



## **FACULTY SENATE**

---

**TO:** Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests      **DATE:** October 30, 2013  
**FROM:** Paul Farrell, Chair of the Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Agenda and Materials for the November 4, 2013 Faculty Senate Meeting

---

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the November 4<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting. As always, we will meet in the Governance Chambers at 3:20 p.m. Please join us, if you can, for a few minutes of informal conversation prior to the meeting.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the October 7, 2013 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
4. President's Remarks
5. Chair's Remarks
6. Presentation: Higher Learning Commission Update (Fashaad Crawford, PhD, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs)
7. University Research Council (URC) Report (Francoise Massardier-Kenney, Chair of the University Research Council)
8. Announcements / Statements for the Record
9. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment



## **FACULTY SENATE**

### **Minutes of the Meeting**

October 7, 2013

**Senators present:** Patti Baller, Madhav Bhatta, David Dees, Paul Farrell, Rick Feinberg, Mary Ferranto, Steve Fountain, Lee Fox-Cardamone, Kimberly Garchar, George Garrison, Mack Hassler, Min He, Albert Ingram, Jay Jahangiri, Thomas Janson, Robert Kairis, Mary Kellerman, Deborah Knapp, Richard Mangrum, Stephen Minnick, Jayne Moneysmith, David Riccio, Mary Beth Rollick, Susan Roxburgh, Vilma Seeberg, Deborah Smith, Fred Smith, Beatrice Turkoski, Terrence Uber, Roberto Uribe-Rendon, Robin Vande Zande, Will Ward, Christopher Was, Susan Weaver, Donald White, Linda Williams

**Senators not present:** Ann Abraham, Brian Baer, Vanessa Earp, Willie Harrell, Tracy Laux, Oana Mocioalca, Daniel Roland, Edith Scarletto, Kim Winebrenner

**Ex-Officio Members present:** Provost & Senior V.P. for Academic Affairs Todd Diacon; Executive Director Deborah Huntsman; Deans: James Blank, James Bracken, John Crawford, Robert Sines, Deborah Spake, Douglas Steidl, Wanda Thomas, Stanley Wearden, Julie Gabella for Mary Ann Stephens; Director Robert Walker

**Ex-Officio Members not present:** President Lester Lefton; Vice Presidents: Grant McGimpsey, Alfreda Brown, Gene Finn, Gregg Floyd, Iris Harvey, Greg Jarvie, Ed Mahon, Willis Walker; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, Daniel Mahony, Donald Palmer, Eboni Pringle, Susan Stocker

**Observers present:** Michael Allen (GSS), Michelle Crisler (USS), Larry Osher (Podiatric Medicine), Myra West (Emeritus Professor)

**Guests present:** Sue Averill, Edward Collins, Fashaad Crawford, Janis Crowther, Lisa Delaney, Michele Ewing, Mary Ann Haley, Justin Hilton, Tess Kail, Ralph Lorenz, Eric Mansfield, Rebecca Murphy, Char Reed, Katie Smith, Melody Tankersley, Therese Tillett

#### **1. Call to Order**

Chair Farrell called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Governance Chambers, second floor, Kent Student Center.

#### **2. Roll Call**

Ms. Tess Kail called the roll.

#### **3. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of September 9, 2013**

Chair Farrell called for corrections to the meeting minutes. Senator Feinberg moved to approve the meeting minutes; Senator Turkoski seconded. The minutes of the September 9, 2013 meeting were approved as amended.

#### **4. Provost's Remarks [Attachment A]**

Provost Diacon read from a prepared statement that included his reflections on what he sees as the new normal in higher education and how Academic Affairs can help our students succeed and thrive in this new normal.

## Questions:

Senator Deborah Smith stated that she teaches a course that has a high DWF rate and that she has noticed that those students tend to have poor attendance. She assigns points based on attendance and shows the students the correlation between failure and attendance, yet it doesn't seem to make a difference because the attendance remains poor. The university needs to figure out a way to change the student culture. Over the years, the issue of attendance seems to be getting worse. Provost Diacon responded that there is a subcommittee of the ad hoc group who will be looking at academic policies, and it would be helpful for Senator Smith to email her thoughts and observations to that committee.

Senator Vande Zande commented that office hours need to be rethought because the traditional model does not work any longer. She stated it may be better for faculty to be available when the students need help, which may fall outside of the traditional 5 days a week and that many courses are now taught online. Due to these changes, perhaps the idea of holding strict in-person office hours and what defines an office hour should be rethought. Provost Diacon replied that he would like faculty to hold reasonable in-person hours at times when students are available, not at 5:00pm on a Friday. He was unsure how best to handle online students and mentioned it would be discussed going forward.

Senator Garrison stated that this trend of decrease in state support for higher education is something that we should not accept, and was more optimistic about the decreases. He believes this is the new norm if we remain complacent and apathetic to the change in the political climate in this country. He has asked himself what has changed since the '60s and the '70s when there was greater support. Certainly the wealth of the nation has not decreased. If anything it has increased exponentially. So it's a matter of how we're using the resources that we have developed in this nation. The partnership between faculty, staff and administration holds out great possibilities if it is embraced properly to help secure funding for higher education. There are some things that the administration can't do for political reasons that the faculty and staff can do when it comes to strategies that need to be adopted. The decisions that are being made in the state governments about funding higher education and education in general has a lot to do with who are making these decisions. The people we elect simply are not making the right decisions. Senator Garrison invited the Provost to comment on that. Provost Diacon replied that he needed to spend his time on the hand he has been dealt. He feels that is his role and that while he has ideas about what has happened and why, that is better discussed at Ray's.

Senator Garrison asked the Provost for an update on the search for a new Dean of the College of Nursing. Provost Diacon stated that they have brought in one candidate so far and almost everyone thought very highly of that candidate. Due to various reasons he was asked to bring in two additional candidates to be interviewed and he agreed to do that. The job has been reposted and the search committee is working on identifying other candidates. He asked the search committee to have the additional candidates identified by the first week of November. The original candidate was informed of the decision and seemed to understand. Senator Garrison asked if the job was originally posted before the first candidate was brought onto campus and the Provost replied that it had been posted. Senator Garrison stated he had attended her presentation and was very impressed. His concern with the process is that barriers get in the way of hiring non-white people into higher-level positions. Dr. Broome happens to be an African American, seemed to be eminently qualified for this position from his vantage point, and has been in higher education for a very long time. He is aware of all of the barriers that are created in order to frustrate these kinds of candidacies. He hopes this isn't what's happening. The Provost replied that Dr. Broome also impressed him but he also agreed to a request from the faculty the College of Nursing to bring in additional candidates.

Senator Riccio seconded Senator Deborah Smith's comments on the culture of the students, because he agrees that over almost 50 years he thinks attendance in classes has gotten worse. In his department, where they teach courses like abnormal psychology and personality which students love, even there attendance is often poor.

Senator Riccio stated that several constituents asked him about a quote in the paper that 50% of the faculty are adjuncts at Kent State. The Provost replied that he was not sure who made that statement but the numbers depend on whether you count the number as individual appointment or full time equivalents. He stated the number might equal 50% if everyone who taught just one course was added up, but what really counts is the full time equivalents and that number did not make it into the article.

## **5. Chair's Remarks [Attachment B]**

Chair Farrell read his remarks.

## **6. CAO Elections**

The Faculty Senate was required to elect one senator and one non-senator to the Committee on Administrative Officers, which is supposed to interview all candidates to all major offices. The candidates for the senate seat are Vanessa Earp and Tracy Laux. Candidates for the non-senate seat are Sharon Bell and Eric van Baars. Senators should have received vitas for three of those candidates as requested at a previous meeting of Senate. The winners of the election will be announced via email.

## **7. Reports**

### **a. University Teaching Council Status Report (Dave Dalton, Outgoing UTC Chair)**

Dr. Dalton presented a report on the University Teaching Council. The Council administers a series of four grant programs. These grants include:

- Teaching conference grants that provide faculty funding to attend conferences related to teaching and less related to the presentation of their own research findings.
- Teaching development grants which are material grants.
- Workshop grants, which fund speakers typically for one or more departments.
- Teaching development grants which provide faculty in depth opportunities for development of course projects during summer months.

The budget for the University Teaching Council is approximately \$100,000. Of that, 40% goes towards summer teaching development grants. The grant submission process is now online and streamlined.

Over the past few years they have looked at the Lovejoy Commission Report and created a subcommittee to look at the types of instrumentation used nationwide in peer review systems. That information has been shared with faculty but has met with reluctance; faculty responded they felt they were evaluated enough and teaching is no longer rewarded at the university.

Dr. Dalton stated that, in his opinion, the teaching development grants have been underutilized. To help alleviate this problem they used some of that grant money and sponsored workshops based on faculty needs relating to software and hardware that faculty could use to "flip the classroom."

The funding for the Council has remained flat since it began. He would urge the administration and faculty to increase the funding.

Senator Riccio asked if the Council had decided whether the purpose of course evaluations was to provide feedback to the instructor or are they going to be used for things like promotion and tenure. Dr. Dalton replied that he thought they would be used for both, however he did encourage the faculty to also conduct formative evaluation of their teaching on their own.

b. Report on Student Survey of Instruction (Jarrod Tudor, Provost's Fellow)

Dr. Tudor presented information on the Student Survey of Instruction. He reported that there are many reasons for moving to an online system; it will save paper, reduce our carbon footprint, and save time and money associated with compiling them, driving across campus, and driving them from one campus to another.

The Provost has made it clear that he doesn't want anything too different from what we're doing now. The questions will be the same as on the paper evaluation. When the faculty member is ready to administer the SSI they would ask the students to open up their device (phone, tablet, or laptop) and tell them that the link to the survey has been sent to them. The faculty member would leave the room for approximately 15 minutes; during that time the students would complete the evaluation and send it in electronically. This eliminates the paper. Students who do not have a device will be given until the end of the day to use a computer to fill out the evaluation.

The biggest concern is to have a high return rate. Currently the response rate is in the 90% range with face-to-face classes. They plan to pilot the online evaluations this semester in face-to-face classes to see how the process works. The pilot will include all of the fall FYE courses on the Kent Campus. Distance learning courses are not going to be impacted this semester. After the fall pilot the study group will report back to Faculty Senate on the process. In the spring 2014 semester a larger pilot project will take place, that will include all sections of FYE and another college at the Kent Campus, which has not been selected at this time.

The goal in the end is to get all SSIs on line in the electronic format. There will be a hold harmless provision for faculty members who are teaching FYE sections and those who may be included in the college that is selected in the spring 2014 term. If the response rate is unbelievably low those evaluations will be discarded and not count against the faculty member.

They have selected a firm that has agreed to do the pilot. The firm is called eXplorance Blue. The study group looked at three different firms that put on demos and every person on the study group agreed that eXplorance Blue really was the best.

Senator Deborah Smith stated that an issue some of the faculty who teach online and are already using online evaluations have is that there is no limitation on the length of the students' comments. This can lead to long diatribes from students who are almost always highly disgruntled who take the time to write these long screeds that they would never write on the paper, because there's just a tiny, little box on the paper. She asked if the study group has looked into limiting the character count of comments to make it parallel to the paper form. Dr. Tudor replied that they had considered this and that all of the firms they considered have software that can curtail this and the students will only have 15 minutes.

Senator Riccio asked what is the purpose of the SSI, is it to give the faculty feedback or for the data to be used when making other decisions, such as reappointment/tenure/promotion. While he thinks the system sounds better, he is still concerned about what will be done with the data. Dr. Tudor replied that neither he nor the study group would be making those types of decisions.

Senator Hassler stated the part of the recommendation from the Lovejoy Commission involved modifying the text of the questions, is that something the study group will be doing? Dr. Tudor replied that the study group would not be modifying the questions.

Senator Ferranto commented that the College of Nursing used online SSIs for non-online courses and she didn't think the results of that were very good. Is the thought that the response rate will be better since students will be completing them in class? Dr. Tudor replied that they will be done just like now, the faculty member leaves the room and the students complete the evaluations. Senator Ferranto commented that on her regional campus some of the students might not have the technology so the faculty can check out computers from their library for that class period.

Senator Janson asked what had changed in the past few years to make the university move in this direction. When he was chair of Senate it had been decided to implement online evaluations for all classes but the Senate was not in favor of doing so. Why is it being done now? Dr. Tudor remarked that the technology has come a long way and now many students should be able to complete the evaluations while in class, this was not the case a few years ago.

Senator Roxburgh stated that it would be helpful to track how many students this change would impact because they do not have the technology. She would like to be able to distinguish that group from those who chose not to answer. Dr. Tudor replied that they would like that information as well. He stated they would know that information fairly quickly, because faculty can match the roster count with who filled it out that day in class and who filled it out perhaps later that evening. Provost Diacon replied that doesn't get to the heart of what Senator Roxburgh was really asking. He stated that the faculty could simply ask the class who did not have a device.

Senator Seeberg asked if the company would sell the results to Rate My Professor or a similar group. Provost Diacon replied that language prohibiting the selling of the data would be in the contract.

Chair Farrell asked if there has been any thought given to conducting a pilot at a regional campus. Dr. Tudor said that is something the study group can consider, although they would have to have buy in from that campus's dean.

## **8. New Business: Resolution on the Presidential Search**

The Executive Committee of Faculty Senate put forth a Resolution on the Presidential Search.

*"Whereas, Faculty Senate is cognizant of the need for confidentiality in the early stages of a Presidential search,*

*Whereas, broad participation in screening potential candidates is important to the credibility and acceptability of a new President,*

*Whereas, the acceptance and support of the faculty and staff is essential to the success of the President of a public university,*

*Whereas, the secrecy of the process used in the selection of President Lefton made his transition into the position and acceptance by the faculty and staff an unnecessarily complicated and time consuming process,*

*Be it resolved, that Faculty Senate calls on the search committee and the Board of Trustees to ensure that the candidates, on the short list of finalists that will eventually be developed, meet with the Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative Officers, as required by University policy, and that an opportunity be afforded to the*

*Committee on Administrative Officers, and the faculty and staff, in general, to provide input on the candidates before the search committee makes a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees."*

Chair Farrell indicated that this proposal was in response to solicitations from a significant number of faculty as well as input that was received at a number of the open sessions from both faculty and staff saying that this was something of considerable importance. It can also be said this was one of the major complaints about the process in selecting President Lefton.

Senator Williams heartily endorsed this with the emendations. No Faculty Senators wished to speak against the motion.

Dr. Pamela Grimm, a guest and former Senator, did speak against the resolution. She stated that in an ideal world the candidates would come before the larger body of faculty to answer questions, present ideas, et cetera. However, what would, should, and could happen is not the same as what will happen. Dr. Grimm felt that if the university requires an open search the number of people who will apply will be reduced. She wanted to make sure that the Faculty Senate understood that point before voting on the resolution. She was especially concerned that it might result in a less diverse pool of applicants for the president's position for a variety of reasons, none of which are documented by data but just based on her thoughts about what it must be like to be a president someplace, looking for a job someplace else, trying to improve your situation moving to a larger university where you feel you can make a bigger difference, have a greater impact. She urged Senate to think about what it's like for that person to openly acknowledge knowing full well that if odds are equal the chance of getting that job are one out of three, which means two out of three will not get it. She is concerned that it will result in a smaller pool and especially concerned that it will result in less women and less African Americans and other minorities applying.

Senator Williams suggested the perhaps the resolution could be changed to only include that the candidates would meet with the CAO. Dr. Grimm was unhappy with that because there are no department chairs on the CAO, however at least the members were voted on by Faculty Senate.

Senator Riccio stated that there will always be candidates that are not selected and they will have to go back to their institutions and share that information. He did not see how requiring the finalists to meet with the faculty would make a difference. Dr. Grimm stated she was concerned that people would not even apply when they found out they would be required to meet with the faculty and their names would be made public. It might make it difficult for them at their current institutions. Chair Farrell stated in the previous search only the name of the successful candidate was announced; Senator Riccio replied that was the issue with that search. Chair Farrell replied that the search committees only recommend one person and that is why only one name was shared.

Senator Garchar inquired if there is any actual data that shows the drop in applicants in academia for these kinds of positions if there is disclosure. Chair Farrell replied that what we do have is anecdotal information that potential candidates have said they will not apply if their name becomes public at any stage other than after they have been appointed. There's no statistical data, because to have statistical data you would have to know how many candidates, which is part of what's kept secret in most of these secret searches as opposed to merely confidential.

Senator Deborah Smith stated that it was her understanding that at public universities in Ohio the names of finalists for positions such as president are a matter of public record. That means that any citizen of Ohio could request this information. There is no guarantee no matter what that this information would not get out. She thinks it would be a great shame in light of that if we prevent the faculty from having an opportunity to meet with the candidates since we cannot guarantee

their secrecy in a public university with an open records law. Chair Farrell replied that although Ohio has an open records law the names of the other candidates in the search that yielded President Lefton were not released. Senator Deborah Smith replied that to her knowledge no one requested the names, she thinks the names would be requested in this search. Chair Farrell responded that he did think they were requested, however there seems to be a way in which they can be kept confidential since that has happened at other universities.

Senator Garrison stated that there are competing interests. There's a need on the one hand for candidates, actual or potential perhaps, to remain anonymous. There is the equally important interest of the faculty having input in what arguably is one of the most important decisions that will be made at this university, the selection of the next president of this university. He doesn't see the need for privacy for the candidate overruling the important need for faculty input in this important process. Senator Garrison also stated that most people who work at institutions of higher learning over an extended period of time suspect that all provosts eventually including the one sitting in our midst hope to be president at some university somewhere. That's just part of the normal process of progression. We need people who would stand up and be courageous and take a stand for what they believe in. He would be concerned about someone who would not be a candidate because they don't want their name exposed. There needs to be a sense of trust and belief in the person who is going to represent the institution at the highest level.

Senator Fred Smith stated that this issue seems to come down to two concerns balancing each other or maybe not balancing each other, for us to decide. One is a concern with the number and quality of candidates applying, saying some may not apply if their name gets out that they're applying. The other is faculty having input. There isn't any actual data, just some anecdotal information, that candidates would not apply if they knew their name would somehow get out. He suspects the names of the candidates who are applying may get out anyway, we don't have complete control over that. They may ask someone for a letter of reference and that person shares the information. He thinks the importance of the faculty involvement is critical, and therefore supports this issue.

Senator Lee Fox Cardamone stated that she appreciated Chair Grimm's statement of support. There are only 17 people on the committee and it is imperative that other people be brought in to have input and vet the person selected. There's a level of ridiculousness with the secrecy.

Senator Feinberg stated we have a choice of either sacrificing a small degree of confidentiality at the very end of the process or presenting the faculty and the university community at large with a fait accompli. To him the greater evil by far is to present the university with a fait accompli, to make a selection without giving the people who are going to be governed some opportunity for input into who is going to be doing the governing. Furthermore, as a practical matter it seems that if an administrator is doing a good job, has established good relations with his or her colleagues, those colleagues would be supportive of that individual stepping up and moving on to a more prestigious position.

Chair Farrell believed that a public search could be problematic for a provost because there are two different issues. First the president at their institution may feel the provost is disloyal and so say, if you want to go somewhere else, you can go. The other point is that, where a provost or a president is significantly involved in fund raising, having donors know they are a finalist in another search could impact their donations. The third case is that the board of trustees, especially at private schools, may take the attitude that if your loyalty is not just to us then you shouldn't be our president. So if you are going to apply somewhere else, you should tender your resignation here.

There are a lot of compromises along the way. One of them is as Dr. Grimm suggested, if there's a short list of three they could meet with the CAO not with the entire faculty. Another was done at the University of Kentucky search in 2011, where the preferred candidate was named on a Sunday



and they spent Monday on campus meeting with faculty, staff and students. And the full board of trustees only extended an offer after their meeting on the Tuesday. So at least there was a belief that the input from the faculty was there for the board before it made a formal offer.

Chair Farrell asked the Senate to think if they believe meeting with the faculty as a whole will give better input and feedback on the candidate. Do we believe an open search yields better candidates? The evidence is mixed there. The searches that hired Bob Frank, Tim Moerland, and various other deans with whom faculty have not been terribly comfortable with were open searches. An open search does not guarantee a better candidate either.

Senator Knapp stated that the best candidates would have the least to fear from exposure. It's the marginal candidate that has fear of exposure. As someone who studies selection and the validity of selection techniques, it's probably a better idea to have more input than less input and more perspectives than fewer perspectives on a candidate.

Senator Kairis asked for clarification on a comment made by Chair Farrell. Chair Farrell stated that the search committee might only bring forth a single candidate; Senator Kairis thought the policy required at least three candidates. Chair Farrell replied that he reads the policy to say they are required to put forward three names. Senator Kairis stated that if the policy indicates there are three candidates, doesn't that indicate the names are subject to public exposure?

Senator Williams inquired what happens if the Faculty Senate passes the resolution. Chair Farrell replied that the resolution will be conveyed to the chair of the search committee and the chair of the Board of Trustees. Senator Williams stated since it would not become policy. All we are doing is sending a message to the search committee. Senator Feinberg replied that it lets the community know the opinion of Faculty Senate.

Senator Deborah Smith called the question. Senator Fred Smith seconded it. There was over a 2/3-majority vote in favor of calling the question.

Chair Farrell called for a vote on the resolution as read previously. The motion passed unanimously.

## **9. Announcements / Statements for the Record**

Senator Williams expressed her concern over the way Kent State handles 403Bs. There are only 10 firms and there's kind of a catch 22 about that. If there was a firm like Merrill Lynch that you wanted to be in financial business with, they would not be able to put up your 403B in terms of getting your money from your gross pay. You can do anything you want with your net pay, but the whole point about a 403B is taking the money from your gross pay. As it turns out, there is a catch 22 so that other firms who would like to set up 403Bs cannot do so at this university unless they have 38 faculty members who want to do that. They can't get 38 faculty members because you are not going to want to sign up with somebody who can't set up a program that can take it out of your gross pay. The University of Akron, who is also reputed to be a public university in Ohio, has to go with these rules and they are much more lenient, they'll let Merrill Lynch and Ameriprise and Edward Jones and some of these big people that cannot do it for Kent State. When she questioned HR about that, they said, but the people at the 10 firms are willing to drive wherever the faculty member is. That is not the point; the point is that faculty should be able to select who they want to handle their money. She wanted to know if Faculty Senate thought this issue is worthy of scrutiny. She will send all the information and everything that she knows to the faculty senate forum, so that Senate can think about and consider this. She asked if Senate considers that this is worthy of attention or was she just upset about the monopoly that these 10 companies have and everybody else is cool with it. In that case it's just a problem she has and she will get over it.

Senator Janson wanted to make it clear to the Senators that the slate of candidates for the presidential search isn't necessarily made up of people who apply. Yes people apply, but the best people are those that we ourselves as a search entity go out and try to convince to at least consider Kent State, and we give them all the reasons why. When you talked earlier today about those who apply, that's not necessarily how it works anymore because we're in competition with Michigan and Wisconsin and West Virginia, all these big universities who are also looking for the best person.

Senator Dees stated that on Friday morning Chris Was and John Dunlosky are doing a talk on how to build a better student, and he encouraged Senators to attend if they have time.

Senator Garrison had a statement for the record [Attachment C] that he had already sent out to the Senators. He did not read it due to the lateness of the meeting. His statement had to do with having nonwhite faculty member representation on the Presidential Search Committee. Senator Feinberg asked if the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had considered Senator Garrison's statement when they crafted their resolution on the Presidential Search. Chair Farrell replied that the concern wasn't raised when drafting the language for the resolution.

## **10. Adjournment**

Chair Farrell adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Vanessa J. Earp, Secretary Faculty Senate

attachments

**College is Worth It!  
Public Universities in Ohio  
are Increasingly Efficient!!**

You are not likely to see these headlines in your local newspaper, but both statements are true. In recent testimony given to the House Finance and Appropriations Subcommittee on Higher Education, Bruce Johnson, President of the Inter-University Council of Ohio (IUC), presented long-term data supporting both points. But most importantly, Johnson's testimony confirmed what our students and their parents know instinctively: *who we ask to pay for the cost of college has changed dramatically over the last 25 years, with an ever-increasing burden of financing a college education being placed on our students and their parents.*

Johnson's testimony proves that college is worth the cost. Since 1992 the unemployment rate for college graduates has tracked at roughly one half the unemployment level of those with high school diplomas and no college credits earned. In addition, college graduates in Ohio make higher salaries and pay more taxes than those with only a high school diploma. For example, in 2010 the median annual earnings of college graduates (bachelor degree) was \$55,700, versus \$33,800 for high school graduates with no college experience, and college graduates averaged \$13,000 in taxes paid that year, versus \$7,100 for high school graduates with no college experience.

In addition, contrary to common opinion, universities are demonstrating increased efficiency. When adjusted for inflation, universities operate with revenues that have not risen over the past 25 years. In fact, they have fallen from historic highs 15 years ago. So what is really happening when it comes to college costs and revenues? The real issue is the precipitous drop in state support. In 1998 the total revenue generated by the state higher education appropriation combined with net tuition revenue reached a high of \$13,004 per full time equivalent student. By 2011 that figure, when adjusted for inflation, declined to just \$10,330, which is the same level as 1986. **Most dramatically, since 2009 the state subsidy of public higher education has declined in real dollars (not adjusted for inflation) by nearly \$100 million.**

It might surprise you to learn that *Ohio is next to last in the nation in the amount of tuition increases over the past five years.* In other words, only one state in the entire country has tuition increases that are lower than Ohio's. If tuition increases are lower here, then why is there the growing concern with college affordability, and why do our students feel increasing financial pressures? Simply put, the state now pays less of the cost of higher education, and students and their parents shoulder more of this load. In 1986 student tuition accounted for 35.6% of the

total of higher education revenue in Ohio; in 2011 this jumped to nearly 57%. Far from being inefficient, public universities are teaching students with the same amount of revenue as they did in 1986. What has changed is that students and their parents must cover an ever-increasing portion of the total cost of their education. The cost of college is not increasing. What is increasing is the percentage of total costs students are forced to pay. *The decline in state appropriations, and not inefficiencies or unnecessary spending, is what is driving higher student debt loads.*

The financial burden on academic institutions is further exacerbated by the way our critical capital needs are now financed to support our students' education. In the 1960s Kent State built 60 buildings, and the state bore nearly 90% of the construction costs. Today, as we embark on our Foundations of Excellence construction projects, the campus, and thus our students, will fund well over 80% of total costs— the reverse of 50 years ago.

The point here is not to cry foul, nor to blame legislators. Ohio has weathered a decades-long decline in its manufacturing base, and as a result our officials have faced difficult times and have been forced to address problems with no easy, nor good, solutions. Ohio was and still is a leader nationally in higher education, and this is due to wise decisions made in Columbus. Furthermore, the trends we face go far beyond Ohio, are national in scope, and impact students and their parents nation-wide.

In other words, this message is not about assigning blame. Instead, I seek here to dispel the simplistic assertion that increases in college tuition and debt are driven by uncontrolled costs and inefficiencies among the faculty. Whenever possible, we must try to get this accurate story out to the general public: college is worth it, and universities in Ohio are increasingly efficient.

Kent State is an outstanding, first choice university. We make a difference in peoples' lives, and our graduates earn more and pay more taxes than those with only a high school education. Kent State University is a great investment in our state's future and in the future of our students.

For Faculty Senate:

*What is the faculty's responsibility in this new normal?*

While rising cost of college isn't our "fault," we are responsible for making the best of this situation. It is our responsibility to create the best experience for our students, and here we have nearly complete control over our destiny.

For example:

All professors can make sure they keep office hours and are available for one on one interactions with students

All of us can make sure that we do not let rigidity act as a stand-in for rigor. Before we pass an academic policy we must make sure that what is being presented as an increase in rigor is nor simply an increase in rigidity (here give my UT history prerequisite example).

We must strive to meet the needs of our students on their schedules. Extended hours for academic advising and advising in the residence halls are examples of what I have in mind here.

We need to reduce the number of courses with high DFW rates, and do so in a manner that maintains academic freedom (David Dees, Eboni Pringle and others are working on this)

We will create an intentional degree-completion program for students who stopped out with 90 or more credits. These people spent a lot of money, but don't benefit from having a degree. We'll give motivated returners one more chance to succeed.

In general, let's END SINK OR SWIM APPROACH—because the cost of failure today is too high precisely because the students bear most of that cost, as opposed to 30 years ago (refer to my own sink or swim behavior for much of my career as a professor)

*What is the administration's responsibility in addressing the issues raised by the new normal?*

In general, we, I, have to facilitate the success of our faculty

- For example, we have to make sure Infosylum works well, and we are doing this
- We have to raise the profile of the FPDC, and ensure that it adds full value, and we are doing this with the hire of David Dees
- We have to create a welcoming environment for newly-hired faculty, and we are doing this with new faculty lunches with the provost, and through our new faculty liaison program directed by Lashonda Taylor

In the end, working together we can continue to improve the Kent State Experience for our students, boost their success, and ensure quality.

**Presented by Provost Diacon to Faculty Senate on 10/7/13**

## **Paul Farrell - Remarks to Faculty Senate, October 7, 2013**

Welcome to the October meeting of Faculty Senate.

The last weekend has seen activities such as the official opening of the Esplanade extension and of the Kent State Hotel and Conference Center, as well as Homecoming weekend.

The last month has also seen a number of activities of note including:

- The initiation of the search processes for Deans of the Colleges of Nursing and Podiatric Medicine,
- The creation of a Faculty Professional Development Center Redesign Steering Committee, which I thank those of you who volunteered or nominated others for
- Presentations on three software systems for conducting online Student Surveys of Instruction, as part of an initiative on which Jarrod Tudor will present later in the meeting
- Receipt by the Faculty Senate office of the census of faculty, which once again bring to mind the manner in which the number of tenure-track faculty have diminished over the years
- A Board of Trustees meeting at which a number of Faculty Senate actions were approved including
  - Merger of two academic departments—Department of Environmental Health Sciences and Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics—to form the Department of Biostatistics, Environmental Health Sciences and Epidemiology. Effective Fall 2013.
  - Motion to amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws regarding representation of colleges to provide representation for the College of Podiatric Medicine. Effective immediately.
- To implement the latter, we have been working with the Office of the Provost to create an accurate census of the electorate for the College of Podiatric Medicine with the aim of conducting an election before the November meeting
- The initial stages of the Presidential search have been proceeding. The current status is that the position has been advertised and the search consultants are contacting potential prospects from those nominated and from their lists to see who might be interested, and also trying to refine the search criteria for suitable candidates.

I would note that there were no meetings of either the Graduate or Undergraduate EPCs in September due to a lack of items requiring EPC approval, and it appears that the same will be true for the scheduled October meetings. This means there are no EPC items on today's agenda, and that there will be none on the November agenda. This leads to a concern that there will be a large number of proposals being presented to the November and January EPC meetings and arriving at Senate in December and February. I would like to re-echo the concerns voiced by Senator Dees that this leads to less than ideal consideration of these proposals and the appeal to Deans and College Curriculum Committees to process these in a more expeditious manner.

The agenda today includes:

- An election to elect one senator and one non-senator to the Committee on Administrative officers, which interviews all candidates for major academic administrative offices. The candidates for the senate seat will be Vanessa Earp and Tracy Laux, and for the non-senate seat Sharon Bell and Eric Van Baars. The persons not elected will be the alternates for the next year
- A report from the University Teaching Council presented by the outgoing Chair David Dalton
- A presentation on the initiative to conduct a pilot using a commercial system for Student Surveys of Instruction with the aim of enabling online administration without the significant decline in response rates that we have seen with the previous pilot. It is hoped to achieve this by administering the survey in class using mobile devices
- A motion from the Executive on the Presidential Search

# STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD

## Faculty Senate Meeting

### 7 October 2013

This statement for the record is about shared governance and what obligations it places on the administration and the major faculty organizations on this campus, e.g., Faculty Senate and the American Association of University Professors at Kent State University (AAUP-KSU); and the legacy of exclusion, discrimination, and prejudice at Kent State University (KSU).

As an institution, at this point in time, most in the faculty and administration generally know what is meant by the concept of *shared governance*. We all understand it to be the affirmation and existence of an approach to the governance of this institution which allows, encourages, and ensures that in relevant areas the operation of this institution, relative to the decision-making process, includes meaningful and significant input and participation of both the faculty and the administration. It is the recognition that both groups have an interest in the accomplishment of the “true mission” of this institution; the shaping of the curriculum; the development of academic programs; instruction of students; establishment of policies and procedures for this university; creation channels of engagement for the faculty, student, and administrators with the broader community; the search and discovery of new knowledge, its integration with other discoveries and insights, and its application into the affairs of humankind; etc. On this much, most thoughtful, experienced, and knowledgeable educators who have embraced the idea of shared governance would agree.

However, the concept of shared governance would be seriously flawed if left there, for it would fall prey to the forces of prejudice, discrimination, and bias which still walk the hallowed halls of the academy. For there to be *true shared governance*, it must include the principle of racial and ethnic inclusion and integration in the most meaningful and significant ways. After all, that was, and remains, one of the most important objectives of the Civil Rights Movement, which did not exempt Institutions of Higher Learning from these standards and expectations. Shared governance which only includes the participation of Caucasians in the ranks of faculty is not *true shared governance*. Rather, it is like an injured bird flying awkwardly through the air, unable to sustain a straight course of flight.

Moreover, it is the responsibility and obligation of both the leadership and members of the Faculty Senate and AAUP-KSU, and the administration (Board of Trustees and Executive Cabinet)—inherent in the role and purpose of these entities, and the public trust (personal and institutional) attached to these entities—to create and maintain a set of policies and procedures that ensure true shared governance. The Excellence Agenda at KSU demands this; the Civil Rights Movement in this country, which continues to this very day, contrary to the opinion of some, demands this; the 21<sup>st</sup> Century vision, standards, and norms for our present day institution associated with the social advancement, progress, and evolution of our society, demands it. We must remain vigilant and active against any form of *regressive creep* in the practices, procedures, policies, and decision-making processes at this university.

This goes beyond it being an imperfect academic decision to exclude one of the most vocal and engaged ethnic groups on this campus, a group who has always raised awareness to incidents of discrimination, and processes and systems of inequity, and hostile and ineffectual climates and environments, relative to



equal opportunity and equal access to career paths at this institution. This has become a justice issue for many of us—one that cuts to the core of who we are as an institution. For the last half century—long before the current administration took over the reins of leadership on this campus—Black faculty and students fought against institutional racism, overt acts of bigotry and prejudice, the lack of equal opportunity, and a comprehensive and effective system of exclusion of Black people from the decision-making processes, committees, and fora of this university. There was a cloud of racial insensitivity and unconsciousness that characterized administrative decisions. Because of the determined activism of Black faculty and students, and their allies, on this campus the status quo at that time, changed. It appears that the icy and counter-progressive winds of conservatism are creeping back onto this campus. This must not be allowed to happen.

The *Excellence Agenda* must apply to everyone, if it is to have legitimacy; and the dictates of what is “right” and “proper” demand the existence of appropriate racial representation and inclusion on all decision making committees, and in all decision making processes that are important to the business and mission of this institution. With all due respect to my White colleagues, as I have said elsewhere before, they do not, and cannot, represent the perspective of African Americans; and they do not have the same stream of experience, relative to institutional culture and its impact on the well-being and opportunities (or lack thereof) for Black faculty, staff, and students in Higher education in general, and on KSU’s campus, in particular; they do not have the experience with institutional racism, in the way that we have; nor do they stand in the midst of the history of this institution and its legacy of activism, change, and progress, as we do. The absence of individuals, who can bring this knowledge, experience, insight, and wisdom to such a committee, leaves it seriously flawed and weakened.

On behalf of some of my colleagues, as a member of this body, I had asked the membership of the senate to endorse the following statement:

***We, the members of the Faculty Senate whose names are attached, stand firmly on the principle of racial inclusion with regard to important decision making processes, bodies, committees, and other mechanisms responsible for the general operation of this university. We therefore, request that the Presidential Search Committee be augmented with the inclusion of African American and other ethnic group representation.***

I want to acknowledge and thank those few colleagues who realized the importance of the statement above and lent their support, even though this simple, unambiguous, and uncontroversial request did not move forward for lack of sufficient support. This matter, unfortunately, continues to be unresolved.

---

George R. Garrison, Ph.D.  
Professor



## **Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes of the Meeting**

**September 24, 2013**

- Present:** Paul Farrell (Chair), Don White (Vice Chair), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)
- Not Present:** George Garrison (At-Large), Vanessa Earp (Secretary), David Dees (Appointed), Lee Fox-Cardamone (Appointed)
- Guests:** President Lester Lefton; Todd Diacon - Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Jarrod Tudor - Provost's Fellow

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Farrell called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Urban Conference Room.

**2. Discussion on Conducting Election for Senator from the College of Podiatric Medicine**

Chair Farrell indicated that he was coordinating with Associate Provost Sue Averill to determine the census for the College of Podiatric Medicine. There is still some ambiguity about the administrators with faculty rank. Chair Farrell has communicated specific names to Associate Provost Sue Averill to determine their status.

**3. President Lefton and Provost Diacon arrive.**

President Lefton indicated that there were no major initiatives intended other than those already announced; that is, the construction of the Architecture building and the science corridor renovations. He also indicated that enrollment projections were good, that the overall budget was looking good, and that fund raising was on target.

President Lefton confirmed the plans for the change in software and design of the University web site, which had been discussed by Vice Presidents Harvey and Mahon at the September 18 Faculty Senate Executive meeting. He also indicated that the plan was to have the decisions made before the new President came, in order to spare him/her the task.

The upcoming accreditation process by the Higher Learning Commission was also mentioned, with the expected date of early April for the visit.

The Executive inquired about the turnover in Deans, and the fact that there were interim Deans in a number of positions. The Provost indicated that these would probably remain until after the new President is appointed. He indicated that the search committee for the Dean of Nursing, although very satisfied with the candidate interviewed, had requested that the normal process be followed and two other candidates should be brought to campus. In response to a further query, he said that the original thought to combine the Dean's positions at Trumbull and Geauga had been abandoned following consultation with the faculty at the two campuses.

The Executive expressed some concern to the Provost concerning the process used to determine the selection of awardees for the summer research and the apparent lack of consultation with the University Research Council. He promised to look into the matter.

4. President Lefton and Provost Diacon left.

There was some additional discussion over the form of the motion on the Presidential search to be presented to the October Faculty Senate meeting. It was agreed that Chair Farrell would circulate a draft to the Executive to see if there was a form agreeable to be presented as a motion from the Executive.

5. Adjournment

Chair Farrell adjourned the meeting at 4:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Paul Farrell for  
Vanessa J. Earp, Secretary of Faculty Senate



## **Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes of the Meeting**

**October 23, 2013**

**Present:** Paul Farrell (Chair), Don White (Vice Chair), George Garrison (At-Large), David Dees (Appointed), Lee Fox-Cardamone (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

**Not Present:** Vanessa Earp (Secretary)

**Guests:** Francoise Massardier-Kenney (Chair, University Research Council), Satyendra Kumar (Professor, Physics)

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Farrell called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. in the Faculty Senate conference room, 227 Schwartz Center.

**2. Report from the Chair of the University Research Council (URC) Francoise Massardier-Kenney**

The Executive asked Dr. Massardier-Kenney for her impressions of URC over the last year, and, in particular, for the information she had on the process used to select the recipients of outstanding research awards, summer research support, and postdoctoral support. She indicated that for the outstanding research awards Vice President McGimpsey had asked chairs, directors, and people who received grants recently for nominations. She indicated that the number of applicants has been decreasing and this may be due in part to the unwillingness to be seen as an unsuccessful candidate. She also indicated that there was a problem with some of the faculty members of URC, who did not attend regularly and some who never attended. She expressed concern that faculty were seeking nomination to URC not because they were researchers but because they wished to have committee service on their vita. Vice President McGimpsey was also concerned that URC seemed to be pushing for its members to get awards. She perceived that there were problems in this regard with respect to research leaves and summer support. The Executive indicated that there may be a need to have a more formal conflict of interest policy.

Dr. Kumar indicated his concern over the lack of faculty input on research policies from the URC, particularly with respect to the distinguished scholarship awards and the postdoctoral competition in the recent past. Those who had been unsuccessful were given no feedback on their proposals, and were told conflicting stories on how the review had taken place, varying from over the phone to at a restaurant over a glass of wine.

Dr. Kumar and members of the Executive indicated that in the past, the process for summer research awards had been more inclusive and perceived as fair and equitable. Past practice was to create panels of faculty to evaluate summer research awards consisting of faculty in related areas.

Dr. Kumar also expressed concern over a number of other issues including the ad-hoc changes to off-campus overhead rate for grants, on support of companies through the Third Frontier program rather than researchers at Kent, and on the organization of events with no Kent faculty participation.

George Garrison asked about overhead and also about the faculty's need to be notified why their proposal is not accepted .

3. Nominations for Provost's Tenure & Promotions Advisory Boards

The Executive Committee reviewed a list provided by the Chair and added some additional names. Approval of the list was moved by Senator Garrison, seconded by Vice Chair White, and passed unanimously.

4. Communications

Chair Farrell notified the Executive of two communications:

(1) Dean Palmer, the Chair of the University Requirements Curriculum Committee, suggested that Undergraduate Studies should be represented on URCC, since they manage the Experiential Learning and First Year Experience courses. The Executive could see no objection to adding a representative of Undergraduate Studies. Since there are no faculty there, it would have to be a Dean or Associate Dean. The only concern raised was the balance of faculty and administrators.

(2) Kent City Councilman Garret Ferrara emailed on whether the Senate would be willing to support the Kent City Levy to build a new police station. The Executive felt it would be inappropriate and possibly unhelpful to do so.

5. The Executive deferred discussion of the Fall Retreat Discussions. Tess will produce a list of items from the retreat and an attendee list for the next Executive meeting.

6. Faculty Census

A brief discussion of the preliminary 2013-14 faculty census and the possible impact on representation on faculty senate was held. No decisions can be made until the census for administrators with faculty rank is also received.

7. Set Agenda for the November 4, 2013 Faculty Senate Meeting

Tess Kail will confirm, whether the President Lefton will speak. There are no EPC items. There will be a presentation by Dr. Fashaad Crawford on accreditation and a report on the University Research Council by Dr. Francois Massardier-Kenney.

8. Adjournment

Chair Farrell adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.