

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

MARCH 19, 2014

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, Delatte, Delgado, Duffy, Ekelman, Genovese, Goodell, G. Goodman, Gross, R. Henry, Hoffman, M. D. Jones, Karem, S. Kaufman, Kosteas, Krebs, Lehfeltdt, J. Lieske, Little, Majette, Margolius, Marino, C. May, Meier, Nawalaniec, Resnick, Rickett, Sridhar, Steinberg, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, Wolf.

M. Bond, Dumski, J. Ford, Mageean, McHenry, Sawicki,
G. Thornton, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Dixit, Doerder, Geier, Gorla, D. Jackson, Jayanti, Kalafatis, Kent, Liggett, Niederriter, Rashidi, Talu, M. Walton, Welfel, J. G. Wilson, Witmer-Rich.

Artbauer, R. Berkman, Boise, C. Brown, Halasah, E. Hill, Karlsson,
LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, Novy, Parry, Sadlek, Spademan, Stoll, Triplett,
Ward, Wehner, B. White, Zachariah.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M.

amendments to the Minutes. She then asked for a motion to approve the Minutes. It was moved and seconded and the Minutes of the meeting of September 11, 2013 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Goodell stated that her report will be short. She welcomed everyone to Senate's second official meeting of the semester. She said she hoped that everyone had a great spring break including the four plus inches of snow we got. She noted that she did manage to get caught up a little bit and hopefully everyone did too.

Dr. Goodell reported that first of

for the most part, advising is well underway. The 2014-2015 schedule is already up on Campus Net and so the next big deadline is March 31, 2014 when registration opens. Hopefully, the staggered opening dates and the advanced schedule of advising will avoid a last-minute rush to register in August. She asked everyone to please keep on

Provost Mageean stated that they have developed what we call a five-step planning process. The schedule is six campus visits as they progress from discovery and listening to analysis to generation and finance. So, there will be regular monthly meetings on campus with the executive team. The process includes regularly scheduled open houses, focus group meetings and on line portals for those unable to attend physical planning meetings. She noted that the web site detailed on the handout she just distributed has been open for two weeks. She added that in case people have some time on their hands, there are 750 page views and we have had 200 visitors so far. Provost Mageean reported that the next visit is March 26 –

Provost Mageean noted that we have an excellent College of Urban Affairs and they will use some of our external expertise.

Senator Beth Ekelman inquired if there will be other opportunities for faculty to provide input other than the one focus group. Provost Mageean replied, "None that are currently scheduled." She added that if the demand exists, they could probably accommodate that; it is important that we hear from all of the constituents.

Senate President Goodell reported that Professor Rachel Carnell is the Senate's representative chosen by the Provost and she had included Dr. Goodell on a couple of emails between her and someone from the architect's office and asked Senate to choose faculty to attend a focused group meeting and Dr. Goodell replied immediately and said, "Please give me the details of when and where the meeting will be, date time and location and we will convene some faculty but I have not heard back from her. So as soon as she gets back, she will ask and send an email to the entire Senate and each caucus will be requested to choose faculty from people who represent all the different kinds of teaching settings that your college occupies. So the College of Sciences, you have a big job to get lots of people from different settings. Education, we might not have such a big job but in fact very few of us teach in that building; it is mostly office space. That will be coming if and when I get any reply back from the architect's office on that."

Senator Jeff Karem indicated that he had a question about the timeline probably because he is presenting a timeline later on regarding the SEI. He stated that he is curious what's driving the need to comp

already have that information. Vice President McHenry stated that in addition they went through the rigorous process of selling bonds in 2012 and so there are some projects that we do have to get done from a basic facilities perspective. This will allow us to focus the time we have on our academic space and that will complete some of the other information they already had.

Senator Robert Krebs noted that as Vice President McHenry had commented, we have been doing a lot of building and his question is, "Is that outside of the master plan then or just a matter of filling in space?" The word just came out yesterday that CSU is selling the YMCA building but most people probably don't realize that we own it. He asked Vice president McHenry to comment on this.

Vice President McHenry stated that the last formally approved master plan by the Board of Trustees was done in about 2004. Much of what people see that has happened in the last ten years came from that plan. Now it is time to look again at the next five to ten years. She stated that in terms of the YMCA Building, that is owned by the Euclid Avenue Development Corporation which is a non-profit affiliate of CSU that owns the dorms and a couple of parking garages. This is going on to the market because it doesn't exactly fit with the rest of our housing portfolio. CSU bought that building in a defensive move because it came on the market in a foreclosure. We wanted to make sure that the

investigation long before we actually bought a license for one of them. Many of our sister institutions are using these so we are having good conversations and so the administration is committed in working with Jeff Kareem and helping to support their good work. Evaluations can still be done in classroom while you have students there but if it can be done electronically, it bypasses all that scantron stuff, the use of paper,

the side effects or consequences of all of this exercise (and she is sure there are many), but a very positive one is this has caused many departments to really ask those questions about how they do advising and what is the ultimate way of doing it. It certainly has revealed to her the many and varied ways in which it is done, done well and not done very well, across the university. Some colleges have a centralized system and in some colleges it very much falls on the faculty and we know increasingly that the role of the advisor is an absolutely critical one in student success. It is one of the many things that contribute toward student success and it is part of our mission. The university should be

Ms. Allie Dumski, President of the Student Government Association, thanked everybody on Faculty Senate for the discussion and feedback that SGA had after the last meeting. She stated that SGA much appreciated the candid and productive feedback

posting grades. Yes, the students should know their grades from their assignments that

colleges to determine the enrollment projections for next year. He noted that we do have a 2% limit on an undergraduate tuition increase and there are ongoing salary negotiations.

2. Financial Impact of 4-3 Conversion to the Budget. Dr. Resnick reported that there are two parts to this: one is the actual conversion itself and the next is the graduation incentive plan. The initial estimate for the 4-

Professor Resnick replied that again, the assumption of this projection is that students would remain enrolled in the same number of courses and those undergraduate courses have been converted from four credit hours to three credit hours.

Professor Margolius stated that she is aware of several things. She knows that four is four thirds of three and three is three fourths of four. If students still need to take 120 credit hours to graduate, don't they need to take like four thirds of many courses? She said she knows we are dropping from 128 to 120 credit hours. Professor Resnick replied that he understands but again that is a limitation model.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltdt commented that it is a limitation of the model but it is also a limitation of how we have been advising students because she is not sure of the message that the students need to take more courses in order to stay on track for a timely graduation has been part of what we have been telling them.

Professor Resnick noted that that is a legitimate point. We don't really know the impacts on enrollment that this change is going to have so that is one reason why the current budget building process is happening in a much finer resolution because we honestly don't know how the overall response will play out.

Senator Bill Kosteas stated that he is worried about students who try to take on too many credit hours now. What he envisions is that students who are currently taking say 16 credit hours reason, "Well, I can take 15 or 18 for the same amount of money." Dr. Kosteas commented that he can see that students wouldn't want to take 20 credit hours. He is worried about those students. It's less a revenue issue but becomes more of a student success issue when too many students try to bite off more than they can chew. They will try to bump up to 18 credit hours which is not an immediate but a longer term budget ramification because they will be in that five part tuition band a year longer. He went on to say that he really worries that what the students are going to do is try to jump up to 18 credit hours and not be able to handle the workload and then they will start withdrawing. This is compounded by the fact that

Dr. Goodell stated that finally Item D is for informational purposes only.

D. For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 60, 2013-2014)

- 1. Undergraduate Course Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:
Course submission (THE)**
- 2. Graduate Course Revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:**
 - a. DTE Graduate Proposal 3 (ECE 502, EDL 503, EDL 504, ESE**

some are more about persuasion. Professor Marino stated that Barbara Margolius will be coming around to ask departments if they want to sign up for a pilot and then it will be brought back to Faculty Senate for a vote.

The two “Information Only” items from the Admissions and Standards

Professor Karem stated that the item he hopes

mathematicians out there, they are welcome. He said that he has talked to Mathematics but no one has stepped forward. He noted that those kinds of sub-committees are willing to present a report to UFAC on suggestive practices which UFAC will bring to Senate. One of the biggest sources of dissatisfaction has been a quartile system that state inaccurate means and statistical metrics of that nature. We need to think about what we are going to approve while moving forward. Dr. Karem stated that if we do end up piloting or using electronic submission formats, one thing that is advantageous is customizing. We don't want to worry that we are going to be a victim or a prisoner of technology, which as a humanist and as somebody who has watched the entire Terminator franchise, is always of concern.

Professor Karem reported that UFAC will continue to review other SEI procedures to synchronize the timing and method of administering evaluations. He noted that several years ago, Senate approved the use of these in the twelfth week. That was intended actually to spur and expedite the calculations at the end. As it turns out, that's not working partly because the colleges hold on to them until the fifteenth week. The Student Government Association has viewed the twelfth week as problematic. UFAC is

Professor Kareem stated that a year from now, UFAC should have feedback from colleges, SGA, and Testing Services about the new instrument. The evaluation of an electronic submission pilot by UFAC will be in our report to Senate. By the end of 2015 spring semester, UFAC hopes to be able to present calculation and data model to Senate for f

fully online classes and asked if those faculty who teach only online are being held to a higher standard.

Professor Wolf replied, “No. This involves the mobile programs because the eLearning Center is closely involved with the mobile programs. She noted that her graduate program in Nursing is fully online and the Center for eLearning helps Nursing as they are developing their programs.

Professor Vogelsang-Coombs said that she understands that the Center is a resource but the way it reads, at least to her untrained eye, she might have been online too long, that this is a new standard and that it could be a standard for one set group of faculty and not others. This might hinder some faculty from going from a blended course to a fully online course.

Professor Wolf remarked that she can take this issue back to committee to discuss.

Dr. Davis Jones stated that she was just thinking about implications and changes. She asked if any determination was made as to how the technology fee that the committee proposes would affect incoming freshmen enrollment.

Professor Wolf remarked that she would get to those in just a minute. We are just looking at the definitions right now.

Dr. Goodell added that these are a separate discussion. We are not proposing any changes to these – they are really for informational purposes only.

Dr. Davis Jones stated that she doesn't know if it is a change but in terms of the 60% and the 40%, she doesn't know if that is

Professor Ekelman commented that the Masters of Science and Health Sciences is a fully online program. Most of the courses that are within that program have been developed with the help of E-Learning but some haven't. She asked, "Do those currently existing courses have to go back to get approval?"

Dr. Goodell asked, "Is this retroactive?" Professor Wolf replied that she would have to check with Ms. Caryn Lanzo, Director of the Center for eLearning.

Dr. Goodell stated that this would be up to Senate to decide whether we wish that it would be retroactive or not.

Professor Hoffman noted that she would like to propose that we strike that language requiring approval by the Center for E-Learning. She stated that it is not defined well enough to know how it would apply in every situation. She added, not the other terms like course sequence or fully online program – that could be defined in a number of ways but she thinks this issue would be ameliorated if we just strike the language that would require approval by the Center for eLearning. She added that we already have bodies in place to approve courses. She stated that she didn't know that we even had an ample discussion of what role the Center for eLearning should have that we can make a truly important decision at this time.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltd seconded Professor Hoffman's motion.

Dr. Goodell asked for discussion on Professor Hoffman's motion.

Senator Marius Boboc stated that he thinks being a "quality matters" peer evaluator, the reference to the Center for eLearning comes from the perspective that entirely online programs that have all of the course sequences delivered online have to have a particular structure and they are all consistent across the board in which case the Center for E-Learning is a lot more invested in managing that look. He added that it has nothing to do with electronic content of the classes. It is just the appearance of the courses so that they a

Professor Wolf replied that this would fall under the fee issue where it defines how the fees are assessed for these types of classes. Blended courses that are less than 60% online, are defined by the percentage of total course hours minus actual face to face contact hours. The ones that aren't, are not subject to the \$25.00 per credit hour eLearning fee.

Professor Krebs remarked that we are discussing a motion right now and asked to get back to Professor Goodman's point. Dr. Goodell added that Professor Goodman's point is not really what we are discussing. We are discussing whether or not to strike that language and separate out the assessment of the course from the definitions of online blended, sequence, etc. She added that we will come back to that.

Dr. Goodell stated that this is again part of the discussion which we are not actually having. We are discussing, right now, whether we are going to strike the second sentence, "Fully online courses that are part of a course sequence for a fully online program would require

revisit this, but, if you go and you look up definitions of online courses, this is the percentage that you are going to see pretty much across-the-board.

Professor Ekelman asked, "Shouldn't the percentages that you just said, 60% and

on the information that is provided by the faculty who is teaching that course. She added that there is inconsistency there too.

Professor Duffy stated that when Senate finishes the discussion on the question, and we get outside of this question, he will offer a motion to put somebody from the Registrar's Office on the committee.

Senator Claire May commented that she was reading this differently and then somebody's comment made her look at it again. So the heading, Levels of online learning with related definitions, 1) Fully Online, 2) Blended Courses, 3) Online Components but Online Components to her is not a different level of online learning. That is like a sub definition of what an Online Component is. It's

talk about flipped classes, somebody posted a video that they want someone to watch online as part of the assignment. Now there is an eLearning component to it. So, however we are defining this, it needs to be consistent with the gamut of the ways that e

Professor Jeff Karem indicated that he had a friendly amendment to Professor Duffy's motion. He might want to add, "ex officio" representative to the eLearning Committee from the Registrar's Office.

Professor Goodman commented that having served on the eLearning Committee, having lots of suggestions for ex officio members had existed for a while and now with the new construction of the committee ex officious don't exist. He is hesitant to just start throwing extra people on the committee when the committee can easily confer with the Registrar's Office as they need to, to define these terms.

Professor Duffy commented that he would simply say that the UCC (University Curriculum Committee) has the Registrar as the ex officio for similar types of reasons.

Professor Karem asked Professor Duffy if Senate is proposing a revision of our Bylaws or is he on an ad hoc basis with a fixed timeframe suggesting an ex officio representative. Dr. Goodell added that this would actually be a change to the Greenbook.

Professor Karem inquired if Professor Duffy is proposing an ex officio member to the committee for the remainder of the semester. Professor Duffy then asked if Professor Karem was offering that as a friendly amendment. Professor Karem replied that he is offering that as a counsel to Professor Duffy's motion. Professor Duffy agreed to accept

Mathematics and remedial English? He stated that we know under the new State Subsidy Formula, subsidy will be based upon retention and graduation rates. So, the more remedial students, the worse we come out on these standards. On the other hand, by not admitting remedial students, they don't come to the university and there is going to be a loss of revenue. The question he has for Stephanie McHenry, and for Provost Mageean is, "What are the implications of raising academic standards so that we do not admit students who need remedial Math or remedial English? Clearly, if we want to raise our academic reputation, we have to raise academic standards. It seems that the predictor of the reputation of the university and how it is ranked in

Professor Davis Jones noted that she had a question. At the last Senate meeting, the Provost and Dr. Goodell and she talked about the number of part-time faculty that we use and she assumes most of them teach part-time classes. As far as trying to attract and/or retain part-time faculty she is wondering what, if anything, has been decided about compensation for part-time faculty who may have been accustomed to teaching four credits and would now be teaching three credits and asked if there will be a corresponding decrease in what they should be paid or has the President even decided on that matter?

Provost Mageean responded that nothing has been decided on that as yet. She noted that what they were primarily concerned about up to now is that the hours and benefits are going to be entirely impacted. She said she doesn't think that there has been any discussion or a decision on compensation.

Professor Davis Jones commented that that would be helpful. Provost Mageean replied that she certainly will get back to Professor Davis Jones on that.

Provost Mageean asked to go back to the question on quality issues. She said that one of the reasons why a lot of our students are struggling is because they find themselves in tracks that might not be the best suited for them. We have a lot of what we call "churn" through the disciplines here –

plan is going to be largely focused on academic space. She noted that they will take a look at some of the work that Dr. Simons has done that does speak to the demand of residential options for students but not necessarily those that CSU would provide. She added that certainly this is not the center of the focus here; it's really only what happens in the academic space.

Professor Hoffman reported that it has just recently come to the attention of a number of faculty that there is a process of program prioritization going on and that there have already been several stages in this process including a rejection of the suggestions of the deans of how to prioritize our programs. She stated that faculty are asking her when faculty are going to be brought into that process. She wondered if Provost Mageean could give Senate a sense of what the process is, what the timetable is, what role faculty in general will have in the process, and what role the Faculty Senate will have so we can attempt to allay some of the concerns.

not just happening on the academic front in case people think the academic area is being targeted. We are looking for reallocation of efficiencies on the administrative front as well. There are many things that make a university as well as all of the support services that go along – IS&T; all the student services that go along. This is a university in the current environment. It manages to sustain while being true to its mission.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray stated that she would appreciate some clarification because she is confused. Cleveland State seems to be doing this great PR campaign that we are trying to go more residential. We are building more dorms and more students are living on campus and that experience helps with retention and those are all positive things. She noted that now we are saying or at least what she has heard is because a lot of our students cannot afford what it would cost to live in the dorms that we are in fact telling their parents when they are here, “You know, they can still get a really good education here and a great experience here and it doesn’t matter if they live in the dorms or not. If you can’t afford to help them live in the dorms, they can still live off campus and get a great experience.” Dr. Berlin Ray again stated that she is really confused. She asked, “Are we doing a great let’s be residential PR campaign, since working in the community, hey they think they hear all that, or are we building buildings that our students can’t afford to live in in which case I don’t know what we are going to do when they are empty or partially empty. I don’t get it. Then why are we then telling parents on the other side of our mouth that you don’t have to live on campus to get this education.”

Vice President Stephanie McHenry stated that there was a point in time where CSU was trying to change its image of being a 100% commuter school to one that has options and it has a campus. That’s what we can contribute the last probably half a billion dollars’ worth of building over the last ten years. We have gotten to a point where we have been 95% consistent over the last two years and close to that for the last three so we have achieved some of what that campaign was about. She stated that it is only responsible of us to point out to people that if students can’t afford to stay in the dorms they should not and so we will continue to do that. She went on to say that she wouldn’t be surprised if we continue building a lot more dorms in the near future. What we have done is create a market place that the private sector will come in and fill that role and we don’t have to borrow more money to get that done if the market figures out how to do it and how to finance it so she thinks it’s both things. It’s both yes to create the image that we have and we must also behave responsibly with respect to our own budgets and our students’ budgets.

Dr. Berlin Ray commented that we have to be careful to say that to students living on campus that experience counts maybe to a possible link to other things like retention. She stated that she heard repeatedly over the last several years that there was a big push to get students on campus and when we keep our students they are going to do better. She commented that she doesn’t know if they do or not. But, we should be careful about making any comments because a community hears it one way and we implement it another.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF

PAGE