Store, Campus Support Services and senior leadership on Monday and now she has the opportunity to talk to Faculty Senate, the decision-makers. SGA really needs Senate’s help with this issue. The cost of textbooks is a huge burden on students and something really needs to be done. SGA realizes the importance of textbooks for many students but there are many ways that we can also utilize alternatives to alleviate this extra burden. SGA is recommending more accurate labeling on the Book Store web site using the required textbooks to their full potential. She noted that some examples of this include using the textbook for a few questions every so often is not efficient enough for a \$200 textbook. Those problems can be put on Blackboard or some of the other services that CSU offers. If your exams are based off of slides that are being handed out in class, the book should be recommended, not required. She stated that all textbooks should be on reserve in the library so that students may go there to check the book out or get the homework problems from that reserve. Faculty could also assign previous editions of the textbook as many know that

most of the subjects haven't changed much in the past years, and there are previous editions that are just as good. Faculty could also notify the Book Store earlier when they decide which books they want to use for the next semester. This helps students by giving them the most money back when they try to sell their textbooks back to the Book Store. Also, consistency across courses is a big issue where one course is using one textbook but the same course taught by a different professor is using a different textbook. Using a consistent book would really help students not only being able to trade books but also study together and help each other in the classes. Ms. Dumski noted that there are very many professors that are very mindful about this and SGA appreciates it but SGA would really appreciate it if there was more consistency across all departments and professors. She went on to say that textbooks are an area that faculty hold the greatest degree of control and faculty can reduce the cost for students. SGA hopes that faculty can utilize their power, utilize alternative textbooks or utilize their book if they are going to require one. Ms. Dumski added that this is an easy way faculty can help students and it helps students achieve their degrees and not have to worry about the cost of their textbooks.

Ms. Dumski stated that if anybody has questions or concerns, she will stay until the end of the meeting. She thanked Senate for its time and said that she appreciates the opportunity to be able to talk to Senate about student issues.

Senate President Goodell noted that she would highly endorse Ms. Dumski's request to all of the faculty to look at the textbook usage in their courses and for all of the Senators to please go back and raise this issue with their colleagues and departments and at college meetings so that we can really begin to attack what has become out of control and just an unreasonable burden on students.

VII. Budget and Finance Committee Budget Update (Report No. 43, 2013-2014)

Professor Andrew Resnick, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, reported that the committee has four items to present. He noted that the first two items are sort of status updates, regular reporting items, and then the second two items are more educational and information literature.

Professor Resnick stated that the first item is the status of the current tuition revenue as of the end of January. He noted that as everyone can see, the Summary across the total institution we budgeted approximately \$150 million from tuition revenue and as of the end of January, our preliminary numbers are \$153.3 million so there is a slight overage. He noted that as everyone may recall, tuition revenue accounts for approximately two-thirds of the total revenue at CSU. If there is at the end of the year any overage, there is an existing tuition revenue margin sharing model. Twenty-five percent of the overage goes to university reserves; the remainder goes to the Provost's Office to be distributed by discretion. He noted that again, this is just sort of the status regularly reported.

Professor Resnick stated that the next item is presented in a little bit more detail, i.e., the State Capital Appropriation budget. He noted that as the President mentioned earlier, we originally requested approximately \$69 million for three main projects that are Main Classroom renovation, renovation of Science and Engineering laboratories, and also the Center for Research and Innovation. Professor Resnick said that the first two projects are clearly a renovation and rehabilitation. The Center for Research and Innovation is actually kind of exciting – it plays into the notion of sustainability for programs and NSF is very big on that. Professor Resnick noted that of the \$16 million we requested, we tentatively received \$14.6 million, 92% of the monies that we requested. There is carry-over from the College of Engineering project that he listed below the total request and allocation. In terms of the percentage that we received from the state of Ohio, there is also a comparison of other Ohio universities and CSU compares very favorably with our counterparts. Dr. Resnick said that again, this is a State Legislature item. He stated that we expect the legislation to be passed in March or April and then be signed into law and then funds can be accessed starting July 2014. He commented that one note that may be of interest to some people that year, over year requests can't exceed a certain percentage of the current requests so the next time we put in a request, we can't request \$300 million. We need to stay within a certain percentage increase.

Professional Resnick moved on to the two items and commented that a little bit more time can be spent on them. He noted that the first is a Summary of University Auxiliary Enterprise Units. There are three main categories in the overall University Budget – the Operating Budget which is approximately 80% of the total dollars, the General Fee Budget that is approximately 10% and the Auxiliary Budget at 10%. He stated that there is a bright line separating these units and there are rules about the transfer of money from one unit to the other. They have to be kept separate. He referred to the document included in the Senate meeting packets and noted that in the CSU Auxiliary Units there are six units that are covered in the Auxiliary Enterprise Units and then there are an additional four that are funded out of the Operating Funds or the General Fee but are managed by Campus Support. So they are included on the list but there are no dollars next to those. Dr. Resnick stated that there is a definition in Auxiliary Enterprise. Auxiliary Enterprise Units are entities that charge fees that are directly related to but not necessarily equal to the cost of the goods or services it provides. Auxiliary Enterprise Units are managed essentially as self-supporting activities. He noted that looking at the list of the six Auxiliary Enterprise Units, there is no polite way to put this but the Wolstein Center is a big money pit. He commented that Parking is also in there and Parking does show a large overage. He added that there has been some discussion and comments that go on about parking fees and where that money flows from one Auxiliary Unit to another. But, the bottom line is that this Wolstein Center is really kind of holding us back. He went on to say that he is not really sure what is going to happen with that in the future.

Professor Resnick stated that he had received a question about where Campus International and the MC2STEM programs lie. He reported that those are actually in the Operating Budget; they are not under the Auxiliary Enterprises. In the Operating Budget they are listed as part of a Contingency Account; they don't have separate line items; he

was unable to determine a specific dollar amount that is dedicated to those particular programs.

Professor Resnick reported that the last item is a Summary of the Euclid Avenue Development Corporation (EADC). He presented this information because it is related to the Auxiliary Enterprise Units. The Euclid Avenue Development Corporation is a quasi-independent agency; it is a non-profit corporation. It was created to operate student housing and parking facilities. Currently, the EADC has equal amounts of assets and liabilities. The income for Euclid Avenue comes primarily from rent on student housing. The assets are the Residence Halls and several parking garages. The liabilities are from three separate bond issues. He noted that there was an issue that came up again with parking. One of those bond issuances is designated for “parking garage” but it seems to be some sort of interest only loan and has a higher rate. Currently, CSU has a lease agreement with the EADC covering the residence halls. So, the idea is that Euclid Avenue is operating these residence halls and they need to be generating revenue that is 120% of their total expenses and that is generally based on the occupancy rate. Professor Resnick noted that if that debt ratio falls below 1.2, the existing agreement provides for CSU to – if you want to call it – pay for utilities or you are not going to be reimbursed for the utilities from student housing or rent rooms from student housing. In addition, there are other issues with other student housing developments. He noted that Langston is a completely separate development but the occupancy of Langston has not yet impacted occupancy rates of EADC housing assets. There is discussion of a new residence hall on Euclid in the old Federation Building that may impact housing rates in the future but we can’t tell right now.

Senator Robert Krebs asked about the Main Classroom \$4 million expense. He asked if that is for the roof or is that new stuff. Professor Resnick replied that he believes this is for the interior – that’s not the roof. President Berkman confirmed that this is not for the roof; this is for the interior, all classroom space.

Senator Barbara Hoffman stated that she had two questions about the Auxiliary Enterprise Units. She noted that it sounded like Professor Resnick had been saying that funds are transferred from one unit to the other and asked, “Is that the case?”

Professor Resnick replied that within Auxiliary Enterprise Units funds can flow from one unit to another. He went on to say that funds cannot flow from the Auxiliary Units to the Operating Budget or vis-versa but, within the Auxiliary Units, funds are able to flow from unit to unit.

Professor Hoffman noted that the overage from parking can go to finance Wolstein. Professor Resnick replied that Dr. Hoffman was correct. Professor Hoffman asked if there is anything we can do about that. Dr. Resnick replied that he is not sure.

President Berkman noted that Dr. Resnick had called Wolstein Center a big money pit and agreed that it is big. He said that we are and have been for the last year looking at a number of alternatives. The Wolstein Center facility is twenty years old

now. It was built way out of scale – it seats 15,000 and there are almost no arenas except for Rup Arena and Grand College Arenas that seat 15,000. We cannot continue to afford to lose a million dollars per year on it. We are exploring a number of options. But it is actually even somewhat more serious than a million dollars and that is the fact that the building is twenty years old and virtually no maintenance has been done on the building. So, all systems – electrical, HVAC, sound, environmental, etc. are all in less than adequate and usable condition. He noted that we are going to have to do something. We are not exactly sure what that something is but when we discover it, we will be happy to share it with Faculty Senate.

Dr. Goodell added that everyone may remember that one of the new trustees asked in a Trustee meeting, which she attends as Faculty Senate's representative, if we could tear it down and the answer was a resounding "No" at this time. President Berkman added that he believes that two trustees mentioned tearing Wolstein down. Dr. Goodell reported that this issue has been on the Agenda of the Board of Trustees for a long time.

Senator Joel Lieske stated that he thinks Wolstein has been running a million dollar deficit since it was built.

Professor Resnick commented that the provenance of Wolstein is a little convoluted. Apparently, the State built it and gave it to CSU without CSU really requesting it so it is not clear who is really responsible for all of the maintenance.

Professor Lieske stated that he understands that James Rhodes made an offer to former President Walter Waetjen that he couldn't refuse. Dr. Lieske turned to the Athletic budget and stated that it is \$10.3 million; that doesn't cover the operating dollars of Wolstein.

Professor Resnick noted that the Athletic budget is in a separate unit account. Dr. Lieske commented that this doesn't cover the deficit for the Wolstein Center. Dr. Resnick stated that the Wolstein Center is in a separate budget category.

**VIII. Admissions and Standards Committee
Proposed Admissions Requirements for the new MEHPE Degree (Report No. 41, 2013-2014) (January 15, 2014 Meeting)**

Senate President Goodell stated that now we have the previously removed item from the Agenda as everyone should recall from the last Senate meeting. She noted that there was a concern raised by one of our Senators, Kathleen Little, about the potential overlap with the program in the Masters of Education for Health Professions Education. Dr. Goodell stated that there has been considerable discussion amongst the effected departments in both Education and Science and they have come to a very amicable agreement with even some opportunities hopefully for some collaboration between those departments in the future. She stated that it is here again from the Admissions and Standards Committee.

Professor James Marino, chair of the Admissions and Standards Committee, stated that this agenda item is actually for the admissions requirements for the new Masters of Education in Health Professions Education (MEHPE) which is the very first agenda item from UCC today. Professor Marino stated that if Senate approves this agenda item, then in the next agenda item when UCC comes to the podium, their agenda item actually has requirements. He noted that the proposed requirements by Admissions and Standards are:

- A terminal degree that would be a Master's degree
- Official transcripts from all degree granting institutions
- A personal statement by the applicant describing previous education
- Experiences, alignment of the degree with the applicant's personal career goals, and the applicant's commitment to completing the MEHPE as a member of a two-year cohort
- A CV with relevant experiences
- A letter from the applicant's immediate supervisor acknowledging the applicant's commitment to health professions education and granting the applicant necessary release time from work to take part in program coursework. This is related to the emphasis as a cohort program.
- A graduate degree application to Cleveland State

At this point, Professor Marino inquired if there was a content specialist present at Senate today. Dr. Goodell replied, yes. Dr. Marino then asked if there were any questions about the proposal. There were no questions.

Dr. Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed new Admission Requirements for the new proposed MEHPE (Masters of Education in Health Professions Education) program and asked Senators to vote. The proposed MEHPE was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell noted that we have Professor Nigamanth Sridhar standing in for Professor Bill Kosteas on the University Curriculum Committee changes on the 4 to 3 and others. She noted that there is some documentation in the meeting packets.

IX. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Sridhar commented that Bill Kosteas couldn't be present today because hopefully he is bringing his wife and new child back home from the hospital right about now.

Professor Sridhar reported that the UCC has been making progress on the 4 to 3 conversions. He said that when he read the Agenda for UCC for this coming Friday, he thinks that the UCC has their last program proposals for the conversion and they will have seen all of the program revision proposals from all departments and programs. He added that this is UCC's understanding. At last week's meeting, UCC noted that they

were waiting for a few revisions of proposals and a couple of new ones and they believe that they now have all of them. Hopefully UCC will get through the approval process very quickly and by the time Senate meets again, UCC will have actually approved all of the program revisions and sent them on for the Transition Team for transition plan approvals as well.

Professor Sridhar reported that all proposals for conversion changes have been reviewed. He noted that there are still a couple that have been submitted along with program revisions. This was always to have been expected. As departments come close to finalizing program revision proposals, they sometimes realized that they need another course or another course change. He noted that in the UCC's Agenda, there are a few course items as well that don't actually require a Faculty Senate vote but they are listed for "Informational Purposes Only." Dr. Sridhar went on to say that all of this is in the system. He is sure everyone has been looking at and keeping track of programs making sure that what is going through the approval process is really what programs and departments intended.

A. Proposed new M.Ed. in Health Professions Education (Report No. 44, 2013-2014)

Dr. Sridhar stated that the first item from the UCC for a vote is the proposed Health Professions Education program. He noted that we just talked about the admissions standards. The idea of this program is to attract people that are already working in the health profession areas and coming in to learn how to teach in that profession. The proposal as it was written was to include initial cohorts coming from the Cleveland Clinic and eventually learning how to teach in their field. The program will basically be 30 credit hours of coursework spread over two years. The idea is to have these people go through the program in a cohort. This includes creation of two new courses, ALD 588 and ALD 589 and that is basically what the UCC is proposing for adoption. He noted that Ann is present to respond to any questions.

Professor Lieske suggested that if no one has any objections, he moves that Senate approve all of the proposal changes from UCC.

Dr. Sridhar commented that we can't do that. We will need to go through each proposal, one by one. He added, not one by one as in each program but one by one as in each of the major proposals.

There being no questions, Dr. Goodell then stated that the UCC has proposed a new program, a M.Ed. in Health Professions Education and asked Senators to vote. The proposed new M.Ed. in Health Professions Education was unanimously approved by voice vote.

B. Proposed Undergraduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion (Report No. 45, 2013-2014)

Professor Sridhar noted that the next item is all of the undergraduate program revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion and, of course, there are twenty items. He pointed out that there is one item that is marked as conditionally approved and this is the BS in Social Work. Professor Sridhar reported that he just talked with Professor Bill Kostea before the Senate meeting started to ask him if he had an update since the Agenda was printed and he wasn't sure and we can pardon him for that. He noted that the item that we were waiting for from the UCC was something minor. UCC had asked for a minor change in a degree map because a number of credit hours were not adding up correctly – nothing substantive and UCC does expect that minor change to be made quickly. This proposal is conditional because UCC is still waiting for something to come back. Professor Sridhar noted that it may have already come back to Bill Kostea but he is not aware of it. Other than that, twenty items are on the agenda for Faculty Senate approval:

- 1. Speech and Hearing Major, Minor, and Honors and Scholars Program**
- 2. COSHP CSU Teach Programs: BS in Biology – integrated science licensure, BS in Chemistry – integrated science licensure, BS in Environmental Science – integrated licensure, BA in Mathematics, BS in Mathematics + licensure in Physics, BA in Physics – integrated science licensure, BA in physics + licensure in Mathematics**
- 3. BS in Pharmaceutical Science: Pharmaceutical Analysis and Chemistry track, Medicinal and Biological Chemistry track, Pharmacy Administration track is being deleted**
- 4. Bachelor of Civil Engineering**
- 5. Art Certificates: Certificate in Graphic Design, Certificate in Arts Management and Community Development**
- 6. B in Social Work***
- 7. Asian Studies Minor and Concentration**
- 8. Women's Studies Major and Minor**
- 9. Arabic Minor**
- 10. Middle Childhood Education Program Major**
- 11. Early Childhood Education Program**
- 12. Mild/Moderate Interventions Specialist Program**
- 13. Moderate/Intensive Interventions Specialist Program**
- 14. Theatre and Dance: Theatre Major, Theatre Minor, Dance Minor**
- 15. Film and Digital Media Major (Communication), renamed Film, Television, and Interactive Media**
- 16. BA in English: Literature, Creative Writing, Multicultural and Multiethnic Literature concentration (eliminated); English Minor, Professional Writing Certificate (eliminated)**
- 17. Spanish Major and Minor**
- 18. German Minor**
- 19. International Film Minor**
- 20. Philosophy Major, Honors and Minor Program (both traditional and ethics tracks)**

***Conditionally approved**

There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed twenty Undergraduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion as listed on the Agenda, Item IX. B. numbers 1 through 20 and asked for a vote. The twenty proposed Undergraduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion were unanimously approved by voice vote.

C. Graduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion (Report No. 46, 2013-2014)

Dr. Sridhar moved to Item C, Graduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion. He noted that several of the Graduate courses are being impacted as we go through the 4 to 3 conversion of Undergraduate courses. He stated that we have four items on that list that are all in the CSU Teach Post-baccalaureate programs – Graduate Programs from the Department of Physics and Graduate Programs in Economics and then Global Interactions.

- 1. CSU Teach post-baccalaureate programs: Integrated Science – Biology, Integrated Science – Chemistry, Integrated Science – Environmental Science, Integrated Science – Physics, Integrated Mathematics, Integrated Mathematic & Single Field Physics**
- 2. Physics Graduate Programs**
 - a. M.S. in Physics, Optics & Materials Specialization**
 - b. M.S. in Physics, Optics & Medical Imaging Specialization**
 - c. M.S. in Physics, Medical Physics Specialization**
 - d. Graduate Certificate in Medical Physics (new program)**
 - e. Physics 4+1 Program, Optics/Materials Specialization**
 - f. Physics 4+1 Program, Optics/Medical Imaging Specialization**
- 3. MA in Economics**
- 4. MA in Global Interactions**

Dr. Goodell then asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed Graduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion, listed on the Agenda as Item IX., C., numbers 1 through 4 and asked Senators to vote. The four proposed Graduate Program Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 Conversion were unanimously approved by voice vote.

D. Additional Graduate Program Revisions

Dr. Sridhar moved to Item D and said that two program revisions are from the Music Department and they are a Professional Studies Certificate which is a new program and there are Revisions to the Master's Degree in Literacy Development/Reading Endorsement. Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any questions on these two revisions. Dr. Sridhar then inquired if there was anyone from the Music

Department present o respond to questions. An unidentified person responded that there was a representative of the Music Department present to respond to questions.

Dr. Goodell noted that we don't have the handout from Bill Kosteas but the Music Certificate is not a degree program. She added that we also have someone from Education to respond to questions about the Reading Endorsement revision. The program revisions are:

- 1. Music – Professional Studies Certificate (new program) (Report No. 47, 2013-2014)**
- 2. Revisions to the Master's Degree in Literacy Development/Reading Endorsement (Report No. 48, 213-2014)**

Dr. Goodell asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Goodell stated that the University Curriculum Committee has proposed Graduate Program Revisions to the Music Professional Studies Certificate and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Music Professional Studies Certificate was unanimously approved by voice vote.

Dr. Goodell then stated that the University Curriculum Committee also proposed revisions to the Master's Degree in Literacy Development/Reading Endorsement and asked Senators to vote. The proposed revisions to the Master's Degree in Literacy Development/Reading Endorsement was unanimously approved by voice vote.

E. For Informational Purposes (Report No. 49, 2013-2014)

Dr. Sridhar stated that finally Item E is "For Informational Purposes." He noted that a number of revisions either came in late as new proposals or revisions that resulted from program revisions that came in. Dr. Sridhar went on to say that probably at the next Senate meeting UCC expects to have approved all of the program revisions. He then asked if there were any questions regarding the following items:

- 1. Undergraduate Course Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:**
 - a. SPH 438/538**
 - b. COM December Courses to UCC (except for COM 220)**
 - c. CHM 416 Conversion**
 - d. COM 620 Name Change Revised**
 - e. Music Education MUS 421**
 - f. MLA 312 New course for Lang. Ed. Program**
 - g. Urban Studies additional course changes**
 - h. Middle Childhood 4 to Course Proposal 10-13-13**
 - i. Early Childhood 4 to 3 Course Proposal 10-13-13**
 - j. Moderate Intensive 4 to 3 Course Proposal 10-13-13**
 - k. Mild Moderate 4 to 3 Course Proposal 10-13-13course proposal 4 to 3 conversion**

- 2. Graduate Course Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion: (Report No. 50, 2013-2014)**
 - a. ACT 531, 532, 533**
 - b. Marketing Graduate Cross-listed**

Dr. Goodell remarked that the UCC had done an unbelievably fantastic job.

Dr. Sridhar commented that UCC is actually thinking about taking a break for one week and they are also planning to devote one meeting to discuss this whole conversion process that has happened. Members of the committee will sit down and voice their opinion on what they are going through and all of the things that have come up in these different meetings. UCC will dedicate a full meeting without looking at new proposals but just to document what they have. Hopefully, UCC will have that before the next Senate meeting.

Senator Andrew Gross inquired when is the next Senate meeting. Dr. Goodell replied that the next Senate meeting is on the 19th of March, a week after Spring break.

Dr. Goodell remarked that everyone will always be indebted to the UCC's extreme attention to detail and their hard work through this very difficult process.

The "For Informational Purposes" items discussed above were received by Faculty Senate.

X. University Faculty Affairs Committee

Dr. Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, noted that he had a couple of quick announcements and reminders. He stated that he didn't have any action items. He said that just to give everyone a sense of what is ahead for the Student Evaluation of Instruction Instrument, UFAC is planning to present a timeline for the implementation, hopefully at the March 19th meeting. He stated that at the Provost's Council last month, UFAC shared the instrument with all of the college Deans and it should be making its way to the college faculty for the addition of college-specific questions. He asked Senators to please go to their delegation FACs because UFAC needs to get those questions and get them approved by the end of the semester. If all goes well, UFAC should be able to launch the colleges instruments in the fall based on what they have heard from Testing Services. He added that everyone should make sure that their colleges are working on the instrument.

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

Dr. Karem said he wanted to give a little context on discussions regarding the new University Harassment and Non-discrimination Policies and Procedures. He then asked Yulanda McCarty-Harris, Director, Office for Institutional Equity, to join him at the podium. He stated that Yulanda has been an invaluable resource and is already fine-

tuning aspects to these policies in response to UFAC and other faculty commentary. Professor Karem stated that the main purpose of this presentation here today is to introduce essentially the open comment period. He noted that one of the issues of the Policy on Policies is that there is a 30 day comment period for suggestions. He said that these policies will be posted electronically soon if they have not already been posted. The point of our meeting today is not to have a fine-grain discussion of nuances to the policy; it is to give a bit of context to where it emerges from. The idea of having a policy about sexual harassment and non-discrimination; this is not new. We've had these and they have been part of different Affirmative Action plans and other policy documents but in keeping with the points that Provost Mageean made, we are trying to make policies more transparent up front and filed in clear and legible areas so that is the impetus for this. Professor Karem noted that there are a number of new detailed items in this and he will defer to Yulanda for the specifics here, but just to give a holistic sense of what has been summarized to him. He went on to say that many of these things involve issues of due process, effective timelines, of duty to report instances and to complete investigations. The one thing that he would say is that in the past, having observed many university policies before, moving towards clear timelines, moving towards accountability he thinks is mutually beneficial for every aspect of the campus community. He sees this really as a step forward even though he is sure that people have questions and suggestions about individual details. He can report that the Office for Institutional Equity has been very proactive in reaching out to the Faculty Affairs Committee and to Senate Officers to talk about this so there already have been discussions under way just to get some initial sense of how to start a feed-back loop so he is really hoping that what this would do is give a time for Yulanda to give a little context and then have something to bring back to caucuses and fellow faculty for comment through the mechanisms that are out there. He added that moving forward, this is the beginning of an educative process as well because everyone needs to be aware of these policies and how to handle them. He went on to say that he hopes that was a good enough introduction for Yulanda McCarty-Harris.

Ms. McCarty-Harris commented that for those who have not met her, she has actually been at CSU since November of 2012. She said that she has met many people and she thanks Faculty Senate for allowing her the opportunity to come to Senate and speak regarding these important policies. She said that Dr. Karem has done a great job basically summarizing where they are. She did provide Senate with an Executive Summary. She stated that there have been some comments from the Academic Steering Committee and also from UFAC that are not part of this Summary because she didn't want all of these drafts going out that were different. She noted that they do have everyone's comments and they will be taking those comments into consideration. All will be considered as it relates to making sure that any sanctions or disciplines will follow the Collective Bargaining Agreements. Ms. McCarty-Harris noted that one of the key areas they are looking at relates to a Title IX Coordinator being designated. A colleague letter basically sets forth this guidance. It came from the Department of Education. She noted that offices have talked about these issues. One of the things that campuses failed to look at is the issue of "thank you very much for the guidance but no thank you we don't want to follow it basically." So, right now, with the high public awareness as well

as all of the issues that are going on at Penn State, President Obama once again has already formed a Task Force to deal with these issues. She stated that clearly, it is on the radar in the Department of Education as it relates to “how is your campus dealing with these issues” relating to sexual assault. One of the key things that we are running into in terms of the challenges is making people realize that they are not criminal in nature. If it comes to that, it is tracked on the criminal side. If it is tracked, then we have an obligation administratively to deal with issues. That standard is also one of the key areas that talks about the preponderance of evidence. More likely than not that it occurred and you can imagine criminal beyond a reasonable doubt, that’s a whole different standard. She stated that we are about education and prevention. How do we basically identify what is going on and how do we correct that. She noted that those are the key things that the Office of Institutional Equity is looking at.

Ms. McCarty-Harris went on to say that one of the other things they talked about is the duty to report. Clearly it is a university issue of the duty to report. But there are certain individuals that are in high-level positions, those that have supervisory authority, that have this duty to report. She stated that they often get this information, “I’m coming to you in confidence, please do not share” especially from our students. Ms. McCarty-Harris stated that we have to make sure that they are empowered to talk about these issues. She noted that one of the statistics that came out is that one in five actually do report. There is a lot that goes unreported. She stated that they want to make sure that we are educating our community and empower them to know what are the rules, what are the regulations, what can we do and what we can’t do to ensure that we basically correct the actions.

Ms. McCarty-Harris continued stating that they have expanded the definition to include gender identity and/or expression, something that is already being done right now. If there are issues dealing with sexual orientation and all of those issues, it is usually covered under the Success component of Title VII obligation as well as Title IX. She noted that there are also confidential resources that will outline that if a student or anyone should go to, those individuals are confidential and we do not basically infringe on those rights as it relates to it. So, they are going to be doing a lot of education and prevention. One of the things they are going to roll out hopefully in the Fall is making sure that all of our incoming freshmen students as well as incoming employees go through an orientation conducted by Human Resources so they are trained and know about these issues. Whether you want to call it a training or you want to call it educational, the bottom line is that you need to know what to do when there are problems. Ms. McCarty-Harris said that over this period they will post the information and people will have thirty days to review it. She added that this is one of the challenges that they are running into. She needs to basically get this passed by the Board of Trustees because they need to make sure that this language is in place and these definitions are in place. She asked, “So, what does that do for you?” She stated that she will immediately walk out of this meeting and hopefully get this information posted for the thirty day comment period. She said that she talked with Dr. Goodell and the next Senate meeting is March 19, 2014 and all of the comments should be in by then and she will be able to come to Senate with what they have basically put together. She reported that she talked

with the Provost about certain things. She asked, “What do your comments mean to what we are doing? Your comments mean a lot to what we are doing because a policy is always as good as long as I implement it.” She stated that if anyone has problems with it, basically it won’t be followed. Ms. McCarty-Harris said that her office will take everyone’s comments with serious consideration; however, there are certain things that they have to do because the law says that we have to do them. If anyone sees something and it is not quite the way you want it, realize that there are obligations that are coming from the Federal Government or the State that requires us to do those things.

Professor Karem commented that he wanted to give a procedural reminder to follow up on Yulanda’s point. He noted that it is hoped that on March 19, 2014, Senate will be able to vote and approve of this policy. In the past, anytime there has been an Affirmative Action Plan Policy that has come to Senate for approval, he would certainly hope that we would continue to maintain that role and have a strong voice in this. Professor Karem stated that he doesn’t have the ability to answer questions about this now but if there are general procedural questions, he would be happy to do so. He said that he is also happy to let the Agenda move forward in an unprecedentedly brisk pace. Dr. Karem added that everyone should make sure that they get their questions from their respective FACs added to this.

Dr. Goodell stated that she does not believe that Professor Stella Iwuagwu, chair of the Student Life Committee, is at Senate today

**XI. Student Life Committee
Proposed changes to the Student Conduct Code (Report No. 52, 2013-2014)**

Dr. Goodell stated that she is going to ask Senate’s indulgence on this item because she is aware of the sensitive timeline that the University is under in order to get policies into and through the comment period. She stated that the Student Conduct Code has been going through a lengthy review period. She said that she did ask the Senate Student Life Committee to review the Conduct Code back in December with a memorandum that everyone received in today’s meeting packet. The Student Life Committee reviewed the Conduct Code and had a meeting about it and are now happy to endorse all of the changes as noted in the cover memo from Dr. Stella Iwuagwu. She added that she knows that Boyd Yarbrough, Dean of Students at the moment, is here to respond to any specific questions about the changes.

Senator Barbara Margolius stated that it is her understanding concerning the Student Code of Conduct that the academic portions were not looked at in this review and asked if that is right. Dr. Goodell responded that she has everything here that was looked at so Professor Margolius could look at it and see what was looked at.

Professor Margolius said that it looked to her like it was all related to Title IX. Dr. Goodell responded that she believes that is correct.

Professor Margolius then said that the question she has is, “Is it considered that now that the Student Conduct Code, after these revisions, we are not going to look at it for a long time?” She added that she has concerns about the academic side.

Dr. Goodell replied that there is no assumption to her knowledge of that. She thinks that committees should review the proposed Conduct Code regularly.

Provost Mageean commented that what is before Faculty Senate relates only to Title IX. However, a number of people had some concerns on the academic side so they will be raising that issue. She added that an active review will begin very shortly.

Vice President Boyd Yarbrough stated that because of the urgency of bringing Title XI issues to the Board of Trustees for approval in time, they didn’t want to delay this. They will take an appropriate amount of time to do a more substantive review of the entire process in the future.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that the Student Life Committee has proposed endorsing changes to the Student Conduct Code as outlined in the memo from Dr. Stella Iwuagwu and asked Senators to vote. The proposed changes to the Student Conduct Code were unanimously approved by voice vote.

XII. Electronic Learning Committee Recommendations (Report No. 53, 2013-2014)

Senator Linda Wolf, chair of the electronic Learning Committee, said that before she talks about the Online Course Assessment Tool (OCAT), she wanted to give Senate a little history. She noted that the E-Learning Committee would like to recommend the use of the OCAT for peer evaluation for on-line courses as a mechanism for continuous improvement. OCAT is for use with online courses only. It is not meant for peer review of face-to-face classes. She noted that the OCAT is a comprehensive tool because both course design and course delivery are evaluated in this. The previous E-Learning Advisory Committee reviewed numerous tools and this was the one that they found to be most comprehensive. Subsequently, the Electronic Learning Committee has reviewed it and have found it to be one of the best for this purpose. Professor Wolf stated that this particular tool has been used in the School of Nursing in their online graduate program for two or three years now. They use it not only to evaluate teaching and course design but they use it for accreditation purposes as well.

Professor Wolf asked Senators to look at the second page under the heading OCAT PROCESS DATA, where it says, “This course is Quality Matters approved: Yes or No” and if it is approved, you check yes. She added that she will talk about Quality Matters in a couple of minutes. Then, if yes, the year it was approved because Quality Matters certification approval is good for five years. She noted that there is a little blurb underneath regarding Quality Matters that it is a nationally recognized faculty-centered peer review process. It looks at eight standards and they are:

1. Course Overview and Introduction
2. Learning Objectives or Competencies
3. Assessment and Measurement
4. Instructional Material
5. Learner Interaction and Engagement
6. Course Technology
7. Learner Support
8. Accessibility

Professor Wolf added that it looks at a number of other things. Their committee then added, “Is the faculty member being reviewed the course designer?” because this particular OCAT Part A relates all of the course design and part B relates all teaching evaluation. She noted that if the faculty being reviewed is not the course designer, they do not need to evaluate Part A. If the faculty being reviewed is the course designer, then the entire Part A and Part B will be done.

Professor Wolf stated that the committee is recommending this for use for in on-line courses. She noted that questions have been asked about how long this takes. She said that depending on if Quality Matters approved it or not it can take anywhere from sixty to ninety minutes depending on how familiar you are with the tool. She added that they do these in Nursing; they conduct these every semester on every course that is taught so that each course is reviewed each semester and Nursing has a schedule for that. Since they do them every semester, they do have it down to a science. The Electronic Learning Committee is recommending that this be used for course evaluation for peer evaluation for on-line courses.

Senator Barbara Hoffman asked Professor Wolf to define peer. Professor Wolf replied that in the Nursing graduate program everyone that teaches a graduate program, those are peers; your fellow faculty members.

NOTE: From this point on, the flash drive ran out of space and the recording stopped. The remainder of the Minutes are from rough shorthand notes.

Professor Hoffman commented that a lot of people don't have peers in their department. Professor Wolf replied that you could ask someone from another department who has on-line courses to evaluate.

Professor Hoffman said that certainly we have a combination of people involved. Dr. Wolf stated that many of the peers in Nursing are reviewers too.

Professor Hoffman asked, “How many people do we have who are qualified in OCAT?” Professor Wolf responded that we don't have to be certified. In fact, it is done face to face in Nursing.

Professor Hoffman stated that she is concerned that there are not enough faculty in her college to teach on-line courses or to define a group of sufficiently large peer reviewers. Dr. Wolf commented that all of us in graduate programs in Nursing all do it.

Dr. Hoffman commented that this is not a common practice in colleges.

Senator Beth Ekelman remarked that Health Sciences has lots of courses. We have a pool of faculty willing to do peer reviews on peer evaluations. I would say you should have a discussion within your college and look for those who feel they have enough qualification. I am not quality certified. Dr. Wolf stated that you do not have to be certified.

Senator Mittie Davis Jones stated that in Urban Studies they have online courses but many are taught by part-time instructors. Those courses need to have standards and a process to assess if the standards are being met. Dr. Wolf reported that in Nursing they have one part-time faculty for undergraduate programs and each program is reviewed by one of them.

Professor Davis Jones inquired what action is being proposed by the committee. Professor Wolf replied that this is just a point of information on a tool that faculty could use as a peer evaluation tool.

Dr. Goodell remarked that this has been proved very reliable.

Professor Karem stated that one reason E-Learning is working on this is that the promotion process requires procedures and standards on recommendations for peer evaluation. E-Learning is proposing using a best practice model. There is a problem over who is qualified. If people are going to get promoted, we need some process for evaluation.

Senator Marius Boboc inquired, "How do you at some point quantify feedback? How can it become part of the dossier in order to quantify continuous progress as a professional?" He asked, "How is it done in Nursing?" Professor Wolf answered, "By different people." She noted that in Nursing, a good chunk of their courses are already certified. She added that you look at how that person is teaching. In Nursing they only have two new faculty teaching the undergraduate program.

Dr. Goodell said that it would be very helpful for people to take this information back to their colleges. She added that it will be sent to the Deans in each college.

VIII. Website and Senate Statements related to A.S.A. Resolution (Report No. 54, 2013-2014)

President Berkman stated that this is just an opportunity for Senate to comment on the ASA (American Studies Association) Resolution to endorse an Academic Boycott of Israel. This is an academic freedom issue. He reported that this occurred during the

winter break. One hundred fifty university presidents signed the statement and it was followed by AAUP opposing the boycott. He noted that if Faculty Senate wanted to consider it or have a discussion of it, Faculty Senate should be provided the opportunity.

Dr. Goodell reported that this issue was not discussed at our last Academic Steering Committee meeting but we decided to bring it to Faculty Senate for discussion.

An unidentified student commented, "In general, when the university makes such a decision, how does CSU come to that particular statement?"

Provost Mageean responded that we speak only for ourselves.

President Berkman noted that he and the Provost made the statement and they brought it to Faculty Senate.

Dr. Karem asked, as a former member of ASA, "Is there a resolution on the floor?" Faculty Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy noted that someone could make a motion.

Professor Karem stated that he would be in support of bringing a motion to the floor. He went on to say that a boycott is contrary to academic freedom. Engagement and dialogue is always better. It is imperialistic to adopt the ASA resolution. No resolutions were offered on the topic.

XIV. Open Question Time

Textbooks: Professor Eileen Berlin Ray said that she had a comment for Ms. Allie Dumski and President Berkman on the issue of books for students. She noted that there are other options, good ones that were not discussed. Her students find textbooks in other places other than the Book Store at steep discounts. She noted that given the 4 to 3 conversion, she might not cover several chapters. So renting chapters is an option. She pointed out that we are limited in how we work with the Book Store.

Senator Kathleen Little suggested putting the textbooks in the Library.

Senator Linda Wolf commented that Nursing operates differently. They have a set of textbooks that are used in five classes. A number of other textbooks are used in the Nursing program. These books are lent to students by surrendering their student IDs and their IDs are returned to them when they return the books. There are creative ways for students to acquire and use textbooks.

Provost Mageean noted that students are pretty savvy. In addition to the Bookstore, students may shop at Amazon. She noted that we also have to look at electronic textbooks as alternatives. The Reserve in the Library has not been heavily used.

Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange commented that alternatives have not been uniformly used by instructors.

Provost Mageean also noted that in the Colleges of Engineering and Sciences some textbooks are over \$200. If you don't buy the book, the success rate comes down. This is a student success issue.

Professor Krebs remarked that he is not familiar with copyright laws and their impact on these discussions.

Dr. Glenda Thornton, Director of the Michael Schwartz Library, stated that we have several issues here: 1) the cost of these textbooks; 2) giving instructors individual use only; 3) the fact that our sister institutions around the State are putting some textbooks in the library, and 4) the issue is security. We could explore the possibilities.

SGA President Dumski asked, "Who would buy the textbooks? For some courses Professors put them in the Tutoring Center which allows students to go there when they need to use the textbook." She advocated to at least have this as an option. She added that she encourages Professors to standardize their textbooks. She asked, "Who is purchasing the textbooks?" She went on to say that \$200 from a department's budget is better than forty students purchasing them separately.

Senator James Marino suggested that we take no particular position on Professors donating textbooks to the library.

Professor Visocky-O'Grady commented that there is no budget line for that, but it is a good idea although she doesn't have any budget to do that.

Capital Plan: Professor Karem began a different discussion about capital improvements. He mentioned a specific case of a hanging ceiling. He questioned if there was a way to get this taken care of.

President Berkman asked Professor Karem if he tried to call on his cell phone. The President stated that we are in the last stages of selecting a Master Planning firm. There are lots of buildings and lots of issues to take a look at relative to the physical plant. He noted that he is meeting with the group that has been recommended as the Master Planning firm to make recommendations on what steps can be taken. He inherited a very large deferred maintenance budget. We are taking a bite out of this deferral through the bond issue. Deferred maintenance represents \$100 million of the total bond issue. We need \$13 million of funds regarding renovating classrooms. He noted that \$100 million is not enough. It is hoped that the Master Planning Committee can give us a clear way to plan. He added that Rhodes Tower and the Wolstein Center are ticking time bombs. President Berkman asked that if there are any safety issues, please call X-2500 and let us know immediately. There are policies in place and a maintenance team goes through two cycles per year aggressively making contact with

departments. Any time you feel your needs are not being met, then we will look into it. The phone number to call is 216-906-5348.

Professor Lieske commented that as a follow up, he hopes there is a triage plan in place. In Rhodes Tower, we had two water breaks in one year. There is concern about IS&T and the Library being taken out.

Email Policy: Dr. Goodell noted that we have an additional item and that is the upcoming email policy.

Associate Vice President Tim Long reported that at the moment the University does not have an email policy approved by the Board of Trustees, a continuing audit point that remains to be addressed. This policy relates to issues we had on campus with the "Freedom of Information Request" because of redirection of CSU to a personal account. We have a campus-wide email system. The wholesale direction of email is not quite the problem that it was. The policy being formulated will be presented to our senior staff next week. This policy will have a thirty day comment period and then go to the Board of Trustees at the March meeting. This policy draft was brought to the Academic Steering Committee and we discussed what we intend to do.

Dr. Goodell stated that we have a committee on Information Technology and they are taking a look at the email policy. She also encouraged everyone to look at the email policy. There will be a time for public comment. She added that notification will go out after the Senior Staff meeting next week. Then there will be a month of comment period.

XV. New Business

Professor Marino reported that he just received his Faculty Senate meeting packet this afternoon. He stated that Senators are supposed to read the materials before the Faculty Senate meeting but do not have enough time. Meeting packets should be sent out much earlier than they have been.

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 5:05 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel