

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

OCTOBER 15, 2014

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, W. Bowen, Delatte, Delgado, Ekelman, Elkins, Engelking, Fodor, Galleta, Granot for Jayanti, Gross, Hampton, Hoffman, Holland, Inniss, D. Jackson, Karem, S. Kaufman, Krebs, Little, Liu, Lupton, Margolius, Marino, C. C. May, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Robichaud, Spicer, Sridhar, Visocky-O'Grady, Zingale.

Artbauer, R. Berkman, Dumski, J. Ford, LeVine, Mageean, McHenry, Ramos, Sawicki, Yarbrough, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Dobeck, Gorla, R. Henry, Holsinger, Kalafatis, Kosteas, Lazarus, Majette, Mazumder, O'Neill, Rashidi, Shukla, Storrud-Barnes, Talu, W. Wang, Wolf.

Boise, Bond, Bowling, C. Brown, Halasah, E. Hill, Jadallah, Karlsson, Lock, Mazzola, Novy, Parry, Sadlek, Spademan, Thornton, Triplett, B. White, Zachariah.

ALSO

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

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

I. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of October 15, 2014

Senate President Sridhar stated that before approving the Agenda for today's meeting, he has a couple of changes to the Agenda. He noted that the Minutes of the meeting of September 10, 2014 are not ready for approval yet. The Senate Secretary is working hard at getting them ready. In addition, we don't have any reports from the University Curriculum Committee and the Admissions and Standards Committee. He reported that the University Curriculum Committee has had a hard time getting everybody together. They have just started meeting so they don't have anything to bring to Senate for approval yet so the UCC and the Admissions and Standards Committee will be removed from the Agenda. Dr. Sridhar then asked Senators for a vote to approve the

Agenda for today's meeting. The Agenda as amended was approved unanimously by voice vote.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Dr. Sridhar noted that this is his first report as the Senate President. This past month was a whole month of firsts - his first Board of Trustees meeting which was eliminated, but his first Faculty Senate meeting and of course his first block party on campus. Many congratulations to the university in celebration of our fiftieth anniversary. He said that he believes that President Berkman has a few more things to add in his report.

Dr. Sridhar stated that he has a few important items to talk about but he will keep his remarks brief and a few other things that he will not go into details right now.

Dr. Sridhar said that the first and most important thing is centered in front of everyone of course is Program Prioritization. He noted that everyone saw a report from the Provost yesterday that details all of the programs in the university, at least all of the majors, and where they went. This has been a long process and we, as a faculty, have been waiting with bated breath for some news or any news about the process and how we can provide input. While we do recognize that this is a very important step for the university and a whole, he is sure that most faculty members will join him in saying that the faculty feels a little bit left out. He noted that faculty input into this process is not been sought in any kind of systematic manner. Some Deans have chosen to share some of these many steps with their faculty and asked for responses but the feedback mechanism is not one that has been put in place in any specific manner.

Dr. Sridhar reported that over the last several weeks, he has been in conversations with a number of faculty colleagues across campus and he has had a chance to find out from them, even some department chairs in different colleges, that the level of information that they have received from their deans has been varying in level of content and quality. In fact, he even asked Provost Mageean, after a number of these conversations, if she expected that the faculty who have actually seen the immediate steps and provided feedback. Some deans did solicit faculty feedback and some did not. He stated, so what we now have in front of us is a document that needs some drastic recommendations with only a little bit of faculty input. He noted that at the last Steering Committee meeting, the members of the committee pressed the Provost on two things: to release the report to the entire faculty and to give faculty a sense of what will follow the report as well. At this point, Dr. Sridhar thanked the Provost for getting the report out before today's meeting. He stated that he believes that the Provost has some remarks about his second point.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the alarming part of this Program Prioritization report of course is the large number of programs that have been recommended to be suspended. He said that it is the administration's responsibility to look at budget feedbacks of different programs. He noted that in the Provost's email yesterday did indicate that any

program alterations would go through the Faculty Senate process. During the last few weeks, he has been in conversations with the Provost to see this played out a little bit more. In particular, he has been talking with the Provost about what such a curricular review would actually mean. Is it a matter of going through the motions of making alterations or will there be real review. Will the committees have a chance to really examine whether a particular program aligns with the university's curricular priorities? Dr. Sridhar stated that the Provost has said that her office has spent a significant amount of time and effort collecting and assembling a large amount of data that has formed the report. This has been going on for several months now and there has been a lot of effort that has gone into it. He has been engaged with a conversation with the Provost that this data is made available to the faculty committees as they perform any curricular review that comes along. He noted that they have not reached an agreement on how this might work but he will continue to work with the Provost on this matter.

Dr. Sridhar reported that at the next Steering Committee meeting, we do anticipate spending a large portion of time discussing this process and where we go next with this report. He said that if anyone has any specific comments, they should be sure to get those comments to their Steering representative before next week's meeting.

Professor Sridhar stated that the Provost has been saying for a while that any talk of faculty hiring will come after the Program Prioritization process is complete. He noted that there are a few faculty searches that are moving forward this year in special cases and the Provost will give us report about that in a few minutes.

Dr. Sridhar noted that another item that came up at the last Senate meeting was the proposal to create a new Honors College. He reported that after the meeting last month, he met with Dr. Elizabeth Lehfelddt, the Interim Director of the Honors Program, along with the chairs of the University Curriculum Committee, Admissions and Standards Committee and the University Faculty Affairs Committee to discuss the proposal. Because the item that would be important to address the proposal and also briefly discuss the timeline, they are still waiting for the actual proposal. He noted that as soon as the proposal comes through, the committees will begin reviewing it.

Dr. Sridhar reported that another matter that was brought to his attention at the last Steering Committee meeting was from our colleagues at the Law College. He noted that over the last several months, the Dean has been working on several measures of the budget of the Law School. On September 11, 2014, the Law School faculty called a special meeting and at that meeting, the faculty voted to pass a motion of disapproval of the actions of the Dean. He stated that such actions and budget discussions are outside of the purviews of shared governance of this Senate, but it is of note for the faculty across the university that such action by faculty in one college did occur. He noted that members did receive in their meeting packets a copy of the resolution that the Law School faculty passed. After this meeting, President Berkman and Provost Mageean along with Associate Vice President Tim Long met with the faculty of the Law College on October 2, 2014 to discuss this matter further and to talk about budgetary processes at the university. Dr. Sridhar noted that he wasn't present at that meeting so he won't be

able to provide any more details about what actually transpired at that meeting although he heard some reports from some people.

Finally, Dr. Sridhar noted that he wanted to talk about the master planning process. The Smith Group JJR, the consultants that CSU hired to help develop our next master plan are close to finalizing their plan. He stated that he had a chance to see a presentation of this plan at the September Board of Trustees meeting and he knows that they came back to campus last week to meet with faculty groups. Unfortunately, Dr. Sridhar was out of town last week conducting a program review at another university and missed these meetings on the master plan. He noted that there were several members of the Committee on Academic Space and the Student Life Committee that did attend and he received reports from some of them. One comment that he does want to bring up here at Senate was some indicated that their experiences working with other universities, the level of involvement that they saw from the faculty at CSU was relatively high, much higher than at other places. Dr. Sridhar went on to thank everyone in this meeting and other colleagues who are not here but have been engaged in this process for having done so. He noted that last year when this process began, everyone will remember that the timeline was originally set to be just a few weeks. We, as a faculty, raised an objection that we didn't have a chance to provide input. He said that the administration did listen to us and extended the timeline and he is sincerely thankful for all of his faculty colleagues who have been engaged with this process. He added that this our campus and we do care about what goes on here and we continue to show that we do. He stated that we still have a few more days to provide input and he encouraged everyone to look at the presentation that has been posted and let the planning group know if you have any comments.

III. Senate Nominating Committee Election of Faculty Senate Vice President

Senator William Bowen reported that the Nominating Committee for the Vice President of Faculty Senate met and talked to a number of people and decided to put forth two names – one is Cheryl Delgado from Nursing and the other is Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady from Art (CLASS). He noted that ballots are being distributed and asked everyone to vote. Professor Cheryl Delgado (Nursing) was elected at the new Faculty Senate Vice President.

IV. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman began by seconding Professor Sridhar's comments concerning the level of participation that we had in the master plan. Indeed the master plan consultants have done dozens of university plans and did say that this was one of the highest levels with over two thousand comments on the web site which, in a master planning process, is an awful lot of traffic. He stated that the consultants carefully looked at all of the comments and again, were here last week to roll it out to those faculty members who wanted to see what is close to a final reiteration. President Berkman

reminded everyone that it is a master plan, which is in part fantasy and in part reality. He noted that the reality part is the price tag and the fantasy part is the price tag, but it does really provide at least some short term issues that really need to be addressed in terms of the campus infrastructure and the academic infrastructure and it helped us walk through those.

President Berkman said that he wanted to alert everyone to the fact that there are a series of discussions going on now state-wide with all of the Presidents concerning the new funding formula and alterations in the new funding formula that would take place with the 2015 biennium. Everyone may remember that in the initial iteration of the funding formula the university did relatively well largely based on our enrollment growth. In these new iterations of the formula, Cleveland State does much less well and indeed faces a significant threat if these were to be the assumptions that were to go into the new funding formula. President Berkman said that to him the assumptions clearly delineate between a bounty and a bonus for large residential campuses with strong FTIC populations and really discriminates significantly against urban campuses with strong transfer populations and a high percentage of students who have risk factors. He added that this is the new thing that keeps him up at night. It has a very significant price tag for us attached to it and the political dynamics are not the best since, in Ohio if you count the residential campuses, who benefit from the formula, as opposed to the gritty urban campuses and there he is leaving out Ohio State and Cincinnati – he is talking about the grittier campuses, the Youngstown, perhaps the Wright States and perhaps the Toledos – the numbers politically are not on our side. He stated that this will be a challenge and he wanted to make everyone aware of it. He didn't want to give all of the details or where we are now with it, but he wanted to make everyone aware that this is a very significant challenge.

President Berkman stated that he wanted to share with Senate some really, really good news on a couple of fronts. Vice President Tim Long has been working for a while to put together a set of dashboard indicators that would allow us over a three/four year period understand where we are in terms of key indices for the university and the health of the university. He wanted to share a couple of the data points which he thinks the faculty deserve credit for and acknowledgement for and also some in which he believes the administration deserves credit and acknowledgement. He said that he will give twelve, thirteen and fourteen. In twelve, thirteen and fourteen we went through significant review by Moody, and Standard and Poor's – everyone knows what those are and everyone knows what their purposes are – and we emerged in all of those three years with an A1 rating from Moody and an A+ rating from Standard and Poor's. Maybe even more importantly than that, and those are very strong bond ratings, even more important than that is the fact that we emerged with a stable outlook. Very few institutions in Ohio, given the new funding formula when doing a Moody, and Standard and Poor's review, which is really a two-hour conversation with the Review Committee, has emerged with a stable outlook. President Berkman said that what he feels best about and what everyone ought to feel best about, what we all as a community ought to feel best about, and some people when he came here he said that he could never be satisfied, he could never be comfortable as long as we had the lowest or one of the lowest graduation rates in the state

of Ohio. So, between 2011 and our 2014 actuals, in terms of graduation, and he doesn't have the exact number and he doesn't know if Janet Stimple is here and has the exact number, but in the spring of 2011 which was the 05 cohort – these are six-year graduation cohorts which apply to only the freshmen who started the institution and finished at the institution, does not calculate success for any transfers, it does not calculate success for graduate students, but nonetheless, unfortunately it is the coin of the realm in higher education this graduation rate. It is the IPEDS graduation rate. He noted that in 2011, the graduation rate, that 05 cohort, was 29.9%. He believes that in 09 when he came, our graduation rate was 25.6% and indeed we were the lowest in the state. Last year in 2014, the number that he last saw was a graduation rate of 39.8%. So, in this five/six year period we have seen an increase of about thirteen percentage points in our graduation rate and everyone, as a faculty, ought to take enormous pride in the fact that so many more students made it through the university and walked across the stage. For those faculty members who have attended graduations, you may remember how many students did walk across those stages. The same is true with retention and, of course, one leads to the other and that is our retention number rose from 64.9% in 2011 to this year's number of 69.7% for 2014. President Berkman said that our goal was to get to the statewide average, which was about 73 – 74% in terms of fall-to-fall first year retention, and as everyone can see, we are getting close. President Berkman said that again, he is sure from all of our perspectives that an enormous and significant step forward in terms of what we are doing for our students, how we are supporting our students, how we are educating our students, how we are selecting our students and the fact that they succeed in getting a degree. He said that to him, there could be no better news than that.

President Berkman reported that everyone recognizes also that we have increased our student credit hours that used to be which were funded on and will no longer be funded on but we increased our student credit hours from 302,969 in 2011 to the 2014 actual of 331,293 student credit hours. This is big in an environment in which most universities in the state of Ohio have lost both headcount and student credit hours. He said that he feels good about the report card and he hopes everyone feels good about the report card.

President Berkman noted that what he wanted to do today, which should take just a few minutes... Dr. Nigamanth Sridhar attended the Distinguished Alumni Awards Dinner. He didn't know if any other faculty attended the dinner, but he wanted to share with everyone the comments of the recipients so they don't have to come to the microphone and speak for twelve minutes and we could just actually do a two-minute video of them. What he has said, and he doesn't know if he has said it here year after year, there is never a distinguished alumni event; each college designates their choice for distinguished alumni; there is never an event in which most of the recipients do not talk about one or two faculty members that had an enormous impact on their lives. He noted that everyone would see that these are some incredibly successful people. He is only showing three out of the eleven that were awarded. They are incredibly successful accomplished people who thirty years or thirty-five years out of Cleveland State University – twenty to thirty years out of Cleveland State University, maybe some a little less – still recall and recite and talk about the impact that faculty had on their lives. He

said that he couldn't get everyone to come to the distinguished alumni events so he brought a little bit of it to them at Senate today. President Berkman then showed a video from the Distinguished Alumni Awards dinner featuring three distinguished alumni.

V. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Title IX. Provost Deirdre Mageean talked about Title IX training. She noted that some people might have been contacted about Title IX training. This is a very important issue for not just us but every university. You cannot escape the headlines in the *Chronicle*, inside Higher Education and every other area about failures of universities to address headline complaints of discrimination and harassment of which sadly there are many. The fact of the matter is, we are all kind of in the front line of this and we need to be trained to be aware of the issues, to be aware of the reporting requirements, to be part of the offices that we use, and doing this is a very, very serious issue. It is probably unfortunately, not here, but in many institutions, swept under the carpet or to be kept secret in order to protect images of universities. And, not just universities, but now the feds, the Obama administration, several senators, taking this issue seriously as they should and they are putting us under the microscope and giving us orders about what we need to do.

Provost Mageean stated that we have embarked on a systematic effort to do Title IX training and in consultation with the Legal and Compliance Office and the Office for Institutional Equity directed by Dr. Yulanda McCarty-Harris. She reported that it was agreed that a modular training produced by the Law School is the best way for all of us to go through this. She noted that she volunteered her staff and the Provost's Council is the initial guinea pigs to do this and to be the first to be sent through our three-hour training and they asked a lot of questions. She noted that one of the policies may sometimes have ambiguities and sometimes we don't always know the answers. She reported that the training was successful. The modular program is good. It has the advantages that while it might take you sixty minutes plus to get through it, you can stop and move on at various stages unlike some things we have on our own computer systems here. It doesn't punish you for leaving and you don't lose all of your work when you come back but you do have to pass the quiz to move on to the next step. Provost Mageean stated that the next layer down are the Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Chairs, Directors and a lot of people have been through that training already. We have something in the order of well over one hundred people, faculty and staff, trained. However, we need to get all faculty trained. She has put forward the money to cover the license because it is a head-count based license fee to train all faculty. The fact of the matter is that faculty are the front line troops of this issue. All of the faculty know because of the relationships they have with their students in metering and guidance. She certainly remembers in her days when a student comes to you to disclose something and the question is, "What do you do? What are the reporting requirements that you have? What can you keep confidential and what can you know?" Provost Mageean noted that this training helps you and positions you to meet that role and to understand what you do in those circumstances. She stated that she cannot make it mandatory but she is strongly encouraging faculty to be involved in this. It is in the faculty's interest; it is in the students' interest; it is in the institution's

interest to get this right. She went on to say, “Let’s face it; there are a lot of things they don’t train us for when they put us in the classroom as faculty. You did your Ph.D. and basically have knowledge of how to write a Ph.D., which hardly teaches us to teach if we are lucky. It is a complex world in that classroom and there are a lot of things going on and faculty need to have the tools to know how to deal with them.” Provost Mageean reported that Ms. Rachel King, Chief Compliance Officer, and her colleagues will be reaching out through the Deans, through the colleges to try to make sure that this is made available to all faculty on their computers. Faculty can do the training from the comfort of their homes or their offices; it’s modular. Again, Provost Mageean asked all faculty to please do this. At this point, Provost Mageean asked if anyone at Senate today has already gone through that training. She stated that the training is not overly burdensome and some are getting through it and the payoff is considerable. She thanked everyone for their time on this issue.

Program Prioritization. Provost Mageean stated that she has been trying to keep everyone informed about that from several months ago about what the process was and what we were trying to accomplish. She noted that President Berkman talked today about changes to the budgetary formula and she thinks this is just one force that is affecting all of us. Somebody said that the only thing that’s certain in higher education these days is uncertainty. We know that we are all being buffeted by various forces, budgetary, oversight, compliance, demographics in our case affecting our enrollment, and so we find ourselves, as a university, trying to be responsive, trying to position ourselves for long-term sustainability, trying to respond to workforce needs which essentially effects budget, at least in Academic Affairs – a fixed budget and obviously the threats of even potential climbing budget. She noted that we also find ourselves extremely stressed. One of the things she noticed when she came here is really how relatively few faculty we have for all of the things that we do. Obviously she can’t comment on the history of why that happened or why it is, but it is what it is and we find ourselves extremely stressed. So, what we are trying to do in this process is related a little bit to how we can position the university’s long-time sustainability, looking at where the strong demand was, workforce needs, the strength of programs and then trying to liberate up some resources that might help us invest and understanding that there is really no new investment coming to help us to respond in those areas.

Provost Mageean noted that in addition, we have other things going on that we had to contend with. There is the College of Engineering that does not have a permanent budget because the last go around; we had rather savage budget cuts of some fourteen percent. They did not cut positions but they offered up their operating budget. Other colleges chose to let positions go and she has been keeping that college going through transfers out of her budget on a temporary basis on a year-to-year so they are kind of not hand to mouth existence but certainly not where those colleges would like to be. They are also one of our fastest growing colleges and because of that she has asked the dean in the college to give her a five-year plan, where that growth might take us. That is just one indication of one issue that we now face. There are other course priorities that we are trying to build like our NEOMED partnership, which requires a permanent budget and that, too, has to be funded. But, in the meantime, even before we start this program

prioritization, other parts of the university are also looking at the realities they are dealing with. One of them was the Law School that has been working on its one forty plan which required them to bring back something they order three quarters of a million of faculty positions. By the way, those lines do not come back to the Provost for recirculation somewhere else. Those went straight back into the university budget and they are still about \$260,000 short in that but they have \$216,000 and they have been working on that. And, colleges that have been feeling a lot of change because of external forces like the College of Education. She noted that she really had to take a serious look at what programs they can offer, what programs they can let go, and what programs are truly needed and they have all of this before this meeting talking amongst them. She knows that Urban has been doing this as well. Provost Mageean stated that they have really been trying to bring this together in some kind of coherent way and to carry on using the metrics that were first devised with the Budget Task Force and the first systematic attempt at program prioritization, which was under former Provost Mearns. She said that she promises Senate, and she speaks from experience, that it is a totally futile exercise to start ranking programs from one to one hundred. Frankly, it becomes meaningless. So they went with the fairly basic one of where there are opportunities for investment as demanded by enrollment growth, strength of program workforce needs, etc. and strategic directions of the university, where things look stable, and that's two, and two is a good place to be actually, and three, those areas that they thought could be discontinued without serious impact on the university of a tuition nature, of an enrollment or credit hour nature, that it doesn't impact other programs. She added that this stuff is extremely complex and that is why it has taken them so long. They have sat there centrally as the minister of center looking at all of these issues, looking at all of the data, numerous and iterative conversations with deans and others about this, trying to bring a whole university-wide perspective. It is natural that people would look at their department, their program, their college, but in fact the rebalancing of the resources has to be done across the university. It was easier for them to just do this first pass-through and then put those recommendations out there for consideration. Provost Mageean noted that when they looked at the ones that we discontinued, frankly, there is a very small enrollment and there were ones that they discontinued without impacting other areas of the university substantially. This is actually very tricky because we are growing something or discontinuing something and there are domino effects in all of their programs. If Engineering is growing, it puts an increased pressure on GenEd programs in other parts of the university. If Health Sciences or Nursing are going as they are, it too puts pressure on those others so you have to make sure you don't impact any of those areas that would in some ways undercut or undermine the growth in other areas. Provost Mageean stated that we have Masters programs that had filling enrollments, we had some majors with very small enrollments, and some of those areas that we looked at were being cross listed, sometimes with gaps that were indefensible 200s to 600s or 200s to 500s and people were being asked to teach a lot of these courses. She knows that sometimes it's not the faculty's fault because faculty were actually responding to an earlier request to increase graduate programs. She stated that this is the reality that we are dealing with. We have awful diseconomies of skill in the university. We have very, very small departments and then in every one of these small departments, we are taking out someone from teaching to be the chair or taking out somebody out of the classroom to be a graduate director. We

are pulling people out of the classrooms in a number of cases. She would like to see people getting back into the classrooms and she is as guilty of this as anybody else because she takes people out of the classroom and appoints them as interim director of Honors Programs and things like that. So, given the small number that we started with, we had to get very realistic about what it was that we were able to do and where we can continue to grow. Provost Mageean stated that we may not be rewarded with student credit hours but tuition is still a big part of our bread and butter, and, if we don't follow where the enrollments are, we certainly will feel that very quickly in our pocketbook.

Provost Mageean noted that these plans are out there. As Dr. Sridhar mentioned, some things he chose to communicate more extensively than others and in one college dealing with all of the chairs. She has asked the deans some time ago to start setting up meetings with the colleges. She noted that she along with the team that worked on this will come to all of those meetings, talk to people, take their comments, answer their questions, and talk about the data points that are there. She will make available to everyone the data that they have used but don't expect to see any magic algorithms or formula because they did not use them. As she said in her comments, they were data informed; not data driven and she will also ask Dr. Sridhar to work with her in university-wide meetings so that different parties can hear from different parts in the university because everyone here in Faculty Senate obviously are part of an enterprise ensuring governance which considers the university as a whole. Most people are in their departments and in their colleges dealing with the day-to-day realities of that world and don't always have an opportunity to understand and appreciate some of the larger issues.

Provost Mageean stated, this is where we are with things. She said she would like to move this along as quickly as possible once the line for inputs and opportunities to challenge or address some of these issues. Everyone knows that they have been holding positions until some of these issues are resolved on the simple grounds that it would be very short-sited and certainly not strategic to start just assigning positions when we haven't really resolved where we thought the growth was going to be. Then we would find ourselves with total misalignment between resources and with where the growth ought to be. She said that she told all of the deans that certainly visiting positions and temporary positions would be made available to all of the colleges in the meantime so that nothing is left without a person in the classroom and she would be happy to do that.

Provost Mageean commented that at the last Senate meeting, faculty asked for the number of faculty departures and those positions she reported back then are sixty-two full-time faculty hires including thirty-four tenure positions had been made the previous year but this compares to our loss this past year of twenty-four tenured or tenure-track faculty including eighteen retirements and six resignations. They also had resignations of five lecturers but some of those two positions were as tenure-track assistant professors, which was nice to see. For this coming year, she has authorized a small number of hires pending the outcome of program prioritization. Those are a couple of areas where it is critical to have people in for accreditation and in some clinical positions where simply the process couldn't move forward without somebody with tenure or in a tenure position.

Provost Mageean stated that they are still moving ahead. She has authorized searches for eight tenure-track positions, four college lecturers, and seven new visitors for a total of nineteen positions. Again, it would be premature for her to release positions without coming to a conclusion around programs that would actually grow. She still has acted on a request to extend seventeen visiting positions but those were in the works. We have nineteen requests for urgent tenure-track and lecturer hires and we have some emergency visitor replacements. Sadly, we have had faculty die and others leave in mid-semester so we obviously have to get those people replaced. She noted that this would bring us to a total of seven new hires and that is more than our budget can stand for this year but she is working very hard with the deans to make sure that we have the classes covered. Provost Mageean commented that we have, in many ways, been doing this, as she mentioned in her memo to the faculty, it is sort of a de facto reallocation of positions. She thought it a lot better just to put it out there and talk about the forces and show the data and tell everyone what's going on behind some of that thinking. She has worked really, really hard with the colleges on this. In some ways, we are very fortunate because given the changes in STRS and the retirements that we have, it does give us the flexibility to reallocate without closing down units and departments and laying anybody off so at least we have that flexibility to move forward with good will to make sure that everything is realigned in the places where there is growth. Provost Mageean noted that it is extensive data so probably most senators have not had a chance to get through everything. Everyone will notice that in addition to our category three which is suggested recommended spending, there is a fourth because we thought we did a lot more in some areas. In a few areas, there were external or accrediting reviews imminent or ongoing and we thought it best to wait until we got that feedback from that before jumping ...

VI. Report of the Student Government Association (Report No. 9, 2014-2015)

Ms. Allie Dumski thanked everyone for the opportunity to speak at Faculty Senate today. She noted that it has been a busy couple of weeks after a successful homecoming. The Executive Board is fully engaged in their list of fifty and they really enjoyed working with some of the faculty on their committees.

Ms. Dumski stated that today she would like to talk about something that is new to SGA's list of fifty and that is internship credit. Last week, the College of Business hosted their first internship and co-op fair with over thirty employers. There was a great turnout of students and employers there and as students, they greatly appreciate these opportunities. She noted that there are numerous benefits to interning and SGA wants students to take up these offers but they also want the students to get credit for them. Most students do summer internships ranging from twenty to forty hours per week. To credit hour standards, this is about three credits and that is one elective or three credits closer to graduation and a good experience to add to students' resume for post-grad life. Over the summer, this would cost students \$1,204.50. As a college student, that's a lot of money to pay to work in exchange for what SGA sees as little classroom usage and little professor interaction. She stated that she spoke to a student recently who interned at Lubrizol over this summer at forty hours per week. To receive credit, all the student had

to do was write a four to five page paper on her experience. She received the paper requirements from her advisor through an email and had no professor interaction or mentorship – all of this for \$1,204.50. Ms. Dumski stated that she realizes that this is just one student's experience but it does open the door for discussion. She went on to say that maybe we need to evaluate the professor interaction with students during internships or maybe we should re-evaluate the cost of internship credit. She said that she truly believe that students pass up the opportunity to get credit for their internships because of the cost. Students completing internships and graduating faster not only benefit the students but the university. Ms. Dumski said that they want to make sure that if students are paying this much money for credits to appear on a piece of paper, that it is money well spent. She commented that if faculty has had a good experience mentoring an intern student, SGA would love to hear their story. SGA plans to work with the Provost's Office to further discuss this but she wanted to open it up to the Faculty Senate to see if anybody had any feedback for them. Typically, she would be here throughout the Senate meeting, but she has a finance exam today at 6:00 PM so she is going to sneak out. She added that if anyone had any thoughts, they should email her and she looks forward to hearing from them and working with them more.

VII. University Faculty Affairs Committee (Report No. 10, 2014-2015)

Senator Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, stated that he had just a few quick updates to report. First, is the re-visitation of the Student Evaluation procedures and processes which is ongoing and UFAC continues to work on that.

UFAC has received a number of inquiries about procedures in the Greenbook regarding chair searches and they are responding to those. UFAC is also moving ahead on the questions the Senate posed about the posting of policies during the summer and they are working with the Office of Compliance to find some common ground on that.

Dr. Karem remarked that the last thing he wanted to say is on the Provost's words about Title IX training. He stated that if Senators are not familiar with Title IX, this is a section that deals with issues of equity, discrimination, harassment, and really important issues as the Provost said according to the news. Something people may not know is that there really has been a sea change in how universities are obligated to handle these. Twenty years ago, it would have probably been sufficient for a faculty member simply not to do anything that is harassing or discriminatory. He noted, that's a good start. However, under new Federal Law, if you witness or are aware of, or if someone confides to you something, with varying degrees of confidentiality requirements, you do have a duty to report or you will not be fulfilling your role as a faculty member. One of the reasons why the training is so important is so that faculty knows what they need to do to fulfill their duties to the students and to the community and also to ensure that faculty is doing what the university needs you to do. So, it is not just a matter of technicalities and small details of training. There are nuances but there is a really important change to how the laws work. He stated that when faculty gets the invitation, he would encourage faculty to complete the training. If anyone has questions, he knows that the Office of

Institutional Equity and the Office of Compliance are both very responsive in answering questions and he encourages everyone to talk to those offices.

VIII. Advancement – Alumni Records and Solicitation (Report No. 11, 2014-2015)

Vice President Berinthia LeVine thanked Faculty Senate for inviting her and Brian Breitholz to attend Faculty Senate today. She said that they are really appreciative of the opportunity to talk about University Advancement and the CSU Foundation. Ms. LeVine noted that she wanted to share a little bit about what they do in University Advancement. Using a PowerPoint presentation, she stated that the definition for what they do is, they raise, they receive and management of private gifts for the advancement and benefit of Cleveland State University. And, of course in doing so, they maintain very strong connections with our alumni. She reported that this past year, we had a record-breaking year for the university. We raised over \$20.3 million and this is a first, ever, and it is due in large part to the fund-raising prowess of our President. She went on to say that in order to raise these kinds of dollars, we need to have transformational gifts. Transformational gifts are gifts that are seven figures and above. She referred everyone to the PowerPoint presentation listing of the transformational fundraising that was done this past year. Not only a million dollars for our Radiance Scholarships but the \$3.6 million gift that was committed for the Mandel Honor College, our \$10 million gift from Parker Hannifin Foundation and Don and Pam Washkewicz and the \$1 million gift from the Glasscock family for scholarships. Now, this is a tremendous accomplishment for Cleveland State. The most recent year that we seeded \$6 or \$7 million was actually in 2010. Ms. LeVine stated that they are also very proud of the number of donors that we have. For the first time ever in the history of the university, crossed the 7,000 donor mark and we have the highest number ever of alumni donors as well. So, we believe that we are on a roll.

Ms. LeVine stated that she thought Senate would like to see how those dollars come in to the university, in other words, the source. She pointed out that the greatest percentage by far is from our alumni and our friends. She said that she wanted Senate to have a general sense of the importance of our alumni connections to the fundraising of the university as well as the significant support that we receive from the corporate community. People might ask, “Where did all of the money go this past year?” Referring to the pie chart shown in the presentation, she stated that obviously the \$10 million gift to the College of Engineering certainly skews the numbers. She noted that this chart changes every year and it really is dependent upon the gifts that we receive.

Ms. LeVine commented, “Where does the money go? How is it spent?” She reported that this past year, 42% of the dollars that we raised went to Endowment. She noted that she will talk about Endowment in a minute. Twenty-one percent went to operating. Generally, through the annual campaign and through Radiance, these are dollars that come through the Foundation to the University to the designated unit. The endowment stays at the Foundation and is invested and managed. Of course the capital dollars will come to the University for the capital projects for which they are designated. The CSU Foundation also has grown over the past years. She referred to a chart that

showed that we have the largest number of assets under management in the history of the University. We are still a small Foundation – we are at \$72.3 million; we have about 300 Endowed funds. Those funds spin off money for use for scholarships, for faculty support, for programmatic support.

Ms. LeVine stated that she thinks fundraising is often a mystery to many people. Now, she happens to love it. She likes the opportunity and she has probably the best position at the University because it's her opportunity to go out and talk to people about all of the great things that are happening at here at CSU and to encourage people to support all of those great things.

Ms. Levine noted that there are four broad areas that they oversee. The first is fundraising; bring charitable dollars into the University. Our Asst. V.P. Grant Pipers for that area oversees all of the fundraising for the University in the operational side. Alumni Affairs, and everyone will hear from Brian Breittholz in a few minutes; he is a great addition to our team. He brings over twenty-five years of experience in urban universities to our alumni work and we are already seeing a big difference in the engagement of our alumni.

Ms. Levine reported that in the Finance and Administration and all the administering of the funds through the Endowment – the investment of our dollars –that is handled through John Petrus and then of course our CSU Foundation. The CSU Foundation comprises many of our volunteers. She said she will talk about that in a minute. She commented that people always say, “Well, what do you do over there? Isn't it just going out and talking to somebody about supporting the University?” Ms. LeVine stated that it is a lot more than that. She said she will give everyone a sense of what these four components are.

Development – That is fundraising for our colleges; it's fundraising on our annual campaign; it's our Corporate and Foundation relations. For example, the grants that we receive from private foundations, that's what falls under the Corporate and Foundation relations principal gifts. Principle gifts at this University, by the way, are gifts of \$100,000 or more. They are few and far between and we need many, many more of them.

Charitable Gift Planning – That's for those people who include the University in their estate plan. We have been very lucky; we have been the recipients of many planned gifts and that adds to our bottom line.

Donor Relations – We cannot raise money if we don't have good relationships with our stakeholders and that includes everyone.

Alumni Affairs – Ms. LeVine stated that Brian Breittholz will talk a little bit more about this so she didn't want to go into that in detail but noted that this is our Alumni Association and its Board, our Student Alumni programming, volunteer engagement, the marketing and communications that we do for our unit and all of our events.

Finance and Administration – Ms. LeVine commented that we don't just go out and just raise money from somebody blind. We need to do prospect research and we have a couple of people on our team who provide the information that we know that we need before we go out to meet with a donor.

Accounting – Ms. LeVine stated that you can't raise money if you don't have trust from your stake holders. Those donors who give us money, they need to know what's happened and they want to know it in a timely way.

Donor Records and Reporting – Ms. LeVine reported that last year our team made 130,000 records changes for donor information. We updated over 9,000 Alumni records based on an Alumni survey that went out. This is time consuming and tedious but very important.

Gift Processing – Ms. LeVine noted that this is what happens when a person writes a check to the University and we say thank you. The check goes into our system and we hold it between 24 and 48 hours to send you an acknowledgement.

Database – Ms. LeVine stated that Brian Breittholz will talk about that.

Foundation – Ms. LeVine stated that our Foundation is a very important part of fundraising. Our Foundation Board has grown over the past three years from 26 members to 47 members plus a faculty representative, a student representative and representatives from each of the Visiting Committees. She noted that they oversee over thirty-five meetings per year of those volunteers either in one of our standing committees or in the Board. The Foundation is responsible for managing our Endowment and we have a professionally managed Endowment. She said that she is proud to say that this past year, our return on our investments was 17.3%, one of the highest in the country even though we are a small Foundations. Of course, our Foundation directors do fundraising as well.

Ms. LeVine commented that those people who know her well know that she often says fundraising is a team sport. It requires lots of different players. Faculty are perhaps some of the most important players because faculty are the line of first entry for our students and, as everyone saw from an earlier slide, Alumni comprise most of our donors. We have over 6,000 Alumni who participated in one way or another in writing a check to the university. She stated that she did not go into detail on all of the annual giving that was done. She would be remiss if she didn't thank those around the table for contributing to our Faculty/Staff Campaign because actually, we set a record. We had over 200 more donors this year than last year for our Faculty/Staff Campaign and set a new high for fundraising. That shows support of this university. She noted that President Berkman showed Senate some videos earlier today and actually; they put them on tosh together that she is not going to show Senate because it showed some of the same people that President Berkman showed. She noted that she pulled out the snippets where each of those recipients of their awards mentioned a faculty member. She commented that that is

what she hears when she goes out to meet with an Alumnus and she is talking to them about, “What do you remember at Cleveland State? They remember their faculty members.” So, that student that comes here and interacts with the faculty and then goes on to be successful, they are thinking about you (faculty) and your part of the team whether faculty are out there with her asking for money or whether the faculty member is behind the scenes working with and teaching and encouraging our students. So, she wanted to say thank you to the faculty for that.

Ms. Levine said that she could go into a lot more detail but she wanted to give Brian an opportunity to really talk about our Alumni because our Alumni are great and we have a lot of work that we need to do with them. She added that she and Brian are happy to take questions.

Mr. Brian Breittholz greeted everyone. He noted that in terms of the Alumni, we have a 120,000 folks who are Cleveland State Alumni of which 112,869 are currently living. He stated that 80% of our Alumni live in the Northeast Ohio area. From that Alumni base, we have 96,000 plus who are mailable so these are the folks we can actually reach through letters. Our phone records include 91,587 and our email records are actually 44,743, approximately 39% of our Alumni data base. He stated to keep in mind when it comes to those emails because oftentimes we just email the Alumni and we do email a lot to save money but open rates vary anywhere from five percent on a low end to 79% so there is great variance. Twenty-eight percent is the average of the open rates. Again, when sending an email message to a very segmented population, we will have a much higher open rate.

Alumni Profile – Mr. Breittholz noted that in the PowerPoint presentation, we have 62,000 plus with Bachelor’s degrees and then when the Master’s degrees are added and the terminal degrees, there are approximately an additional 37,000 alums and 164 Associate degrees.

Top Employers – Mr. Breittholz pointed to the top employers who employ our graduates in the area. What we don’t have is the exact numbers next to each employer because our records tend to be a little bit different. Our records will indicate one source, the company has a different number and the companies don’t often share, but we work very hard to get the data as strong as possible.

Increasing Alumni Engagement – Mr. Breittholz stated that this is the main priority of his. He pointed out a couple of initiatives that are underway. He stated that our goal really is to expand in a rich Alumni involvement at the different stages of their lives. He added that we couldn’t continue to do the one size fits all approach; it just doesn’t work so they are introducing a variety of new initiatives. Our past, for Cleveland programs are based on the concept of being a tourist in your own town and we will find the CSU connection to make that work. He noted they have had a number of programs that they offered including a tour of the Soldiers and Sailors monument. That one actually sold out over three times. He noted that it is very interesting that we are finding the success of being a tourist in your own town. They are doing another one coming up,

a Haunted Cleveland tour and they had ten spots left and posted the ten spots and within forty-five minutes all ten spots were gone. So, they are finding some new successes and it is really nice to have sold out events.

Volunteer Opportunities – Mr. Breittholz commented that volunteer opportunities were increased. What they have discovered when they do corporate records discussions, there are a lot of Alums who come up to us after the presentations and ask, “How do I get involved?” Mr. Breittholz noted that we didn’t have a strong mechanism for them to become involved. Typically, there was a Visiting Committee or the Alumni Board but there was very little additional for them so ways are being created with each of the Colleges to find ways to get people involved in more meaningful ways. He noted that one example is their new partnership with the Admissions area where they are creating a volunteer Alumni admissions recruiting network where our young Alums can help recruit incoming students to the university. Mr. Breittholz reported that they are also emphasizing more college programs because they know that some of our graduates have an affinity to their college and they are very interested in college-based programming so more of that will be seen as they roll out more programming that is college-based.

Work Place Alumni Chapters – Mr. Breittholz stated that it doesn’t really make a lot of sense now-a-days where everyone is stressed out with little free time where we have to go home at the end of the day and then go someplace to participate in an Alumni event. When we have so many of our Alums who actually work in Cleveland, in downtown Cleveland, why not create chapters within their companies. He noted that Sherwin Williams is our first group; they are going to pilot an Alumni Chapter with Sherwin Williams and that is kicking off on November 14, 2014 and they are very excited to see that new initiative and we are among two or three schools in the country that do similar programs. As part of the Fiftieth, they will be introducing a Fifty Fascinating Alumni book and website highlighting fascinating Alumni. They have reintroduced a Viking Traveler Program, which is group travel that typically appeals to an older segment of the population. They are rethinking their outreach and Alumni communication with our Viking E-News Letter and social media engagement. In general, they continue to think about, “How do we better personalize all of our email messages and our communication messages?” If you subscribe to the *New York Times* as an example, when you set up your subscription, you actually select what department you want to hear from, what news you want to receive. He noted that they want to be able to do more of that with our Alums so that they can identify with us. What do they want to hear about? What more information would they like? How would they like to become more meaningfully involved?

Alumni Survey – Mr. Breittholz reported that they recently did a survey of Alumni as part of our campaign readiness process. He noted that some of the findings were interesting. Over ninety percent of our Alumni believe that Cleveland State is effective in keeping the Alumni up-to-date on programs, activities, and progress – a great number. Eighty-four percent would recommend Cleveland State to potential students – also a very good number. If asked, 66% would give to their college or program, but interestingly, only 43% feel it is important for Alumni to make contributions. Fifty-nine

percent said their strongest point of connection is with their college or department and again, as Berinthia said, it is where faculty plays such a significant role. He asked, "Where do our Alumni live?" As you can see on the presentation in the dark green area that is the highest concentration; our top states are Ohio, Florida, California, Texas, Pennsylvania, and Illinois and then also the top counties and the top countries are shown. He added that it was interesting to see where our Alumni reside.

Mr. Breittholz thanked Faculty Senate for providing time for Berinthia and he to talk to Senate.

Ms. LeVine made one other comment. She noted that they are contemplating a major campaign for the university. They are in the middle of a leadership phase gift to that campaign and they are exploring what that goal might be and what the timetable might be. She asked everyone to stay tuned for information about the campaign.

Senator Andrew Gross thanked Ms. LeVine and Mr. Brettholz for coming to Senate. He said he appreciated it and noted that he may have had a small role in urging them to come and visit Faculty Senate. Dr. Gross stated that he is happy to hear from Ms. LeVine. He noted that he had just a few short questions. Number one, will disappear in the book of trans?? or trends ??

Ms. LeVine said, "Yes, this information is always in the book of trans." She said they also have an annual report that is posted on line that has all this information. She said that she is happy to send the link to it to Dr. Gross.

Dr. Gross had a question for Mr. Breittholz. He referred to the Alumni and said 120,000 Alumni and noted that's a very big group and he hopes that they are the number one stake for A) because of giving and B) because of acknowledging what they have learned and spreading the word. He commented, on that 120,000, 113,000 gave and about 96,000 are mail able so what percentage of those living or mail able, do give annually or even just one time. He asked if he heard right, about 6,000 gave?

Ms. LeVine said, "Yes." She stated that they are on the low side of percentages and we have historically been. She noted that their goal is to get to eight percent – that's a very ambitious goal. Dr. Gross agreed because the national average has shrunk from the high teens to the low teens and he has written about this. He said that he compared Harvey Mudd College in California, which was his own case there. He thanked Berinthia for sharing that number because that's really important.

Ms. LeVine stated that she thinks that things are looking up. In this most recent issue of the CSU Magazine and in the CSU Magazine they always put an envelope in and they rarely get it back. This year, they received almost \$7,000. She didn't know from how many donors but that's a lot of money to get from a magazine that, in the past, you would be lucky to get one or two maybe \$10 or \$25 gifts.

Dr. Gross stated that he was very heartened by hearing that 96,000 are mail able and e-mail able, etc. He noted he had two more short questions. One, in terms of the large givers, he is happy that his college has been renamed from “Nance” to “Ahuja” because “Nance” gave zero dollars. But, what he is asking here, and having been very vocal, the Fenn College should have had “Washkewicz-Fenn” or vice versa. He asked, “If somebody gave now X million to rename a college that is above \$10 million, would that be done? Could that be done? Should that be done?” He noted this is something he likes Ms. LeVine to ponder.

Ms. LeVine said that she would say this to everyone – we have gift agreements for every single significant gift that we have and those gift agreements lay out quite specifically how the naming is to be and under what circumstances that naming might be changed. She said that they are very clear about policies and procedures. She stated that she follows the rules so we need to have policies and procedures because you can’t build trust if you don’t.

Dr. Gross stated that his last question is, “Last Sunday in the employment section of the *Plain Dealer*, not too many advertise any more, there were nine positions for Advancement at Kent State University. He noted that surprised the heck out of him and he is wondering how we compare in terms of staffing vis-a-vis our sister institutions in Northeast Ohio.

Ms. LeVine replied that we are on the low side. She noted that Kent State University raised \$250 million in their campaign and they have one hundred on their staff. She has a chart in her office, she is sorry she didn’t bring it today, that shows sizes of staff. It is a study that was done and it benchmarks size of staff against dollars raised. Cleveland State is in the lowest quartile. This past year, we were almost on the upper end of what we could raise, what studies show is raised, given the size staff that we have. So, if you look at other high performing institutions that are raising lots and lots of money, they have a team out there that is much larger than ours.

Dr. Sridhar asked, “How big is our staff?”

Ms. LeVine responded that we have in the Advancement Division that’s on the Advancement Division payroll thirty-eight people. In the Law School, there are three additional people. We do not have one fundraiser for every college. Many colleges across this country and in this State have at least three people in each college doing fundraising.

Senator Nick Zingale commented that since we are low on resources, in what ways does the Advancement Office work with recruiting particularly with Alumni information or sharing Alumni data? He noted that it seems like there might be a connection there where the potential for boosting our recruiting efforts of new students by connecting them with what we know about our Alumni.

Ms. LeVine responded that they believe that we have been under involved historically and she will let Mr. Breittholz talk because we are moving in that direction.

Mr. Breittholz stated, "Yes, we are moving in that direction and we find that Alumni and especially young Alumni can speak very well to perspective incoming students about the benefits of Cleveland State so that's why we are entering in this partnership with the Admissions Office to train as many good volunteers as we can get to help with recruitment. On the flip side, we are going to look at the actual graduation aspect and career mentoring and how we can begin to partner up our Alumni with students who are about to enter the work force as well."

Ms. LeVine added that we need to get many more people to feel like they are owners of the enterprise. When they feel like they are owners of the enterprise, they are going to write that check and they are going to write that bigger check. This is one way that we can help our Alumni feel like they are truly, not just graduates, but owners of this institution.

Senator Karem stated that he had a suggestion for future thought. He commented that at Steering there are some faculty members who feel most comfortable just being in the classroom and not going out in another context. He noted that there are some faculty who are comfortable going out so Ms. LeVine might consider soliciting or making a request to see if there are people who are interested in doing something to make their discipline or something they do accessible to Alumni or other members of the community. There are a lot of us who do work in the community and we can modulate what we do in the classroom to do something for the Alumni audience and that could be a good way to kind of increase that sense of ownership.

Ms. LeVine said that they definitely want to do that. They had three faculty members that went with them to a Lubrizol breakfast they had on Monday. They interacted with our Alums, they spoke and it was really good. She noted that Dr. Karem is right on point. She said that we need to do a lot more of that and so they would be happy to take volunteers.

Senate President Sridhar commented that on this point about large staffs in Advancement and what they get. He said that he is an Ohio State graduate and he received a card in the mail from the College of Engineering at Ohio State that said that they had a campaign to raise \$350 million of part of half a billion campaign at the university. At the Steering Committee meeting when Ms. LeVine gave a report of the \$20 million, he felt reasonably good and then when he went home and during the weekend he received this card from Ohio State and he was like...

Dr. Sridhar move to question time. He pointed out that Provost Mageean has to leave about 4:45 PM so we still have about twenty minutes so questions for the Provost and the President or anyone else.

IX. Open Question Time

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray had a question for the Provost. She noted that the Provost said that balancing of resources has to be done across the university and she totally agrees. She was expecting to get at some point a more holistic perspective and she thought this was what we were getting. She thought that at some point we were going to see a program prioritization of non-academic units as well and she is not clear how much we are really saving by what's in this report for academic units. She is curious on what we are saving there and how can we make decisions if we don't know throughout the university, the non-academic units as well. She just has this feeling that there might be some money there that could be used over in the academic units and we don't have that information. She added that she thought Senate was going to be getting that information before decisions were made.

Provost Mageean responded that Professor Berlin Ray was right. The President did say that each of the buckets or the baskets or whatever it happens to be are starting a little earlier because there was a previously established committee of the Budget Task Force and we moved forward on that but the other parts of the university are moving... Provost Mageean noted that Vice President McHenry can speak to her division and everybody else is trying to do just that. She stated that if you really look at the areas that are cutting, she doesn't know that they will meet the needs of all of the ones and so they have to find additional resources to do the ones. She noted that they are still running numbers. This is a very complicated and complex task. There is no easy way to plug numbers in at one end and not the other. Unfortunately, some of the areas where growth needs to occur at least in academia are not the cheapest areas. We subsidize budgets in different ways. She stated that they are still trying to figure out some of the numbers in that regard and let's see what the other parts of the university can come up with because money can be moved, it can be moved from one sector to another. She noted that Vice President McHenry is present and she can speak to some of the other areas but they are engaged. We had a head start so to speak.

Professor Berlin Ray noted then that we should be seeing prioritization at every level of the administration and non-academic units.

Provost Mageean commented that in Student Affairs, which is academic support, Dr. Yarbrough is doing that within his area and Enrollment is doing that as well

Vice President Stephanie McHenry stated that she could address quickly where we are with that. She noted that on the administrative side, it is a little different in a sense that we can't, for example, decide that we don't like IT but we really like HR so we will stop doing IT. There are things that have to function throughout the university so our approach is more a litany of business processes – how we have been doing things and how we can improve those business flows based on some of the pains that most senior folks on the administrative side articulate to them. One of the processes that seems to get bogged down, seems to take too long, in curriculum we look at those for opportunities to innovate even within the process itself or use technology. She said that in just looking at some peer data, which she is not prepared to present today, we are not fat anywhere as

compared to peers as far as she can see on the major functions. She doesn't think it is right to expect that we are going to find millions and millions of dollars because people are sitting around and not doing as much. But, she does think that through business processes we can identify some opportunities to be more efficient which at the end of the day will save.

Professor Berlin Ray stated that she is interested if there areas that are fat and if some of that fat can go to some of the leaner areas. She added, if we can find that, we need to see that.

Vice President McHenry stated that her deadline for having at least the initial sweep of the low-hanging fruit is the end of this calendar year.

Professor Zingale had a question for Provost Mageean. He noted that it is not directly related to prioritization but indirectly to prioritization. He wondered if she could comment on the four to three graduate level and her thoughts on that and whether or not the Budget Office has had a chance to look at the budget impacts that may come if we decide to move. He added that in Urban, they are trying to strategically figure this out and is interested in the Provost's thoughts.

Provost Mageean replied that it should be done very simply; bottom line. We should move from four to three. There are all kinds of imperatives that are really knocking on our door that suggest that we do this. She noted that Dr. Zhu, Dean of the Graduate College could speak to those issues and he has spoken to Graduate Council about those issues. They won't let us count at full-time eight credits anymore; it has to be nine. We are having problems with the international students about what is a full-time student. Provost Mageean went on to say that we got away with it and now we can't get away with it any longer. They really need to be nine credits. She reported that she had asked Associate Vice President Tim Long to do an analysis for us because one does want to see what the budgetary impact of doing that would be. She noted that they haven't got a timetable to do it. She said she thinks the arguments are to convert it. When you look at urban universities serving similar populations as ours, three-credit courses can deliver to the kind of population that we have. In Urban, this is something being looked at very strongly and in Business likewise, but there are many of these that should be done. However, for that one, she is waiting to see what the budgetary analysis will be. In some areas, we are already off on that road in the Graduate area already.

Professor Zingale asked, "If we decide to do this, what is the timeframe? Should we be thinking to wait for the Budget Office to come back on something?" He noted that there is some confusion.

Provost Mageean replied that she knows. She is hoping Tim Long can give her figures pretty soon. She has been keeping him very busy just these last few days looking at this new scenario coming out of Columbus. She thinks that is something he should be able to produce for us fairly quickly but whatever it is, it would take at least a year. She hopes to get the figures soon.

Dr. Jianping Zhu, Dean of the Graduate College, said that implementation should be in fall 2016.

Associate Vice President Tim Long commented that it is next up on the list and it will be fall of 2016; he will have the numbers.

Dr. Sridhar stated that he just wanted to project a little bit; independent of credit hours or courses so it will be good if we can keep those two separate. One is directly a contributor to the other but we should really keep them separate and talk about them. The conversation is alive so we should talk about that.

Senator Jim Marino had a question for Provost Mageean about prioritization and the communication problem when we go back to our units and talk to our colleagues. He noted especially there is a very unfortunate coincidence of timing with the release of the Master Plan, which is, which is of course, an end. It sets forth fundraising goals for capital with the release only the academic budget for prioritization, which is all about cost control. It's very hard to talk about an academic budget that has got to stay stable or shrink. He understands that master plans are about capital, which is a fantasy, and it's money to be raised eventually, but having them released within a week of each other, it makes it very hard to go back to our units and convince our colleagues that this isn't somehow a raid on the academic budget. The Master Plan suggests that we want to find another half billion dollars over whatever period of time for capital improvements. Professor Marino stated that on the one hand, he understands that this is about aspiration and about fundraising plans, at the same time we are talking about budgeting for the instructional budget that never gains. The model of Dickinson is that you can only find money for academic programs by taking them from academic programs; that there is a zero sum gain for the instructional budget while for other institutional reasons we are talking freezing resources in other areas.

President Ronald Berkman stated that there is nothing right now that helps to provide some assurance. There is nothing in that Master Plan for even \$100 that we have agreed to give. He has made that clear to the Master Planners and he has made that clear to the Board that right now, other than the deferred maintenance projects that we went out and bonded for a couple of years ago, we have not agreed to move ahead with anything in the Master Plan. He went on to say that there will always be a rating between what we could do on the capital side, and what we do on the capital side right now, almost completely depends on what the State does because we are not going to go out and borrow any more money. Our financial position is strong but it's not going to stay strong if we go out and we create more debt. So, right now, really our ability to move ahead with anything significant on the Master Plan side depends on whether the State is going to have another round of capital funding, how much capital funding or whether in fact we can find a donor and, there are some who are conceivably interested in bricks and mortar projects, that's the only place it's going to come from. It's not going to come from; it's not going to come from the academic budget to fund capital projects in the Master Plan. He added that Professor Marino could certainly bring that back with absolute assurance.

Senator Barbara Hoffman asked Provost Mageean, “Given that we are not going to a prioritization from the non-academic side until the end of this calendar year, how can we move forward with any prioritization decisions until we have the whole picture. Are we not supposed to be looking at the whole picture? How can we make decisions about one part of it when we don’t have all the data?”

Provost Mageean replied that as she mentioned earlier, all those trees that she has indicated, she is not sure that we will have sufficient money to do the ones that they do so we can look for the money and also where to keep those ones investments. Frankly, while we can sit and try to work all of this out, we are losing grounds in many areas. We have an Enrollment Task Force going on at the moment. It is like everything is happening. We have the enrollment Task Force, we have the Master Plan, Program Prioritization Plan, but they are all intimately linked. If we do not move to where the enrollment growth is, then we start losing a lot more money than the academic budgets then we would otherwise hope for because we are simply losing it in a number of those different areas. So, we have to look where the workforce and the needs are and they are playing out together. We have to move forward. A primary example is the College of Engineering, which she mentioned has a rather strange budgetary situation. But they have been the beneficiaries of some external funding. They are looking at some space trying to make these things happen but she is confident that the Engineering College is giving her, even though they have discussed it as a five year plan, for instance takes it where they think they will grow, what they think the faculty members would be, what is the space that will be required to do this. If the additional tuition comes in from those areas where there is growth that is the money that will help sustain and perhaps expand some of the budgets. In the meantime, given the resources we currently have, there are just some things where it simply doesn’t make financial sense or other resources to move forward. She noted that as Vice President McHenry said, there are not fat cats in this university. While there may be some savings in the non-academic side, we all have to do our bit and we have to start moving forward.

Professor Hoffman asked Provost Mageean what is the timetable for this process. When are we going to get the data that produced the report?

Provost Mageean replied that there is no one large database. If Professor Hoffman wants to look at any of the databases, she can provide the links into the data sources that they have used. If Professor Hoffman is looking for a grand Excel spreadsheet, there isn’t one, but she has been able to look at the data that pertains to some of the programs that are mentioned there. The notes in the spreadsheet are very cryptic, she understands that, and so they can be elaborated on and that’s also part of the business of the College Deans where we can do those stats. She can show the numbers and the five-year trends and anything Professor Hoffman needs on the enrollment to discuss. She noted that the interesting thing is going back and forth with the Deans, which they did a lot. They really looked very hard at some of those numbers and there was general agreement that there were just parts of the enterprise or some programs that were not sustainable. Departments are stretched to the limit doing numerous things and some of

them are vital and can keep going but not if they are diluted by trying to keep very small areas going. If you have something with five majors in it; if you have something with areas where enrollments have been dropping off systematically until recovery and you can only mount that major by cross-listing it with an undergraduate which means that graduate students and undergraduate students sit in the same classroom and the graduate student gets an extra piece of work, frankly, she would be asking for her money back if she was a graduate student under those circumstances. She stated, "That's just viable. Take those resources and make sure the things that are important, that our undergraduates do want their majors and are asking for, then provide the GenEd requirements for the other areas that are viable and sustainable. We have to do that, even while we are waiting for these other parts."

Senator Kathleen Little stated that there were a number of programs that had further information needed. She asked, "What's the next step on those – there were quite a few of those."

Provost Mageean replied that they continued the work there and as she mentioned earlier, some of them are where there is accreditation and an external review process going on. Waiting for them to take place to see what the results are and we are anticipating results from there. She noted that in Health Sciences there are areas where they have actually asked for some feasibility of expanding the PA program, and like Speech areas where there is a high workforce demand and we are waiting to see what comes out of those areas for us. While those are pending areas, it just seems premature to make a judgment or to make a call on why they should keep them.

Senator Joan Niederriter commented on something Provost Mageean had just said. She commented that as someone who has taught graduate and undergraduate piggyback courses she would say the outsiders in the undergraduate should take more or pay more?? She said that she doesn't take herself to be dumbing it down when they ask her for one more paper for graduate students. This misrepresents what happens in those classrooms. She noted that her question for Provost Mageean is, "Is it your hope in the future if it turns out that Nursing and Engineering and Speech and Hearing and all of those places do generate the kind of income that we are hoping that they do that that income will do more than simply support those programs; that it can actually be used to do what CLASS has been doing all these years – putting money back into Engineering and Nursing, etc."

Provost Mageean stated that there was a survey distributed that listed those things and yes, she would hope it would be but remember it is a two-way street because if Engineering and Nursing grows, they have to do GenEd requirements and classes in the area that provides those so and you get the revenue margin back on those big credit courses. She noted that last year, CLASS got \$750,000 returned to it in revenue margin because they exceeded the credit hours they thought. Well, a lot of those are generated from the GenEd requirements that are conducted in class. So it has a curious way of distributing back. She added, "Yes, that is part of what we do centrally. There is the carry-over money that goes back but then there is the revenue margin distribution. It's a

model that we keep trying to tweak to make sure that actually CLASS was the largest beneficiary and a lot of those credit hours come from the GenEd requirements, which will grow if the other areas grow as well. There is no hermetically sealed college in this university.”

Professor Karem stated that he had one question about prioritization and then a good-for-thought question. He commented that on the non-academic side, he is curious and he doesn't know if this will be answered today, will there be a multi-college spreadsheet coming out of that? He said that he respects what the Provost is saying about the desire to streamline processes, that sounds very different than what's coming out of the spreadsheet which is not, how can we increase the efficiencies with the various units, but where we vest and where we divest them. He said that he is just curious and asked, “Will there be similar data or summary in a set for everything else? It is illuminating. It does show where we see ourselves at and it's good to show that ratio.

Vice President McHenry commented that the point she was trying to make earlier is that there are some things that we cannot cut so what's more likely to show are those areas where we can show what we are spending now. We can make some proposals about improving business processes and we can show what those savings might be over time. Vice President McHenry said, not to put too fine of a point on it, we all know that the biggest expense we have are all of those people and that is by far the largest expense in the university. To the extent that we can streamline things probably the biggest bang for the buck that we could ever get would be to have less people doing the same things. Vice President McHenry added, “And so that is what I would expect to see if I were you, not necessarily saying well this area is more efficient than the other, but where are the biggest opportunities to streamline.”

Senator Robert Krebs noted that he wanted to get back to the education side. He noted that once upon a time we had this sustainability and health focus recognizing that maybe justifiably the health got much more attention. But, in the current program prioritization, there were all of these groups kind of thought of as the old bargaining field sustainability for what their role was in the university, particularly, anything with environmental in the title and that is not just one place, it includes Urban. He commented that it is just a statement he doesn't quite understand. But the common theme program review, what program review is going on? Will this effect environmental sciences over the College of Sciences and Health Professions and also Urban Affairs and it sort of basically says, “All environmental programs on campus participating in common theme program review, defer any action pending review completion and recommendation.” He stated to Provost Mageean, “You being in one of those departments, what's going on with that?”

Provost Mageean responded, “If I recall correctly, clearly this is an area where there are several units contributing or wanting programs and I think what we are asking is that before calling any number on any of those, we should look at what we might be able to do in a more interdisciplinary and integrated way. I know there is already conversations but perhaps we can do something better instead of having different units

offering different offerings that there might be something that we can do more realistically together. We will wait until those conversations take place, must take place to see if that is something that can be done. I know that is primarily, as you said, it's Urban and in the biological sciences."

Senator Zingale noted that he could add to that. He kind of wanted to speak for Professor Sanda Kaufman, who is not here today, because she is their program director for their Environmental Studies program. He said that he thinks how that program works is they pull students from multiple areas of the university and so when you decide to shut down one program, it might have impact on various other programs across the campus. So, it's kind of a threat. It is leading to a deeper dive into what is going on down there because there are multiple colleges that could be impacted if one of them gets shut down.

Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange said that she just wanted to clarify that there is not necessarily anything on the table about closing a particular program. What is on the table is a discussion of how the current – there are five programs currently on campus that are engaged in environmental studies in one way or another – and what they are planning on doing is having the three colleges that participate in environmental studies are each doing an internal program review and an internal self-study in effect and then they are bringing in external reviewers for each of those colleges who will work together as a team. They have representatives from the colleges to discuss the programs in hopes actually of perhaps streamlining and enhancing areas where there is a lot of student demand and interest so that we can perhaps do a better job of recruiting students to fill that particular area of interest.

Dr. Sridhar stated that he just wanted to make one point; it's making him nervous when we are talking about closing programs. He doesn't think that anybody is actually talking about closing and he sincerely hopes that we are not talking about closing programs because that's an academic issue that there are things that would have to happen for that. He noted that these are recommendations that have come out of the Provost's Office and also for review for suspension. These aren't programs being closed and he just wanted to make that point for the record.

Senate Secretary Debbie Jackson said that her question is how something was defined as a program. She noted that in the College of Education they have minor programs that weren't included. She asked, "Are minors going to come up next or not?"

Provost Mageean responded that Professor Jackson's question is a great question. When we start going into this, what is the best way to look at this? These are departments, by programs. She almost blew her socks off when she realized how many tracks and programs there are which, when they worked it out, it was about 1.7 for each faculty member at the university. She stated that the College of Education takes the prize because just trying to keep track of all of those. All they are really trying to do is go with the most substantive tracks/programs that they split into undergraduate and graduate. They just didn't get it done because the numbers just started to get a little bit silly but they did work with the Dean of the College of Education very, very closely to make sure

that they had covered everything. Provost Mageean commented that Education is kind of ahead in this in many ways. The fact of the matter is that some of the colleges are already having these discussions even ahead of this knowing what the reality is that is staring them in the face in terms of enrollments and teachers not being paid to do Master's and some things going out of favor in other areas like Special Education moving up. The question is, how do we do those things to track? You are offering the kind of programs that students want and need and where the students are.

Professor Hoffman said that her question at this point is as we are reading through the multi-colored spreadsheet, should we find errors, would the Provost like for them to bring them to her attention.

Provost Mageean replied, "Yes." She noted that some faculty members have already done that. As everyone might imagine, something that is being an iterative process as things moved around human errors, you give the wrong number occasionally. One brought to their attention from Business, it was promptly corrected. It takes just a little while to get that fixed but if people actually send an email to Teresa LaGrange, she is the mistress of the spreadsheets, she will get that fixed. She does know that sometimes departments think they have numbers differently from what's recorded. Officially, there may have to be a discussion as opposed to merely changing something.

Professor William Bowen said he had a point of clarification. Dr. Sridhar made the point that we are not talking about program closures and we are just talking about suspensions. He is just wondering as a practical matter, what's the difference?

Professor Sridhar replied that he didn't say that we are talking about suspensions. He said that these are recommendations that we should be looking at that. Nobody is going off and suspending programs without the Faculty Senate really doing anything about it. So that is what he wanted to point out. He brought it out because there were a couple of people using words that said, "Well we are thinking about closing this program or that and he just wanted to make sure that that wasn't the intention."

XI. New Business

Senate President Sridhar asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie K. Jackson
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel