



FACULTY SENATE

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests **DATE:** September 2, 2014
FROM: Lee Fox-Cardamone, Chair of the Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Agenda and Materials for the September 8, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the September 8th 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 July 21, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
4. President's Remarks
5. Chair's Remarks
 - a. Correction in Meeting Minutes of May 12, 2014
6. Reports:
 - a. Presentation on CurricUNET software by the Office of Curriculum Services
 - b. A Look at Academics in Athletics (presented by Randal L. Richmond, Associate Athletic Director)
7. EPC Action Items:
 - a. Office of the Provost: Revision of the name of the Faculty Professional Development Center to the Center for Teaching and Learning to reflect the center's shift in focus. Effective Spring 2015.
 - b. Regional College: Establishment of Respiratory Care major within the Bachelor of Science degree, to be offered fully online and administered by the Ashtabula Campus. Included in the proposal is establishment of 10 RSPC courses. The major is a two-year completer program for certified or registered respiratory therapists who hold an accredited associate degree in respiratory therapy. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 120. Effective Fall 2015.
8. Old Business: Reaffirmation of Proposal to amend the Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws in order to establish Senate membership for the Regional College originally submitted on September 13, 2010.
9. Announcements / Statements for the Record
10. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment



FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Meeting
 July 21, 2014

{{waiting on some attendance confirmations}} hard copies at Monday's meeting will show the correct attendance for July 21, 2014.

1. Call to Order

At 3:20 p.m. in the Governance Chambers, Chair Fox called the summer meeting of the Faculty Senate to order and welcomed everyone.

2. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Secretary Tom Janson called the roll.

3. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of May 12, 2014

Senators Stoker/Roxburgh moved approval. The minutes were approved with minor corrections.

4. Remarks from President Beverly Warren

President Warren gave her first address to the Faculty Senate by saying that the faculty define the strength of the university and that each faculty member has a role to play. She shared her excitement in joining the ranks at Kent State and pledged that the faculty and administration will work together in the framework of shared governance; She noted that not everything would require a faculty vote, but instead we will work together to advance the common good, with an opportunity to improve the lines of communication. Although our roles may be different, our beliefs and goals are the same. And although we will not always agree, the university community will develop knowledge of the common good through understanding and respect, and thereby come to logical agreement. Everyone needs the willingness to listen to all points of view in order to make collective decisions for the greater good. It is a challenge to think differently and tackle tough decisions together.

President Warren announced her Presidential Listening Tour, the goal of which is for her to listen and learn about the distinctiveness of Kent State in conversations with the Kent State community and to learn from faculty who have a willingness to share the heart of KSU, specifically, what is our distinctive excellence and what can we do better in working together for the common good?

5. Chair's Remarks

The remarks by Chair Fox are attached.

6. Educational Policies Council (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.

Associate Provost Melody Tankersley presented the action item as supported by the EPC. This action is in response to alumni and employer requests that students gain hands-on experience. Senator Kerns corrected a typo in the documentation to correctly read that a 2.75 GPA is required to participate. Senator Uribe-Rendon drew a parallel with a similar program in the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology. Associate Provost Tankersley explained that the Cooperative Education Program is not credit bearing and does not compete with existing coursework offered at Kent State because it does not lead toward degree requirements. The proposed program does not take the place of any other field experience, and is not a program requirement. Tuition is not charged for the proposed program; however, a minimal fee (\$500) will cover the cost of maintaining full-time student status.

In response to Senator Fred Smith, Associate Provost Tankersley said that the program can be combined with experiential learning requirements. In response to Senator Feinberg, she outlined the benefits of the proposed program as job experience and the array of benefits of being a full-time student, e.g., library access, health care, etc. She said that the current goal is to pilot the program first and solve any problems that may arise before opening the program to all undergraduate students.

Senator Roxburgh asked about ultimately expanding access and how the approval process will work in other disciplines after the pilot program is completed. Departments and Schools will have the option of developing the program for their particular needs.

Senator Stoker remarked that the Cooperative Education Program should not be an unpaid program; students must be compensated for their work in industry. Associate Provost Tankersley explained that students must request the opportunity to be employed by a particular employer, and that the national norm for "co-ops" is paid positions.

Senator Kristof questioned why the proposal is limited to on-ground students and not available to fully-online degree students. This option will be explored during the pilot program. The same answer was given to Senator Smeltzer who questioned the number of times (semesters) a student is eligible to participate.

In response to Senator Kairis, Associate Provost Tankersley explained that a zero credit has been approved for the program so that the student's participation and the name of the employer will appear on the transcript.

Senator Rollick questioned a possible negative financial impact on the university through FTE calculation at the state level. Associate Provost Tankersley didn't think that the program will negatively impact the university due to the fact that graduation rates are based on a six-year period, and that relatively few students will participate.

Senator Mocioalca brought up the international student population. The administration will look into the intricacies of international student status which normally prevent employment in the United States.

Chair Fox called for a vote on the proposal to establish a Cooperative Education Program. The program was approved.

- 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.

Dean Mary Ann Stephens described the action item as a clarification and refinement of transfer credit rules for graduate students. The EPC approved action codifies and spells out uniform conditions based on current practice. Rules for transfer of graduate credit need to be clearly presented in the University Catalog.

Chair Fox asked for questions; there were no questions. Chair Fox then asked for a vote on the revision of admission-transfer graduate student policy. The action item was approved.

7. New Business: Administrative Policy Regarding Research Involving Human Subjects

Two faculty members were present at the meeting to answer questions regarding human subjects review, Professor Deborah Barnbaum, Department of Philosophy, and the Director for Initiative for Clinical and Translational Research, Dr. Douglas Delahanty, Research and Sponsored Programs.

Professor Barnbaum summarized the policy pursuant to the protection of human research subjects, informed consent cases in which research may or may not be approved using human research subject at Kent State University. This is referred to as "the common rule," which refers to federal regulations put in place by the HHS, FDA, etc., for the use of human research subjects.

The new policy will clearly state that Kent State policy is being modeled on the federal policy; it states that the university adheres to all federal policy regulations. This proposal eliminates any superfluous recommendations that Kent State may have owing to out-of-date and inconsistent wording. This will allow the university to follow federal policy as it changes in the future.

In response to questions from Senators Dees and Child, the visitors do not foresee any changes in the approval process nor in IRB practices from a faculty participation standpoint. The application forms will not change.

A motion was made (Deborah Smith/David Dees) to accept the new wording for the Administrative Policy Regarding Research involving human Subjects. Chair Fox called for a vote. The motion was approved.

8. Announcements / Statements for the Record


There were no announcements or statements.

9. Adjournment

Chair Fox-Cardamone adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Senator Tom Janson
Faculty Senate Secretary

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 not 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.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date **15-Jul-14** Curriculum Bulletin _____Effective Date **Spring 2015** Approved by EPC _____Department **Faculty Professional Development Center**College **PR - Provost**Proposal **Revise Institute**Proposal Name **revised center's name to Center for Teaching and Learning****Description of proposal:**

Since 1998, the Faculty Professional Development Center (FPDC) has been offering programming to assist with the professional expectations of faculty members at Kent State University. This center, formed through a collaborative relationship between the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the university administration, has not experienced significant changes in budget, structure and/or function over the past 15 years. In June 2013, Provost Todd Diacon requested that, through the proper shared governance processes, appropriate faculty members and administrators examine the current direction of the center and consider clarifying the mission and focus.

The FPDC Re-Design Steering Committee was formed to meet this purpose. The committee members were nominated by deans, chairs and directors, Faculty Senate and AAUP. The core working group considered all elements of the center, including name, focus, location, staffing, and consulted with faculty colleagues throughout the process. In an effort to include as many perspectives as possible, an advisory group to the steering committee, consisting of other nominated faculty colleagues as well as professional development individuals from within and outside the university, periodically provided feedback and insight as the ideas and suggestions were created. The committee has recommended a variety of changes that are included in this documentation.

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

None

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

Faculty and administrators (94) from various units across the university participated on the steering and/or advisory committee. The AAUP and Faculty Senate were consulted at various times in the process.

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 to revise the name of the
Faculty Professional Development Center
to the
Center for Teaching and Learning
to reflect the center's shift in focus**

The following is from 3343-2-03 *University Policy Regarding the Establishment or Revision of Academic Administrative Structures*.

1. The quality of the faculty, students and programs.

The Faculty Professional Development Center was established in 1998 as an independent university structure to support scholarship and scholars. Since then, the center has seen little change in its structure, budget and function. In 2013, at the request of the provost, a steering committee was formed and charged with examining the direction, mission and focus of the center.

After a careful analysis of the university support for faculty, as well as feedback from faculty and internal and external professional development educators, the steering committee identified that there is no direct unit at Kent State that provides teaching and learning support for faculty. The center, due to a broad focus and small staff, was not able to provide the in-depth support for teaching and learning that faculty were requesting. By shifting the focus of the center to teaching, learning innovation and educational support, and increasing dedicated resources, the center better serves faculty and students through improved learning environments. A name change to the Center for Teaching and Learning represents the re-conceptualized center.

The report of the steering committee is attached to the end of this proposal.

2. Centrality and coherence to the mission and strategic directions of the university and other academic units.

The mission of Kent State is to “discover, create, apply and share knowledge” in its service to its students, Ohio, the nation and the global community. This aligns with the re-focused mission of the center to provide opportunities for faculty to learn, grow and lead, as well as to support community members in the process of enhancing Kent State’s environments of learning to promote student success.

All of Kent State’s academic units provide some form of teaching and learning opportunities. Having a support structure to help with this mission is critical. Additionally, improvement for student learning is mentioned extensively in the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan. This newly refocused center will be critical to the implementation of these stated goals and objectives.

3. Comparative advantage versus other structures.

The previous Faculty Professional Development Center was under-staffed, with two full-time professionals, one part-time support staff and student workers, to provide the wide range of services that it offered to the whole university. With this more direct and specific focus, the current staffing and structure recommended by the steering committee will be able to better serve the faculty. As noted by the committee, an independent unit that focusses specifically on

improving teaching and learning does not current exist at Kent State. Having such a center will provide faculty with focused services that will help to improve classroom practices and student learning. Housing this center under another unit would diffuse the mission of helping faculty to improve student learning.

4. What makes the unit particularly appropriate for Kent State University.

Centers for teaching and learning are normative practices at universities with similar size and mission as Kent State. Given the broad range of faculty roles and responsibilities, support for teaching and assistance in researching student learning are important elements to increase student success rates.

5. Demand for the unit and for the graduates of the unit.

During the last academic year, the following faculty interactions were conducted by the FPDC:

▪ Mild interactions (large workshops/lectures, short meetings)	475
▪ Moderate interactions (small group workshops/trainings)	105
▪ Intense interactions (one-to-one sessions, peer reviews)	44

Most of these faculty interactions were focused on teaching and learning. With a more clear and stated focus, it is expected that these interactions will increase.

6. Duplication and interrelatedness of the unit's program(s) within the university, state, and region.

As noted in the attached report, the steering committee carefully examined faculty professional support throughout the university and identified that a unit specifically focused on teaching and learning was needed. Additionally, the committee also conducted an extensive examination of 32 other centers (attached list) from the region and throughout the country to identify best practices. This extensive review helped to solidify the types of services the committee suggests the re-conceptualized center should offer.

7. Efficiency and effectiveness of the unit in leveraging existing resources and expanding new resources.

The current staffing of one director, three faculty developers/leaders and two staff support allows for an easy shift to this new focus. All current professional consultants have a background in college teaching and learning and will be able to provide the services identified in the committee report. Additionally, with a more clearly defined focus and a name that better reflects the work of the center, identifying fundraising opportunities will be an easier task.

8. Administrative reporting structure.

The reporting structure will remain the same as the current Faculty Professional Development Center. The center director will report to the associate provost for faculty affairs.

9. Space and capital budget needs.

There are no required space and capital budget needs to refocus and rename the center. However, to expand services and meet the issues addressed in the steering committee report, expanding the staffing of the center would increase the quality and amount of services available to faculty.

10. A proposed operating budget with any one-time resource needs.

There is no proposed budget change in this recommendation.

11. Evaluation procedures including academic assessment procedures.

The evaluation procedures will follow the current practice. This includes an annual report to the Provost's Office, the center's Advisory Board and, as requested, to the Faculty Senate.

12. A timetable for proposal implementation.

Tentative Approval Timeline:

Senior VP and Provost:	August 2014
Educational Policies Council:	August 2014
Faculty Senate:	September 2014
Board of Trustees:	December 2014
Implementation:	January 2015

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date **30-Jan-14** Curriculum Bulletin _____Effective Date **Fall 2015** Approved by EPC _____

Department _____

College **RE - Regional College**Degree **BS - Bachelor of Science**Program Name **Respiratory Care** Program Banner Code **RSPC**

Concentration(s) _____ Concentration(s) Banner Code(s) _____

Proposal **Establish program**

Description of proposal:

The Bachelor of Science degree in Respiratory Care will be offered fully online through the Ashtabula Campus. It is designed as a completer program for certified/registered respiratory therapists who hold an accredited associate degree in respiratory therapy/care. The program will enable students to expand their career options and gain skills and knowledge to enhance their current practice; it will also support the provision of the advanced level of care required by respiratory therapists in the future.

Does proposed revision change program's total credit hours? ☐ Yes ☐ NoCurrent total credit hours: _____ Proposed total credit hours **120**

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

The proposed BS degree will articulate 2+2 with Kent State's AAS degree in Respiratory Therapy Technology (and other similar accredited associate degrees in the country). Faculty, staff and administrators will be shared among the two programs.

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

Consulted on the program development were the senior program director of nursing and allied health, the senior academic program director of the College of Nursing, nursing faculty, AAS degree's Respiratory Therapy Advisory Committee, assistant academic dean for the Ashtabula Campus, Ashtabula Campus library services and business affairs.

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

Yvonne George
Department Chair / School Director

4/9/14

David A. Stocker
Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

4/15/14

Wanda Thomas
College Dean (or designee)

5/5/14

Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

1/1/

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

1/1/



Board of Regents

University System of Ohio

John R. Kasich, Governor

John Carey, Chancellor

Request for Approval

Submitted by
Kent State University

Establishment of a
Bachelor of Science Degree in
Respiratory Care

Date to come



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Request.....	3
Section 1: Introduction	3
1.1 Brief summary of the request.....	3
Section 2: Accreditation	4
2.1 Institutional accreditation	4
2.2 Results of the last accreditation review.....	4
2.3 Notification of appropriate agencies.....	4
Section 3: Academic Leadership—Institution.....	4
3.1 Mission statement	4
3.2 Organizational structure.....	4
Section 4: Academic Leadership—Program.....	5
4.1 Organizational structure.....	5
4.2 Program development.....	6
4.3 Collaboration with other Ohio institutions.....	8
Section 5: Student Support Services	9
5.1 Admission policies and procedures.....	9
5.2 Student administrative services	10
5.3 Student academic services	10
Section 6: Curriculum	11
6.1 Introduction.....	11
6.2 Program goals and objectives.....	11
6.3 Course offerings/descriptions	12
6.4 Program sequence.....	15
6.5 Alternate delivery options.....	15
6.6 Off-site program components	15
Section 7: Assessment and Evaluation	16
7.1 Program assessment	16
7.2 Measuring student success.....	17
Section 8: Faculty	17
8.1 Faculty appointment policies	17
8.2 Program Faculty.....	19
8.3 Expectations for professional development/scholarship.....	19
8.4 Faculty matrix.....	21
Section 9: Library Resources and Information Literacy.....	23
9.1 Library resources.....	23
9.2 Information literacy	24
Section 10: Budget, Resources and Facilities	24
10.1 Resources and facilities	24
10.2 Budget/financial planning	24
Appendices	26

REQUEST

Date of submission: [date]

Name of institution: Kent State University

Degree/degree program title: Bachelor of Science degree in Respiratory Care

Primary institutional contact for the request

Name: Therese E. Tillett
Title: Director of Curriculum Services, Office of the Provost
Phone number: 330-672-8558
E-mail: ttillet1@kent.edu

Delivery site: Fully online-only through the Ashtabula Campus

Date that the request was approved by the institution's governing board:
Approved by the Kent State University Faculty Senate on [date], and the Board of Trustees on [date]

Proposed start date: Fall 2015

Date institution established: 1910

Institution's programs: Degree programs at the associate, bachelor's, master's, post-master's and doctoral level; undergraduate and graduate certificates (325 majors in 44 degrees and 61 certificate as of fall 2014)

Institution has Higher Learning Commission approval for online or blended/hybrid delivery: Yes

Educator Preparation Programs:

Program leads to licensure: No
Program leads to endorsement: No

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief summary of the request

Kent State University proposes to establish a Bachelor of Science degree in Respiratory Care, which will be offered as a fully online-only completer program for students who hold an accredited associate degree in respiratory therapy and are a certified or registered respiratory therapist. The degree program will be administered by Kent State's Regional College, and offered through the Ashtabula Campus.

Since fall 2008, Kent State has offered an accredited Associate of Applied Science degree in Respiratory Therapy Technology at the Ashtabula Campus. The proposed BS degree will offer a seamless 2+2 articulation for Kent State's associate degree and any other accredited associate degree in respiratory degree in the state and country.

SECTION 2: ACCREDITATION

2.1 Regional accreditation

Original date of accreditation: 1915
Date of last review: 2007 - 2008
Date of next review: 2014 (update this section before sending)

2.2 Results of the last accreditation review

Kent State University accreditation was reaffirmed by the North Central Association Higher Learning Commission on 28 February 2008. (update before sending)
(www.kent.edu/aqip/upload/reaffirmation-of-accreditation-2008.pdf)

2.3 Notification of appropriate agencies

Kent State University has notified the Ohio Board of Respiratory Care, the American Association for Respiratory Care and the Commission on Accreditation for Respiratory Care (CoARC). See Appendix A for letters to those agencies.

CoARC awarded initial accreditation status to Kent State's AAS degree in Respiratory Therapy Technology in November 2012. This accreditation is valid for five years. After that, the program will be scheduled for review to obtain continuing accreditation status, valid for 10 years.

SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP—INSTITUTION

3.1 Mission statement

The mission of Kent State University is to discover, create, apply and share knowledge, as well as to foster ethical and humanitarian values in the service of Ohio and the global community. As an eight-campus educational system, Kent State offers a broad array of academic programs to engage students in diverse learning environments that educate them to think critically and to expand their intellectual horizons while attaining the knowledge and skills necessary for responsible citizenship and productive careers. (www.kent.edu/president/mission-statement.cfm)

3.2 Organizational structure

The Kent State academic organizational structure and administrative leadership and divisions organizational structure can be found at www.kent.edu/president/organizational-chart.cfm.

The organizational structure for Kent State University Regional Campuses is in Appendix B. The organizational structure for the Ashtabula Campus is in Appendix C.

SECTION 4: ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP—PROGRAM

4.1 Organizational structure

Describe the organizational structure of the proposed program. In your response, indicate the unit that the program will be housed within and how that unit fits within the context of the overall institutional structure. Further, describe the reporting hierarchy of the administration, faculty, and staff for the proposed program.

The proposed BS degree in Respiratory Care is an initiative of the administration and faculty of the Ashtabula Campus and will be delivered online through that campus. Administratively, the degree will be housed in Kent State's Regional College, which also administers Kent State's associate degree in respiratory therapy technology. Staff and program faculty report to the academic program director. The academic program director reports to the assistant dean of the Ashtabula Campus, who in turn, reports to the campus' dean and chief administrator officer. Kent State's seven regional campus deans/CAO report to the dean of the Regional College, who reports to Kent State's senior vice president of academic affairs and provost.

Provide the title of the lead administrator for the proposed program and a brief description of the individual's duties and responsibilities. Describe the qualifications of this individual for the oversight of a distance education program. Include this individual's CV/resume as an appendix item.

Yvonne George, MEd, RRT, academic program director for the associate degree in respiratory therapy technology, will be the lead administrator for the proposed program. The program director is responsible for all aspects of the program, including all operational, administrative, instructional, managerial, financial, continuous review and analysis, planning, development and general effectiveness of the program. A registered respiratory therapist, Ms. George holds a master's degree in adult learning and development from Cleveland State University. She completed her Bachelor of Business Administration degree through a 100-percent online format and has instructor training in the Blackboard Learning System. Ms. George is enrolled in professional development in the area of education from the American Association of Respiratory Care's Leadership Institute. This training includes several lessons in the area of course development and also has lessons specific to distance learning, including the following:

- Internet-based classroom management systems
- Web-based instruction/distant learning
- Computer technology in the classroom

Ms. George completed a Quality Matters™ workshop at the Ashtabula Campus in April 2014 and is incorporating the Quality Matters™ standards into the development of the program and course design. Quality Matters™ is a professional development training for quality assurance in online education and known for its peer-based approach and continuous improvement in online education and student learning.¹ See Appendix D for a program director's job description and Ms. George's curriculum vitae.

¹ Quality Matters. MarylandOnline, 2013. Retrieved from www.qualitymatters.org

The newly created Regional College has 31 Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty and 44 NTT faculty that are all regional campus faculty members. Under the current Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws, there is not a pathway for Regional College representation on Faculty Senate. To allow for this representation, we submit the following proposal for consideration by Faculty Senate:

This is a Proposal to amend the Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws in order to establish Senate membership for the new Regional College. There are three (3) amendments in this Proposal:

1. In the Charter section (C) (1) (b): delete the words "...or the vice-provost for regional campuses."
2. In the Charter section (C) (1): Add an item (e) following item (d) which will move the current item (e) to an item (f). The wording of the new item: "Tenure-track faculty with appointment in the Regional College shall be entitled to representation in addition to their representation as members of a regional campus."
3. In the Bylaws section (B) (1) (a), add a new item (iii). This will move the current item (iii) to item (iv). The wording of the new item: "The Regional College census will show some overlap of individuals who are members of the College as well as faculty on a regional campus. These individuals are entitled to participation in the election of representatives both from the College and from a regional campus. [See Charter section (C) on "membership."]

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1. <u><i>Raymond Bruce Gunning</i></u> | 2. <u><i>Debra L. Lusk</i></u> |
| 3. <u><i>Stephanie</i></u> | 4. <u><i>Anne D. Brown</i></u> |
| 5. <u><i>Chuck B. Kelly</i></u> | 6. <u><i>Carol White</i></u> |
| 7. <u><i>Daphne P.</i></u> | 8. <u><i>Min He</i></u> |
| 9. <u><i>Ar. C. Williams</i></u> | 10. <u><i>Thomas C. Brown</i></u> |
| 11. <u><i>Alison</i></u> | 12. <u><i>Lowell S. Zink</i></u> |

Submitted to Faculty Senate September 13, 2010