

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

**DECEMBER 2, 2015**

**PRESENT:** Bleeke, Boboc, W. Bowen, Deering, Delatte, Delgado, Duffy, Ekelman, Engelking, Galletta, Genovese, M. Gibson, Hampton, Henry, Holland, D. Jackson, J. Jenkins, Kalafatis for Fodor, R. Krebs, Lazarus, Little, Lupton, Marino, C. C. May, Mazumder, Mead for S. Kaufman, Nawalaniec, Niederriter, O'Neill, Resnick, Robichaud, Shukla, A. F. Smith, Sonstegard, Sridhar, Visocky-O'Grady, Vogelsang-Coombs, W. Wang, Xu, Zingale.

R. Berkman, Halasah, Karlsson, Lehfeldt, S. McHenry, D. Ramos, Sadlek, Yarbrough, S. Zachariah, J. Zhu.

**ABSENT:** Berlin Ray, Fodor, V. Gallagher, Holtzblatt, Inniss, S. Kaufman, Rashidi, B.Ray, W. Zhao, H. Zhou.

J. Bennett, Boise, M. Bond, Chesko, Gleeson, Grech, Khawam, LeVine, Lock, Novy, Parry, R. Reed, Rushton, Sawicki, Schultheiss, Singh, Spademan, G. Thronton, B. White.

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** C. Kothapalli.

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

**I. Approval of the Agenda for the meeting of December 2, 2015**

Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to approve the Agenda. He noted that this is the revised Agenda that members found on the table as they entered the meeting room. It is different than the Agenda mailed earlier. Dr. Sridhar reported that the only change to the Agenda is the report from the Budget and Finance Committee and approval of the Minutes of the meeting of February 11, 2015. The February 11 Minutes are not yet ready for approval. The report from the Budget and Finance Committee members received in their meeting packets was actually a draft and not yet ready for distribution. The Budget Committee will report at the next Senate meeting. It was then moved, seconded and the revised Agenda for the December 2, 2015 meeting was unanimously approved by voice vote.

## **II. Report of the Faculty Senate President**

Dr. Sridhar commented that this is the end of the semester and we are all quite busy so we will see if we can get done with our work today and go back to work and write final exams, etc. He noted that he scheduled a test on the last day of class and then a final exam the next two days so he has two tests in the next two days.

Dr. Sridhar reported that he had a few items that he wanted to touch upon. We just went through our course evaluations using the Blue system this time. He noted that our Student Government President Emily Halasah is going to talk about this more as well. Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange sent an email yesterday reporting on response rates on the SEI. We had about fifty percent, which he is told is respectable for on-line student evaluations, but given that this is the first semester, we could have gotten a lot better. He will talk about some issues that SGA President Halasah and he discussed earlier today and she will touch upon them as well.

Dr. Sridhar stated that he did ask Institutional Research some specific questions and the questions were to see if we could ease our differences between classes taught by full-time faculty and classes taught by part-time faculty. Institutional Research reported that they could provide this information. He noted that we would keep track of that. He knows that several people are interested in how well our students respond to course evaluations.

Dr. Sridhar reported that there would be some changes coming to registration schedules in terms of dates when students can register for classes, etc. for the next academic year. The Provost will talk more about this but basically the idea is that there will be a shift of a week or so ahead so students will be able to register for classes earlier. He noted that the only reason he is bringing this to the Senate's attention now is because we have to look at it from an advising perspective to make sure that we talk to our students earlier next semester rather than what we have been used to in past years.

Path to 2020 Program: Dr. Sridhar reported that there have been several conversations throughout this semester and we have had visits to college faculty. He attended a few meetings and he knows the other members of the 2020 Team went to other meetings as well and talked about the overall plan. Then he heard from some faculty saying, "Oh, all they are doing is some budget stuff and that is why there is not a whole lot going on." Dr. Sridhar stated that he just wanted to stress the importance of the budget stuff that this project is doing because when you look at what it is that we care about as a faculty, it is to make sure that the size of the full-time tenure-track faculty that we have in the university doesn't diminish. So, that is the thing that has been at the forefront in his own mind as he has been working with this program. He added that every once in a while he brings this issue up in our meetings and says, "There are no faculty cuts, right?" and the response always is, "No, there are no planned reductions in faculty." He wanted to make sure to say that in this body as well and actually stress the importance

of budget work with respect to the academic core of the university and what it means for us.

Dr. Sridhar reported that the 2020 Team showed up at the Provost's Council this morning to talk to all of the academic deans about the college budgeting project. The Engineering College has been the pilot in the project. We have been looking at the budget for Engineering. He noted that this has something to do with the fact that he is in the College of Engineering but not necessarily because the College of Engineering has not had a non-salary operating budget for the last few years. The 2020 Team used that as a reason for using the College of Engineering as a pilot. He reported that they spent about an hour dissecting how college budgets are put together and why it is important for there to be this kind of a push with respect to long-term academic planning again from the perspective of ensuring that the academic missions of each of the colleges is actually kept whole. A recommendation made to the Deans was that when the Deans go back and do this same exercise in each college, the faculty be involved in this process. Again, he is making that comment here and in the next few weeks we should be hearing from the college leadership about this item. In addition, when faculty members do get a request, please volunteer some time in working with this project. He went on to say that the more ownership we take as a faculty in this budgeting process, the outcome will be better for us and for the university and our students.

Dr. Sridhar noted that on the other side of the budget, the administrative costs support project is the one that we have been anxiously looking for as well and it is moving ahead. There has been a lot of work and progress has gone slower than what was originally anticipated, but that is not to say that this work is stopping; it is just that people are looking at it more carefully, which is a good thing as well. Again, the goal there is to actually find efficiencies and reduce budgets and see that we don't have to worry about reducing anything in the academic side. Dr. Sridhar said that this is his quick report on the 2020 project. He doesn't want to take up time talking about it because that becomes too much but he is happy to answer questions about Path to 2020 as well on behalf of the 2020 people.

Aside from that, Dr. Sridhar wished everyone good luck with final exams. He said that he knows that this is a busy time for all of us. Let's go and make sure that we finish this semester well. He hopes everyone shows up for commencement – that's always an enjoyable time to celebrate our graduating students. He would like to see all faculty members attend and be present for our students.

Finally, Dr. Sridhar said that he had a comment that the decorations in our meeting room today for Faculty Senate is a good addition. He noted that he could take questions now or we can take questions later.

### **III. University Curriculum Committee**

Senator Fred Smith, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, stated that the two items the UCC has are annotations of the procedure for Program Alteration and he will talk about that first.

**A. Program Alteration Procedures (Report No. 17, 2015-2016)**

Dr. Smith reported that the procedure for Program Alteration was approved by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 2001 but inconsistent in steps. He noted that last year it was thought that some additional specification should be made of how the process should be carried out. He stated that Dr. Sridhar and Dr. Jeff Karem developed some of that specification and asked the UCC to provide input of what information the UCC would like to have carried through any program merger, abolition or suspension. He noted that the UCC did that last spring. Then there was some additional discussion this fall about issues that should be considered in various steps in the process and so the UCC reconsidered what information should be considered and just added a brief statement to this document saying what information it feels should be considered. Dr. Smith noted that is what everyone has in the Senate meeting packet. Professor Smith said that basically, after considering a suggestion from Professor Norbert Delatte, a long list of factors should be considered by each step of the program alteration. The UCC decided that it was preferable to be somewhat minimal in its specifications and that the issues that should be addressed could be summarized in the two bullet points that are near the bottom of the first page of the document. "What are the effects on students, faculty, resources, and institutional image?" and "Have alternative approaches to program alteration been considered?" Dr. Smith stated that with that introduction, he would be happy to answer questions.

Provost Jianping Zhu stated that they talked about this step before. He noted that yesterday, he spoke with Dr. Sridhar and step 1 is an initiation and step 2 and 3 have specific dates in there and within so many days there has to be an action. In Step 4, we have specific dates. So, he talked with Dr. Sridhar and proposed that specific dates be added so that it doesn't stop somewhere. It has to go through the process within so many days.

Dr. Sridhar said, "Let's talk about that." He noted that the proposal is to make an amendment. In step 4, which is when the college Curriculum Committee holds open meetings for the faculty in a college, that meeting will occur within fifteen working days after the Curriculum Committee has had a chance to talk with the department. So, this was just an omission because every step added a time limit but we just left that one out. The only change in step 4, where the open meetings will occur, those meetings will occur within fifteen working days after the Curriculum Committee has concluded its discussions with the department or unit.

Dr. Smith noted that it is only steps 2, 3 and 4 that have time in them because those are the steps that involve processes in groups that seem to not normally meet so Graduate Council and the UCC set this up for ongoing operations.

Provost Zhu reported that for the rest of the staff, the understanding is that whatever the next available meeting, that date that will bring the recommendation to the next step - the college at the next faculty meeting or the next UCC meeting and the next Graduate Council meeting.

Senator William Bowen stated that his understanding concerning the changes is that the college Curriculum Committee would hold an open meeting for all concerned faculty to voice opinions within fifteen days. Dr. Sridhar added, "After concluding the meetings with the department."

Professor Smith noted that he suggested at least ten days but within fifteen days because this already says that the college Curriculum Committee will make information available ten days prior to the meeting. So it has to be at least ten days of the request that there should be some limit within which the committee meets.

Senator Robert Krebs remarked that he is sure that people looked at this but on the second bullet on the front page where it states "Have alternative approaches to program alteration been considered?" and asked, "Isn't the only alternative to an alteration no alteration? Is that not better to consider, "have multiple types of alterations been considered?" He stated that's at a fundamental level.

Dr. Smith replied that that is what is imagined by the custom of alternative approaches and considered alternative approaches to alternative alterations.

Dr. Krebs remarked, "Leave that to the English Department."

Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Curriculum Committee is bringing amendments to the ten-step process of the Procedure for Program Alteration in the form of clarifications and additional information with respect to what the committee would like to see throughout the entire process of program alteration and what eventually gets submitted to this body (Faculty Senate) for consideration. Dr. Sridhar then asked for a vote. The proposed amendments to the Procedure for Program Alteration were unanimously approved by voice vote.

#### **B. World Languages – Arabic Major Full Proposal (Report No. 18, 2015-2016)**

Dr. Smith stated that the second item from UCC is a proposal for an Arabic Major. He noted that as was indicated when the information was distributed last week to Senate there were a few small additions and corrections made to the proposal between the time the Senate Agenda was distributed and now. For anyone who read the proposal last week, what was changed since then is that certain courses that fulfill core requirements can be used as electives if they are not used to fulfill core requirements and a field study course has been added explicitly to the list of electives and some language has been cleaned up. He noted that other than that, this is a proposal for a 36 credit major that is structured like other language majors with Arabic as a major in the WLC (World

Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) Department. Dr. Smith reported that the Senate approved last year a proposal for a proposal. Now what we have is the proposal.

Dr. Sridhar stated that the University Curriculum Committee is bringing forward a proposal for the Arabic major in the World Languages Department and asked if there were any questions about this proposal. There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar asked Senators to vote. The proposed Arabic Major full proposal was unanimously approved by voice vote.

### **C. For Information (Report No. 19, 2015-2016)**

Professor Smith stated that the UCC seems this fall to have few items on the Agenda even though some have been under discussion so he listed on the UCC's memo some other things that the UCC has been doing so people don't think that the UCC has been lazy. He commented that when the UCC does something like approve the Arabic Major in seconds, that there was an enormous amount of work in getting the proposal to what we have.

#### **1. UCC discussed the following: a. Curriculog implementation**

The UCC has discussed pending implementation of Curriculog, which was software that the university was acquiring.

#### **b. Review and assessment of the general education program**

Professor Smith said that the UCC had started talking about reviewing and assessing the general education program. Dr. Barbara Margolius started attending UCC meetings and provided valuable input.

- 2. Reviewed the substitution of MTH 95 for MTH 115 and approved changes to prerequisites for MTH 167, 328, and 329**
- 3. Noted the deletion of MTH 161 from the catalog due to the approval of MTH 147 for the Ohio Transfer Module**

Dr. Smith reported that the UCC made some changes to math prerequisites and made some changes to a course that has never been offered from the catalog because MTH 147 has been approved for the Ohio Transfer Module. Professor Smith then asked if there were any questions that he could answer for the UCC.

There being no questions, the "For Information" items were received by Faculty Senate.

### **IV. Admissions and Standards Committee**

**A. Proposed Revision of Criteria for Proof of English Proficiency used in the Undergraduate Admission Process (Report No. 20, 2015-2016)**

Professor Chandra Kothapalli, chair, Admissions and Standards Committee, presented the committee's first item regarding revision of Criteria for proof of English Proficiency. He noted that this is both at the undergraduate level and the graduate level. This was brought by the Center for International Services and Programs, the ESL Program as well as Undergraduate Studies. The goal is to revise the current criteria because we want to be on par with other colleges both in Ohio and nationwide. The requirement for TOEFL, IELTS and ITEP scores will be in line with other colleges. Keep in mind that they need revision every two years. The rationale for some of these changes is that other students who fail in the ESL program at CSU are those who had inadequate scores in some of these exams. They are taking on-line courses using that as a substitution. These kinds of changes will make sure that this won't happen.

Senator Nicholas Zingale asked what the impact of admissions might be with these changes.

Professor Kothapalli responded that the Committee has been told that the College of Engineering and the College of Business already have these standards in place. This is for the remaining colleges to be part of that level like some of the colleges that already have minimum scores.

Professor Zingale asked if this would be university-wide. Professor Kothapalli replied that Professor Zingale was correct.

Professor Zingale noted that the question he had is that we look at the other colleges to see what the impact might actually be.

Dr. Sridhar stated that when this was discussed at Steering, Cindy Skaruppa, Vice President for Enrollment Services, was there and she was part of the discussion and it was good that she was there because she could address that specific question. Enrollment Services doesn't see this as having a negative impact on admissions. The only impact it will have is that the students that we do admit are more successful once they come here and start taking courses. The true impact is that when students start taking other courses when they come here through this kind of back channel so-to-speak, they don't have the level of English proficiency that they need and begin to do poorly in other credit courses. Ensuring that students have the English proficiency that they need, will ensure every student's success.

Professor Zingale commented, "Do we know that for sure? Is this just what other universities are doing or do we really know that students that get admitted with a 65 are at risk of not performing as well as someone admitted with a 78?"

Professor Sridhar pointed out that there are two different things with this proposal. The first thing is scores in standardized tests. That actually is just an

administrative correction because the organizations that administer these tests changed their scoring criteria. And when they changed their criteria, and every year they publish these correspondence tables to old scores, the currently published scores in the new formats are actually lower than what we used to require. This is a correction to bring it back to what we used to require and what everybody else does. The standardized test scores are not really being changed in terms of actual cases. It is just that over time the test scores got moved from what we used to require and we just have to go back. The other part of the proposal has to do with taking courses that would have otherwise required students to come here and take English as a second language and there is sort of a loophole that students used and that loophole doesn't serve the students well and so this change fixes that loophole.

Senator Yan Xu asked, "What is wrong if the student meets the minimum and comes here and takes more language courses at the university and that can increase the enrollment?"

Professor Kothapalli replied that he believes that this has been done or is being done but once they come here, then they take all this stuff and they are failing and then they go on line and take a substitute course improving their score and move forward to other courses. So this is just to close that loop and that is the second point here.

Dr. Sridhar stated that there are two different things here – whether students are admitted or not and then are required to take English courses or not. Students get admitted but then may be asked to take extra English courses. He noted that this is exactly what Professor Xu is saying. So students that come in and take the English courses here and then do better, that is what this proposal will do. What this proposal will do is that if a student comes in not having met certain provisions in the requirement, they will be required to take English 101 and English 102, which is what we require our freshmen (domestic students) to do anyway. So, note that this particularly applies to international students. So domestic students may be required to take these courses but it is international students that can still get around it.

Professor Xu said that he is almost sure that they are going to have an impact on enrollment. For graduate students 550 and for undergraduates 500 and now you raise the bar and you are going to limit a qualified population. You know that you can select, sure. You raise the bar but most of these students have a lower standard of 65. He added that he feels that it will have an impact on admissions.

Dr. Sridhar replied that just from the parameter that he knows of admissions. Like he said, at the Steering Committee discussion the same question came up about whether there will be a negative impact in admissions and Enrollment Services said to us that there wouldn't be; that is as much information as we have. He commented that if somebody else has anything to add they were welcome to do so.

Vice Provost Peter Meiksins stated that he can't speak for Admissions but he can say that the International Office whose job it is to promote international admissions



participated actively in developing these standards and actually made several recommendations that the committee itself had not originally ever made. So, from their perspective, that actually brings our admission requirements in line with standard practices in the State. They were in favor of that and argued for it in a subcommittee. So, the people who are in the business of promoting international admissions state that this is correct.

Senator Beth Ekelman commented that if she recalls at Steering, there was some concern about the one criterion for successful completion of the thirty semester hours. She noted that she didn't remember the exact concern and asked if Dr. Sridhar could reiterate that to everybody because she thinks that was one area that did raise a question.

Dr. Sridhar replied that this was another thing that came up at Steering. If everyone looks at page 2 of the document under that English Composition requirement, the proposed language says, "Successful completion of 30 semester hours of college-level coursework from an accredited college in the United States or English speaking country with a cumulative 2.0 GPA, including the equivalent of CSU's ENG 101 and ENG 102 with a grade of C or better." He noted that the concern here is that this language would delay students that want to come to CSU. So, the example that came up was, what if an international student happened to visit grandma here in Cleveland and decided to take ENG 101 and ENG 102 here at Cuyahoga Community College and wanted then to come to CSU, right? This proposal would expressly disallow a student like that who does in fact meet all of the requirements and otherwise has the necessary English proficiency but just because they don't have 30 hours, we are telling them to stay away and go take courses somewhere else. Dr. Sridhar reported that the discussion that came up at Steering was that perhaps we could add a further amendment to this proposal and somebody from the floor would have to propose that amendment to actually say either have 30 semester hours or take the placement test to place out of these courses.

Senator Bowen proposed Dr. Sridhar's amendment.

Dr. Sridhar noted that this is a friendly amendment to the proposal. He then asked if there were any further questions.

Senator Fred Smith commented that any student has to satisfy only one of these criteria. Dr. Sridhar responded, "Yes."

Dr. Sridhar then stated that we have a proposal from the Admissions and Standards Committee to update English language proficiency requirements for international students. He noted that the only change to the proposal as presented by the Admissions and Standards Committee is an amendment to Item 1, the third bullet that talks about completion of ENG 101 and ENG 102 and so the current language reads: "Successful completion of 30 semester hours of college-level coursework from an accredited college in the United States or English speaking country." Dr. Sridhar noted that we will add a phrase that says, "If a student doesn't have 30 semester hours, that student would have to take a placement test to place out of ENG 101 and ENG 102

before they are admitted.” With that amendment, Dr. Sridhar called for a vote. The proposed revision of Criteria for proof of English proficiency used in the undergraduate admission process as amended was unanimously approved by voice vote.

**B. Additional 3+3 Agreements from the College of Law (Report No. 21, 2015-2016)**

Professor Kothapalli next presented two additional 3+3 Agreements from the College of Law – one with Ursuline College and one with The University of Findlay. He noted that a similar 3+3 Agreement between the College of Law and Lake Erie College was approved by Faculty Senate last year after a change in Ohio Supreme Court rules. The undergraduate institution will award the undergraduate degree. Under the 3+3 agreement, the undergraduate institution agrees to award the undergraduate degree after the student successfully completes the first year of the J.D. curriculum, whether in the full- or part-time program, permitting completion of both the undergraduate and law degrees in six rather than seven full-time equivalent years, saving both time and money for the student. Professor Kothapalli noted that one thing he wanted to bring to Senate’s attention is that the College of Law will not forgo any tuition, alter its curriculum, or award credit for courses taken elsewhere. In addition, the credentials that students must satisfy to be admitted to C-M under a 3+3 agreement are slightly higher than our median credentials.

Dr. Sridhar noted that these two agreements are technically the same as the one that Faculty Senate passed with Lake Erie College with minor changes. Dr. Sridhar stated that the key thing we are approving is the fact that we are taking these students into the College of Law without having completed a bachelor’s degree. So they will come here for three years with 19 credit hours of course work at their own institution having a GPA of 3.4 or higher. He inquired if there were any questions about this proposal.

There being no questions, Dr. Sridhar stated that the Admissions and Standards Committee has proposed two separate 3+3 Agreements – one between the College of Law and Ursuline College and the second between the College of Law and The University of Findlay where undergraduate degrees are awarded by the respective home institution and Law degrees are awarded by the Cleveland Marshall College of Law and asked for a vote. The proposed 3+3 Agreements were approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Kothapalli reported that we may have two additional 3+3 Agreements with the College of Law – one with John Carroll University and another with Mercy Hurst University.

**V. Report of the President of the University**

President Ronald Berkman reported that today the Governor named the group of Presidents that would be the Commission on the capital budget. He noted that the good news is that we are going through an exercise similar to the one that we went through two years ago in which responsibility of recommendations for allocation of the capital budget

will be given to a Commission of eight Presidents – four from the community colleges, four from four-year colleges. The four-year colleges on the Commission are Cincinnati, OU, Miami of Ohio and Cleveland State. We have been given a club number that means that no one really knows what the number is and so just makes something up. Since our imaginations in politics don't reach that far, we will make up the number that we used last year. So the club number is exactly the same number that was used last year which was \$404,500,000 and that is what is on the table. Now whether that will be the ultimate number, no one really knows – it could be less, it could be more. Now it becomes a matter for the universities to lobby for more. We had initially requested that the control number, which is the ultimate number, be \$450 million. The process is underway. It is going to be a longer and a little more complex process and a more contentious process given that the community colleges association has new leadership and the community colleges believe on mass that they have been short-changed through this Commission process; that the four year colleges have received the lion's share of the capital appropriations and the community colleges have not received a fair share. So, it will be a political high-wire act he assumes but there will be a capital budget. That is the good news. The capital budget right now will be scheduled as it always is to be passed in the first week of April. President Berkman noted we would be consulting with the vice presidents and the deans to assemble a capital budget request. He said that there are not a lot of States in the United States doing capital budgets and this is our third successive – we missed one year of a capital budget cut since he has been at CSU. In the last six years, we have gotten a capital budget so we should feel fortunate that we are in a State in which there are still expenditures going on, on the capital budget side. He stated that this is good news and he will keep everyone posted.

President Berkman commented that for those who walk Euclid Avenue, they may notice that the Jewish Federation building has been abated and is scheduled for demolition beginning on the 12<sup>th</sup> of December. That is going to be another housing largely focused on student housing development totally financed by a private real estate developer out of St. Louis, Missouri. It is going to be 486 beds of student housing. He said he feels that it will be a vast improvement to the skeleton of the Jewish Federation building, which stopped breathing a long time ago and is really a mark on the campus. He noted that that footprint extends from Euclid Avenue all the way to Prospect Avenue. So that big parking lot in back of the Jewish Federation building is also part of that footprint. The developer will also be building 215 spaces of structured parking to go along with the housing. His understanding is that it is now scheduled for opening in September of 2017. So, that will be another addition to housing.

President Berkman turned to the Campus International School. He reported that we are now ready to break ground after discovering again through another process, that something called twenty-first lane had been vacated officially by the county but not vacated officially by the City so we had to go back to somebody and ask for something to do something that should have been done or was done or could have been done, etc. before anybody could do anything to begin excavating the property. His understanding is that whatever that was is now done and that we will move ahead.

President Berkman announced that we have also submitted our plan, as everyone may remember, we were required to submit a plan to reduce the cost of attendance for students by five percent. The universities were all required to submit these plans; the University of Toledo submitted a plan that they alleged would reduce the cost of attendance by 56% for students. They were on the high side. On the low side, Central State said that they would reduce it by 6.9%. Cleveland State, and we have already – the good news is that we had already recognized most of these savings. We achieved a tremendous saving, and we didn't know this was coming, but we achieved a tremendous saving in the reduction of credits to 120. Even though it was not after the legislation, everyone may remember that he spoke at the legislative process, we fought to get language into the five percent bill. We said that any universities that had initiated these cost-cutting measures after the last fiscal operating budget could count those towards their five percent reduction. So, we were allowed to count measures like the tuition incentive plan, like the reduction in 120 – all of course resulting in a quicker completion time for students. Again, he thinks that students would be flocking to Toledo if the cost of attendance were now only fifty percent of what it was yesterday. He asked, "How much of this is real?" President Berkman said, okay, he can't really tell anyone but we will have to submit an accounting to the legislature exactly how these savings were realized. He went on to say that perhaps the game is making them now and maybe in two years they will forget what they said. President Berkman said that in any event, he is proud of what we've done. Indeed as he mentioned, many of the recommendations about how to cut costs were out of our playbook that were in the legislative bill.

President Berkman announced that tomorrow is the holiday party; maybe that's why the decorations are up in our meeting room today. He hopes that everyone will pass by and attend – there is free food and free drink. Then, of course, commencement is a couple of Sundays away. He reminded everyone that on Saturday, the Cleveland State men's basketball team plays their first game at Quicken Loans Arena. Quicken Loans Arena will be reconfigured down to a 7,500 seat arena so it won't feel as cavernous as obviously it would at a 20,000 seat arena. Students will still be admitted free to the "Q" and he believes that there are thousands of students who have never been to the "Q" who for the first time will have an opportunity free of charge to go to the "Q". He noted that we will open against Kent State; there will be five more games during the course of the year with the "Q". It represents another one, he believes, of our exciting Downtown partnerships. The "Q" has just been a tremendous partner and a tremendous booster of this relationship. So, if people can get to the game and go by the "Q" on Saturday next to the Cav's flags and the Lake Erie Monster's flags, we will flag the Cleveland State University flag and division I basketball will be played in the "Q."

President Berkman announced that the women won the Horizon League volleyball tournament – that's the good news – a great year for the women and a very exciting and very well attended final game here in Woodling Arena. The bad news is that in the NCAA draw they drew the number one team in the country, USC, who they play at USC tomorrow night. He understands that they have two women who are 6', 10" tall. He said that he didn't know that there are any women at all who are 6', 10" tall. But if

there are, USC has two of them. He added that in any event, anything could happen in sport.

President Berkman inquired if there are no other faculty members from the English Department except Professor Karem who are on the Faculty Senate. It was pointed out that Professor James Marino from English is a member of Senate. President Berkman asked why Professor Marino didn't speak up when Professor Krebs asked for an English faculty member. Professor Marino replied, "Bob's on his own some days." President Berkman said that he seconded that motion.

Finally, President Berkman wished everyone a great holiday.

## **VI. Report of the Interim Provost**

Interim Provost Jianping Zhu reported that he has two quick updates. One is the early registration that no one has mentioned. He stated that the reason he wanted to mention it here at Senate is that faculty in the academic side will be affected and many faculty actually serve as advisors. In the College of Engineering, many faculty members do advising. So, with the move of the registration date, this is one way that faculty can help to advise students properly. He understands now that the original plan was to show the schedule by February 26, 2016 and then registration will begin on March 28, 2016. The proposed date that the schedule will show is February 12, 2016 instead of February 26, moving it up two weeks. Then the registration will start on February 29, 2016. Provost Zhu noted that this means that faculty advising responsibilities will start earlier and faculty need to advise students. The window will be shorter by approximately one week. So, that also requires more faculty members to be seeking out students to provide the proper advising.

Provost Zhu stated that the second way that faculty could potentially help students is typically when they set up for next semester for fall 2016, it depends on how they performed in their prior class for the spring of 2016 and because we are moving on, that part makes it harder. If faculty and their colleagues who are teaching those classes could give more time for feedback to students in their classes, that feedback will help so the students will have a better idea as to where they stand. Should they actually see clearly that they are not going to make it in the class, that would be the time to drop the class and that decision will affect what classes they are going to take in the fall. Provost Zhu commented that there are a number of other things that faculty can do to help to make the process as smooth as possible. He added that there will be some challenges and those are the two things that immediately come to mind but there are many other things that faculty can do.

Provost Zhu commented that faculty might have questions as to why we are doing this. He noted that Dr. Sridhar had touched on this. He stated that we have a large population that are enrolled right now in spring semester in good standing and by the close of registration they don't always register for the fall semester. So, typically, we

wanted to reach out to these students to find out whether there is anything we can do to help them stay in school to continue to finish their degree. He noted there might be many reasons – family reasons, academic reasons, financial reasons, but using our existing schedule, there is very little time after the conclusion of the registration. It is basically two ways. We lose students gone for the summer and once they leave the campus, it is very difficult to reach them and to have a conversation to find out what is wrong, why the student is not registering for the fall and is there anything we can do. So, the one major rationale for this is that while the students are still here on campus, it is easier for our advisors and faculty to reach out because we know that the students have not registered for the fall and is there something we can do to help the students. Provost Zhu stated that this is just one step to take to help and improve the rate of student return from spring to the fall semester. He stated that we know this is going to be an experiment and there are many questions that we don't have clear answers for yet. By increasing the number of weeks that we can work with the students and to help them significantly to return and improve the rate and whether that shorter advising window will adversely affect the number of students that need to seek advising. But, we need to try to find out actually whether we have concrete data to go through to support the argument one way or the other. Provost Zhu mentioned that he just wanted to give everyone a heads up at the suggestion. He said that he feels this is a very good suggestion from Dr. Sridhar. He noted that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be in February and faculty will probably want to hear about the major change in February so it is good that we are having this conversation. He went on to say that if anyone has questions, our expert, Ms. Janet Stimple of the Registrar's Office, is present today to respond to questions about the details. He noted that if anyone wants to ask about the timelines, etc., Ms. Stimple can respond to questions. He added that we needed to get the discussion and conversation started early on. Dr. Zhu noted that this is his first item.

Dr. Zhu turned to his second item: changes the university plans to make to our internship and co-op proposals. He reported that recently there has been some public outcry from the community at large and questions about the charges in internship and co-op classes for which a student paid tuition but has not received any significant level of faculty assistance or the course doesn't have any meaningful academic content. Basically, the student is working at a company and not getting paid. They are here for a three credit or a four-credit course and pay the tuition. That practice has not been scrutinized. Basically we have had some discussion and it appears at the faculty committee level that Vice Provost Peter Meiksins is leading all the way to the Board of Trustees. If the course has no academic content, has no faculty involvement, purely just for the sake of the student who is doing an internship and then it needs to show some number of credits on the transcript. For that reason for charging tuition, it doesn't appear to be a reasonable practice. Provost Zhu reported that we do have many programs that require an internship without which you cannot get your degree and for some of the accreditation purposes it may be even a specific number of credits required. For those, we are going to continue the practice of charging tuition but we do need to make sure for the courses that we charge tuition that the number of credits is appropriate relative to the faculty member's efforts put in there and in terms of academic content. To determine that, it does require some discussion. The Committee that Vice Provost Peter Meiksins is

leading now involves a representative from all colleges. They will work out the guidelines and bring some consistency to our practices. But for the other kinds of internship courses, the program doesn't really require them for graduation; it is one of the options just like electives that students take and there is no current faculty involvement and no academic content. And the program or requirement does not really grant credit. Basically, it is an option for the students. He noted that if that were the case, then he would discuss it with our deans who will in turn discuss this with department chairs. He went on to say that we need to take action and we need to stop charging tuition. Students need to be made aware of the fact that these courses are not a requirement and we need to provide some other options. If there are students who do want to have that experience and even wanting to have a note on their transcript, a good option from the committee is that we publish and create a zero credit course for that kind of purpose. If a student really wants it and needs to have a note on the transcript to show that the internship exists, if that helps when they seek jobs, it is not necessary to have greater than zero credits but just to show that they had the experience in an official way. So if that is the case, if the department plans to continue an internship in that way, then we need to start asking the students or encourage students to sign up for one credit or two credits and pay for tuition. The message needs to go out to the students for this spring 2016 semester that it is really their choice. If they want to continue to sign up for credits and pay for tuition, they need to understand that it is their choice – that we are not requiring them to do that. Chairs may have a discussion with the student regarding the internships that are not required by the program. It is purely for enrichment and for the student's experience and maybe sometimes just to make the student's credentials look better. The student actually did something. For that, he will work with departments to begin the process as quickly as he can to create a zero credit course so that the student can put on his official transcript without having to pay for it.

Provost Zhu stated that everything would have to be approved by the Faculty Senate in March 2016. So we are talking about only two Faculty Senate meetings – one in February and one in March. So, if the department plans to act, if we would like to require an option for the students to take a zero credit class and to have that in place by the Fall 2016, we have to move this proposal as part of the process so that we can go to the college and be in time for Faculty Senate approval in March 2016. He said he thinks this is very important. The cost is a very big issue and the students' interest is first. He went on to say that he knows this is really close to a semester and we are all busy with makeup exams and grading exams, and just going through that much stress as the students are going through stress. He noted that if a department decides that it wants to continue this non-required course, we do need to take action quickly and not continue to charge the student tuition for which there is no faculty involvement and there is no credit content.

Provost Zhu noted that these are his two quick items.

An unidentified Senator asked if there is a credit hour option that would require students to get them for academic credit and are there some that don't pay but it would

actually have to be registered as a course. She asked if that three-hour option that you pay would cover that or would the zero credit hour option cover that.

Dr. Sridhar responded that he doesn't think it is appropriate to answer that question today. He said that it is a good point but he doesn't think it is appropriate to provide an answer at this forum because that would be too premature. The idea is that there would be a proposal that would go through a process and questions like that would be considered by the time it comes up for approval.

President Berkman stated that he wants everyone to be aware that we have during the last couple of weeks, almost on a daily basis, been discussing the imminent announcement of the Tamir Rice verdict, which may happen before classes end or may not happen until classes do end. There is no firm knowledge about when it will happen. What he wanted to underline is that the administration has developed a coordinated response plan with Student Affairs. We will talk about it with the Executive Team and the Deans next week. The response plan has been coordinated with the other agencies that are involved which are the Cleveland Police, the Ohio Highway Patrol, the FBI. He noted that from his perspective, it is incredibly important that we recognize the rights of our students to have points of view; the rights of our students to exercise their right to peaceably protest if that is what they decide to do. There is a set of guidelines to govern those protests. He said that he just wanted everyone to be aware that we (Cleveland State) are aware and almost daily monitoring the situation. As of yesterday, at least yesterday's speculation is that there would not be an announcement until after commencement or very close to commencement, which could impact how, commencement would be conducted. He again said that he just wanted everyone to be aware and to keep watching his or her emails. If there is something that impacts commencement or is close enough to commencement, he will obviously send out an alert as everyone has gotten in the past from the university as soon as we know something about when there is likely to be an announcement with the verdict. CSU will also send out something to the university community. Again, it is important, as he said yesterday at a meeting, that we have had a tremendous record of balanced diversity, tolerance and expression on this campus and this is our moment to be able to sustain and respect that. President Berkman stated that this is a difficult time, it is a tense time, and it is an unpredictable time so he asks for everyone's tolerance and participation. He went on to say that if students want to dialogue about it, he encourages faculty to allow their students to dialogue about it.

## **VII. Report of the Student Government Association (Report No. 22, 2015-2016)**

SGA President Emily Halasah noted that she just had a couple of updates on what SGA members are working on. The Urban Studies Senator, Dan McCarthy, was able to collaborate this semester with the RTA (Regional Transit Authority) to establish an RTA shelter on the corner of East 22<sup>nd</sup> Street and Euclid Avenue. That is where the CSU line runs through and a lot of our students utilize that location. So, in preparation for winter, the students are all under the Main Classroom Garage until the bus comes. He (Dan



McCarthy) was able to fully fund that and he is also looking into getting heat lamps installed once increased utilization is seen.

SGA President Halasah reported that their junior class Senator Simiola Babayode, and their senior class Senator Paul All are collaborating with Career Services to hold an event on Thursday, February 18, 2016 – the event is called “Wakeup Call” and there will be four mini sessions geared towards résumé building, cover letters, how to utilize degree audit, graduation express and then mock interviews. SGA is bribing attendance with food as always. If students complete three of the sessions, then they get access to lunch and then that will be followed the next Tuesday by the Career Services fashion show which will then be followed on February 25<sup>th</sup> with the Career Fair so hopefully this will serve as a vehicle for students to be more prepared to land interviews and jobs at the Career Fair.

SGA President Halasah reported that their College of Science Senator, Nadet Najjar is working with IS&T and Student Life to implement a web site that lists all of the research opportunities for our students on campus so they have easy access to that information. She added that she knows some of them do require research opportunities for their coursework. Ms. Halasah reported that SGA’s other Science Senators, Julia Swit and Vinnie Cardamone are working to install printers in the Health Sciences building. The Health Sciences building is absolutely perfect but there are no printers to print students’ reports and lecture notes.

Finally, Ms. Halasah commented that last but not least as was mentioned earlier in the Faculty Senate President’s report concerning the course evaluations, SGA’s Academic Affairs Director Gabby Cvengros held an event on November 17, 2015 to encourage students to fill the evaluations out. Again, the students were bribed with food. About 200 students attended and completed all of their evaluations. She noted that as mentioned earlier, the average was just under fifty percent, forty-seven percent, and although this is better than in summer or spring, it is still very low. SGA hopes to advertise and push and really encourage and educate our peers as to why these are important to bring at least seventy-five percent engagement next semester. SGA President Halasah stated that SGA plans to work with Vice Provost Teresa LaGrange’s office to further stratify the data to see which courses full-time faculty and then part-time faculty fill out. She noted that regarding concerns on all issues, Faculty Senate is SGA’s forum to express those concerns to full-time faculty. However, SGA is concerned that large numbers of our classes are taught by Adjuncts and there is no organized place for students to voice their concerns and furthermore, the students don’t have the opportunity to sit here at Faculty Senate to hear her push about the course evaluations and other issues. She added that she would have more on that next semester. In addition, SGA will be working with Vice Provost Peter Meiksins on the co-op and internship debacle.

### **VIII. Open Question Time**

Senator Fred Smith said he wanted to ask the President if the cost of attendance for all universities is available anywhere.

President Berkman replied that he didn't know but then asked Timothy Long, Associate Vice President for Finance and Budget, if he knew if this information is available anywhere.

Associate Vice President Long replied that they are not publicly out in a site but the IUC (Inter University Council) has made them available to any and all who would like to have that information. He noted that his office was given a copy because his office requested that information but, if it helps, his office can facilitate that.

President Berkman remarked that we want to see how Toledo will use the funding. "It only takes 60 credits to graduate."

Senate President Sridhar asked if there were any other questions. There were no additional questions.

#### **IX. New Business**

Senate President Sridhar then asked if there was any new business. There being no new business, Senate President Sridhar asked for a motion to adjourn. It was moved, seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:09 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

Debbie K. Jackson  
Faculty Senate Secretary

/vel