

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

MARCH 9, 2016

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Bleeke, W. Bowen, Deering, Delatte, Delgado, Duffy, Ekelman, Engelking, Fodor, V. Gallagher, Genovese, M. Gibson, Henry, Holland, Holtzblatt, D. Jackson, J. Jenkins, S. Kaufman, Krebs, Lazarus, Little, Lupton, Marino, Mazumder, Mead, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, B. Ray, Resnick, Robichaud, Shukla, A. Smith, Sonstegard, Sridhar, Visocky-O'Grady, W. Wang, Xu, Zhao, H. Zhou, Zingale.

R. Berkman, Chesko, Karlsson, Khawam, Lehfeldt, McHenry, Sawicki, Yarbrough, J. Zhu

ABSENT: Boboc, Corrigan, Hampton, Inniss, C. C. May, K. O'Neill, Rashidi.

All, J. Bennett, Boise, Bond, Gleeson, Grech, Halasah, LeVine, V. Lock, Novy, Parry, Ramos, R. Reed, Rushton, Sadlek, Schultheiss, Spademan, G. Thornton, B. White, and Zachariah.

ALSO

PRESENT: Kothapalli, J. Lieske, Linda Wolf.

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

I. Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of March 9, 2016

Dr. Sridhar noted that we have one change to the Agenda today. There will be no report from the Student Government Association. He then asked for a motion to approve the Agenda. Senator James Marino moved and Senator Stephen Duffy seconded the motion and the Agenda as amended was unanimously approved by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of September 9, 2015

Dr. Sridhar stated that we have Minutes of the meeting of September 9, 2015 for approval and asked for a motion to approve the Minutes. Senator Marino moved and Senator Resnick seconded the motion and the Minutes of the meeting of September 9, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Dr. Sridhar stated that he would give a brief report. He reported that he attended the Board of Trustees meeting this morning. The Board of Trustees approved promotion and tenure positions – eleven faculty were promoted to full professor, four faculty were promoted to associate professor with tenure and one promoted to clinical professor with tenure. He offered congratulations to all faculty members who were promoted today and a round of applause followed. He added that the Board also approved professional leaves of absence for thirty-seven of our colleagues. He noted that he contributed to those eleven faculty members promoted to full professor so that made it particularly special for him.

Dr. Sridhar reported that last week at the Board Academic Affairs Committee meeting there was actually quite a substantive discussion about textbooks. The Board has been receiving emails from students for a long time now for a good part of this year at least complaining about the rising cost of textbooks and what we, as a campus community, would do about this. So, last week at the Academic Affairs Committee meeting, there was a panel of students that came to present their perspective and there was also a faculty panel that talked about all kinds of things that faculty do in our classes. The administration presented some ideas as well. He noted that he wanted to spend maybe three to five minutes talking about what the faculty panel said as faculty representing all of us. Faculty members basically pull all kinds of tricks out of the book to make it cheaper and easier for our students to access textbooks. This includes things like using older editions, using library resources, using e-books and sometimes, when available and when the quality of the material is good enough, then using open access materials and things like that. He did want to say that the discussion at the meeting was pretty robust. He had along with him for support and for substantive contributions Professor Crystal Weyman from BGES, Professor John Holcomb from Math, Professor Michael Horvath from Psychology, Professor Catherine Monaghan from the Center for Faculty Excellence, and Professor Bill Kosteas from Economics together they presented a pretty strong picture of what faculty can do. The Board turned around and said, “Well, as the experts and as the people who control the curriculum, we would like for the faculty group to spend a little more time and investigate the issue of textbooks.” Dr. Sridhar reported that we do have a task force but it has not quite been approved. He is still in the process of sending the details to the Academic Steering Committee but all of the people he has asked so far to sit on the task force of faculty have agreed. He added that we would have a faculty led committee or task force looking at textbook affordability and what we as a campus community would like to do about the issue. At the next meeting of Senate, he hopes to be able to report that we have a committee up and going and the kinds of things the committee is looking at.

Dr. Sridhar stated that a few other things have come up for discussion that he wanted to draw Senate’s attention to. One item in particular, and this is the item numbered V.C. under the Admissions and Standards Committee about the guidelines on course capacity. He suspects that there will be a discussion here at Senate as well and he

encourages everyone to look at the memo included in the meeting packets, if people haven't already, and participate in the discussion.

Dr. Sridhar ended his report and said that he would take questions later on.

IV. University Curriculum Committee

Senator Fred Smith, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that the committee has a number of proposals that require Senate approval. The UCC has these recommendations, not all of which were available and some which are still not available in OCAS for Senators to have reviewed. He noted that he didn't hear from anyone who looked for this but couldn't find it but he is going to, in the spirit of openness, tell everyone what is not available. So, if Senators don't want to approve it, they don't have to. He noted that the reason for this disorder is that this is the last meeting at which changes for the fall catalog can be approved so the committee was ambitious in putting certain things on the Agenda hoping that they would be tied up before three o'clock today.

A. Credit-Neutral changes to the Bachelor's degree program in Computer Engineering (Report No. 32, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith stated that the first of these proposals is a Credit-Neutral change to the Bachelor's degree program in Computer Engineering that involves moving some courses from electives to required courses. This proposal also includes some changes to the requirements for Honors students, which UCC is not asking for approval today. So, again this proposal is changes to the ECE curriculum. Again, the UCC is recommending the changes be made except to the changes pertaining to honors and scholars. There were no questions.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is bringing forward a proposal to make some Credit-Neutral changes to the Bachelor's degree program in Computer Engineering. He noted that we are not voting on the pieces that pertain to the Honors and Scholars programs, just approving the rest. He then asked for the vote. The UCC's proposed Credit-Neutral change to the Bachelor's degree program in Computer Engineering was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Addition of 33-credit course-only track in the MS in Chemical Engineering (Report No. 33, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith moved to the proposed addition of a 33-credit course-only track to the MS in Chemical Engineering. This track requires more credits than their thesis track but that is common for course-only tracks in masters programs in Engineering. There were no questions.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Curriculum Committee is bringing forward a proposal to add a 33-credit course-only track to the Master of Science program in

Chemical Engineering. He asked if there were any questions. There were no questions. Dr. Sridhar then asked for a vote. The proposed addition of a 33-credit course-only track to the MS in Chemical Engineering was approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Tri-C Honors Articulation Agreement (Report No. 34, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith noted that the next proposal is an Articulation Agreement with Tri-C for the Honor's program that specifies that two slots in the Honor's program will be allocated to transfer students from Tri-C assuming that they satisfy program admission requirements. He pointed out that CSU reserves the exclusive right to admit students into the Honor's programs. He added that this is not a Tri-C function. He then asked if there were any questions.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Curriculum Committee is bringing forward a proposal which is an Articulation Agreement between the Cuyahoga Community College Honor's program and Cleveland State University's Honors College and asked for a vote. The proposed Articulation Agreement between Cleveland State University's Honors Collage and Tri-C's Honor's program was unanimously approved by voice vote.

D. Changes to the MS in Mechanical Engineering and to the 4+1 Program in Mechanical Engineering (Report No. 35, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith next presented changes to the MS in Mechanical Engineering. He noted that this is one of the proposals that the UCC is content with which was reviewed for technical reasons. It is not available in its entirety in OCAS. He noted that the proposed changes to the MS in Mechanical Engineering removes the project requirement from the non-thesis track maintaining the program at 33 credits and corrects the minimum number of credits in the catalog description in the 4+1 program.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is bringing forward a proposal about changes to the Master of Science program in Mechanical Engineering and the 4+1 program in Mechanical Engineering and asked for a vote. The proposed changes to the MS in Mechanical Engineering and the 4+1 Program in Mechanical Engineering were approved unanimously by voice vote.

E. Social Work MSW Catalog Changes (Report No. 36, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith next presented massive revisions to the catalog for the Master of Social Work program, which reorganizes and realigns the courses distinguishing between generalist and specialization courses and between two different specializations within advanced courses. He noted that UCC had extensive negotiations with the Social Work program on how the advanced program is characterized to entail certain courses that are not required and described in the catalog. He stated that those are now resolved and UCC is content with and recommends the catalog changes. Dr. Smith stated that there is

another part of the Social Work program that Senate will hear about from the Admissions and Standards Committee.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is bringing forth a proposal with change to the catalog for the Social Work Master's Program and asked if there were any questions or discussion about this program. Being no discussion, Dr. Sridhar asked for a vote. The proposed catalog changes to the Social Work MSW program were unanimously approved by voice vote.

F. Changes to program requirements for the Transportation and Water Resources Specializations of the MSCE (Report No. 37, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith stated that finally we have proposed changes to the Transportation and Water Resources and Structures and Foundation Specializations of the Master of Science and Civil Engineering. He noted that this is sort of the one point at which we might be overreaching and asking Senate to approve this because not even the majority of the UCC have seen the final changes although the four people who have seen it all think it is great. He added that maintenance thinks it is great too. Dr. Smith said that what these changes do is first clarify the degree requirements stating positive rather than exclusionary language and then each of these specializations, three of the four specializations in Civil Engineering proposes to eliminate its core requirements and substitute instead a requirement that students complete some of the courses from a menu of courses relevant to that specialization.

Dr. Sridhar said that this is a proposal coming forward from the University Curriculum Committee but not with majority support from the UCC, not because the UCC doesn't like it, but because they haven't seen it. The last changes came in today at 1:15 PM, two hours ago, so it is quite rational that most people haven't yet seen it. The program used to have a set of required courses. Those required courses are typically not offered in rotation every semester which means that students sometimes have to spend an extra semester sitting around waiting for a required course to be offered. Instead, what the department is doing is making a menu of courses available and having the advisor and the student select from that list of courses which ones will be used to satisfy program requirements. Then there isn't one particular course that a student is waiting for; the student takes a different course with the same end. So, that is what is happening with all of these three different tracks. He added that these are the transportation, water resources and structures and foundations tracks of the Master of Science program in Civil Engineering. Dr. Sridhar then asked for all those in favor of approving this proposal as presented by the UCC to please say aye. The proposed changes to the program requirements for the Transportation and Water Resources Specializations of the MSCE program were approved unanimously by voice vote.

G. For Information (Report No. 38, 2015-2016)

Finally, Dr. Smith stated that he has just two reports on additional UCC activity just in case anyone thinks the UCC has been sitting around doing nothing. He noted that

there are 4 to 3 conversions that are listed on the UCC memo and a 2 to 3 conversion. UCC restored the Computer Science minor to the undergraduate catalog and clarified that electives may be numbered 300 or higher. UCC has several new and modified GenEd courses and replaced two practicum courses in the Diversity Management Master's program in Psychology with two other practicum courses.

1. **4-3 Conversions:**
 - BME 580 – ChBME change to BME 580 (graduate)**
 - EVE 578 – EVE 578 revised (graduate)**
 - EVE 579 – EVE 5769 revised (graduate)**
 - CVE 478 – CVE 478 (undergraduate)**
 - CVE 479 – CVE 479 (undergraduate)**
2. **2-3 Conversion of PHL 528 – Credit change (graduate)**
3. **Restoration of Computer Science minor to the undergraduate catalog and clarification that electives may be numbered 300 or higher**
4. **New and modified GenEd courses:**
 - a. **Approved FRN 441 (Capstone) as SPAC (undergraduate)**
 - b. **Approved ARB 404 as Capstone (undergraduate)**
 - c. **Approved EDB 495 as Capstone (undergraduate)**
5. **Replacement of two practicum courses in the Diversity Management Master's program in Psychology with two other practicum courses**
 - PSY 692 (graduate)**

Dr. Smith then asked if there were any questions for UCC. There were no questions and Senate received the "For Information" items.

V. Admissions and Standards Committee

Dr. Chandra Kothapalli, chair of the Admissions and Standards Committee, reported that he had two items from the committee, which require a vote, and one informational item.

A. Proposed Admission changes to MSW Program (Report No. 36, 2015-2016)

Dr. Kothapalli presented the committee's first item, proposed Admission changes to the MSW Program. He referred to the Admissions and Standards Committee document included in the meeting packets. He referred to the text highlighted in yellow and the text highlighted in blue. He noted that the Admissions and Standards Committee highlight minimal text in blue. He noted that the specific changes by the Admissions and Standards Committee are on pages 2 and 3 and pages 8 and 9 that are basically, raising the requirements similar to other programs at CSU. This includes a writing sample, references, inclusion of field evaluations for long-standing programs and official transcripts from all undergraduate and graduate institutions attended. Students who apply before completing their bachelor's degree must submit evidence of degree completion before beginning the MSW program.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is bringing forward a proposal outlining Admission changes to the MSW Program. He asked if there any questions about this proposal. There were no questions. Dr. Sridhar then asked for all those in favor of the proposal to please say aye. The proposed Admission Changes to the MSW Program were unanimously approved by voice vote.

**B. Proposed Policies to address Security and Quality of E-Learning Courses
(Report No. 39, 2015-2016)**

Dr. Kothapalli stated that the second proposal from A&S is the proposed Policies & Procedures to Address Security and quality of E-Learning Courses. He noted that the document prepared by his committee is based on other documents. Faculty Senate drafted the first some time back and the Electronic Learning Committee drafted the other document. Dr. Kothapalli stated the document has two sections – one is about the policies to follow and the other is recommended practices.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is proposing a set of policies and procedures to be followed for the security of exams, particularly for e-learning courses. He also noted that there is a similar document that will come up in a future Senate meeting talking about security policies for all courses that involve exams that are administered on Blackboard. He added that this policy only pertains to courses that are fully on line as defined by the Senate E-Learning Committee. He then asked if there were any questions.

Senate Vice President Andrew Resnick stated that he had a few concerns. One concern is that there are statements in this document that seem to violate judicial due process. He noted that the second paragraph on page 1, “Faculty are expected to report any violations and swiftly act upon it.” He noted that there is already a procedure in place on how to report academic dishonesty. In addition, on page 5 under “General guidelines to Instructors: 5. The faculty should be prepared to demonstrate their intolerance for any form of academic dishonesty by taking appropriate action when cheating does occur.” Dr. Resnick stated that these are the concerns that he has with the document.

Professor Kothapalli stated that it is obvious that the security statements are actually from the previous report from the Task Force presented to Senate. He presumes that this was discussed at that point but if not, ...

Senator Beth Ekelman said that the concern she has is on page 2 of the document where it talks about plagiarism and the use of Turnitin and SafeAssign. She noted that those are useful tools but there is literature out there that they are not always accurate. She added that the way this is written it just says run it through those. That is maybe one piece of information a faculty member should consider but it is more complicated than just using the Turnitin or SafeAssign. Professor Ekelman stated that the other concern she has is the fee – going to proctor exams and it talks about asking E-Learning for

options for locations and fees. So, students have to pay extra fees. She asked, "Who pays the fee?" She asked if this could potentially be discriminatory if you are trying to accommodate students with physical disabilities and if they are required to pay a fee that nobody else is required to pay. She noted these are of concern in how this document is written. She commented that she didn't know what people thought about that. She noted that her last comment is what Professor Resnick mentioned. She suggested, instead of saying "swiftly act", maybe they should say, "Follow academic misconduct procedures of the university" or things like that.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there should be a friendly amendment to that effect. He noted that that would be a good way to say that. Rather than talking about acting upon it, we could say that faculty members will follow established university procedures with respect to academic dishonesty. Dr. Sridhar then asked if somebody would volunteer to make a friendly amendment. Professor Ekelman made a friendly amendment to amend those phrases talking about "acting swiftly" and whenever the case is to use the established process for academic dishonesty "faculty members will follow established university procedures" with respect to academic dishonesty.

Dr. Sridhar noted that the other is the fee that pertains to specific students. He then asked, "What kind of amendment could we say or should we just strike it?"

Professor Ekelman inquired if anybody knows what type of fee is being talked about. She asked, "Is it \$100, is it \$20?" Professor Kothapalli replied that the majority of the students already take some other courses on campus. So, they are not far from the campus. He stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee proposes that they will be taking the final exams on campus. In case the students cannot do that, this is just a citation that has to be decided. He noted that he is willing to strike the fee off if it is not needed in this document.

Senator Robert Krebs stated that unintentional vagueness comes into this document. Something that we have to really remember from hearing the next conversation is that the procedures that we approve or recommend can apply to many, many more faculty members than are full-time here at Cleveland State. So, when we impose in the sense a requirement for additional workload, one has to ask, "How will they be able to accomplish that? Do they have the same computer access that we do and if we are setting up these rules, what are the consequences if it is discovered that they are not being followed for reasons that sometimes are beyond the control of the person who has been placed in charge of being the instructor. He noted that Dr. Kothapalli is saying verbally, "Well, we call them policies but maybe if they are followed or if they choose to follow them, or to not follow them, are there any repercussions?" Professor Krebs added that that is not clear here.

Professor Kothapalli stated that the document is divided into two categories. The first one is the policy and there are three main policies that we are offering and each policy has multiple options that faculty can choose between. Either of the options will satisfy our requirement. And then in the second category, we have practices. These are a

bunch of practices that are just recommended. Faculty can chose to follow each one of those practices in the course. They only need to follow a majority of these. In case they don't fit the course, depending on the student – how many of them are in the class, how many are taking exams in class, etc. He noted that the final thing is, we deliberately left it a little vague regarding the fee so then we are not setting in stone any numbers. He added that the committee did include a statement that says that this document will be advisory. So, depending on the consensus, we felt they were not feasible and we took them out.

Dr. Sridhar stated that he would also like to add one other thing. He noted that this particular issue was discussed at the Steering Committee meeting and we said to the Provost who was there and Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange as well that it is the university's responsibility to make sure that faculty have a way of actually using one of these options. So, if there is a policy that says that students have to take a proctored test, the university should make such an option available to the faculty member. It is not the faculty member's responsibility to go out and find a way to offer proctored tests because then you are opening a can of worms that nobody has standard ways of doing this. He noted that there does need to be an implementation plan that comes beyond this. This document is setting forth the policies of what kinds of things one needs to look at with respect to exam security. This is not talking about how these are going to be implemented.

Senator Allyson Robichaud stated that she just wanted to back up Professor Krebs on this. She noted that in this policy, number 4 doesn't look to her like one of four possible options. It looks to her like if you are going to have these exams that need to be proctored, then students are going to have to figure out a way to do it and so it doesn't strike her that these are necessarily four different options one could choose from such that you could always satisfy the requirement that is in the policy. If it is a policy, it doesn't make sense to have such a document if it can't or won't be followed.

Professor Kothapalli stated that the committee wanted to put something in the list but it is subject to interpretation in a sense that they can choose one of these options. They can choose Turnitin or they can choose SafeAssign. He added that they can choose other options or other software but it may not be applicable for every course. Or, it may be applicable for some courses in sciences. He added that this is the reason why the committee proposed options. He stated that we could expand on these options depending on specifics we get from feedback.

Dr. Sridhar commented that it almost sounds to him that maybe we should not provide options in the policy document. Perhaps provide them as a separate appendix to the policy. When the policy says that there has to be some checking, then how you do the checking is outlined somewhere else. Again, he stated that the sense of getting and the way he is getting from the particular policy and from Professor Robichaud is that as a policy, we don't want something to be changing month-to-month, right? As a policy we want it to be clear without vagueness. If there are parts that do have vagueness, whether

we intended it to have that or not, they should be in a different part rather than being in the actual adopted policy.

Senator Brian Ray stated that Dr. Sridhar's suggestion is not a bad idea except that you run into issues. He noted that this looks like a nice first draft that outlines the kinds of issues we want to get at but there are ranges of things that probably need to be hashed out in a second draft. He suggested that maybe it would be worth distributing the proposed policy broadly so that people who actually do the courses can take it apart and say, "Hey, hold on. You tell me that I have to do this..." and then rework it. But there is a range for structure. He noted what he just heard is that the first sets are required but the text actually says that everything seems to be recommended. He referred to "Security Features" that says, "The following policies & practices are recommended."

Professor Kothapalli stated that the policies are on pages 1 and 2, "recommended practices." Dr. Sridhar pointed out that the next sentence states, "In Section 1 below, the policies A, B and C are mandatory for all E-Learning courses." Professor Ray noted that this sentence contradicts the first sentence which says that "They are recommended" which controls. Professor Ray noted that in the policy some are framed as oratory. He added that faculty should make every attempt, and some are like the E-Learning... It just seems like we could add another option.

Dr. Sridhar stated that we will pull this proposal back for now and refer it back to committee to do one more editing to make sure that things are clear and accurate and then bring the policy back to Senate at the next meeting.

Professor Ray suggested that he would send the proposed policy to faculty who are teaching E-Learning courses.

Again, Dr. Sridhar stated that this policy would be referred back to committee. It will be sent to faculty that are teaching E-Learning courses for their feedback and then we will bring the proposal back to Senate.

C. For Information: Guidelines on Course Capacity (Report No. 40, 2015-2016)

Professor Kothapalli stated that the last item from the Admissions and Standards Committee is for information only. He noted that this is regarding course capacity in GenEd courses. He noted that this was mainly designed for efficient use of classroom space and instructional resources. He stated that this would take effect in spring 2016. A memo from Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange and Vice Provost Peter Meiksins has been sent out to all of the deans and chairs and associate deans. These are applicable for GenEd courses but there are a bunch of exemptions that can be petitioned to get rid of them.

Dr. Krebs stated that he had a point of information. He noted that his understanding is that this was listed as an action item in Steering and for Senate and

asked why this is not an action item here today. He asked, "Why is this just for "Information."

Dr. Sridhar replied that this was actually brought to Steering as an "Information item." There was no change from Steering to Senate. It came to Steering as an "Information item." He noted that if Senate wants to place it as an "action item," we can do that from the Senate floor but again, it came to Steering as an "Information item" and that is why it came to Senate as an "Information item."

Dr. Krebs stated that his thought is that this is a curricular issue and that this is an action item because it certainly affects a broad range of courses. This is not a one-course effect.

Dr. Sridhar commented that he agrees with Dr. Krebs. He noted that he has been working on this item for the last couple of hours before he came to Senate so this is fresh information. Dr. Sridhar said that ever since he saw the memo that was sent to all deans, associate deans and chairs the past six weeks or so, he has tried to get more information and the particular number in contention. He noted that for those that are unaware that there is in fact something in contention, he would highlight it so that Senate could actually talk about it. He stated that if everyone looks at the memo in the meeting packets under the section that says "Additional Guidelines for Upper Level Courses Fulfilling General Education Requirements" there is a bullet point that says, "WAC courses are expected to be scheduled at a capacity of 35." He noted that under that there is a sub-bullet that says "WAC course that are offered as capstones may be scheduled with a lower capacity (minimum of 25)." Dr. Sridhar noted that these two numbers, the 35 and the 25, have been reported to him that they came from the University Curriculum Committee in years past and that it predates GenEd 08 as well. He stated that he has asked people to pull this up and Violet Lunder is actually going to go back and do a deep dive into the files which – she actually has boxes and boxes of paper from the last thirty some years so she will go in and do a deep dive and find this class capacity. Dr. Sridhar noted that what he has been doing with respect to this specific question of "this is a curricular issue" and that it concerns the size of the classes especially for WAC and Capstone course, we need to make sure that this is not something that we are stepping into without realizing what we are doing. Dr. Sridhar noted that, "After having said all of this, right, we had a lengthy discussion about this at the Steering Committee. There is an exemption process and if there are departments that have asked for exemptions with legitimate reasons and have been denied exemptions, that is another piece of information that we would like to look at as well to make sure that they are actually doing this in the right way possible. Dr. Sridhar noted that from the discussion at the Steering Committee, the memo has been clarified quite a bit because the previous memo had all kinds of things about department chairs and requirements in major courses, etc. He went on to say that this memo is not intended to look at any of the major courses. It is only looking at GenEd courses and particularly targeted at low level courses but some upper division courses as well especially the capstone courses. He noted that this is the background. He then opened up the floor for questions and comments.

Senator William Bowen stated that he had a brief question. He noted that the memo just seems confusing. Regarding all lower level general education courses, he believes that is talking about maximum capacity of 40 students and then it uses that same terminology where WAC courses are expected to be offered at the maximum capacity and then the next bullet point has a minimum capacity. He noted that this should be clarified. Are we talking about not more than 40 students or not less than 40 students?

Dr. Sridhar stated that the intent is to say that when you schedule a course, if you are scheduling a course that is just a GenEd course that is not a WAC or a capstone, you cannot schedule the course with a capacity of less than 40 students. That is the base message. Unless it is an English course or a writing course, there are all of these other exemptions already built in. So, if you are scheduling a GenEd course... Dr. Sridhar could not give a course number because he doesn't know which courses satisfy off the top of his head. If it is a course that satisfies any general education requirement that doesn't fall into one of the exemption categories, the course is supposed to be scheduled at a minimum size of 40. If the course happens to be a WAC course, then the capacity has to be at 35. You can't schedule a course at 20 for example. If the course happens to be a WAC and a capstone, then it cannot be 15; it has to be at least 25. He noted that this is what the memo is saying.

Senate Vice President Andrew Resnick said that he looked for the Physics classes; they have Physics I and Physics I WAC and asked if that means that the minimum class size would be 75.

Dr. Sridhar remarked that Professor Resnick had a good question. He stated that just before Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange gets up and starts saying something, this is exactly what was done in the Steering Committee. Each person at the Steering Committee discussion came up with an example of a course that didn't satisfy what was in the memo and then we said, "Okay, we will strike that and we will strike that and we will strike that." For example, there used to be a bullet point that said that all sections of the same course must be offered at the same capacity. But then Steering looked at the situation where there are courses that are offered as day sections with a size of 200 in MC 202 and the same course is offered as a night section with a capacity of 45 in some other room because there is only one or two. You can't offer all of these courses as night sections with a capacity of 200 – something like that. He added that there are all kinds of other issues with this as well.

Professor Ekelman commented that she recalls discussion at Steering about the upper level diversity courses. She was concerned that the requirement of a minimum capacity of 40 when you are getting into upper division, you have more discussion, more reaction, more reflection and she had thought that that requirement for upper division diversity was going to be removed. She noted that that was her recollection of that discussion but it is still in the memo.

Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange replied that from her recollection, the diversity level was going to be changed. They intended to change that recommendation and

removed the recommendation from all sections that are all the same size – they are offered at the same size. She said she just wanted to let Senate know to sort of clarify some of the discussion. This is not intended to be restricted in all of the classes in all situations. The goal is primarily to sort of equalize some of the workload issues in the colleges but what they found is that some colleges have a practice of very low capacity and other colleges have a much larger capacity for every single course. The point to keep in mind is the university's exemption process. She went on to say that anybody that has any questions about a course that is offered and the impact on the teaching in that course could apply for an exemption. There are no restrictions on the kinds of things that can be exempted.

Dr. Krebs stated that his understanding is that this document already has a fairly long history of the best way to do things because the original documents go all the way back to June of last year. Before it ever came to Faculty Senate, it had already gone around to all the chairs and it was already the idea that it was going to be implemented. He noted that the advisor in his department has actually informed him that she has already gone through the exemption process, or attempted to, and it was all benign. He said that he understands that we have differences across different departments and how one actually handles workload is a question. He doesn't think that all departments are equal but just simply say, well if we have differences among all departments, let's just take the highest workload and make that the standard and this is a problem because his poll is inadequate and he just doesn't have the time to keep running polls for everything. What really bothers him about this is that he is finding more and more departments who are reporting that most of their WAC courses are taught by part-timers because the regular faculty finds them to be too oppressive. Then that really becomes the standard, not so much for how we are treating the faculty, we treat faculty fairly and that's a record. Dr. Krebs asked, "What is the value we are giving to the students here? If that level is here, are we really effectively teaching writing with 35 students in a classroom? That is the important question to ask. We all like to complain about how students can't write by the time they hit our upper division courses, but we need to be investing the time. This isn't a problem with the administration in how to speak – part of it is the faculty, right? If we want our students to write, we have to teach them to write but I am not sure we can do that with 35 students in a classroom."

Vice Provost LaGrange reported that they have heard that from other faculty members and she has to say that she doesn't necessarily disagree with Dr. Krebs. She noted that there are departments, however, that routinely consistently always teach the writing courses at 35 students, not because they want to, but because that is how many students want to get into class. She noted that they would end up with more if the maximum wasn't set at 35. She said that she thinks this is a curricular issue and what she has suggested to other people that have brought it up is that that is something that perhaps the UCC (University Curriculum Committee) should revisit especially now that the courses have been changed from four credits to three credits. It might be something that UCC wants to reevaluate in terms of what size a writing class should be. But, that has nothing to do with this memo. She again stated that this is a curricular issue that is up to the UCC to determine.

Dr. Sridhar noted that if Vice Provost LaGrange is saying that, then some of this memo has no meaning anymore because the memo basically is setting up what the courses should be scheduled as so, if he may, he would like to suggest an amendment to this document. Take out the sections that talk about WAC and capstone until after the UCC or whatever other curricular party has looked at what the maximum size of a writing class should be or a capstone class should be. He stated that there is in fact some level of arbitrariness in terms of departments scheduling some courses of one section of the same course with a group size of 20 and another one of size 30 and 50 and so on, right? So there are a large number of courses that we could cover without getting into the WAC and capstone, which are the ones that we are talking about right now. Dr. Sridhar stated, "If I may make a recommendation to Vice Provost LaGrange, if we can talk about those courses and ask the curricular parties to look at what the right size for a WAC or a capstone course could be, that may be the right way to go forward."

Senator James Marino stated that he is a little troubled by the fact that there is a kind of blanket guideline with an exemption process. He said he believes that there are individual classes that are kind of out of line, but he is not sure why we should change everything and then have the individual departments who presumably put some thought into class size when they were generating these decisions then appeal to the administration. He said that he would much prefer that the administrators focus on the specific problems and speak to those department chairs and there is a kind of individual way to fix these problems without kind of using a broad base.

Dr. Sridhar commented that there is probably a reason for that premise here. It is not always true. Sometimes departments do in fact put in an arbitrary number and let's just be honest with that. But again, the point is, he is asking Senators as colleagues, if the issue that they are seeing is specifically with WAC and capstone courses. So, let's leave that aside for now and spend some time thinking about it.

Vice Provost LaGrange reported that currently the capacity for WAC courses is 35 so we went with that. With all due respect, until UCC changes the capacity, we do need to have some way of ensuring that it is not just for faculty in various departments to ensure consistency in teaching loads. It's also for students that need to complete a degree program. And, what we have encountered, in some cases students are blocked out of, for example, WAC and capstone that they actually need in order to graduate. Students can't take WAC because it is artificially capped at 25. So this is to address things like that that we actually go lower than that. It is to address things like that that she originally came up with this. She noted that if there are some curricular issues revolving around the question of whether a WAC course really should be 35, then she certainly thinks that the faculty should address that but until then, we do need to have some way of making sure that faculty are treated fairly and students are as well.

Dr. Fred Smith commented that he was going to say exactly what Vice Provost LaGrange just said. If someone wants the UCC to look at it, UCC can do that but on the

WAC criteria sheet we say that not just because these courses should not exceed 35 students but that if there is a TA, they can be as large as 45 students.

Senator Sanda Kaufman commented that what she was thinking sort of from the exercise that is decision-making, is that we need to pin down what the problem is and fix that rather than make rules that seem to fix something other than we are actually saying we are fixing. So, she is going to go with Professor Marino's comment. Let's look at problems when they come up like if there is consistently an under-booked class that causes problems for students, and maybe we should fix that. But, otherwise, we seem to make these blanket rules that don't actually address what the problem really is.

Dr. Sridhar stated that we do need to go find those particular classes that are offensive or offending the rules but then this is basically setting up a framework of where we need to be so that we can identify classes that are not in line with that. If we don't have any standard, if we don't have a line drawn, then you cannot enter that class that says that this does not satisfy the standard because there is no standard defined. Dr. Sridhar noted that his personal feeling with this issue, after having looked at it the first time when he saw this in June of last year, he had several conversations about this issue. Actually before this memo was written with former Provost Mageean and Vice Provost Peter Meiksins as well, and the idea that the origination of this whole thing was to say, what should that line be so that you can find out where the problems are. What we are finding now is the reverse effect, which is that we are causing other kinds of problems – the memo is unintentionally causing other kinds of problems. He noted that concerning the curricular issues that do come up, we should look at them as a faculty and see what the curricular issues are. But until then, we use this course capacity and keep going but let's act fast and find those curricular issues. Dr. Sridhar stated that he doesn't have a point of order in terms of what we do next. This was an information item that sparked a significant discussion.

Professor Resnick stated, "I guess I move to make it a voting item." Dr. Sridhar asked, "What are you making a voting item?" Professor Resnick replied, "This memo on course capacity. Senate can modify the memo so we can vote on it. We can't do anything with it if it is for information only." He added that he would move to strike the second bullet point to recommend that UCC clarify this issue.

Dr. Sridhar asked for a second to Dr. Resnick's motion. Professor Beth Ekelman seconded the motion. Dr. Sridhar stated that Senate needed to first vote on whether we make this a voting item or not.

Professor Marino commented, "Pursuant to Professor Resnick's motion, I move that we send this memo to the UCC for due consideration."

Dr. Sridhar stated that the motion to table is that we will make this an action item and the action we are taking on this item is to send this memo to the UCC for due consideration. Senator Stephen Duffy seconded the motion.

Dr. Sridhar then asked for a vote on Professor Resnick's motion. The motion to refer the Admissions and Standards Committee's Guidelines on Course Capacity to the UCC for due consideration was unanimously approved. Dr. Sridhar noted that the UCC would bring this item back to Senate after having reviewed it.

VI. Budget and Finance Committee Report (No. 41, 2015-2016)

Professor Joel Lieske, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, stated that for purposes of conciseness he would read the committee's report. He noted that the committee did not have any action for Senate; these are all informational items.

"This report is intended to provide information on some budget and finance issues that we have discussed at several meetings of the Budget and Finance Committee last fall and the Provost's Budget Advisory Committee.

"1) The good news is that the \$3.1 million budget deficit projected by the Budget and Financial Analysis Office for FY 2016 has pretty much been wiped out by surplus enrollments for summer, fall and spring. Thanks largely to a very effective marketing campaign by Rob Spademan's office; there was an 18.5% increase in the number of new freshmen and a 22.8% increase in the number of student credit hours.

"2) One trend that we have been following is the growing level of debt and debt service in the operating budget. At the end of the fiscal year 2015, the university's balance of indebtedness was \$254 million. I just received that figure from Tim Long today. Currently, debt service is at some \$17 million per year and is the university's third largest college after CLASS and the College of Sciences. Fortunately, budget projections suggest that it has peaked and will go down in the future.

"3) We are also monitoring the continuing burden of paying the operating deficit of the Wolstein Center. The good news is that under the leadership of Boyd Yarbrough, our new Vice President of Student Affairs, it has declined from \$915,000 last year to \$831,000 this year. The bad news is that it has been operating in the red since it was built and that three management companies have not been able to make it profitable. Last year, the administration floated the idea of putting this expense in the operating budget but wisely decided to forego this option. Athletics should not compete with our academic mission and educational excellence.

"4) We have also discovered that our faculty, staff, and students are paying some \$620,000 more in parking fees than it costs to operate and amortize the facilities. A couple of my colleagues on the committee have suggested that most of this surplus is probably being used to cover the operating deficit of the Wolstein Center. But we are hopeful that the move to play some men's and women's basketball games in the Q and hire the Cavs booking agent to schedule events in the Wolstein Center will help eliminate the red ink. We understand the ostensible rationale. Residual Gund activities might serve as overflow for us, and students might be more inclined to attend games at the Q.

But we will have to take a hard look in the future at revenue and expense data to see whether these happy outcomes are working out.

“5) A final item in our report concerns the leasing or sale of university-owned land for economic or community development projects, particularly those that are paid out of our operating budget. Last year the university decided to lease a parking lot and 200 parking spaces at the southwest corner of Payne and 24th to the International School for a new K-8 building. To replace these spaces, the university will pay two private parking facilities a total of \$21,400 each year for 175 spaces. We have been assured that the revenue the university receives from leasing the parking lot has more than made up this cost.

“That concludes our report.”

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any questions.

Professor Resnick thanked Professor Lieske for the Budget and Finance Committee report. He stated that he had a question on item 1) and added that this is not to be taken the wrong way. He asked, “How is it that we know that the enrollment increase is largely attributed to the marketing campaign?” Professor Lieske responded that the marketing campaign is one of the factors.

Dr. Resnick asked if there is any data to support that the enrollment increase is related to the marketing campaign. Professor Lieske replied that what you have is an increase in the number of freshmen and the question then becomes that he is open to explanations and he is not saying that this is the only one; the committee is not saying that. The committee is saying that this is probably one of the reasons that we were able to increase the number of freshmen.

Professor Resnick stated that there could be other factors. By doing something right with the marketing campaign and it is working, right, we should know what we are doing right and what is working so we can repeat that maybe not across the university but also within our individual colleges so this thing warrants an investigation to find out if this truly is the case because it's worthwhile. It could be external factors as well that have nothing to do with marketing.

Professor Lieske responded that Professor Resnick made a good point. He noted that one of the issues the committee discussed was the declining pool of students for college in Northeast Ohio. We are clearly getting a greater response rate and that was one of the possible explanations but, if Professor Resnick could suggest other things to do, we are open to that.

Professor Resnick stated that he doesn't have anything offhand to suggest, but he thinks this seems logical to him that if we are going to make a statement, that the enrollment increase was largely due to an effective marketing campaign, that we should

have some kind of evidence to support that. He said that evidence is worth looking at so that we can repeat that if that is the case.

Professor Lieske stated that if Professor Resnick could direct the committee to other possibilities, the committee would check it out.

Dr. Sridhar noted that that is not what Professor Resnick is saying. He is saying, "Let's go look at what the marketing folks did that they could attribute to the enrollment." Professor Resnick said, "Yes. It is truly an inquiry question; it is not an argumentative question at all. I am curious. If we are doing something right, rather than guess at what is increasing the enrollment, let's go find out what is increasing the enrollment."

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any other questions.

Professor Krebs stated that he had another positive question. He asked, "If we are getting 175 spaces for \$21,400 and our spaces that just came on the campus network are filled and we are already at capacity, if all of the passes are sold, do we sell our passes for more than those spaces cost? Should we be renting more spaces and selling more passes?"

Dr. Sridhar remarked, "That's a 2020 Program Budget 'Asset Monetization;' that's what you can look at so go talk to Brian Ray – that's his project." Dr. Sridhar then asked if there were any other questions for the Budget and Finance Committee. There were no further questions.

VII. Electronic Learning Committee Recommendations for Faculty Online Teaching (Report No. 42, 2015-2016)

Professor Linda Wolf, chair of the Electronic Learning Committee, reported that the E-Learning Committee has been looking at some guidelines that have come out from the Ohio Department of Higher Education. What they recommended in April of 2015 – this should be on page 2 of the handout – they have a list of expectations for all faculty members and specifically the Ohio Department of Higher Education lists items that online faculty must possess to teach online. All faculty members are to be prepared to teach in the online setting. She noted that this is the key thing and the second thing is that all faculty members will need to go through professional development. The Ohio Department of Higher Education doesn't specify how much or what type of training to be prepared and that is necessary. Professor Wolf noted that at this point, the E-Learning Committee has identified our own criteria. The E-Learning Committee is recommending, and faculty is defined as all full-time, part-time and adjunct faculty members who teach totally online in blended classes. The Committee has four items that faculty can choose when they begin to teach online to indicate that they are prepared to teach online.

- 1) Faculty members need to take the Faculty Online Teaching and Design (FOTD) course designed and taught by the Center for eLearning. There is

now a stipend of \$500 for successful completion of the training course. There are specific criteria about what completion of the course involves. Or,

- 2) Faculty can use the CSU templates that have been designed by the Center for eLearning and that helps to ensure the consistent framework, for online courses taught at CSU. Or,
- 3) Faculty can complete the *Applying the Quality Matters Rubric (APPQMR)* training. This training looks at course design and that helps ensure consistency in how online courses are designed. Or,
- 4) A Faculty member's Department Chair/Dean/Associate Dean, etc. and/or in consultation with the Director of the Center for eLearning may identify appropriate alternatives to the above-mentioned recommendations.

Professor Wolf commented that this is done because sometimes you get new faculty who have extensive online teaching and they may not need to go through a course or do some of these other suggestions. She added that it could be individualized. She noted that this has been done on purpose so that it can cover a vast array of situations. For professional development, the committee has recommended that faculty can choose one of three requirements to meet this and at this point, the committee has only recommended that one of these professional development workshop/course/presentations must be completed every two years to maintain the professional development requirement. Again, these are similar to the others:

- 1) Completion of the *Applying the Quality Matters Rubric (APPQMR)* training,
or
- 2) Complete workshops presented by the Center for eLearning and/or the Center for Faculty Excellence related to Blackboard and other online teaching topics,
or
- 3) Faculty can take the Faculty Online Teaching and Design (FOTD) course.

Professor Wolf reported that documentation has to be maintained for these faculty activities so it is incumbent upon faculty to maintain their own documentation but it also needs to be maintained in a centralized location, college, school or department. The Center for eLearning will maintain documentation for all classes that are taken through the Center for eLearning and reports can be drawn upon request. In addition, the Ohio Department of Higher Education is empowered by the Ohio Revised Code, Chapter 3333 and they can come in at any time and demand this information. Dr. Wolf stated that this is why we have to maintain this and each college or school needs to identify a way of maintaining this information.

Professor Wolf asked if there were any questions.

Professor Ekelman inquired if the Ohio Department of Higher Education requires this ongoing training for part-timers. Professor Wolf responded, "Yes. It requires this

training for anyone who teaches online.” She noted that the definition of faculty is on the first page of the material she distributed for today’s meeting – Faculty is defined as all full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty members who teach totally online.

Professor Ekelman asked if we are going to be able to pay them. We pay our part-timers so poorly. Professor Wolf replied that this is out of the purview of the E-Learning Committee. She noted that the Center for eLearning has been given the opportunity to give a \$500 stipend to anyone who completes the Faculty Online Teaching and Design course. If a faculty member chooses to do one of the other requirements, this would be up to the department or college or school.

Dr. Sridhar noted that these apply to courses that are totally online or blended as defined previously. Professor Wolf added that these are not courses that use Blackboard as a repository for documents for enrichment activities. That is not included in this. This is a just strictly totally online course or blended courses that are listed that way in CampusNet.

Professor Ekelman stated that she is just concerned because she knows that our MSHS program is online and we have maybe two faculty assigned to that program. A lot of our online courses are taught by part-timers so there is an issue about compensating them, assuming they are in town, but some of our part-time faculty members are out of state.

Interim Provost Jianping Zhu said that he wanted to add to that. He stated that also we could do that. He had informed Professor Wolf the other day that we could get the \$500 payment for the adjunct faculty if they go through the recommended training.

Professor Wolf stated that the \$500 payment is only for the Faculty Teaching and Online Design course that is taught through the Center for eLearning.

Dr. Sridhar remarked that that is an online course itself so somebody out of state can take that course. Dr. Ekelman stated that that might be overkill for some of our people who have been teaching for years for us; they design courses for us. She noted that she is just thinking how we can compensate the people for their time for some of these things. She also asked if some of the continuing education components would be available online or are they in-person programs? Professor Wolf replied that she believes that Karen does both.

Senator Joseph Mead stated that he is sort of sensitive to something that Professor Krebs said earlier today about imposing a uniform policy on everybody that will require additional labor for part-time faculty. He asked, “I wonder if there has been any discussion with people who teach online classes about the effectiveness; are they going to workshops already? Is this really a problem and is this the only or best way to answer it?”

Professor Wolf replied that if the people come from other universities, as long as they have documentation from those universities that they could provide, that would count as online training. But, this is something that is beyond our control. This is coming from the Ohio Department of Higher Education and it is not something that we can make our own rules for.

Dr. Sridhar remarked, "Actually we are making our own rules." He added that the requirements are coming from the State of Ohio. The committee is bringing forward recommendations for how to complete their tools and to implement them. Professor Smith added that this is something that has to be done in some way and these are the recommendations that the E-Learning Committee has come up with.

Dr. Sridhar stated that this is completion of the *Applying the Quality Matters Rubric* and asked Professor Wolf, "How long does that take and do you have any idea how long it takes actually for somebody to go through that training?" Professor Wolf replied that it is a one-day training.

Senator Brian Ray commented that the language from ODHE is pretty broad. Professor Wolf stated, "Yes." Professor Ray asked if our specifics are modeled after other institutions or does the Department of Higher Education actually provide a range of specifics on how to... Professor Wolf replied that there are no specifics. Our E-Learning Committee identified these activities based on what we have here at Cleveland State, what we can offer, and what is already offered because all of these are already offered and in place.

Professor Ray stated that he wondered in terms of what is required versus what might be offered as supplemental enrichment. He asked, "Do we benchmark our requirements against what other schools are doing to comply with that same... Professor Wolf responded, "No, because it is so broad that it is still... Each university can define this in the way that they want to. This is how we are defining it for Cleveland State.

Professor Ray commented, "I guess what I am hearing from you is that maybe we think about calibrating it and separating out what is sort of the minimum that we think would be necessary for people to sort of be able to be competent." Professor Wolf responded that we have four different methods for the initial training and one of them is that faculty members can discuss this with their Department Chair, Dean, or Associate Dean or whoever else in the administration. They can identify their own method of providing documentation or proving that they are prepared to teach online. She added that this is why we have identified these four different ways. She said that they are varied – some of them are structured and the last one is very fluid. The Ohio Department of Higher Education just gives this documentation.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the point that Professor Ray just mentioned now and some of the discussion as well, we want high standards for how we teach online. We want high standards so it is not a bad thing for our standards for meeting this need to be higher than what the State defines as they would require. He noted that the point that is coming up

again, is that we have part-timers and that this becomes an undue burden for them to go through this thing, which becomes a request to the Provost to see how they are actually going to compensate these people to do these things. He noted that this is a separate point from the policy itself, which is planning what we are going to do to guarantee quality of online courses.

There being no further questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the Electronic Learning Committee has brought forward a proposed policy for faculty online teaching and asked Senators for a vote. The proposed Recommendations for Faculty Online Teaching were approved with one no and two abstentions.

VIII. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman said that he would like to start with Professor Sridhar's disclaimer that some of this may be true and some of this may not be true. He said that he is also going to stick with his "Let's get done and get out into the air."

President Berkman reported that yesterday was the last meeting of the Governor's Capital Budget Committee. There are now a series of recommendations for allocations for capital projects for all four-year colleges and for our two-year colleges and they are still confidential. They were probably confidential for about an hour after the meeting was over but that's how they were represented to us but nonetheless, if it comes to pass what was recommended, what we know was recommended on the Governor's side and what we know was recommended on the legislative side, we should do extremely well in this round in capital allocation. He commented, "Who knows whether there will be another round of capital allocation; we certainly don't know if there is another round, whether it will follow the same process which gave college presidents an enormous amount of flexibility and authority in allocating dollars, sometimes to the distress that didn't think that college presidents should be in charge of some things so responsible as allocating dollars among universities. He stated that this may be the last rodeo in terms of that process but again, he feels really confident that we will do extremely well in what is a contest in many respects.

President Berkman stated that the other piece from the State that he will share with everyone just briefly, but he thinks everyone really should understand it in a more complete way, is that there are a series of mid-budget revisions being recommended by the Governor which are very dramatic and very sweeping in changing the role of community colleges in the State of Ohio. He noted that there are probably ten examples but the most significant one would be a policy that would allow community colleges to give baccalaureate degrees. Obviously, this has happened in twenty-four states. President Berkman commented, "When you look at how budget decisions are made, everyone should count the votes. When you look at how these decisions are made, everyone should count the money." President Berkman noted that the differential between what it would cost to get a nursing degree in a four-year institution as opposed to what it would cost to get a four-year degree in a community college institution is incredibly dramatic. He stated that this particular provision would become legislation.

This is all going to be heard by the Legislature in April and obviously, the senior college presidents will do what they can to try to do whatever “damage control we could do.” He noted that that particular stipulation of four-year colleges also stipulates that the community colleges must charge their standard tuition for those additional two years. So, they cannot raise their tuition for upper division courses. A student who pays \$2,495 to go to Tri-C for their freshman and sophomore year, if they took a nursing degree at Tri-C for their freshman and sophomore year, they would pay \$2,495 for those two additional years. President Berkman stated that we are probably talking about the difference of \$35,000 in the cost of a nursing degree between a two-year institution and a four-year institution. He noted that this is one of the majors and there are others. There is a proposal that there be 3+1 degrees and that universities must effect articulation agreements with community colleges that allow students to complete three years of their curriculum at a community college and one year at a senior college. He went on to say that to make a long story short, community colleges have, for whatever reasons, been successful and he believes the biggest reasons are the dollars in making their case that they are an alternative, not an addition, not an additive; they are all alternative to the existing four-year college structures. President Berkman stated that this is only a foot in the door in terms of what is going to be. Again, this is not new. There are twenty-three or twenty-four states that already do this, that are already committed, and probably one of the biggest is Florida. In Florida, they started with a very small – you could offer it if another college hasn’t offered it within twenty miles of you; you don’t have any additional capacity, etc. and the programs are limited to seven programs in the entire state. There are now twenty-seven baccalaureate programs just at Miami Dade Community College. He noted that this is the new tomorrow. He stated that again, there are other pieces in it that are going to require a very short period of time for the four-year institutions, however they can mobilize, to at least try to slow down what is a fast-moving train in Columbus and a fast moving train across the U.S.

President Berkman reported that at the Board meeting this morning, he read two letters that were really wonderful shout-outs to the faculty. He said, “Here is how he got ahold of the letters.” He was visiting a donor trying to get money which he does an awful lot and sometimes he gets it and sometimes he doesn’t, but we’ve gotten a good chunk of it – the campaign is at \$85 million in terms of fund-raising attainment of the \$100 million campaign so we have had a very successful run so far. But in any event, this donor had two grandchildren who went to Cleveland State University and before he met with President Berkman he asked his two grandchildren, one of them who transferred from another local institution to Cleveland State to give him the real skinny on Cleveland State – the good, the bad, the ugly, the redemptive and the one thing that comes out of both of these letters – President Berkman said he hopes that faculty will transmit this to their colleagues – what comes out of both of these letters are really nothing less than an ode to the faculty. The big element, the big plus that they see at Cleveland State University is a faculty who is engaged, a faculty who cares about their success, a faculty that is no nonsense. One of these letters said that the faculty recognizes that we have other things that are going on in our lives, our syllabi are relevant, what we are being taught we can apply to what we are doing now and we know we will be able to apply going forward. It is not just completing a syllabus either; it’s about the class being able to come along as a

class and as a group of learners. He noted that it was a wonderful ode to the faculty and he has heard it many, many times so faculty ought to be very proud that, in this particular non-randomized sample of student opinion, faculty came out very well.

President Berkman said that Professor Zingale sent him a coin and he just had to follow him. A lot of the marketing that we have done has moved from traditional marketing to social media marketing. This is the new market-place in social media and the one thing that you can do in social media better than you can do, at least he has been told, in the traditional more standard forms of advertising is that you can get better, more precise, more significant analytics about where students found information, how they got to you, what prompted them, how many clicks they needed until they got to the application, etc. There is a growing set of analytics that tells us much, much more about the population, who is applying and whether they are coming through Facebook or whether they are coming through Linked In or whether they are coming through other social media. So, it doesn't prove that it wasn't effective, not that it means that social marketing is the new frontier but it is certainly, for most universities, where the advertising market is going and, in doing that, it allows us to collect a little more data on student decision-making. President Berkman stated that we have an enormous challenge every single year. The good news so far is that we to date have more freshman applications than we had all of last year. He said that he looked at the data this morning and we had about 10,500 freshman applications. Last year, when all was said and done, in June really we had 9,000 freshman applications. By the way, that is twice as many as we had the year before which was 5,000 freshman applications. We have also contracted with a proven vendor who has demonstrated throughout the country that they have the metrics and they have the tools to increase the applicant pool and we have seen the result of that. President Berkman reported that someone recited a figure this morning at the Board of Trustees meeting and it goes something like this: "I believe that for every 100 students who graduate from a high school in Ohio, there are 61 first graders taking their place." President Berkman added, "So that is how significant the bleed is in terms of the pipeline that is going to come through public education in Ohio."

Finally, President Berkman said that this is his abbreviated report.

IX. Report of the Interim Provost

Interim Provost Jianping Zhu said that he just wanted to echo President Berkman's thank you message to our faculty in terms of their interactions with the students and very positive feedback from the students. He noted that he has another piece of evidence demonstrating that. The latest round of a national survey of student engagement shows that CSU students feel themselves more positive than other peers at other similar universities in terms of their interaction with the faculty, staff and others on the campus. That is the data survey from the students' feedback themselves. So, they feel very positive on our campus and that has to do with how we feel our students feel about the job faculty do in the classroom and also everybody else. So, that positive response is not just for the faculty and the staff and their peers; in terms of students and student interaction across the board, our students feel more positive than their peers in

other similar institutions. Provost Zhu added that this shows the importance of what everyone does every day and he thanked everyone.

President Berkman referred to the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) sample that Provost Zhu was talking about that included 500 seniors and 500 freshmen so it is a thousand students who were surveyed by NSSE.

Provost Zhu stated that that is overwhelming evidence that the faculty and staff are doing a great job supporting our students and indeed in terms of improving our student success rate both in terms of retention and graduation rates. He noted that other than that, it is pretty hot in our meeting room today and we have great weather outside so he just will pick up the pace.

Provost Zhu reported that regarding promotions he wanted to add another update as well: the Board's decision that one of our faculty, after serving CSU for 37 years, was approved for Emeritus faculty status this morning and that is Dr. Richard Rakos from the College of Sciences and Health Professions.

Provost Zhu stated that his other update is about the CSU budget process. He noted that every year, the colleges make a budget at this time of the year but this year, given the ongoing 2020 project, the process is slightly different. The Deans have submitted their activity-based budget on Monday of this week and today we began discussions with each college on top of the regular budget process to look into the college budget and have some open discussion about where the college is heading, what are the college priorities and with resources how the college is reallocating and refocusing their resources to support the strategic priorities. At the end of the meetings he will take each individual college's and there will be a one-day retreat for all of the college Deans to meet together and to meet with the senior leaders of the Provost's team to have a discussion and to share their experiences and share their vision for each college. It is hoped that through that exercise it will optimize our use of resources and improve our efficiency. Hopefully, in the end we enhance our goal of improving student success.

Finally, Provost Zhu stated that this is his quick update.

X. Open Question Time

Professor Ray said he had a question for Dr. Sridhar and Professor Duffy on the college budget process that they pioneered. He asked, "Is there a recommended procedure for how to do the activity-based budgeting?" He noted that one of the really valuable things he found on the administrative side was that it was highly collaborative in the kind of strategic planning and so there were some points in which there were only certain people invited but at least in ten possible, most people were invited to participate in a kind of brain-storming and identifying those things. He asked if that was recommended at the college level as well or what was the process at the college level.

Dr. Sridhar stated that he could speak to that. He noted that at the college level and many of the Deans that he heard were welcome too. At the college level what they did as part of the Engineering College pilot was to go through and establish the so to speak template for how each college and each department assembled those budgets and then each Dean was asked to basically replicate that process with their Department Chairs and then produce the activities budget. He said that he knows a little bit about the process that Professor Ray is referring to on the administrative side that was not the exact replica of what happened on the administrative side because the point of doing those things were different. The point of the administrative side was to explicitly look for efficiencies and where things could be done differently so that you could spend less money in that particular operation. He added that the point of the activity on the college side was for the college leadership to articulate what the strategic plans and the five-year plans for the colleges were and how their budgets reflected those goals that were set out in the strategic plan. So, the intent was a little bit different but each Dean did in fact go through a process of supplying the strategic plan or a five-year plan, whatever they wanted to call it, and align the goals set for those with the activity-based budget. The group meeting that is going to occur is the meeting with all of the Deans together with the Provost.

Professor Ray asked, "What role did faculty play in developing the initiative piece of it?" Dr. Sridhar replied that that depends on each college. That depends on how each Dean did that with their own college. Professor Ray noted that the 2020 team didn't recommend either. Dr. Sridhar replied, "No."

Professor Duffy stated that in fact, they had some of the biggest inertia they had to overcome that was, "Oh my God, we are not engineering and we designed ours based on our strategic plan and how money supported mission statements in the strategic plan."

Professor Bowen noted he had a question for President Berkman. He remarked that President Berkman's statement about the junior colleges being able to give the bachelor's degrees is kind of breathtaking. He asked, "What is the strategic implication in your view for Cleveland State?"

President Berkman replied that obviously the first consequence is net recruitment to four-year institutions particularly for professional degrees is going to become much more difficult. It depends upon how the labor market reacts in some respects but if you can get a BS in a Bachelor of Science in Nursing as he said for about \$10,000, and have an entry into the Cleveland Clinic at a starting salary probably the same as you would if you got a Bachelor of Science from Akron or from Kent or from Cleveland State, the laws of the market are eventually going to catch up with the decision-making. He noted that this is really one of the implications and the hunt for students will become much more significant. No one has been as tough on a community college since Ronald Reagan because the community college completion rates are abysmal. They are almost statewide in the single digits but yet they are held up everywhere and nationally as the paragon of how we want to provide post-secondary education.

Professor Bowen stated that he wanted to push back a little bit. He said that he wonders whether that is really strategic. “Yes, we are going to factor increased competition but that is different than saying how we as an institution can respond to that and to say that we are going to have a more difficult time with enrollments is probably correct but doesn’t really say how we go about doing what we need to do. Maybe we should stake out new degrees now before there is competition. Or, maybe we should focus on our graduate programs. There are ways that we, as an institution...”

President Berkman remarked that Professor Bowen is correct. He noted that he mentioned enrollment because enrollment means money. So, if we can’t maintain enrollment in a difficult environment right now, and he stays focused on that because that is what keeps the trains running, that imperils our ability to continue to do what is right. He stated that the first State-wide action bill is for all of the Presidents who met as a Presidents’ only group yesterday, due in the next month or so, tried to convince the legislature that this is not the right path for the State to take. Or, as they talked about the track to make the guard rail so small, so let them give a baccalaureate degree in welding since we all know in Ohio that welding will save the world and that the community colleges give courses in welding so the notion was, can we restrict it to baccalaureate degrees that have these well-established workforce routes to them. So, the first thing is, can you live in it strategically and politically and next month slow it down to a degree that doesn’t have a significant impact? He added that Professor Bowen’s point is well taken but starting new degrees cost a lot of money. Hiring new faculty costs a lot of money. He stated that his real answer to Professor Bowen is he really hadn’t thought and he doesn’t think that the group thought other than kind of the traditional political challenge – we are going to oppose this basically and we are going to oppose it legislatively and we are going to oppose it with our constituents. He added that there wasn’t really that much of a thought about strategically what might be a counter to this initiative.

Professor Smith noted that the summary that he has seen and he is looking at says, “Up to ten bachelor’s degree programs may be offered through Ohio’s community colleges.” Dr. Smith asked, “For those ten specific programs, is each community college allowed to choose ten – what is the ten?”

President Berkman replied that it is unclear and he doesn’t think that it is accidentally unclear. It is legislative language and in the committee as you look at this, our Governor’s recommendations have to be translated into legislation. So, when you get to the rule-making process, there will be a discussion about did they mean ten per college, did they mean ten per discipline, did they mean ten per region, etc., and the committee will themselves ask what should we do, what should we allow community colleges to do. So, these are really ticklers, these are really door openers basically. Where they will go when they reach the higher education committee and the legislature is really hard to gather but in some ways the more intriguing question is how they got there.

Professor Smith inquired if President Berkman and his colleague presidents have a strategy for precedence. President Berkman replied, “Yes.” He noted that Ohio is

really fortunate by having a very, very strong organization, an Inter University Consortium which really, is the most powerful state-wide higher education lobbying organization, lobbying policy collaborative organization that he has ever seen. The former Lieutenant Governor of Ohio whose advantage is that he obviously knows his way around Columbus heads it. "So, yes, there is a legislative strategy, there is a PR strategy, there is a constituent strategy, there is a business outreach strategy, but we have a very limited amount of time." President Berkman went on to say that one of the problems with the mid-budget revisions is that there is really something like 45 days before the legislature has to pass it. If this had come out in the beginning of the biennium, there would have been six months before it went from the Governor's recommendation to legislative authority. Here, it will be 45 days before it does that.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any more questions. There were no questions.

XI. 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 and seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:43 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie K. Jackson
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel