

**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.

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 undergrad**

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

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

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

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 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

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

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 \$21,4

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

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.

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

class and as a group of learners. H

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,

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 difficul

