

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

MARCH 4, 2015

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, W. Bowen, Delatte, Delgado, Ekelman, Elkins, Engelking, Fodor, Genovese, Henry, Hoffman, Holland, Holtzblatt, D. Jackson, Jayanti, Kalafatis, Karem, Krebs, Lazarus, Little, Lupton, Marino, C. May, Mazumder, Nawalaniec, O'Neill, Robichaud, Spicer, Sridhar, Visocky-O'Grady, Wolf.

R. Berkman, Halasah, Karlsson, Mageean, Novy, Sawicki, G. Thornton, Yarbrough, J. Zhu.

ABSENT: Boboc, Galletta, Gorla, Gross, Hampton, Holsinger, Inniss, S. Kaufman, Kostea, Majette, Margolius, Niederriter, Rashidi, Shukla, Storrud-Barnes, Talu, W. Wang, Zingale.

Artbauer, Boise, M. Bond, Bowling, C. Brown, Dumski, J. Ford, E. Hill, Jadallah, LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, McHenry, Parry, D. Ramos, Sadlek, Spademan, Triplett, B. White, Zachariah.

ALSO

PRESENT: A. F. Smith, J. Yin.

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

I. Approval of the Agenda for the March 4, 2015 Meeting

Senate President Nigamanth Sridhar asked if there were any changes to the Agenda for today's meeting. There were no changes. Dr. Sridhar asked for a motion to approve the Agenda. It was moved, seconded and the Agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of November 5, 2014 and December 3, 2014

Dr. Sridhar noted that everyone did receive Minutes of the November 5, 2014 and December 3, 2014 Senate meetings. He asked if there were any mistakes or if anyone

had any comments about the Minutes. He reported that Violet found a couple of errors and will make those corrections. He then asked for a motion to approve the meeting Minutes. It was moved and seconded and the November 5, 2014 and December 3, 2014 Senate meeting Minutes were approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Dr. Sridhar stated that today's Agenda does present us with the possibility of the meeting actually being done on time. He commented that he did want to make note of the university celebrations and the Presidential Forums that have been going on. He reported that he has been going to all of these events and they are actually pretty good. He noted that we had one this morning and of course he loved it because it was all about engineering and innovation and all that kind of stuff. In addition, there was a little bit of a surprise at the end; there was a gift that the GE Foundation made to create a scholarship fund for students that are graduating from the MC2STEM High School and going to CSU in STEM majors. He went on to say that \$500,000 was for GE scholars over ten years. He added that this is a nice thing. He supposes that this has become the new standard when we have these forums. The next Deans better be sure that they have checks waiting at the end of these forums. He noted that additional events are planned and he would encourage faculty to attend them if their schedules allow.

Dr. Sridhar said that the other big thing he wanted to appraise every one of that he has been involved with is the Enrollment Task Force. He has been talking about the Task Force at several of the Senate meetings and there have been a few changes in the way that the committee has been constituted. He noted that the mission has been broken up into two pieces. The large mission, of course, is to develop a comprehensive enrollment plan for the university and that's going to be an exercise that he is sure that we will have several government steps that we go along with. But, there is also a quicker short cut for the committee to see if they can come up with quick turnaround strategies that will actually have an impact on enrollment in the next academic year. He stated that the committee has been working as two subcommittees – Data Subcommittee and Strategies Subcommittee – both groups have been working on these pieces. Dr. Barbara Margolius is on the Data Subcommittee as the faculty member and Dr. Jordan Yin and he are both on the Strategies Subcommittee. He reported that the groups have been looking for things that don't take a whole lot of resources and that don't require a large amount of work but will still result in increases in enrollment for the next academic year. He added that examples of those are things like identifying programs that are limiting students coming in because of the lack of resources. The Provost actually has worked with the Deans and has been looking at authorizing visitors or quick turnaround faculty appointments for the next academic year in programs that are basically bursting at the seams because there are too many students and not enough faculty to teach courses, etc. and this is one example of those kinds of initiatives.

Speaking of faculty hiring, Dr. Sridhar stated that he is sure that the Provost will mention something in her report but his department chair did let faculty know in their department meeting that Deans have been asked to submit faculty position requests for

FY 17 and those requests are due in a couple of weeks so all of us should be hearing from our department chairs. If faculty have not heard from their department chairs, perhaps the faculty should talk to them. Dr. Sridhar noted that there are a few searches that have been authorized for the next academic year and there are a few moving on but then we are now talking about a real hiring cycle for the following year and so we will wait for the Provost to tell us more about it.

Dr. Sridhar reported that there has been a bit of an update on the curriculum approval process on the curriculog system that we have requested. He believes there is some movement in terms of moving forward with purchasing this system. He added that the goal is to have it in place for the next academic year so we will see if we can actually get there.

Dr. Sridhar said that he wanted to thank the AAUP negotiating team; they have been working really hard. The AAUP team has sent us an update that there has been some kind of “in principle” agreement reached. He thanked the team very much for all of the service they have been putting into that effort.

Finally, Dr. Sridhar stated that the last thing he wanted to say is it is mid-term time and the Student Success Committee has been reminding us repeatedly about the importance of feedback that the faculty give the students. Of course mid-term grades are due for freshmen students but regardless of whether students are freshmen or not, we should be giving the students better feedback and that is one of the things the students have been asking for and the Student Success Committee has been recommending as well so that will be a good thing for faculty to focus on.

Dr. Sridhar noted that this is it for his report. He stated that if anyone had any questions, he could respond to them real quick or we could save them for later in the meeting. There were no questions at this time.

IV. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman began with an unfortunate occurrence. He didn't know if anyone had heard in the media, but which everyone will hear in the media tonight, that a student discovered that there were swastikas penciled on the wall on the fourth floor of the Main Classroom and that on the first floor of the Main Classroom, where there is a map of the world, someone took a pen or black magic marker and eradicated Israel from the map. President Berkman said that he put out a statement last night and he doesn't know if anyone saw it, but he will read it to Senate and then he will ask for everyone's help in terms of how we, as a faculty, communicate to our students about such incidents and about what they mean for us as a university. He said that he wrote the following statement to all students, faculty and staff.

“One of the most distinguishing characteristics of Cleveland State University is the incredible diversity among our student body – faculty and administration – and the way these diverse groups have respectfully interacted and learn from each other. This

epic of tolerance and respect was breached with the discovery of hateful graffiti on the first and fourth floors of the Main Classroom building. Behavior like this seriously diminishes a learning environment at a campus community that is a source of pride. Cleveland State police are investigating this matter as a hate crime and will take appropriate measures to hold individuals accountable and to prevent further incidents. If you have any information regarding this matter, please contact CSU police. As members of the CSU community, each of us has individual responsibility to promote a culture that is based on respect, civility, diversity and inclusion.”

President Berkman noted that this is the message he had sent to all faculty, students and staff and that is the message he released to every television station who has today weighed in about the incident. President Berkman said that he would ask Senate as a faculty governance organization and as representatives of the faculty to think about a faculty or we, as a faculty, begin to talk to our students about it. He noted that if anyone went up there and saw it or saw pictures of it, it is a very unsettling image, not just for Jewish students, but an unsettling image for any student or for any group who sees it and who takes pride in the diversity and inclusion and respect and tolerance we’ve had on this campus. President Berkman said that he would ask everyone, and Senate President Sridhar whether there is a group or whether there is an opportunity for Senate President Sridhar as a faculty to talk about it. He noted that we have students who are scared. It is not only Jewish students who are very, very scared, so it is a very unfortunate and scary incident. He said that he thinks what we want to do as best as we can is to continue or bring to our students the message that this is safe ground and this is an aberration; this is an aberration that the entire CSU community rejects and that we have to, as a group, work to continue to promote tolerance and respect. And, whether it is racism or sexism or anti-Semitism or homophobia, or whatever it may be, any expressions of it on the campus really diminish the campus and diminish us all. He went on to say that it has been a very jolting experience for him. Again, if people watch the news or receive the news he wanted to give everyone a heads-up about it if people haven’t seen it already.

President Berkman mentioned matters of SSI and the continuing consultation of the SSI formula. He noted that Tim Long was in Columbus this week and he, President Berkman, was on the phone for act three of the current SSI consultation. He said he believes that we have actually reached an agreement in principle about how we will go forward in 2017. He believes it takes us out of the major perils. He noted that the major perils zone, if everyone remembers, had us losing \$4.3 million in 2016 and an equal amount of money in 2017. He stated that we are facing a budget situation as we have talked about next year which has its own challenges without that kind of cutback.

President Berkman said that we don’t know what we are going to see with tuition; we don’t know whether we are going to see anything with tuition. We know that the Governor’s budget recommends two percent for 2016; no tuition increase for 2017. We know that Senator ?? continues to talk about Senate Bill 2 which is a five percent tuition cut. It has been described in various ways – a cut of costs, a budget reduction – but the bottom line is whatever it must be, in essence it must flow to students. It is not about trimming costs or saving money for the university. He noted that the dividend that the

Senator is after, and that will be the arbitrary of what is acceptable and what is not acceptable, is that this five percent somehow flows back into the pockets of students. It doesn't necessarily have to be in the form of an absolute tuition reduction but again, the deflection point is that it somehow flows back into the pockets of students.

President Berkman stated that he circulated to Dr. Sridhar and to Dr. Jeff Karem the Executive Order and the Task Force and the charge to that Task Force. He noted that to him it is a sign of cloudy times ahead at best, some very serious clouds. The energy around doing something transformational or reforming of higher education in Columbus is pretty high and continues to build so there is a lot of work.

President Berkman noted that on Tuesday, a group of our students, the presidents and others will be going for IUC day which is a day in which all of the students – and this is the first year we are using a very large cohort of students from each of the campuses – and we should have really done it before because really no one tells the story better than the students tell the story. We get paid to tell the story and they pay to tell the story so we were encouraging this year that we ought to include five to seven students from each university in the delegations that will, in the afternoon, blanket the capitol and see representatives from respective districts, the leadership of the various committees, etc., and it will be a great experience for our students to see government at work or government at rest, whichever it may be. He noted that this will happen next Tuesday. He added that it is the beginning of a long campaign to make the case for higher education. We are not Kentucky, fortunately; we are not Louisiana, fortunately; we are not even Florida where the Governor today proposed a two-year tuition freeze for all state universities in Florida; it's bigger for them because they had to build in a five percent increase every year in Florida until they reach the national average; so it's a ten percent cut in tuition over two years for Florida. Again, President Berkman stated that we are not Louisiana where there is a \$300 million cut to higher education or Wisconsin with a \$400 million cut to higher education. President Berkman stated that indeed, we have a chance if we craft this correctly while there is a very, very real and a very, very quotient movement to reduce the cost to students. There may also be the possibility that the legislature will backfill some of that cost for the university. To give a gross example, President Berkman said that while we may have to freeze tuition, we may get two percent more in SSI from the State to help us backfill. Now the IUC has adopted and begun to lobby at every level this tuition rebate program, the one that we started. It has now been adopted and has come forth as a recommendation from all thirteen universities. We are offering a five percent rebate to students who complete thirty hours and are in good academic standing. We are asking the State, and this will help us as well because we funded this ourselves, but we are asking the State to provide seventy-five percent of that rebate and we will provide twenty-five percent of that rebate. So, if it is a five percent rebate, whatever that aggregate number is that we give out to students, we are asking the State to reimburse the university seventy-five percent of that cost. Whether it will come to pass or not, we will see, but President Berkman said that he thinks it is a proactive program. Again, the way faculty voices weigh in here, will be very important. The overall mantra, and it is a real and authentic mantra, and the best mantra to our students is that the greatest savings that can be attained for our students are savings that will result in

shortening time to completion. He went on to say that's going to be a savings much greater than a five percent across-the-board tuition increase which, by the way, is a regressive tax for many, many students. It is much more effective, much more efficacious, much more meaningful if we could shorten – and we are out front; we are really out front in having done what we have done the last couple of years in terms of the 120; in terms of the multi-semester scheduling; in terms of wait-listing; in terms of the whole series of activities that were designed to shorten time to completion or to try to help to shorten time to completion so we stand in a very good position. He added that we had to chair the higher education committee here on Monday and Cleveland State is, actually in Columbus, identified as the one university that has actually concretely taken steps to contain costs and reduce time towards a degree. President Berkman said that if that comes to pass, and that is if Senator ?? is willing to support the rebate program as opposed to the five percent across the board tuition cut program, hopefully that will be an instrumentality, that will allow us to achieve some backfill for some of the money we may lose.

Finally, President Berkman said he wanted to mention for those who may not know, it is the fiftieth anniversary of Cleveland State University and we have really had a great series of activities. He noted that this morning we had a panel of twelve from “Laboratory to Wall Street.” We had three of our alums up there on that panel. One of our alums, Lloyd Trotter, is the retired Vice Chair and the retired President and CEO of GE Consumer Industrial Division, the largest division in General Electric; he was number two in General Electric when Jack Walsh was the CEO of General Electric. He is a proud alum and talked about that; it took him nine years. He worked in a tool and dye factory as a machinist all day long. As a matter of fact, he told a moving story; it was on 45th and St. Clair this machine shop that he worked in after high school. This was 1963. There were 2,000 machinists who worked in the shop and when he was hired, he was the first African-American to be hired in this machine shop on 45th and St. Clair. He said that he thought it was both one of the happiest and saddest moments of his life. President Berkman noted that he did a wonderful job. He was joined by two other CSU alums – Maryrose Sylvester who is the President of GE Lighting in Nela Park and who is an MBA graduate of Cleveland State, and Peter Buca who is the Vice President for Innovation at Parker Hannifin who is also a graduate of CSU. President Berkman said that then we had a taped video from Russell Stokes who got his degree from the Business School and is now the President and CEO of GE Transportation, just a division with 12,000 employees, world-wide. President Berkman commented that he didn't know how this happened, but as Jeff Emanuel ?? said when he was here, he is the current CEO of GE, three of the most transformative executives including two of our current division CEOs are graduates of Cleveland State University. President Berkman noted that the occasion was made for him all the more poignant and all the more meaningful when at the end of it General Electric handed us a check for \$500,000 for scholarships for students at Cleveland State University. President Berkman continued stating that we had some faculty there, some students there, it was a really wonderful symposium and we didn't go out. We had a fiftieth anniversary committee and we talked about going out and getting some big headline speakers to come in for the fiftieth anniversary but what we discovered is that among our own are some extraordinary headline speakers. So,

three weeks ago we had the health care panel with Toby Cosgrove, Thomas Zenty and Akram Boutros. He added that he hoped it was still on the web page. He thought it was also a grand-slam in terms of being one of the most substantive conversations he had ever heard the three of them have. He thought it was absolutely the same today. He noted that we have two or three more coming up and he hopes that people will look at the web page and think about our students and about what opportunities there may be for our faculty and our students to participate in our activities.

President Berkman thanked everyone very much and said that he would take questions during the Q&A time.

V. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Deirdre Mageean stated that her remarks would be fairly brief. She said that she had two main areas to talk about today. One is that she thinks that many in the room today are well aware that she has been going through a series of external reviews – the Health Sciences review. She commented that certainly her bed-time reading for the last three months has been self-studies for all of these different groups. She noted that in case everyone is wondering why we seem to be having so many compressed into a short period of time, first of all there is a little bit of a backlog but the other thing is that a number of these in the Health Sciences have been sitting in that “To be determined” category and they have really been using external reviews to give them some additional information and insight that really helps process and move to conclusion. She noted that they have gone through Economics, Environmental Sciences, Chemical and Biological Engineering and Health Sciences. She stated that sometimes these reviews can be rather formal-like and almost predictable and she also has to say that the folks that we have had in to do interviews and the self-studies that were submitted by the departments have been extraordinarily useful and very helpful to her and her colleagues in Academic Affairs were very pleased that these proceeded. Provost Mageean added that they have a few more to get through before the end of this semester, but they are proving to be very useful.

Provost Mageean reported that as she was saying to Dr. Sridhar, the process for reviews here are a little idiosyncratic compared to most universities and she knows that we have tweaked it a little bit this semester. What she would like to do when they come up for air after all of these is to sit down with Dr. Sridhar and some others and really look at the process so it serves the purpose and make sure there is adequate time for all the constituencies to be seen and heard. One of her concerns is that a day and one half is being a little bit compressed and sometimes there is a push to make sure the reviewers get to talk to everybody.

Provost Mageean congratulated Nursing, who are used to pain and suffering, and reported that they have decided to undergo both the National Accrediting body and the State Board within a couple of weeks of each other. While of course, we have to wait for the official review, they have gotten the thumbs up from both of those boards of well done to the School of Nursing for all of their hard work and the standards that they have

maintained. Provost Mageean noted that we are wrapping up for two other major National accrediting in 2016 with the College of Business and the College of Education. She commented, “No rest for the wicked; we just keep moving in all of these.”

Provost Mageean noted that Dr. Sridhar made mention of the positions. He has correctly sent out a memo to the Deans saying, “Okay, now please submit to us your requests for faculty positions, both lecture and tenure-track positions – mindful of course the prioritization that was done so we expect to see those requests reflect the decisions that came down from the Program Prioritization, but also saying of course if something extraordinary or unusual has occurred within that time periods, the hiatus between the results of that new process going on, that we need to be attentive that they could submit those.” Provost Mageean noted that they have moved on some of those already in areas of Engineering to Health Sciences to address some immediate areas of concern, shortfall, or we had to simply quickly get some people in position.

Finally, Provost Mageean noted that this is all she has to say on those two areas. She reported that March 20th is the deadline given to the Deans and they want to make this a very quick process. She added that it will be going through a much expedited process compared to the usual one because they have already done all of the prioritization of the programs and in April Senate will get the release of those programs and move forward. Provost Mageean stated that she would be happy to take questions at the appropriate time.

Senator Kathleen Little commented that relative to program prioritization because of the deadline of March 12th, the position requests have to be sent to the Dean and asked, “What about those of us in the pending category still?”

Provost Mageean responded that she will have to sit down and work with the Deans on that area to see what they are asking for in those areas. She added that we have a big ?? of positions through at least this year and there will be more next year – there are still retirements and others coming in this year so we will hold back some few in reserve, especially to deal with those areas that are not fully resolved yet. Clearly, if there is an emergency or immediate needs that need to be satisfied in that area, they will be addressed on a case by case basis.

Senator Little asked if Provost Mageean could give Senate a date when those pending will change to some other category. Provost Mageean replied that she cannot give an absolute date but she knows that the team is trying to put to bed all of those remaining ones now that we have largely completed most of the reviews. Again, she stated that she could not give an absolute date right now but obviously she doesn’t want that to be dragging behind the rest of the positions. She would like to get that done so it is done in parallel with release of the other positions so let’s shoot for April along with all of the others.

VI. University Curriculum Committee

Dr. Fred Smith, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that the committee has seven proposals that require Senate votes. He said that he would go through the information about them in the memo that was distributed to Faculty Senate. He added that if there are any questions, he will answer them.

A. Proposed change in Name of MUPDD degree to MUPD (Report No. 50, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith stated that the first item is a change in the name of the Master of Urban Planning, Design, and Development to remove the word “Design.”

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is proposing a change to the name of the Master of Urban Planning, Design, and Development degree to just Master of Urban Planning and Development. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The Proposed change in the name of the Master of Urban Planning, Design, and Development to Master of Urban Planning and Development was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Proposed program change for MS in Chemical Engineering (Report No. 51, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith moved to the proposed program change for the MS in Chemical Engineering to permit Biomedical Engineering electives to be counted toward the degree.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is proposing a change to the Master of Science program in Chemical Engineering to allow courses from the Biomedical Engineering program to also count as electives. He asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The proposed program change for the Master of Science program in Chemical Engineering was approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Proposal to propose a Master’s program in Business Analytics (MSBA) (Report No. 52, 2014-2015)

Dr. Smith next presented the proposal from the College of Business to propose a Master’s program in Business Analytics that will be called a MSBA (Master of Science in Business Analytics).

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is proposing a new Master’s program in Business Analytics, a PDP. Senate already approved the two certificate programs that this program will be composed of so he understands that it is just going to be a companion of these two.

Professor Smith clarified that this program development plan would augment the two certificates currently offered in Business Analytic into a 33-credit Master’s degree.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The proposal to propose a Master's program in Business Analytics (MSBA) was approved unanimously by voice vote.

D. Proposed dissolution of the CSU-Akron Joint Master's program in Social Work (Report No. 53, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith presented the proposed dissolution of the CSU-Akron Joint Master's program in Social Work that is due to the success of the joint program. These programs feel that it is time for each institution to have an individual Master's program and to pursue individual programs.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is proposing the dissolution of the CSU-Akron Joint Master's program in Social Work with the goal of pursuing a separate program here and at Akron. He asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked for a vote. The proposed dissolution of the CSU-Akron Joint Master's program in Social Work was approved unanimously by voice vote.

E. Proposed addition of CNS 523 to the School Counseling and Mental Health Counseling programs (Report No. 54, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith said that the next proposal is to add a one-credit small group experience course CNS 523 to the School Counseling and Mental Health Counseling programs.

Dr. Sridhar asked if there were any questions about this proposal to add one course to the School Counseling and Mental Health Counseling programs. There being no questions Dr. Sridhar asked for a vote. The proposed addition of CNS 523 to the School Counseling and Mental Health Counseling programs was approved unanimously by voice vote.

F. Proposal to establish a Doctoral program in Urban Studies and Public Affairs (Report No. 55, 2014-2015)

Professor Smith stated that the next proposal is to establish a Doctoral program in Urban Studies and Public Affairs. He noted that the Urban College has had a joint program with the University of Akron which is being dissolved. Essentially, his understanding is that Akron is going out of the Doctoral program in Urban Studies business so we need a program that will be unique to CSU.

Dr. Sridhar stated this is a proposal from UCC to establish a Doctoral program in Urban Studies and Public Affairs and asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The proposal to establish a Doctoral program in Urban Studies and Public Affairs was approved unanimously by voice vote.

G. Proposed Curriculum revisions for Music Education (Report No. 56, 2014-2015)

Dr. Smith next presented the proposed curriculum revisions for Music Education that bring courses into alignment with the TAG requirements for music teacher education, improve the course arrangement to add field experiences earlier in music education, and to balance the variety of courses focused on different specialties within music education.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the UCC is proposing a number of curriculum revisions for the Music Education program as noted in the UCC memo and asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The proposed Curriculum revisions for Music Education were approved unanimously by voice vote.

H. For Information: Approved new or modified GenEd courses and 4-3 Conversions (Report No. 57, 2014-2015)

Dr. Smith moved to the final item of the UCC – Items for Information. He noted that UCC has approved new or modified GenEd courses and 4-3 conversions as described in his memo to Senate: HIS 220H, Theatre 311, and revisions to BSHS capstone course HSC 484.

- 1. HIS 220H approved as GenEd (African-American emphasizing writing, critical thinking, and oral communication) and as SPAC**
- 2. Theatre 311 (existing course) approved as WAC effective Fall 2015**
- 3. Revisions to BSHS capstone course HSC 484 (change of emphasized skills from Writing, information literacy, and oral communication to Writing, information literacy, and critical thinking); already approved as WAC**

There were no questions on the “For Information” items and they were received by Faculty Senate.

Dr. Sridhar noted that he wanted to add two things under the UCC items. First, he knows that Fred Smith puts in a lot of effort in putting in those links to OCAS in the UCC memo so when faculty receive the memo with the Agenda, there are various links faculty can click on and go into the curriculum approval system. He commented that he hopes that all of us are taking advantage of those links and reviewing the proposals before coming to the Senate meeting. Second, he noted that in Steering, there was discussion about approval deadlines. Currently the approval deadline for any curriculum changes to effect the catalog for next year is March 1, 2015 which has already gone. But, then this year we have three Senate meetings that occur after the March 1st deadline. He reported that there have been negotiations with the Registrar and it looks like we can actually use all of the three remaining Senate meetings all the way up to May 6th to approve curriculum changes and he believes the proviso is that any proposals that are already in the system will go through and whatever does get reviewed and gets approved

at the Senate meeting on May 6, 2015 will still be entered into the Catalog for the next academic year.

Dr. Smith added to Dr. Sridhar's comments that it is understood that students may begin registering for things – not sure when that happens – but it will be before May 6th and that the Catalog will accommodate changes so what we have been told by the Registrar, as long as everyone understands, there may be some changes made after students begin to register and things that are approved at the May 6th Senate meeting can go into the Catalog.

Dr. Sridhar reported that students can begin registering at the end of March 2015. He stated that yes, hopefully, there won't be a whole bunch of these and, if there are, we can alert the Registrar's Office to see which programs will be affected.

Ms. Janet Stimple, Asst. V.P. of the Registrar's Office, stated that they will not change courses but new courses are okay.

Dr. Sridhar noted that if there are new courses, that would be okay; if there are courses that are being changed, then those... He referred to the comment he made about the approval deadline. For things that include Catalog changes, we can use the May 6th deadline but if courses are being changed for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, that are already on campus and students have begun registering for those courses, we can't make changes beyond once students have begun registering.

Professor Smith asked if there were any questions for the UCC. There were no questions.

VII. Budget and Finance Committee Administrative Operations Data (Report No. 58, 2014-2015)

Professor David Elkins, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, reported that he was at Senate today to address three items. 1) the feature of the FY15 budget, 2) the on-going development of FY16's budget, and 3) the development of Administrative Operations Data.

Professor Elkins stated that first, regarding the FY15 budget, it is unlikely that there will be any "margin money" in the Fiscal Year 2015. Two, Fiscal Year 16's budget: the Budget Office is working on several planning models as it prepares the FY16 budget. One of these FY16 planning models is based on the following assumptions:

1. Flat enrollment which is based on FY15 production of 408,000 SCHs. FY15 represents a 5.4% drop from FY14's SCH production.
2. Two percent tuition increase;
3. State Subsidy at or around \$70 million (which is at the current FY15 level);
4. Salary and fringe increases
5. All other existing expense levels remaining constant

6. No additional expenses

Professor Elkins stated that based on this assumptions, we will have a \$1.6 million shortfall. He noted that this means that the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated revenue. The university, of course, cannot run a deficit. The university will need to resolve on-going discussions of program costs and priorities. In short, the university will have a “sooner rather than later” opportunity to address expenditure levels to balance the FY16 budget. He added that more information will be forthcoming at the March 17, 2015 PBAC (Planning and Budget Advisory Committee) meeting.

Administration Operations Data: Professor Elkins reported that it is clear that state-mandated changes in university revenues are not likely but imminent. Whether we are discussing tuition rollbacks, tuition caps, or overall student cost reductions, this change is coming. This fact, along with general dissatisfaction on the part of the entire faculty budget committee that non-academic units have not engaged fully in program prioritization, prompted us to ask the Budget Office to prepare further Administrative Operations Data.

Professor Elkins reported that last week a preliminary analysis was done and presented to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. It was decided that it wasn't really proper to send that forward for a variety of reasons. Basically, the data was not quite good enough and he takes full blame for that. He noted that his colleagues and he are waiting for more complete data. They have asked for and the Budget Office will provide budget data from FY11 to FY14 (there may be some FY15 estimates in this data). The purpose of this data is to provide a longitudinal assessment of growth and decline. The critical year is Fiscal Year 2012. He reported that in FY12 the university confronted a significant revenue shortfall. As such, the university was forced to make widespread budget cuts. As we understand the nature of these FY12 budget cuts, they reflected areas that the university classified by degree of priority. Those units identified as higher priority were cut less or perhaps not at all and those areas defined with lower priority were cut more deeply. Part of the joint efforts of the Planning and Budget Advisory Committee or PBAC and the Faculty Senate's Budget and Finance Committee is to longitudinally track areas of growth and decline in successive budget years. By doing so, we hope to observe whether actual budgetary changes reflect previously identified priorities.

Finally, Professor Elkins stated that we have been told that this data will be available and provided to us by early April. He added that the April PBAC meeting is scheduled for April 7, 2015. The Steering Committee meets on April 22nd and Faculty Senate meets on May 6, 2015.

Professor Elkins asked if there were any questions.

Senator Barbara Hoffman asked Professor Elkins if Senate members could have the first part of his report distributed in writing. Professor Elkins said that he would distribute his report to Senate.

The Budget and Finance Committee report on Administrative Operations Data was received by Faculty Senate.

VIII. Admissions and Standards Committee

Professor Jordan Yin, chair of the Admissions and Standards Committee, reported that a couple of items have come to the committee in the last month.

A. Proposed change to full-time Graduate Enrollment Status (Report No. 59, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin noted that the first item is approved changes to full-time Graduate Enrollment Status being that the new proposal of 9 credit hours of graduate enrollment would be considered full-time and this is one credit hour greater than our current 8 credit hours and this was proposed by the Graduate College to bring us into consistency with Federal reporting standards both for the US Department of Education and Immigration.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is bringing forward a proposal to change full-time Graduate enrollment status from the current 8 credit hours to the new 9 credit hours. Dr. Sridhar noted that to clarify, it used to be 9 credit hours five or six years ago and we changed it to 8 credit hours and now it went back to 9. He asked if there were any questions about the proposal. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The proposed change to full-time Graduate Enrollment Status was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B. Approved change in Admissions Standards for Master of Public Health (Report No. 60, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin stated that the second item is the Change in Admissions Standards for the Master of Public Health program. It simply specifies which exams can be used to qualify for admission.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee is bringing forward a proposal to change admission standards for the Master of Public Health program and asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote on the proposal. The proposed change in Admission Standards for the Master of Public Health program were approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Approved changes in Admissions and Benchmark Standards for Bachelor of Music in Music Education (Report No. 56, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin reported that the third recommendation of the A&S Committee is changes in Admissions and Benchmark Standards for the Bachelor of Music in Music Education. He noted that these run parallel to UCC's Item G because it is also a

curricular issue as well and it establishes yearly benchmark standards as well as a dismissal process for the Bachelor of Music in Music Education.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee brings forth a proposal to change Admissions and Benchmark Standards for the Bachelor of Music in Music Education and asked if there were any questions. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The proposed change to Admissions and Benchmark Standards for the Bachelor of Music in Music Education was approved unanimously by voice vote.

D. For Informational Purposes:

Approved Admissions Standards for College Credit Plus (Report No. 61, 2014-2015)

Professor Yin reported that the last item is an informational item. The Admissions and Standards Committee has approved the admissions standards for the renamed Post-Secondary Education Options Program. The program that will soon formerly be known as PSEOP in the Fall of 2015 will be called College Credit Plus. He noted that this is a reorganization by the State of Ohio and will require some changes to our admissions standards and this is pending. He added that there is a companion proposal for minor changes that will go to the UCC in the near future. He asked if there were any questions.

Senator James Marino commented that he hates to ask Professor Yin if he could outline the proposed changes to the College Credit Plus program specifying that these are mandated by the State Legislature so our colleagues are not surprised by that come Fall.

Professor Yin asked Dr. Peter Meiksins if he would like to address Professor Marino's question.

Dr. Peter Meiksins, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, responded that the State of Ohio stipulates that we cannot have different admissions standards for PSEO students, now CCP students, than we have for our conventional freshmen matriculating students – we have to use the same standards. He went on to say that if we were to do that literally, the admission standard would be the ACT composite score of 16 for students as early as seventh grade. He added that that is what the rules literally say. There is, however, a counter prevailing wind in the State's mandate which is that it's also the case that a student who places into developmental coursework may not take that developmental course work at the university. They have to take the course for the English or math classes – those are the two areas in which you can be developmental at the high school. A fairly substantial number of both are entering freshmen and an even more significant number of students who aspire to take courses through PSEO now in College Credit Plus place into one or both developmental categories. So the rules we proposed, and this is in keeping with what Kent and Akron are doing, is to say that we are using our admissions standards when a student places into developmental coursework and the students may not take college courses here. They have to stay in the high school

until they have placed into college-level coursework in the subjects. Dr. Meiksins noted that we have set that as the university's definition of college-ready which the Board approved back earlier in the year and was then updated by the Math and English departments. He went on to say that the difficulty is that the Math requirement is set at a 22 sub score for Math which would disenfranchise an enormous number of students especially students of color and this was brought up in the discussion in Admissions and Standards. We clarified that situation by saying that any student who places into developmental coursework is thereby not normally automatically admitted to the program. Students can still appeal or ask to be admitted and then a review committee would take a look at each individual application and determine which of them have an appropriate record that would suggest that they are capable of doing college-level coursework. Dr. Meiksins remarked that they are trying to square a circle here. We are being told to admit students using our admissions criteria and at the same time being told not to do that. So this is an attempt to be fair to the students and not to the students who really are not ready to be in college, and to allow students who are ready to be in college but whose test scores may not indicate that, an opportunity to be involved nevertheless. He added, so that is what the document that Professor Yin has that basically says that.

Senator Robert Krebs noted that he had a question that still also applies to PSEOP in the sense of as we bring in young students and they are coming into these classes sometimes not prepared, we don't always know until they get here. If a student gets a low grade at the age of fourteen and then they choose to stay at CSU, that seems to still affect their GPA when they try to graduate. He stated that this seems a little strange. The main reason why it seems to be strange is that you also have this funny situation that if they don't stay at CSU, go to another school and struggle and when they transfer back here, they are told that they have to wait a year because they had a bad performance at the other school. This can even occur to a student who has over a 3.0 in thirty hours at CSU. He stated that there is some really conflicting rules with how it has been handled at PSEOP and he hopes that it gets looked at better and improves when we get to this College Credit Plus.

Professor Yin thanked Dr. Krebs for raising that issue. He noted that this wasn't raised directly in the latest round of conversations Professor Marino is alluding to. This was not our idea; this came out of Columbus and is foisting certain responsibilities upon each institution subject to this mandate from the State of Ohio to have to process to admit students as low as seventh grade. And, every institution handles some of the issues that Professor Marino is speaking about in a different way – things like course forgiveness, fresh start, reevaluation, and reassessment. We handle it differently than Ohio State, differently than Kent; we all have different procedures for handling these students sort of from what literally might now be cradle to grave so we might need to reconsider those as we move ahead. Those are neither admissions nor curriculum; those are broader issues that we might need to reconsider. He noted that he doesn't know how many seventh graders we will get anytime soon but, as the Provost has mentioned, there has been a policy developed for minors in laboratory science classes and we will just have to sort these things out as we move ahead.

Senator William Bowen stated that as somebody who believes that our university's future is the best way to go about creating a good future for us is to have high standards and low tuition. He noted that he just wants some assurance that we are not creating a double standard. He added, "Are we creating a double standard or are we just kind of waffling?"

Vice Provost Meiksins said no; he doesn't think we are. We are essentially doing as best as we can with what the State has asked us to do which is to admit students who are still high school students using the same criteria we use to admit college students. In the past, we had completely different criteria for admitting students to PSEO than we did to admit students to CSU if they were freshmen. He added that this moves those things much closer together. We can't do it completely because of the different implications of being in developmental coursework if you are a high school student then if you are already a college student. That is the thing that can't be ??? because the State itself told us that those students can't take college-level courses in English and Math.

The Faculty Senate received the Admissions and Standards Committee's report on Admissions Standards for College Credit Plus.

**IX. University Faculty Affairs Committee
SEI Principles and Policies (Report No. 62, 2014-2015)**

Dr. Sridhar stated that he wanted to thank Professor Jeff Karem and Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange for making the rounds across campus going to all of the colleges.

Senator Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, commented that he has a seventh grader and wondered if when he gets home he can send him here.

Dr. Karem stated that at last UFAC is presenting action items for Senate – two distinct kinds. One, is a recommendation to adopt Blue, the online system for campus-wide SEI use starting in Fall of 2015. The second is a recommendation of adoptions – adoption of an updated set of principles and policies for the Student Evaluation System. He noted that he would like to tackle these separately if we could although they obviously intertwine.

Dr. Karem reported that Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange and he visited every college except the College of Business but they will see Business tomorrow and he welcomes that opportunity. He noted that one of the messages that they have been trying to get out that they did bring to Senate the last time is that in case everyone didn't know, the paper system is a more abject failure than anyone could have ever conceived at this point. We cannot process the data until we hire an independent contractor who can do archaic SPS code that no one teaches anymore so our pre twenty-first century scan tron setup means that although this body approved new and improved questions last year, the machines don't like those questions until we write new code. So, while we had the question last time around for adopting the pilot of Blue, would it be safe for faculty to use

Blue for their data. He commented that actually, it is probably the only safe choice at this point to be frank; he just wanted to put that out. Dr. Karem said that on the back of the proposal, he listed the universities that use Blue, and this is selective North American universities, and Blue is used on every continent except for Antarctica. He wanted to make clear that this is not a data software product – it is mature, it's robust, it has been around for at least a decade and it is used by many institutions that he thinks we would be happy to be associated with on any list.

Dr. Karem asked, before there is a move on the first part of this proposal, are there questions either about the existing paper system or prospectively what Blue can do. He noted that we have had a presentation with Vice Provost LaGrange and we saw what the report looked like. We've covered all of the colleges and many of us have piloted that but he wants to make sure that people have a chance for questions.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee is recommending that we use Blue as the official system for student evaluation of instruction beginning fall 2015 and asked for a vote. The University Faculty Affairs Committee's proposal that Blue be the official system for student evaluation of instruction beginning fall 2015 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Karem stated that the second component to UFAC's proposal has more complexity to it. He noted that everyone may or may not be aware that the policies governing student evaluations, not just the instrument itself, have been under Senate control as a matter of our Bylaws so whenever there has been an updating to the procedure, the data reporting of any kind, it comes through Faculty Senate. He noted that UFAC took a look at this particularly since we have been re-doing every aspect of the system, and UFAC found that there were a number of gaps in policy. UFAC decided to reconceive of our policy proposals along four lines. He noted that he would go through them.

Dr. Karem stated that one of the first things UFAC noticed is that Senate has actually never had a statement of principles regarding student evaluations, which is not to say that we are not a principled body, but the question of what these mean or don't mean has never been a subject that we've taken a stance on. He said that we know they are out there, we know they are in dossiers, we know we need to collect the data, we know our old data is not as reliable as we would like, but now that we are moving to Blue, we will be in a better position. We really haven't actually made a statement to sort of guise, say PRCs, faculty and other members of the university as to what we think SEIs represent. He asked everyone to bear in mind that quantifications sometimes creates either anxiety or creates false certainty. He continued stating that UFAC put together some principles and he read through them. UFAC believes,

- 1) The overarching goal of the SEI process is continuous improvement of education at CSU.

- 2) More specifically, the SEI process is intended to provide faculty feedback from students for evaluating, improving, and refining their methods of instruction.
- 3) The SEI should not be construed as the sole or primary evidence of competence or excellence in teaching. Rather, the SEI is part of a constellation of materials that document teaching performance, including, but not limited to, peer observations, teaching portfolios, and student outcomes.
- 4) Accordingly, personnel action (promotion, denial of promotion, renewal, non-renewal, merit awards, discipline, or sanction) should not be undertaken solely on the basis of SEI data.

Professor Karem reported that Senate has never actually had a discussion of this nature. He stated that we have simply talked about the managerial details and people have questions about them. To him this seems like a very cautious and self-evident proposition but he is living the SEI life for almost two years which is not as glamorous it sounds. He went on to say that he recognizes that it doesn't sound very glamorous.

Professor Karem stated that the middle point here is really more updating of older principles which is the administration of the SEI. He said that for various reasons UFAC decided to keep a window of time open from the twelfth week to the fourteenth week of classes. The online system provides reminders, faculty can remind students if time in class, but UFAC thought that this reflected both the past practice of using the twelfth week as the official time but then offering more flexibility that gives a kind of a combination of the best of old and new.

Professor Karem noted that point 2) in the administration of the SEI, this is simply an updated statement. He added that this will be sent to students explaining the anonymity of the responses, why they are completing this, and their entry into a sweepstakes – no – although that is one way eventually SGA or others could incentivize participation and many universities do that but that is not going to be an official Senate policy. We don't have an I-Phone budget for sweepstakes. He noted that this is a statement that faculty can read and this is in line with what Senate previously approved but we are just updating.

Professor Karem stated that lastly, UFAC thought it was important to mention that while faculty will be able to check the response rate, UFAC recommends that people, for lack of a better word, nag their students. UFAC doesn't recommend that there be incentives or disincentives to complete this. Don't punish the class if the response rate is low; don't give cookies the day that you recommend people do their exams. He noted that this is just a cautionary response because some folks have asked at college meetings, "Well, to increase response should we give extra credit?" Dr. Karem said, "No would be the answer because we don't want to inflate the academic evaluations of the students with their evaluations of the course."

Professor Karem moved to the third component. He stated that this is for faculty – one of the more exciting components to Blue is that we actually can have good data

reported for the first time. Pretty much almost every statistical goodie that you would like is available in the standard report out package from Blue. He added that UFAC actually liked the way it worked as it is so they simply recommended adopting the standard calculations; mean, mode mean, mode medium, bar graphs, etc. Blue allows two different comparators for the scores and UFAC recommends they be current department and college means. In terms of reporting up the administrative chain, Blue does aggregate reports of SEI data sent to chairs and deans through increasing ?? of instruction and UFAC also recommends that the chairs or their designees can have access to individual faculty reports. He added that now they currently do that because the paper comes back to the department and with the SEI system that Blue runs you get an aggregate report but obviously if the chair or dean needs to look at data they should have a chance to do both.

Dr. Karem turned to new material which is, “What about broader access? Who else gets to look at SEI data?” He said he just wanted to give a little political briefing. He noted that this is not straight out of Columbus; it is out of his part of the country, South, in Kentucky, Texas, Louisiana, etc. There is a strong push across the country for students to have access to their peers’ assessment of courses and their instructors. He commented that this will come to Columbus at some point. Our Board of Trustees is very interested in this as well and SGA (Student Government Association). He also noted that SEI data, student reports that are sent to chair, is our public record so at a certain point, the transparency needs to happen. If SGA wants to do public records requests on an annual basis, they can’t. Dr. Karem stated that in writing those he is happy to help so he can do that; however, he thinks as President Berkman had suggested, it is good for CSU to be proactive and ahead of the curve on these issues of political importance. UFAC met with SGA and with IR (Institutional Research) and IS&T (Information Services and Technology) to think about what is a way the students can have access to this data in a way that is user friendly to them and responsible for the broader means of the campus so UFAC has the following proposal.

Students can have access to SEI data through appropriate authentication as in CampusNet (ID and password). If you are in an Akron partnership with us, which is quickly disappearing – no, you can’t look at our data. Significantly, UFAC decided through various discussions that using the “rate my professors” model even without the chili peppers, isn’t necessarily the most responsible way to collect data because it sort of is an aggregate listing or popularity contest or perhaps a forum that doesn’t really meet the finer greater means of students who are interested in thinking about what their peers think of these courses.

UFAC is proposing that students can have access to this data while using CampusNet for course registration, shopping for courses if you will, and that each course will list the overall historical mean for the course itself, regardless of who is teaching that course. In other words, you will know that this is a course that everybody loves because it is the English department or this is a really hard course in statistics, be advised; this is something, whoever is teaching it, students might find difficult. As students view the sections, UFAC recommends that the instructor’s name for each section be accompanied

by a listing of the historical instructor mean (on the 5-point scale). Dr. Karem noted that he will talk in a second about what is sufficient historical range there. UFAC believes and this is sort of like an FDA warning statement: “The SEI should not be construed as the sole or primary evidence of competence or excellence in teaching” should be appended to these disclosures to indicate that this is an important data point. It’s what students and peers have said about this course but this is not a university approved assessment of the final and total verdict on a particular course or instructor.

Dr. Karem reported that the Office of Institutional Research will determine when a sufficient data set has been gathered to include historical instructor and course means via the CampusNet. Dr. Karem noted that this may seem a little bit abstract, but IR has been very responsive to concerns that we don’t want to put data up with the samples that have one or two offerings. This is not going to be good guidance for students and it might not be fair to courses or instructors. In general, having spoken with Tom Geaghan, Director of Instructional Research, who is very savvy about these things, he suggested that at a minimum, there would need to be three to five iterations of a particular course and a particular instructor’s offering of a course. That means that there may be some need to update it but we switched our questions, we are using a new system and, having a kind of waiting period, is actually a good thing. UFAC believes that faculty should have the same access to this data as students and this is very important for people who are going up for promotions to understand if you are having issues with scores in your English 101, maybe it is good to look at how things are with mandatory literacy courses that may skew lower on the scale than say senior seminars.

Dr. Karem commented that this is something that has been possible but difficult under the old system. Custom analysis can be requested from Institutional Research. He noted that we do have a searchable data base and we do have a recommendation that these need to be accompanied by rationale – we don’t want people simply bugging IR for the sake of it and UFAC believes that these requests should be appropriately anonymized. He went on to say that of course, it should always be anonymized with respect to students – that goes without saying; it is part of the core commitment to the SEI process. If faculty are interested in building up dossiers and discovering how you stand with respect to parallel courses across the university, it shouldn’t be, “I want to know how I did next to Professors Smith, Jones and Jackson, or something like that.” It really needs to be a broader integrated data set so that it is not producing kinds of invidious comparisons.

Professor Karem stated that this is UFAC’s package and these are ways that we think we can take responsible ownership for the SEI process while meeting important constituencies’ needs inside and outside the university. This is the product of lengthy consultations and UFAC thinks it is really important that wherever we come down on this that Senate take action in this direction so that we don’t simply leave it to someone else to do so. He said that he welcomes questions and discussion.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O’Grady noted that she had a question about the historical data and the comparative means. She asked, “What if only one faculty member

is the person always assigned to that class for the last fifteen years? Who is your comparative? Is it other classes that are like it and do departments determine that?"

Dr. Karem replied that the comparative means are simply aggregated by department and college in the standard reporting out. He noted that if you were in the student access via CampusNet, it is one in the same. Your historical mean would be your historical mean for that course after sufficient longitudinal data sets have been built up. Right now the way it is running is, all of the English department courses are aggregated so the comparative mean there is your department-wide one.

Senator Eileen Berlin Ray stated that she is wondering about the access to the data. She knows we want to vote on it. She noted that some people in her department had mentioned this to her and had some concerns with it and she is wondering if it is possible to go back and talk to them and come back with some of those concerns before Senate votes on the proposal..

Dr. Karem responded that Dr. Berlin Ray could make a motion to table the proposal. Professor Berlin Ray said that she would like to get more input specifically with this written out and give departments a chance to review it. Dr. Berlin Ray then moved to table the proposed SEI Principles and Policies until the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator William Bowen.

Dr. Sridhar then asked Senators to vote on the motion to table the proposed SEI Principles and Policies. The motion to table the UFAC's proposed SEI Principles and Policies to the next Senate meeting was approved with three nays.

Dr. Sridhar stated that what we can do is send out this draft to all Senators one more time with a specific request to go back to departments, collect feedback and then come back to the next Senate meeting for a vote.

Senator Krebs asked if Senate could still vote on the rest of the proposal. Dr. Sridhar explained that there were two parts to UFAC's proposal and Senate already voted on Blue, the online system for campus-wide SEI.

X. Open Question Time

Professor Jordan Yin stated that he had a comment on the Washington Post. He said that they had commented that the comments people put on the internet would not be representative but there was really very little understanding. He noted that one of the comments was, "Well if the students would just stop partying so much, they would finish on time." Professor Yin stated, "I think our product is not well understood and I give the opportunity to our President to spread the word a little bit."

President Berkman thanked Professor Yin.

XI. New Business

Dr. Sridhar stated that he did want, on the recommendation from Senator Jim Marino who had to leave, to bring up one other item as New Business in response to this horrible act in the Main Classroom Building and that Senate produce a brief statement and send it out to the campus community. Clearly we can't actually write in real time here and pass it on but we can draft something together and then send it out for a vote by email to Senators because we can't really wait until next month to get approval. He stated that with Senate's permission, he will get something drafted and send it out to all Senators and ask for an email vote of approval and then we can reach out to the campus community.

President Berkman stated that the most important audience is the students so when Dr. Sridhar gets that done, he would be happy to facilitate the message being delivered to every student at Cleveland State.

Dr. Sridhar noted that next week is spring break and hoped that everyone enjoyed spring break. He added that there is an open house at the STEM School and stated that those who are interested should check it out.

Senate President Sridhar asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:22 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie K. Jackson
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel