



FACULTY SENATE

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests **DATE:** July 14, 2014

FROM: Lee Fox-Cardamone, Chair of the Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Agenda and Materials for the July 21, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the July 21st 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 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of May 12, 2014
4. Remarks from President Beverly Warren
5. Chair's Remarks
6. EPC Action Items:
 - a. Establishment of Cooperative Education Program that will allow eligible undergraduate students to augment their academic study at Kent State University with an approved semester of full-time, career-related employment while still remaining a full-time student. Effective Fall 2014. *(Proposal attached)*
 - b. Revision of Admission–Transfer Graduate Student policy to provide clarification on the transfer of credit into master's, doctoral and EdS degrees; the transfer of credit that was earned at Kent State University; and the conditions surrounding the transfer of credits (e.g., role of the student, time limits, impact on the student's GPA). Name of policy changes to Transfer of Graduate Credit. Effective Fall 2015. *(Proposal attached)*
7. New Business: Administrative Policy Regarding Research Involving Human Subjects
(3 attachments)
8. Announcements / Statements for the Record
9. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment



FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting

May 12, 2014

Senators Present: Patti Baller, Madhav Bhatta, David Dees, Vanessa Earp, Paul Farrell, Rick Feinberg, Mary Ferranto, Steve Fountain, Lee Fox-Cardamone, George Garrison, Willie Harrell, Min He, Susan Iverson, Jay Jahangiri, Thomas Janson, Robert Kairis, Stephen Minnick, Jayne Moneysmith, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, David Riccio, Mary Beth Rollick, Susan Roxburgh, Edith Scarletto, Vilma Seeberg, Deborah Smith, Fred Smith, John Stoker, Beatrice Turkoski, Terrence Uber, Roberto Uribe-Rendon, Robin Vande Zande, Christopher Was, Susan Weaver, Donald White, Linda Williams

Senators Not Present: Ann Abraham, Brian Baer, Kimberly Garchar, Mack Hassler, Mary Kellerman, Deborah Knapp, Tracy Laux, Richard Mangrum, Oana Mocioalca, Daniel Roland, Will Ward, Kim Winebrenner

Senators-Elect Present: Ed Dauterich, Christopher Fenk, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Anne Morrison, Larry Osher, David Smeltzer

Ex-Officio Members Present: President Lester Lefton; Provost & Senior V.P. for Academic Affairs Todd Diacon; Vice Presidents: Grant McGimpsey, Iris Harvey; Executive Director Deborah Huntsman; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Blank, James Bracken, Barbara Broome, Daniel Mahony, Donald Palmer, Douglas Steidl, Mary Ann Stephens, Wanda Thomas, Ralph Lorenz for John Crawford; Susan Peti for Director Robert Walker

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Vice Presidents: Alfreda Brown, Gene Finn, Gregg Floyd, Greg Jarvie, Ed Mahon, Willis Walker; Deans: Eboni Pringle, Robert Sines, Deborah Spake, Stanley Wearden

Observers Present: Michael Allen (GSS), Barb Hipsman (Emeritus Professor)

Observers Not Present: Michelle Crisler (USS)

Guests Present: K. Allen, Sue Averill, Erin Barton, Fashaad Crawford, Janis Crowther, Nichole DeCaprio, Pamela Fitzgerald, Julie Gabella, Mark Goodman, John Graham, Mark James, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Karen Keenan, Jennifer Kellogg, Jan Leach, Alexandria Lesak, Eric Mansfield, Rebecca Murphy, Char Reed, Said Sewell, Charity Snyder, Melody Tankersley, Jarrod Tudor, Whitney Wenger

1. Call to Order

Chair Farrell called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. in the Governance Chambers, second floor, Kent Student Center.

2. Roll Call

Secretary Earp called the roll.

3. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of April 14, 2014

Chair Farrell called for corrections to the meeting minutes. Senator Janson moved to approve the minutes with a commendation to Secretary Earp. Senator Dees seconded. The minutes of the April 14, 2014 meeting were approved as written.

4. President's Remarks

This has been the end of a particularly successful year on a number of fronts. This weekend the university graduated a couple of thousand students. It was very interesting to observe the new graduates and their families taking advantage of our newly designed plazas and venues. Wherever you went they were there taking pictures, and they spread out far and wide. It wasn't that there was only one place to go, they were every place. It was very nice to see them taking pride in the campus and in their achieving of a degree.

President Lefton stated that there's a palpable change in attitude amongst the graduates and amongst applicants. He thanked those involved in this week's graduation exercises. The applications for the fall continue to be very strong. Currently there are approximately 22,000 applications. It looks like we'll bring in the largest class ever. It won't be that much larger than last year, but last year was the largest class ever. President Lefton has charged Vice President Jarvie and Nancy Dellavecchia to bring in at least one more student than we had last year so that we have a larger class than last year. However, far more important than the class size, is the quality of all of the students who have applied to come next year. This is up in every category (men, women, AALANA students, Ohio students, out of state students, and international students). This is very significant. It's particularly significant given the numbers that came out today from Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE). RPIE calculated today's fall to fall retention at 80.4%; overall retention on every campus on every dimension is up anywhere from 2 to 7.8 percent. These numbers are particularly good. While this is good, it is also creating challenges. The challenges are particularly in housing and in the number of microscopes and class sections. Students are staying in Kent instead of leaving for the weekends, which is fabulous.

These numbers are also good in terms of our budget, at least 50% of our budget is based upon the number of graduates we have, not the number of students we have in seats. And for that reason, as retention goes up, so will graduation rates. If we can't retain students we cannot graduate them. Obtaining a retention rate of 80% is a very, very good thing. When President Lefton started the retention was 68 percent. His goal was to get it to 78%, and he thought that would have been unbelievable. The fact that we're hitting 80% is absolutely amazing.

Speaking of the budget, however, news from Columbus is not particularly good. We will see budget cuts this year. We're not sure how big the budget cuts will be, because they keep changing their mind about every six weeks. The recent estimates have varied from budget cuts of 500,000 to 2.5 million compared to last year. We won't really know these numbers until September. We will manage through this year largely because of enrollment increases and retention increases. President Lefton has said to the President's Administrative Council and just about anyone else who listens and will pay attention, we have capped our enrollment. There is not an official cap, but we really can't take many more students in the freshmen class. His goal has never been to take 4,700 student or 5,500 students. Maybe another 25 or 50 students, but that's it. That won't make a significant difference. Another 500 students it would blow the top off the blender. We can't do it unless there are some very significant changes in the institution including new dormitories and new classroom buildings and all kinds of other things that would have to take place. He believes it is a very bad idea to increase the size of the freshmen class by large amounts, in part because there's huge competition for students in northeastern Ohio. While other institutions in northeastern Ohio have not seen enrollment increases and in some cases they've seen significant enrollment decreases, with new presidential leadership, they'll be very assertive in trying to increase their enrollment. They'll steal some of those students from us. There's going to be a lot of pressure. The number of students graduating from high school in Ohio is going the wrong direction. That is, there are fewer high school graduates than ever before, and that trend is likely to continue for the next decade or so.

The university will face challenges in the future. We are about to enter a new era in higher education, which he thinks is going to move much faster than anyone in this room probably actually believes. Remember the brick that we used to use that we called the cell phone? Remember, there wasn't an iPhone seven years ago. There wasn't an iPhone, let alone a Galaxy 5 Samsung kind of thing, although they're starting to look like bricks these days, they're getting so big. We didn't have smart phones. We didn't have Twitter. Things have changed quite dramatically. We can't think of being without our smart phones now or our iPads or all of the other communication devices. He expects higher education to change as fast as the telecommunications industry has changed over the next decade. He doesn't think it's going to happen this year or even next year, but he does think that we are going to see a rapid march toward change and it may not be changes that we like. It may not be changes toward increased nuance and increased focus on liberal arts. It is going to be change toward commercialization, toward corporatization, toward universities that are premier research institutions. There has been a bell shaped curve of different kinds of institutions for a long time. He does not think that's going to continue to be the case. In his opinion, and he might be wrong, we're going to see a bifurcation and a double bell. On one end there will be a lot of schools that produce certificates and produce college degrees but are really training grounds to get people jobs with specific kinds of skills. Then you are going to see the research institutions. He does not think there's going to be that middle ground. Kent State has been a part of that middle ground for a long time. Now, we've moved to the right and are headed in what he considers to be the right direction. It could change very quickly. His suggestion, desire, and hope, is that we will be willing to make the changes that are necessary to be part of being a first tier research institution. That is going to require rapid change and it is going to require being nimble. It is contrary to the idea of talking about things for four or five years. He believes departments, colleges, senates, and presidents that think that they've got the luxury of thinking about things for five or seven years because this will blow over, are wrong. The public, the legislature, the foundations, the President of the United States are all sticking their nose in higher education; they're not leaving it up to us anymore. We will see laws that will force us to change in ways that we don't like. He does not like that thought. He is just prognosticating on what's going to happen. One of the things that he thinks will happen is a huge, huge increase in online web based learning and education. Kent State is the leader of online education in Ohio. Almost 18% of our student credit hours are offered online. President Lefton stated that Kent State does twice as much online learning as any other university in Ohio, including "that place" in Columbus. He thinks we are going to see many, many, many online degrees and a significant portion of student credit hours coming from online or distance or mediated kind of learning.

Change is afoot and the president urged us to be flexible, nimble, and to be thinking outside of our comfort zone. If we don't there may not be a university anymore. We have got to get our accrediting agencies to recognize this and to be equally nimble, because we need the accrediting agencies. It's not going to be pretty.

He thanked everyone for their fellowship and their cooperation. He remarked that the last few years have been extraordinary and we've done a lot. The university is a lot better off today than it was a decade ago; enrollment is great. He did not do that, the faculty did that. He may have conducted and prodded and provided some leadership, but at the end of the day it's the faculty that run the institution. And so he thanked Senate for everything that they have done. The faculty have made Kent State a better place and made Northeast Ohio a better place. Judging from many of the students that he talked to yesterday, we're making America a better place because of what we're doing here.

Questions:

Senator Riccio asked how we reconcile the notion of diversity, which we used to think of as mixing of people on a campus, with increasing our distance learning. President Lefton replied that diversity isn't just about ethnicity, it is about ideas. It's about a range of ideas. It's a range of

viewpoints. It's a range of people. It's a range of philosophies. He believes you can have a range of people, a range of philosophies, a range of students in classes. You know, as we reach out in our distance education programs, there's no reason that we have to keep offering classes to and for students from Cuyahoga County. We can be reaching out to India and to France, to Israel and Nigeria as easily as we can locally and thus keep the mix of ideas and people fluid and moving. The bigger challenge is not of finding the right mix of students. It's finding the right mix of ideas. The political demagoguery that is taking place within universities is beginning to mirror the political demagoguery that we see in Washington, and people are lining up on sides. Instead of having a free and open debate the way we should within the university, we're staying silent. People are afraid to talk and he thinks that's a bigger concern and something worthy of your consideration and over the next decade as well.

Senator Garrison stated that it is clear that the set of responsibilities and the business of Faculty Senate and AAUP KSU are very different. The President interacts with both entities and in different ways. One important issue is morale. He thinks the morale of the faculty ought to be the concern of each of these entities that were mentioned and he would hope that as the union prepares for its future business and as the Faculty Senate reflects on its responsibilities relative to morale, and as the administration prepares for its future business with AAUP KSU, that we will be primarily concerned with faculty morale. He encouraged President Lefton to discuss this issue with President Elect Warren.

Senator Vande Zande asked President Lefton to speak more on the issue of university becoming either a research oriented institution or a training institution. President Lefton replied that Ohio needs more and better first tier universities. With 11 million people, although declining, but still holding on to around 11 million people, a state of our size should have significant research universities that make significant contributions to the health and welfare and education of its population. Not just training people to be fracking experts. And we are not going in that direction. He read notes today for an IUC meeting that is taking place tomorrow in which the governor is asking us to continue our efforts at commercialization and technology transfer, developing more and better opportunities for science and technology to be transferred into copyrights and patents and licenses to not only enhance revenue, but also to create more jobs in Ohio. The problem is that Ohio continues to divest in higher education.

5. Chair's Remarks [Attachment]

Chair Farrell welcomed the newly elected Senators. The official copy of Chair Farrell's remarks is attached.

6. Elections: Faculty Ethics Committee, Committee on Administrative Officers, and Ohio Faculty Council

Chair Farrell initiated the three elections that Senate must conduct for the upcoming year. Only current and outgoing Senators were allowed to vote. Incoming senators do not vote in these elections. The Senate was asked to vote on the following:

Faculty Ethics Committee (One Senator)

Candidates were:

Susan Roxburgh, Professor, Sociology, Kent Campus

Me He, Professor, Mathematical Sciences, Trumbull Campus

Jay Jahangiri, Professor, Mathematical Sciences, Geauga Campus

Senator Roxburgh was elected, with Senators Jahangiri and He as alternates.

Committee on Administrative Officers (One Senator and one non-Senator)

Senator Candidates were:

George Garrison, Professor, Pan-African Studies
Don White, Professor, Mathematical Sciences

Senator White was elected, with Senator Garrison as the alternate.

Non-Senator Candidates were:

Declan Keane, Professor, Physics
Kim Finer, Professor, Biological Sciences, Stark Campus

Professor Keane was elected, with Professor Finer as alternate.

Ohio Faculty Council (1 representative and at least one alternate)

Candidates were:

John Marino, Associate Professor, Business Technology, Trumbull Campus
Stephen A. Minnick, Associate Professor, Physics, Tuscarawas Campus
Chris Was, Associate Professor, Educational Psychology, Kent Campus

Professor Marino was elected, with Professors Was and Minnick as alternates.

The results of the election will be distributed via email by Tess Kail.

7. EPC Action Items

- a. From the April Meeting: EPC Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Policies: Revision Credit Testing Eligibility policy to remove a credit-hour restriction of Advanced Placement (AP), Credit by Examination (CBE) and College Level Examination Program (CLEP) combined—maximum 30 hours for bachelor's degree students, 15 hours for associate degrees and 50 percent for certificates. Effective Fall 2014.

This item was discussed at the April Faculty Senate meeting but was not voted on due to absence of a quorum. There was no additional discuss on this item. The item passed unanimously.

- b. From the April Meeting: Associate and Assistant Deans Committee: Revision of Transient Work at Another University policy to eliminate the 18-credit restriction and require students to be in good academic standing for eligibility, among other changes. Effective Fall 2014.

Dean Lorenz presented this item. The policy under discussion had not been updated in many years and there were several things that were seen to be in need of updating. The major change in the policy is the elimination of the 18-hour cap on transient work. The committee wanted to clean up the policy language and make the policy easier for students to understand.

Senator Williams asked for clarification of the term "last 30 units." Dean Lorenz replied that meant 30 credit hours.

Senator Rollick asked why the grade of D was used in the policy. It seems like the minimum grade that would transfer was a C and now in the policy it is a D. Dean Lorenz stated that the grade of D was the grade stipulated by Ohio State regulations.

The motion passed unanimously.

- c. From the April Meeting: Undergraduate Studies: Revision of undergraduate Dismissal policy to include statement that the provost will not dismiss a student who earned a 2.000 term GPA (unadjusted for the recalculation provisions in the course repeat policy). This statement inadvertently was removed the last time the policy was revised. Effective Fall 2014.

Senator Deborah Smith asked for clarification on what language was struck from the policy. She wanted to know if the language that went before the Board of Trustees was really struck by Faculty Senate or was it accidentally deleted. Associate Provost Tankersley replied that the language was not actually struck by Faculty Senate and was accidentally left out when the policy went to the Board of Trustees.

The motion was approved unanimously.

- d. Division of Graduate Studies (presented by Dean Mary Ann P. Stephens): Establishment of Change in Program of Study policy to provide guidance for graduate students transferring from one graduate program to another within the university. Effective Fall 2014.

Dean Stephens presented this policy and explained that this policy was needed because currently there is no policy in place that guides graduate students in how to change majors. The policy codifies current practices by creating both a policy and a form that goes along with the new policy. Each college will be using the new policy and form. It is up to the new program to determine whether a new university application or additional application materials are required. The only time a new university application is required by the university is when the change in major will result in the student changing colleges.

Senator Seeberg asked for clarification on what type of application is needed. Dean Stephens replied that it is a new graduate application; the same one that students would fill out if they were applying to the university for the first time. Senator Seeberg asked if the students would have to pay the \$30 application fee again. Dean Stephens responded that they would have to pay the application fee. Senator Seeberg went on to ask if a student would have to retake the GRE, if they wanted to switch programs and their GRE scores were more than five years old. She stated that seemed very cumbersome. Dean Stephens replied that having students retake the GRE would be up to the program. Senator Seeberg stated that the GRE requirement could not be waived because it was part of the Kent State application. Dean Stephens stated that departments and programs waive the GRE requirement all the time. Senator Seeberg then asked if the university would waive the \$30 application fee and was told no. That fee pays for the cost of processing the new application.

Senator Seeberg proposed a friendly amendment that removed the language requiring students to submit a new Kent State application. Senator Deborah Smith seconded the amendment.

Senator Smeltzer stated that there should be some type of paper trail when students switched areas of study and that making them fill out a new application made sense. Senator Seeberg replied that there was already a transfer policy in place for most programs. She does not see the need for students to reapply to Kent State, when they have already been admitted. Dean Stephens stated that some of the programs have old information and that some of the programs may require new or additional information from the student, which is why a new Kent State application is needed.

Senator Deborah Smith argued that the programs within the College of Arts and Sciences are vastly different, for example philosophy and physics. Changing majors within this college could be similar to changing to another college. It is her understanding that the current practice is

that the "new" program gets to decide if the student needs to reapply to the university and that practice should remain in place.

Senator Williams asked how many students this new policy would impact. Dean Stephens could not provide a specific number as those transfers are not handled via her office.

Senator Kairis made a friendly amendment to Senators Seeberg and Smith's amendment. The amendment would remove the first clause in the next paragraph as well. Senator's Seeberg and Smith accepted the friendly amendment. The proposed amendment would allow the graduate coordinator of the proposed program to determine whether the student had to submit a change in program of study form or a new Kent State application.

Senator Iverson requested clarification on the \$30 fee. Dean Stephens replied that if students were transferring from one area to another they would not be charged the \$30 fee. If students had to submit a new Kent State application they would be charged a \$30 fee.

The friendly amendment passed. There was no further discussion on this item. The motion passed as amended.

- e. Division of Graduate Studies (presented by Dean Mary Ann P. Stephens): Revision of Combined Bachelor's/Master's Degree Programs policy to adhere to credit-hour guidelines specified by the Ohio Board of Regents; to specify student status (undergraduate/ graduate) for purposes of tuition, financial aid, etc.; and to distinguish between formal (university approved) and informal combined degree programs. Effective Fall 2014.

Dean Stephens presented this item. The current policy does not align with the Ohio Board of Regents requirements for a combined bachelor's and master's degree. Students in a combined bachelor's and master's degree must complete 150 credit hours. Of those 150 credit hours, 120 are unique to the bachelor's degree and 30 are unique to the master's degree. This will allow our gifted and outstanding students the opportunity to begin graduate school early. It will also allow the university to entice those undergraduates to continue their studies at Kent State.

The policy distinguishing between formal and informal programs, informal programs are agreed upon between the student and their advisor while formal programs will go through the Educational Policies Council. The students will remain in undergraduate status until their bachelor's degree is awarded, this will allow them to take full advantage of financial aid benefits.

There was not discussion on this item. The item passed unanimously.

- f. Division of Graduate Studies (presented by Dean Mary Ann P. Stephens): Revision of Leave of Absence policy. Language is added regarding students' financial obligations to the university; and the timeframe is extended, from one calendar year to three consecutive semesters (e.g., fall, spring, summer) with allowance for one extension for maximum one additional semester. Effective Fall 2014.

The current leave of absence policy has been in place since July 1, 2012 and the university has learned a lot in that time. This revision aligns the leave of absence policy with the university's enrollment policy.

Senator Iverson mentioned that she thought the policy was better; however, she would like to see the leave of absence form align with the reenrollment form. Currently, advisors sign off on the leave of absence form, but they are not notified when students reenroll. Dean Stephens

replied that was not done because they were trying to get this form into the Workflow system and having advisors gain access to that program has been problematic. They can try to work on this issue.

Senator Feinberg restated certain parts of the policy to make sure he understood it correctly. Graduate students who take a leave of absence will pay tuition and the time off will not count towards their statute of limitations (time to complete the degree). Dean Stephens replied that was correct and that students would not have access to other student services such as the library or recreation center.

The motion passed unanimously.

- g. Approval of Additional Course for the Kent Core for Fall 2014 PH 10002 Introduction to Global Health (3) College of Public Health.

Provost Diacon spoke in favor of this motion. He believes that in an RCM environment every college should have the opportunity to offer a Kent Core course assuming the colleges' wishes to offer one. However, the course has to be appropriate for the Kent Core and the University Requirements Curriculum Committee (URCC) along with Faculty Senate decides that. Three of the previously offered Kent Core courses have been removed from the list so adding an additional course would not impact the number of Kent Core courses offered. This course went to URCC, where it was approved. Next it went to all members of the Educational Policies Council, as an information item, via email because the April meeting was cancelled.

Dean Palmer explained that the URCC looked at the appropriateness of having Introduction to Global Health course as a Kent Core course. The University Requirements Curriculum Committee decided it should be offered in the "other" category of the Kent Core because it was interdisciplinary.

Dean Alemagno mentioned to Senators that in their packets there was a syllabus for the course. She also stated that this course has been recommended by the Association of American Colleges and Universities to be considered part of the general education requirements to help create an educated citizenry. This course is a good fit for the Kent Core because of the internationalization of the campus and many students study abroad. It is also currently offered on all campuses.

Senator Fred Smith stated that he had serious concerns over the addition of this course to the Kent Core. It was his understanding the Kent Core would be made up of courses from the social sciences, physical sciences, and humanities, not courses from professional areas. He went on to say that just because the College of Public Health does not have a Kent Core, Senate does not have to give them one.

Senator Deborah Smith stated that it was her understanding that the other Kent Core courses were part of the Ohio Transfer Module. She wanted to know if this course has been approved through the Ohio Transfer Module. Dean Palmer replied that not all Kent Core courses are part of the Ohio Transfer Module but he could not tell Senate which ones were not.

Senator Williams remarked that since the moratorium on the number of Kent Core course was getting ready to expire she thought this was an excellent time for Faculty Senate to have a conversation about the philosophy or criteria behind the Kent Core. There are not guidelines for URCC to follow when designating a course as part of the Kent Core. She felt it was premature of Senate to vote on this motion today before having a larger conversation about the Kent Core.

Senator Garrison replied that he thought it was very telling that the Provost informed Senate that this decision to offer a class as part of the Kent Core was being driven from the RCM environment. He does not agree that every college should be able to offer a class as part of the Kent Core and is disappointed that this seems to be profit driven.

Provost Diacon stated that the university has not ended the moratorium on Kent Core courses. There is currently a cap on the number of courses allowed and since three courses were removed from the list there is room for additional courses. The Provost went on to say that the administration does not feel that will be an end to the moratorium in the sense that the number of classes will increase.

Chair Farrell stated that in the opinion of the Senate the moratorium ended in September 2013. After examining past Faculty Senate minutes and other records it appears that the Senate voted on a two-year moratorium three to four years ago. It appears that there was an administered edict that the moratorium was extended indefinitely; however, there is no formal record of Senate voting on this issue. Last year there was a discussion the floor of Senate about allowing the College of Public Health and School of Digital Sciences to offer a Kent Core Course and at that time it was stated that the discussion should wait until September 2013 when the moratorium would expire.

Senator Dees commented that a few years ago he had the privilege of leading the Kent Core Redesign Committee. He requested that Senate look at the undergraduate philosophy statement about what Senate thinks undergraduate education is and use that to lead a discussion on the Kent Core. We also need to think about ways to assess how the courses are going and build a serious core experience that is tied to what we believe is an undergraduate education. This will be a tough decision and it will take a long time but it needs to be done. Senate should revisit the whole Kent Core again.

Senator Bhatta stated that if the Institute of Medicine as well as the Association of Prevention, Teaching, and Research think this course should be included in the liberal arts education then it is appropriate for the Kent Core.

Senator Roxburgh stated that she is a medical sociologist who teaches Sociology of Healthcare at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. When she looks at the syllabus for this class she feels that it could be considered encroachment, but since it is taught in another college for a specific group of students it is not encroachment. However, if it were offered as a Kent Core then it would be encroachment because it overlaps substantially with the undergraduate health and healthcare course offered by sociology.

Senator Feinberg reminded Senate that there is a two meeting rule. When an issue is introduced for action it is discussed at the first meeting but not voted on until the second meeting. This is an important decision and he did not want Senate to rush to a decision. He moved to enact the two meeting rule so that it can still be discussed today but not voted on until a later meeting. Chair Farrell replied that the two meeting rule only applied to particular amendments to the charter and bylaws of Senate.

Senator Riccio moved to table this item. Senator Williams seconded the motion. The motion to table this item passed.

8. New Business

Action Items:

- a. Resolution on the Procedural Failures in the Presidential Search

Chair Farrell read the resolution. It passed unanimously.

- b. Motion Supporting the School of Journalism and Mass Communication - Faculty's letter concerning the release of Public records concerning the Presidential search.

Senator Smeltzer introduced Jan Leach and Mark Goodman to speak on this item. The School of Journalism and Mass Communication faculty proposed, distributed and sent this resolution objecting to the way the search was conducted. They did not object to the selection of President Elect Warren but to the closed process. They consider it inconsistent with the public affairs and public reporting that we teach.

Senator Kairis inquired if there was a pending legal action. Professor Leach replied that there is not a pending legal action. The faculty just want to put ourselves on the record as saying this goes contrary to what we teach our journalism students. They oppose the closed nature of the process, not the outcome of the process, and we ask that the university not do this again. Senator Kairis asked if they were asking the university to release the records from the search. Professor Leach stated that they were asking for the records. Professor Goodman stated that here are three or four possible resolutions to this conflict. One is for the sides, the opposing viewpoints to continue to disagree about whether their obligations under state law have been met, and we revisit this exact same conflict the next time we have an executive search. The other is for the university to comply with the request in the resolution and actually supply the information. The other two alternatives are that the university formally request an Attorney General's opinion from the State Attorney General that will settle this issue, at least potentially in terms of their legal obligations. The last is a lawsuit.

Observer Hipsman stated that she finds it's a little duplicitous to hear the president say that the faculty run the institution and then to turn it around and have a closed search process. The Committee on Administrative Officers was not included in the process. She respects the people who served, the four or five faculty members and the staff members, on the committee. However, the university is very large and it is a very large group who run the university. She has served on many other search committees and was never asked to sign the statement that this committee was asked to sign.

Senator Feinberg stated that he appreciated the initiative of the School of Journalism for taking the initiative on this important matter. He believes that they are showing great leadership for the university community, and he wishes that he were a member of the unit that had done the same thing.

Professor Garrison stated that he was delighted to see the School of Journalism and Mass Communication take this stand. It's more than just a legal issue; it is also a moral issue. The faculty should not go gently into the night when it comes to these issues. We should make it clear and to the height of our voice that we disapprove of this kind of activity from the administration and from the board of trustees. They knew what our thoughts were on this. We passed our own resolution; the Faculty Senate did. We engaged members of the board and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate made it very clear how displeased we were with the direction that they were going. They proceeded anyway. It completely, totally ignored the opinion of the faculty. There were no Hispanics or African American faculty members from this university on that committee. While he does think that the faculty in general can express the

views of the faculty in general, there are some specific issues that are ethnically based at this university. We are not living in a post racial society despite what people like to think. Experiences of African American students, Hispanic students, Native American students are different. The experiences of African American faculty and administrators are different. These issues need to be articulated. There are questions that come from these experiences that need to be put on the table. How can we talk about inclusion when we fail these simple litmus tests? It wasn't as if the board of trustees didn't know about this, because he made it perfectly clear to them both in the Executive Committee and here that they were proceeding along the wrong path in this regard. The whole idea of shared governance requires politically, legally, morally that there be meaningful input, meaningful scrutiny by the faculty relative to these very important decisions and we were pushed to the side on this. He supports this resolution totally, and wished that a reporter from the Akron Beacon Journal or the Record Courier were here because they need to know what our opinions are with regard to this.

Senator Uribe supported the comments made by Senator Garrison. He feels that we need to take account of all these issues. We need to take action to avoid such situations in the future. The proper forum to do that is here in the Faculty Senate. The morale of the faculty is low, but it's low not only because of this, but because we also see that shared governance is just a label. It's no longer a highlight of this university. We see that decisions, which should take into consideration the input of faculty, are made totally by administrators.

Senator Fred Smith moved the previous question. Senator Dees seconded. Faculty Senate approved moving the motion by the required two-thirds majority. The motion passed.

Information Items:

- c. University Policy 3342-5-16 regarding Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment.

A representative from the Office of Human Resources went over the slight changes in this policy, which include changes to include gender identity and correctly place transgender identity in the gender category.

- d. Kent State University Campus Completion Plan.

Chair Farrell explained that this is something that's required by the Board of Regents. Every university had to submit a campus completion plan that specifically had to address completion strategies, and more specifically had to address workforce development priorities and student success.

9. Announcements / Statements for the Record

Senator Stoker raised a concern from faculty members from his department. Apparently students are able to see their grades when the faculty members enter them, even though the grade deadline has not passed. This is concerning because the students know that grades can be changed and at times have pressured faculty members to change their grades. The Senate has asked the administration in the past to change the system so students cannot see their grades until after the deadline had passed. Associate Provost Tankersley stated that she would look into this issue.

Observer Hipsman thanked Myra West and Hal Williams for their service and wanted it entered as a resolution from senate. They've served in the Ohio Faculty Council as the retired faculty members for more than 10 years, driving down to Columbus and attending various functions on behalf of the retired faculty and on behalf of most of you. She motioned that Faculty Senate thank Myra West and Hal Williams for their continued service as retired faculty on the Ohio Faculty Council. This was seconded by Senator Deborah Smith. The motion passed unanimously and concluded with a round of applause.

10. Adjournment

Chair Farrell adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Vanessa J. Earp, Secretary Faculty Senate

attachment

Paul Farrell - Remarks to Faculty Senate, May 12, 2014

Welcome to the May meeting of Faculty Senate, the final meeting of the 2013-14 session, and the final one at which I will serve as Senate Chair.

I would particularly like to welcome the new Senators-elect who are joining us for the first time today, Christopher Fenk, Kathy Kerns, David Smeltzer, Jeffrey Child, Darci Kracht.

I would like to extend my thanks and that of the University to all the Senators who have served so diligently over the past year, and particularly to those, whose terms have been completed. These include Stephen Fountain, Mary Kellerman, Deborah Knapp, Richard Mangrum, David Riccio, Daniel Roland, Edith Scarletto, Robin VandeZande, and William Ward.

I would also like to extend our thanks to Mack Hassler, who is retiring this year after one of the longest periods of service to Kent State. His term as an at-Large representative will be completed by Richard Feinberg.

I would like to thank them for their service in the usual way.

I would also like to extend my gratitude and that of Senate to my fellow members of the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate: Vice-Chair Don White, Secretary Vanessa Earp, At-Large member George Garrison, and Appointed members Lee Fox and David Dees. I believe that your contributions on the Executive Committee enabled us to be an effective voice for the views of Faculty Senate and the faculty at large.

Since this is my last meeting as Chair, I would like to reflect a few moments on events at Kent State and particularly those of Senate during my 3 years as Chair. My first year saw the departure of Provost Frank, the search for a new Provost and the arrival of Provost Diacon, searches for a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and a Dean Technology, revision of the policy on reappointment, simplification of the description of EPC membership, establishment of the curricular guidelines for the experiential Learning Requirement, integration of the graduate schools, revision of the names of colleges, revision of the academic forgiveness policy, revision of the curriculum review process, establishment of the Cuban Studies Institute and the acquisition of the Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine.

My second year saw continued discussions and actions to integrate the College of Podiatric Medicine into the mainstream of University life and policies. This year, the first of Provost Diacon's term, also saw a new Dean of Business Administration, and a new Interim Dean of Arts & Sciences. We approved a significant number of changes to policies to ensure clarity and consistency, and liberalize the rules where appropriate, for example with respect to declaring a different catalog year for a minor than a major, and removing the requirement that Kent Core Additional category courses must be from two categories. We also finally approved a policy on distinguished ranks, which was acceptable to both Senate and the administration. As usual we also approved many new courses, programs and name changes.

The last year was dominated in many ways by the Presidential search, and the discussions and motions surrounding it. It also saw searches for a Deans of Nursing, of

Podiatric Health and of the Tuscarawas Campus. The Faculty Senate retreat also identified a number of issues of concern to the faculty, particularly the implementation of RCM, and the lack of respect and reward for University service, which I believe will continue into the next year. It saw the adoption of a number of policy changes from the ad-hoc committee for academic policies, more of which are on the agenda today, together with name changes, the establishment of centers and other curricular actions.

In reflecting on my three year, and also thus on President Lefton's last three years, I would have to identify as great successes and examples of how Senate and the administration can work together, the acquisition of the College of Podiatric Medicine, and the eventual incorporation of it into the governance structure, which received the unanimous support of Senate. This together, with the long awaited policy on distinguished ranks, shows how shared governance can work to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned provided that respect and patience is shown by both parties. I am also proud of our willingness to approve policy changes, after due and careful consideration and input, which promote both quality and student success. Our administration has at times been surprised by our willingness to embrace change and the quality of our input on these issues.

Since it is President Lefton's last Senate meeting, I would also like to mention some other initiatives during his time here which have changed the face of Kent State and the city of Kent. I think most would regard the dramatically changed sense of collaboration between town and gown, which has seen the blossoming of Kent and the creation of a far more welcoming environment for our students. I would also mention the dramatic improvements in marketing, recruiting and advising students, which has led to an increase of quantity and quality of the student enrollment at Kent State; the expansion of the international programs of Kent students and the increase in the number of foreign students attending. All these have contributed to creating a more vibrant and diverse community, which can only benefit us all.

As my parting thought on the past few years, I would remark that we must never lose sight of the fact that what is important is not the number of students we attract, or the number we graduate, and even less so the attractiveness of our campus or the achievements of our athletes, but rather the quality of the education that we provide to those who come here, and the extent to which it equips them to live happy and prosperous lives in a rapidly changing world. I believe passionately that this is directly related to the extent to which faculty have the time to engage in quality personal interactions with our students particularly in the classes that are core to their majors. It is important that in changing our face to meet the challenges ahead, we do not lose sight of our core values but rather cherish and maintain them.

On a matter of procedure, since we have so new Senators among us, I would like to remind Senate that any discussion item can be made an action item by a vote of Senate, and that any action item can be tabled either until a definite date, indefinitely, or until it has been considered by a subcommittee of Senate.

Since our agenda is so full today, I will forego my usual practice of outlining the agenda and proceed immediately to the action items of the day. Finally, I must apologize to my executive for failing at this last meeting of the year to honor their request that I give a one hour's oration.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

C.O.A.

Preparation Date **16-Apr-14** Curriculum Bulletin _____
 Effective Date **Fall 2014** Approved by EPC _____

Department _____

College **PR - Provost**Proposal **Establish Policy**Proposal Name **Establishment of a University-Wide Cooperative Education Program**

Description of proposal:

The Office of the Provost proposes establishment of a Cooperative Education Program that will allow eligible undergraduate students to augment their academic study at Kent State University with an approved semester of full-time, career-related employment while still remaining a full-time student.

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and staffing considerations; need, audience)

Starting fall 2014 semester, the Cooperative Education Program will be piloted through the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology and be made available only to students declared in a major in that college. After the pilot ends, the program will be coordinated by Undergraduate Studies, in conjunction with the students' academic college, and open to all eligible undergraduate students.

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):

Bursar, Registrar, Student Financial Aid, Undergraduate Studies, Provost's Office, Curriculum Services, College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology'

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

 Department Chair / School Director

____/____/____

 Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

____/____/____

 College Dean (or designee)

____/____/____

 Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

____/____/____

 Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee)

____/____/____

Proposal Summary

Establishment of a University-Wide Cooperative Education Program

SUBJECT SPECIFICATION

The Office of the Provost proposes establishment of a Cooperative Education Program that will allow eligible undergraduate students to augment their academic study at Kent State University with an approved semester of full-time, career-related employment while still remaining a full-time student.

Starting fall 2014 semester, the Cooperative Education Program will be piloted through the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology¹ and be made available only to students declared in a major in that college. After the pilot ends, the program will be coordinated by Undergraduate Studies, in conjunction with the students' academic college, and open to all eligible undergraduate students.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

For several years, students in the Aeronautics, Applied Engineering and other majors have struggled with undertaking semester-long full-time work experiences away from campus while trying to maintain full-time student status to keep their eligibility for aid, loan deferment and insurance, among other services/resources. These employment opportunities are highly desired, selective and in the student's chosen field. Some recent examples include the following:

Term	Co-Op Assignment	Students
Spring 2014	Delta Airlines (Atlanta)	1 from Aeronautics – Flight Technology
Spring 2014	United Airlines (Newark, Chicago, Houston)	3 from Aeronautics – Flight Technology
Fall 2013	NASA Glenn Research Center (Cleveland)	5 from Aeronautics – Aeronautical Systems Engineering Technology

Typically, these students end up taking a full-load of coursework or paying for a 12-credit internship or practicum course to keep their full-time student status.

In preparation of developing a cooperative education program, a review was conducted on cooperative education programs at 13 universities². In addition, members of the Provost's Office conducted extension discussions with the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology and with administrators from the following offices: Bursar, Registrar, Controller, Career Services and Student Financial Aid.

Student Eligibility for the Co-Op Education Program

- Enrollment as a full-time student
- Admitted into a degree program³
- Minimum cumulative 2.750 GPA at time of co-op application
- No holds on the student's record from any source (financial, academic, conduct)
- Cooperative position must directly relate to student's major or concentration
- Completion of two semesters (one semester for transfer students) at Kent State prior to the first co-op rotation

¹ Effective for fall 2014, the College of Aeronautics, Applied Engineering and Construction Management.

² Clemson University; Drexel University; Georgia Institute of Technology; Mississippi State University; North Carolina State University; Northeastern University; Ohio University; Rochester Institute of Technology; University of Akron; University of Alabama; University of Cincinnati; University of Massachusetts Lowell

³ Students in a fully online program must receive their dean's permission to enroll in the Co-Op Program.

Student Application Submissions

Completion of the Student/Employer Agreement (Appendix A), which will include the following:

- Student information (name, major, GPA, class standing, contact information)
- Employer information (name, address, contact)
- Co-op agreement (job description, start date, weekly hours and pay rate)
- Notice for international students studying on an F-1 visa
- Signed statement of understanding from the co-op student
- Signed statement of understanding from the co-op employer

Cooperative Education Registration

Student will register for COOP 20092 Cooperative Education, which will be administrated by the Provost's Office and carries no academic credit (i.e., 0 credit hours). The course also does not carry a grade; students will earn either the mark "Complete" or the mark "Not Complete" (Appendix B).

Enrollment in the course will be restricted by special approval. The course will not display in the Schedule of Classes. Students will be able to register only after submission and approval of all application forms.

COOP 20092 Cooperative Education will have variable title, allowing the addition of employer's name at the end of the title, e.g., "Cooperative Education: NASA," "Cooperative Education: Federal Aviation Administration." The course and variable title will appear on a student's transcript.

As the course carries no academic credit or grade, it will not count toward students' earned hours, GPA, residence, class standing, academic standing or institutional honors. The course will, however, be counted toward full-time enrollment and the Experiential Learning Requirement. Tuition will not be assessed for the course; instead, a special course fee will be applied to the student's account. The fee will support the cooperative education coordinator position in Undergraduate Studies.

Students wishing to earn academic credit and/or grade will be directed to register for a credit-bearing internship or practicum course. See page 3 for difference between a co-op and an internship or practicum.

Full-Time Enrollment Verification

The Kent State co-op administrator will complete and submit to the Office of the Registrar a "Cooperative (Co-Op) Education Program – Student Full-Time Enrollment Verification Request" (Appendix C) for the student to be designated and reported as a full-time student and for the student to continue having access to all student services and resources the student had before the co-op semester.

Students will not be eligible to receive financial aid or scholarships during the term they are on co-op assignment, but these awards can be reinstated upon their return to regular coursework. Students should contact with the Office of Student Financial Aid for more information.

Student Co-Op Administration

During the pilot phase in the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology, oversight of students in a cooperative work experience will be done by Jackie A. Ruller, project manager in the dean's office who has been administrating the college's co-op and internship experiences over the past year.

Once the pilot phase is finished, and the cooperative education program is made available to all eligible undergraduate students, oversight will be done by a dedicated position in the Division of Undergraduate Studies.

The co-op administrator will periodically check in with the student while in a co-op semester. In addition, the student's academic unit may require assignments (e.g., weekly journal, final reflection paper). Students will be required to complete a mid-semester assessment of the experience (Appendix D). The students' co-op employer will be required to submit a student performance evaluation at the end of the semester (Appendix E).

Students who chose to leave the co-op employment within Kent State's course add/drop deadlines may do so by self-dropping the course. Students who leave the co-op employment after the add/drop deadlines must contact the co-op administrator, who will then enter the "Not Complete" mark for the course on the student's record. Any refund of the fee will follow normal procedures and deadlines.

Difference Between a Kent State Co-Op and an Internship or Practicum

Cooperative (Co-op) Education

1. A co-op is administered by colleges and/or departments in conjunction with a central office that maintains university-wide eligibility criteria and oversight.
2. A co-op is a joint venture between Kent State, a selected employer and the student; supervision and evaluation of the work experience is primarily done through the employer.
3. Students are hired for full-time, paid positions that last the duration of a full semester (a small percentage of co-op positions may be unpaid but must be approved by the university).
4. The co-op employment directly relates to the student's declared program.
5. Co-op experiences typically occur in the fall or spring semester and may extend to multiple semesters that alternate with semesters of coursework.
6. More on-the-job training is offered through a co-op than an internship.
7. A co-op student will not be employed on campus, but may continue living in a residence hall during a co-op semester.
8. Students do not earn academic credit or a grade for a co-op.
9. Students pay the university a flat fee for a co-op to maintain full-time enrollment status during the semester of co-op employment.

Internship or Practicum

1. Eligibility for and oversight of an internship or practicum is coordinated by the academic unit administering the specific internship/practicum course.
2. The university provides supervision and evaluation to internship and practicum experiences in conjunction with and recommendation by the site professionals.
3. An internship or practicum can be full- or part-time, paid or unpaid, depending on the employer and the career field.
4. The internship or practicum experience relates to the student's occupational goal and usually is a required part of the student's academic program, typically at the end of the program.
5. An internship or practicum is usually a one-time assignment.
6. The internship or practicum typically does not interfere with classes due to timing.
7. An internship or practicum opportunity takes place on or off campus.
8. Students earn academic credit and a grade for an internship or practicum course.
9. Students pay the university tuition for an internship or practicum, based on the set credit hours of the course.

ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES

The alternative is to continue to require students with co-op work prospects to register and pay for 12+ credit hours to maintain full-time student status. The consequence is students who struggle to balance a full coursework load with a full-time job opportunity in their chosen field, or those who choose to abandon one for the other.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION AND JUSTIFICATION

Recommendation is to establish a formal university-wide cooperative education program to ensure consistency of policies and procedures. The creation of a course will allow the co-op experience to be displayed on the student transcript, as well as to initiate procedural communication among various student services to maintain the student's full-time enrollment status while away on a co-op work assignment.

Benefits for students in cooperative education program:

- Apply classroom learning in a work setting and gain on-the-job experience
- Enhance academic performance through increased understanding
- Realistically confirm choice of major and career
- Strengthen level of maturity, confidence and sense of responsibility
- Increase understanding of human relations and business/industry operations
- Begin building a network of professionals in the chosen field
- Observe an employer before accepting full-time employment

Benefits for cooperative education employers:

- Participate in the education of potential permanent employees
- Evaluate a student's on-the-job performance before making a long-term commitment
- Gain the "inside track" on recruiting quality students for permanent employment
- Offer assistance to senior professionals, releasing them for more complex responsibilities
- Reduce costs and time associated with recruiting and training new graduates
- Obtain immediate productivity from co-op graduates
- Maintain high visibility with students, faculty and administrators at Kent State University

TIMETABLE AND ACTIONS REQUIRED

- Approval by the Provost (May 2014)
- Approval by Educational Policies Council (May 2014)
- Approval by Faculty Senate (July 2014)
- Implementation (Fall 2014)



Cooperative Education Program Student/Employer Agreement

APPENDIX A

*Student: Please complete, sign and return to Jackie Ruller at jruller@kent.edu,
or fax to 330-672-2894. For questions call 330-672-7064.*

Student Name: _____ **Kent State ID:** _____

Student Statement of Understanding

By attaching my signature below, I agree to abide by the following guidelines of the Kent State University Cooperative Education Program:

- I understand that I have satisfied all criteria to participate in the Cooperative Education Program:
 - Minimum cumulative 2.500 GPA
 - Completion of two semesters (one semester for transfer students) at Kent State prior to the first co-op rotation
 - Enrollment as a full-time student
 - Admitted into a degree program (program cannot be fully online)
 - No holds on my record from any source (financial, academic, conduct)
 - Cooperative position directly relates to my major or concentration
- I understand the academic requirements specific to my academic major, and I understand that I am responsible for making certain that I fulfill all the requirements for my degree program.
- I understand that when I am engaged in a co-op position I maintain full time student status as long as I am registered for the appropriate co-op course and pay the required fees.
- I agree to conduct myself in an ethical and professional manner in all my interactions with the co-op staff and employers. I understand that as a Kent State student, I am a representative of this institution and all that I do reflects on the university.
- Before I embark on the co-op experience, I understand that I must review and make any needed adjustments to my financial aid, scholarship, student loans and health insurance.
- I understand that failure to abide by this student agreement could result in dismissal from the Cooperative Education Program and a Not Complete mark on my student transcript.
- I am to notify my co-op coordinator of any significant changes in my status or issues that arise that would have a direct effect on my performance as a participant in the Cooperative Education Program.
- I will return my Student Performance Evaluation, completed by my employer/supervisor, to my co-op coordinator at the end of my co-op assignment.
- I understand that as long as I receive a Complete mark for this co-op, I fulfill my Experiential Learning Requirement (ELR).

I have read, understand and agree to accept all elements of this cooperative education contract.

Student Signature Date

I have verified that the above-mentioned student fulfills the criteria for eligibility in a co-op position, and I approve the student's participation in the Cooperative Education Program.

Co-op Coordinator (print name) Co-op Coordinator Signature Date



Cooperative Education Program Student/Employer Agreement

Student Information

Current Mailing Address: _____ _____	Kent State E-mail: _____
	Home Phone: _____
Address During Co-Op Semester: _____ _____	Cell Phone: _____
	Work Phone: _____

Student Academic Information

Major(s): _____	College: _____
Concentration(s): _____	Overall GPA: _____
Class Standing: <input type="checkbox"/> Freshman <input type="checkbox"/> Junior <input type="checkbox"/> Sophomore <input type="checkbox"/> Senior	Major GPA: _____
Expected Date of Graduation: _____	U.S. Citizen: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Co-Op Organization Information

Organization Name: _____	Contact Person: _____
Street Address: _____ _____	Title: _____
City: _____	Phone: _____
Zip, State: _____	E-mail: _____

Co-Op Work Information

Co-Op Job Title: _____	Hourly Pay Rate: _____
Start Date: _____	Hours Per Week: _____
Work Hours: <input type="checkbox"/> Day <input type="checkbox"/> Evening/Night <input type="checkbox"/> Weekend (Check all that apply)	
Duties/ Responsibilities: _____ _____ _____	

The information is accurate to the best of my knowledge. If there is a change to any of the above information during the course of my contract, I will notify my co-op coordinator as soon as possible.

Student Signature

Date



Cooperative Education Program Student/Employer Agreement

For International Students Studying on an F-1 Visa

Because the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Office has certain rules that I must follow, I agree to:

1. Obtain and complete information relating to Curricular Practical Training (CPT) for F-1 Students.
2. Bring the signed contract, position description, Employer Statement of Understanding and completed CPT form, AFTER it has been signed by me, by my employer and by my co-op coordinator to the International Student Advisor BEFORE I begin my co-op assignment. This step is necessary so that the International Student Advisor may authorize my Form I-20 for CPT.

I have read, understand, agree to and accept all the elements of this a.

Student Signature

Date

International Student Advisor Signature

Date



Cooperative Education Program Student/Employer Agreement

Employer Statement of Understanding

Dear Employer:

We are pleased to learn that your organization has extended an offer of co-op employment to _____ for the _____ term.

To help ensure the interests and promote the benefits of the co-op arrangement, we have developed the following Employer Statement of Understanding.

By signing this Statement of Understanding, the cooperating employer agrees to accept the following responsibilities related to its participation in the Cooperative Education Program at Kent State University:

- To provide meaningful employment related to the student's field of study, enhancing, supplementing and using his/her background and education. The work assignment will challenge the student's technical, educational and professional development.
- To place the student under the supervision of a qualified manager who can provide effective guidance during the co-op work term and assist the student in adjusting to the work environment.
- To provide a safe and professional work environment, ensuring that the student has the training, equipment, supplies and space necessary to perform his or her duties.
- To communicate clearly to the student your organizational policies and professional standards of conduct.
- To state that the employer is an equal opportunity employer, and offers employment without regard to race, color, gender, religion, national origin, age, sexual orientation, disability or veteran status.
- To appropriately maintain the confidentiality of student information.

Terms of Cooperative Education Program Arrangement

A co-op arrangement for each student will be a period agreed upon by the student, the cooperating employer and Kent State University. Should the employer become dissatisfied with the performance of a student, it may request termination of the co-op arrangement. Termination should occur only after the Cooperative Education Program coordinator has been notified in advance of employer's dissatisfaction with the student's performance, and a satisfactory resolution cannot be obtained. Conversely, the academic department of the student may request termination of the arrangement for any student not complying with department guidelines and procedures of the co-op program, or if the employer does not uphold the responsibilities listed above, as long as the employer has been notified in advance and satisfactory resolution cannot be obtained.

Employer Representative Signature

Date

APPENDIX B



Name: Therese E Tillett
Organization: Curriculum Services

Submission Date: 4/21/2014



Course Catalog Update

<< Go back to Course Catalog Update form

Print
STU0004

Course Catalog Update Information:

Reference Number: CCU007305

Date: 21-APR-14

Level: of

Currently On The Worklist Of: , unassigned

Owner: Office of Curriculum Services, 330-672-8558 or 330-672-8559, curriculum@kent.edu

Basic Course Data		
Change type: Establish		
Faculty member submitting this proposal:		
Requested Effective Term: 201480		
Campus: Kent		
College: VA-Academic Affairs and Provost		
Department: PROV-Provost		
Course Subject: COOP-Cooperative Education		
Course Number: 20092		
Course Title: Cooperative Education (variable title)		
Title Abbreviation: Cooperative Education		
Slash Course and Cross-List Information:		
Credit Hours		
Minimum Credit/Maximum Credit: 000 to 000		
Contact Hours: Lecture - Minimum Hours/Maximum Hours:		
Contact Hours: Lab - Minimum Hours/Maximum Hours:		
Contact Hours: Other - Minimum Hours/Maximum Hours: 000 to 000		
Attributes		
Is this course part of the LER, WIC or Diversity requirements: No		
If yes, course attributes: 1. 2. 3.		
Can this course be repeated for credit: Repeat	Course Limit: 99	OR Maximum Hours:
Course Level: Undergraduate	Grade Rule: F-Satisfactory/unsatisfactory (S/U)	
Rationale for an IP grade request for this course (if applicable): New grade: Complete/Not Complete		
Schedule Type(s): 1. COP-Cooperative Education 2. 3.		
Credit by Exam: N-Credit by exam-not approved		
Prerequisites & Descriptions		
Current Prerequisite/Corequisite/Catalog Description:		
Catalog Description (edited): Limited to students on approved, full-time co-op work assignments. No academic credit is awarded for the assignment; however, the course will appear on the student's transcript with a grade of "Complete" or "Not Complete."		
Prerequisites (edited): Special approval.		
Corequisites (edited):		
Registration is by special approval only: Yes		
Content Information		
Content Outline:		
Content Hours per Course Topic	Topic Description	
500	Co-op assignment varies per student and co-op employment (full-time employment over the course of a semester)	
Display/Hide Delimited Course Outline		

Total Contact Hours: 500
Textbook(s) used in this course: None.
Writing Expectations: Student will be required to submit a mid-semester assessment of the assignment.
Instructor(s) expected to teach: Not applicable
Instructor(s) contributing to content: Not applicable
Proposal Summary
Explain the purpose for this proposal:
The Cooperative Education course is part of a new Cooperative Education Program, which will be piloted fall 2014 through the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology. After the pilot phase, the program (and course) will be open to all undergraduate students and coordinated through Undergraduate Studies. The course carries no academic credit (i.e., 0 credit hours) and no grade; students will earn either the mark "Complete" or "Not Complete." Enrollment in the course will be restricted by special approval. The course will not display in the Schedule of Classes. Students will be able to register only after submission and approval of all application forms. The course will have variable title, allowing the addition of employer's name at the end of the title, e.g., "Cooperative Education: NASA," "Cooperative Education: Federal Aviation Administration." The course and variable title will appear on a student's transcript.
Explain how this proposal affects program requirements and students in your unit:
As the course carries no academic credit or grade, it will not count toward students' earned hours, GPA, residence, class standing, academic standing or institutional honors. The course will, however, be counted toward full-time enrollment and the Experiential Learning Requirement. Students wishing to earn academic credit or grade will be directed to register for a credit-bearing internship or practicum course. Tuition will not be assessed for the course; instead, a flat fee will be applied to the student's account.
Explain how this proposal affects courses, program requirements and student in other units:
See answer above.
Explain how this proposal affects enrollment and staffing:
For the pilot phase of the Cooperative Education Program, the course will be restricted to students in the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology. The course will be administered by the college's project manager, who is responsible for that college's internships and co-ops currently. After the pilot phase, and the program is open to all eligible undergraduate students, the program will be administered by a dedicated position.
Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by the proposal):
College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology; Office of the Provost; Office of the University Registrar; Office of the Bursar; Office of the Controller; Office of Student Financial Aid, Career Services Center; Office of Curriculum Services

Comments (500 Character Maximum):

NOTE: Please do not use the following restricted characters: (~ * / \ --)

The grade listed for the course (Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory) will not be used for this course. Instead, a new grade mode will be created specifically for this course: "Complete" and "Not Complete."

303 more characters

You must click the submit button to submit your catalog update request for approval. After the document is successfully submitted, a printable confirmation page will appear.



Cooperative Education Program

Student Full-Time Enrollment Verification Request

APPENDIX C

Date: _____

Student and Co-Op Information

Student Name: _____

Kent State ID: _____ Kent State E-mail: _____

Student's College: _____ Degree Program: _____

Co-Op Term: ☐ Fall ☐ Spring ☐ Summer Co-Op Year: _____

Co-Op Course ID: _____ Co-Op Section CRN: _____

Co-Op Section Title: Cooperative Education: _____
name will appear in course title on student's transcript

Employer Name: _____

Employer Address: _____

Comments: _____

Approval Information

Kent State Co-Op
Coordinator:

print name

signature

approval date

REGISTRAR'S OFFICE ONLY

Completed on: _____

Completed by: _____

Cooperative Education Program Student Mid-Semester Assessment

APPENDIX D

Please take the time to reflect on your cooperative education experiences when answering the following questions. Once you have completed your assessment we suggest that you review it with your supervisor. By reviewing your assessment with your supervisor, you will be able to evaluate your performance and create a plan for the remainder of the semester.

STUDENT INFORMATION

Name: _____ Major(s): _____

Kent State ID #: _____ Concentration(s): _____

CO-OP EMPLOYER INFORMATION

Organization Name: _____

Student's Supervisor: _____ Title: _____

Work Telephone: _____ Work Email: _____

Please check the box that pertains to your current co-op and overall number of co-op experiences.

This is my: ☐ First ☐ Second ☐ Third ☐ Fourth co-op **with this employer**

This is my: ☐ First ☐ Second ☐ Third ☐ Fourth co-op **overall**

Work Term: ☐ Fall ☐ Spring ☐ Summer 20 _____

I. FEEDBACK

Please rate your satisfaction with the following by using the scale on the right-hand side.

Rating

1. Orientation to company _____
2. Orientation to department _____
3. Formal Training program _____
4. Mentoring program _____
5. Overall rating of co-op _____
6. Formal evaluation _____
7. Quality of supervision _____

VS	Very Satisfied
S	Satisfied
N	Neutral
D	Dissatisfied
VD	Very Dissatisfied
NA	Not Applicable-event did not occur

Cooperative Education Program Student Mid-Semester Assessment

II. LEARNING OUTCOMES

Learning outcomes are designed to evaluate your professional, personal and academic development, relevant to your co-op. The outcomes listed below are similar to the evaluation that your supervisor will complete at the end of the semester.

For each item, please check the appropriate box and then reflect on each statement, providing specific examples or observations that support your assessment.

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree N = Neutral D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree

LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS	Response				
Professionalism – This co-op has allowed me the:	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. Ability to adapt to new situations. (initiative, motivation, responsibility)					
2. Ability to work effectively on a team. (working with others, demonstrating flexibility, contributing to the organizations goals)					
3. Ability to successfully complete assignments. (meeting deadlines, organization, planning, prioritize tasks)					
4. Knowledge of the organizations work culture. (professional ethics, decision-making, chain of command, mission, diversity)					
5. Ability to utilize technology. (understanding complex systems, using technology/information)					

**Cooperative Education Program
Student Mid-Semester Assessment**

LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS	Response				
Academic – This co-op experience has allowed me to:	SA	A	N	D	SD
6. Increase my awareness and understanding of the link between classroom concepts and work applications.					
7. Have a greater awareness of my chosen career path.					
8. Increase my communication skills. (verbal, written, listening and presentation)					

III. LEARNING ASSESSMENT

9. Please describe your current career objective(s) and relate them to your current co-op.

10. Please summarize what you have learned during this co-op.

*Thank you for completing your mid semester assessment.
This information is helpful not only in assisting you with your career development,
but also in assisting other students with this company/employer.*

Cooperative Education Program Employer Performance Evaluation

APPENDIX E

To be able to enhance the educational experience, please provide the co-op student with feedback regarding his or her performance and areas for improvement.

STUDENT INFORMATION

Name: _____ Major(s): _____

Kent State ID #: _____ Concentration(s): _____

CO-OP EMPLOYER INFORMATION

Organization Name: _____

Student's Supervisor: _____ Title: _____

Work Telephone: _____ Work Email: _____

I. ACADEMIC PREPARATION

Please circle the response that corresponds with your evaluation of the student.

1. Ability to integrate theory (academic learning) and practice

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

2. Verbal Communication

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

3. Written Communication

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

II. SKILLS AND ABILITIES

Please circle the response that corresponds with your evaluation of the student

4. Ability to solve problems and analyze facts and data

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

5. Ability to take initiative on a project or assignment

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

6. Ability to make decisions/judgment and take action

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

7. Ability to plan, prioritize, and follow-up to achieve results

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Ability to recognize the need for and be responsive to change

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

Cooperative Education Program Employer Performance Evaluation

9. Willingness to take risks and accept responsibility for the consequences of his/her own actions

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

10. Demonstrates the necessary technical skills and the ability to apply his/her knowledge and skill

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

III. PROFESSIONALISM

Please circle the response that corresponds with your evaluation of the student.

11. Attendance Regular Sporadic

12. Punctuality Regular Sporadic

13. Takes initiative

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

14. Presents a professional image

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

15. Works well with others

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

16. Is pleasant to work with

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

17. Demonstrates a willingness to learn

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

18. Enthusiasm

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

19. Is dependable and has a strong commitment to his/her work

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

20. Quality of work performed

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

IV. OVERALL PERFORMANCE

Please circle the response that corresponds with your evaluation of the student.

21. I would rate the student's overall performance as follows:

Does Not Apply	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Average	Very Good	Exceptional
0	1	2	3	4	5

Cooperative Education Program Employer Performance Evaluation

22. What would you identify as the student's strengths during his/her assignment?

23. What are some suggested areas of improvement for the student?

24. What can Kent State do to better assist you in meeting your employment needs?

25. What changes would you recommend to improve the co-op process?

26. Will the student be returning to work with your company?

☐ Yes Please specify the semester: ☐ Fall (Aug-Dec) ☐ Spring (Jan-May) ☐ Summer (May-Aug)

What type of employment: ☐ Part-time work ☐ Full-time work ☐ Co-op

☐ No

☐ Not yet determined

Supervisor's Signature:

Date:

I have reviewed this evaluation with the student: ☐ Yes ☐ No

*Thank you for contributing to our students' educational and career development.
Please return this evaluation to the student or to the address printed above.*

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

6.b.

Preparation Date **30-Apr-14**

Curriculum Bulletin _____

Effective Date **Fall 2015**

Approved by EPC _____

Department **Division of Graduate Studies**
 College **PR - Provost**
 Proposal **Revise Policy**
 Proposal Name **Transfer of Graduate Credit**

Description of proposal:

A review of the policies from five other universities revealed that KSU's current policy on the transfer of graduate credit needs to be enhanced and clarified. More specifically, the current policy is missing information on the following topics:

- 1) The transfer of credit into the educational specialist degree;
- 2) The transfer of credit that was earned at Kent State University; and
- 3) The conditions surrounding the transfer of credit (e.g., responsibilities of the student, time limits, impact on the student's GPA).

Further, although the current policy is entitled "Admission – Transfer Graduate Student," it provides information on the transfer of graduate credit, not the admission of transfer students. Changing the policy title to "Transfer of Graduate Credit" will better reflect its content, and make it easier to locate the policy in the catalog.

The revised policy is intended to address the above mentioned limitations and provide clear guidance about the conditions associated with transfer credit at the graduate level.

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and staffing considerations; need, audience)

Revisions were made with consultation from graduate coordinators. Much of the original policy remains, and the additional information reflects existing practices, so there should be little to no impact on other programs, policies or procedures.

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):

The proposed policy was developed by the Graduate Studies Administrative Advisory Committee (GSAAC), with consultation from graduate coordinators within their respective colleges.

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

 Department Chair / School Director


____/____/____

 Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

____/____/____

 College Dean (or designee)

____/____/____



Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee)

____/____/____

Proposal Summary for a Policy Transfer of Graduate Credit

Subject Specification:

Revise the Admission – Transfer Graduate Student policy to provide more guidance about the conditions associated with the transfer of credit at the graduate level.

Background Information:

The proposed policy was drafted following a review of the policies at five other universities: Ohio State University; University of Cincinnati; Arizona State University; University of Washington-Seattle; and University of Wisconsin-Madison. Two graduate students assisted with data collection and the initial draft of the policy. The Graduate Studies Administrative Advisory Committee (GSAAC), with consultation from graduate coordinators within their respective colleges, developed the final proposal.

In summary, review of the policies from the five other universities revealed that all five specify the nature of transfer credit at the graduate level, including that the course should have been of graduate level, from an accredited institution and should not have been used in a previously awarded degree. Three of the universities specified the minimum number of credits that must be completed in the degree program, while the other two universities specified the maximum number of credits that may be transferred into the degree program. Two of the universities prohibited the transfer of credit that was taken in non-degree status, and the time limits for allowing for the transfer of credits varied across the five universities.

GSAAC agreed that Kent State University's current policy is generally sufficient, and that most of the information should be retained, including the 12 credit hour limit. It was agreed however, that the current policy needs clarification, and that information should be added regarding:

- 1) The transfer of credit into the educational specialist (Ed.S.) degree;
- 2) The transfer of credit that was earned at Kent State University; and
- 3) The conditions surrounding the transfer of credits (e.g., role of the student, time limits, impact on the student's GPA).

Further, although the current policy is entitled "Admission – Transfer Graduate Student," it provides information on the transfer of graduate credit. It does not provide information about the admission of transfer students, because that is covered in the "Admission – Graduate Student" policy. Changing the policy title to "Transfer of Graduate Credit" will better reflect its content, and make it easier to locate the policy in the catalog.

The revised policy is intended to address the above mentioned limitations and provide clear guidance regarding the transfer of graduate credit that was either earned at another university or at Kent State.

Alternatives and Consequences:

The alternative is to continue to use the policy as it is currently written. As a consequence, there will not be clear guidance about the conditions associated with transfer credit, and would likely lead to inconsistent application of the policy.

Specific Recommendation and Justification:

The specific recommendation is to revise the Admission – Transfer Graduate Student policy and change the title to “Transfer of Graduate Credit” for publication in the 2015-16 University Catalog. The rationale is to provide students and programs with more guidance regarding the nature of credit transfer at the graduate level.

Timetable and Actions Required:

EPC Approval, May 2014
Faculty Senate Approval, July 2014
Effective, Fall 2015

PROPOSED 2015 CATALOG CHANGES

CURRENT POLICY: Admission - Transfer Graduate Student

Please refer to the policy for Admission - Graduate Student in this Catalog for admission criteria for transfer students. For policies regarding transfer and advanced standing admissions to the College of Podiatric Medicine, please refer to that college's section of this Catalog.

A maximum of 12 semester credits hours from accredited institutions offering the master's degree may be accepted for transfer towards a master's degree. A master's degree and 12 semester credit hours (or maximum 44 semester hours of graduate credit) from accredited institutions may be accepted for transfer towards a doctoral degree.

In both instances, the following must occur:

1. Graduate credit was received from that institution.
2. The work was of B grade or better quality
3. The work fits into the student's program at Kent State
4. Credit is less than six years old for a master's degree and less than nine years old for a doctorate at the time the degree is conferred at Kent State.
5. An official transcript with an accompanying explanatory letter is filed in the department.
6. The student's advisor, department graduate committee and college dean approve.

An "accredited" institution is one that is approved or accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency (e.g., North Central Association of Colleges and Schools) for graduate-level work.

PROPOSED POLICY: Transfer of Graduate Credit

Graduate credit earned either at Kent State University or another university before admission into a given graduate program may be transferred into that program. A maximum of 12 semester credit hours may be transferred into the master's degree, the Educational Specialist degree or the doctoral degree. Some programs may have a lower maximum. Credits should be transferred at the time the student is admitted to the program, but no later than the end of the second semester of enrollment in that program.

Students who wish to have credits considered for transfer should petition the graduate program. The program can accept or reject such credits at its own discretion, regardless of the discipline or institution in which the credits were earned.

The following conditions must be satisfied in order to transfer graduate credit:

1. The credit was earned at an accredited university (or international equivalent).
2. The credit was not used for a previously awarded degree.
3. The student earned, at minimum, a grade of B or satisfactory in each course for which credit is to be transferred.
4. The work fits into the student's program-of study.
5. The credit is less than six years old for a master's degree and less than nine years old for a doctoral degree at the time the degree is conferred.
6. The student's petition for transfer credit is filed with the program and college. If the credit was earned at another university, an official transcript must be filed with the petition for transfer credit.
7. The student's advisor, department chair/school director and college dean approve.

Transfer credits from another university count in the student's total earned hours but do not count in the student's graduate grade point average (GPA). Credits transferred from Kent State University count in the student's total earned hours and in the student's graduate GPA.

Normally, the number of credit hours transferred from a particular course cannot exceed the number of credit hours given for a Kent State course that covers equivalent material.

Students who wish to transfer credits taken outside the university after matriculating into a Kent State University program must obtain approval from their program for those transfer credits in advance of taking the outside courses.

MARKED-UP CURRENT POLICY TO REFLECT CHANGES

Admission - Transfer of Graduate Student Credit

~~Please refer to the policy for Admission—Graduate Student in this Catalog for admission criteria for transfer students. For policies regarding transfer and advanced standing admissions to the College of Podiatric Medicine, please refer to that college's section of this Catalog.~~

Graduate credit earned either at Kent State University or another university before admission into a given graduate program may be transferred into that program. A maximum of 12 semester credits hours from accredited institutions offering may be transferred into the master's degree may be accepted for transfer towards a, the Educational Specialist degree. A master's degree and 12 semester credit hours (or maximum 44 semester hours of graduate credit) from accredited institutions may be accepted for transfer towards a or the doctoral degree. Some programs may have a lower maximum. Credits should be transferred at the time the student is admitted to the program, but no later than the end of the second semester of enrollment in that program.

Students who wish to have credits considered for transfer should petition the graduate program. The program can accept or reject such credits at its own discretion, regardless of the discipline or institution in which the credits were earned.

~~In both instances, the following must occur:~~

The following conditions must be satisfied in order to transfer graduate credit:

- ~~1. Graduate~~ The credit was received from that institution earned at an accredited university (or international equivalent).
- ~~2. The credit was not used for a previously awarded degree.~~
- ~~2.3. The work was student earned, at minimum, a grade of B grade or better quality or satisfactory in each course for which credit is to be transferred.~~
- ~~3.4. The work fits into the student's program at Kent State of study.~~
- ~~4.5. Credit~~ The credit is less than six years old for a master's degree and less than nine years old for a doctorate doctoral degree at the time the degree is conferred at Kent State.
- ~~5. An official transcript with an accompanying explanatory letter is filed in the department.~~
- ~~6. The student's petition for transfer credit is filed with the program and college. If the credit was earned at another university, an official transcript must be filed with the petition for transfer credit.~~
- ~~6.7. The student's advisor, department graduate committee chair/school director and college dean approve.~~

~~An "accredited" institution is one that is approved or accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency (e.g., North Central Association of Colleges and Schools) for graduate-level work.~~

Transfer credits from another university count in the student's total earned hours but do not count in the student's graduate grade point average (GPA). Credits transferred from Kent State University count in the student's total earned hours and in the student's graduate GPA.

Normally, the number of credit hours transferred from a particular course cannot exceed the number of credit hours given for a Kent State course that covers equivalent material.

Students who wish to transfer credits taken outside the university after matriculating into a Kent State University program must obtain approval from their program for those transfer credits in advance of taking the outside courses.

BACKGROUND

The Code of Federal Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46) Subpart A (a.k.a the Common Rule) provides regulations for IRB functions, operations and membership, review procedures, criteria for approval of research, general requirements for informed consent, and other related areas.

In general, the current administrative policies governing the conduct of the IRB and Human Subjects research at Kent State University, as provided in the University Policy Register, are not in complete alignment with federal regulations. In addition, they are detailed and prescriptive in some areas and silent in other areas. In some areas, the policies prescribed are more stringent than federal regulations and as a result prevent faculty from carrying out research that is routinely performed at other Ohio universities as well as nationwide. In some cases, this places our faculty at a disadvantage when competing for external funding and prevents faculty from performing cutting edge research.

The purpose of the proposed changes is to modernize the administrative policies by tying them to federal regulations. Thus, under these new administrative policies, the IRB will adhere to federal regulations in evaluating human subjects research protocols. As a consequence, when federal regulations change, the IRB will be able to adopt new regulations quickly. It is important to note that nothing in the proposed administrative policy prevents the IRB from adopting and applying more stringent evaluation criteria than the federal regulations, if circumstances at the university warrant.

In preparing the proposed changes, the following procedure was followed.

- In response to a request from a researcher, the IRB unanimously agreed to initiate a review of the current university administrative policies governing human subjects research.
- The IRB policy committee performed a review and reported back to the IRB that changes to the policy were desirable.
- IRB policy committee, in collaboration with the interim chair of the IRB, the Director of Research Compliance and university legal counsel drafted a revised administrative policy.
- The revised policy was reviewed by the IRB and approved unanimously.
- The revised policy was reviewed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Ultimately, the revised policy will:

- Better reflect the regulatory requirements of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) [(45 CFR 46.102)] and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations [(21 CFR 50.3; 21 CFR 56.103; 21 CFR 312.3; 21 CFR 812.3)], and as such regulations may be amended in the future.
- Allow the Kent State IRB to review and approve research involving human subjects in compliance with the applicable federal regulations rather than necessarily imposing more restrictive regulatory oversight that is not consistent with regulations.
- Allow the Kent State IRB to respond rapidly to and align with changes in federal human subjects research regulations.
- Allow Kent State researchers to collaborate with researchers at other institutions, engage in cutting edge research, and compete more successfully for funding support.

3342-3-03.2 Administrative policy regarding research involving human subjects

(A) Purpose.

- (1) The university, in the course of carrying out its teaching, research, and service missions, engages in research involving the use of human subjects across a wide array of academic disciplines and administrative functions. In order to protect the rights, well-being, and personal privacy of individuals as per guidelines and statutes, to assure a favorable climate for the conduct of scientific inquiry, and to protect the interests of the university, the policies and procedures described below have been established for the conduct of investigations and educational projects involving human subjects.

(B) Scope.

- (1) This policy shall apply to all activities conducted by, or under the auspices of the university, irrespective of the funding source, that meet the criteria for:
 - (a) “research” involving “human subjects,” as defined in the Department of Health and Human Service (DHHS) regulations [45 CFR 46.102] as such regulations may be amended, and/or
 - (b) a “clinical investigation” involving “human subjects” or “subjects,” as defined in Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations [21 CFR 50.3; 21 CFR 56.103; 21 CFR 312.3; 21 CFR 812.3], as such regulations may be amended. This includes graduate theses or dissertations.

(C) Implementation.

- (1) All members of the university community, including all faculty, staff, and students engaged in research recognize and share in the responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects.

- (2) No research involving human subjects shall be initiated until approval or exemption has been granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).
 - (3) Under the approved federal-wide assurance (FWA) provided by the university to DHHS, all research involving human subjects, and the oversight of such research shall be guided by the ethical principles set forth in the Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research, and performed in compliance with the regulations set forth by DHHS at 45 CFR. part 46.
 - (4) For clinical investigations involving drugs, biologics, medical devices, and other test articles, the university shall comply with human subjects research regulations established by the FDA for clinical investigations [21 CFR. 50; 56; 312, and 812].
 - (5) The university shall conform with other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations germane to human subjects research.
 - (6) Investigations conducted by university students in connection with academic work must be supervised by a faculty member, who will refer such proposals to the IRB for review. For student research, the faculty advisor is assumed the principal investigator in regards to IRB applications.
- (D) Authority and Responsibility.
- (1) The IRBs designated under the university's FWA are the principal mechanism by which the university reviews proposed research to ensure that it is planned and conducted in a manner consistent with applicable law and policy, and that the rights and welfare of human research participants are adequately protected. The responsibilities of the IRB include, but are not limited to:
 - (a) reviewing, approving, exempting, requesting modifications to, or denying proposed research involving human subjects to ensure that it is planned and conducted in a manner consistent with applicable law and policy, and that the rights and welfare of human subjects are adequately

protected. [45 CFR 46.109(a)]. Notwithstanding the preceding, research that has been approved by the IRB may be subject to further review and approval or disapproval by the provost or the provost's designee. No university official, however, may approve research that has not been approved by the IRB [45 CFR 46.112];

- (b) conducting continuing review of research approved by the IRB, at intervals not less than once per year, including as necessary, observing, or having a third party observe, the consent process and investigational activity; or requesting and inspecting information related to human participant research activity. [45 CFR 46.109(e)]
 - (c) suspending or terminating approval of research activity that is not being conducted in accordance with the requirements established by the IRB for a particular research activity, has been associated with serious harm to research participants, or that is not otherwise in accordance with federal human subject research regulations or university policy. [45 CFR 46.113]
 - (d) reporting to appropriate university and federal officials, and as applicable, any department or agency head:
 - (i) unanticipated problems involving risks to research participants or others and serious or continuing noncompliance with this policy or the requirements or determinations of the IRB. [45 CFR 46.103 (5)].
 - (ii) any suspension or termination of IRB approval. [45 CFR 46.103 (5)]
 - (e) contributing to the development and implementation of administrative policies and procedures consistent with federal regulations and best practices.
- (2) Sponsored projects involving human subjects are subject to rule 3342-3-04.1 of the Administrative code.

- (3) The institutional official, by appointment from the Provost, shall represent the university in providing assurance to the federal government that the university will comply with federal human subject research regulations, and shall be responsible for ensuring that all regulatory and programmatic requirements for the conduct of human participant research at the university are met. [45 CFR 46.103(b)(5)(c)]

CURRENT POLICY with Revisions

3 -03.2

Administrative policy regarding research involving human subjects

- (A) Purpose. The university, in the course of carrying out its teaching, research, and service missions, engages in research involving the use of human subjects across a wide array of academic disciplines and administrative functions. In order to protect the rights, well-being, and personal privacy of individuals, to assure a favorable climate for the conduct of scientific inquiry, and to protect the interests of the university, the policies and procedures described below have been established for the conduct of investigations and educational projects involving human beings subjects. To implement these policies and procedures, the Kent State University institutional review board (the human subjects review board hereinafter called IRB), under the direction of the provost or designee, will be established. ~~The IRB and policies and procedures are in accordance with United States department of health and human services regulations for the protection of human research subjects (45 CFR 46, as amended).~~
- (B) Responsibilities of the IRB. The IRB, under the direction of the provost affairs or designee, has the following responsibilities:- Scope.
- (1) ~~To review on a continuing basis the university's policies and procedures with respect to the use of human subjects, and to establish guidelines and to make policy recommendations as desirable or necessary;~~ This policy shall apply to all activities conducted by, or under the auspices of the university, irrespective of the funding source, that meet the criteria for:
- (a) "research" involving "human subjects," as defined in the Department of Health and Human Service (DHHS) regulations [45 CFR 46.102] as such regulations may be amended, and/or
- (b) a "clinical investigation" involving "human subjects" or "subjects," as defined in Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations [21 CFR 50.3; 21 CFR 56.103; 21 CFR 312.3; 21 CFR 812.3], as such regulations may be amended. This includes graduate theses or dissertations.
- (2) ~~To review all research projects involving human subjects with authority to approve, require modification, disapprove, or terminate. The IRB must determine that:~~
- (a) ~~Risks to subjects are minimized;~~
- (b) ~~Risks are reasonable in relation to benefits;~~
- (c) ~~Selection of subjects is equitable;~~
- (d) ~~That informed consent is obtained and documents, when appropriate, and~~
- (e) ~~There are adequate provisions to protect privacy of subjects and confidentiality of data.~~
- (3) ~~To provide assistance and advice in research involving human subjects, and to implement the guidelines and policies of the university and the federal government through the office of research and graduate studies which has general administrative responsibility for human subject matters.~~

(C) Implementation. General principles. The following general principles apply equally to all research projects involving human subjects, whether carried out solely with university resources or with the assistance of outside funds. The university has responsibility for communicating and explaining these principles to university personnel, and for providing procedural guidelines to effect their observance.

- (1) The university and the individual members of its faculty, staff, and student body engaged in research projects recognize their All members of the university community, including all faculty, staff, and students engaged in research recognize and share in the responsibility for protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects.
- (2) ~~No investigation~~ No research involving human subjects shall be initiated until approval or exemption has been granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).
- (3) All externally funded projects involving human subjects will be reviewed before submission of the proposal or within thirty days after submission if allowed by agency guidelines. Under the approved federal-wide assurance (FWA) provided by the university to DHHS, all research involving human subjects, and the oversight of such research shall be guided by the ethical principles set forth in the Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research, and performed in compliance with the regulations set forth by DHHS at 45 CFR. part 46.
- (4) Appropriate professional attention and facilities shall be provided to insure the safety and well-being of human subjects. No subject in an investigation shall be exposed to unreasonable risk to physical, psychological, or social health or well-being. In the event of risk it must be determined that the benefits derived outweigh the risks and no appropriate alternative procedures apply. For clinical investigations involving drugs, biologics, medical devices, and other test articles, the university shall comply with human subjects research regulations established by the FDA for clinical investigations. [21 CFR. 50; 56; 312, and 812]
- (5) The confidentiality of information received from subjects in experiments or respondents to questionnaires, profiles and interviews shall be fully protected, both during and after the conduct of an investigation. The university shall conform with other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations germane to human subjects research.
- (6) The confidentiality of information received from subjects in experiments or respondents to questionnaires, profiles and interviews shall be fully protected, both during and after the conduct of an investigation. Investigations conducted by university students in connection with academic work must be supervised by a faculty member, who will refer such proposals to the IRB for review. For student research, the faculty advisor is assumed the principal investigator in regards to IRB applications.
- (7) ~~Where a consent form is required, the subject must be provided a copy of the form.~~
- (8) ~~A request by any subject for withdrawal from an investigation shall be honored promptly without penalty.~~
- (9) ~~The university shall negotiate and maintain necessary assurance of compliance as required by the office for protection from research risks, United States department of health and human services.~~

(D) Scope: Authority and Responsibility. It is not the intent of these rules to interfere with the normal delivery of health care and clinical services by members of the university, or with usual instructional practices. Otherwise, this policy applies as follows:

- (1) To all research investigations involving human subjects whether supported by university funds, private funds, or governmental funds. This includes graduate theses or dissertations and other student directed research. (For student research the faculty advisor is assumed to be the responsible investigator.) The IRBs designated under the university's FWA are the principal mechanism by which the university reviews proposed research to ensure that it is planned and conducted in a manner consistent with applicable law and policy, and that the rights and welfare of human research participants are adequately protected. The responsibilities of the IRB include, but are not limited to:
 - (a) reviewing, approving, exempting, requesting modifications to, or denying proposed research involving human subjects to ensure that it is planned and conducted in a manner consistent with applicable law and policy, and that the rights and welfare of human subjects are adequately protected. [45 CFR 46.109(a)]. Notwithstanding the preceding, research that has been approved by the IRB may be subject to further review and approval or disapproval by the provost or the provost's designee. No university official, however, may approve research that has not been approved by the IRB [45 CFR 46.112];
 - (b) conducting continuing review of research approved by the IRB, at intervals not less than once per year, including as necessary, observing, or having a third party observe, the consent process and investigational activity; or requesting and inspecting information related to human participant research activity. [45 CFR 46.109(e)]
 - (c) suspending or terminating approval of research activity that is not being conducted in accordance with the requirements established by the IRB for a particular research activity, has been associated with serious harm to research participants, or that is not otherwise in accordance with federal human subject research regulations or university policy. [45 CFR 46.113]
 - (d) reporting to appropriate university and federal officials, and as applicable, any department or agency head:
 - (i) unanticipated problems involving risks to research participants or others and serious or continuing noncompliance with this policy or the requirements or determinations of the IRB. [45 CFR 46.103 (5)]
 - (ii) any suspension or termination of IRB approval. [45 CFR 46.103 (5)]
 - (e) contributing to the development and implementation of administrative policies and procedures consistent with federal regulations and best practices.
- (2) Investigations conducted by university students in connection with academic work must be supervised by a faculty member, who will refer such proposals to the institutional review board designee for initial review and for decision as to whether full IRB review is necessary. Sponsored projects involving human subjects are subject to rule 3342-3-04.1 of the Administrative code.
- (3) The institutional official, by appointment from the Provost, shall represent the university in providing assurance to the federal government that the university will comply with federal human subject research regulations, and shall be responsible for ensuring that all regulatory and

programmatic requirements for the conduct of human participant research at the university are met. [45 CFR 46.103(b)(5)(c)]

(E) Procedures. The specific review procedures are as follows:

- (1) Experienced IRB members are assigned responsibility for preliminary review of all human subject research in a specified department or group of departments.
- (2) Before beginning a project, the investigator shall submit an "Application For Approval To Use Human Subjects In Research" form to the designated reviewer. The investigator shall include in the application a description of all research procedures and the manner in which the rights and welfare of the participants are assured, copies of consent forms, and questionnaires to be used.
- (3) The reviewer makes the determination whether the research is level one and exempt from further review and can begin immediately; level two can require expedited approval; or level three requiring full board review for approval.
- (4) Upon receiving notification of approval, the investigator can initiate the research project.
- (5) Subjects must be informed of the purpose of the research, the procedures to be used, the degree of risk or discomfort and the anticipated benefits. The subject must know that participation is voluntary and that he/she can withdraw at any time without penalty. Consent of the subject is usually documented on a consent form which the subject or guardian signs. The consent form contains the basic elements of informed consent in language understandable to the subject including information on whom to contact for answers to questions or problems.
- (6) Any approved investigation which undergoes subsequent modifications affecting the rights or welfare of the human subjects involved must be resubmitted. It shall be the responsibility of the investigator or project director to request such review prior to initiating the modification.
- (7) Research involving other than legally competent adults (such as children, people with mental disabilities, etc.) shall require written informed consent from parents, guardian or other appropriate authority as well as the subject's assent.
 - (a) For the purpose of this rule, "people with mental disabilities" means persons aged 18 and older with any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. Or any other condition defined in Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 28 CFR 35.
- (8) Research involving special populations such as pregnant women and prisoners must be conducted in accordance with appropriate regulations.
- (9) Approval of a proposed investigation is granted for a period of no more than one year. Continuation or renewal proposals must receive the same critical review as initial applications.
- (10) If a subject registers a complaint, the investigator shall attempt to relieve the complaint. If the investigator finds that the complainant cannot be satisfied, the investigator shall refer the complainant to the institutional review board or to the office of research and graduate studies.
- (11) If a subject experiences any harm, physical, emotional, or mental, as a result of an approved investigation, the principal investigator must fully report the circumstances to the institutional review board or to the office of research and graduate studies.



Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes of the Meeting

**May 28, 2014
(Incoming Executive Committee)**

Present: Lee Fox-Cardamone (Chair), Deb Smith (Vice Chair), Tom Janson (Secretary),
Paul Farrell (Past Chair), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: Fred Smith (At-Large)

1. Call to Order

Chair Lee Fox called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office following the meeting of the out-going executive committee chaired by Paul Farrell.

2. Appointment of the Past Chair

As past chair of the Faculty Senate, Senator Paul Farrell was appointed as an ex officio member of the executive committee for the AY 2014-2015.

3. Nominations for Two Additional Executive Committee Senators

The executive committee advised Chair Lee Fox regarding the appointment of two senators to the executive committee. A list of names was generated. Chair Fox will phone senators requesting their service.

4. Future Planning Items

- a. Fall Retreat: Possible topics for the Fall 2014
- b. Goals: Ideas from the Fall 2013 Retreat

The executive committee briefly discussed the need to begin preparing for the Faculty Senate Fall Retreat, but tabled discussion to the next meeting when the newly appointed members will be present.

5. Additional Items

Meeting dates for the summer were proposed. Tess will contact the Provost's office to coordinate a possible meeting with the Provost during the summer months.

Char Reed may be contacting the executive committee regarding possible meeting dates with President-elect, Beverly Warren.

6. Adjournment

Chair Lee Fox adjourned the meeting at 4:53 p.m.

Tom Janson, Secretary
Faculty Senate

Dates: Proposed Executive Committee meeting: June 18, 2014
Proposed Executive Committee meeting: June 25, 2014
Proposed Executive Committee meeting: July 2, 2014
Faculty Senate meeting, July 21, 2014
Proposed Executive Committee meeting: July 28, 2014



Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes of the Meeting

June 18, 2014

Present: Lee Fox-Cardamone (Chair), Deb Smith (Vice Chair), Tom Janson (Secretary), Fred Smith (At-Large), Kathy Wilson (Appointed), Paul Farrell (Appointed Past Chair), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: David Dees (Appointed)

Guests: Senator Linda Williams

1. Call to Order

Chair Fox called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office.

2. Meeting Minutes for Approval

A. Faculty Senate meeting minutes of May 12, 2014

The minutes were corrected and approved, motion by Vice Chair Deb Smith, second by Senator Fred Smith. The minutes will be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval at the July 2, 2014 senate meeting.

B. Executive Committee meeting minutes of May 28, 2014

The minutes were approved, motion by Secretary Janson, second by Vice Chair Deb Smith.

3. Educational Policies Council (EPC)

The Executive Committee reviewed the actions of the May 19, 2014 meeting of the EPC. The following actions were discussed in great detail. Placement on the agenda for the July Faculty Senate meeting will be decided at a future meeting.

Action Items

Office of the Provost

- A. Establishment of Cooperative Education Program that will allow eligible undergraduate students to augment their academic study at Kent State University with an approved semester of full-time, career-related employment while still remaining a full-time student.**

Graduate Studies

- B. Revision of Admission-Transfer Graduate Student policy to provide clarification on the transfer of credit into master's, doctoral and EdS degrees; the transfer of credit that was earned at Kent State University; and the conditions surrounding the transfer of credits (e.g., role of the student, time limits, impact on the student's GPA). Name of the policy changes to Transfer of Graduate Credit.
- C. Revision of six academic policies to clarify and update information and language as they pertain to graduate students, and not to change the policies' intent. The policies are Admission-Former Kent State Student, Admission-Non-Degree Student, Course Repeat Policies, Enrollment-Graduate, Time limits for Graduate Degrees Transient Work at another University.

Undergraduate Studies

- D. Revision of Placement Testing policy due to the uniform statewide standards established by the Ohio Board of Regents to determine testing thresholds for remediation-free status. Name of policy changes to University Readiness Standards.

Lesser Action Item

College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies

- E. Establishment of Religion Studies [RELS] concentration in the Classics [CLSS] major within the Bachelor of Arts [BA] degree. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are unchanged at 120.

The committee expressed among its members the feeling of erosion of faculty governance due to a lack of substantial and official faculty involvement. The Philosophy Department formerly housed the Religious Studies minor while the Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies (MCLS) is identified in the EPC agenda as the new home of the Religion Studies concentration in the Classics major. Although MCLS faculty approved the creation of the concentration, the Philosophy faculty were not involved in its relocation and in the creation of the concentration and the center within which it may be housed.

4. Experiential Learning Requirement (ELR)

Senator Linda Williams joined the meeting for a discussion of the implementation of the ELR which was approved by Faculty Senate in 2011 and was first listed in the 2012 University Catalog. The committee agreed that it may be time to restate to the University community that the ELR is a flexible requirement. It may be satisfied by undergraduate students in one of several ways, i.e., by completing an program-approved ELR course, by completing an ELR non-course activity approved at the unit and College level, or by completing an ELR Plus-1 credit course in which a student earns one additional credit in an existing course with faculty permission. Any alteration of the above options such as requiring a specific course is not in the spirit of the ELR approved policy.

Following discussion it was decided that this topic will be discussed with the Provost at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Senator Williams then excused herself from the meeting.

5. Summer Courses

The committee briefly discussed the policy for TT and NTT faculty hiring for teaching summer courses. The University's decision to allow pro-rated salary in courses that do not make enrollment minimums as well as formulas used to determine such minimums may cause highly qualified faculty not to accept summer assignments. This is unfortunate because course offerings needed by students may be hindered during the summer sessions. The committee forwarded this topic to the RCM committee.

6. Reviews of Individuals in Interim Positions

The Executive Committee discussed Interim appointments to academic administrative positions. The number of years an appointee remains as interim without being subject to a formal review is troublesome. This is particularly true of college deans. The Collective Bargaining Agreement limits Campus interim deans to a one-year term. A policy needs to be created. The topic will be discussed with the Provost at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

7. Posted Summer Office Hours

University policy governing office hours is both general and vague. Members of the Executive Committee suggest that the five-hour per-week policy be revised to allow major differences for both online and summer teaching. The matter is hereby transmitted to the Professional Standards Committee.

8. Announcements of Curricular Changes

It has come to light that proposed curricular changes have been disseminated prior to formal approval of the Faculty Senate. This practice violates the Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws which are recorded in the University Policy Register. The committee will share this matter with the Provost at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

9. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Practice

Recently there have been a number of disturbing cases where the Provost has turned down tenure and promotion candidates who have unanimous support of their colleagues, chairs/school directors and deans, and a positive recommendation from the Provost advisory committees. The Policy Register affirms the support of faculty colleagues in the following excerpt:

(E) Procedure for making decisions regarding tenure.

- (1) Due process is integral to an effective tenure policy. The guiding premise in the following procedure is that the essential phases in the tenure consideration occur at the unit level and at the regional campus (if applicable). Assessments and the recommendations beyond these levels should reflect due regard for

the professional judgment and recommendations made at the unit and regional campus levels. Review and assessment by extra-unit and extra-regional campus faculty and the academic administration are necessary to insure the integrity of the system.

Data is needed on actions by the Provost and the Provost Advisory Committees in order to investigate the matter. There should be “no surprises” at this level of approval. This is a topic for further discussion by the Executive Committee.

10. Senate Appointments to EPC, FaSBAC and CoC

Nominations were made by various members of the Executive Committee. Chair Fox will contact the nominees requesting participation as listed below.

- A. Educational Policies Council (EPC) Undergraduate Council (3 senators)
- B. Educational Policies Council (EPC) Graduate Council (3 senators)
- C. Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FaSBAC) (2 senators, 3 non-senators)
- D. Committee on Committees (CoC) (2 senators, 5 non-senators)

11. Administrative Policy Regarding the Use of Human Subjects in Research

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) subcommittee, IRB Policy Committee (IPC) and the University Privacy Officer developed a revised policy to better reflect the regulatory requirements of the Department of Health and Human Service and Food and Drug Administration regulations as such regulations are amended; to allow Kent State University IRB to review and approve research involving human subjects in compliance with the applicable federal regulations rather than imposing more restrictive regulatory oversight; and to enable the IPC to develop IRB committee policies and procedures that align with the changing federal policies and guidelines and best practices used at other institutions.

The IPC requested confirmation from the Executive Committee that the minimal changes listed above, which basically abide by federal law, should be approved. Although the committee didn't see any obvious issues with the changes that need to be made, the committee thought it best that a presentation be prepared for a future Faculty Senate meeting at which time questions from the senate could be answered and incorporate recommended changes.

12. Greetings from President Warren

Chair Fox reported that President Warren accepted the invitation to speak at the next Faculty Senate meeting scheduled for July 21, 2014. President Warren will also attend an Executive Committee Meeting scheduled for July 2, 2014, and requested that the committee join her for dinner at her home on an evening to be announced. Tess Kail will collect committee members' summer schedules to determine a suitable evening date.

13. Faculty Senate Newsletter

Secretary Janson asked about the continuation of the Faculty Senate Newsletter. Vice Chair Deb Smith will take on the authorship of the newsletter. Secretary Janson hoped for a more informative and timely post that will coincide with the writing of the Faculty Senate meeting minutes.

14. Adjournment

Chair Fox adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Tom Janson, Secretary
Faculty Senate

Dates: Executive Committee meeting with Provost Diacon: June 25, 2014
Executive Committee meeting with President Warren: July 2, 2014
Faculty Senate meeting, July 21, 2014
Executive Committee meeting: July 28, 2014



Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes of the Meeting

June 25, 2014

Present: Lee Fox-Cardamone (Chair), Deb Smith (Vice Chair), Tom Janson (Secretary), Fred Smith (At-Large), David Dees (Appointed), Paul Farrell (Appointed Past Chair), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: Kathy Wilson (Appointed)

1. Call to Order

Chair Fox called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office.

2. FPDC Reorganization

Chair Fox called on Senator Dees to discuss the status of the Faculty Professional Development Center (FPDC) reorganization. Several aspects of the center are being updated; one important step is to update the membership roster of The Center for Teaching and Learning Council Membership. Senator Dees presented a proposed roster identifying which areas of the university each member represents, as well as how each member is appointed.

Following discussion of the various council member positions, a motion (D. Smith/F. Smith) was made to ensure that the two Provost appointed members have faculty rank. The proposed wording is as follows: a. One chair or director with faculty rank, and, b. one member of the Academic Affairs Administrative Council with faculty rank. The underlined words constitute changes to the committee "means of appointment." The motion was approved.

Also in regard to the committee make-up, Senator Dees would like committee members' appointment years to be staggered in order to assure consistency. The entire item is hereby referred to the Committee on Committees.

3. Meeting Minutes for Approval: Executive Committee meeting minutes of June 18, 2014

Following discussion, a motion to approve the minutes of June 18, 2014 as amended (F.Smith/D.Smith) was approved.

4. May EPC Items

Four items from the May 19, 2014 meeting of the Educational Policies Council (EPC) were discussed. A motion was made (D. Smith/T. Janson) to send items A. and B. below to the Faculty Senate as action items, and to approve items C. and D. below at the Executive Committee level. The motion passed.

Add to the Senate Agenda as Action Items

- A. Office of the Provost: Establishment of Cooperative Education Program that will allow eligible undergraduate students to augment their academic study at Kent State University with an approved semester of full-time, career-related employment while still remaining a full-time student. Effective Fall 2014.
- B. Graduate Studies: Revision of Admission-Transfer Graduate Student policy to provide clarification on the transfer of credit into master's, doctoral and EdS degrees; the transfer of credit that was earned at Kent State University; and the conditions surrounding the transfer of credits (e.g., role of the student, time limits, impact on the student's GPA). Name of policy changes to Transfer of Graduate Credit. Effective Fall 2014.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

- C. Graduate Studies: Revision of six academic policies to clarify and update information and language as they pertain to graduate students, and not to change the policies' intent. The policies are Admission-Former Kent State Student, Admission - Non-Degree Student, Course Repeat Policies, Enrollment - Graduate, Time Limits for Graduate Degrees, and Transient Work at Another University. Effective Fall 2014.
- D. Undergraduate Studies: Revision of Placement Testing policy due to the uniform statewide standards established by the Ohio Board of Regents to determine testing thresholds for remediation-free status. Name of policy changes to University Readiness Standards. Effective Fall 2014.

5. RCM Review

The Executive Committee referred to a summary of questions based on discussion at the fall semester 2013 Faculty Senate Retreat and later at the November 4, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting when a resolution was passed to review how Responsibility Center Management (RCM) has supported and/or hindered the academic mission of the university. The existing questions were divided into two categories, academic quality and clarification of process/transparency. Chair Fox appointed a four-member sub-committee consisting of Senators Fox, Farrell, D. Smith and Wilson to organize and reword the list of RCM questions. These will then be approved by the Executive Committee and then forwarded to the Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FaSBAC) with an expected response date to the Faculty Senate no later than May 2015. Senator Farrell also requested that the following data be provided to the Senate: percentage of the university budget allocated separately over the last five to eight years for both faculty and for administrators (including staff members and professional advisors).

6. Parliamentarian

The Executive Committee agreed that a senator should serve as parliamentarian. A motion was made (Dees/D. Smith) to explore the possibility of appointing a parliamentarian. The motion was approved. Chair Fox will move forward with the appointment.

7. Executive Committee Meeting Schedule, Fall Semester 2014

Committee members fall teaching schedules were compared so as to identify possible days and times for committee meetings. Tess Kail will send an update to the committee for comments.

8. Faculty Senate Fall Retreat 2014

Chair Fox appointed a sub-committee consisting of the at-large and appointed members of the Executive Committee to plan a fall semester retreat. Senators Dees, F. Smith and Wilson will present ideas for the retreat at a future meeting.

9. Set Agenda for the July 21, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting

Chair Fox reminded the group that President Beverly Warren will address the Senate. The committee discussed the various additional agenda items that need to be included.

10. New Business

- A. Chair Fox reported that Senator Linda Williams requests the Executive Committee invite an appropriate member from the Division of Human Resources to discuss retirement accounts. Chair Fox will prepare this visit for a future meeting.
- B. The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, July 2, 2014 in the Urban Conference Room. The meeting will begin at 3:30 p.m. and the Provost will join the meeting at 4:00 p.m. Provost Diacon has invited Ebony Pringle to the meeting to discuss the Experiential Learning Policy. The Executive Committee also has a list of topics to present to the Provost. Following the meeting, the Committee and the Provost are invited to President Warren's home for dinner.
- C. The undergraduate advising policy is now in print. The Executive Committee would like to know several points of procedure: Is the process in place for all undergraduate students? Do students know to make appointments with professional advisors in the colleges rather than with their faculty advisors? What is the faculty role in undergraduate mandatory advising?

11. Adjournment

Chair Fox adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.