

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

SEPTEMBER 9, 2015

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Bleeke, Boboc, W. Bowen, Delatte, Deering, Delatte, Delgado, Duffy, Ekelman, Engelking, V. C. Gallagher, Genovese, Hampton, R. Henry, Holland, Holtzblatt, D. Jackson, J. Jenkins, Krebs, Lazarus Little, Lupton, Marino, C. May, Mazumder, Mead for S. Kaufman, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, B. Ray, Resnick, Robichaud, A. F. Smith, Sridhar, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, Xu,

Bennett, R. Berkman, Grech, Halasah, Karlsson, Khawam, LeVine, S. McHenry, Singh, G. Thornton, Yarbrough, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Fodor, Galletta, Gibson, Inniss, K. O'Neill, Rashidi, Shukla, Sonstegard, W. Wang, Zingale.

Boise, M. Bond, Chesko, Gleeson, Lehfeldt, Lock, Novy, Parry, D. Ramos, R. Reed, Rushton, Sadlek, Sawicki, Schultheiss, Spademan, B. White.

ALSO

PRESENT: J. Lieske

Senate President Nigamanth Sridhar called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M. He welcomed everyone to the first Senate meeting of the 2015-2016 academic year.

I. Eulogy for Richard J. McArdle (CASAL)

Professor Catherine Monaghan stated that her connection to Dr. McArdle is that he was on her search committee and so was instrumental in bringing her to CSU and she actually was also his replacement. She said that it given her great pleasure to be able to deliver this Eulogy for him. She, however, did not know Dr. McArdle well enough because he retired soon afterwards so Dr. Ferris Anthony, who is a Professor Emeritus here at CSU and was a former Dean of our College of Continuing Education, kindly, wrote the Eulogy that she is about to share with Senate now. Dr. Monaghan then delivered the Eulogy written by Dr. Ferris Anthony, Professor Emeritus for the late Dr. Richard J. McArdle, Professor Emeritus. Remarks follow.

“Dr. Richard McArdle passed away on Monday, April 6, 2015, the day after Easter Sunday. He was 81 years old. Beloved husband of Katherine for 56 years, loving father of Bernard, Constance, Nancy, Susan, and Richard. He had 10 grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

“Dr. McArdle came to Cleveland State University from his native Nebraska where he earned his undergraduate and graduate degrees. He joined the CSU College of Education faculty in 1969 as professor of education and chair of the Department of Education. He was given the task of organizing the College of Education, and by the end of his first year, he led the College to its present departmental structure.

“Dr. McArdle left CSU in 1971 for the University of North Florida where he became department chair in their College of Education. When CSU’s first dean of Education, Sam Wiggins, retired in 1975, Dr. McArdle returned to CSU as Dean of the College of Education. He served as dean for 12 years, and during his tenure, the College grew in enrollment while adding a significant number of new programs, one of which is the program that I am part of a teach-in, which is the Master’s in Adult Learning and Education Program.

“Dr. McArdle was appointed Acting Provost in 1994, a position he held for two years. In addition to his administrative positions, he continued to teach and do research on a full and part-time basis until 2008.

“Richard McArdle was a CSU pioneer, having joined the faculty when the University was yet in its infancy. He was a highly respected educator who served as a gifted leader and a mentor to younger faculty. He was recognized as an outstanding teacher, beloved by his students.

“His wide-range of academic interest included a special focus on systems theory, future theory, and junior athletics.

“Richard McArdle was often described as “calm and cool” since he always managed to keep his head even under extremely stressful situations. He was a balanced, rational professional who had an outstanding ability to solve problems, and his integrity was beyond question. Dick McArdle was also a kind, considerate person, always respectful of others and always willing to help.

“His avocational interests included golf, and he was recognized as an outstanding player. Dick McArdle was a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great grandfather. Cleveland State University is a better place for having had Dr. Richard McArdle as one of its pioneer faculty. Knowing and working with him was a glad distinction. He was part of Cleveland State University’s proud past and forged trails that continue to lead us into our unlimited future.”

Dr. Sridhar asked for a moment of silence in memory of our colleague Dr. Richard McArdle.

II. Approval of the Agenda for the September 9, 2015 Meeting

Dr. Sridhar stated that he would like to make one change to the Agenda for today's meeting that everyone received in their packets. He noted that the change has to do with approval of Minutes of meetings. He added that we did get back meeting Minutes for three meetings from last year, 2014: February, March and April thanks to Dr. Duffy. Violet has the corrections for those Minutes from Dr. Duffy but was unable to make all of the corrections before today's meeting. We don't yet have March 2014 and April 2014 ready so we will strike them off the Agenda. We will bring those Minutes to the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Sridhar then asked for a motion to approve today's Agenda. It was moved, seconded and the Agenda as amended was unanimously approved by voice vote.

III. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of February 12, 2014, March 19, 2014 and April 9, 2014

Senate President Sridhar stated that approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of March 19, 2014 and April 9, 2014 has been removed from the Agenda. He noted that it was a while ago but he hoped that everyone had a chance to read the Minutes of the February 12, 2014 meeting. We are playing catchup. He went on to say that he has been told that we should be caught up with all of Minutes in another month or so. He then asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of February 12, 2014.

Senator James Marino moved and Senator William Bowen seconded the motion. The Minutes of the Meeting of February 12, 2014 were unanimously approved by voice vote.

IV. Announcement of Coming Faculty-wide Elections

Dr. Sridhar announced two faculty-wide elections that everyone should be receiving ballots for soon – Academic Misconduct Review Committee and in a couple of weeks for the University Peer Review Committee. He noted that both of these are extremely important committees and asked faculty to please take a minute or two it takes to look at the ballots carefully and return them to the Faculty Senate Office.

- A. University Peer Review Committee – Election of one at-large Faculty Representative**
- B. Academic Misconduct Review Committee – Election of one Faculty Representative**

V. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Sridhar stated that he has a few things to report. He noted that this summer has been a very busy one and in Cleveland it is still pretty hot outside. He remarked that we are always complaining about the heat in the summer but anyway it has been a busy summer but also a good summer – lots of work was actually done from his own research grant. They had more work than anticipated so that contributed to a busy summer plus there were all kinds of other work as well some of which he will briefly mention. Everyone will also hear the President talk about more during his report.

Dr. Sridhar pointed out a couple of things that did happen over the summer. All through last year, the Task Force in Strategic Enrollment Management met and worked and that group finalized their report over the summer. Everyone should be receiving by email in the next day or two a five-page summary of the full report. The full report will be ready and available for anybody that actually will work with it. The full report will not actually be published because there is a fair amount of interesting and important things that we, as a university, have outlined as strategies and we don't want to be putting them out there on the Internet for everybody to read. But the summary report will be sent out to everyone. He noted that if anyone has questions, we would work through them. He is also inviting the chair of that committee to be here at Senate next month to actually present and answer questions. Hopefully, this next month will be a good time for everyone to read and digest the summary report and then Senate can actually discuss the report at the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Sridhar reported that our classes are full. We do have a pretty large incoming freshmen class, which is nice. Our enrollments are great and we are doing well in general but there was also some confusion with respect to sizes of classes, etc. pretty close to the start of the semester. He noted that we would hear from Provost Jianping Zhu about that in a little bit. He will talk about why there was some confusion and how we should avoid that confusion in the future.

Finally, Dr. Sridhar said he wanted to lead into what the President will talk about and that is a new program the university is getting into called the "Path to 2020." If everyone remembers the last Senate meeting in May, the President did respond to our inquiries all of last year asking for a comprehensive review of expenses of the university, not just on the academic side, but on the non-academic side as well. He noted that over the summer, he has been working along with the President's Chief of Staff, Jim Bennet, and Associate Vice President Tim Long and Ms. Bonnie Kalnasy of the Budget Office on plans for what this program will look like. There will actually be an event tomorrow morning. Everyone should have received an email about this program and that will be the launch of this program. He noted that the President would outline the plans for this program. The one thing that the President did say was that all through the planning of this Plan for 2020 they have been pretty insistent that there will be full faculty participation in all of the projects that will actually go through. There will be ten projects that will actually be part of this plan and the President is working with the Office of Performance Management to ensure that there will be useful faculty input for all of those projects. Dr. Sridhar noted that he would be calling upon several faculty members over the course of the next month or so for several of these committees and projects.

**VI. Senate Nominating Committee
Election of Faculty Senate Vice President**

Dr. Sridhar moved to the Senate Nominating Committee consisting of Professors Norbert Delatte, Mark Holtzblatt and James Marino.

The Senate Nominating Committee has nominated Professors Cheryl Delgado, School of Nursing, Brian E. Ray, College of Law and Andrew Resnick, Physics, College of Sciences and Health Professions as candidates for Faculty Senate Vice President.

After ballots had been counted, Senate President Sridhar announced that Dr. Andrew Resnick of Physics was elected to a two-year term as Senate Vice President.

VII. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman welcomed everyone back that may not have made the President's Picnic today and missed out on the hot dogs, brats, chicken, etc. He noted that a lot of students left very, very happy. It was actually a very nice event and has been a nice event and the students really resonate with it. The Food Service people told him that they served more food today than they have served at any other picnic and it went on over three hours so there was a pretty big food window and he saw students carrying away some pretty hardy take-out dishes.

Again President Berkman welcomed everyone back to a new semester. He stated that we had really a privilege several weeks ago and Professor Sridhar was present welcoming 1,860 new freshmen to Cleveland State University. In the last five years, in essence, we have doubled the number of freshmen who come to Cleveland State University. While we have been doing this, while we have been on this upward trajectory, we should be proud of a number of key things: that as the number of students has increased, so has the median ACT score, median SAT score, the median GPA of the students and perhaps exceptionally so has the diversity of the freshmen class. President Berkman noted that this year the freshmen class includes 1,860 students, 30% of whom self-identified as minority students. If anyone had been at the Convocation, you really did get a sense of the incredible diversity that there was and there is among the freshmen class. He noted that this deserves a shout out to the admissions folks, to everybody who participated in the process – it is a difficult and competitive process and he said he would talk a little more about that in a few minutes.

President Berkman stated that he didn't exactly remember what happened at the April meeting. He has some vague recollection that there were several senators who were unhappy about several things. But, he does remember what happened at the May 6th meeting that Professor Sridhar referred to – one that really was in essence a formal charge or a formal request by the Faculty Senate that we commit to taking on a comprehensive program to look at the issues that this university is likely to face over the next five years. He noted that while he has avoided using the term "strategic plan"

because when he came to CSU we had a strategic plan and there was some issue about whether we ought to engage in another strategic planning exercise. He stated that the position he took as some may remember is that most of the strategic goals in the strategic plan that we had had not been achieved. They were goals that were rudimentary to the progress of the university. He said that he didn't see a need at that juncture to engage in the process. We did do a refresh, a strategic plan light and finished it two years ago when we again looked at where we were in terms of some of the strategic imperatives laid out in "Vision Unlimited." He stated that in addition to the Faculty Senate's request that we engage in this exploration and plan towards "2020", we have also had a formal request by the Board of Trustees at the May meeting (this was independent of it) that the university engage in this exercise.

President Berkman said that since the time of the meeting on May 6, one of the reasons he believes that this exercise is imperative now and what has changed in the last five years is almost everything. And, what will continue to change is almost everything. Since we met on May 6th, the legislature has passed a budget, which includes no authority for any university to raise their tuition in this year or next year. At least all of the years that he has been here, we have had authority to raise tuition. We have been prudent in how we use that authority given the nature of our student body but that authority has always provided us with some additional revenue. Right now, there is no authority in the biennium for any tuition increases. President Berkman remarked that if he was a betting person, he would bet that we will not see any tuition authority for a decade coming out of the State unless dramatically the political environment and the imperatives about rising costs of a university changes. So, that's one very, very important change that we see this year and again, he continues to think that it will be very hard for any legislature, after their previous legislature has frozen tuition, to say we are going to unfreeze tuition and we are going to charge the citizens of Ohio more for tuition. Again, anything can happen – it's Columbus but, as we go forward, he believes that our assumption has to be we will not see tuition increases in the near future.

President Berkman reported that what has also happened at the legislature and he talked to Senate about this last year for those who were here and remember that the President of the Senate was a strident advocate of a legislative mandate that all universities reduce the cost of attendance and he differentiates to everyone between what a five percent cut in the cost of attendance means in comparison to a five percent cut in the cost of tuition. He reported that that bill has passed the legislature. President Berkman said he believes that it is the end of October when we must provide to the legislature a plan to reduce costs for students across the board by five percent. In concert with that, the Governor's Task Force on Affordability is chugging its way towards doing something. He said that everyone may remember the charge of the Governor's Task Force that really asks for, in essence, a suit to nuts exploration of everything universities do, why they do it, what it costs them to do it and why can't they do it some other way that would be less expensive. President Berkman said that he summarized it but he thinks this really, at the bottom line of the essence, is the message.

President Berkman stated that also, in terms of a budget piece, and he feels proud about this, we committed and have implemented salary increases for every faculty and staff member at the university. Again, it becomes a new significant expenditure but an expenditure that he is proud that we were able to make.

President Berkman reported that we had tremendous success as President Sridhar referred to in enrollment largely on the freshmen side. The overall enrollment picture in terms of headcount to be transparent here is relatively flat. What has happened is the student credit hour, which is really the coin of the realm, they don't pay you for the heads; they pay you for the credits. And, actually now of course they only pay you for the completed credits – not the credits that students sign up for. So, while the headcount remained relatively flat, the student credit hour went up pretty dramatically and it went up dramatically he believes for two reasons. One, because of the large increase in the freshmen class and the number of freshmen who are taking a full load or something very close to a full load and second, he believes we have now leveled off from what we were told to expect and we did experience in the 4 to 3 conversion and that is we see a dip in the number of student credit hours as students learn the multiplication table and learn that four times three is only twelve and four times four is sixteen, etc. President Berkman said that we have seen a recovery in the number of students who are taking a full load.

President Berkman stated that everyone also knows how well we are and will continue to be for the foreseeable future in an intense competitive environment in terms of enrollment. Akron, if people saw the *Crains* article or if people saw the *Plain Dealer* article on Akron, part of their financial problems were created by the fact that they lost about 4,000 headcount in the last five years; it went from about 25,000 to just about 21,000 in the last five years. As he mentioned to everyone before, as people ride around the campus, he notices the newest entrance to the advertising sweepstakes here in our neighborhood is Baldwin Wallace who has put out a big advertisement that caught his attention. All of these factors are really the rationale and the reason that we are undertaking this exploration of every single management, administrative, academic, and student affair related function at the university.

President Berkman noted that Jim Bennett who came on as Chief of Staff about nine months ago has brought an unusual set of skills and has been leading this process forward. Everyone heard a reference to the Office of Performance Management so this entity, the Office of Performance Management, is, in essence, this group that is going to be responsible for providing guidance, not leadership, leadership and guidance he should say. But as it is explained, if you come tomorrow, each of the areas that are going to be explored, whether it is enrollment, whether it is financial aid, whether it is career services, whether it is maintenance, whether it is parking, etc., each will have a program, a departmental representative and have a project leader on each of those projects. And, those are the projects that Professor Sridhar referred to in terms of the eleven or twelve discrete areas that each of these groups will be looking at.

President Berkman stated that we did have a very productive summer. By the way, the Office of Performance Management consists of Jim Bennett, Tim Long, Dr.

Deirdre Mageean, Dr. Sridhar and Bonnie Kalnasy has been added. He noted that in any event, we spent almost our entire presidential retreat on August 4th and August 5th devoted to this issue. Again, tremendous progress was made. We reviewed thirteen projects and again, we will talk about those projects tomorrow and the project leaders and we have identified a number on or around \$100 million which represents the costs outside the faculty and outside those that are spent inside of colleges – that is really a cost center that we have been looking at particularly. President Berkman said again, the bottom line is that it is all about what we do now; whether we are doing it as effectively as we should and what does effective mean. He noted that effective to him means that it contributes to student success. His first prerogative in measuring what we do is that it contributes to student success and that it maintains the financial stability and integrity of the institution. And, again, largely due to what we have been able to accomplish on the enrollment side, we went in to the end of last year at our last Board of Trustees meeting, and we actually asked the Board for authority to potentially use \$3.1 million from reserves to cover what was, at that point, a potential or projected or possible deficit going into this year. President Berkman said that we are not in the ninth inning but we have made substantial strides and are already closing almost that entire deficit so he doesn't think that we will need to use the \$3.1 million reserves. He noted that the reserves we have are very, very ample, and it has actually opened up the discussion of whether we might use these reserves for some other utilities rather than leaving them as reserves. But from today as we look at it, we probably have already balanced the budget for next year, which is good news, extraordinarily good news. But, the other prerogative is that we remain on strong financial footing and that we meet the mandates. These are not suggestions or ideas any longer that we meet the mandates from the Governor and the legislature about mechanisms to reduce costs.

President Berkman stated that we are in a very, very good place for two reasons. One, over the last three years with the collaboration of Faculty Senate and its colleagues, we have made significant strides already in reducing the costs for students. We have put in place programs that will cut and are cutting already the time towards completion. We have seen a dramatic increase in the graduation rate – a seventeen percent increase in the graduation rate over two years. We are well ahead over the curves and indeed if you go back for those who really have nothing to do, and you want to look at the Senate Bill and some of the ideas or some of the policies in the Senate Bill for what universities ought to examine as they think about how to cut the cost to students, you will see a menu which is largely or in good part Cleveland State's menu – 120 credits, tuition incentive, multi-term registration, etc. He noted that again, we have gotten ahead of the curve on that front. President Berkman stated that the other piece that puts us in a good position is that it was an extraordinarily productive summer. Almost all of these separate projects have some sort of launch as the Task Force on Enrollment, perhaps the most important, or one of the most important is complete. He added that President Sridhar said earlier, faculty would receive a summary of that, the executive summary. But, all of them have begun to move – all of them have leadership, all of them have charters, all of them have methodology, etc. Now, it is not going to happen over-night; it's going to be at least a year long process, maybe more than a year long process, but he thinks that we've made remarkable progress in a very short period of time. He noted that tomorrow morning, this would be

introduced to all faculty and staff. The group will take questions at 9:30 AM in the Ballroom. President Berkman added that everyone, of course, is invited.

President Berman stated that since enrollment is such a huge project, he introduced to Faculty Senate the new Vice President for Enrollment Management who came to us from Portland State University. For those who know Portland State, it is a university very much like Cleveland State and a university that also has done incredibly creative things. So Dr. Cindy Skruppa, who is here today, we welcome her as the new Vice President. A round of applause ensued. President Berkman stated that she has the good fortune of having a hard project, which she either meets or doesn't meet at the end of the year. But we have the good fortune truly of having her here as a member of the team. He noted that most everyone at Senate has met Jim Bennett, Chief of Staff, who has transformed in a year from dressing like a managing partner to dressing like Faculty Senators. Everyone applauded. President Berkman again stated that we are very grateful; it is a very complicated process and without Jim Bennett's leadership and his guidance and his camaraderie and his collegiality with everyone across the entire university we would not have gotten this far.

At this point, Dr. Sridhar stated that the next item on our Agenda is a report from Interim Provost Jianping Zhu. He noted that this is our first meeting with Dr. Zhu as Provost. He is sure that it has been a challenging summer for Dr. Zhu stepping into the Provost's Office and taking over responsibilities and having to move quickly.

VIII. Report of the Interim Provost

Interim Provost Jianping Zhu said that he also wanted to extend a welcome to everyone. He noted that as we heard from Dr. Sridhar and President Berkman, we are off to a great start with a lot of good news. The only thing left for him to cover is perhaps the bad news. He added that we have a tough job ahead of us.

Provost Zhu stated that Dr. Sridhar and President Berkman have covered the important projects that we have been working on during the summer so he will take this opportunity to outline a few of his priorities that are going forward. He said that he certainly looks forward to working with everyone here in his new capacity to enhance our programs and to put CSU on more solid footing going through our next fifty years – we just completed our first fifty years looking back so we look forward to a better and brighter fifty years ahead of us.

Dr. Zhu stated that as he took this new role, his first priority is to ensure smooth operations and to ensure the efficiency of the Provost's Office that supports the faculty and department chairs and the deans. He said he wanted to ensure that our operations go smoothly. In terms of decision-making, in terms of answering questions and dealing with the challenges and the various issues that come up from the academic side, the Provost's Office wants to make sure that we are very efficient and as efficient as we can be to respond to them. In addition, the Provost said that he wants to enhance our cultural collaboration because the entire university, regardless, it is for recruiting, it's for student

success, it's not really a task for an individual unit. Really, it takes the entire university or takes a whole village to accomplish the recruiting or to ensure that the students graduate on time. He added that he really wants to enhance that culture that we, on the academic side, closely work with student services, recruitment, and all of the other sectors to show that we work together to ensure student success. Dr. Zhu also emphasized that he wants to be sure that the faculty members carry out the core of the academic mission.

Dr. Zhu reported that that right now we have fifty plus searches ongoing for full-time faculty, tenure-track faculty, plus full-time lecturers. And, that's almost twelve or thirteen percent of our current faculty size so the Provost's Office took a look at a significant opportunity to actually enhance our faculty and to bring a new very dynamic group of faculty into our university. He noted that the faculty plays a key role in this recruiting process. He said he wanted to emphasize that the Office of the Provost will be working with each office and will work with department chairs and closely work with Faculty Senate to ensure our success of recruiting fifty plus faculty. Dr. Zhu commented that as everyone has heard, we have a lot more new students and that means there will be more teaching in the classrooms, especially, many of the students are full-time students. Our composition of students is changing and we are having more and more full-time students that will carry full loads. So, in terms of our teaching requirements, that is what is changing especially in the beginning level classes. This is a very important thing and is one of the highest of priorities and we need to make sure we are all on top of this. He stated that recently, some people might have seen a whole one-page ad inside *The Chronicle of Higher Education* that highlights that we are recruiting forty-six full-time positions. He noted that actually some are carry-over positions from last year. That is why he is saying that there are more than fifty searches going on although new position-wise, it is forty-six positions that are advertised in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. So, thirty-six tenure track plus ten full-time lecturers and that is brand new although we do have some searches that were not filled last year that are still continuing. So, if those additional positions are counted, that is fifty plus searches. He noted that this by itself is a challenge. These are positions with a high quality of faculty and the competition is very important because all schools are looking for the best talent so we really need everyone's help to move forward.

Dr. Zhu turned to student success. He stated this is another very high priority. We have been working on this over the last four or five years. We have a curve of innovations and now many other schools are using that as a template for their efforts. He noted that we would be continuing those efforts in terms of improving our retention and graduation and in terms of reducing our costs. There are a number of concrete initiatives that are not just a philosophical approach, but there will be concrete steps that we are going to propose and that will be taken over the coming year to ensure we make good progress in both fronts in terms of time to graduation and reducing costs. Provost Zhu wanted to show one of those to Senate today. For example, we have been hearing from multiple constituencies from students, from student services, and from others that appeal to have textbooks posted and to make that information timely available for our students once the registration starts. He noted that until now, we have been having a pretty poor

record in terms of compliance. Federal regulations require that once you open the registration, the textbook information should be on line and available to the students. So, the students can do comparative shopping and the textbook has become pretty expensive now days. Provost Zhu reported that in discussions over the summer, there was a leadership meeting and very good ideas were proposed at that meeting. So, for now, we are working with individual departments and colleges to implement what we call the proactive textbook process, that is, instead of waiting passively for people to suggest the textbooks that are going to be used for the new semester, we will have a list that will show the textbooks for the classes that were used for the last time those classes were offered. So, there will be a list and it will be sent forward to the faculty by their department and the faculty will have plenty of time to look at that list and look at the courses and decide whether the textbook is an appropriate one. If the textbook is not appropriate, faculty will have time to indicate whether they want to change to a new textbook. If faculty members don't require a textbook, they will have the opportunity just to say, "No textbook is needed." Dr. Zhu stated that with this proactive approach, we hope we will have a much higher rate of compliance with the Federal regulations in terms of making textbook information available to the students. Dr. Zhu noted that this is just one example that is forthcoming and certainly will depend on faculty cooperation. Faculty will play a very crucial role here in terms of ensuring student success and in terms of a joint effort to reduce the cost of completion and the cost of attendance at the university.

Dr. Zhu also asks of faculty to be active participants for our 2020 project because as President Berkman has emphasized and as Dr. Sridhar has pointed out, it is an important undertaking, it is a campus-wide undertaking and faculty should play a very important and essential role in that. He noted that tomorrow is the luncheon event and he encouraged faculty to participate.

Finally, Dr. Zhu reported that it has been brought to his attention that there was a memo sent out in the summer regarding the class cap. He noted that it seems as though there has been some confusion about that and he was asked to make some clarification. He stated that it is not a major policy change. He knows that there were some concerns and faculty felt like in the summer a major change was made in terms of the university academic policy. It is just to bring some uniformity into the current class schedule. The classes, especially for the General Education and for the first year beginning enrollment in division classes, it has been seen from multiple departments that for the same classes that offer multiple sections, there has been significant variations between the section size. Some faculty members have been routinely teaching classes with forty students and others are teaching twenty students for exactly the same class. The reason perhaps has been an historical reason or being personal preference. He noted that what makes this issue more pressing are two reasons: one issue is that like any students and we have students who are waiting to get into classes over the summer that we were closely monitoring the enrollment registration progress; the second issue is about the space – better utilization of space. Especially for the spring semester, we will have one building being taken down, the Chester Building, and we will have some space there so it just makes it much more important to make efficient use of existing space. So from that point

of view, and as soon as discussions are held with the associated deans and then the practice reviewed, we have found that there is a need to bring some uniformity to the class size. The base is historically what classes have been taught and typically the size. So that is what is described in the content of their memo and that is not totally to decrease because of the size that has been listed in the memo and that has been used by many instructors. Dr. Zhu again stated that he just wants to bring some uniformity to class size.

Dr. Zhu reported that the second item he wanted to bring attention to is that implementation of that will not begin until the spring semester. For fall semester, it was only a selective soft implementation. It is when the class size is below the recommended count and when class is already full, then the department is asked to increase the summer enrollment to put actual students into the class. If the class has no wait list, then the class will still keep the cap at the lower level, as it was determined almost a year ago. As everyone knows, for classes we put into the system over a year ago, there now is multiple term registration so there was no across the board implementation for the fall. The full-scale implementation will not begin until spring 2016. So that leaves plenty of time and of course there is an exception clause built into the memo that allowed departments to present an argument from both a pedagogical point of view or from whatever other point of view that the cap should be at a lower level and the option is open there. So, hopefully that clarifies the confusion and this is not a major policy change made over the summer without the faculty involvement and it is not an increase of the teaching load. Dr. Zhu stated that this issue was brought to his attention and that this was connected with the workload. In fact, the faculty members have been teaching under those clauses. We are just trying to bring some uniformity to the class size.

At this point, Provost Zhu said that he would be happy to take questions during the question and answer section. With that, Dr. Zhu said that this concludes his report. He said he looks forward to working with everyone to further enhance our student success and to reduce the cost of attendance of our students.

Dr. Sridhar stated that we will move on to the next item of the Agenda and that is to welcome our new Student Government Association President Ms. Emily Halasah.

IX. Report of the Student Government Association (Report No. 1, 2015-2016)

SGA President Emily Halasah stated that she would be really quick. She just wanted to introduce herself to those she has not worked with as well as to introduce the rest of her executive team. She asked her team to stand. She introduced SGA Vice President Malek Khawam, SGA Treasurer Singh Harinder, and SGA Secretary Olga Grech. Everyone applauded.

Ms. Halashah stated that the SGA staff is quite excited to serve the students this semester and to work with Faculty Senate. She reported that SGA committee appointments for university and Faculty Senate committees should be ratified this Friday. They are also currently filling their Cabinet and their Senate. She noted that this is all she has to report to Senate today and SGA will be in touch.

X. Update on Student Success Initiative Campaign (Report No. 2, 2015-2016)

Ms. Berinthia LeVine, Vice President for University Advancement, thanked everyone for his or her support this past year. She noted that we just came off a record-breaking fund-raising year. She noted that many, many records were set. Over \$22 million was raised this year, the largest ever in the history of the university and the largest number of donors in the past five years, 7,472. We received many transformational gifts that everyone has read about and heard about which were we are very proud.

Vice President LeVine stated that she wanted to share with everyone a little bit about the source of these dollars. Referring to her PowerPoint presentation, Vice President LeVine stated that this past year, everyone will see that over one-third of our gifts came from our alumni. She noted that if we were to take the one transformational gift from our alum, Don Washkewicz, out of this, that number would drop significantly. But, she wanted everyone to know that alumni's giving is up. She has to say that everyone plays an exceedingly important role in the gifts that our alumni give to us as a university because our students, when we speak to them as alums, which do they cite and what experiences do the alumni, cite? They cite the faculty members with whom they engage. She said that she didn't wanted to minimize faculty's role in our fund-raising success currently and in the future.

Vice President LeVine reported that this past year was a banner year for the College of Engineering. Referring to her PowerPoint presentation, Ms. LeVine reported that these numbers change from year to year depending upon a lot of factors. She noted that this is something many people don't really know about how do these dollars break down when we go out and talk to folks about making a gift to the university. This past year everyone will see that most of the dollars came in for Capital needs and that was because of the gifts we raised for the College of Engineering and for the tennis dome. But, the operating numbers are the dollars that come in through our annual campaign. She wanted to emphasize the importance of these dollars. These dollars are dollars that we spend now. Donors give them to us so that we will spend them now. The Endowment portion is the money that comes in permanently and provides a perpetual stream of money for the university primarily in the form of scholarships. Ms. Levine reported that this past year, we are really proud that we had record spending from our Endowment primarily for scholarships. The Faculty/Staff campaign that everyone participated in goes in primarily to our operating accounts. As she stated, those dollars are granted to the university quarterly and they are used for general operations.

Vice President LeVine reported that our funds under investment have grown significantly. As she mentioned earlier, the Foundation is responsible for the fiscal operation and management of the funds and everyone will see that we now have almost \$75 million under management. She noted that this still is a low number for universities nationally but we are on an upper trajectory. Last year, our Portfolio performed in the upper fifty percent of all portfolios and the year before we were in the upper quartile. In

May, we announced the university's first ever campaign - \$100 million. She noted that this is a big milestone for us. The campaign is focused on two major areas related to student success but it is counting every dollar that comes into the university. It is focused on student scholarships and focused on expanding and strengthening workforce and career preparedness capabilities. Our co-chairs are two alumni, Monte Ahuja from the College of Business and Don Washkewicz from College of Engineering. We have a campaign cabinet comprising fifteen individuals most of whom are alums of the university, all of who have agreed to solicit between three and five individuals and all of whom have made gifts to the campaign. In fact, The Foundation, the Board of Trustees and cabinet leadership have given over thirty percent of the campaign proceeds to date. As of July 30th, we were at \$79.7 million. We have crossed the \$80 million mark and we are very, very pleased about that. Vice President LeVine added that of course she has to caution everybody that the last \$20 million, the last \$10 million, those are always the challenging gifts to get.

Vice President LeVine made a couple of other remarks about that. She noted that we raise money in lots of different ways. We raise money individually, one-on-one President Berkman has been, as she mentioned to everyone before, a stellar fund-raiser for the university and it takes a stellar fund-raiser to bring in transformational gifts. But, fund-raising is a team sport and it requires everyone because there are many in this room that she has worked with over the past year, the President has worked with on proposals that we have. We started out the year with a transformational gift from The Cleveland Foundation of \$5.5 million and another transformational gift from Key Bank Foundation of over \$1 million. Those gifts were the result of the involvement of faculty and staff in that process. Vice President LeVine stated that she wanted everyone to know how appreciative she is of that involvement. She reported that this past week, we had a first ever in our Call Center – we have students who make calls to alumni. Last year we had 2013 alum that committed \$1,000.00 over the phone. Last week we had a Business alum that committed \$5,000.00 over the phone to one of our student callers that is going to be matched by a \$5,000.00 gift from that person's company. These are success stories based on interactions that our students had or are having here at the university with everyone. Ms. LeVine stated that she couldn't emphasize that enough. When our students come to faculty with an issue or they come to faculty for guidance, faculty make a difference in what is going to happen down the road for this university fund-raising. We are on an upward trajectory right now. We want to keep that upward trajectory and she said she wanted to thank everyone in advance for everything that faculty do to help us make that trajectory and make the dream possible for our students. Vice President LeVine thanked Faculty Senate for the time to give an update.

**XI. University Faculty Affairs Committee 2014-2015 Annual Report
(Report No. 3, 2015-2016)**

Dr. Sridhar stated that the item from the University Faculty Affairs Committee isn't an actual discussion item for the Agenda. He noted we received an Annual Report from the UFAC last year that was included in today's meeting packets. He stated that questions concerning that report could be posed during the Open Question Time.

Faculty Senate received the 2014-2015 Annual Report from the University Faculty Affairs Committee.

Dr. Sridhar stated that we would move on to question time. He commented that we haven't had any questions from the floor at all so he is sure everyone is willing and ready to ask questions so let's start that.

XII. Open Question Time

Senator William Bowen had a question for Interim Provost Zhu. He noted that the textbook policy sounds good from a compliance point of view and it is not necessarily a threat from an academic freedom point of view, but sometimes faculty members switch out classes right at the last minute. And, sometimes when faculty members switch out, they want to get a different textbook. He stated that the policy has to remain flexible enough he would think so that if he gets assigned to a class right at the last minute and say that is not the textbook that I am going to use, it switches out. As long as that can happen, then there is no threat from an academic freedom point of view.

Provost Zhu responded, "Yes, that flexibility is needed regardless of whether we use the system or not, right? Even without what we call the proactive system, you still may run into a situation where a faculty was assigned to teach a class and chooses a textbook and then later there is a last minute change and the faculty would not be able to teach a class that another person is teaching. So, whether we have a system or not, that is going to be an issue. We need to have the flexibility to address this issue." Provost Zhu noted that one step beyond, no matter what system we use from his point of view and from his more than a decade of experience as a department chair and to teach on the front line with faculty and teach himself and surveying the students, there are a lot of needs in terms of your department and your class. He said that he does feel for first year classes for example, multi sections and an example that comes to mind, college algebra for example, for the schools that he worked at, they tipped them off at sixty or seventy sections. He noted that for classes like that, you probably need a policy in place where ahead of time the faculty committee decides that based on their learning outcomes based on the basic skills needed for the student to move forward, you need to have a book in place already. We should not really depend on the last minute or to hire an adjunct faculty to decide the textbook for that particular section where you have sixty sections. When the students move on to the next class, they are expected to have a common set of skills and we cannot totally leave that to individuals. Provost Zhu stated that when we talk about academic freedom, we have to draw a fine line as to where that extends. We totally leave that to whoever decided whatever and however and the way and whichever chapter the faculty wants to cover. There is a common learning outcome for someone who is at the beginning of classes. So, that question and that approach are not just tied into this approach. He said he understands that many of our departments are doing that for the very beginning of classes, lower division classes. And that is considered as best practices for many schools. He said knows we don't have a formal policy in place here and that causes an issue. When we discuss this proactive approach, many respondents

that did raise that issue. So, until we have that person in place, we cannot decide on the textbook. Provost Zhu stated that he does think from the point of ensuring uniformity, especially the first year or second year of the class, that is not the best practice and it is not best for our students.

Professor Bowen stated that it goes beyond the adjunct. He noted that he is in total agreement with Provost Zhu with the adjunct, but also full-time tenured faculty change right at the last minute.

Dr. Zhu commented for example that some are more specialized than others where we do expect the reason for that class being there is for different faculty to bring different perspectives so students learn at the more senior and graduate level do understand that. As he said, that flexibility should be there no matter what system we use in terms of textbooks. For some beginning level classes where you can tell the students that there is a clearly defined base and basic learning outcomes that come out of that class, you want for the student to move into the next class and uniformity is definitely needed and that is being used in many other schools. He added that he has worked for four schools, this is the fourth on, and this is the first one that he has come to and all of the schools are similar. All four schools are public universities and one of those, not too far from us, although they are in a different kind of financial trouble, but in terms of that, we do have a coordinator for thirty or forty sections, there is a full-time faculty to actually work with other full-time faculty to make sure outcomes are clearly defined and the appropriate textbook is selected to cover the material. So, it won't happen that one faculty member covers five chapters and another faculty member only covers the three chapters. So, those are the best practices we seriously need to look into and use that at the lower level multi-section classes. Dr. Zhu added, but for specialized classes, he totally understands. The reason we need to have a diverse group of faculty is, every time someone teaches the class, that person brings in a new perspective and students benefit from that.

Senator Kathleen Little indicated that she had a comment for the Provost. She stated that when Provost Zhu was discussing the class size memo, he mentioned perhaps class size is being based on historical factors and faculty preference. She said she can tell him that in sixteen years at CSU, she has never been asked how many students she would like in a class. She noted that what the factors are, and she hopes that Provost Zhu considered these, are online versus traditional. She said, "Because what we were told when we brought this up at Steering was that multiple sections of the same class had different caps. Hopefully, you can appreciate why that might be different for online versus traditional classes. Also, I have been told by certain chairs that they make those decisions sometimes whether that is a full-time tenure-track faculty member or a part-time person teaching the class and I think that also might be academically sound. Land-based classes, we have to have enough lab equipment to serve the students so these are the real factors, not the ones that you identified."

Provost Zhu replied that he certainly appreciates that Dr. Little has never taken the size into her own preference by saying that she only wants to teach twenty students.

He added, whatever the department decided, he certainly appreciates that. But just because she never asked for that, that doesn't mean that other people didn't have that on their preference list. He said that he, as a chair at other schools, certainly experienced that where faculty certainly had preference for his class that cannot have so many students. So, he is not saying that this is the determining factor; it is actually what prompted us to look into this and to see if we should have more or less a uniform approach as to class size to better utilize our classroom spaces and also to bring some fairness to faculty. For someone teaching forty students in the same class that others are teaching fewer than twenty students per class for the same class, there is a difference here. Dr. Zhu stated, "Now, back to Dr. Little's questions and the examples that she gives. That is precisely the reason that we will have exceptions. In fact, for on-line, if he read it correctly, on-line classes are treated separately." He added, "Remember that there is a footnote on the bottom there that that will be considered differently. The Departments have different reasons for the classes for that particular section to have a different size. That is open."

Professor Little stated that the other issue was that you were given twenty-four hours to respond to that memo.

Provost Zhu said that he appreciates Dr. Little bringing that up and that is something that is confusing. He noted that there are two things: one thing is the memo she is referring to that is to bring some uniformity into the scheduling practices in the classroom schedule. That memo was sent out on June 30th and the department chairs were asked to respond by August 1st if exceptions are needed for the fall semester. As he mentioned, in that memo specifically to be clear for implementation, implementation will not start until the spring. For the fall semester, all caps will remain as is and only if the class in the fall has a wait list, then we ask the chairs to increase or the chair can request an increase. So it is not just a one-day notice. The incident that Professor Little mentioned is a separate process. It is the wake-up before classes start. We have noticed that there are a thousand on the wait list there and for most of those classes, the number of students on the wait list, there are fewer than five students. More than half of the wait list has that kind of situation. And, based on our historical data, we know that about one half of the students in any series of classes they are waiting for, the reasons being that they put themselves sometimes in multiple wait lists and they already got into the class and they forgot to remove themselves from other wait lists. So, with that data in mind, we figure if there are five students a week, we probably only need two or three spaces to accommodate those students instead of opening a new section. We probably just need to increase the cap by a couple of students. Also historical data suggests that within two weeks of this semester, students are finding the right classes and they drop and there are only two or three over the cap and eventually we drop to the original cap. So, with that, the week before the semester began, there was an announcement sent out to ask the chairs, if you have no objection about the classes on the list, we will increase the cap by two or three students and if you have an objection, respond within a day or so. So, that is what Professor Little is talking about. That has nothing to do with this policy. Students are waiting and if we don't react quickly, then they take a class at Tri-C or some other place or leave us so we have to respond in a timely manner to those requests. The chairs

were given time to respond. If they object and say I don't want those two or three students in their class, they had the opportunity to respond to the Registrar's Office before the cap was in place. Provost Zhu went on to say that those are two separate things and he is glad that Professor Little raised this issue. We have to clarify that with others. It is not really connected with that memo; it was trying to address the wait list the week before the classes began.

Senator James Marino said that he had one procedural question. "Was the UCC paperwork on these class caps considered? Were the UCC class minimum/maximum sizes considered?" He said he knows that Provost Zhu is talking about variation but there is a known arbitrary deliberative faculty process when courses are approved for several kinds of caps and, "Were those caps considered during this process?"

Provost Zhu replied that Professor Marino is talking about the memo and not the action the week before classes began – the memo about the caps process of sections of classes. He noted that his understanding is that the discussion of the General Education Committees was taken into consideration. For example, the WAC class above 35 is not an option number that we come up with. He asked if Vice Provost Peter Meiksins was present. Provost Zhu then asked Vice Provost Meiksins if he could clarify.

Vice Provost Meiksins stated that as far as he is aware, the only general education area that was discussed by class maximum was Speaking Across the Curriculum and the other area was Humanities or Social Science or whatever. It is whatever, which is why there are classes, say in Diversity some of which enroll 200 people and some enroll 20 as a cap and that was the issue that was partly addressed by the attempt to create some kind of uniform class size but it is not even uniform.

Professor Marino stated that he is talking about the class proposal paperwork where all initial course ranges are submitted and considered by college curriculum committees and the University Curriculum Committee. He wanted to make sure that those things aren't overridden in a process, which presumes that things are going to be adjusted unless a chair justifies. Some of these things have been thought out through a deliberative process.

Vice Provost Meiksins noted that again, this a governance question. He has been on the University Curriculum Committee many, many times and he has chaired it and he chaired the College Curriculum Committee in his College and he doesn't think that he has ever heard anyone say that the class size specified on a form is intended as a guideline. He imagines that if we check what the forms for the existing curricula say the class size is, then it rarely corresponds to what they actually are precisely because those are never discussed as such. He asked Senator Fred Smith, chair of the UCC, if he could recall ever at a University Curriculum Committee meeting that class size is discussed except for WAC.

Professor Fred Smith commented that he was just asking Beth Ekelman if there really are class sizes on the forms.

Dr. Sridhar stated that he doesn't recall that there are class sizes on forms although for some, at least for the time he served on the UCC, it is only the WAC and SPAC courses that have a class size. Provost Zhu added, "Because it is writing intensive." Dr. Sridhar remarked that if he may submit, this kind of action would probably be better if it actually went through governance processes as well. We do have committees that look at these things so we could go through that process, at least in the future, to make sure that that is the way things are done.

Provost Zhu stated that that is a good point of verbal attacking. Just like he said, in the summer, it was the anticipation for the demolition for the Chester Building and also the anticipation of an increase in the enrollment because every week he was monitoring the enrollment situation so there is something put in place to respond to that. As he said before, implementation will not begin until spring and we certainly have plenty of time to discuss this again and take this into consideration.

Professor Little stated that the other issue she should mention is it created a problem, at least in her department for her chair, and for some of those enrollments that were increased; they had to find a different classroom because the original classroom held 30 and raising the class size to 35, there wasn't enough room. And, twenty-four hours to make those decisions and to make those changes was difficult.

Provost Zhu noted that certainly he understands that any time we have to respond to a situation quickly, it creates as hardship. But, he also hopes that faculty understand, university-wide, we have hundreds so if there are two or three waiting for the class, and you talk about a 1,000 wait list, it is a large number of students. So we do have to respond quickly and for a situation like Professor Little just mentioned, yes, it is not really an accepting force upon the chairs to immediately within a day find a room to accommodate the students. He noted that he appreciates the efforts to find the students. But if the chair had decided within this date... He could not find that the chair responded to the Registrar's obviously and said we cannot really increase this due to the difficulty that it would have created. Provost Zhu inquired if the faculty did find a place to accommodate these students.

Professor Little replied that the chair brought up in a faculty meeting that she had to make some quick changes because of this.

Provost Zhu stated that it is not the intention to bypass any faculty discussion about that. He just hopes from his point of view that Professor Little understands why we have to respond quickly to the wait list and to make sure that the students find their class and get into the classroom.

Dr. Sridhar said that he believes at least a portion of this confusion came because the email that was sent out the week before classes actually originated from the Registrar's Office but was sent from the Vice Provost's Office, which caused this confusion. So, in the future, that kind of email should probably come from the

Registrar's Office email so that it is clear to department chairs what is actually happening. So, that is another tactical change but it is easy to live with as well.

Senator Beth Ekelman commented that Dr. Sridhar might be able to answer her question instead of Provost Zhu. She stated that Steering was having some difficulty determining the chairs of certain committees like UFAC for example, because we need to know that the chair will get a course release since it tends to be a very heavy committee. She knows there are other committees that typically get course releases. She asked if Dr. Sridhar had found out if that is happening.

Dr. Sridhar responded that he could report on this. He commented that again, this is another one of those things that he did over the summer. He tried to look up paper work from Senate records for how Senate committee chairs are compensated for their time, etc. and the only paperwork he could find was from 1990. There was a memo proposal from the then Senate President to the then Provost with a proposal for course release for committee chairs. He wrote a similar proposal to Provost Zhu and they talked about this and this is still a conversation that they are having. He noted they did have one meeting about this and they have some ideas about how to go forward with this. It mostly comes down to talking about what we, from the Senate side, talk about how much work is there for each of the committees and he does think that there are some committees that have inordinately more work than other ones, especially the chairs of those committees which is what is reflected in the proposal that he wrote. He noted that there is also consideration about what other things a particular faculty member may be doing. He stated that this is not done yet but this is an ongoing conversation and discussion he is having with the Provost. He hopes to resolve this issue soon and to have some established process written down in a way that the Provost's Office and the Dean's Office's of the respective faculty members actually talk about this before the year starts. He went on to say that the key thing to keep in mind is that chairs of Senate committees who do in fact have a lot of work need to have a way of that additional work being recognized and compensated. Dr. Sridhar said that the initial approach was to ask for a course release. It seems not to be asked and not easy to implement, etc. but let's wait on this and work through this process. He is in the process of working with Provost Zhu and they have come up with some initial things and hopefully, by the next Steering meeting, Dr. Sridhar will have a real update.

Professor Ekelman commented that typically UFAC chooses its chair in the beginning of the fall.

Dr. Sridhar stated that those are the kinds of things that cause problems so the particular problem that Professor Ekelman is bringing up is that UFAC chooses its own chair. UFAC is appointed at the last Steering meeting of the previous year, the committee then meets and selects a chair at the beginning of the fall semester by which time teaching assignments for the year are already made so at that time to assign a course release to a particular person becomes hard. Operationalizing these things, especially if it is not written down in some place it becomes hard to manage. So those are the kinds of things that need to be figured out and written down correctly. He noted that in the past

few years, what has happened is that he did some polling of past committee chairs, etc. and most of the committee chairs of these difficult committees also had lots and lots of extra banked credit hours anyway because they couldn't take personal leaves during the time that they were serving as chairs. That contributed to this confusion as well. Somebody already has a ton of banked credit hours contradicting course release so essentially they shake hands with the department chair and say, "Well, at some point you recognize this in the future and so that just happens to be a shared understanding between that person and the department chair." Dr. Sridhar stated that what we want is for there to be a written record of how this process is managed. He went on to say that this is what he is trying to figure out to do while still taking care of both assignments which happened in January while committee appointments which happened in May and some chairs are being selected in August and the fall. So, there are lots of pieces there to be worked out and he doesn't want to rush into something that is untenable. It is an important problem. He has had three conversations with the Provost so far and they will continue to talk about this issue until they have a resolution.

Senator Robert Krebs said he had a question for President Berkman. He said that he has heard that there is a big problem but now construction bids are coming higher than anticipated. He is just hoping that President Berkman can answer in the affirmative. He asked if Chester is locked in in terms of the construction contracts or is that going to be a bit of an unknown as we take the building down.

President Berkman responded that what we are doing is guaranteeing maximum prices. We now have a design bill authority. He can't say that this has ever happened before and he congratulates those who had a role in it but the Center for Innovation in Medical Professions came in \$1 million below budget and of course right on time. But, yes, the prices of materials are escalating. But, just look around Cleveland and look around at the amount of construction that is going on in this market. We saw significant escalations in steel and concrete and glass while this project was going on. He noted that Vice President Stephanie McHenry could speak to where we are with the Chester Building and the subsequent construction of a new School of Engineering.

Vice President Stephanie McHenry reported that we are right at the beginning of the design build process. We have a number in mind but we have not sat down with Gilbane who is the architect to get them to commit to a number. That's where the rubber really hits the road. We are at the programming stage now and we are doing verification on all of that this week. Shortly afterwards the design starts and as we go through that process, that is where we start to understand where we might come in on prices and then there is a chance to make adjustments prior to the final signoff. That is a process fortunately we can use now as opposed to multiple prime bids which are much more difficult.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any further questions. There were no further questions. Dr. Sridhar then encouraged everyone to go to the meeting tomorrow at 9:30 AM for the launch of the Path to 2020 program.

XIII. New Business

Senate President Sridhar asked if there was any new business. Being no new business, Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie K. Jackson
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel