

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

OCTOBER 16, 2013

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, Delatte, Delgado, Doerder, Duffy, Ekelman, Geier, Genovese, Goodell, Gross, R. Henry, Hoffman, D. Jackson, Jayanti, Kalafatis, Karem, S. Kaufman, Kent, Kosteas, Krebs, Lehfeldt, J. Lieske, Little, Majette, Margolius, Marino, Robinson May, Meier, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, Resnick, Rickett, N. Sridhar, Steinberg, Talu, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, J. G. Wilson, Wolf.

Artbauer, Berkman, C. Brown, Dumski, Fedor, J. Ford, Mageean, Sawicki.

ABSENT: Dixit, Fodor, G. Goodman, Gorla, M. D. Jones, Liggett, Rashidi, Welfel, Witmer-Rich.

Boise, M. Bond, Boychuk, Halasah, E. Hill, Karlsson, LeVine, Lock, Mazzola, S. McHenry, Novy, Parry, Sadlek, Spademan, Stoll, G. Thornton, Triplett, B. White, Zachariah, J. Zhu.

Senate President Joanne Goodell called the meeting to order at 3:08 P.M.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the October 16, 2013 Meeting

Senate President Joanne Goodell noted that the Agenda was revised and she hoped that everyone had received the revised version. She then asked for a motion to approve the Agenda. Senator Paul Doerder moved and Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady seconded the motion and the revised Agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of May 1, 2013

Dr. Goodell noted that the next item is approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 1, 2013 which were circulated to everyone via email. She asked if there were any amendments to the May Minutes. There were no amendments to the Minutes. A motion

for approval was made, seconded and the Minutes of the meeting of May 1, 2013 were approved unanimously by voice vote.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate President

Senate President Goodell stated that this semester has been one of the busiest semesters she has ever had and it is almost impossible to believe that we are half way through. She said that she has yet to follow up on the use of the current online system for submitting the FAAR reports but she hopes to get back to that soon.

Dr. Goodell commented that since our last meeting, the focus of the 4 to 3 conversion of programs has been intense, with faculty across the university meeting and talking about these issues, to the exclusion of most everything else. The University Curriculum Committee chair, Bill Kosteas, will report later on where we stand right now.

Dr. Goodell reported that last Friday, October 11, 2013, she had attended the Ohio Faculty Council meeting in Columbus and heard from the new Chancellor John Carey and Vice Chancellor Stephanie Davidson. Chancellor Carey talked about Governor Kasich's agenda in regards to completing college in the Ohio Report and student success and completion. Vice Chancellor Davidson talked a little about the various committees and the task forces in the State and reminded everyone that much work is going on around the State. And to assist with that, Vice Chancellor Davidson also mentioned that there will be a conference coming up in the future so that universities can learn in depth about what they are expecting on the report. The Undergraduate Student Success Committee is working on that right now and they will be attending that conference in Columbus later this semester. Dr. Goodell noted that she asked the question of how are the faculty chosen for these various committees and bodies that are deliberating in Columbus and who are on these committees. Vice Chancellor Davidson said that she thought that the committees were chosen by approaching our representatives in the administration and people were nominated or recommended to both. Dr. Goodell noted that a few of our colleagues jumped on the bandwagon and said, "Well, why can't you come to us, the Ohio Faculty Council; why can't we go to our faculties and ask if there are volunteers who would like to serve on these committees." Dr. Goodell commented that she thinks that will be happening. As we move forward she doesn't know what we can do about the current state of faculty representation on a lot of these committees – probably not much. Vice Chancellor Davidson did give representatives to the Ohio Faculty Council a couple of web sites which are part of the Board of Regents' web site that lists all of the people who are representing every institution in every one of these deliberating bodies all of which are focused on completion plans. Vice Chancellor Davidson said that she will come to Ohio Faculty Council meetings as well in the future.

Professor Goodell noted that many faculty searches are underway, and she is personally chairing two searches – one for a faculty position and one for a staff position so she knows how much time this takes. She stated that as everyone knows, we are now using the online system for faculty hires as well as staff. If anyone has any feedback about this, positive or negative, please pass the feedback on either to your department

chair, dean or your Steering Committee representatives, so that we can monitor how that is working out for faculty searches. She noted that the Provost will tell us a little bit later how the current faculty searches are going. There certainly have been some issues with the hiring processes last year and several of the searches have not been successful.

Senate President Goodell stated that as members will notice, the format of the Senate meetings has changed after discussions first with President Berkman and Provost Mageean, and then with the Academic Steering Committee at their meeting three weeks ago and Steering agreed to this new format. Dr. Goodell noted that since her daughter was sick that day and she wasn't part of the discussions, she has been told that she has to be "strict" with the President, the Provost and the Student Government President to keep them to ten minutes each, and we will see how that goes. Dr. Goodell went on to say that we must ensure that Senate business gets done, so she will ask that they are each mindful of their time limit. She added that questions for the President, the Provost and Student Government will be delayed until the end of the meeting, time permitting.

Dr. Goodell reported that the Provost's Office, specifically Peter Meiksins, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Programs, is planning to convene the college academic advisors to brainstorm issues around the 4 to 3 conversion, and to have input into the transition guides that are currently in the process of being prepared. She noted that of course it is difficult to prepare transition guides for programs that do not as yet officially exist, but there is much thought being given to general guidelines. Dr. Goodell gave kudos to Dr. Joyce Mastboom of CLASS who found a copy of the University Transition Guide used in 1998 when the transition from quarters to semesters took place. She must have a fantastic filing system! Dr. Goodell noted that this issue is the one that has the potential to be the most difficult to navigate, and hopefully the Provost's Office will be able to supply some additional resources to assist the colleges in their advising endeavors. The Provost has agreed to provide some additional resources for the Registrar's Office to enable the Degree Audit process to be fully functional as we move forward.

Dr. Goodell reported that in the last meeting she and Senate Vice President Sridhar had with President Berkman and Provost Mageean, the topic of program prioritization came up, and President Berkman noted to the Provost, Dr. Sridhar and her that he preferred to think about this not in terms of ranking programs with the possibility of closure, but rather to find a model that is a good resource allocation model that fits with the Cleveland State University. She said that she hopes there will be future opportunities to continue to explore this topic.

Finally, Senate President Goodell stated that in Dr. Sridhar's and her last meeting with the President, the issue of faculty representation on the University Academic Space Planning Committee will come up later in today's Agenda, so she would delay her discussion of that until then and perhaps the Provost will have a chance to address this issue as well.

Dr. Goodell thanked everyone for their attention.

IV. Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman noted that first of all the initiative of trying a change in the Senate Agenda is hopefully a mechanism to facilitate a better dialogue between Faculty Senate and the administration.

President Berkman couldn't remember if he had mentioned this at the last Senate meeting, but at the Service Recognition Awards in which we recognize years of service, we recognized Professor Andy Gross, who has completed forty-five years of service at Cleveland State University, but he has another record which everyone can aspire to. Of those forty-five years of service, thirty years were spent as a member of the Faculty Senate. Everyone applauded. President Berkman noted that it is a high bar but maybe some Senators will aspire to it.

President Berkman referred to Dr. Goodell's comment about how faculty are named to the committees – unless it is done through the Provost's Office, he can tell her that he has never been asked by anybody in Columbus to recommend any faculty for any committee in any capacity at any time in his five years here at Cleveland State. So, maybe the wires are crossed or maybe they are not.

President Berkman reported that they are about to engage in two important processes – one is going to happen on the fast track. He doesn't know whether the Chancellor talked about the new requirement that all universities will now submit a six-year capital plan to the State of Ohio. He noted that we will all, by the year's end, be required to submit a six-year capital plan. The first two years will be funded on the basis of the recommendations of the Capital Bill Commission. As he mentioned earlier to Senate, he is a member of the Capital Bill Commission. They had their initial meeting with the Governor; there has been no firm number that has been given to them; there has been a neighborhood number that has been given to them. The neighborhood number is \$400 million and it's a pretty good number, not far from the historical control numbers that had been given for capital budgets. He noted that the Commission had one meeting about two week ago. There are three senior college members and three community college members of the Commission. The Commission is chaired by Rod McDavis, President at Ohio University. Bruce Johnston of the IUC is also a member. President Berkman reported that the process is under way and we are going to have to submit both the six-year and the two-year plan. It is a little bit ahead of our schedule. He stated that we are going to do a full master planning exercise this year. There has not been a physical master planning exercise in ten years at the university; a master planning exercise in terms of the goal of matching up academic needs, academic resources, physical plant, physical needs, infrastructure, projections into the future, etc. President Berkman stated that we are not going to have time to engage in a full comprehensive consultative master planning process before we need to submit the first iteration of the six-year capital plan.

President Berkman commented on a few things taking place this weekend that are very exciting. We will have the Distinguished Alumni Awards on Friday night. As of yesterday, 453 people had indicated that they will attend the Distinguished Alumni Awards. They had to be moved to the Wolstein Center on the basketball court which is a good thing. The next day will be filled with homecoming activities – a presidential luncheon, lectures by faculty and others in many of the colleges, a homecoming parade, the new version of Midnight Viking Madness, the men's and women's basketball teams and a football game that will take place at Krenzler Field at four o'clock against Ohio State. He noted that tickets are still available.

President Berkman noted that he is going to California next week for two days to give a talk at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and in preparation for doing that, he has been reading or at least scanning or at least going to the index and locating relevant portions of two books which he would recommend to everyone if they find the time and inclination. He said that Eric Bock has just published a book called *Higher Education in America* with tremendous depth and breadth in about virtually every subject on Higher Education as well as the national education agenda. Bill Bowen, the former President of Princeton – he was the President when Dr. Berkman was at Princeton, and for an economist, and for anyone, he is really an extraordinary writer. He is really a delight to read and he has a book called *Higher Education in the Digital Age* which came out about a year ago and which is really one of the better and more analytic thoughtful and reflective notions about what technology will do and what technology will not do in higher education. President Berkman went on to say that those are his two recommendations.

Finally, President Berman noted that we have what could be an amazing opportunity for the Urban College in China. Our partner university, Capital University of Economics and Business in Beijing, the largest business school in the School of Economics, has gotten what they describe as a mega grant from the Chinese government to engage in a mega cities research project. Cleveland State has been selected as a partner institution on that research project. Dr. Ned Hill, Dean of Urban Affairs, and President Berkman and several others will go to China in the first week of November. He noted that for those faculty who have been to China or worked in China or negotiated in China, they will attempt to try to define what a partner institution is in such a project. They have gotten somewhere in the neighborhood of \$600 million from the Chinese government to engage in this process which is basically a project around urban planning, urban design, urban systems that are for mega cities and China has at least almost nothing but mega cities. They even have little villages of seven or eight million people and they are the small part of the inventory. President Berkman stated that this is an exciting opportunity for us, it's an exciting opportunity for our students; it would be a great opportunity for graduate students and it would be a great opportunity for faculty. He noted that Dr. Jianping Zhu is going with him (President Berkman) as well. They will see what they can harvest as a result of this visit but also they are visiting a number of other universities in order to continue to try to enrich the number of Chinese students who look at Cleveland State as an opportunity. China continues to be, in spite of all, one of the fastest growing graduate student and student exportation to countries in the world.

President Berkman stated that he will take questions later on and thanked everyone very much.

V. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Deirdre Mageean wanted to bring a couple of issues to Senate that people expressed concern about at the last Senate meeting – a couple of concerns around the hiring process and the timing and stated that Dr. Goodell has mentioned specifically concerns about the numbers and positions last year that failed. She stated that they released about forty positions, a combination of tenure track positions and lecturer positions this year and thus far, there are eleven we have not seen. Nothing has appeared in the Provost's Office yet. This is usually the preliminary step for getting these out. The Provost's Office turns these around in twenty-four hours and then they go through the usual, i.e., budget, human resources and diversity. She noted that those departments are spread across the university and it is really important to get those out. Faculty Senate may not be aware of how contracted the process can be but if they haven't reached her office yet; the time is really reduced and negatively impacts the ability of not just getting people but getting good people. She indicated that she is really concerned about one department which has two tenure-track positions – one an assistant and one an associate, that have not produced anything for us. Dr. Mageean reported that she has spoken to some of the respective deans and they will be leaning heavily on their departments.

Provost Mageean noted that another thing is of course that we make sure that the process is as expeditious as possible and so she will be talking to Jesse Drucker in Human Resources and with others in Budget. They are trying to see other ways where they can cut out a few of the signatures and they have done that. They have also counseled some people in those offices where there is some slight error or whatever on the forms, to please not manually write something and send it all the way back and then it has to go through the process all over again with all of the signatures. That is a waste of everybody's time so they are making sure that this does not happen. Provost Mageean stated that her office is doing everything at their end to make sure that once it hits them, it moves along as quickly as possible. She went on to say that if we all work together, we can get these things out quickly and efficiently. Provost Mageean said that she does want to congratulate Dean Anette Karlsson for running a really very impressive workshop on how to conduct a successful search. There were some colleagues who came and there were morning and afternoon sessions. She saw the afternoon session which was very well attended and she thanks all of the faculty who attended. She noted that all of these things are very helpful. Members of an educational institute can always learn something new.

Provost Mageean then commented on the second thing she had heard. Someone had mentioned concerns about the new FAAR system. She noted that there was some concern about it so noting that, she asked Tommie Barclay, Director of Web and E-Initiatives, who is responsible for it, to come and at least speak to those at Dean's Council and talk about some issues around that. Thus far, two colleges are piloting it – Education

and CLASS, and so there was an opportunity for them to offer some suggestions about some things that worked and some things that didn't work for that particular college and for what their faculty needed. So, that feedback is being provided to her. She added that it might be useful to have a few faculty who would then have a look at it with them because clearly we want something that works for everybody. The beauty of it is, of course, that it can be pre-populated; you don't even have to do all of the work with something that can be pre-populated for courses or teaching, etc. You can import and export from it from your existing curriculum vita. If it exists in Word or something like that, it can be constantly updated. She noted that the goal would really be to have everybody using this system. Dr. Mageean indicated that she was not sure if we can manage it completely with everybody using it by April of next year. If we could, it could then be used for discussions of work load and all those other things that go along for the coming semester. She added that this might be a good goal to have if we can get in the corrections and amendments such that it works for everybody. Assuming it works really well for the departments and colleges if they can aggregate from that in terms of the annual reports that have to be done for the department, for the college, if it works well for accreditation and program review, she really would exhort everyone to embrace it when and if we can get all of these things worked out.

Provost Mageean commented that Dr. Goodell mentioned the whole issue of transitions so obviously faculty, and particularly UCC, with Dr. Kostea working really hard on all of the program conversions and block scheduling issues, the big work now that hits everybody for another week is transitioning. We talk about how best to address this realizing that students are going to have to be very carefully advised to cope with this. Our seniors who are departing are fine but for new people coming in and everybody in between, we will be doing this for the next few years until our cohorts are out the door and we are working with the population that came in under the new system. Dr. Mageean stated that we need to guide the students through the process. Most of that will fall on the shoulders of departments and it could potentially be very, very time consuming especially having to work with departments with very large numbers of majors like Biology and Psychology with over 500 majors. Those departments clearly are going to feel the burden. Dr. Mageean mentioned that the general and college advisors could do a certain amount of work on the advising of the conversion but it is the faculty who do most of the advising. She noted that Dr. Goodell and Dr. Sridhar and she met with Dr. Peter Meiksins to talk about this and they had the good fortune of Dr. Sridhar already having worked through this a little bit giving them an estimate of how many minutes per student it really would take to get this thing done. She said that they are trying to develop a list of principles and the same people will be meeting again and trying to work through some of this and they will be sending resources to the colleges to deal with this to buy out time or to compensate for the extra work that will be done. Ideally there should have been a transition team doing this; it's easy for her to say that of course because she just parachuted into this situation, but in the same way there was a transition team when we did the conversion from quarters to semesters and we kind of need this thing. So there is a de facto transition team working on this and they are carefully looking at the resources. She stated that money is available. She added that this is something that all of the colleges and departments need to look at very, very closely. They wondered at one stage

what the enrollment and what the implications were for enrollment dates. As everyone is aware, we have a graduate enrollment timetable here which is March 24; honors students and athletes are next, followed by seniors, juniors, sophomores and freshmen and then full open. Dr. Mageean stated that at this stage, they think there is enough flexibility in the calendar for that and she is talking to the Registrar to see if we could possibly push it back a week. She noted that they will continue to review it to make sure there is enough flexibility. Provost Mageean added that of course the other issue is communicating all of this to people – students, faculty and everybody and that is the other part of the job that has to be done.

Provost Mageean stated that she would like to take this opportunity to introduce a new member of the community, Dr. Boyd Yarbrough, the new Interim Dean of Students. As some people know, Dr. Jim Drnek resigned and has taken a position at Cal State Bakersfield. She noted that we needed somebody to hold the reins for the year while we conduct a full search. Something that some may also be aware of is that we are looking at how Student Affairs is structured, if it is optimally organized and structured for the benefit of the students. As we put this emphasis on student success, clearly the academic units and the students' portion of this has to work hand in hand so Dr. Yarbrough will be working with all of the new staff in Student Affairs and with Student Government so please make him welcome. Dr. Mageean added that Dr. Yarbrough started on Monday.

Dr. Mageean next talked about space. She noted that as the President mentioned, this will be an important issue but it didn't take her too long after arriving here to realize that space and parking are two issues that occupy all of our time. She said that we did not have a very openly coordinated way of dealing with space. Clearly space is going to be an issue whether it is academic and classroom space, research space, student support service space, conference room space, whatever those things are and she noted that they are pushing the limits. As everyone knows, we have increased enrollment. Historically this is the largest student body ever. We have growth in areas that fall along with that; one prime example is Disability Services. Not even before the first two weeks were over, we had 800 students registered and Disability Services is without appropriate space. So we have a few crises that we are trying to deal with as well – not just research and transfer space. She said that a decision-making body is needed that would get everybody around the table and they could deal with this in a coordinated way. So we would have requisite administrative units that need to work on this, i.e., budget, institutional research, conference services, guidance, IS&T people. In addition we need faculty voices so she approached Dr. Goodell pretty early on and said that she would like her to nominate some faculty members. She stated that she also asked Dr. Sawicki, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, if he would have a faculty representative from the University Research Council who could particularly address research challenges from the faculty perspective. At the time, Dr. Goodell said that it would be useful to have faculty from a Senate standing committee, i.e., the Committee on Academic Space. Dr. Mageean apologized that she was not aware that there was such a committee and Dr. Goodell suggested that would be a good committee to draw people from and Provost Mageean agreed. She reported that they started with two faculty and they now have three members from that committee who would be the voice and representation of the Faculty Senate on

this larger Academic Space Planning Committee. She noted that the Faculty Senate Committee is of course advisory and she noticed from a September 26th article in *The Cleveland Stater* that there was a letter of frustration that the recommendations or advice from that committee wasn't really being heard. Provost Mageean said that she will look into that further. There was a report produced in May and she hasn't looked into that but maybe she would suggest that this is a way of making sure those voices are heard and that they are part of the decision-making apparatus not just advisory but actually there in the decision-making body. She expects that this will be a very busy committee, meeting very frequently as we deal with these challenges and the whole master planning process. Provost Mageean said that they do know that there are vacant spaces; we have parts of the university that are unused. She hears great tales about homeless people living in the bathrooms and Jimmy Hoffa is buried somewhere in Fenn Tower, and Elvis sightings somewhere in the Chester Annex, etc. The fact of the matter is that we have a lot of space that just isn't up to the task anymore and we need to take a very close look at that.

Provost Mageean stated one final thing she will come back to is the whole issue of textbooks. She noted that there is a committee meeting state-wide to look at and try to hold down textbook prices. Everyone knows that along with tuition, textbooks are an onerous burden on our students who are already strapped financially. Textbooks have increased in price 812% since 1978, three to four times inflationary so now the average student spends about \$1,168 on supplies and that is even more in places like engineering and statistics where you get those things that weigh half a ton. She reported that there is an effort state-wide to try and deal with this and interestingly, the study shows a direct relationship between textbook costs and student success. We know that there are a lot of students who simply cannot afford to buy textbooks. She stated that they are going to be conducting a survey of students. She asked Student Government members of Faculty Senate to take note and said that the administration will work with them just to find out how many students are actually buying the textbooks and then how many are actually availing themselves of the policy of renting textbooks which is one way of holding costs down. She noted that in 2010, this was introduced to one percent of our students and the transactions of renting books are now up to thirty percent which is good. She added that she would ask faculty in their departmental meetings in their curriculum areas to relook at ways that they could address this issue. There are some very large departments with multiple section courses where they are trying to teach pretty much the same curriculum. Faculty could look at standardizing some textbooks and maybe use their creativity to see how they can contribute to this; perhaps this is something we can discuss with the Student Success Committee or someone more appropriate.

Provost Mageean noted that this is her report and she will be happy to address questions later.

VI. Administrative Academic Space Planning Committee (Report No. 13, 2013-2014)

Senate President Goodell commented that in the not yet established new format of the Senate meetings, instead of having the Student Government representative speak

now, she thought it would be appropriate, having just heard from the Provost about the academic space issue, to continue on with that particular item. With just a little bit of background, Senate President Goodell said that the Provost did ask her during the summer what we should do about academic space and she had advised the Provost that Senate has a committee on academic space but certainly from her perspective the committee hasn't had a lot to do and, what they did do last year, there was no way that those recommendations could move forward – there is no formal mechanism for those recommendations to be acted upon. She noted that the administrative group is lacking faculty input. She reported that there was concern in the Steering Committee and people wanted the whole Senate to have the opportunity to express those concerns, ask questions, make statements, and perhaps move motions, but she didn't know the will of Senate so the topic is open for discussion.

Dr. Goodell added one further thing. She noted that before this was even an item on the Senate Agenda, she did speak with the chair of the Committee on Academic Space, Judy Ausherman, a colleague of hers in the College of Education, about how to get the representation on the committee. There are eight members, one from each college on the committee and that seems like a large number of faculty to add to an already large group of administrators, and, as everyone knows, it is difficult to coordinate all of those meetings. Dr. Goodell stated that one option would be that we, as a Senate through UFAC (University Faculty Affairs Committee) consider changing the way the standing Committee on Academic Space is comprised. Currently we appoint one person from each college. We could consider adopting the model that runs with PBAC and the Senate Budget and Finance Committee in which there are five members from across the university who are elected to the Senate Budget and Finance Committee and all five of them attend PBAC (Planning and Budget Advisory Committee). The number of faculty is a little less than the number of colleges but still representation from across the university is provided about issues that affect everybody. It isn't necessary to have eight people, one person from each college, on this space committee. Dr. Goodell stated that this is just a thought that had occurred to her and she has discussed it with Judy Ausherman and Dr. Ausherman said that she would discuss it with her committee when they meet this year. Dr. Goodell noted that the future of that committee was considered by UFAC (University Faculty Affairs Committee) when it was discussing committee structure last year. The perception is that this is one of the committees that isn't really doing very much. The mission of that committee is no longer appropriate. And as everyone knows, Senate did abolish two committees and established two new ones to take care of things that weren't actually being done so UFAC certainly made some great recommendations there, but she knows that perhaps Dr. Jeff Karem, chair of UFAC, can add a little bit about discussions around the Committee on Academic Space in UFAC.

At this point, Dr. Goodell asked Dr. Jeff Karem, chair of UFAC (University Faculty Affairs Committee) if he cared to comment.

Senator Jeff Karem said that first of all, UFAC is excited to hear further suggestions for revising things in the Green Book. He would say that Violet Lunder, Administrative Coordinator to Faculty Senate, could contribute to this as well. He noted

that the process of trying to find the records of every committee at times is tucked away in distant corners. He would say that he didn't have many opportunities to review past Academic Space Committee reports so he does think having some opportunity for that committee to be empowered would improve its function. One thing that was helpful was the Provost's explanation of space concerns. When this issue was brought to Steering, there was a reference to purely academic space but what he is hearing now is this is a much bigger portrait. The issue of services is under the purview of the Committee on Academic Space so he does think if there was a judicious intersection of those two at some executive power that would speak well. He noted that he is certainly happy to consider proposing revisions to shrink the Committee on Academic Space to a PBAC model.

Senate President Goodell stated that she would like to hear from the committee members themselves and to have an opportunity to discuss that.

Senate Secretary Stephen Duffy asked how many administrators are going to be on this new committee.

Provost Mageean replied that at the moment the total committee will be fifteen including four faculty and she would chair the committee. There will be two Deans; somebody from IMS because of the teaching needs because some of the services are disability services; we need budget; we need the Registrar's Office so it would be fifteen minus four or five but it is the coordination of all of those parts to make it really a true decision-making body. She noted that it is all about to happen anyway but it's getting everybody in the room; it's facilities. It's Joseph Han, Assistant Vice President of Facilities and Safety, telling us that you can't do that with that room just because. She said what she was trying to get away from is one faculty from every college – not because we don't want those voices but because it tends to disintegrate into a pleaded college versus college or department. What she is trying to do is to get people to think of the university as a whole as Jeff Karem alluded to. It's increasingly difficult to disaggregate what's academic and what's not academic and that means that parts will have to move in tandem with student success so that's really what we are trying to get away from, one faculty from every college.

Dr. Duffy stated that he participated in the last major issue that appeared before the Committee on Academic Space. Engineering lost a chunk of real estate to another college so in the process of moving away from one voice, one college, whose voices are going to be heard?

Provost Mageean said that the other thing this committee has the ability to do, is that there would be invited members depending on the agenda. These individuals would represent items on the agenda so if Engineering was on the agenda this time for expansion, there might be faculty from Engineering and the Dean.

Dr. Duffy noted that he was going to make a suggestion. Depending on which faculty members are appointed or elected to this committee, the holes could be filled by the Deans from the colleges that don't have faculty members on the committee.

Provost Mageean commented that hopefully again the two Deans who would be there would be representing the university and not their respective colleges but we want to try to achieve some balance – aspire to achieving that balance by having them participate in that process. She added that of course this would also be in line with where we are moving strategically as a university and whether those allocation resources are problematic.

Dr. Goodell asked if there were any other comments or questions. She noted that the Provost's Office perhaps requested that an academic space or space inventory occur. She asked if the Provost could give Senate an update.

Provost Mageean responded that a normal annual inventory should be conducted. She noted that this was sent out from Dr. Teresa LaGrange's office. The annual inventory is normally sent out at this time of the year assembling an inventory of where we are with office space so that when we have a situation such as the crises situation with Disability Services or a classroom space or we have to open four more sections then we know where to look for space. One of the things that really struck them when they were trying to find space for Disability Services was even with the people they felt had knowledge of available space, all together, nobody knew definitively whose space it was they were considering. This is just not the way to run a railroad. Provost Mageean stated that the inventory inquiry has been sent out and they really rely on everybody filling it in appropriately. Then they will go back and try to run through it so it's just a normal annual inventory but they would like to get some teeth this year to make sure exactly how we use all of our space.

Senator Jennifer Visocky-O'Grady commented that she is remembering last year that there was really a comprehensive inventory and she remembers it being in the spring but Betty Gump, Assistant Registrar, ran it and groups of people came through all the buildings and walked through them and they had a massive amount of extra work to do to fill out the forms. She noted there was a big comprehensive space audit that was just completed. What happened to that information?

Ms. Janet Stimple, Registrar, commented that what Dr. Visocky-O'Grady referred to was just completed last Wednesday. She noted that this inventory covers offices, labs, research space, etc.

Provost Mageean reported that the Registrar's Office has invested in software.

Ms. Stimple commented that classroom space was loaded into the software.

Senator Beth Ekelman stated that she did her department's space inventory last year; they did labs, research space, office space, every space; it was more than just classrooms.

Ms. Stimple commented that the Registrar's Office walked through academic space, classroom space and lab space.

Professor Ekelman stated that the Architects' Office sent the inventory.

Dr. Goodell wondered why Dr. Ekelman got the inventory last year but perhaps not the year before.

Dr. Ekelman replied that she does the inventory yearly and she did it last year because that was her job.

Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange stated that the university does space inventory every year and a manual report is sent to the Ohio Board of Regents. This time we are asking people to take a closer look at space.

Mr. Joseph Han, Asst. Vice President of Facilities and Safety, stated that they do an annual report on space because there is a constant change of space use. He noted that Evelyn Frey, Senior Planner in the University Architect's Office, makes an annual report and we begin this process now. The final date is February 2014 this year. Each of the colleges has information to verify to make sure that their space inventory is accurate. He added that this is an ongoing process. The more accurate information they have from the colleges, the easier it is for them.

Dr. Goodell stated that she needs to hear from the Senate on what should be done. She asked if Senate should go with the recommendation or with the request from the Provost that Dr. Goodell would nominate three faculty. Her nomination process would consist of going to the Committee on Academic Space and asking them for three representatives from the committee to be on the University Space Planning Committee. She asked if we can pull from somewhere other than the Committee on Academic Space because that's going to get very confusing. Dr. Goodell asked if a Senator would like to make a motion regarding her recommendation on the University Space decision-making body, or whatever we are going to call it.

Senator Elizabeth Lehfeltdt moved that Faculty Senate President Goodell nominate three faculty from the Senate Committee on Academic Space to serve on the University Space Planning Committee. Dr. Visocky-O'Grady seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell asked Senators to vote. The motion that Dr. Goodell nominate three faculty from the Senate Committee on Academic Space to serve on the University Space Planning Committee was approved by voice vote with two abstentions.

Dr. Goodell stated that she will then move forward with the nomination of three faculty from the Committee on Academic Space to serve on the University Space Planning Committee or University Space Planning Task Force.

VII. Report of the Student Government Association (Report No. 14, 2013-2014)

Student Government President Jon Fedor, stated that it is a pleasure to be at Faculty Senate addressing everyone. He noted he was sorry that he was not able to be at the September Senate meeting but he trusts that the SGA Vice President Allie Dumski did a fantastic job updating Senate on what was going on with the student representative body here on campus.

Mr. Fedor stated that he is an electrical engineering major here at Cleveland State and he has been involved in student government for the past couple of years. He noted that it is a really great thing for him to be involved. He extended his thanks to the Faculty Senate leadership for moving SGA up in the agenda since he has an electronics course that starts at four o'clock and he has an incentive to move this along. He noted that he is used to this in academic debates all the way through high school and being held to those rigid standards.

Mr. Fedor said that he wanted to quickly brief Senate on the mission of the Student Government Association in four different areas and then go into a couple of areas that SGA is working in right now. First of all, the Student Government Association exists to provide representation in advocacy on behalf of students across the university both in their own representative body and in the university and faculty committees. They work to be a trusted source of information for students and they also exist to provide opportunities for involvement. Primary among those three areas is the area of advocacy. He said he is telling Senate about these three core competencies of the SGA organization because Faculty Senate is their ally. SGA represents students, Faculty Senate represents faculty of the university and we have a need to work together to make sure that these two large components of the university work well together.

Mr. Fedor stated that if there is any area that faculty have a need to leverage student opinion or just to get information about students, SGA would be happy to work with Faculty Senate. If any faculty would ever like to come and speak to the SGA Senate that meets every first and third Friday evenings and address certain issues with them, they always have an open standing invitation for members of the faculty or faculty leadership and the administration, of course, to do that. He explained that SGA accomplishes their mission in a very simple way by helping students own their experience and own their space at CSU. So, it's a very pertinent topic of conversation to be talking about what we do with our space here on campus. There have been things happening in the College of Engineering that he is a part of even these past couple of weeks where he has concerns about the use of space. It is very important to SGA. If we don't create ownership of our space and of our experience at CSU, especially for students, then it becomes a very difficult situation for the students to care about what is going on at this university. So, the Student Government Association sees that as a huge opportunity for the student body

here at CSU. When you create ownership, people take better care of what they own, students invest and create a sense of responsibility, and SGA tries to foster responsibility as a result of that mission.

Mr. Fedor stated, "What are we doing to accomplish this mission?" He then answered the question by stipulating that first of all, SGA is working on Homecoming. They have a lot of partners, all across the university. The idea of creating traditions on campus for Homecoming comes from the University Alumni Association, the President's Office, the Student Alumni Association, all of the departments, University Marketing as well as the Student Government Association. This year they have a really great lineup of events they are aiming for, and hope to foster and extend this idea of creating ownership in the university; creating a sense of responsibility and belonging among the student body as well as in a lot of cases the Alumni at this university. He noted that these are the keys and students, as future Alumni hopefully, and the folks who have already graduated have the opportunity to see what's going on here at CSU and to be proud of it. He stated this is what is occupying a large amount of SGA's time.

Second, Mr. Fedor reported that SGA is looking at participating on university committees. As everyone knows, Student Government Association representatives sit on university committees across the university. He noted that he is a member of the E-Learning Committee as well as attending the Planning and Budget Advisory Committee and both of those committees have meetings coming up very soon and he is really excited about that. SGA has members that are appointed by the Student Appointments Board and if there are times when Faculty Senators have questions about who those representatives from SGA are who are representing students, please don't hesitate to ask SGA. Also let us know if students are not showing up. If anyone would like an increased student voice in the matters that committees are discussing, whatever it may be, he is very happy and amenable to provide those resources.

Third, Mr. Fedor reported that SGA had their Constitution reviewed by the Senate Student Life Committee. Recommendations were made and some things changed. They approved many of the recommendations of SGA's Investigation and Legislation Committee made regarding their Constitution. Student Senate later ratified those recommendations. He thanked Senate for the recommendations that were made by the Student Life Committee and they are now moving forward.

Mr. Fedor stated that another interesting area addressed earlier by the Provost has been an 812% increase in the cost of textbooks since 1978. That is a tremendous number, and it is true that students have felt a burden because of this increase. He noted that SGA Treasurer, Jake Wehner, has proposed an interesting idea and SGA would love to have the partnership of the Faculty Senate as well as the chairs of the departments across the university in helping to create a wider more expansive textbook reserve. Textbooks for each course offered should be made available. Thus, for students who need to get homework assignments where there is not really a huge amount of material to get directly from the textbook that is used, the student would be able to go to the Library, check out this textbook very briefly, use it for a few hours and put it back for other students to

access it. He noted that this happens already for some courses and there are entire colleges that he believes have this as a policy. But SGA would like to make that a policy across the board and it would go a long way in the interim of addressing this issue for students. He said he wanted Faculty Senators to think about this issue. SGA will discuss this issue.

SGA President Fedor talked about the Viking Traditions Book. He stated that this is primarily targeted towards students. Along with the Student Alumni Association, this Traditions Book is basically a part of SGA's efforts to increase pride in our campus. We are doing that by creating and extending traditions that we have on campus and ask Alumni and faculty to take a part in. This will help students who don't really know or don't really have the incentive to get involved on campus to go ahead and do that – to invest in and own their space and experience here at CSU. He noted this was a huge initiative they put together that was captained by SGA's Vice President Allie Dumski who is present at Senate today as well as their representative of the Student Alumni Association. The Traditions Books were just printed and will be available for the first time starting Friday, October 18 and then they will be available during the Homecoming festivities on Saturday, October 19 as well. He added that SGA are really excited about this and they are really excited to be able to recognize those students and other members of the university who contribute to this effort at commencement. This will be an additional incentive to get to that point to graduate and to continue to invest in the success of this university and their future (our own future).

Finally, Mr. Fedor also extended his thanks to Dr. Willie Banks who has served as Interim Dean of Student Life. He welcomes Dr. Yarbrough to the university as the new Dean of Student Life. SGA are looking forward to working with him and they are looking forward to working with Faculty Senate. At this point, Mr. Fedor stated that he has to attend class but SGA Vice President Allie Dumski, who reported at the previous Senate meeting, will be available for questions afterwards. If anyone has questions for him as the SGA President, his email is: president@csusga.com and he would be more than happy to field any questions Senators may have. He thanked Senate for its time.

VIII. University Curriculum Committee

Professor Bill Kosteas, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, noted that he has three items this afternoon for informational purposes only. The UCC is basically close to finishing up the course revisions, of course, not mentioning all of the additional courses that departments are deciding to submit for revision, and graduate courses that departments realized they do want to revise as well. As far as the undergraduate courses are concerned, UCC has a couple of courses outstanding and in a week or two their work should be wrapped up. Dr. Kosteas reported that this Friday, UCC will finally begin looking at program revisions because they have been dealing with up to this all of the issues with individual courses. He is hoping that UCC will start to make quick progress on program revisions. Senator Kosteas referred to the UCC memo that refers to UCC's last two meetings since the last Steering Committee meeting.

Dr. Kosteas stated that he would just mention briefly, that on a couple of occasions he has come to Senate and brought to Senate's attention that UCC has noticed in their review of all of these course revisions syllabi have been all over the map. There is a need to standardize syllabi and have some minimum criteria for what should be on syllabi. One of the items that came up very recently is this question about what makes a course a 400 level versus a 300 level versus a 200 level or a 100 level. That is something that is a future revision for the UCC to consider. Obviously UCC can't do that this year but perhaps once the dust has settled with the 4 to 3 conversion, that is another item that faculty need to address; to come up with some guidelines.

At this point, Dr. Kosteas asked if anyone had any questions. Hearing no questions, Dr. Kosteas offered:

For Informational Purposes Only (Report No. 15, 2013-2014)

A. Undergraduate course revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:

Anthropology

B. Graduate course revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion: Art, Economics, English, Philosophy

C. Undergraduate course revisions as part of the 4 to 3 conversion:

Marketing, Accounting, Computer and Information Science (CIS)

There were no questions or comments on the three informational items and Faculty Senate received the informational items from the University Curriculum Committee.

IX. University Admissions and Standards Committee

Professor James Marino, chair of the University Admissions and Standards Committee, stated that the committee has three items for Senate today.

A. Proposed Admission Revisions – Master of Accountancy (Report No. 16, 2013-2014)

Senator Jim Marino first presented the proposed Admission Revisions to the Master of Accountancy for international students. He noted that the request is that international students be required to take the GMAT for admission and that their verbal score be used in admissions decisions with a cutoff at the fifth percentile. He noted that they found the fifth percentile cutoff was generally not to be opposed. Dr. Marino added that they are taking the top 95%, just the cream.

There being no questions or discussion, Senate President Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed Admission Revisions to the Master of Accountancy for international students and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Admission Revisions to the Master of Accountancy for international students was unanimously approved by voice vote.

B. Proposed Admission Revisions – M.S. in Physics (Report No. 17, 2013-2014)

Dr. Marino stated that the M.S. in Physics program has requested to require the GRE of applicants and to use the GRE quantitative score in admission decisions. He noted that there is no actual cutoff involved in this proposal. They would simply be using that test score basically as one of the measures for evaluating applicants.

Senator Andrew Resnick commented that requiring a GRE test score puts us in line with other Physics Departments. Dr. Marino agreed.

Senator Robert Krebs commented, “Until Dr. Marino mentioned that, if the department has been doing this for years, do we need to have a statement?” Dr. Marino replied that they have not but everybody else has – we want to be like the other two.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed Admission Revisions to the M.S. in Physics and asked Senators to vote. The proposed Admission Revisions to the M.S. in Physics was approved unanimously by voice vote.

C. Holiday Scheduling for Future Academic Years (Report No. 18, 2013-2014)

Dr. Marino reported that it turns out that our holiday scheduling practice for years is illegal. Our standard practice has been to celebrate Columbus Day on the normally scheduled Monday and to use Veteran’s Day through a kind of slight of hand twice. He noted that we first of all move it usually to a Tuesday to balance out the one day cancellation for Columbus Day. Secondly, we double count it by making it a no classes holiday. We do cancel classes but it’s not a full holiday. Staff still reports and we use that holiday also to be the Friday after Thanksgiving. He noted that this is not the illegal part; the illegal part is that Veteran’s Day, under Ohio law, may never be moved; it must always be on November 11th because it’s the actual anniversary of an actual historical event. He stated that Columbus Day is a moveable holiday but we haven’t been moving it. We have been moving Veteran’s Day around and this is against the law but we are totally permitted to move Columbus Day around.

Dr. Marino stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee proposes that we continue with our ways but simply use Columbus Day to function as Veteran’s Day has in the past and to be a doubly moveable holiday. We will observe obedience to the law after next November and we will never move Veteran’s Day again. So Veteran’s Day from now on will be scheduled for November 11th and, if this makes any sense, we will move Columbus Day from year to year to balance out the one day, Wednesday-Friday, or Tuesday-Thursday course cancellations; no courses that day but have staff to report and then use Columbus Day as that magical undercount for a holiday that allows us to eat turkey sandwiches on the Friday after Thanksgiving.

Senator Norbert Delatte asked, “What happens when November 11th falls on a Saturday or a Sunday?” Dr. Marino replied that whatever the law states in the years before would apply.

Senator Barbara Hoffman mentioned Canadian Thanksgiving Day typically falls on Columbus Day. Dr. Marino replied that we cannot obey Canadian and Ohio law simultaneously. He noted that it is an 1812 thing.

There being no further questions or discussion, Dr. Goodell stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed that Columbus Day be now legally used to take the place of the illegal use of Veteran’s Day and asked Senators to vote. The proposal that Columbus Day legally be used to take the place of the illegal use of Veteran’s Day on the day after Thanksgiving Day was approved by voice vote.

At this point, Dr. Marino stated that on today’s Agenda there is an item D for Advising and Transition Issues Resulting from the 4 to 3 Conversion but he will not discuss that item. He noted that Drs. Goodell and Sridhar did ask him to attend a meeting on this transition but he had a scheduling conflict with a class. He said that he is at their disposal for future meetings.

X. University Faculty Affairs Committee

Report on Student Evaluation of Instruction Instrument (Report No. 19, 2013-2014)

Professor Jeff Karem, chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee, stated that he wanted to make it clear that this is not an action item; it is more of a refresher course. The Student Evaluation of Instruction Instrument was presented as an initial proposal at the last Faculty Senate meeting last spring. At that time, the Senate Steering Committee suggested that the appropriate way to solicit feedback would be to distribute this instrument to Faculty Affairs Committees to get an official report back. He noted that this process has commenced and UFAC should be getting official reports back by November 1, 2013. He stated that it is UFAC’s hope to have a proposal to Faculty Senate for the December 4, 2013 meeting.

Dr. Karem said that he wanted to go over some of the ideas behind this proposed Student Evaluation of Instruction Instrument. The new instrument has its roots most immediately in the Promotion and Tenure Processes and Procedures Task Force last year which was a joint task force involving substantial faculty and administrative representation. It was polled mutually by the CSU AAUP and the administration. It was actually a contractual obligation that hadn’t been met for a long time. There is actually a desire to look at standardizing some procedures and practices. Dr. Karem reported that one of the issues within that report was the multi various nature of student evaluations across the campus and numerous statistical data problems within it. He noted that one of the recommendations in the task force was a set of ideas about the selection of the data; he said that he would go over those calculations in a second. In conjunction with

appropriate faculty governance structures developed or proposed for a student evaluation instrument for a course, we are going to set common questions upon which many variations could occur within different colleges.

Dr. Karem noted that he distributed a report last spring and he also distributed reports to FACs. He stated that the reason for this is that he recognized that Student Evaluation Instruments by their very nature can be philosophically divisive among faculty. The fact that there is diversity among colleges also means that there needs to be a respect for those institutional voices so he is really trying to maximize the opportunities for input. He noted that he has already received ten very thoughtful sometimes multi page with citation appendices to the proposal. So the scholarly apparatus with whom the university is commencing is doing its work.

Dr. Karem said he wanted to go through some observations and then talk about some of the flawed recommendations. He noted that Steering had a conversation about this as well. For Senators who were here for this the last time, they may have tuned out, but for most people who are hearing this for the first time, please cherish this experience. Dr. Karem noted that a spread sheet that shows all of the different questions was sent to everyone. UFAC observed in looking at the multitude of student evaluations that, in general, there are three different categories of questions. One is the evaluation of the course, one is the evaluation of the instructor and the last is kind of student self assessment data. He noted they actually found the greatest variation was in the student self assessment; that is with respect to grade, what is your reason for taking the course, what is your year of study, what are your degree plans – things of that nature. UFAC recommended that there be common questions on the course, as well as common questions on the evaluation of the instructor. In general, UFAC tried to move towards questions that were more behaviorally descriptive rather than ultimately prohibitive. Asking did the instructor return materials in a timely fashion is perhaps a more tactile kind of feedback. Was the instructor always fair with me or something like that is something that is more objectively calculable whereas the other is more impressionistic. The latter is still a valuable consideration but it's hard to quantify fairly. UFAC also found that some of the questions were actually binary – Did the instructor turn the syllabus in to you; he said he hopes that always happens but he is not sure how that can be a quantitative range from one to five. UFAC tried to reach some common set of questions there. It was also observed that there were some colleges that had questions printed on the same sheet with the answer bubbles, which is a great idea. In some colleges, there are things in courier 12-point font from 1990 on the document and a scan-tron sheet in the other. UFAC received numerous reports of misaligned calculations resulting in evaluations being thrown out. Dr. Karem added that they do not want that to happen. UFAC is recommending that logistically, when there is a common core of questions approved, we have a convenient easy to use score sheet.

Dr. Karem stated that he would go through them briefly and answer questions. For the assessment of instruction and course questions, UFAC proposed that almost all of the evaluation instruments use a five-point scale of (1) to (5) ranging from “strongly

disagree” to “strongly agree”. UFAC has already made a few revisions based on the last Senate meeting – that one always represents the least and five the most.

Assessment of Instructor – the questions are:

- 1) The instructor was well prepared for class.
- 2) The instructor presented the course material clearly.
- 3) The instructor gave clear information about course expectations and assignments.
- 4) The instructor responded well to students’ comments and questions in class.
- 5) The instructor was available outside of class to help students during office hours or other appointments.
- 6) The instructor provided timely and useful feedback on student assignments and examinations.
- 7) The instructor made the course material interesting.

Dr. Karem added that UFAC didn’t find these to be controversial questions.

Assessment of Course – Dr. Karem noted that these do represent a kind of common core that is already out there.

- 8) The required course texts and materials were useful. (UFAC decided that they didn’t need to ask the question as to whether or not they were expensive because we already know the answer.)
- 9) The course assignments were useful in developing my knowledge/skills.
- 10) The pace and organization of the course worked well for me.
- 11) This course advanced my knowledge/skills.
- 12) This course fulfilled my expectations.

Dr. Karem noted then they end with Overall Evaluation of the Instructor and Overall Evaluation of this course and then Self-Assessment questions that could be added by the colleges.

Dr. Karem reported that a question arose – “Where would be the role for qualitative hand-written responses?” Dr. Karem stated that the college would handle this – there would be a separate place for this.

At this point, Dr. Karem asked if there were any questions about the instrument. He noted that he recognizes that Senate will not be taking any action on this but he thinks it is really important right now. The oversight of the student evaluation instrument by Senate Bylaws is the purview of the Senate so we need to take ownership of this and that is why he wants to make sure that there is opportunity for thorough attention to it.

Senator Joel Lieske commented that he raised an issue at the Steering Committee meeting – this issue concerns appointing Emeriti James Schuerger and Emeriti David Grilly of the Psychology Department. They may have documented a very strong

correlation between the students' expected grade and the overall evaluation of instructor. Dr. Lieske complimented UFAC for the design of the survey instrument, but with this correlation, a very strong correlation, point five, this provides an incentive for individual faculty to inflate student grades and an incentive for the students themselves to deflate the evaluation of the instructor. So the question he has for the administration particularly the Provost's Office is, "How are you going to deal with this?" because this is potentially corrupting. He said that he has a friend at Lafayette College who informed him last year that of the typical college student, 24% of all college students would expect an "A" and the professor going up for tenure and for merit increases, this is a real incentive to inflate student grades. If you want to get tenure and you want to get high marks, you want to give students high grades. Dr. Lieske asked, "How is this going to be handled?"

Dr. Karem responded that he is certainly glad to defer to the Provost. The first thing he would say is that the situation that Dr. Lieske was describing, for better or for worse and he would say worse, that it already exists. He would say any college that has that concern should make sure it has the student expected grade question on the self-assessment which then means the faculty could feel they are at a disadvantage and can establish that correlation and say, "Well, in courses of this nature that are difficult, students are expecting a low grade, and based on the scholarship that he has read, this explains his evaluation." Dr. Karem stated that there is no instrument we can design that will solve that problem. But, if we could have a clear and more consistent set of data, it actually will empower faculty to use the numbers in a way that can help advise their teaching and their promotion and tenure opportunities. It is one thing when we are talking about the data – right now what's out there is worse than inconsistent. It doesn't correlate actual college means – it correlates the things from colleges that don't exist. Dr. Karem stated that there is almost no way we could make the situation statistically work. He would like to consider how we could but whatever we end up approving certainly would be much better than what's happening now.

Provost Deirdre Mageean stated that there is much more she can add to that. She stated that yes, Dr. Karem is right. She knows having taught methods and stats courses herself that there is a correlation between those courses and your grades. It is just something that the Department Chairs and Deans have to be aware of and to monitor very closely as they should be doing anyway. It is a universal problem. It is something that has existed. What Dr. Karem is mentioning here is that we can do all that we can to make all of the other bits work. There are other ways of gauging a professor's performance in class and there are other forms of feedback as well but she didn't know if there is much more that we can add except that there has to be vigilance and the monitoring by the departments and the Dean's themselves. We can continue to consult but she hasn't heard of any solution to this problem yet.

Senator Sanda Kaufman commented that she is concerned a little bit about question number 12) "This course fulfilled my expectations," which is sort of a black box, in other words, who knows what students might have expected and moreover, if it is a core course or something that they have to take for their degree, they may have no expectation at all; they just have to take it and so they are bound to be disappointed if

they hate the subject. For instance, quantitative courses she predicts would never fulfill anybody's expectations.

Dr. Karem replied that he understands Professor Kaufman's point. One way that he would recommend the colleges can deal with this is through student self-assessment questions. He noted that what everyone is not seeing here are all of the questions that say, "What is your reason for taking the course? Is it because it is a general education requirement or a major requirement?" You need to put that data out there. He noted that it is important to know, based on what the student is taking the course for, if it is meeting that need. If it turns out that there is a strong correlation between students who don't want to be taking the course and not finding that it fulfills expectations, that's useful for a faculty member. Look, if students aren't enjoying statistics and have said that they are taking this only because they have to, then that doesn't speak as much about my instruction as the requirement itself. Dr. Karem went on to say that many instruments that are out there have questions that are designed to speak to this issue. But if that language is too fuzzy and people have better recommendations, he is happy to wordsmith this – he is from the English Department.

Senator Andrew Gross commented that Professors Jeff Karem, Jim Marino and Bill Kostea all have three very difficult committees and he wishes to congratulate them and thank them for their hard work.

Dr. Gross then said he had two points to make briefly. One, try to convince the Faculty Senate and the faculty at large to bring the student evaluation timing at the end of the semester rather than what he believes now is the habit or the practice or the mandate of having it in the sixth or seventh week currently.

Dr. Karem noted that the student evaluation should be the twelfth week.

Dr. Gross continued stating that at one point they had it in the Business College during the sixth or seventh week. He stated that his other point is with regard to what Professor Joel Lieske said and he agrees to what Dr. Lieske said. The only thing that he would suggest is that Dr. Karem makes a policy to bring back evaluations by the alumni. This is very useful and very important and often more sage and wise than those of the students' evaluations.

Dr. Karem noted that he does know that many departments within their self-assessments are doing a survey so he thinks Dr. Gross' suggestion is a very good idea

Senator Jim Marino noted that he had a quick comment for Dr. Lieske and a question for Dr. Karem. His comment to Dr. Lieske: "Joel I can reassure you that in CLASS, the CLASS Faculty Affairs Committee has no intention of removing the expected grade question from the CLASS survey." His comment to Dr. Karem: "Jeff, what are the reasons that UFAC can't suggest certain mandatory self-assessment questions as well? Are there certain self-assessment questions we might feel have a university-wide utility?"

Dr. Karem replied that UFAC could. They found that there was such variation that UFAC thought it was better to defer to local governance. He can say that in the Law College, there were forty questions about teaching methodology used in the course. In Engineering there should be questions about technology. There should be questions about a sufficient range of pedagogical theories – UFAC simply thought that with the potential number of questions, that UFAC might be intruding too much on colleges on judgment of their needs. But, if there is widespread support for say the question on the expected student grade, that's fine. UFAC was simply trying to find not the lowest common denominator, but the greatest common factor – that's the extent of the platform.

Dr. Goodell commented to Dr. Karem that they are two different things. Dr. Karem replied that he knows and that is why he was choosing his words carefully.

Dr. Karem stated that he wanted to say something else about some of the statistical recommendations coming out from the processes of the task force. He said that he knows this has really important facts on our colleagues. Probably outside of the Deans and the folks in the Provost's Office in various capacities, he has looked at dossiers of faculty who need advice. He noted that in general, the problem that most harms faculty with respect to student evaluations is not necessarily the scores themselves but an inability to find good data to compare. The inability for there to be "apples to apples" comparisons across similar disciplines really disadvantages faculty. It disadvantages departments who are trying to evaluate how we are doing in particular teaching skills as compared to other departments. He commented on three quick bullet points in the material that came out of UFAC and the Promotion, Procedures and Processes Task Force. Dr. Karem mentioned some problems originated outside the instrument and these are the things he thinks they will contend with and they are more practical.

Professor Karem stated that the college means against which individual evaluations are prepared ranked into quartiles or were based on a fixed mean from 1999 rather than actual means of the scores gathered each semester within each college. Thus, in some cases the mean is calculated on the basis of a college that no longer exists if you are in Sciences or CLASS. He noted that this makes both the means and the ensuing quartiles meaningless. Consequently, UFAC recommends that Institutional Research calculate an actual mean for each college for each semester. Alternatively, the Task Force suggested that Institutional Research calculate rolling means every five years and they are hoping to have a discussion about that down the road. Ready access to the data for comparisons are almost impossible while evaluations are retained in the Chairs' and Deans' Offices. It is possible for faculty to ask for access when preparing dossiers. Dr. Karem noted that there is no unifying data base from which faculty or administrators could draw sample sets to compare scores and means within departments for individual course numbers or types of courses, etc. Dr. Karem stated that it is possible from the special request for such data from Institutional Research which usually requires months to get such reports. So, if someone is up for promotion and tenure, it takes longer to obtain a book from OhioLINK by far if you have to have a separate resource project to get those. He noted that if this data were available in an accurate and current data base,

such comparisons could be made extremely expeditiously. The Task Force found a relatively low response rate from the student evaluations – about 60%; this is even worse for on-line courses. Both UFAC and the Task Force found that the process by which the evaluation is administered does vary considerably by college and department and also it varies as he said in terms of type face. He noted that if he were a student the old-fashioned slanted font in CLASS makes it look like the student evaluation is an after-thought whereas the nice shiny light blue tactical field for Engineering and Education evaluations speaks of having my opinion valued. That's as close as they will get to talking about the brand new student evaluations.

Dr. Karem stated that UFAC recommends that the university consider a uniform method of administering evaluations so that variations and procedures do not produce disproportionate results and improving the process would lead to a higher response rate. Dr. Karem said that he welcomes any other questions about this item. He said that it is really important the faculty communicate with their colleagues because he wants to be really clear that this is a process that has been generated from the ground up. He is also planning on speaking to Student Government to ask them, "What are the questions that you think need to go on the evaluations?" He noted that one of the reasons of concern about the response rates is that it may be that the students don't feel these are the questions they want to be answered.

Senator Marius Boboc had two quick points to make. He noted that the first point is that quite a few of us teach online or hybrid classes. He is looking at item number 5) "The instructor was available outside of class to help students during office hours or other appointments." Does that infer outside the virtual classroom environment? So if we were to use this maybe formally across the campus, we might want to make the language clear to all of our students. Dr. Boboc stated that the second point is that one other way in which we could evaluate holistically this set of items would be to think of the continuous improvement. If we were department chairs, or Deans, or Associate Deans or even colleagues, faculty need to look at the data generated by this instrument and talk to our colleagues about what could I do better next time; which of these items do support such conversations?

Dr. Karem responded that UFAC was tasked with developing one evaluation for non-online courses and E-Learning is an entirely separate instrument. UFAC was asked to leave that to the E-Learning Committee. He said that he is happy to interpret and find a common core for that too. They were intending evaluations to be in person and academic space being utilized in the evaluation.

Senator Robert Krebs commented that Dr. Karem started to allude to one question that has come up in a couple of places that has to do with access. He asked about student evaluations: "Are they a private document? Are they a public access document? Are they somewhere in between? What's the recommendation?"

Dr. Karem replied that everyone will note that he studiously avoided that subject but this is definitely something for future discussion. His understanding would be that

ultimately these are public documents because this is a State university. He noted that there have been questions about what sort of access should be given. Right now, candidates for promotion can ask at the departmental level, "Can I see what the scores look like?" Dr. Karem stated that sometimes department chairs must hand everything over and other times, they might get the spreadsheet; there is a lot of variation and he feels that this itself is a problem. He can report that there are trends in different universities across the nation that make that information more readily available on line in different venues and that is a discussion worth having as well. Wherever we go with our access of sharing policy, we need to begin by having an instrument that is sensible and data that is usefully collected. It may well be even in future discussions there needs to be a different way that the university handles this. Institutional Research is looking at so many kinds of data that's very different than this. He wonders if that is part of the challenge in getting data. If they are assembling a book of trends and evaluating these backwards statistics, maybe there needs to be a mechanism with their colleges to maintain some kind of credible approach. Dr. Karem stated that UFAC has not been asked by anybody to recommend an access policy, but when they get there, they will be happy to help with a solution.

President Ronald Berkman lauded the work of the committee. He stated that this is really extraordinarily important work and as Professor Duffy and Professor Goodell, who sit on the Board of Trustees know, this has been an issue at the last two Board of Trustees meetings – both questions – the question of uniformity, the question of the current standard being used for student evaluations and the question that Professor Krebs asked and that is the Board's question of, "Is the data available to students, how is it available to students, and how can students access the data across the university." President Berkman noted that it would be helpful at the next Board meeting if either Professor Karem or Professor Duffy make a report to the Board about what the committee has done because the committee has gone a long way in terms of answering or helping to disquiet the Board that we do have a uniform instrument in the university for evaluation and also to prompt the question about the mechanism that might be used to make the information both available to faculty who ought to have it in a timely way and his understanding is that sometimes faculty don't see it until they start putting their dossiers together for tenure and promotion. President Berkman stated that really it should be accessible in response to Dr. Boboc's question if faculty are going to have any value in terms of having to critique to evolve a course or to identify issues, and also available to students. President Berkman encouraged Professor Karem to talk to the Provost about having it as a reporting item at the next Board of Trustees meeting.

Senate Secretary Duffy added a comment. He noted that it is interesting to hear the suggestion that was made here was also made at the Board meeting and that is that we also look at the Alumni surveys of faculty. He said he feels this is an excellent idea.

Senator Paul Doerder stated that he had two quick things. He noted that it might be useful to ask seniors about their freshmen experience as well because they are several years now removed from their freshman experience and their freshman courses. He noted that the second point is, "Is UFAC going to consult some statisticians?" He would

recommend that UFAC does or the Senate could consult some statisticians before approving this. He thinks the means are probably not relevant and means are not the way to compare faculty members. He noted that the data are not normally distributed. Many faculty receive goods and excellent evaluations. He has seen this in promotion dossiers many, many times. Professor Doerder feels the data are not normally distributed. He thinks that the means and any percentiles or quartiles based on a normal distribution would be meaningless.

Professor Karem responded that Dr. Doerder raised a good point that several faculty have already asked about, i.e., what is the role of the quartiles because the quartiles can give a very misleading impression of teaching performance. If you have a college where everyone is scoring four, which is a good score, you can still be in the lowest quartile which does not accurately represent the quality of your teaching. He does think there is almost certain to be an institutional commitment to a means of some kind. He does question the value of quartiles themselves, to be honest, because they do end up creating the need for everyone to be above average to be good. If everyone is performing at a good numerical level with respect to the evaluations, he is not saying that it is prohibitive in all respects, then that may be sufficiently prohibitive for the purpose. He noted that he will bring that question back to UFAC and for Senate's consideration. Dr. Karem stated that he didn't know what the origin is of the need for quartiles. He is used to seeing means as a component of every evaluation. The quartiles themselves are not seen in every other university.

Senator Beth Ekelman commented that she was on the Task Force and if she recalls properly there was an original Faculty Senate report about how they wanted to do the statistics and she thinks it had been suggested that people who are really good at stats look at this survey as it is being developed. She thinks that can be done at the same time to make sure that the numbers are being equal. She noted that there were a lot of recommendations when this originally was developed that were never implemented she thinks because we didn't have the infrastructure to do it but she does agree with Professor Doerder that we really can look at those together.

Dr. Karem commented that if anyone knows a few good statisticians to let him know.

Senate President Goodell stated that perhaps we can survey faculty and find out.

Dr. Karem thanked everyone for their time and asked them to please make sure to converse with colleagues about this issue and he welcomes feedback.

Dr. Goodell added that the Faculty Affairs Committees in each college are presenting their reports and she encouraged everyone to contact their own colleagues to give any feedback to their Faculty Affairs Committees on this particular matter.

XI. Budget and Finance Committee

Report on the Budget (Report No. 20, 2013-2014)

Professor Andrew Resnick, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, stated that the first meeting of the Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) this year will be on October 24, 2014, next week, so he doesn't have any results to report to Senate at this time. He noted that some of the discussion they had about the Space Committee is relevant to how the finance committees operates. He stated that this is his second year on the committee – it is a very tight interface between the faculty and the administration. Thanks to his predecessors it is an extremely well functioning committee. It's not at all like the budget processes currently sucking all of the air out that we have been hearing about recently. He noted that we are all aware of the financial pressures that are facing higher education and he thinks our financial officers should really be recognized for their efforts to maintain stable finances for CSU.

Professor Resnick reported that the Budget and Finance Committee met about a month ago to discuss some hot topics that they could bring to the meetings and present to Faculty Senate in an effort to make the committee a little bit more relevant. There are about a dozen questions and he will report on those as we move forward. The questions range from programmatic or planning items such as a report on the impact of the removal of tuition and caps. The tuition cost is fixed after above twelve credit hours; it was effective in the budget from that; 16 once effected the budget; what fraction we have in the budget spent on academic programs but also very detailed things like requesting a report detailing how much of the CSU bond issuance is set aside for deferred maintenance.

Dr. Resnick commented that as he stated earlier, this is his second year on the committee and it has been a very steep learning curve for him. Something he learned very early on was that although the revenue stream is fairly straight forward to understand, last year we received approximately \$236 million dollars in revenue and of that, 65% was from tuition and fees; 27% from state appropriations so 93% of the revenue came from two sources. On the expenditures side however, it is very different. Dr. Resnick said we spent \$231 million but the top three items only count for 77% of all expenditures. So trying to understand the flow of money is something that is going to require a lot more time for him to understand how it all works. Professor Resnick noted that again, PBAC (the joint faculty administration finance committee) is meeting in one week and he will have more to report at the next Senate meeting.

At this point, Professor Resnick asked if anyone had any questions.

Senator Barbara Hoffman asked Dr. Resnick what were the top three items of expenditures. Dr. Resnick replied that the top three expenditure items were: salaries and fringes 64%, debt service 5.8% and financial aid 7.4%.

At this point, Dr. Joanne Goodell stated that the next item on the agenda is further discussion of the faculty hiring process issues.

XII. Faculty Hiring Process Issues

Dr. Goodell noted that she believes the Faculty Hiring Process Issues was addressed in the first part of today's meeting so unless anyone has any questions for the Provost regarding this issue it is now open for general question time – questions for the President or the Provost or any Senate Officers on any matter.

XIII. Open Question Time

Senator Joel Lieske said he wanted to applaud the administration for trying to establish a smoke free campus. He spoke in favor of a smoke free campus a couple of years ago at a Faculty Senate meeting and he is really supportive. But, when he goes around campus, particularly here on weekends, he finds a subservient breach; he finds four students on Columbus Day sitting at a table South of Stilwell Hall smoking. He noted that of course he called them out on it. He noted that most of us are not inclined to do that. He sees other smokers just outside of Rhodes Tower and they say, "Well we are leaving." He stated that he thinks the smoking policy is not really being followed. He sees protestors smoking who tell him, "You are not going to tell me how to lead my life." So, the question Dr. Lieske said he has is, "What can be done about the smokers?"

President Berkman commented that he doesn't know that he can answer Professor Lieske's question. First, we have a complexity because we are an urban campus and once a student is on the sidewalk, they are no longer on the CSU campus. So, it belongs to the City of Cleveland. The smoking ban does not pertain to the City of Cleveland so unfortunately, the smokers are free to move to any sidewalk and smoke. President Berkman noted that the second piece is we always knew it was going to be a very, very significant compliance challenge. He noted that Vice President Stephanie McHenry is not here but she has worked with Public Safety, both the sworn officers and maybe Joseph Hahn could talk about it, and the other Public Safety Officers to do what Professor Lieske does, to call out students when we see them smoking on the campus and if we find that there is not anywhere near the compliance that we need, then we will have to consider ratcheting that up in terms of sanctions that students might be given if caught smoking near buildings, in buildings, and on campus property. But he noted that for students, the code is broken and they know they can go out onto the sidewalk and have liberty. At this point, President Berkman asked Joe Hahn if he wanted to comment.

Mr. Joseph Hahn, Safety Director, stated that it was known that the smoking policy was going to be a difficult policy to enforce especially. He doesn't think that we want to have a hard enforcement at this stage of the process. He noted that many campuses that are going through a similar process like we have implemented the soft approach. That is the way we are approaching it now. He stated that probably at least half of us here would have difficulty approaching folks that are smoking outside of our offices or outside of our buildings. He stated that he would encourage us to continue to talk to folks but don't put yourself in harms way if you feel threatened obviously. Mr. Hahn said that Human Resources has little cards and he carries these around. Sometimes he finds it is easier for our safety team members to hand folks a card as a soft reminder

that this is a tobacco free campus, not just smoking but tobacco free campus. He noted that every once in a while you will see people spitting on the sidewalk and you know it is tobacco. In order to really change the culture, all of us, have to participate in the process. There are statues that allow officers to actually issue citations but we are not ready to go to that stage yet. So, he is hoping that in time we will show a transition and more people will feel awkward smoking in a tobacco free area. Remember, it wasn't that long ago, when we went to a movie theater, a bowling alley, a bar and these were not smoke free venues. When you go to most palaces now, the culture has changed. He said that he believes we are going to get there. We just need a little bit more time of continual reminder, not telling folks how to live their lives, but encouraging folks that we do have a policy here that we are serious about.

Senator Barbara Hoffman asked President Berkman, "In your discussion of the six-year capital plan, you mentioned a figure that I believe was an approximation, \$400 million – was that supposed to be an approximation of what CSU would have?"

President Berkman responded, "No, the \$400 million figure is the figure that has been floated for this biennium, for the next two years for all State supported universities. This system, by the way, includes community projects that flow through to universities. So, there will be a bit of a scrum concerning arts projects, culture projects, recreation projects that typically by Ohio law stipulates has to flow through a university to be able to be funded by State appropriations. The State cannot directly give money, for example, to Playhouse Square or to the Art Gallery. It can give money to an institution which can have an operating agreement with that cultural entity that allows students or allows faculty to make uses of those enterprises in exchange for, in essence, being a physical agent and flow-through for State dollars." He said he understands that's how it has worked for the last thirty years in Ohio.

Professor Hoffman asked, "Just to orient our heads about this, approximately how much would it cost to tear down and replace Rhodes Tower?"

President Berkman responded, "No we have not had the courage to ask anybody that question. I think it should remain an enduring monument to the creation of CSU even if it remains people-less over a long period of time." President Berkman said, "As a point of comparison, it cost the University in a competitive bidding process to take down Viking Hall and the Rascal House over \$6 million."

Dr. Joanne Goodell commented that Rhodes Tower is a lot bigger than that and a lot more asbestos infested.

Dr. Goodell indicated that she had a question for the Provost and the President. She stated, "At some point we had discussed with the Provost that it would be good to get some updates from other areas of the university like the Vice President of Business and Finance Stephanie McHenry and from various parts of the university that have projects going on now. We obviously have a vested interest in knowing how things are going in

other areas of the university.” She asked Provost Mageean if she had given any of that any thought and is that something we should plan for perhaps in future meetings.

President Berkman replied absolutely. He stated that all Dr. Goodell needs to do is to indicate which area she would like to hear a summary from, whether it be the administration or finance or budget or Institutional Research or whatever the area and the administration will tell the particular area that they have their designated ten minutes of life and then he will have them come to Senate to make their report and answer questions. President Berkman said that he thinks it is really a good way actually of disseminating more information; it’s actually information finding users rather than users looking for information.

XIV. New Business

Senate President Goodell asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Goodell asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:55 P.M.

Stephen F. Duffy
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel