MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE

APRIL 6, 2016

PRESENT: Berlin Ray, Boboc, W. Bowen, Corrigan, Deering, Delatte, Duffy,
Engelking, Fodor, V. Gallagher, Genovese, M. Gibson, Hampton, Henry,
Holtzblatt, D. Jackson, S. Kaufman, Krebs, Lazarus, Little, Lupton,
Marino, C. C. May, Mazumder, Mead, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, O'Neill,
Resnick, Robichaud, Shukla, A. Smith, Sridhar, Xu, Visocky-O'Grady,
W. Wang, Xu, Zhao, H. Zhou, Zingale.

R. Berkman, Halasah, Khawam, LeVine, Sawicki, J. Zhu

ABSENT: Bleeke, Delgado, Ekelman, Holland, Inniss, J. Jenkins, Rashidi, B. Ray,
Sonstegard.

All, Bennett, Boise, Bond, Chesko, Gleeson, Grech, Karlsson, Lehfeldt,
V. Lock, McHenry, Novy, Parry, Ramos, R. Reed, Rushton, Sadlek,
Schultheiss, Spademan, G. Thornton, B. White, Yarbrough, Zachariah.

ALSO
PRESENT: Kothapalli, Lieske.

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

I.   **Approval of the Agenda for the Meeting of April 6, 2016**

Senate President Sridhar stated that he has two changes for today's Agenda.
Under the Admissions and Standards Committee, item A, a proposal to modify use of the
"X" grade, is not an action item; it will be for discussion only. He will get into the details
of why this became a discussion item from an action item. It will be brought back at the
May 6, 2016 Senate meeting as an action item. He noted that too many things have gone
on at the Steering Committee meetings so it will not be presented as an action item. Dr.
Sridhar stated that the second item he would like to add is a short one-minute Agenda
item from Yulanda McCarty-Harris, Director of the Office for Institutional Equity. He
noted that this is Sexual Assault Awareness month so Yulanda would like to say a few
words about that and also about the Title IX committee that we have on campus. This
item will be item IX on the Agenda. Dr. Sridhar then asked for a motion to approve the

Agenda with the two changes he mentioned. Senator James Marino moved, the motion was seconded and unanimously approved by voice vote.

II.   Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of December 2, 2015

Dr. Sridhar reported that we have Minutes of the meeting of December 2, 2015 for approval. He noted that in addition, Violet Lunder also sent out an abbreviated summary of items that we talked about at the last meeting on March 9, 2016. Senate Secretary Debbie Jackson actually took notes at that meeting and the next day sent out an email that asked if this summary would be something that we should all look at. The Academic Steering Committee reviewed it and decided that we will do this as a practice going forward. We will send out an abbreviated summary of things that Senate talked about, not official transcribed Minutes. The official Minutes will take a little longer to publish than a summary but we will at least have a summary of the meeting and actions that were taken and we will present the summary at the following meeting of Senate.

Dr. Sridhar then asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of December 2, 2015. Senator William Bowen moved and Senator Andrew Resnick seconded the motion and the Minutes of the meeting of December 2, 2015 were unanimously approved by voice vote.

III.   Report of the Faculty Senate President

Dr. Sridhar said that he wanted to make a couple of quick reports to update everyone on the Path to 2020 Project. In particular, he wanted to spend a couple of minutes talking about the budget process for FY 17. He noted that he is sure that the Provost may touch upon some of this in his report as well.

Dr. Sridhar reported that on March 21, 2016 there was a Budget Committee meeting that he had the pleasure of attending. He noted that all of the Deans were there and presented their strategic plans and what they are doing with their colleges, as well as a budget request for FY 17. He commented that this was a good exercise and he learned a whole lot from all of the Deans in the room. It was a very, very long day but it was an enlightening experience and it was a good exercise spending a whole day thinking about the academic core of the university. Following this, the Provost made presentations to both the President as well as the Executive Team sort of summarizing where we are on the academic side and what we should be looking for when we build the FY 17 budget. He noted that the budget process itself is in full swing. We should hear something in the form of a report from the Senate Budget and Finance Committee at the next meeting of Senate because by then the Budget Office will actually have real things for us to look at.

Dr. Sridhar stated that in addition to the academic exercise that he just described, all of the Vice Presidents have been making presentations to the Executive Team with ideas of where budgets can be made on the non-academic side. Now, these are not really budget cuts. These are really ideas that Deans will be presenting with the goal of using these ideas, some combination of these ideas that actually will make good on the shortfall

that we may have with expected revenue and expenses. Dr. Sridhar stressed that this is not a budget cut at this point. It will become a budget cut on the administrative side but at this point, no one is talking about cuts as yet. This is just an idea. Dr. Sridhar noted that there would also be a presentation about the public private partnership, the Asset Monetization project, by Senator William Bowen. Dr. Sridhar noted that if there are other questions about the 2020 Program, people could meet with Dr. Bowen at the end of today's meeting during Open Question Time.

Dr. Sridhar also wanted to bring everyone's attention to the summit on Undergraduate Education in the 21st Century that will be held on Wednesday, April 20, 2016. He noted that everyone should have received an email from the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence. He noted that if anyone did not look at the email because it came from just the CDE email address and people don't have the habit of reading those things, people should go and look for this email and actually read it. He noted that this is an all-day summit. Dr. Barbara Margolius and a group of faculty which the Faculty Senate commissioned as an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education has been working hard and putting this event together. It is a one-day event. There will be speakers from Cleveland State University as well as from outside – people from Kent State University, Arizona State University, Portland State University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, University of Georgia and Spellman College. Dr. Sridhar said that he thinks this will be an exciting discussion about general education in general. He noted that it is a good idea for there to be a good representation of faculty and he asked faculty to please register. He reported that Dr. Margolius sent him an email saying that there will be no cost for anything but they would like to have enough chairs for everybody and enough lunches for everybody that will actually show up so please do register for this event if you plan on attending.

Finally, Dr. Sridhar stated that student evaluations would go live at the end of this week or early next week. He asked that faculty keep an eye out for that. He commented that he couldn't believe it is already half of the semester but it is – four more weeks and it will be history.

An unidentified person reported that Friday of this week student evaluations go live. Dr. Sridhar stated that usually an email goes out and he is hoping that there will be an email sent out to all faculty and not just the students because during the last semester, he learned about it when his students came and said, "I got an email, what is this?" Dr. Sridhar noted that if somebody asks about student evaluations in your class, you know what it is.

Finally, Dr. Sridhar stated that this is his report. If there are questions, he can answer quick ones now or we can have questions later during Open Question Time.

IV. Announcements of Coming Elections

Dr. Sridhar stated that along with today's Agenda, everyone received an announcement of elections to be held at the May 4, 2016 Senate meeting. He noted that

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

V.   University Curriculum Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Creation of CSU 290 – 0 credit Internship

Dr. Smith reported that other activities the UCC has been engaged with are also described in UCC's memo to Senate. UCC created a course for a 0 credit internship, CSC 290 that was recommended by the ad hoc Task Force on Co-ops. This course was created to satisfy what was perceived as a desperate need to have a way of indicating on a transcript that a student had completed a legitimate internship even if that internship had 0 credits associated with it. The course description that the UCC approved modified what was originally sent to the UCC as in the memo. He stated that if there were any questions about the description, he would be happy to answer them. He noted that other expertise is at Senate to address questions. Remarkably the UCC's discussion was 75 months long. He added that there really are things to talk about.

Dr. Smith reported that we have some new modified GenEd courses, a title change to a GenEd course and a change in the BSW Program practica grading scheme from a grade to S/U.

2. New and Modified GenEd courses (undergraduate)
    a. SOC 201 GenEd Skill Area Revision (undergraduate)
    b. World Languages – SPN 470 – New Course + WAC (undergraduate)
3. BSW Program Change Revised (undergraduate) Changes grading scheme for practica to S/U
4. WST Course Revision (undergraduate) Title change to "Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies"

Finally, Dr. Smith reported that at the last Senate meeting, the UCC was asked to look at the enrollment limits for WAC courses. He noted that the UCC met the day after the Senate meeting so there was really no time for the committee to prepare a deep

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

Dr. Smith commented that those who are involved with the submissions and looking at curricular proposals are aware that for the last couple of years, we have used an in-house built system of OCAS to manage the curricular approval process. He noted that this was sort of a new nameplate on a system that was designed to handle materials for the 4 to 3 conversion. It was built in a day and we appreciate the work that IS&T did on it but things built in a day don't really work as well as we like them to. So, the university has acquired a new curriculum approval management system to help us with the flow of materials pertinent to curricular proposals called Curriculog that interfaces with the catalog software that we have and we are going to implement the system he believes on April 18, 2016. He noted that no new submissions to OCAS would be possible after April 15. Dr. Smith stated that anyone who wants to submit a proposal after April 15th would have to… He noted that there will be some training at some point, but before that training occurs, Kevin Neil, the Registrar, will have to be consulted on exactly how to do it. So, Curriculog will have many wonderful features. Among them, it will help people answer the questions that they have to answer. It won't let people submit things with unanswered questions that people further in the process need. It will allow people, like when they are asked a question, "Does this change affect any other program, department or college?" to do a search of the catalog on the spot to make sure that if you are deleting a course you won't be able to say no without having checked to make sure that no is the right answer. Dr. Smith added that it offers many wonderful features and the next chair of the UCC, he is sure, will enjoy using it. Dr. Smith then asked if there were any questions about Curriculog. There were no questions.

VI.   Admissions and Standards Committee

Professor Chandra Kothapalli, Chair of the Admissions and Standards Committee, stated that the committee has two items, one for Senate consideration and one for informational purposes.

A. Procedures to address Security and Quality of E-Learning Courses (Report No. 39, 2015-2016)

Dr. Kothapalli presented the first item, Procedures to address Security and Quality of E-Learning courses. He reported that the committee brought this item to the Senate floor at the March 9, 2016 meeting and received some feedback. The committee went back and drafted a document with all of the comments and additions expressed by everyone. He then asked if there were any questions.

Dr. Sridhar stated that there was a big discussion about this item at the last Senate meeting. The most critical aspects of the procedures were to point out that there were some things that were required of courses and the faculty and the students and it wasn't clear in the document what was actually required and what was recommended and

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

Dr. Smith asked, "What will happen to someone who doesn't follow required procedure?" For example, if someone has a course of this type and has three exams that count for 33% each, but doesn't have the exams on campus, will that faculty member be prosecuted and go to prison or what will happen?"

Professor Kothapalli replied that he doesn't think that is the goal here. The goal of this document is to provide some guidelines in the absence of any guidelines. Professor Kothapalli noted that in the documents we have two separate things. The procedures are what are expected of every e-learning course. Some of these things are already in place and some of these things actually came back from the E-Learning Committee two years back so this has not been created out of the blue and there are many things that are practices. Dr. Kothapalli stated that he wasn't sure if he had answered Dr. Smith's question.

Dr. Sridhar remarked that the question was not answered.

Senator Nicholas Zingale referred to page 5 of the document, "Required Procedures & Recommended Practices to Address Security and Quality of E-Learning Courses" under "Quality" and noted the document states, "We recommend the following as requirements for E-Learning courses" and asked, "Are they requirements or are they recommended; what are they?"

Professor Kothapalli replied that those two things have already been discussed in the previous Senate meeting. He noted that he just put the text in the document on how we can improve. He stated that these are the requirements.

Professor Zingale asked, "They will be required?" Professor Kothapalli replied that we did strike the words "as requirements" from that so it should read, "We recommend the following for E-Learning courses." Professor Zingale stated that they won't be required, they will be recommendations.

Senator James Marino referred to page 2 of the document, section 2, and noted that there is some language that he thinks, considering we are trying to tighten up security, there is some infelicitous language. He noted that right now, the sentence reads, "Students who are unable to take such a test on campus should consult with E-Learning for off-campus options and notify the instructor of alternative testing arrangements prior

to the exam." Dr. Marino commented, "Pardon me for being legalistic, maybe I just dealt with students. This actually only requires the student to tell the teacher how they are taking the exam. They have to talk to E-Learning and then they notify the teacher. There is no point there where either E-Learning or teachers sign off on the alternative arrangement." Dr. Marino stated that he understands the sense here is other than is intended or is written. He noted that we might want to tweak this like "we will agree on alternative" or "will consult with E-Learning and agree with the professor on alternative testing arrangements" that might be a friendly modification.

Dr. Sridhar stated we need to adopt these procedures and recommended practices to address security and quality of E-Learning courses. The Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed this document as required procedures and recommended practices to address security and quality of E-Learning courses specific to exams and assessments in such courses.

Senator Raymond Henry referred to section 2 under "Required Procedures" where it states that if this is an on-line course, it doesn't state the nature of the test. So, if you have an exam that is an essay-based exam, that is not specified here as any different than a multiple choice exam and, in that situation, the temptation to plagiarize a lot is a lot less or the copying or any other issues. So, here we are not distinguishing in different types of tests. The only distinguishing thing is that it gives a test that counts for more than 25% of the credit. Dr. Henry stated that he is not sure if that is necessarily a requirement for every test or high stakes tests, and one that could actually be better administered not on campus. He stated that he is using himself here as an example here. He gives essay tests where students have a full week to work on them. He stated that that is not fitting with what it states in the document but there is nothing that distinguishes that from any other test.
Dr. Sridhar noted that Professor Linda Wolf, chair of the E-Learning Committee, could not be here today. She is usually here. He noted that this is something that came from the E-Learning Committee.

Professor Kothapalli stated that if there is additional information we could complete this.

Professor Henry noted that this is just a question of the only distinguishing characteristic needed here and that is to state these tests are high stakes which is only a term of their value towards the total grade in the course. Once again, he said that he is thinking about his own situation here where now, because in on-line classes he recognized that he didn't want to give multiple point tests, so he has an exam that is an essay-based exam and that seems to him to indicate here these must be held on campus. He noted that he doesn't know how to get around that and be consistent with the language of …

Senator Robert Krebs noted that later in the document it actually recommends those kinds of exams. So what we need to recommend is to just be clear for this section that really applies for those high stakes closed book exams.

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

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

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

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

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

Dr. Kothapalli stated that at this point it is tough to foresee how exactly this is going to roll out with those specific things, but they may be things we need to tweak as we move forward and we should accommodate those things. One of the comments expressed where the students have to pay for parking and how to accommodate their schedules; there is no golden standard or golden option available, which we can incorporate into the document where it addresses all of the concerns and all of the possibilities. This is just to accommodate what we can and then we can devise this document…

Professor Berlin Ray stated that if Senate votes on these procedures today and approves them, then this goes into effect and so to her that is a pretty critical thing to have the bugs worked out before we then say to our faculty that now you are going to have to do this and you are going to have to accommodate and you are going to have to come down to campus – so she doesn't understand. She added that she understands what

Dr. Kothapalli is saying but those are some critical concerns and, in her opinion, this is premature to hoist these onto our faculty.

Professor Kothapalli reported that there is data from the Registrar's Office, which was that a majority of the students, what they can do in this process, is they actually do take other courses on campus.

Dr. Berlin Ray remarked that the students take other courses at times they can and then they go to work and take these classes to fit in when they can't come to campus and that is one of the reasons. So, they are taking these on-line courses so they don't have to come back to campus.

Dr. Kothapalli stated that the way the document is written in this form, we are not expecting all of the students to take the same exam on the same day at the same time.

Professor Berlin Ray remarked, "So the adjunct comes back more than once."

Professor Kothapalli commented that they are to make arrangements with the E-Learning Center to take the exams.

Dr. Sridhar said, "We are getting into the meat here, right?" These procedures and recommended practices were sent out last month and then comment was solicited and other people presented comments and that is where this is at now.

Senator Allyson Robichaud stated that if the whole class is doing a high stakes test, which means that the whole class has to come to campus to do this, she doesn't see how these procedures are going to work either. There is limited classroom space as it is so would you have to get hold of the Registrar's Office in the fall and book a room for a particular day after polling the class to see if they can all make it or would you have to have sequential dates and then you are going to increase the chance of cheating unless you have three different exams. She recognizes that this is really difficult but she does think that some of these practical concerns are going to cause a lot of trouble. And, this is even for full-time faculty who may not always want to come to campus either but are around a lot more than part-time faculty. So, we really are sort of making a high bar here for folks.

Professor Robichaud noted that the policy Dr. Kothapalli is saying is required is when it is an on-line class with a high stakes exam. She noted that it looks to her like everybody in that class is supposed to be in a room at the same time taking the exam. She added that students are supposed to be on campus being watched taking the exam and try to imagine setting up in sequential times. It would be tricky to implement so she thinks that Dr. Kothapalli might have to think more about implementation.

Senator Kathleen Little stated that she would like to make a recommendation to move point 2) under "Recommended" as opposed to "Required" and that would take care of it. Professor Kothapalli noted, "Move point 2 from 'Recommended' to 'Required?'"

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

Interim Provost Zhu stated that he appreciates the concern because this university takes pride because our students are the center of the university so we have to be considerate of our students and make sure whenever we implement a policy that it is reasonable. Also, we need to take into consideration the faculty profile here. We do have a large number of classes taught by adjuncts. He noted that the same procedures and policies being recommended here have been used at other places and at other places that he worked at before and it was a similar policy. And, yes, in fact some of the questions create an inconvenience for some of the students. We do have data showing here that of 90% of our students that are taking on-line courses really look forward to the convenience so they don't have to come to campus. But at the minimum throughout the fifteen-week semester, they cannot make an effort to come in once to take the exam. And, for our faculty, it is a similar situation. We may be having faculty who are not physically located here while teaching on line for us. That is the beauty of this exception rather than the norm here. So when we implement and discuss our policy, we will have to weigh in that we do have some serious issues in terms of test security and then we just recently addressed this very large-scale issue and this is the part of the policy that is trying to address that. We probably don't have the answers and the solutions to every individual case and exceptions that you can think of. Dr. Zhu stated that he is sure that we can come up with a situation where truly it is difficult for that particular student or maybe for that one faculty member. But we have to take the overall impact of our policy in play into consideration when we develop the policy. When there are individual situations, we certainly should consider them like any policy exceptions, but we shouldn't be driven by exceptions when we develop our policies. Dr. Zhu added that this is just his thought. He stated that we have gone through multiple rounds of discussions on this policy and he appreciates the efforts of the faculty and the Admissions and Standards Committee members because they are putting a lot of time into these procedures and recommended practices as well. He went on to say that personally, the way he sees this and is compelled to previously replay that record before, it is a reasonable policy and it is a reasonable combination of what is required and what is recommended. He added that there is the flexibility to build in for truly difficult situations and we can allow exceptions.

Dr. Robichaud inquired if Provost Zhu could tell Senate how, in his previous universities; the scheduling of tests at the same time in a classroom is doing better. Dr. Zhu replied that Professor Robichaud had a good question. He stated that yes; it follows common time and different instructors for high enrollment classes. For example, in the beginning, he came from a math background, like college algebra and classes with multiple sections. He noted that there is a common time set at the beginning of the semester. And students, when they registered, were reminded that this is going to have a common exam and that you have to come to campus. So, when the students signed up

for the class, the message was delivered to the students. When they sign up, there is a pop-up thing in the course registration process so they are reminded. And, regarding the students, we used a policy that if you lived thirty miles away, then you didn't have to come but you have make arrangements. If you have a local community and learning center, or there is a local community college there where you can arrange for a proctor exam, then we would send the test down to the center but the student would have to make an arrangement ahead of time. But the test time is a common and determined before the class starts.

Dr. Robichaud asked, "How are the classroom designations done?" Provost Zhu replied that it works with the Register's Office, just like the Register's Office works through. If a class meets on Monday and Tuesday at this time, then your exam is scheduled at this time in this room. So they take the on-line courses into consideration when they developed the schedule.

Dr. Robichaud stated that we need some rollout time then since students have already signed up for classes for 2016-17 so maybe this will be the fall of 2017. If you need to involve the Registrar to free up class rooms and times and students need to be made aware in the common hour and that sort of thing, to try to impose that for the fall of 2016 might be pretty crazy.

Provost Zhu responded that he agreed with Dr. Robichaud. Regarding the rollout time, we need to have some consideration because we have multi term registration compared to the school where he used to work – it was just for one semester at a time. So, for that, he agrees that we probably need to take the multi term registration into consideration when we decide on the details and roll-out and perhaps the fall of 2016 might be a little too soon. We need to look at the overall impact of this and our overall reputation with on-line classes and nothing 100% cheating proof and we cannot prevent that. It is just that we need to make a good faith effort. We need to take into consideration terms of individual cases but we shouldn't be driven by exceptions.

Professor Marino stated that he doesn't think we are going to find a perfect solution by tweaking the details here. There is a fundamental; a synchronous testing will always be intentional text security, right? It is the fact that it is the range of time between taking the test. It creates the window for cheating in the first place so we have to make a decision, "Do we prioritize security in taking these tests or do we prioritize convenience?" He added that there is no perfect solution.

Provost Zhu commented that that is why he thought we should be driven by individual exceptional cases. It is just that if we thought that in his judgment and his involvement in handling of larger scale cheating, yes, he feels that a high priority at this point is that we need to put something in place. At least when other issues come up, we can actually defend to the public that we have indeed put a good faith effort in place and have a policy in place, and of course people understand that no matter how you design a policy, individual cases are going to happen. But, if we don't even have a policy in place, then we are responsible for larger scale cheating and that is going to effect the

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

Professor Little asked if there would be exceptions for completely on-line programs where students from California are literally taking our classes. Provost Zhu replied that he would encourage that if for truly implementing this kind of policy in particular programs, where courses will be difficult, then faculty should be encouraged to seek other ways to do the assessment. You set out for relying on high-stake exams. He added that the recommended practice has suggestions there and several faculty members throughout our discussions have mentioned that there are other ways to assess instead of using the high-stake exams. He pointed out that if truly the program can make a good case, he is sure that the program can appeal to the standard admission to present a plan and how to maintain the integrity of the program and yet without having to do this synchronized exam.

Professor Zingale commented that he is not speaking out against the policy because he thinks that we need something. In defense of his colleagues, he stated that he doesn't think people here are against the policy or this detail or this high stakes. He thinks that what Provost Zhu said last time kind of revealed the underlying meaning of what is going on here to him at least. And that is it seems to be a movement away from these high stakes exams into other forms of testing as a part of this. But, he finds it interesting here the assumption under "Recommended Practices, it says 'If possible, develop and administer numerous tests throughout the semester.' He noted, "Why I point this out is if the policy is going to be shirked at all, it is going to be shirked in that way. Instead of having a 25% exam, you are going to have somebody that has a 10% exam and a 15% exam and they can in essence do that and shirk the policy completely." He added that the assumption coming out of this section xiv is that somehow this would reduce the possibility of cheating. He said he wonders why more testing seems to suggest that that would be less likely.

Dr. Sridhar remarked that he could respond to Dr. Zingale. He noted that this list of seventeen things actually recounts the history of the original which is basically three years of various committees on e-learning that have sort of combined a set of test practices that the faculty have been using. That is why originally, this was under "Procedures" and then we moved it into "Recommended Suggestions" because this is just... Somebody tried this and said, "This worked in my class." Dr. Sridhar stated that there is no telling that it will actually work in your class or in anyone's class. That is not the intent of these kinds of things. This is basically just a set of suggestions that other people have used and have worked in other classes, that's it. That is why these are just recommended suggestions. Again, just to go back on this point, Dr. Sridhar said that he

doesn't think that this is basically something that is written down that says everybody must follow this rule or else. The spirit of this is that we have had four years of various faculty committees on e-learning that have tried to do this kind of thing and it is apparent why we haven't actually adopted something like this because it is actually a fairly complicated kind of thing. Dr. Sridhar went on to say that the other option other than passing these recommended practices and approving them today would be to say, okay, we will take another four weeks to go and do this, but we have reached that point of not getting any more than we are going to get. If there is a strong sentiment that people want one more opportunity to go and take a crack at this and will actually commit to providing real substantive feedback, maybe we can come back next month. But, if we are going to come back next month with a little bit of wording, he doesn't know if that is worth it. Dr. Sridhar stated that we, as a body, commit to saying we will go back and provide substantive feedback to the committee, committees, E-Learning and Admissions and Standards, and we can come back with another document or we approve this. He noted that it doesn't say that we have to wait two years to come back with an amendment. We can come back with an amendment in six months if we need to.

Professor Fred Smith stated that he is speaking for other people, not for himself. He noted that one thing he heard that would improve satisfaction with these procedures is to have it come with an operational plan for how on-campus testing will work. He noted that if someone came in with a plan saying that part of the e-learning fee goes to supporting some testing center where a student can come between 9 AM and 9 PM to take tests, with that essentially the faculty member doesn't have to be there because someone being paid out of the e-learning fee will be there. He added that this is the kind of thing that might improve the palatability of these procedures.

Dr. Sridhar thanked Dr. Smith and stated that this is actually a good concrete suggestion that we can work on so maybe we can come back with a specific plan from the Registrar as well as E-Learning to say how this is actually going to be implemented. We will come back with that next time and that should be better. He stated that these recommended procedures and practices will go back to committee for now with all of the little pieces from the Registrar's Office and will come back at the May Senate meeting.

B. Proposal to modify use of the X-grade (Discussion only) (Report No. 47, 2015-2016)

Professor Kothapalli moved to the committee's second item that is an information item. He noted that this is a proposal involving the X-grade. There has been a lot of discussion on this topic the past two weeks since the Steering Committee discussed this topic. The Admissions and Standards Committee asked for the data from 2010 to 2015, the last six year's data to see how "X" grades, "I" grades and incomplete grades have been given. He stated that we have the data now that shows there is a difference between undergraduate and graduate data in how the "X" grades are being administered. For example, at the undergraduate level data over the past six years shows that 75% of "X" grades assigned to undergraduate students ultimately become "F" grades. But, at the graduate level, only 36% of them end up in "F" grades. The committee does see that

there is a huge discrepancy between undergraduate and graduates. He noted that the second thing was that "X" grades are also administered by the Registrar's Office when students don't receive a letter grade from the instructor at the end of the course. We are not talking about a few cases; we are talking about 600 cases last fall 2015. There was discussion of how we can accommodate the "X" grade and the subsequent course description. For example, if the student receives an "X" grade in course A, which is a prerequisite for subsequent course B, then one of the suggestions was that the student should not be allowed to register for course B. If frozen at registration, then the student will be automatically prevented from registering for course B immediately. Dr. Kothapalli stated that at this point, we are not asking for a vote on eliminating the "X" grade. We wanted to get input from Senate. We want to see how the Senate feels about abolishing the "X" grade at least at the undergraduate level. At the graduate level, we do see that many students use the opportunity of the "X" grade to work with the instructor and eventually get a letter grade. Twenty-two percent of the graduate level students who were assigned an "X" grade eventually went on to get an "A" or "A-" grade – the data definitely shows that. Dr. Kothapalli stated that we don't want this policy in the current format at the graduate level. But, at the undergraduate level, we do have data from the past six years, which completely shows that 75% of these "X" grades eventually become "F" grades. Dr. Kothapalli stated that this is the basis for this proposal and this is up for discussion now.

Professor Krebs noted that it looks like 20% of the students delay this. What he has heard is the problem is the fact that the "F" gets delayed. Some of the students do have an opportunity to get their W's in, sometimes they probably have to go through the petition process, whatever it is, but 15% actually go on to get a grade. So yes, 80% of the students go on to fail the course. But what is easier? They are going to get the "F" at some point; there is just a delay. He asked, "Is that really a problem? The big question that comes in is if you have assigned a grade, changing a grade, right now the "X" is an easy grade to change. If you have to put a letter down, it is more of a problem."

Vice Provost Peter Meiksins stated that there are essentially two answers to Professor Krebs' question. One is that CSU is the only four-year public institution in the State of Ohio that actually has the "X" grade. Other institutions have figured out a way to deal with this problem essentially by using the "I" (incomplete) for the purpose that we currently use the "X" for. He noted that the other issue is that right now, what is clearly going on is that some faculty confronted with a student who didn't complete the course gave that student an "F". Others give the same student who did the same portion of the work an "X" which has a differential impact on the student's status in the system. If you give them an "F", it counts against their GPA right away and, if they are on probation, they get dismissed. If you give the student an "X", it doesn't count towards their GPA. You essentially kick the "F" down the road a semester, so that student is allowed to persist for another semester. When 80% of them eventually wind up failing a course, we have essentially allowed that student to persist for another semester; we have taken their tuition dollars in the knowledge that they are highly unlikely to continue as a student any longer because 80% of them wind up failing the course. Vice Provost Meiksins stated that it is actually somewhat higher than that if you look at the numbers – 80% turn into an

"F" or a "U", and then another single digit turns an "I" to an "NA". There are various other non-passing grades. He noted that he did the math and it is 13.3% of the X's eventually turn into a passing letter grade. He stated that this is a problem that only we have because only we have a grade that functions in this particular way. The problem can be resolved by simply using the "I" (incomplete) in a situation where you have a student who you know or suspect is likely to complete the course. The system will be abused but his argument and other peoples' arguments are that using a simple system that we understand is preferable to using a complicated system that we don't understand.

Professor Smith commented that in all this, when he looks at transcripts and how students can be in good standing, it is like what he sees on their transcript. He noted that he is curious how many of these "X's" turn into "F's" that lead to a student being dismissed as opposed to a student just having a lower GPA. Vice Provost Meiksins responded that he hasn't run those numbers but he is sure that it can be done. Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange said, no, it can't be done.

Professor Smith stated that he certainly understands that we don't want people to persist if they are not going to be successful. But, if students had an "X" that turned into an "F", then they would all stay in good standing. So it really is an issue of concentrational "X's" from a single person, but alternative "F's", right? He continued saying, "Like you have to do really badly to be dismissed, really badly, like you have to get a lot of "X's", one won't do it."

Vice Provost Meiksins agreed but noted that he can't present numbers here at Senate. He can tell Dr. Smith that "X's" and "F's" correlate with one another on students' transcripts. They are not isolated events. Students who get an "F" tend to get more and "X", as Dr. Smith sees himself with students' transcripts, "X's" tend to cluster on certain student's records and not on others so there is a tendency for this to be part and parcel and an overall problem with that student. He noted that he couldn't say that all students get an "X" in that situation. He doesn't have those data. He does think that this is an issue when we, as a faculty, what we are doing is we are giving the same student an "X" or an "F" and the difference is who the instructor is, not what the student did. He added that he doesn't know that that is an appropriate situation to allow to persist.

Senator Jeremy Genovese stated that his understanding is that the "I" (incomplete) grade is given in a circumstance where the student can't complete the course but you have made arrangements with the student to complete the last week of class and take a final or something like that. The "X" grade is given in circumstances such, as the student doesn't show up. All of a sudden you don't know if there has been some emergency – you just don't know all of a sudden towards the end of the semester when the student disappears for example. He stated that if his understanding of the definitions were correct, then to do this we would also have to change the definition of the incomplete. He said he thinks the incomplete actually says that on the grades when you look at it now. So, if you are going to broaden the number of students who are getting an incomplete, you have to broaden the criteria as well.

Vice Provost Meiksins stated that in effect that would be the case.

Professor Genovese said that he doesn't see how this proposal is solving a problem because we will only wind up then with just the same number of students with incompletes as opposed to "X's". Vice Provost Meiksins responded that that is a possible interpretation. He said he thinks that Professor Genovese gave a lucid and clear and accurate description of what the "X" is. If we survey the 500 faculty plus adjuncts on campus who have the ability to give an "X", you would get multiple very different answers to the question of what an "X" is. He remarked that his scientific sample in talking to his colleagues around the office tells him that that is the case.

Professor Genovese noted that his gut feeling is that he would rather help the 12% of students who really need the "X". The other students who don't do the work, their grade is going to turn to an "F" anyway so at least from his perspective, this problem is caused by something else but it seems to him that that is better for the students.

Dr. Sridhar stated that he doesn't think that it is better for the students to delay an "F" by a semester. If an "F" is definitely coming, he personally thinks that taking tuition money from that student for one more semester is wrong. He doesn't think that delaying an "F" by a semester is a good thing for the students in general. He also wants to say that the point of this discussion is for people to voice opinions. He went on to say that there is no proposal at this point on the table to abolish the "X" grade. The attempt here is to do some fact finding and the reason is that we talked about this issue in the Steering Committee and thought that we had something that was a good suggestion which was that as soon as somebody got an "X", we would treat it like an "F" for prerequisites. Then the next morning in his office he had a forty-five minute long discussion with the Registrar about all of the different things about why administratively, the Registrar now has the power to drop a student from a course which is a wrong thing to do. So, the reason he recommended to the Admissions and Standards Committee that we not bring this proposal for a vote but rather have a discussion was to collect facts. So, there is no proposal and let's not argue about a proposal at this point. If we want to voice opinions of what should go into a proposal, let's go.

Senator Sanda Kaufman stated that she would like to support Professor Genovese's comment for various reasons. She said that she thinks she has clarity and if people don't have clarity about the function of this grade, it is an easy fix to actually train the 500 people who issue grades. But, she finds it enormously useful and distinguishes the "X" from the incomplete because incompletes force the student to discuss what the conditions are for completing whereas this one is going to signal to the student that there is a problem, in case they didn't notice, when they really have a serious problem and they could get around to tell us and so she doesn't think that it is that much of a burden to carry it and let it turn into an "F" anyway as would an incomplete. But in exchange, if we change the incomplete description, what ends up happening is that someone who comes for just three weeks to class is going to try to make arrangements with me so they can complete the class in some future as opposed to what the incomplete requires now which is that you complete the majority of the course, that you should have done most of

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

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

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

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

Dr. Sridhar noted that the Admissions and Standards Committee would come back to Senate at the next Senate meeting with a real proposal. Now is a good time to give the committee feedback if there is any. He stated that the discussion we have had for the last ten minutes all pertains to undergraduate classes. Use of the "X" grade in graduate classes is different all together because the data seems to suggest that faculty and students are using the "X" grade in a very different manner than the undergraduate classes. He noted that again, if anyone has comments, please send them to the Admissions and Standards Committee.

VII.   Campaign Update (Report No. 48, 2015-2016)

Vice President Berinthia LeVine stated that it is her pleasure to be at Senate today to update everyone on the status of the campaign. She reported that as of March 31st, year-end this year's fundraising is a little over $12 million. Everyone will recall that she

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

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

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

distribute about it if anyone hasn't gotten the brochure. Finally, Vice President LeVine stated that she really appreciated the opportunity to come to Senate to speak with everyone. If anyone wants more details on how the dollars have been allocated, she would be happy to provide everyone with any number of reports that show that. At this point, she noted that she would be happy to answer any questions now. There were no questions.

VIII.   2020 Program – P3 Asset Monetization Update (Report No. 49, 2015-2016)

Senator William Bowen stated that last summer Dr. Nigamanth Sridhar asked him at Steering Committee to sit on the University's P3 Project and he agreed to do it. He reported that P3 stands for Public Private Partnership. He reported that the committee has met several times over the course of the year. The point of his report today is to tell everyone the status of the current discussions of that committee and some of the things that people are doing around it. The membership includes Vice President Stephanie McHenry, Tim Long, Kathleen Murphy, Joseph Han, Bruce Ferguson, Boyd Yarbrough and he (William Bowen). He noted that the discussions also include JLL. He said that he has a couple of brochures at Senate today if anyone is interested. This is a third party consulting firm that does this P3 type of thing regularly. Dr. Bowen stated that the committee's objectives are to determine a plan that outlines how to fund some of the key things in our 2014 Master Plan and to form projects with private partners to create resources for purposes of meeting some of the campus housing and parking demands that we have and renovate some of the buildings, etc. as outlined in the Master Plan. He commented, to put it into perspective, the plan includes somewhere around the order of $500 million worth of deferred maintenance, buildings needing structural repairs, parking garage issues. There are a whole lot of financial considerations that work their way one way or another into that plan and the $500 million was the number given to him to contemplate and start to think about this.

Professor Bowen reported that first the committee considered opportunities in housing markets, office markets. There may be some opportunity to extract some value in student housing markets though to his knowledge that hasn't yet been fully fleshed out. There do not seem to be opportunities in office markets. JLL went in and looked at the markets pretty carefully and none of our spaces here could be used productively for office space that we rent or lease out to somebody. In the opinion of the consultants, the parking operations may be the best opportunity for us to extract value and bring in revenues to the university. Dr. Bowen noted that the only way to tell that, the only way to know for sure whether parking operations does have this opportunity is to go to the market and find out. He reported that on April 27, 2016, Cleveland State University would issue something called an RFQ for our parking operations. An RFQ is a request for a quotation and it is a standard business process whose purpose is to invite suppliers into a bidding process on a specific product or service. Having thought long and hard about Cleveland State's finances and budgets and future challenges, Dr. Bowen personally thinks that it is a good idea to issue an RFQ though it is too early to tell about the RFP. The RFQ just gives us some idea about what the value of our parking assets look like. Dr. Bowen said he wanted to be very clear about it. An RFQ is very different

from an RFP. An RFP ends in a contract and an RFQ simply tests the market to see if there is interest in an asset so they are different things. Usually, an RFP is issued six to eight months after an RFQ. If the results of the RFQ are promising and President Berkman decides to issue an RFP, bidders will need to prepare their proposals and then structure their financing plans and our administration will have to structure the transaction. There are a lot of important details that have to be decided before we actually know what the RFP will look like and how much revenue we can generate for the university with things like that. Dr. Bowen stated that he has been told by the consultants who do this all of the time that once the university determines whether and to what extent the market has any interest in any asset in our parking operations the procurement process takes six to eight months. So assuming that an RFQ result is known, to put ourselves a little bit into the future we find out whether anybody has expressed interest in our asset, which at this point is unknown, and President Berkman decides to go ahead and issue the RFP. According to the consultants we should have as a faculty six or eight months during which time we will want to be kept in the loop he is sure and have our opinions heard on issues like parking and tariffs and what the privileges are going to look like and what the service levels are going to be and things like that. Professor Bowen stated that given the speedy launch of the RFQ it would be good for us to get some assurances from the administration that there will be plenty of opportunities for faculty input along the way in a lot of the elements – parking rates, charges, privileges, etc. and that they will be presented to Faculty Senate in a timely manner which is to say with enough advance notice for us to deliberate in appropriate committees and look at the options.

Finally, Professor Bowen wanted to briefly mention the OSU deals because people seem to know about that. Ohio State University privatized their parking a while ago. It was entirely different in scope and scale and quality than we are talking about here at Cleveland State. OSU received $483 million up front for their parking. OSU has 37,000 parking spaces and so they turned those 37,000 parking spaces over to QIC Global Infrastructure in Australia for the next fifty years. At CSU, we are talking about maybe 4,000 parking spaces so the amounts of money are substantially smaller. Finally, Dr. Bowen stated that if anyone would like to see the documents to please let him know.

Budget and Finance Committee chairperson Professor Joel Lieske thanked Dr. Bowen for his excellent report. He noted that they have been in email conversations about this and they both share some concerns one of which, is this Asset Monetization a good thing for the university, for the staff, for the faculty, for the students? He said that it is very difficult to answer this question without really knowing the case for monetization and not proceeding with monetization. He noted that with respect to bargaining, several years ago he looked into the increase in paring fees and, if he remembers correctly, he believes that our parking fees have gone up 120% from 2000 to 2012. He noted that we have excellent parking facilities because we have a very capable administration. He thinks also we have very good parking facilities because faculty, students and staff pay for them and right now, we are making a profit on parking – it is about a $700,000 per year profit. He noted that this profit is used, in part, to pay the operating deficit of Wolstein Center. So, if we outsource parking, will we have this revenue coming in? He

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

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

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

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

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

anything that he (President Berkman) prefers not to speak about, he will bring it up with the committee and he will get Professor Resnick's answers.

Professor Krebs stated that we could look at this two ways. "At Ohio State, of course, which everyone has heard about, what was the end result? Immediately, it was negative. But now, a few years later, did people say that it was simply neutral moral, negative moral, positive moral because you still have an ax with the university that has to be protected in a sense and parking has a disproportionate effect."

Dr. Sridhar commented that he didn't know the answer to Professor Krebs' question but he knows that Ohio State dedicated a portion of that money to fund one hundred new faculty positions – one hundred new fresh faculty lines that didn't exist before.

IX.   Sexual Assault Awareness Month (Report No. 50, 2015-2016)

Professor Yulanda McCarty-Harris, director of the Office of Institutional Equity, stated that it is a pleasure to be at Senate today. She noted that she is here to talk about what is going on. She asked, "Does anyone know what the month of April is?" She stated that April is Sexual Assault Month but she is at Senate today to basically encourage everyone to please tell his or her students that it is Sexual Assault Awareness Month. She noted that she has brought fliers to today's meeting that will announce what is going on. She stated that right now, a survey is being conducted. She said she wanted to thank President Berkman for being a champion. As a result of this, President Berkman actually sent out a letter to our students. She noted that within two days, she already had over 900 responses of people completing the survey. It is very important that students complete this survey because this allows us to see what is going on with our students, what they are experiencing and whether there are myths about it. She reported that there is a great article in the "Vindicator" with information about what is going on as it relates to Sexual Harassment Month. But, if you look at the "Cauldron" there is an op-ed that says, "I would not even know where to report should that happen to me." She reported that clearly there are mixed messages as to what is going on. She asked faculty to please have their student fill out the survey. She also wanted to acknowledge that we have on campus a Sexual Violence Prevention Council with twenty-four cross members of students, faculty and staff and there are actually three or four people that are Faculty Senators that are part of that Council. She thanked Provost Jianping Zhu for his service as well as Dr. Eileen Berlin Ray, Dr. Norbert Delatte and Dr. Mittie Davis Jones for their service. SGA President Emily Halasah is also one of the students on the council and Denise Carry who is the Coordinator in Health and Wellness. Finally, Yulanda thanked Senate for allowing her to get the word out.

X.   Report of the President of the University

President Ronald Berkman stated that he would like to second the importance of this issue of sexual assault on campus. He noted that it is a very difficult, vexing, and complex issue. It happens with more regularity than some might assume that it happens.

It is difficult for all parties involved so the degree to which we can raise student consciousness about what is appropriate and what is not appropriate and maybe Yulanda and Berinthia can get together and for those who give for the Faculty Campaign, they can get one of the shirts that the students designed last year saying that "Consent is Sexist." ??? A student project could do it and maybe the shirts could be given to people who donate to the Student/Faculty Campaign. He added that he is maximizing two utilities.

President Berkman turned to the public private partnership issue. He stated that we would have plenty of time. Professor Bowen has been involved in it and will continue to be involved in it. President Berkman said that he will make one modification and that is it is not he who will make a decision concerning an RFP or whether we ultimately have an arrangement that allows us to enter into such a partnership. By statute, the Board of Trustees is the only entity that has legal authority to execute a contract for State owned land. This would be a contract for State owned land. It would have to go before and receive the approval of the Board of Trustees as it did at Ohio State University. Once again, the ultimate decision-maker here is the Board of Trustees. President Berkman stated that the issue is revenue. Everyone understands that there are revenue challenges particularly in a climate with zero tuition increases and the anticipation of continued zero increases. He noted that just as a metric, a two percent tuition increase brought in about $5 million per year to the university. So while we are in this period where there are no tuition increases we in essence start each year with a $5 million deficit from what we typically had when we had a two percent tuition increase. This year we have been able to close. We initially thought we would need to use some reserves to close that deficit but we had strong enrollment numbers, strong retention and, as he reported at a previous Senate meeting, or as Senate members on the Board of Trustees heard that we have notified the Board that we will not use any resources from reserves for this year. The operating revenues will cover the entire budget. He noted that revenue is a continuing concern, it has to be a continuing concern, but there will be plenty of opportunity to discuss whether this is a wise way to raise revenue and where that revenue would be invested. President Berkman reported that one thing about the Ohio State deal was that in their agreement, Ohio State stipulated that they will be the ultimate decision-maker in terms of fees, in terms of conditions of parking, in terms of locations, etc. so they did not seed to the partner the ability to raise parking rates to whatever they wanted to raise parking rates that everyone thought that the market would bear. He commented, "Boy, I bet that market on the weekend can bear a lot in terms of what they can get for parking."

President Berkman turned to the campaign. He reported that the campaign is really a five-year campaign. We are finishing the second year of the campaign. It is a $100 million campaign and, as Vice President LeVine said, we are at $85 million two years into the campaign. It is a difficult trudge fund-raising. He noted that there are a lot of big institutions in Cleveland. It is a small town with a lot of institutions with big appetites. So it is a competitive environment; the hospitals always have an advantage since everybody has some stake in living longer. The University Hospital and the Cleveland Clinic together probably have 400 development officers that are out visiting folks. He stated that we have done well but what we are also really trying to do here is

not only meet the $100 million target, which he believes that we will do, but we are and we have taken significant strides into developing the culture, the infrastructure, a group of professionals and that will allow us to go forward because this is an arena that we will have to play in if we want to continue to be competitive, if we want to do some innovative things, if we want to help students who really desperately are in need of financial help. This is an arena we are going to have to play in.

President Berkman commented about Radiance. He stated that by and large, the students have received scholarships from Radiance and to him this is an eye-opener. Generally, these are students who have completed ninety credits or more and are in good academic standing and cannot close the remaining delta that they have to finish their education. And, that remaining delta comes from them tapping out their PELL grants. Many tap out their PELL grants much faster now than they used to tap out their PELL grants. So, for really the most needy students, they are most vulnerable because once PELL goes away, they before had a maximum $5800 PELL grant let's say, and now that $5800 is theirs to pay. And, also students who run the gamut in terms of Perkins and Stafford and other loan possibilities. These were students in which this infusion of dollars made the difference between them walking with ninety credits or getting those additional thirty credits indeed to be able to walk across the stage. It has been an important piece.

President Berkman mentioned that we recently received a grant from APLU that recently adopted a program very similar to our program willing to do the same thing. There has been recognition now nationally – APLU is the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities. He noted that there has been a recognition nationally that lots of students are getting three-quarters of the way around the track but can't finish. President Berkman asked Cindy Skaruppa of Enrollment Services to quickly mention the APLU grant.

Vice President City Skaruppa reported that we were able to receive $50,000 of seed money to put into place a formalized process of identifying and supporting seniors specifically, seniors who had perhaps one or no more than two semesters to complete their degree. In addition, if they were in good-standing, if they had an active claim that showed that they were right on track and getting mentoring and intrusive advising and that type of thing then they would be eligible for up to $1200 additional dollars for that one semester or each semester of the two that they needed to complete their degree. She reported that we are very happy with that and part of the portion of the Radiance dollars will be dedicated to what we call the last mile program.

President Berkman stated that this is the Newman Foundation, which is a spin-off of the Gates Foundation which has been very, very active in this space and has been fortunately particularly active with the urban universities where of course this problem is much more manifest than in some of the big land-grant universities.

President Berkman stated that he wanted to present to Senate something for consideration – maybe the Steering Committee can consider it first and that is that we

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

President Berkman noted that he mentioned last time that we would never be out of challenges. We have a significant challenge on the international student front and that is that the government of Saudi Arabia has dramatically changed their program for funding international students. He reported that we have 650 or 700 Saudi students on campus. Firstly, the Saudi Arabian government will cut in half the dollars that are being utilized to support the scholarship program – a fifty percent cut in the scholarship program. They will then allow students to only be compensated or only be supported if they attend one of the top 100 universities in the world – not one of the top 100 universities in the United States, in the world. President Berkman stated that he is sorry to say that we didn't make the cut. We are talking about a 600-student deficit among the other enrollment challenges. We are now talking about a 600 student deficit that will have to be made up from other programs – a deeper dive, a greater investment into international and other places and we are going to have to do it. He noted that obviously we are aggressively pursuing students throughout Ohio and in other states where we feel there is connectivity. He noted that his understanding is that the students who are now in the program will be funded to finish the program. But, they only get four years of funding so it is not like we can say oh we will give you X's and you can stay for a couple more years on Saudi royal revenues. President Berkman noted that the students only get four years of funding so they will be funded and they will be allowed to finish but then those slots will be factored out of the program. Interestingly, when you think about what are the multipliers of the reduction of the price of oil, CSU is the recipient of one of the negative multipliers of the reduction in the price of oil. So, that is how it works down the food chain; that is how it works down the supply chain. This is going to be a big deficit to fill; it is going to be a real challenge. President Berkman went on to say that this has been in the making for some time. Today he saw for the first time the official Saudi Arabian press release on the changes in the program. By the way, CASE was number 100. He remarked, "Maybe someone can ask for a recount."

Finally, President Berkman reported that we had a great breakfast this morning for scholarship recipients and their parents – we had about 375 people in this Student

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

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

XI.   Report of the Interim Provost

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

descriptions and then have them posted before people leave for the summer. In that way, when everyone comes back in the fall semester, we could start the process and get that going. Finally, he stated that this is the update on the faculty search and he again encouraged everyone's active participation. It is essential to the university and the quality of our programs.

Provost Zhu stated that the second update he wanted to give Senate is about the discussion that has been started at the university level about possible major changes in our IT infrastructure. In the spirit of shared governance and to keep all faculty involved in the process, he asked colleagues in IS&T if he could share that information here with the Faculty Senate and the answer was yes. They are open to input and suggestions and they wanted a plan right away to activate all faculty in the process.

Provost Zhu turned to PeopleSoft. He stated that everyone knows that we have had PeopleSoft since 1998. So, those who have been here long enough, certainly recall the time when the system was adopted and now after twenty years, it is time to look at the IT infrastructure and to look at the replacement and move us into the next level for technology efficiency. IS&T has begun exploration along with four or five other universities as part of an IT group. All are public peer universities including, if he remembers correctly, Akron, Kent State, Bowling Green University, Miami University and Ohio State University. They are all at a similar stage. Some of the universities are maybe one step or half a step ahead of others in looking at using Cloud based enterprise services to replace the current model of the university servers and also move physically the software. With the Cloud based, basically you have everything up in the clouds. The providers will do updates and maintenance. Provost Zhu noted that this week there would be a conversation with Oracle. He stated that those are the two major providers for Cloud based servers. He stated that if there is enough interest, perhaps Dr. Sridhar could organize an event. Between the Faculty Senate and IS&T, Provost Zhu stated that he wants to make sure that the process will have faculty input on the academic side and if there is enough interest, IS&T has expressed interest in coming to Senate to answer questions and to briefly outline what is going on and what are the advantages to going to Cloud based services. Provost Zhu went on to say that he knows that there are a lot of concerns about some of the software that we have very recently adopted and now we want to make sure that this major change is being discussed. He added that there would be plenty of time for faculty to provide input. Provost Zhu stated that he would be happy to answer any questions during the open question time.

XII.   Report of the Student Government Association (Report No. 51, 2015-2016)

SGA President Emily Halasah stated that she had just a couple of updates. She reported that over the spring break, the water SGA collected was successfully delivered to Flint, Michigan. Everyone applauded. She noted that in addition, Senator Nneka Maceo and speaker Paul All had a meet the dean event. It was so successful that they are looking to do an administration/dean event and like faculty member event so everyone should look out for those. The college senators are working on that for the fall semester.

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

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

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

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

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

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

XIII.   Open Question Time

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

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

one that we should untangle and that is why 800 Saudi students came to CSU – that is really a very good cohort of students. So, in that sense, the word is out about CSU. He stated that it might be interesting to have a focused group with the existing Saudi students who are here and talk about how we can keep interest in CSU alive – how those students can help us keep interest in CSU alive. CSU is really a low cost high quality option for students who want to get an education in the U.S. and who can't get in because there are going to be fifty percent fewer slots, to get into the Saudi supported program.

Dr. Marino commented, following up on that, it might be worth analyzing which feeder schools in Saudi Arabia are coming here; there might be a pattern.

President Berkman noted that Dr. Marino had a good point. He stated that that is why, when talking to the students and sort of engaging the students in being ambassadors for CSU that is a very good suggestion. He then asked Cindy Skaruppa if she wanted to speak.

Vice President Cindy Skaruppa mentioned that of the number of Saudi students that attend west institutions, only ten percent of them actually attend the top 100 institutions. She noted that we are talking about 8,000 or 56,000 or whatever and their goal is something around 8,000 for the following year – around ten percent. Hopefully, students can pay to come to public institutions.

XIV.   New Business

Senate President Sridhar asked if there was any new business. Being no new business, Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie K. Jackson
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel