

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

all faculty members should have received committee preference sheets. He is sure that everyone has filled them out and returned them to Violet Lunder. The Academic Steering Committee on April 20, 2016 will look through those sheets and come up with slates for elections as well as appointments to various committees. He stated that if faculty members haven't filled out committee preference sheets, now is the time to get those sheets back to us as soon as possible.

V. University Curriculum Committee

Senator Fred Smith, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that the committee has three items that require Senate action. He noted that all of them were available in OCAS for review. OCAS is going out of business on April 15, 2016.

A. MSW Program Proposal (graduate) (Report No. 43, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith presented the first item that is a proposal for a Master of Social Work program. Cleveland State University has had a joint Social Work Program with the University of Akron. A year and a half ago, the faculty of the two Social Work Programs decided to dissolve that joint program so that each university could have its own program and the UCC and Faculty Senate approved that. What we have now is a proposal for an independent CSU MSW program. He noted that if there are any questions about the program, either he can answer them or we have expertise from Social Work available. There were no questions.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Curriculum Committee is bringing forward a proposal for CSU to submit a full proposal to the Ohio Department of Education to establish an independent Master of Social Work program to replace the joint MSW program with the University of Akron. He then asked for a vote. The proposed Master of Social Work Program was unanimously approved by voice vote.

B. Educational Technology Program Update (graduate) (Report No. 44, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith next presented a proposal to update the Educational Technology Program. He noted that this is a graduate program that involves some modest modifications and program changing from 19 to 12 credits of the set of courses that are required for the technology endorsement for the teaching license. Not indicated on the memo included in today's meeting packets, but also part of the proposal, is the addition of the online teaching certificate which he believes is seven credits. He asked if there were any questions about the proposal. There were no questions.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is bringing forward a proposal to update the graduate program in Educational Technology. He then asked for a vote in favor of approving this proposal. The proposed update to the Educational Technology Program was unanimously approved by voice vote.

C. OSM Program Revision (Report No. 45, 2015-2016)

Dr. Smith presented the final proposal from UCC to revise the OSM (Operations and Supply Chain Management) program to add an Internship as a requirement to the OSM program. The Internship is being substituted for what was an elective. He noted there is now a mechanism for people who can't do an Internship to not do one but the fundamental structure of the major will now require an Internship. He asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is bringing forward a proposal to make a change to the Operations and Supply Chain Management program undergraduate major to add an Internship requirement in lieu of an elective course that used to be a part of it. He then asked for a vote. The proposed revision to the OSM proposal was unanimously approved by voice vote.

D. For Information (Report No. 46, 2015-2016)

1. Creation of CSU 290 – 0 credit Internship

Dr. Smith reported that other activities the UCC has been engaged with are also described in UCC's memo to Senate. UCC created a course for a 0 credit internship, CSC 290 that was recommended by the ad hoc Task Force on Co-ops. This course was created to satisfy what was perceived as a desperate need to have a way of indicating on a

investigation of that. But, the UCC has done some research and will discuss enrollment limits for WAC courses at the next UCC meeting and hopes to have something to report about it at the next Senate meeting on May 4, 2016.

Dr. Smith commented that those who are involved with the submissions and looking at curricular proposals are aware that for the last couple of years, we have used an in-house built system of OCAS to manage the curricular approval process. He noted that this was sort of a new nameplate on a system that was designed to handle materials for the 4 to 3 conversion. It was built in a day and we appreciate the work that IS&T did on it but things built in a day don't really work as well as we like them to. So, the university has acquired a new curriculum approval management system to help us with the flow of materials pertinent to curricular proposals called Curriculog that interfaces with the catalog software that we have and we are going to implement the system he believes on April 18, 2016. He noted that no new submissions to OCAS would be possible after April 15. Dr. Smith stated that anyone who wants to submit a proposal after April 15th would have to... He noted that there will be some training at some point, but before that training occurs, Kevin Neil, the Registrar, will have to be consulted on exactly how to do it. So, Curriculog will have many wonderful features. Among them, it will help people answer the questions that they have to answer. It won't let people

suggested kinds of things that faculty would do. So the document that everyone now sees has in fact been broken up into the required things that all faculty and students must do if they are actually teaching or taking an e-learning course and then a bunch of other suggestions that the faculty could use in e-learning courses to make them more secure and safer. Dr. Sridhar noted that the document now has some specifics about who would actually do these kinds of things. If we said that a faculty member wants to do something, what kind of resource support is going to be available either from the Center for E-Learning or for the university to actually make sure that that is possible to do and not just written out as such.

Dr. Smith asked, "What will happen to someone who doesn't follow required procedure?" For example, if someone has a course of this type and has th

Dr. Sridhar stated that we would just amend that first sentence to say that high stakes closed book testing is required.

Professor Henry stated that this particular equation is first of all his issue. He said that he doesn't know...

Dr. Sridhar noted that the one thing that is already in this document, if we look at the first page, is that this document shall be revised at least once every two years so this is intended to be a living document specifically recognizing stuff like that. E-Learning is in fact a relatively new thing – it tells us how we are doing things. There always is going to be new technologies that are going to come up. We either enroll students who cheat or prevent them from cheating. So that is the intent of making sure that this document is actually revised.

Professor Henry commented that he doesn't completely understand the purpose of what is going on here. He believes that some of the language might be looser than intended because there are greater varieties of testing options than this might be suited to.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray stated that she would like some clarification on number 2 for required procedures. Regarding high stakes, if your tests are greater than equal to 25%, say that the exams have to be on campus. So, if we have adjuncts teaching e-learning classes, we are saying that and our students are taking e-learning classes because it fits with their own schedule. They don't have to take off work, etc. They have to schedule a class when the adjunct can come to campus and pay for parking and students then are going to have to figure out their work schedule etc. to come to campus or they can work out something else and if there is a cost for it, the student will be held responsible. Dr. Berlin Ray stated that this seems very punitive to her and maybe she is misunder

Dr. Sridhar said that it would be required that the students should have a photo on campus. He added that this is already a problem. Just having photos and being able to photo identify students, as it is will clear up a whole bunch of cheating in on-line classes. We will have value and minimize that.

Interim Provost Zhu stated that he appreciates the concern because this university takes pride because our students are the center of the university so we have to be considerate of our students and make sure whenever we implement a policy that it is reasonable. Also, we need to take into consideration the faculty profile here. We do have a large number of classes taught by adjuncts. He noted that the same procedures and policies being recommended here have been used at other places and at other places that he worked at before and it was a similar policy. And, yes, in fact some of the questions create an inconvenience for some of the students. We do have data showing here that of 90% of our students that are taking on-line courses really look forward to the convenience so they don't have to come to campus. But at the minimum throughout the fifteen-week semester, they cannot make an effort to come in once to take the exam. And, for our faculty, it is a similar situation. We may be having faculty who are not physically

university's reputation down the road and that should count with high priority. Provost Zhu stated that he understands that we all work to accommodate all students' needs even with a policy in place. He said that he is sure that our faculty will exercise their discretion for truly deserving cases. "Back to Professor Smith's point, we say, we caught you this time and if it wasn't for this faculty, we send you to jail." Provost Zhu noted that we are not doing that. We all understand that we have a framework that we can reference to and it offers the guidelines for us on how to succeed. But, for individual cases, there are always individual considerations.

Professor Little asked if there would be exceptions for completely on-line programs where students from California are literally taking our classes. Provost Zhu replied that he would encourage that if for truly implementing this kind of policy in particular programs, where courses will be difficult, then faculty should be encouraged to seek other ways to do the assessment. You set out for relying on high-stake exams. He

doesn't think that this is basically something that is written down that says everybody must follow this rule or else. The spirit of this is that we have had four years of various faculty committees on e-learning that have tried to do this kind of thing and it is apparent why we haven't actually adopted something like this because it is actually a fairly complicated kind of thing. Dr. Sridhar went on to say that the other option other than

'F' or a 'U'

the work, and that something that you can document has prevented you from doing this last portion and that you can arrange for a date when you can complete the class. Professor Kaufman commented that it is going to be much more confusing to change the definition of the incomplete to also cover these weird cases where the student disappears for a good reason or not.

Professor Marino stated that if he has Vice Provost Meiksins' argument correctly, essentially, the "X" grade is allowing students to accumulate academic debt, right? They have fallen behind and we are giving them a chance to fall farther behind. We have a culture of giving students every possible chance but in this case, we are simply delaying the moment of reckoning. If you are really getting an "X" which means you are kind of maybe somewhere around spring break, you have vanished into a van and are never heard or seen again. Professor Marino stated that we should be sending out a search party earlier rather than later. He noted that the argument to get rid of the "X" and tweaking the definition of the incomplete, he doesn't think the definition of incomplete should change much. It should be someone who has completed most of the work and is in some kind of dialogue with the professor about having it completed. It will not be for people who kind of vanished after week three. And even in places that don't have "X's", he noted that he has had students in his graduate institution that tend to ask for an incomplete when they never actually really met.

Dr. Sridhar stated that if there are opinions other than the ones that have been expressed, maybe we could take a minute or two, but otherwise, please contact your college representative on the Admissions and Standards Committee and have a discussion. Perhaps go back to your college colleagues and discuss this proposal and supply feedback to the Admissions and Standards Committee so that they may actually come forward with a proposal.

Professor Kaufman reported that they have already discussed this proposal in the College of Urban Affairs and the faculty actually agreed that we should keep the "X" grade.

Dr. Sridhar noted that the Admissions and Standards Committee would come back to Senate at the next Senate meeting with a real proposal. Now is a good time to give the committee feedback if there is any. He stated that the discussion we have had for the last ten minutes all pertains to undergraduate classes. Use of the "X" grade in the

reported at the last Senate meeting that last year we raised a little over \$22 million and the year before \$20.4 million. She stated that this year we think we are on track to raise a little over \$14 million and it could actually come in a little higher – it depends. We have a number of proposals out. But what this does to the campaign right now, it brings it to \$85 million plus some change. We are on a \$100 million campaign and we are really pleased with the progress that we have been making. As everyone knows, the campaign counts all gifts to the university whether those gifts are for the annual campaign or whether they come in to create an endowment, whether they are for Radiance, or whether they are for a capital project. Vice President LeVine stated that we are on track. She never likes to make long-term predictions on fundraising because you don't really know where you are going to land but we are fortunate that we have very good fundraising President and that certainly helps us a lot. Our front line is beginning to gain much more traction than they have had in the past and are bringing very good prospects to the table.

Vice President LeVine said that she also wants to take this opportunity to let everyone know that if anyone didn't receive their robo-call that we have kicked off our annual faculty and staff campaign. She said that she wanted to thank everyone for his or her support of this campaign in the past. This campaign is a very important component of the fundraising that we do here at Cleveland State University. When we go out to the public, we go to corporations and foundations. Often we are asked, "What kind of internal fundraising support do you have for the university?" She noted that it is very important for us to be able to proudly say, "Well we have a faculty and staff campaign and of our faculty and staff X percent contribute to the campaign. Vice President LeVine reported that last year we raised about \$531,000 from our faculty and our staff and that is just a wonderful accomplishment. Part of that was due though, and she wanted to let everyone know this, to a \$250,000 anonymous gift from a faculty member to create an endowment and we had about 639 donors last year to the campaign – that's about 33% of our faculty and staff. Now, our goal is 100% participation so we still have a long way to go. She commented that she is proud to say that the Advancement Division, before the campaign kicked off, was 100%. She said that she tells people on this kind of campaign, it is not what you give, it's that you give and we are very lucky to have three great chairs this year. She noted that she wanted to thank Anette Karlsson and Debbie Jackson and Juliane Rogers for chairing and she knows that Steve Duffy has been one of our co-chairs in the past. So, she just wanted to tell everyone that when you are approached for this campaign, to please remember that any aspect of university operations that you care about can be supported through this campaign whether it's Radiance – by the way, Radiance is May 13. Everyone knows that Radiance is our annual scholarship event to help students stay in school. We have raised money to help over 1,200 students stay in school and graduate, and we are very proud of that. She reported that the goal this year is \$1.25 million. Our Foundation has issued a challenge – they are trying to raise this additional \$250,000 over what we raised last year. Last year we raised slightly over \$1 million.

Vice President LeVine noted that in addition to Radiance, scholarship, supporting faculty research; you name it, it can be supported. She asked faculty to tell them how you want those dollars to be spent. She commented that she brought a brochure to

from an RFP. An RFP ends in a contract and an RFQ simply tests the market to see if there is interest in an asset so they are different things. Usually, an RFP is issued six to eight months after an RFQ. If the results of the RFQ are promising and President Berkman decides to issue an RFP, bidders will need to prepare their proposals and then structure their financing plans and our administration will have to structure the

stated that he doesn't understand fully what asset monetization is. He said that he really would appreciate if someone from the administration would make a case for asset monetization and also someone who would serve as the devil's advocate to get the case against. Dr. Lieske stated that he also has some concern here about a Fred Thompson Reverse Mortgage. We are going to get a windfall of money like Ohio State did if we do this. He asked, "What are the budgetary financial implications of doing this? I don't know. Is it morally proper for us to make a financial decision that passes on the burden for the next two generations? I would like to see someone address that concern." He said that he doesn't know what is going to be put on the auction block. Right now, Professor Bowen is mentioning parking. Parking is currently an asset, we are centrally located and we would probably bring around \$1,500 every weekend at the Business Garage here for Playhouse Square. So, he doesn't know what the Faculty Senate wants to do. It is the Senate's judgment if Senate wants to make faculty part of this conversation. Right now, we have Bill Bowen representing our interests on the committee. Dr. Lieske noted that Bill is doing an excellent job and he respects the members on the committee but if Senate feels that it would like to bring a committee into the conversation like Budget and Finance he believes that his colleagues and he would be happy to take a look at it. He stated that he didn't know if he made a suggestion here that perhaps this will take a while so faculty can be brought into the conversation but he thinks that Senate has to address some of these issues.

Senator Stephen Duffy reported that right now parking is subsidizing deficits that occur in auxiliary services. He asked, "If we were to farm out parking, how would we fund current deficits or projected deficits that will still probably occur in auxiliary services? That is a question that should be addressed as part of this process."

Dr. Sridhar replied, "Yes, that is a question that should be addressed as part of the process." He noted that all of the questions that Professor Lieske just raised are real good important questions that are part of the process. He stated that Professor Bowen came to him a couple of weeks ago and asked if this is timely enough. The reason that Professor Bowen and he had a brief conversation and decided that they would in fact mention this at Faculty Senate and the reason that they did this is because the RFQ is going out on April 27, 2016 and they didn't want the faculty to be surprised when this came up. So, this education that we just received about the difference between an RFQ and an RFP is a good thing and he thinks that all of the questions that both Professor Duffy and Professor Lieske are raising are absolutely critical ones which the committee is going to be looking at.

Senate Vice President Andrew Resnick commented that the RFQ is going out on April 27th and asked, "When is the deadline for responses? Will we be informed what the responses are and will we go to an RFP?"

Professor Bowen replied that he would write down these questions and gets the answers. He added that if anyone has questions, by all means write down the questions and send them to him and he will be happy to respond. He added that maybe President Berkman will say something about it and maybe someone else will along the way, but

It is difficult for all parties involved so the degree to which we can raise student consciousness about what is appropriate and what is not appropriate and maybe Yulanda and Berinthia can get together and for those who give for the Faculty Campaign, they can get one of the shirts that the students designed last year saying that "Consent is Sexist."

have awarded the faculty rewards in teaching, research, and service at the Convocation. We have had minimal, maybe under fifty faculty members who have ever attended one of these Convocations when their colleagues and peers are being recognized so he would like to ask the Senate to consider that we move the awards for research, teaching and service to the Commencement when there have been many, many more faculty. Again, he said that he would express his appreciation for the tremendous turnout of faculty that we have had at Commencement. He noted that it would raise the profile for the faculty member, it would raise the profile of the Board; there would be hundreds of colleagues there to recognize it so he would ask the Steering Committee to take it under advisement that we eliminate it from Convocation. There actually is a budget-cutting proposal in 2020 that will eliminate Convocation completely and would save \$8,230. He stated that of all of the recommendations from 2020, we should consider it. But, independent of that, he felt that these faculty members who are being recognized should have a higher degree of appreciation than they are getting right now. President Berkman again asked if Steering would consider that and come back with a recommendation.

President Berkman noted that he mentioned last time that we would never be out of challenges. We have a significant challenge on the international student front and that is that the government of Saudi Arabia has dramatically changed their program for funding international students. He reported that we have 650 or 700 Saudi students on campus. Firstly, the Saudi Arabian government will cut in half the dollars that are being utilized to support the scholarship program –

Ballroom this morning where we reported President and Provost Scholarships to students and a mechanism to solidify those who have already committed to come to CSU and to try to tip the scales for those who are still in the decision-making process. We are talking about students who typically have a high school GPA of over 3.5 and an ACT of over 21 or 23 and so we are talking about students who are going to be competitive particularly in Northeast Ohio and lots of different universities. He thought it was a good event; it was well attended and when Cindy Skaruppa asked at the end how many students intended to come to CSU, virtually every student in the room raised their hands. Again, those are the kinds of events and the kinds of awards that we need to be doing.

President Berkman noted that in the next month, we will be reporting to the Board of Trustees our response to the Governor's Task Force on Affordability. The 2020 process has nicely amalgamated and intersected with the Governor's recommendations and our need to respond to the Governor's recommendations. He noted that we have to respond to those recommendations. They all involve different levels of efficiencies; they all involve looking at business and administrative operations. For those who have been involved in 2020, and he absolutely feels it is the big and the biggest dive into getting at the nature of administrative costs that we have done at the university and we are going to see savings. President Berkman stated that they met this week and made a commitment that the savings that we would realize on the administrative side we would invest on the academic side. It won't be a windfall like the \$485 million that Ohio State received but at least the arrow in terms of trying to equalize we will be going in the right direction. He noted that they had unanimous agreement on that as an important priority.

XI. Report of the Interim Provost

Provost Jianping Zhu stated that he has just two quick updates. The first that everyone is very concerned about or knowing about is where we stand in terms of this year's faculty search. He noted that as he mentioned earlier in the year we started with 62 searches. He said that he is very pleased to report that we will finish the semester with 50 or more of those positions filled. He thanked everyone for all of their good work on the faculty search committees. As he discussed with everyone earlier, this is very important. The quality of our university is determined by the quality of the faculty we hire. Everyone may be wondering what is next because a university faculty search is a long process. He noted that this is about the time that we actually begin to plan for the next search cycle actually for faculty leave for the summer. So he had a meeting this morning to plan that out during the next couple of weeks for most positions that are currently going to be carried over to the next year. There will be about a dozen or so positions that probably are not going to be filled. In addition, with the current retirements and resignations, we have some dollars available for faculty recruiting for the next semester. So, put that together, absolutely we will have about another twenty or more searches going for the next semester because we have about a dozen that are carried over to next year. Right now, funding-wise, we have about ten positions that we could allocate. We will allocate those in the next couple of weeks so the Deans have begun to work with the departments for receiving new positions. Provost Zhu encouraged everyone to participate in the process to get the committee formed and to finalize the job

Ms. Halasah reported on a couple of new items. Swipe Out Hunger is an organization that two of our SGA Senators are working with. They work with college campuses. A lot of students have unused swipes at the end of the semester. A swipe is to get you into the dining hall where you can eat as much as you want. So, they are actually collaborating with Julian Keller in the Lift Up Vikes Office. A lot of our students are hungry so that is one of SGA's newer initiatives.

SGA President Halasah stated that our director of Governmental Relations is hosting an Officers Ball on April 22nd from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. It is with all of the university student leaders. She noted that if anyone would like to meet the student leaders, they are all formally invited to that function.

Ms. Halasah turned to the library. She noted that SGA is staffing the late night study facility again. SGA worked with Dr. Glenda Thornton, director of the Library. SGA will staff the study from midnight to 2:00 AM. She asked faculty to let their students know about it if they need a place to study for finals. It will be the week before finals and the week of finals up until Thursday. She stated that advertisements would be coming out about the study.

Ms. Halasah commented on Sexual Assault Awareness Month. She noted that Yulanda McCarty-Harris forgot to mention the prizes. She stated, "How do we engage students? We give them free things." She noted that parking passes are available as well as a bunch of gift cards. SGA bought \$500 worth of different gift cards and students can win those when they take the survey. She again asked faculty to please let their students know that they can win a Green Hangtag. She added, "This is real stuff."

Ms. Halasah turned to course evaluations. She asked faculty to please give class time for course evaluations. She stated that this was worked out way in the beginning of the year with Professor Jeff Karem. She asked again that faculty please let their students know the importance of course evaluations and to encourage students to do them.

Finally, Ms. Halasah asked faculty to please encourage their students to vote in the SGA elections that will take place from April 12 through 14. She noted that there are three parties running this year and that is awesome. She added that she just wants to see more people get engaged with that so faculty should encourage their students to vote.

XIII. Open Question Time

Senator Vickie Gallagher stated that she was wondering about the Saudi students and imagined that we are not going to lose all of them because some of those may not get into the top 100; they still need alternatives like ours, right? She asked if anybody has analyzed the ratio of GPAs or incoming SATs and how many we might lose.

President Berkman responded that Senator Gallagher had a good question. He noted that there are probably cohorts of Saudi students who have the ability to pay themselves to come to the university. He noted that it really is a little bit of a mystery but

one that we should untangle and that is why 800 Saudi students came to CSU – that is really a very good cohort of students. So, in that sense, the word is out about CSU. He