KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests **DATE:** March 2, 2015

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

SUBJECT: Agenda and Materials for the March 9, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the March 9th 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 February 9, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
4. President's Remarks
5. Chair's Remarks
6. Report: "Formula to Finish" Initiative (Nikki Crutchfield, Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Studies)
7. EPC Action Items from the Education Policies Council meeting of February 16, 2015:
   a. **Office of the Provost** - Revision of grading polies and procedures to update language, clarify practice and bring consistency with other policies. *(presented by Associate Provost Melody Tankersley)*
   b. **Associate and Assistant Deans Committee** - Revision of undergraduate minors policy to address residence, upper-division credit, major/minor combinations and associate degree students. *(presented by Associate Dean William Willoughby)*
   c. **College of Arts and Sciences** - Establishment of Master of Geographic Information Science degree, to be offered 100 percent online only. The Geographic Information Science major comprises three concentrations: CyberGIS, Environmental Geographic Information Science and Geographic Information Science and Health. Included in the proposal is establishment of 10 courses and revision to three courses. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 32. *(presented by Associate Dean Janis Crowther)*
8. Old Business
9. New Business:
   a. Resolution: Regarding the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Process. *(presented by Senator George Garrison)*
10. Announcements / Statements for the Record
11. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment

KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Meeting
February 9, 2015

Senators Present: Patti Baller, Jeffrey Child, Ed Dauterich, David Dees, Paul Farrell, Rick Feinberg, Christopher Fenk, Mary Ferranto, Lee Fox-Cardamone, George Garrison, Bruce Gunning, Min He, Susan Iverson, Jay Jahangiri, Thomas Janson, Robert Kairis, Kathy Kerns, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Tracy Laux, Stephen Minnick, Oana Mocioalca, Jayne Moneysmith, Thomas Norton-Smith, Larry Osher, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Mary Beth Rollick, Susan Roxburgh, David Smeltzer, Deborah Smith, Fred Smith, John Stoker, Beatrice Turkoski, Terrence Uber, Roberto Uribe-Rendon, Christopher Was, Donald White, Linda Williams, Kathryn Wilson

Senators Not Present: Ann Abraham, Brian Baer, Madhav Bhatta, Ali Erritouni, Kimberly Garchar, Willie Harrell, Anne Morrison, Vilma Seeberg, Kim Winebrenner

Ex-Officio Members Present: Provost & Senior V.P. for Academic Affairs Todd Diacon; Vice Presidents: Greg Jarvie, Char Reed; Executive Director Deborah Huntsman; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Blank, Allan Boike, James Bracken, John Crawford, Daniel Mahony, Donald Palmer, Eboni Pringle, Robert Sines, Cathy DuBois for Deborah Spake, Wanda Thomas; Director Robert Walker

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: President Beverly Warren; Vice Presidents: Alfreda Brown, Gregg Floyd, Iris Harvey, Ed Mahon, Grant McGimpsey, Steve Sokany, Joseph Vitale Jr., Willis Walker; Deans: Barbara Broome, AnnMarie LeBlanc, Douglas Steidl, Mary Ann Stephens

Observers Present: Fritz Yarrison (GSS), Jerry Feezel (Emeritus Professor)

Observers Not Present: Michelle Crisler (USS)

Guests Present: Joanne Arhar, Sue Averill, Oley Bresley, Fashaad Crawford, Janis Crowther, Mary Dellmann-Jenkins, Ann Gosky, Mary Ann Haley, Jeff Hallam, LuEtt Hanson, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Karen Keenan, Cynthia Kenyon, Navjotika Kumar, Alyssa Kyff, Victoria Manenti, Maureen McFarland, Vonnie Michali, Steve Mitchell, Rebecca Murphy, Felix Offodile, Willie Oglesby, Elizabeth Sinclair, Charity Snyder, Blake Stringer, Melody Tankersley, Therese Tillett, Jarrod Tudor, Whitney Wenger, Lindsey Westermann Ayers, Lowell Zurbuch

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Governance Chambers by Chair Lee Fox.

2. Roll Call

Secretary Janson called the roll.

3. Approval of the December 8, 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Chair Fox called for a motion to approve the minutes (Senators Turkoski/Fred Smith). The minutes of the 2014 December Faculty Senate meeting were approved as written (12-8-2014).

4. Provost's Remarks

Three Initiatives

a. 1 University Commission: The Provost stated that the commission has two goals, to help us recognize and celebrate equally the contributions of all of our campuses even while we recognize their mission differences, and to resolve a series of issues that grew up mostly around distance learning and to update the policies and procedures pertaining to DL. Four subcommittees have been meeting, 1. Structure and leadership (looking at Regional Campus leadership structure), 2. Academics and curriculum (issues involving distance learning and revenue sharing), 3. Faculty roles and responsibilities (issues surrounding faculty relations among regional campuses and the Kent Campus), 4. Student experiences (creating leadership opportunities for students across all campuses). A 1 University draft report will be delivered to President Warren by the Friday before spring break begins (3-20-2015).

b. COACHE Survey: The Provost urged all Kent State University full-time tenure stream and non-tenure track faculty to complete the COACHE survey that was delivered via e-mail. This is an initiative operating out of the Harvard Graduate School of Education and assesses faculty job satisfaction. The deadline to participate is April 10, 2015. President Warren will publicly present the results of the survey and will discuss what we are doing well. Where the COACHE survey points out issues that need to be addressed, President Warren will discuss approaches to addressing those issues. The presidential sharing of these issues will become part of the Faculty Appreciation Week each spring.

c. FolioWeb: The Provost discussed the need to replace FolioWeb by transitioning to a new system. He thanked Professor David Dalton for his work on FolioWeb since 2009. The Provost appointed a committee of 12 faculty, administrators and staff convened by Associate Provost Averill to discuss needs and options for new software. The new system must have the same ease of use, and look of our current system and easily interface with current faculty data. The Provost indicated that a vendor has been selected and that contract negotiations are in the final stages. The current system will continue to be used through the current academic year. The new system will be operational in late spring 2015, in time for 2015-2016 personnel actions. Information and training will be available.

5. Chair's Remarks [attached]

6. EPC Action Items

a. University Requirements and Curriculum Committee – Designation of Kent Core status to the following two new courses in the basic sciences category: BSCI 21010 Anatomy and Physiology I (4) and BSCI 21020 Anatomy and Physiology II (4). Effective Fall 2015.

Associate Provost Melody Tankersley reported on the action taken to approve BSCI 21010 and BSCI 21020 for Kent Core status. Interim Dean Palmer moved to approve the proposal. The proposal reworks the existing BSCI 20020 Biological Structure and Function (5) into two courses and includes some new content. These two courses are needed primarily for nursing students and will align better with their program need. Senator Janson asked why these two new Kent Core course proposals do not include the required two documents, Kent Core Course Proposal Questionnaire and the Kent Core Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan. Senator Dees reminded the Senate that it was agreed several years ago that all Kent Core courses must include learning outcomes and measurable assessment plans.

Senator Stoker commented on the proposal to split one course into two courses which may make them less useful as Kent Core options outside of the College of Nursing. Senator Ferranto spoke at length about the need for the proposal in the College of Nursing. She said

that the current course, BSCI 20020, to be replaced with the two new courses, is only taken by nursing students. Senator Deb Smith questioned the increase of credit hours from the existing courses at 5 credits to two courses totaling 8 credits. The answer given involved the inclusion of more content and allowing for the required associated laboratories.

Senator Farrell pointed out that the basic sciences requirement in the Kent Core is 6 credit hours and that the two proposed courses which total 8 credit hours will completely satisfy the basic sciences Kent Core category.

Senator Dees returned to the topic of learning outcomes and measurement assessments. If the current proposal is approved, the Senate is not following good educational practice. Interim Dean Palmer attributed the current documentation to the historic character associated with some courses in the major sequence. These two courses are directed toward the nursing programs and specifically requested by them.

Senator Dees said that no Kent Core courses should be grandfathered and should be required to contain both learning outcomes and measurements. Senator Williams called the question. Following a suggestion by Senators Child and Fred Smith to refer the matter back to the Department of Biology, Senator Farrell asked Chair Fox whether the motion on the floor was on the original motion to approve the proposal, or on the motion to refer the matter back to Biology.

Senator Child moved to send the proposal back to Biology department for the development of learning outcomes and an assessment plan. The motion was seconded by Senator Fred Smith. Senator Williams made an amendment to the motion to apply the requirement of learning outcomes and assessment documentation to the remainder of the Kent Core proposals on the current agenda. Following brief discussion, Senator Williams withdrew her amendment.

Chair Fox called for a vote on the motion to send the proposal back to the Department of Biology. The motion passed.

b. University Requirements and Curriculum Committee – Designation of Kent core status to the new course CHEM 10055 Molecules of Life (3) in the basic sciences category. Designation of temporary Kent Core status to AS 10095 Special Topics: Molecules of Life (3) in the basic sciences category. (AS 10095 is the pilot version of CHEM 10055) Effective Spring 2015.

Associate Provost Melody Tankersley presented the proposal as an alignment with licensure requirements and programming needs of the College of Nursing. The special topics course is currently being taught spring semester 2015, and the new course CHEM 10055 will be offered fall semester 2015. Senator White moved approval.

Senator Williams stated that the proposal is to replace a current Kent Core course with the new course CHEM 10055. Senator Farrell asked when the phase out will occur. Associate Provost Tankersley said the phase out will occur with the next offering. Professor Mary Ann Haley said that there was a need to clarify the offerings pertaining to associate degree programs on the Regional Campuses. A cross-walk procedure is in place.

Senator Stoker moved to designate the pilot course as a Kent Core for spring 2015 only (Williams seconded). Senator Kerns was not in favor of deferring a decision on the new course CHEM 10055 Molecules of Life. A course outline was attached. Senator Stoker asked why there is a pilot when the content for the new course is already complete. Senator Williams clarified the conversation by stating that the special topics is being taught spring semester 2015 only and the new course will begin in fall semester 2015. She asked if the pilot will earn Kent

Core credit. She then withdrew her second to the motion which then failed for lack of a second.

Senator Iverson asked the same question about Kent Core credit if the motion gives temporary status for the pilot, and also grants Kent Core status for the new course in the fall. Chair Fox answered in the affirmative; Associate Provost Tankersley concurred. Senator Feinberg expressed dissatisfaction with the idea of changing the status of a course already underway. Senator Farrell agreed, asking if the students currently enrolled in the special topics pilot are aware of the proposal to grant temporary Kent Core status. Senator Fenk stated that currently enrolled students were not told that the pilot is/may be a Kent Core course in advance. If the Senate finds the proposal satisfactory, why would we not support both the pilot and the new course for Kent Core status as a service to the currently registered students? Senator Dees reminded colleagues that we wait too long to create these types of proposals, then rush them through the approval process. Dean Thomas expressed concern for students in allied health programs in the Regional College who are required to take Chemistry, and Anatomy and Physiology. She asked if CHEM 10055 will be listed as being equivalent to the courses they are currently taking. Senator Fenk spoke in favor of the new course proposal for the nursing programs and for continuing the existing chemistry courses on the Regional Campuses only for the various associate degrees that require chemistry.

Chair Fox then commanded that no one speak without the "talking stick."

Senator Williams recalled that the EPC discussion included the statement that the new course proposed here will replace a current Kent Core course so that the list is not expanded. Senator Deb Smith pointed out that Kent Core status is not solely about what is needed in the nursing program, but what Core courses exist for all undergraduate students. Aside from the needs of both the nursing program and the various associate degree programs, the proposal is to replace Kent Core status of the existing course with the new course. Lag times in course offering based on catalog year are understandable.

Senator Feinberg moved to send the proposal back to Chemistry for clarification (second by Senator Jahangiri). Chair Fox asked for discussion on the motion to send the proposal back to the Department of Chemistry. Senator Stoker suggested that the Senate approve temporary status to the special topics pilot to accommodate the currently enrolled students. Senator Williams suggested that the April Faculty Senate meeting is not too late to approve curricular changes. Chair Fox called for a vote on the motion to return the proposal to the Department of Chemistry. The motion passed.

c. University Requirements and Curriculum Committee – Designation of Kent Core status to the following four new courses in the mathematics and critical reasoning category: MATH 10771 Basic Mathematical Concepts I Plus (5); MATH 10772 Modeling Algebra Plus (5); MATH 10774 Algebra for Calculus Stretch II (3); and MATH 10775 Algebra for Calculus plus (4). Effective Fall 2015.

Associate Provost Melody Tankersley explained that the mathematics courses in the proposal have already been approved as part of the mandate of the state to move to remedial-free coursework. The proposal requests that the four new courses which are not remedial be credit bearing and would stand for the mathematics and critical reasoning portion of the Kent Core. Interim Dean Palmer moved approval.

Chair Fox asked for discussion on the proposal. Senator Williams explained that there is no subsidy for remedial courses. The proposed courses will provide credit for students who need to begin more slowly and conclude at the point that matches Ohio Transfer Module (OTM)

learning outcomes. She asked about the approval of these new courses for OTM status. Associate Provost Tankersley stated that the application for OTM is being processed. Provost Diacon explained that the state passed a new policy requiring all students who score a certain ACT score to be put in credit bearing courses regardless of current KSU policy. Therefore, the Math Department created an appropriate and defensible curriculum that leads to the same learning outcomes. This proposal is the follow-up action to the 2014 Faculty Senate resolution supporting the state mandated change.

Senator Deb Smith stated that this proposal is a favorable exception to the desire to not add courses to the Kent Core without taking an equal number of courses away. The proposed courses will bring students to identical learning outcomes as compared to the current Kent Core offerings. Senator Dees then called the question (seconded by Senator Wilson). Chair Fox called for a vote on concluding discussion which needed a two-thirds majority. The motion passed.

Chair Fox then called for a vote on the Kent Core mathematics proposal. The proposal was approved.

d. University Requirements and Curriculum Committee – Authorization of the dean of Undergraduate Studies to approve non-course Experiential Learning Requirement (ELR) applications for all undergraduate students; and authorization of any full-time faculty member to approve and supervise non-course ELR applications. The full-time faculty member does not need to have an appointment in the student's major department. Effective Fall 2015.

Interim Dean Pringle introduced Anna L. Gosky, Interim Director, Office of Experiential Education who explained the proposed change in policy in order to remove barriers to ELR completion. Interim Dean Pringle moved to approve the proposal.

Chair Fox opened the discussion and called on Senator Deb Smith. Senator Smith asked for clarification of the need for a full-time faculty member to approve and supervise a non-course activity. Interim Dean Pringle clarified the proposal stating that the current policy requires that the faculty member come from within the student's major department/school. The proposal looks to broaden this requirement. Current policy also requires that the department chair/school director sign-off on the proposal as well as the dean of the student's college.

Chair Fox called for a vote on the proposal concerning non-course ELR application. The motion passed.

e. College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology – Establishment of Aerospace Engineering major within the Bachelor of Science degree to be offered at the Kent Campus. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 128. Effective Fall 2015.

Interim Dean Sines moved approval of the proposal for a new major degree curriculum developed under ADEP standards. Only two public universities in Ohio with ADEP accreditation currently exist; the Ohio State University and the University of Cincinnati. The College currently employs one aerospace engineering faculty member with plans to hire one additional faculty member pending approval of the proposal. Interim Dean Sines introduced Dr. Maureen McFarland and Dr. Blake Stringer who were available to answer question about the proposal.

There was no discussion. Chair Fox called for a vote on the proposal. The proposal was approved.

f. College of Business Administration – Establishment of general Business major within the Bachelor of Business Administration degree to be offered on-ground at the Kent Campus. The last two years of the program may be taken 100 percent online, in addition to on-ground, for completer students. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 120. Effective Fall 2015.

Cathy L. Du Bois, Associate Dean, College of Business, introduced Associate Dean Liz Sinclair, who explained that the new major would eliminate an existing designation of Business Undeclared. The General Business major will serve students who are undecided about their major in the freshman year, and will also serve students who drop out and wish to return following a lapse of attendance at KSU. Senator Garrison moved approval of the proposal.

There was no discussion. Chair Fox called for a vote on the proposal. The proposal was approved.

g. College of Education, Health and Human Services – Establishment of Advanced Pedagogy in Physical Education and Sport major within the Master of Education degree. The program will be offered 100 percent online only through collaboration with the University of Wollongong in New South Wales, Australia. Students will apply and be admitted to one university and complete half the coursework (6 courses) at each university. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 36. Effective Fall 2015.

Dean Mahoney moved approval with a brief description of the program. The advantages include teaching and learning on two campuses and with two departmental faculties, and would bring international perspective to the program. It will help the goal to recruit students from around the world. Dean Mahoney introduced Professor Steven A. Mitchell who was available to answer questions.

There was no discussion. Chair Fox called for a vote on the proposal. The proposal was approved.

h. Division of Undergraduate Studies – Revision of academic structure, from Division of Undergraduate Studies to University College. Effective Fall 2015.

Interim Dean Pringle gave a brief history of the Division of Undergraduate Studies which was formed in 1994. Currently, the division's core mission consists of an emphasis on assisting exploratory students. This emphasis was not the original emphasis of the unit but has evolved in this direction based on student need. She then moved approval of the proposal.

Chair Fox opened the floor to discussion. Senator Farrell asked to be reassured that the name change to University College will not make the division an RCM unit. Interim Dean Pringle answered in the affirmative stating that the University College will retain the same structure as the Division of Undergraduate Studies and will not be an RCM unit. Senator Deb Smith also asked for a similar clarification that there are not, nor will be any full-time faculty associated with the University College. Interim Dean Pringle stated that Senator Smith is correct. Senator Williams asked if students in the Division of Undergraduate Studies will "feel better" if they are attached to a college rather than to a division. Interim Dean Pringle said that this is one of the reasons. Another reason is the current nomenclature of a division is not in line with the nomenclature used by other similar units at universities across the nation. Chair Fox called for a vote on the proposal. The proposal was approved.

i. Division of Undergraduate Studies – Formation of Cooperative Education Program, which was piloted fall 2014 through the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology. Effective Fall 2015.

Interim Dean Pringle again introduced Anna L. Gosky, Interim Director, Office of Experiential Education who explained that beginning fall 2015, the proposal would transition the cooperative education program from Applied Engineering to the Division of Undergraduate Studies, specifically in the office of Experiential Education and Civic Engagement. The program will be made available to 20 students from diverse majors. Subsequently the program would be available to many more students. Benefits of the proposal include practical experiences in the student's chosen career field, learning team work, providing a source of income, and marketability after graduation.

Interim Dean Pringle moved approval of the proposal. Chair Fox opened the discussion. Senator Smeltzer recalled that students may maintain their full-time student status while engaged in the co-op. Ann Gosky confirmed and also pointed out that students may also maintain loan deferment and insurance eligibility. Student housing and other student resources are the same as full-time students attending class. Senator Smeltzer stated that students majoring in Journalism and Mass Communication are required to complete an internship; they usually complete this requirement in the summer, but with the proposal these students would be allowed to complete the requirement during the academic year. He asked about earning credit hours. Interim Pringle explained that the co-op program cannot include earning credit hours. This is the difference between a co-op and an internship. Senator Uribe asked if students in the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology who are taking existing cooperative education courses offered for credit in the college are able to combine with the proposed Division of Undergraduate Studies co-op program. Interim Dean Pringle said that the benefits are the same because the student is considered to be full-time. Senator Janson asked for confirmation that the proposed co-op is a semester-based opportunity available fall, spring and summer terms. Ann Gosky concurred.

Chair Fox then called for a vote on the proposal to formalize the Cooperative Education Program through the Division of Undergraduate Studies. The motion passed.

7. Old Business

College of Education, Health and Human Services – School of Lifespan Development and Educational Sciences – Establishment of Career and community (CCS) non-degree, four-year program to prepare students with intellectual and developmental disabilities for adult life. Included in the proposal is establishment of 46 developmental courses restricted to only students enrolled in the program. Minimum total hours to program completion are 120.

Chair Fox directed senators' attention to the minutes of the December Faculty Senate meeting for background on the proposal. Dean Mahoney moved approval saying that the proposal is for a non-degree, non-credit program for students with intellectual disabilities to provide them with a four-year experience that will help them transition to adult life. The proposal is based on a four-year pilot program that ends this academic year which was supported by a grant. The proposal is intended to formalize the program and keep it ongoing.

Chair Fox opened the floor to discussion and stated that she invited staff from both Legal and Residence Services to answer senators' questions. Senator Deb Smith asked three questions, 1. Is the University Council and Residence Life onboard with taking on the in loco parentis role for these individuals in the particular case? 2. Are these individuals all legally competent adults and are able to enter into binding contracts, sign waivers, etc.? 3. Can an individual enroll in this program without agreeing to be a human subject or being required to participate in a study or experiment?

Vice President Jarvie responded to the first question stating that Residence Services is 100 percent onboard. Some of the students in the four-year pilot program have been through the residence hall process. Regarding contracts, he said that the university already processes these with families of students who are not of-age or if there is something legally that requires a parental signature.

Yvonne (Vonnie) E. Michali, Project Director, Lifespan Development and Education Sciences stated that student do have the ability and can give consent whether or not they want to participate in any research. They may opt-out if they wish. Senator Roxburgh asked whether or not students paid tuition during the grant portion of the pilot. Vonnie Michali explained that during the grant period 19 students did not pay tuition but were supported by the grant. In the future, student will pay tuition equal to all other undergraduates. They will also pay room and board if they choose to live in the dorms.

Senator Janson expressed concern that more undergraduate courses than the 46 developmental restricted courses will be needed to complete the program. In the general population of enrolled students, faculty may not be equipped to teach developmentally disabled students. It was his opinion that faculty may feel pressured to accept them but not have the preparation for teaching them. Mary Dellmann-Jenkins, Director, School of Lifespan Development and Education al Sciences explained that these students will take the additional courses as CCS special topics. They will never sit in a Kent State course without prior approval of the faculty member. The School staff will approach the faculty members of courses in which students have expressed an interest. Faculty have the opportunity to either grant permission or to decline.

Vonnie Michali took this opportunity to explain how the School supports the student and the faculty who want to participate. Mentors are trained in the field who accompany the students to class. Meetings are periodically scheduled with faculty members to assess progress. The participation and learning alongside their peers is an important aspect of the program. If the faculty member prefers, the mentor will be with the student at all times, however, as confidence is gained the mentoring could be phased back. Academic tutoring remains in the School of Lifespan Development. Senator Fred Smith asked about the student selection process. Vonnie Michali explained the lengthy selection process which insures that the student and the program are a good fit. She also addressed financial aid for the parents who have an income that meets qualifications. She is working on developing scholarships. Senator Stoker asked for confirmation that students will not be taking out student loans to pay for tuition. Vonnie Michali said that students may apply for Pell Grants but cannot take out student loans. The parents are able to apply for Parent Plus subsidized loans. The university had to specify that the students themselves could not go into debt.

Senator Farrell revisited the issues of liability outside the residence halls. He asked if there are any extra liabilities either to the institution or especially to the individual faculty instructing these students as a result of their special status. Attorney Michael Pfahl stated that faculty members are public employees who have qualified to work in the scope of their employment which does not change based on the student body. He could not speak to individual liability outside the scope of employment but employees are governed by policies in place covering university practices, policies and procedures. Additionally, he offered to take a closer look at legal capacity and signature as people are assumed to have capacity unless otherwise stated. He will look at that issue relative to this program proposal. He requested samples of documents and contracts which need students' approval. He offered his legal support but his office does not approve or oppose any programs on campus.

Senator Osher asked if the students in this program are held to the goals and objectives of the courses they take with the general population, or are different goals and objectives developed for them in terms of determining course outcomes? Secondly, he asked, what if one of the students

fails a course? Vonnie Michali said that the staff meets with the faculty member to review the syllabus so that the student knows the requirements and expectations. The student then suggests ways in which the course expectations and participation requirements will be met. The faculty member is given an observation form to record class attendance and participation. If a student fails a course, that credit would need to be made up in another course in order to earn the required 120 credit hours for the record of completion.

Senator Deb Smith said that she would prefer to hear back from Attorney Mike Pfahl after he has looked at the liability issue in more detail. She also stated concern about the four-year proposal in light of the cost of tuition, room and board. A two-year program while not cheap would be one-half the cost. She also expressed the concern that the proposal tries to make it look like the student will earn a four-year undergraduate degree even though it's a non-degree program. A two-year program would mitigate that appearance. Fred Smith responded that for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities the maturation period is long. The four-year proposal is a transformational, life-changing reality. College experience provides time to figure out one's self and what a person really wants in life. The two-year programs currently offered are focused on work opportunities. The proposal for a four-year program is more holistic including independent living skills, personal skills, community involvement, volunteer opportunities. This holistic approach is borne out by the concluding pilot program.

Senator Smeltzer gave testimony about teaching high school for eight years that included a mainstreamed enrollment. He believes that the money invested in tuition comes back based on the potential income. Senator Feinberg relayed that he has spoken with a number of the parents who have children attending the pilot program. The parents are supportive of the proposal.

Chair Fox called for a vote on the proposal to approve the establishment of a Career and Community (CCS) non-degree program. The motion passed.

8. New Business

There was no new business.

9. Announcements / Statements for the Record

a. Senator Janson informed the Senate that President Warren will be having orthopedic surgery. He requested that the Chair be authorized by the Senate to send President Warren a get-well card.

b. Mr. Fritz Yarrison, representative from the Graduate Student Senate, announced the Graduate Research Symposium which will take place on April 3, 2015. The deadline for submission is February 13, 2015. He asked senators to encourage graduate students to submit proposals. This will be the 30th annual symposium. He also requested faculty to volunteer as judges of the presentations. A registration form is available from Scott McCully whose e-mail was printed on handouts pertaining to the symposium and available on the center table.

c. Interim Dean Pringle announced the second annual Undergraduate Symposium. Abstracts were due previous to this meeting, but Dean Pringle is in search of faculty to serve as judges. The date of the symposium is March 11, 2015.

10. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Senator Tom Janson, Faculty Senate Secretary
attachment

Chair's Remarks

Thank you Provost Diacon. And again, a good afternoon and welcome to everyone to the February meeting of the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate.

I wanted to begin by congratulating those individuals who have been recently elected to serve on the Joint Appeals Board. We conducted elections for Unit 1 - the College of Arts and Sciences, and Unit 5 - the Regional Campuses. For the College of Arts and Sciences, Susan Roxburgh will serve, with Jeffrey Ciesla and Jay Lee serving as alternates. For the Regional Campuses, Gary Ciuba will serve, with Kim Garchar and Brenda Smith serving as alternates. Thanks to all of you -- the Joint Appeals Board is an important component of the shared governance model, and we appreciate your time and attention to the critical personnel matters that come before that body.

On an unrelated topic, I wanted to provide an update regarding the activities of the Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee, also known as FaSBAC. As you know, FaSBAC is a committee that advises the President on budgetary issues at the university and division levels. It is comprised of faculty members, deans, chairs, directors and students. There are also 6 non-voting ex-officio members. The committee is co-chaired by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the Vice President for Business and Administration, currently Provost Diacon and Vice President Floyd.

One of committee's major responsibilities is to periodically review the effect of RCM on academic quality, unit performance, and allocation procedures. RCM has been in place for 5 years and Faculty Senators passed a resolution last year calling for a review of RCM. That review is now well underway.

The first part of that review was overseen by Senator Dees during Spring 2014, who utilized the Civic Commons to ask the Kent community about their perceptions and concerns regarding RCM.

From the responses to the civic commons conversation, Faculty Senate Executive organized the concerns by theme and organized the membership of FaSBAC into 4 subcommittees, each of which was assigned a specific theme and charged with exploring the effect of the RCM budget model on their area of concern..

Those themes included "student issues," "faculty issues," "administration of the RCM model," and "tax issues." Subcommittee chairs Paul Farrell, Deb Smith, Tracy Laux, and Kathy Wilson spent time with the members of their respective committees strategizing over what specific questions should be asked and how to best gather the data to address those questions.

At this time, we are gathering that data -- requests for information have gone to the Provost's office, the Vice President for Business and Administration's office and to RPIE. I mention all of this to you as an update to the process and to enable us to publicly thank the individuals who are working diligently to these data requests. Associate Provost Sue Averill and her

office have been very helpful, as has Wayne Schneider from RPIE. I intend to have a fuller list of individuals who have contributed to the project for our report to this body in May.

I also wanted to provide this update in order to give faculty, deans, chairs and directors a heads-up about a survey related to the RCM review. Our target date to send the survey is Monday, March 2nd, with a deadline for return of Tuesday, March 10th. All fulltime faculty are being targeted, as are all current and past deans, chairs and directors. The surveys are manageable in terms of time commitment - the faculty survey will take approximately 10 - 15 minutes, while the administrator survey will take approximately 15 - 20 minutes. I know we are inundated with surveys, but I would like to ask you to fill out the survey yourself and encourage your colleagues to fill it out as well.
There is virtually no identifying information requested, and any conclusions will be couched in the aggregate - no individuals will be identified.

We appreciate your support - this has been a substantial undertaking. Fortunately, we have had tremendous support from FaSBAC members, the Provost's office, Vice President Floyd's office and RPIE.
We anticipate tremendous support from all full-time faculty and all current and past chairs/deans/directors. Thank you in advance for your help.

Our plan remains a report to Senate at the May Senate meeting.

Because we have a full agenda today, I will end my chair's remarks at this point. Thank you in advance for your survey responses, and if there are questions for me, I would be happy to address them at this point.

Chair Lee Fox
February 9, 2015

KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

TO: Donna (Lee) L. Fox-Cardamone
Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: Therese E. Tillett
Director of Curriculum Services

SUBJECT: Transmittal of items from the Educational Policies Council

DATE: 17 February 2015

In accordance with Faculty Senate Bylaws, I formally convey to you, with this memorandum, the following motions passed on 16 February 2015 by the Educational Policies Council for appropriate review by the Faculty Senate. Although the Senate may not want to review these items, it is helpful to have the Senate's consideration of the recommendations related to policy formation or substantial changes to programs.

Office of the Provost

1. Revision of grading polies and procedures to update language, clarify practice and bring consistency with other policies.
   Effective Fall 2015 | Proposal

Associate and Assistant Deans Committee

2. Revision of undergraduate minors policy to address residence, upper-division credit, major/minor combinations and associate degree students.
   Effective Fall 2015 | Proposal

College of Arts and Sciences

3. Establishment of Master of Geographic Information Science degree, to be offered 100 percent online only. The Geographic Information Science major comprises three concentrations: CyberGIS, Environmental Geographic Information Science and Geographic Information Science and Health. Included in the proposal is establishment of 10 courses and revision to three courses. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 32.
   Effective Fall 2015 pending OBR and HLC approval | Proposal, Catalog, Letters of Support

EC: Todd A. Diacon, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost
Emily S. Myers, assistant to the senior vice president for academic affairs
Teresa L. Kail, secretary for Faculty Senate
Karen M. Keenan, project manager for academic affairs

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date **1-Feb-15** Curriculum Bulletin _____

Effective Date **Fall 2015** Approved by EPC _____

Department

College **PR - Provost**

Proposal **Revise Policy**

Proposal Name **Grading Policies and Procedures**

Description of proposal:

Proposal seeks to revise the Grading Policies and Procedures as published in the University Catalog. Revisions update language, clarify practice and bring consistency with other policies.

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

Aligns deadlines and nomenclature with other academic policies.

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

University Registrar, Bursar, Transfer Center, Institutional Research, Student Financial Aid, Associate and Assistant Deans Committee, Graduate Studies Administrative Advisory Committee

---

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)

7.a.

Proposal Summary
Revision of the Grading Policies and Procedures

SUBJECT SPECIFICATION

This proposal seeks to revise the grading policies and procedures as published in the University Catalog to update language, clarify practice and bring consistency with other policies.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In fall 2014, the offices of the University Registrar and Curriculum Services undertook a full review of Kent State's grading policies and procedures. Assisting the offices in the review and recommended changes were the Associate and Assistant (A&A) Deans Committee and the Graduate Studies Administrative Advisory Committee (GSAAC), as well as staff from the offices of the Bursar, Transfer Center, Institutional Research and Student Financial Aid.

The intention with the review was not to change current policies and procedures for determining and granting academic grades, but to ensure that the published policies reflected current practices and regulations, and to resolve nomenclature conflicts and other discrepancies that occurred when the Undergraduate Catalog and the Graduate Catalog were merged to form the University Catalog in 2010. Many of the changes are considered house-keeping items to bring the policies up to date.

The changes are highlighted on page 3-7. Below is a summary:

- Separate the listing of academic grades (e.g., A, B, C) from administrative marks (e.g., IP, IN) to highlight the difference between grades (determined by faculty based upon appraisal and evaluation of student performance in completing requirements of a course) and marks (assigned when a letter grade is not appropriate).
- Select one word—"superior" to define the A (4.000) grade no matter the level of the course. Currently, "excellent" is used for undergraduate courses and "superior" for graduate courses.
- Make clear that that the grade descriptive refers to what is assigned to a student in the type of course, and not to the type of student in the course.
- Clarify that a D grade is designated as passing and a U (Unsatisfactory) grade is designated as failing. Current language states a D grade for students in undergraduate courses is "unsatisfactory, but passing," a contraction of terms.
- Distinguish the F grade, which is earned, from the SF (Stopped Attending–Fail) and NF (Never Attended–Fail) marks, which are assigned to students who stopped attending or never attended class—all still are considered failing and counted in the students' GPA.
- Update the S (Satisfactory) grade definition to correct the translation to "passing," rather than "average or superior attainment," which was accurate for graduate courses decades ago and never updated when the U grade began to count in the graduate GPA. In addition, language more appropriate for curriculum guidelines (or not following current practices) is removed.
- Describe further the purpose and consequences of the AU (Audit) mark and that prior departmental approval is required before a student may select the option. Remove duplicated statements and the outdated sentence that faculty can enter a W (Withdrawal) mark on the grade rooster for auditing students who stopped attending (process is done through Registrar's Office).

- Add new marks CP (Complete) and NP (Not Complete) for cooperative education program; and existing marks CR (Credit) for alternative credit programs, T for student exchange programs and TR (Transfer) for credit accepted from other institutions.
- Clarify that all administrative marks are not counted toward the GPA, with the exception of the SF and NF marks.
- Revise the timing of the IN (Incomplete) mark for undergraduate course to align with the one for graduate courses and with the withdrawal deadline. Changes from current 12 weeks to between course withdrawal deadline and end of the classes. Allow a university-approved designee to initiate an IN request on behalf of a student. Align the IN default grade deadline for graduate courses with other graduate policies deadlines. Emphasize the issuance of the IN mark constitutes a contract between student and faculty.
- Update the IP (In Progress) mark to include efforts other than thesis, dissertation, research and individual investigation that require additional time beyond a semester, and that the mark is terminal if the student does not complete the requirements for the course.
- Add language to the NR (Not Reported) mark to reflect existing practice that a grade must be given to a required course before a degree or certificate can be granted.
- Remove language from the SF mark that advises faculty to assign a grade if the student stopped attending after the course withdrawal deadline. Per Title IV regulations, Kent State must adjust financial aid for a student who stopped attending a course at any point in the term; therefore, it is imperative to record last attendance, even if after 10 weeks.
- Note that a course receiving the AU, NF or SF mark is not counted toward a student's course load for financial aid and other purposes.
- Establish a grade change deadline of either three consecutive terms after the grade was submitted or before the student's degree is posted to his/her academic record, whichever comes first. Exceptions are changes to the IN, IP, NR marks and College of Podiatric Medicine courses (the latter have an earlier deadline).

ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES

The alternate to the proposed changes is retaining outdated grading policies and procedures in the University Catalog, which does not support the university's objectives of clarity, consistency and transparency with academic policies.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION AND JUSTIFICATION

The recommendation is to update the grading policies and procedures as listed on pages 3-7 to reflect current practices and procedures.

ACTIONS REQUIRED AND ANTICIPATED TIMELINE

Associate and Assistant Deans Committee..... reviewed 14 October & 9 December 2014
Graduate Studies Administrative Advisory Committee..... reviewed 13 November 2014
Educational Policies Council..... approval sought 16 March 2015
Faculty Senate..... approval sought 13 April 2015
Implementation..... fall 2015 University Catalog

Revisions to 2014 Grading Policies and Procedures (Marked-Up Version)

The transcript is an accurate and complete historical record of work attempted at the university. Changes to transcript entries that alter the enrollment history of a student are not to be made.

Academic Grades ~~and Administrative Marks~~

~~Student proficiency in coursework is recorded by t~~The following ~~letter~~ grades~~:~~ are determined and assigned by faculty based upon appraisal and evaluation of student performance in completing requirements of a course:

A (4.000) Denotes ~~"excellent scholarship" for undergraduate students and~~ "superior scholarship." ~~for graduate students~~

A- (3.700)

B+ (3.300)

B (3.000) Denotes "good performance" for students in undergraduate ~~students~~ courses and "average performance" for students in graduate ~~students~~ courses.

B- (2.700)

C+ (2.300)

C (2.000) Denotes "fair or average performance" for students in undergraduate ~~students~~ courses and "below average performance" for students in graduate ~~students~~ courses.

C- (1.700)

D+ (1.300)

D (1.000) Denotes "poor (~~unsatisfactory~~ but passing) performance" for students in undergraduate ~~students~~ courses and "far below average performance" for students in graduate ~~students~~ courses.

F (0.000) Denotes failure of the student's overall performance. This grade is earned and is not used for students who never attended or stopped attending the course (see NF and SF marks in Administrative Marks section below).

S The grade S (Satisfactory) denotes passing performance, and is used for courses where S/U grading, rather than letter grading, is permitted ~~satisfactory completion of in a course for which a regular grade is inappropriate~~. ~~Satisfactory work is interpreted~~ as average or superior attainment. The credit hours are awarded, but ~~are not considered~~ the grade is not counted in computing grade point averages~~, but w~~. Work earning an S grade may be applied toward meeting degree requirements. ~~For graduate students, the U grade, along with the S grade (see above) are the only grades to be used for thesis (6xx99), dissertation (8xx99), workshops and courses involving internship/practicum. The instructor intending to use the S and U grades in a course other than these must do so exclusively and only where permitted. The instructor will announce this intent to the particular class at the beginning of the course and note it on the course syllabus.~~

U The grade U (Unsatisfactory) denotes failing ~~unsatisfactory~~ performance and is used for courses where S/U grading, rather than letter grading, is permitted ~~in a course for which a regular grade is inappropriate~~. This grade is earned and is not used for students who never attended or stopped attending the course (see NF and SF marks in Administrative Marks section below). Credit hours are recorded as ~~credit hours~~ attempted, and the grade is ~~will be~~ counted as an F (zero quality points) in computing grade point averages. ~~For graduate students, the U grade, along with the S grade (see above) are the only grades to be used for thesis (6xx99), dissertation (8xx99), workshops and courses involving internship/practicum. The instructor intending to use the S and U grades in a course other than these must do so exclusively and only where permitted. The instructor will announce this intent to the particular class at the beginning of the course and note it on the course syllabus.~~

Comment [TET1]: Separated academic grades from administrative marks.

Comment [TET2]: Added more definition.

Comment [TET3]: Since excellent or superior mean basically the same thing, just chose one.

Comment [TET4]: Revised "student" to "cours throughout document to clarify that descriptive refers to the grade for of all students in the type of course, not the type of student in the course.

Comment [TET5]: Remove contraction; Unsatisfactory is defined in grade policy as "failing"

Comment [TET6]: We have been asked by oth universities to translate S and U marks to letter grade (for universities that don't have S/U grading)

This statement was in the Graduate Catalog for decades. However, by this interpretation, does tha mean that a faculty evaluation that equals B- or worse should be given a U grade? That conflicts wi U grade definition of failing.

At one time, many years ago, the statement also noted that Unsatisfactory meant work below average (which would be a C grade). That part of th statement was removed when the U mark began t be counted as F grade in GPA.

If the U mark is interpreted universally as equal to grade, then the S mark should be interpreted as equal to any grade above an F.

Comment [TET7]: Statements have been in th catalog since the early 70s. They are more curriculum policies, rather than student policies. However, a review of graduate internship courses show that approx. 57% are letter graded. The Curriculum Guidelines state letter or S/U grade allowed for internship; while S/U and IP only allowed for thesis and dissertation.

Comment [TET8]: Distinguishes F grade from S and NF marks

Comment [TET9]: See S grade definition above

Revisions to 2014 Grading Policies and Procedures (Marked-Up Version)

Y The grade Y denotes a passing grade ~~in undergraduate pass/fail courses or~~ in undergraduate courses in which students have elected the pass/fail grading option. The credit hours are awarded, but the grade is not counted ~~are not considered~~ in computing grade point averages.*

Z The grade Z denotes failing performance ~~in undergraduate pass/fail courses or~~ in undergraduate courses in which students have elected the pass/fail grading option. The credit hours are recorded as attempted, and the grade is ~~are~~ not ~~considered~~ counted in computing grade point averages.*

* Refer to the Pass/Fail Grade policy in the University Catalog for conditions governing the acceptability of pass/fail grades at Kent State.

Administrative Marks

The following administrative marks are assigned when a letter grade is not appropriate.

AU The mark AU (Audit) denotes ~~that students have registered to audit a course~~ enrollment in a course without benefit of a grade or credit, typically for purposes of self-enrichment and academic exploration. Students may audit ~~without credit~~ any course subject to space availability and prior departmental approval. ~~An audited course is not counted as part of the course load, but students~~ To audit a course, students must go through registration procedures and be assessed ~~pay the normal~~ registration fees. An audited course cannot be applied toward a student's degree or certificate. ~~For graduate students, an audited course may not be counted as fulfilling the minimum course load requirements.~~ An instructor may impose whatever attendance requirements deemed necessary upon the students registered for audit. The students must be informed of these requirements at the beginning of the semester. Failure to meet such attendance requirements subjects the students to being withdrawn from the course by the instructor. ~~This will be accomplished by the instructor's insertion of the mark W for the students on the final grades list.~~ The AU mark is not counted in computing grade point averages.*

CP The mark CP (Complete) denotes completion of requirements for registered course COOP 20092 Cooperative Education. The CP mark is not counted in computing grade point averages.

CR The mark CR (Credit) denotes credit hours, but not letter grade, earned through successful completion of an alternate credit program (e.g., exam credit, trade competency or other non-institutional credit). The CR mark is not counted in computing grade point averages.

IN The ~~administrative~~ mark of IN (Incomplete) may be given to students who—due to extenuating circumstances—are unable to complete the required work between the course withdrawal deadline and the end of classes ~~due to extenuating circumstances~~. The timeline shall be adjusted appropriately for summer sessions and flexibly scheduled courses.

To be eligible, undergraduate students currently must be earning a minimum D grade, ~~currently passing~~ and ~~have completed at least 12 weeks of the semester. G~~graduate students currently must be ~~currently~~ earning a minimum C grade ~~or better grade and are unable to complete the required work between the course withdrawal deadline and the end of classes. The timeline shall be adjusted appropriately for summer sessions and flexibly scheduled courses~~. Appropriate documentation is ~~generally~~ required to support the extenuating circumstance. The student or university-approved designee must initiate the request for the IN ~~Incomplete~~ mark from the instructor, and it is the responsibility of the student to arrange to make up the incomplete work.

~~Incomplete grades must be made up within one semester (not including summer sessions) for undergraduate students, one calendar year for graduate students and three months for College of Podiatric Medicine students.~~

Instructors are required to complete and submit an Incomplete Mark Contract ~~Form~~ to their department chair/school director at the time grades are assigned. This form includes justification for awarding the Incomplete, describes the work to be completed for the course and specifies the grade to be assigned if the work is not completed (default grade). A copy of the Incomplete Mark Contract ~~Form~~ is provided to the student.

The IN ~~Incomplete~~ mark ~~grades will~~ is not ~~be~~ counted in the computation of grade point averages;

Comment [TET10]: We don't have designated pass/fail courses.

Comment [TET11]: Separated academic grade from administrative marks

Comment [TET12]: Added more definition.

Comment [TET13]: Want to stress that department needs to first approve registration.

Comment [TET14]: What is abnormal?

Comment [TET15]: Applies to all students; moved to footnote.

Comment [TET16]: Faculty need to contact Registrar's Office; cannot enter W mark on their own (this is not a new process).

Comment [TET17]: New mark for co-op course

Comment [TET18]: Existing mark.

Comment [TET19]: Aligns deadline with withdrawal deadline for all courses; currently, UG courses have until 12 weeks; GR courses have until withdrawal deadline.

Comment [TET20]: Specifies what "passing" means; consistent with GR statement.

Comment [TET21]: E.g., umbuds; there are times the student is unable to request.

Comment [TET22]: Duplicate of last paragraph

Revisions to 2014 Grading Policies and Procedures (Marked-Up Version)

when ~~until~~ the work is completed, ~~at which time~~ an appropriate grade will be assigned based on the instructor's evaluation of the work submitted and a new grade point average computed.

Unless the course is completed or an extension is granted, the IN ~~Incomplete~~ mark ~~grades~~ automatically will ~~automatically~~ lapse to the default grade designated on the Incomplete Mark ~~Form~~ Contract at the earliest of one of the following: (1) the default date designated on the Incomplete Mark Contract; or (2) at the end of one semester for undergraduate courses, ~~students and~~ at the end of three consecutive terms ~~one year~~ for graduate courses ~~students~~ and at the end of three months for College of Podiatric Medicine courses.

Comment [TET23]: Aligns deadline with other graduate policy deadlines (e.g., leave of absence).

Comment [TET24]: Existing practice.

IP The mark ~~grade~~ IP (In Progress) may be given to students to indicate that work is in progress toward a thesis, dissertation, research, individual investigation or a similar effort that requires additional time beyond a semester, ~~and that a final~~ A grade will be given when the work is completed. The IP mark ~~grade~~ can be utilized only in designated courses and is not ~~used~~ counted in computing grade point averages. ~~For graduate students, an IP grade is used for thesis (6xx99) or dissertation (8xx99) courses during those semesters in which a student is in the process of completing a thesis or dissertation.~~ The IP mark ~~grade when given for thesis registration~~ remains a terminal mark ~~grade~~ if the student does not complete the requirements for the course ~~changes from a thesis option in the master's degree to another degree option~~. For courses required for a ~~the~~ degree or certificate, a ~~final~~ grade must be given before the credential may ~~a degree can~~ be granted.

Comment [TET25]: This policy affects all students given an IP, not just ones registered for thesis.

M The mark ~~grade~~ M (Missing) was used until 1980. It is similar to the NF and SF marks ~~grades~~ (see below) and counts as an F grade (zero quality points) in computing grade point averages.

NC The mark NC (Not Complete) denotes requirements have not been completed for registered course COOP 20092 Cooperative Education. The NC mark is not used in computing grade point averages.

Comment [TET26]: New mark for co-op course

NF The mark ~~grade~~ NF (Never Attended–Fail) denotes that the student neither attended any ~~one~~ class session nor formally withdrew from the course. The NF mark ~~grade~~ counts as an F grade (zero quality points) in computing grade point averages.* In the case of undergraduate courses taken pass/fail, the NF mark ~~grade~~ will be changed to a Z (fail) grade.

NR The A mark NR (Not Reported) indicates the instructor did not submit a grade. The NR mark is not counted in computing grade point averages. For courses required for a degree or certificate, a grade must be given before the credential can be granted.

Comment [TET27]: Existing practices.

SF The mark ~~grade~~ SF (Stopped Attending–Fail) denotes that the student stopped attending the course and did not formally withdraw. The SF mark ~~grade~~ counts as an F grade (zero quality points) in computing grade point averages and must be accompanied by a date of last attendance in the course.* Faculty who cannot determine the exact date of last attendance may use the date of the last academic activity in which students participated. ~~SF grades are not appropriate for students who stop attending after the course withdrawal deadline. After that time, the grades should be based on student performance in the completion of course requirements.~~ In the case of undergraduate courses taken pass/fail, the SF mark ~~grade~~ will be changed to a Z (fail) grade.

Comment [TET28]: Per Title IV regulations, we must adjust financial aid for a student who stopped attending a course; therefore, we need to know the date of last attendance, even if after 10 weeks.

T The mark T denotes student participation in a national or international academic exchange program and is not counted in computing grade point averages.

Comment [TET29]: Existing mark.

TR The mark TR (Transfer) denotes accepted transfer coursework and is not counted in computing grade point averages.

Comment [TET30]: Existing mark.

W The mark W (Withdrawal) denotes that the student has withdrawn from the university or from any individual course without evaluation. For courses ~~students~~ in the College of Podiatric Medicine, this mark is given to students who withdraw prior to midterm exams.** The W mark is not ~~used~~ counted in computing grade point averages.

WF The mark WF (Withdrawal–Fail) is used by the College of Podiatric Medicine to denote that the student has withdrawn from the university or from any individual course/rotation with failing status after seven weeks of course instruction.** The WF mark is not ~~used~~ counted in computing grade point averages.

Revisions to 2014 Grading Policies and Procedures (Marked-Up Version)

WP The mark WP (Withdrawal–Pass) is used by the College of Podiatric Medicine to denote that the student has withdrawn from the university or from any individual course/rotation with passing status after seven weeks of course instruction.** The WP mark is not ~~used~~ counted in computing grade point averages.

* A course receiving the AU, NF or SF mark is not applied toward a student's course load for financial aid and other purposes.

** Please refer to the College of Podiatric Medicine section in the University Catalog for procedures for withdrawal.

Comment [TET31]: Per Title IV regulations, we must adjust financial aid for a student who never attended a course or earned a grade for which student received aid.

Grade/Mark-to-Grade Change Policy

With the exception of the IN, IP and NR marks, o~~O~~nce grades or marks are submitted, they are final and will not be changed except in cases of administrative error. Grades will not be changed by allowing the students to do additional work (e.g., retaking exams; redoing papers; submitting extra credit papers, reports~~, etc.~~) or by using criteria other than those applied to all students in the class.

In the event of a possible administrative error, the students must contact the instructor as soon as possible following the awarding of the grade.* If the instructor is not available, the department/school chair/director should be contacted.

Grade appeals for reasons other than administrative error must follow established policy and procedures for student academic complaints, see policies 4-02.3 for Kent Campus and 8-01.4 for regional campuses in the University Policy Register (www.kent.edu/policyreg).

Approved grade change requests for reasons other than removal of the IN, IP and NR marks must be submitted no later than the end of three consecutive terms after the grade was submitted or before the student's degree is posted officially to the permanent academic record, whichever comes first.* No challenge will be considered or adjustment made after that period. Deadline for removing the IN mark is noted in the Administrative Marks section above.

Comment [TET32]: New policy. Kent State has no deadline; therefore, a grade change can be initiated years later, which is not the norm. A revie of 24 institutions (Ohio public and KSU benchmark showed 75% disclosed a grade deadline. Of those, the deadline to appeal a grade ranged from 10 day to three years after the grade was assigned.

* Request for a grade change in the College of Podiatric Medicine for posted scores (e.g., didactic exams, quizzes, lab practicals), course or rotation grades or other forms of evaluation must be submitted within seven calendar days of posting or receipt. All grade change requests for reasons other than removal of an F grade or an IN ~~(incomplete)~~ mark must be submitted within the first two weeks of the succeeding academic term. No challenge will be considered or adjustment made after that period.

Grade Point Average

Quality points are awarded on the following scale:

- Each hour of A equals 4.000 points
- Each hour of A- equals 3.700 points
- Each hour of B+ equals 3.300 points
- Each hour of B equals 3.000 points
- Each hour of B- equals 2.700 points
- Each hour of C+ equals 2.300 points
- Each hour of C equals 2.000 points
- Each hour of C- equals 1.700 points
- Each hour of D+ equals 1.300 points
- Each hour of D equals 1.000 point
- Each hour of F equals 0.000 points
- Each hour of NF equals 0.000 points
- Each hour of SF equals 0.000 points
- Each hour of U equals 0.000 points

Revisions to 2014 Grading Policies and Procedures (Marked-Up Version)

A grade point average is determined by dividing the total number of points earned by the number of quality hours taken. Totals are extended to three decimal points and are not rounded up.

As an example, assume a student has completed 30 credit hours with a grade distribution of 3 hours of A, 3 hours of B, 3 hours of B-, 15 hours of C, 4 hours of D and 2 hours of F.

3 hours of A at 4 points per hour	12.000
3 hours of B at 3 points per hour	9.000
3 hours of B- at 2.7 points per hour	8.100
15 hours of C at 2 points per hour	30.000
4 hours of D at 1 point per hour	4.000
2 hours of F at 0 points per hour	0.000
Total Points	**63.100**

Dividing 63.100 by 30, a grade point average of 2.103 is obtained, which is slightly above a C average. Cumulative averages are computed by dividing the total quality points by the total quality hours. Grades of S, Y and Z are not included in grade point average.

Grade Reports

Final grades are reported at the close of each academic term and become a part of the students' permanent records. Grades are available in FlashLine.

Midterm Evaluation

A midterm (seventh week) evaluation is completed for all undergraduate freshmen. Midterm results are available to advisors and college/school/campus deans and will be used for counseling purposes when achievement is considered unsatisfactory (i.e., D or F quality). This evaluation will not be included as part of the students' academic transcripts. The midterm evaluation is available to freshmen in FlashLine.

Transcripts

Comment [TET33]: Existing policy, listed in graduation policies in Catalog

The integrity of academic transcripts is fundamental to the validity of coursework and degrees certified by the university. Therefore, all student transcript entries (grades and other notations) are finalized when the degree is officially posted to the permanent academic record following the effective date of graduation (visit the University Registrar website for the degree-posting deadline).

Revisions to 2014 Grading Policies and Procedures (Clean Version)

The transcript is an accurate and complete historical record of work attempted at the university. Changes to transcript entries that alter the enrollment history of a student are not to be made.

Academic Grades

The following grades are determined and assigned by faculty based upon appraisal and evaluation of student performance in completing requirements of a course:

A (4.000) Denotes "superior scholarship."

A- (3.700)

B+ (3.300)

B (3.000) Denotes "good performance" for students in undergraduate courses and "average performance" for students in graduate courses.

B- (2.700)

C+ (2.300)

C (2.000) Denotes "fair or average performance" for students in undergraduate courses and "below average performance" for students in graduate courses.

C- (1.700)

D+ (1.300)

D (1.000) Denotes "poor (but passing) performance" for students in undergraduate courses and "far below average performance" for students in graduate courses.

F (0.000) Denotes failure of the student's overall performance. This grade is earned and is not used for students who never attended or stopped attending the course (see NF and SF marks in Administrative Marks section below).

S The grade S (Satisfactory) denotes passing performance and is used for courses where S/U grading, rather than letter grading, is permitted. The credit hours are awarded, but the grade is not counted in computing grade point averages. Work earning an S grade may be applied toward meeting degree requirements.

U The grade U (Unsatisfactory) denotes failing performance and is used for courses where S/U grading, rather than letter grading, is permitted. This grade is earned and is not used for students who never attended or stopped attending the course (see NF and SF marks in Administrative Marks section below). Credit hours are recorded as attempted, and the grade is counted as an F (zero quality points) in computing grade point averages.

Y The grade Y denotes a passing grade in undergraduate courses in which students have elected the pass/fail grading option. The credit hours are awarded, but the grade is not counted in computing grade point averages.*

Z The grade Z denotes failing performance in undergraduate courses in which students have elected the pass/fail grading option. The credit hours are recorded as attempted, and the grade is not counted in computing grade point averages.*

* Please refer to the Pass/Fail Grade policy in the University Catalog for conditions governing the acceptability of pass/fail grades at Kent State.

Revisions to 2014 Grading Policies and Procedures (Clean Version)

Administrative Marks

The following administrative marks are assigned when a letter grade is not appropriate.

AU The mark AU (Audit) denotes enrollment in a course without benefit of a grade or credit, typically for purposes of self-enrichment and academic exploration. Students may audit any course subject to space availability and prior departmental approval. To audit a course, students must go through registration procedures and be assessed registration fees. An audited course cannot be applied toward a student's degree or certificate. An instructor may impose whatever attendance requirements deemed necessary upon the students registered for audit. The students must be informed of these requirements at the beginning of the semester. Failure to meet such attendance requirements subjects the students to being withdrawn from the course by the instructor. The AU mark is not used in computing grade point averages.*

CP The mark CP (Complete) denotes completion of requirements for registered course COOP 20092 Cooperative Education. The CP mark is not counted in computing grade point averages.

CR The mark CR (Credit) denotes credit hours, but not letter grade, earned through successful completion of an alternate credit program (e.g., exam credit, trade competency or other non-institutional credit). The CR mark is not counted in computing grade point averages.

IN The mark IN (Incomplete) may be given to students who—due to extenuating circumstances—are unable to complete the required work between the course withdrawal deadline and the end of classes. The timeline shall be adjusted appropriately for summer sessions and flexibly scheduled courses.

To be eligible, undergraduate students currently must be earning a minimum D grade, and graduate students currently must be earning a minimum C grade. Appropriate documentation is required to support the extenuating circumstance. The student or university-approved designee must initiate the request for the IN mark from the instructor, and it is the responsibility of the student to arrange to make up the incomplete work.

Instructors are required to complete and submit an Incomplete Mark Contract to their department chair/ school director at the time grades are assigned. This form includes justification for awarding the Incomplete, describes the work to be completed for the course and specifies the grade to be assigned if the work is not completed (default grade). A copy of the Incomplete Mark Contract is provided to the student.

The IN mark is not counted in the computation of grade point averages; when the work is completed, an appropriate grade will be assigned based on the instructor's evaluation of the work submitted and a new grade point average computed.

Unless the course is completed or an extension is granted, the IN mark automatically will lapse to the default grade designated on the Incomplete Mark Contract at the earliest of one of the following: (1) the default date designated on the Incomplete Mark Contract; or (2) at the end of one semester for undergraduate courses, at the end of three consecutive terms for graduate courses and at the end of three months for College of Podiatric Medicine courses.

IP The mark IP (In Progress) may be given to students to indicate that work is in progress toward a thesis, dissertation, research, individual investigation or a similar effort that requires additional time beyond a semester. A grade will be given when the work is completed. The IP mark can be utilized only in designated courses and is not counted in computing grade point averages. The IP mark remains a terminal mark if the student does not complete the requirements for the course. For courses required for a degree or certificate, a grade must be given before the credential may be granted.

M The mark M (Missing) was used until 1980. It is similar to the NF and SF marks (see below) and counts as an F grade (zero quality points) in computing grade point averages.

NC The mark NC (Not Complete) denotes requirements have not been completed for registered course COOP 20092 Cooperative Education. The NC mark is not used in computing grade point averages.

Revisions to 2014 Grading Policies and Procedures (Clean Version)

NF The mark NF (Never Attended–Fail) denotes that the student neither attended any class session nor formally withdrew from the course. The NF mark counts as an F grade (zero quality points) in computing grade point averages.* In the case of undergraduate courses taken pass/fail, the NF mark will be changed to a Z (fail) grade.

NR The mark NR (Not Reported) indicates the instructor did not submit a grade. The NR mark is not counted in computing grade point averages. For courses required for a degree or certificate, a grade must be given before a degree can be granted.

SF The mark SF (Stopped Attending–Fail) denotes that the student stopped attending the course and did not formally withdraw. The SF mark counts as an F grade (zero quality points) in computing grade point averages and must be accompanied by a date of last attendance in the course.* Faculty who cannot determine the exact date of last attendance may use the date of the last academic activity in which students participated. In the case of undergraduate courses taken pass/fail, the SF mark will be changed to a Z (fail) grade.

T The mark T denotes student participation in a national or international academic exchange program and is not counted in computing grade point averages.

TR The mark TR (Transfer) denotes accepted transfer coursework and is not counted in computing grade point averages.

W The mark W (Withdrawal) denotes that the student has withdrawn from the university or from any individual course without evaluation. For courses in the College of Podiatric Medicine, this mark is given to students who withdraw prior to midterm exams.** The W mark is not counted in computing grade point averages.

WF The mark WF (Withdrawal–Fail) is used by the College of Podiatric Medicine to denote that the student has withdrawn from the university or from any individual course/rotation with failing status after seven weeks of course instruction.** The WF mark is not counted in computing grade point averages.

WP The mark WP (Withdrawal–Pass) is used by the College of Podiatric Medicine to denote that the student has withdrawn from the university or from any individual course/rotation with passing status after seven weeks of course instruction.** The WP mark is not counted in computing grade point averages.

* A course receiving the AU, NF or SF mark is not applied toward a student's course load for financial aid and other purposes.

** Please refer to the College of Podiatric Medicine section in the University Catalog for procedures for withdrawal.

Grade/Mark-to-Grade Change Policy

With the exception of the IN, IP and NR marks, once grades or marks are submitted, they are final and will not be changed except in cases of administrative error. Grades will not be changed by allowing the students to do additional work (e.g., retaking exams; redoing papers; submitting extra credit papers, reports) or by using criteria other than those applied to all students in the class.

In the event of a possible administrative error, the students must contact the instructor as soon as possible following the awarding of the grade. If the instructor is not available, the department/school chair/director should be contacted.

Grade appeals for reasons other than administrative error must follow established policy and procedures for student academic complaints, see policies 4-02.3 for Kent Campus and 8-01.4 for regional campuses in the University Policy Register (www.kent.edu/policyreg).

Approved grade change requests for reasons other than removal of the IN, IP and NR marks must be submitted no later than the end of three consecutive terms after the grade was submitted or before the student's degree is posted officially to the permanent academic record, whichever comes first.* No challenge will be considered or adjustment made after that period. Deadline for removing the IN mark is noted in the Administrative Marks section above.

* Request for a grade change in the College of Podiatric Medicine for posted scores (e.g., didactic exams, quizzes, lab practicals), course or rotation grades or other forms of evaluation must be submitted within seven calendar days of posting or receipt. All grade change requests for reasons other than removal of an F grade or an IN mark must be submitted within the first two weeks of the succeeding academic term. No challenge will be considered or adjustment made after that period.

Grade Point Average

Quality points are awarded on the following scale:

- Each hour of A equals 4.000 points
- Each hour of A- equals 3.700 points
- Each hour of B+ equals 3.300 points
- Each hour of B equals 3.000 points
- Each hour of B- equals 2.700 points
- Each hour of C+ equals 2.300 points
- Each hour of C equals 2.000 points
- Each hour of C- equals 1.700 points
- Each hour of D+ equals 1.300 points
- Each hour of D equals 1.000 point
- Each hour of F equals 0.000 points
- Each hour of NF equals 0.000 points
- Each hour of SF equals 0.000 points
- Each hour of U equals 0.000 points

A grade point average is determined by dividing the total number of points earned by the number of quality hours taken. Totals are extended to three decimal points and are not rounded up.

As an example, assume a student has completed 30 credit hours with a grade distribution of 3 hours of A, 3 hours of B, 3 hours of B-, 15 hours of C, 4 hours of D and 2 hours of F.

3 hours of A at 4 points per hour	12.000
3 hours of B at 3 points per hour	9.000
3 hours of B- at 2.7 points per hour	8.100
15 hours of C at 2 points per hour	30.000
4 hours of D at 1 point per hour	4.000
2 hours of F at 0 points per hour	0.000
Total Points	**63.100**

Dividing 63.100 by 30, a grade point average of 2.103 is obtained, which is slightly above a C average. Cumulative averages are computed by dividing the total quality points by the total quality hours. Grades of S, Y and Z are not included in grade point average.

Grade Reports

Final grades are reported at the close of each academic term and become a part of the students' permanent records. Grades are available in FlashLine.

Midterm Evaluation

A midterm (seventh week) evaluation is completed for all undergraduate freshmen. Midterm results are available to advisors and college/school/campus deans and will be used for counseling purposes when achievement is considered unsatisfactory (i.e., D or F quality). This evaluation will not be included as part of the students' academic transcripts. The midterm evaluation is available to freshmen in FlashLine.

Transcripts

The integrity of academic transcripts is fundamental to the validity of coursework and degrees certified by the university. Therefore, all student transcript entries (grades and other notations) are finalized when the degree is officially posted to the permanent academic record following the effective date of graduation (visit the University Registrar website for the degree-posting deadline).

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date **1-Feb-15** Curriculum Bulletin _____

Effective Date **Fall 2015** Approved by EPC _____

Department **Associate and Assistant Deans Committee**

College

Proposal **Revise Policy**

Proposal Name **Minors Policy**

Description of proposal:

Proposal seeks to revise the Minors Policy as published in Curriculum Guidelines and include it in the 2015 University Catalog. Revisions are to (1) allow students in an associate degree major to declare a minor; (b) decrease the upper-division requirement, from 9 to 6 hours; (c) require minimum 50 percent of the minor's total coursework to be earned at Kent State; and (d) establish a double-counting limitation that entails 6 credits hours in the minor to be unique to the declared major or other minor.

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

When/if this proposal is approved, any policy or program that is below the established minimum will need to be revised by fall 2016.

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

Assistant and associate deans and advisors for each college

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)

7.b.

Proposal Summary
Revision of the Minor Policy

SUBJECT SPECIFICATION

This proposal seeks to revise the policy governing undergraduate minors and publish it in the University Catalog.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The policy regarding an undergraduate minor, as published in the Curriculum Guidelines, has been relatively unchanged for decades. However, the university has greatly grown since then, leading to issues that the policy did not address or were open to interpretation. Examples include fielding requests from associate degree-seeking students to declare a minor (policy is silent) and trying to understand "discipline" in the restriction *"students may not pursue a minor and a major in the same discipline,"* when the minor may not carry the same name or reside in the same department much less same college as the major, yet it contains the same courses.

These issues were brought to the Associate and Assistant (A&A) Deans Committee, which charged a subcommittee to examine the policy and make recommendations. The subcommittee comprised the following members:

- Joanne Arhar, professor and associate dean, Education, Health and Human Services
- Mary Ann Haley, assistant professor and associate dean, Arts and Sciences
- Richmond Nettey, associate professor and associate dean, Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology
- Gail Rebeta, university registrar
- Liz Sinclair, assistant dean, Business Administration
- Katie Smith, academic program coordinator, Curriculum Services
- Mary Southards, assistant dean, Stark Campus
- Cynthia Stillings, professor and associate dean (interim), The Arts
- Therese Tillett, director, Curriculum Services
- Bill Willoughby, associate professor and associate dean, Architecture and Environmental Design
- Kathy Zarges, academic program director, Education, Health and Human Services

Once convened, the committee reviewed Kent State's policy against minor policies at 32 other four-year universities, including Ohio public and Kent State benchmark universities (appendix A). Members also examined the structure of the university's 144 active undergraduate minors (appendix B) and the top 25 minors and top 25 minor/major combinations in terms of enrollment and graduation (appendix C).

From that review, the committee focused on the following items for discussion and decision.

1. Minimum total hours required for a minor.
2. Amount of coursework applied toward a minor that must be taken in residence at Kent State.
3. Requirement of upper-division coursework in a minor.
4. Allowance (or restriction) of double-counting courses for both a declared major and minor.
5. Allowance (or restriction) of associate degree-seeking students to declare a minor.

The primary objective of the subcommittee was to construct a policy that provides a standardization and baseline of minimum requirements that is representative of and attainable for a university with such diverse program offerings.

1. Minimum total hours required for a minor.

Since 1991, the policy has stated that a minor *"normally contains between 18 and 25 credit hours."* Prior to 1991, the policy used the word *"should,"* rather than *"normally."* In 2012, the stipulation *"a minor is minimum 12 credit hours"* was added to align the policy with a directive from the Ohio Board of Regents.

The subcommittee discussed the appropriate amount of coursework that constitutes formalized study in an academic area and appears as a separate credential on a student's transcript. Members agreed that while subjective, depending on the area of specialization and level of coursework applied, five or more courses (approximately 15+ hours) is fitting. From the review of Kent State minors, it appeared that academic units agreed, with all minors having 15 or more hours, with the exception of one (see below).

Review of Kent State's 144 active minors:

- Lowest hours:
  - 12 (International Business for Business Majors)
  - 15 (Aviation Management)
  - 16 (Unmanned Aircraft Systems)
- Highest hours:
  - 42 (Education)
  - 32 (Sports Medicine)
  - 30 (Paralegal Studies)
- Average hours: 21
  - # of minors with 18 hours: 42
  - # of minors with 19+ hours: 99

Review of 32 four-year universities:

- 1 requires 12 hours
- 13 require 15 hours
- 1 requires 17 hours
- 14 require 18 hours
- 1 requires 24 hours
- 2 listed no required minimum

The required credit hours for the International Business for Business Majors minor may be higher than 12 depending on the student's foreign language proficiency. This minor is specific to business majors and comprises courses not required in the major. The same minor for non-business majors requires a minimum of 23 hours.

The committee recommends keeping the minimum requirement at 12 credit hours. The current policy aligns with Ohio Board of Regents' requirement, and 98 percent of Kent State minors are 18 or more hours, falling within the range of *"normally."*

2. Amount of coursework applied toward a minor that must be taken in residence at Kent State.

Residence is defined as academic credit earned at a university. Kent State's residence requirement is 30 hours for a bachelor's degree, 15 hours for an associate degree and 50 percent total required hours for a certificate. There is no residence requirement for minors, thereby theoretically allowing students to use most or all transfer/transient coursework or alternative credit toward earning a Kent State credential without taking Kent State courses.

Of the 32 four-year universities reviewed, 12 listed a residence requirement:

- 4 require minimum 50 percent
- 3 require minimum 9 hours
- 3 require minimum 6 hours (all upper-division for one institution)
- 1 requires that maximum 6 hours can be transfer coursework
- 1 states residence requirement is determined by department

Subcommittee members agreed there should be a residence requirement and that it should align with the one for Kent State certificates—*minimum 50 percent of the total required hours in residence*—as the total hours for both types of programs are similar in total hours.

3. Requirement of upper-division coursework in a minor.

The current policy requires minors to include minimum 9 upper-division hours. Previously (before 1991), the 9 upper-division hours were a recommendation. However, the policy has not been enforced as 25 minors (18 percent) have less than 9 credits of upper-division required.

Review of Kent State's 144 active minors:

Upper-division requirement	Number of minors
0 hours	2
3-5 hours	3
6-7 hours	20
9+ hours	119

Half of the 32 universities reviewed (16) listed an upper-division hour requirement:

Upper-division requirement	# of universities
1 course	1
2 courses	1
⅓ total hours	1
6 hours	5
9 hours	7
12 hours	1*

* Certificates are minimum 24 hours.

This area received the most discussion, within both the A&A Deans Committee and the subcommittee. Proponents for eliminating the upper-division requirement argued that minors serve different purposes—some minors offer depth in one subject, while other minors offer breadth of inter/multidisciplinary study—and it may disadvantage students to lose that flexibility.

Proponents for retaining the upper-division requirement debated that, as a subset of or an addition to a major, a minor should have meaningful content and build aptitude in an academic area, which is found in upper-division coursework.

The conclusion from the subcommittee's examination is that an upper-division requirement allows for a student to achieve competency in an academic study and should be retained. However, members recommend reducing the requirement, from 9 to 6 upper-division hours. The rationale for the reduction includes concerns that upper-division courses are not offered frequently, which may delay time to graduation, and the fact that most upper-division courses have prerequisites that may make it difficult for non-majors to satisfy.

4. Allowance (or restriction) of double-counting courses for both a declared major and minor.

The policy states that *"Students may not pursue a minor and a major in the same discipline."* That statement makes sense in a simplified example of not allowing a student in the chemistry major to declare the chemistry minor. It gets complicated, though, when determining combinations that span departments and colleges—for example, the integrated social studies major with economics concentration paired with the economics minor.

If the purpose of the minor, as indicated in the policy, is *"to provide formalized guidance to students in selecting courses in a field or content area that is outside the major,"* having all the coursework in a minor subsumed in a major does not fit that objective. Nor does it make sense to allow a student to earn two different Kent State credentials for the same coursework.

Of the other 32 universities reviewed, 27 universities have a written policy on double-counting courses toward both a major and a minor. Twelve of those universities (44 percent) are as ambiguous as Kent State in wording and write more about prohibiting a major and minor in the same field/discipline/name/department, than about duplication of courses or content.

Of the remaining 15 universities:

- 6 allow no double counting at all
- 1 requires 15 unique hours
- 2 require 12 unique hours
- 2 require 9 unique hours
- 1 requires 8 unique hours
- 1 requires 6 unique hours
- 1 requires maximum ⅓ of minor coursework to overlap with major
- 1 allows full double-counting

The subcommittee recommends that Kent State adopt the restriction of minimum 6 credit hours unique to course requirements for any major or other minor the student is pursuing. Members also recommend keeping the original language—*"Students may not pursue a minor and a major in the same discipline."*—as it may be possible for a student to fulfill the unique hours but still select an unauthorized major/minor combination. Therefore, the language allows academic units to continue to approve or disapprove a combination depending on the nature of the disciplines involved.

There are several majors where the full curriculum for a minor has been embedded as requirement for graduation with the bachelor's degree. Typically, with these, the name of the major or concentration is similar to the name of the minor, if not identical. Program areas will not be required to change their curriculum when/if this proposed requirement is approved; however, students will no longer be allowed to declare the minor if it does not contain 6 hours unique to the major.

5. Allowance (or restriction) of associate degree-seeking students to declare a minor.

Over the past several years, students in associate degrees have been requesting to declare a minor. The policy governing minors, however, is silent on this matter. Most likely that is because it was not an issue to be decided when the policy was created in the 1980s. Back then, bachelor's degrees and coursework were offered only at the Kent Campus, and associate degrees and courses were offered only at the regional campuses.

Kent State's eight campuses operate differently today with more partnerships and student mobility. Presently, 27 bachelor's degrees and 37 undergraduate minors are offered fully at the regional campuses, and students have many opportunities to enroll in online courses from any campus. In summer 2009, 26 courses were offered online from the Kent Campus. In summer 2014, that number had grown to 258, an 892-percent increase in five years.

As the policy did not address the pairing of associate degree majors and undergraduate minors, decisions have been inconsistently made. A review of awarded minors uncovered that seven students in associate degree programs graduated with a minor over the past 17 years. Yet, other associate degree students have been denied when requesting a minor.

Most of the 32 other universities reviewed do not offer an associate degree. A question put out on a registrar listserv elicited few responses, and the ones that did were mixed, with some denying associate degree students from declaring a minor (mainly due to the upper-division requirement in the minor) and others permitting it or recently changing their regulations to permit.

Committee members believe the statement in the policy that a minor "*enables a student to make an inquiry into a discipline or field of study or to investigate a particular theme*" should be applicable to students in Kent State's nearly 30 associate degree majors. For example, students in the associate degree in nursing may benefit by having a minor in applied conflict management; students studying viticulture for the associate degree may enhance their employment opportunities with a minor in business.

However, the committee recommends that the policy not extend to students in the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees or the Associate of Technical Study degree–individualized program. These degrees do not have a major, or a specialized course of study; therefore, declaring a minor does not fit with the intention to allow students to investigate a field or content area outside the major.

ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES

The alternate to the proposed recommendations is retaining the current policy as it stands, which does not represent today's Kent State with its large amount of programmatic offerings and student movement across campuses. The consequences are inconsistent, imprecise and arbitrary decision-making regarding associate degree students, major/minor combinations, residence and upper-division content.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION AND JUSTIFICATION

The recommendation of the subcommittee of the Associate and Assistant Deans Committee is to revise the minors policy to (a) allow students in an associate degree major to declare a minor; (b) decrease the upper-division requirement, from 9 to 6 hours; (c) require minimum 50 percent of the minor's total coursework to be earned at Kent State; and (d) establish a double-counting limitation that entails 6 credits hours in the minor to be unique to the declared major or other minor.

Program faculty and academic units have the prerogative to require more upper-division coursework and more hours in residence than the proposed university minimum, as well as to prohibit outright specific major/minor combinations, but they cannot require less. When/if this proposal is approved, any policy or program that is below the established minimum will need to be revised by fall 2016.

Proposed changes to the current minor policy:

> *An academic minor is a curriculum component, smaller than the major, which enables a student to make an inquiry into a discipline or field of study or to investigate a particular theme. The purpose of a minor is to provide formalized guidance to students in selecting courses in a field or content area that is outside the major and to provide formal recognition of that work on the transcript. Minors may be centered in a specific department or be drawn from several departments, as in the case of an interdisciplinary topical or thematic focus.*
>
> *A minor is minimum 12 credit hours and normally contains between 18 and 25 credit hours, with ~~at least 9~~ a minimum of 6 of those hours being upper-division credit and a minimum 50 percent of the total hours in residence. Minors are sponsored by the unit that offers the courses in that discipline.*
>
> *Students in a bachelor's or an applied associate degree (e.g., AAB, AAS) or the Associate of Technical Study, of which there is a major, may declare a minor. Students in a generalist associate degree (e.g., AA, AS, ATS–Individualized Program) may not declare a minor.*
>
> *Students may not pursue a minor and a major in the same discipline. A minimum of 6 credit hours in the minor must be outside of the course requirements for any major or other minor the student is pursuing.*
>
> *Students must formally declare a minor, similar to the process by which they declare the major.*

ACTIONS REQUIRED AND ANTICIPATED TIMELINE

Associate and Assistant Deans Committee..... approved 10 February 2015
Educational Policies Council..... approval sought 16 February 2015
Faculty Senate..... approval sought 16 March 2015
Implementation..... published in fall 2015 University Catalog

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date **11/4/2014** Curriculum Bulletin _____

Effective Date **Fall 2015** Approved by EPC _____

Department	**Geography**	
College	**AS - Arts and Sciences**	
Degree		
Program Name	**Master of Geographic Information Science**	Program Banner Code
Concentration(s)	Concentration(s) Banner Code(s)	
Proposal	**Establish program**	

Description of proposal:

The curriculum meets the needs of individuals who are interested in professional careers in Geographic Information Science (GISc) and for those who would like to further their current career with GISc training, particularly in information services, environmental or health sciences in both public and private sector positions. Students are exposed to theories, techniques, and applications across GISc, which prepare them for positions ranging from analysts through to management in industries that utilize geospatial data and technologies.

The proposed start date is Fall 2015 with admission every fall, spring, and summer semesters. The program is fully online and courses run for 7 weeks; up to 30 students will be accepted into the program each semester. The MGISc is a 32 hour program with 17 core hours, 9 hours in the student's chosen concentration, and then 6 hours of electives. The curriculum is designed to be completed in under 2 years. Admission requirements include an undergraduate baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution in a cognate field, a minimum 3.0 GPA. No GRE will be required and the admission process is the same as current graduate programs. This program is an Everspring Collaboration and Everspring will handle all marketing and will be the initial point of contact for all potential applicants.

Does proposed revision change program's total credit hours? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Current total credit hours: **32** Proposed total credit hours **32**

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

No duplication issues have been identified by the units consulted (please see below). There will be no impact to staffing other KSU units. Those courses from other units offered as electives may see some increases in enrollment, but as we understand, this is not an issue. Everspring has conducted a market study to identify need and audience; pending approval, they will design the marketing plan accordingly.

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

Department of Geology, Department of Biological Sciences, Department of Computer Science, School of Digital Sciences, College of Public Health

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

_____ 11/4/14

Department Chair / School Director

_____ ___/___/___

Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

GEOG 35

7.C.

Mary Ann Haley — 12/5/14
College Dean (or designee)

Nancy Gonchar — 2/5/15
Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

— 1 1
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee)

GEOG
36

New Graduate Degree Program Full Proposal
[Master of Geographic Information Science (MGISc)]

1. **Academic Quality:** Competency, experience and number of faculty and adequacy of students, curriculum, computational resources, library, laboratories, equipment and other physical facilities, needed to mount the program.

OVERVIEW

This proposal outlines an exciting new opportunity for professionals interested in Geographic Information Science in the State of Ohio, as well as nationally. In particular, our program is designed for professionals in the health, data science, and environmental science sectors. We propose to offer a 32 credit hour ***fully online*** Professional Master of GISc with concentrations in CyberGIS, Health and GIS, and Environmental GIS. This will be the fourth fully online program to be launched nationally. All courses will be taught on a 7 week schedule (apart from the final course, practicum, which will be 14 weeks long). The program will have three admission periods each year (start of Fall, Spring and Summer). The curriculum offerings are designed in such a way that students will take one course at any given time and can complete the entire degree in 5 academic semesters. The courses in the degree will be offered in such a pattern that if a student decides to take a 7 week break, they can start back into the program in the following 7 week segment.

All core and concentration courses will be taught by full-time faculty in the department of Geography. Electives will be available from Geography, Computer Science and Digital Sciences.

This program may be desirable to students with Geography undergraduate degrees, but market analysis shows that the program will be more attractive to working professionals likely to have degrees in affiliated fields, but not geography. Thus this program introduces individuals to the basics of GIS and geospatial principles and quickly escalates students to high end problem solving using GIS. The program culminates in a practicum which is designed to provide practical experience in the application of MGISc course content in real-world professional settings.

CURRICULUM

Our proposed curriculum consists of 32 hours of rigorous curriculum. There are 16 hours of core curriculum for all students; 9 hours of required concentration courses; and 6 hours of electives

In brief, the core courses are:

- **GEOG 59070 Geographic Information Science (4 credits)** Introduction to theories and methods for geographic data processing, including data capture and input, data storage and management, and data analysis and displays. Emphasis is on laboratory exercises using GIS software packages for real world applications.
- **GEOG 59080 Advanced Geographic Information Science (3 credits)** Advanced theories and techniques for handling geographic information systems, including 2D and 3D processing of geographic information, detection and analysis of geographic patterns, 2D and 3D mapping of geographic information, modelling of geographic processes, and an overview of GIS programming tools.

- **GEOG 69164 Cartographic Design (4 credits)** This course builds on students' experiences with GIS to focus on the design needed to disseminate information beyond users of the software and produce effective print and web maps. Principles of map design and the art of map construction will be taught. Concepts such as scale, projections, typography, generalization, symbols, color scheme, and classification to the design and production of thematic maps will be covered.
- **GEOG 69392 Practicum in Geographic Information Science (6 credits)** This course represents the culminating experience for students in the MGISc program. It will be taken in place of two Carousel/Specialist courses on the schedule for the student's final semester. It is designed to provide practical experience in the application of MGISc course content in real-world professional settings. Students will select a professional project in consultation with their employer and program faculty and then will design, implement, and report on their activities in a culminating professional paper.

THE CONCENTRATION REQUIREMENTS ARE:

FOR CYBERGIS

- **GEOG 59076 Spatial Programming (3 credits)** Introduces the student to a variety of computer programming environments suitable for the analysis of spatial problems.
- **GEOG 69082 CyberGIS (3 credits)** Explores cyberinfrastructure-enabled geographic information systems (i.e. cyberGIS) and related technologies including a broad introduction to the use, design, and development of cyberinfrastructure, spatial data infrastructures, geographic information services, and web-enabled mapping technologies. Situates CyberGIS in the broader context of geographic information science focusing on the how synthesizing computational thinking and spatial thinking influence methodological approaches.
- **GEOG 69083 Geodatabases (3 credits)** essential concepts and skills needed to efficiently create a geodatabase, add data to it, and realistically model the real-world spatial relationships inherent to the data. Students will learn about geodatabase features that help ensure data integrity over time and about storing and managing geographic data.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL GIS

- **GEOG 59078 Geographic Information Science and Environmental Hazards (3 credits)** The study and management of natural hazards are inherently reliant on both physical and human processes and spatial patterns. Given the many variables involved and the variety of scales at which they operate, use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) has become standard practice in research on hazards and in their management by government agencies at all levels. Exposes students to a wide array of spatial data that is used in these activities, as well as standard mapping and spatial analysis procedures and forms of data dissemination.
- **GEOG 69079 Environmental Geographic Information Science (3 credits)** GPS and environmental spatial data are commonly used in a variety of management and assessment plans in fields related to environmental science to achieve effective decision making and environmental resource management. This course will focus on techniques used to process, manage, visualize, and analyze environmental data using GIS. Students will learn how to

collect and process GPS and online sources of geospatial data and how to employ techniques such as suitability modeling, measuring distributions, and calculating landscape metrics.

- **GEOG 69231 Environmental Remote Sensing (3 credits)** Students are introduced to the basic principles of environmental remote sensing, including the electromagnetic spectrum, spectral properties of Earth objects, aerial photograph analysis and interpretation and satellite image analysis and interpretation. Special focus will be on environmental applications, especially as they pertain to understanding vegetation, water, and land use mapping and impacts.

FOR HEALTH AND GIS

- **GEOG 59072 Geographic Information Science and Health (3 credits)** Geographic theory and methods serve as the connection among disparate disciplines focused on how and why "health" varies between regions, cities, and neighborhoods. Examines how geospatial technologies, especially GIS, have become an important health analysis tool.
- **GEOG 69073 Geographic Information Science: Global Health (3 credits)** Emerging and re-emerging diseases in non-developed countries pose one of the greatest health challenges of current times. Geospatial approaches often provide one of the only information sources in data poor and challenging environments. This course will expose students to these health issues and disease environments through varied case studies, while simultaneously highlighting the geospatial methods and approaches used to understand and combat disease.
- **GEOG 69074 Spatial Analysis for Health Geography (3 credits)** Spatial analysis is used to verify patterns and associations in health data maps. These results can then be used to further hone the scientific question, or help design an intervention strategy. This course will introduce spatial analytical approaches used by health researchers and practitioners in the exploratory investigation of health data. Students will also be exposed to new mobile technologies that can be used to enrich more traditional spatial data sources.

ELECTIVES: STUDENTS WILL TAKE 2 COURSES (NOTE THAT COURSES LISTED AS REQUIRED IN CONCENTRATIONS MAY ALSO COUNT AS ELECTIVES FOR OTHER CONCENTRATIONS). ADDITIONAL ELECTIVES INCLUDE:

- **GEOG 69004 Quantitative Methods (3 credits)** This course explores the methods and applications of some of the most common statistics found in geographic work. It explores probability theory, spatial statistics, estimation procedures, hypothesis testing, spatial sampling, methods of areal association, correlation and regression analysis, and principal components analysis. Theory and execution of these methods are equally emphasized, and applications to geographic problems are examined within each theme.
- **GEOG 69007 Spatiotemporal Analytics (3 credits)** This course will equip the students with essential spatiotemporal thinking and technical skills in mapping, analyzing, visualizing, communicating, and simulating the spatiotemporal data. ArcGIS and free packages in R and Netlogo will be used in the instruction.

- **DSCI 64210 Data Science (3 credits)** Introduction to the concept of big data and data analytics, including the business challenges of working with big data. Students are introduced to the concepts of both structured and unstructured data. Fundamental concepts include data design and management, database design and management, data driven programming and discovery, and data presentation and use. Data analytics in industry verticals are discussed, including science, intelligence and law enforcement, health, retail and financial services.
- **CS 61002 Algorithms and Programming I (4 credits)** An introduction to the algorithms and tools used in computer science; includes programming in a high level language.
- **CS 61003 Algorithms and Programming II (4 credits)** Further exploration into the tools used in computer science.

OUR FACULTY

All of our faculty hold a PhD in Geography or a related field, and all are recognized experts in their respective areas in the geospatial sciences (see attached CV's). Our proposed program is built around both faculty expertise, and around a growing need for such a professional program.

Name	*Rank*	*Status*	*Highest Degree*	*Degree Date*	*Field*	*Expertise*
Andrew Curtis	Associate Professor	Tenure Track	Ph.D.	1995	Geography	public health, spatial confidentiality,
Jacqueline W. (Mills) Curtis	Assistant Professor	Tenure Track	Ph.D.	2005	Geography	public health, hazards, built environment
Jay Lee	Professor	Tenured	Ph.D.	1989	Geography	geospatial analysis
Jennifer Mapes	Assistant Professor	Non-tenure Track	Ph.D.	2009	Geography	geovisualization
Mandy Munro-Stasiuk	Professor	Tenured	Ph.D.	1999	Geography	remote sensing
Eric Shook	Assistant Professor	Tenure Track	Ph.D.	2013	Geography	cyber-GIS
Emarlana Taylor	Assistant Professor	Non-tenure Track	Ph.D.	2009	Geography	urban ecology, computational modeling
Xinyue Ye	Assistant Professor	Tenure Track	Ph.D.	2010	Geography	web-GIS, mobile applications

RESOURCES

2. computational resources, library, laboratories, equipment and other physical facilities, needed to mount the program.

We are well-positioned at Kent State to offer this proposed fully online program. While this is a very technically intensive program to offer via distance learning, we have been preparing for this for three years and have considerable expertise in delivering DL hands-on content.

RESOLUTION: REGARDING THE REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS

1. Whereas, Kent State University has a tradition of governance based on the concept and model of ***shared governance***;
2. Whereas, the Faculty Senate is the elected body of the faculty with regard to policy and decision making, and oversight responsibilities, regarding the RTP process;
3. Whereas, this university has in place a policy regarding "tolling" that is in compliance and consistent with the federal law, Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;
4. Whereas, this university has in place an anti-discrimination policy, based on race, ethnicity, disability, and gender that is in compliance and consistent with the federal law, the Civil Rights Act of 1964;
5. Whereas, the Joint Appeals Board is a critical level of review for due process and fairness for faculty in the RPT process;
6. Whereas, the integrity of the RTP process, and the right to due process and appeal of administrative decisions are necessary for the full faith, confidence and trust of the faculty;
7. Whereas, furthermore, the integrity and justice of the RTP process requires both fairness in the content and the application of both university and departmental/school guidelines, policies, and criteria;
8. Whereas, the integrity of the RTP process requires the veracity of the facts, objectivity, and honest intentions;
9. Whereas, the faculty handbook in the academic unit is the primary document that sets the standards and criteria by which the faculty are to be judged in the RTP process;
10. Whereas, accurate and honest feedback from the faculty, and chair or director, at the unit level during reappointment evaluations and third year reviews, is critical to a realistic sense of the progress and status of the faculty member in the RTP process;
11. Whereas, fairness and justice in the RTP appeal process requires a level playing field, where neither side has a clear advantage over the other;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate in this resolution, in the interest of justice and transparency, requests that the Provost explain to this body why, on arbitrary and sundry occasions, relative to the RTP process, his decisions contradict that of the faculty experts in the applicants academic unit, the faculty throughout the various levels of review (many of whom have as much experience and knowledge, if not more, as he does), and the administrators at the levels of the unit and college.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate is requesting that the Provost explain why, on arbitrary and sundry occasions, his decisions with regard to the RTP process are in contradiction with KSU policies regarding tolling and anti-discrimination with regard to race, ethnicity, disability, and gender.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate is requesting that AAUP-KSU review and renegotiate, at the appropriate time, the sections to the Collective Bargaining Agreement which permits the JAB to render decisions that clearly prevents the applicant in the RTP appeal process from receiving a fair hearing, and ultimately a fair outcome.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate reiterate and reaffirm that the tradition of governance in the areas of policy and decision making, and with regard to the curriculum, welfare, status, instruction, judicial review, of the faculty and students at KSU is based on the concept and model of ***shared governance***, and invite the two highest administrators of this institution to address this body with regard to this assertion, if they have a difference of opinion with regard to this statement.

Be it resolved that in order to protect the integrity of the RTP process, it is necessary for faculty and administrators, alike, to recuse themselves when there is a conflict of interest, identify factual errors in all documents, immediately remove, or ignore, all such documents from the applicant's dossier or portfolio, and render fair and unbiased judgments on the applicant's files.

Be it resolved that the sixth and/or final year review of a faculty member should be consistent and in agreement with previous evaluations when the faculty member in the RTP process continues a trend of progress.

Be it resolved that in the interest of justice and fairness, faculty members going through the RTP appeals process must be entitled to the same legal protections, access to evidence, and knowledge of legal maneuvers, as those of the administration, in order to be able to adequately and properly prepare and present the appeal;

Be it resolved that when there are errors of judgment and incorrect decisions affecting the continuing employment, welfare, status, and wellbeing of the faculty, the administration, elected bodies of the faculty, and all review Boards, should move swiftly, judiciously, transparently, and fairly to correct such errors and prevent harm to the faculty member in question.

KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting

January 23, 2015

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

Guests: President Beverly Warren, Provost Todd Diacon

1. Call to Order

   Chair Fox called the meeting to order at 10:33 a.m. in the Urban Conference Room, Second Floor, Library Executive Offices.

2. Topics for discussion with the President and the Provost

   The Executive Committee discussed the topics that will be brought to the attention of the President and the Provost, such as limiting times for presenters at the Faculty Senate meetings, concern that the CAO Chair has not been given consideration when setting up interview dates and times for availability, as well as items listed on the meeting agenda for today.

3. Review of EPC Agenda Items for the January 26, 2015 Meeting

   a. The committee looked over the twenty pages of agenda items that were distributed for next Monday's EPC meeting. There is concern that items are being carelessly added to the Kent Core's "additional category." This will be discussed with the Provost so that perhaps some items can be resolved before Monday's EPC meeting.

   b. The EPC agenda for the Undergraduate Educational Policies Council includes eight (8) courses proposed to receive the designation of Kent Core status.
      i. MCLS 2000 Global Literacy and Cultural Awareness (with course number rev)
      ii. BSCI 21010 Anatomy and Physiology I
      iii. BSCI 21020 Anatomy and Physiology II
      iv. CHEM 10055 Molecules of Life
      v. AS 10095 Special Topics: Molecules of Life (pilot version of CHEM 10055)
      vi. MATH 10771 Basic Mathematical Concepts I Plus
      vii. MATH 10772 Modeling Algebra Plus
      viii. MATH 10774 Algebra for Calculus Stretch II
      ix. MATH 10775 Algebra for Calculus Plus

The Executive Committee would like to discuss the Kent Core policy with the President and Provost before new courses are brought to EPC and Faculty Senate.

4. President Warren and Provost Diacon joined the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Questions for the Provost and/or the President

a. Report on SSI/Flash Survey pilot data

The Provost is expecting the data analysis report any day now. He will immediately copy the Executive Committee. Senator Deborah Smith described a strange situation regarding student evaluations for her courses that took place in December 2014. The students received both the online Flash Survey (which were not part of the pilot) and were given the traditional paper SSI forms. The data reported for both types of deliveries differ in that comparisons with the department and college were not uniformly reported.

b. Health coverage for non-biological children of KSU employees in partnerships
President Warren reported that she had received the requested proposal from Human Resources (HR); however, she and he cabinet would like the proposal language to be stated more clearly. University Counsel and HR are tweaking the proposal for resubmission to President Warren. The committee called her attention to contract language that defines domestic partner relationships.

c. With the retirement of Sally Kandel, Provost Diacon announced the hiring of Jennifer McDonough, Associate Vice President, Academic Operations and Administration.

d. Progress on the implementation of "week two" registration procedures Provost Diacon reassured the Executive Committee membership that the new procedures for registration during the second week of the fall and spring semesters will be in place for the fall 2015 semester.

e. EPC agenda for January 26, 2015

In response to the Executive Committee, the Provost was unhappy that the Undergraduate Requirements and Curriculum Committee (URCC) and the EPC are proposing new courses as members of the Kent Core. He restated his philosophy regarding the Kent Core which includes 1. When a department or college adds a new course, an existing Kent Core course must be removed, and 2. Every college should be allowed to offer at least one Kent Core course. Discussion ensued concerning the value of requiring a liberal arts core curriculum.

f. Chair Fox expressed to the President and Provost that there have been numerous complaints by Senators that reports at the meetings of the Faculty Senate are invariably too long and take up too much time in the Senate meetings. Suggestions for timing presentations were discussed.

g. The Committee on Administrative Officers (CAO) conducted a series of interviews during the fall semester 2014 which were scheduled without the Chair being present.

In the future the Provost's office will check with the Chair to be sure that he/she will be available for all scheduled interviews of candidates.

Topics presented by the Provost

a. Following a week of interviews for Dean, Trumbull Campus, an offer has been made.

b. The President and Provost informed the Executive Committee about their desire to rename the Division of Undergraduate Studies as the University College.

c. The Provost will be launching an internal search for Dean, Undergraduate Studies/University College.

d. The Provost announced that Associate Provost, Dean of the Regional College and Interim Dean of the Trumbull Campus, Wanda Thomas, will be retiring. He would like to separate this position into two interim administrative appointments, an associate provost and a dean of the Regional College. The associate provost would become a cabinet-level position.

e. The Provost and President are awaiting the work of a subcommittee on the 1 University Commission. The Provost's target date for submission of the report is Friday March 20, 2015.

f. The Provost and President were curious about the roll call at Faculty Senate meetings where the faculty secretary calls the names of all academic deans and vice presidents. The Provost wants all deans present and their names to be included in the roll call; however, the question was asked about the need to call the names of the vice presidents. Members of the Executive Committee outlined the history of changes with the roll call under Presidents Cartwright and Lefton. A decision to change the roll call was not entertained.

g. Budget: There is currently a push by the Ohio legislature to either reduce tuition by 5% or reduce the cost of an undergraduate degree by 5%. Provost Diacon reported on discussions at a recent meeting of the Inter-University Council of Ohio. The state institutions will need to prepare for a reduction built into the Governor's next biennium budget that may or may not include this proposed reduction. It is unclear at this time if the State Support of Instruction (SSI) will be reduced or if another budget model will be implemented. Provost Diacon is confident that the Governor's budget will address this issue and not bills or laws from the legislature.

h. President Warren announced that she is still working on removal of the credit hour plateau. She has discussed with the Ohio board of Regents (OBR) a change from the current 11-16 credit hours for full-time registration to a new 12-18 credit hour requirement which would match financial aid. Many students have been financially disadvantaged by the KSU 11 credit hour full-time requirement verses the Federal requirement of 12 credit hours for financial aid consideration. The Provost estimated that the cost to degree completion for an undergraduate student currently is $39,000.

A 5% cut would then cost an undergraduate student $37,000, and the university would need to increase the graduation rate to cover the difference. The President suggested that it would take several years to increase the graduation rate to cover this difference.

5. Minutes
   a. Executive Committee meeting minutes of November 24, 2014

      A motion (Senators Deb Smith/Wilson) to approve the minutes of November 24, 2014 was made and approved with corrections.

   b. Faculty Senate meeting minutes of December 8, 2014

      A motion (Senators Deb Smith/Wilson) to approve the minutes of December 8, 2014 was made and approved with corrections.

6. Additional Items

   There were no additional items.

7. Adjournment

   Chair Fox adjourned the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

Tom Janson, Secretary
Faculty Senate

KENT STATE
UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting

January 28, 2015

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

Not Present: Kathy Wilson (Appointed)

1. Call to Order

   Chair Fox called the meeting to order at 3:29 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office.

2. Meeting Minutes for Approval

   The minutes of the January 23, 2015 Executive Committee meeting were approved as corrected (motion by Senator Dees, seconded by Senator Fred Smith).

3. 15-Credit per Semester Initiative

   The Executive Committee received a request from Nikki J. Crutchfield, Assistant Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies, to address the Faculty Senate concerning the University's "Formula to Finish Initiative." The initiative encourages undergraduate students to enroll in a minimum of 15 credit hours per semester or 30 or more credit hours per year in order to stay on track for a timely graduation within 48 months. The Executive Committee approved adding Ms. Crutchfield to the agenda of the February 2015 Faculty Senate meeting. Ms. Crutchfield will be allowed five (5) minutes to present marketing materials and answer questions from the floor. Tom - we did indeed do this - and then I went back and re-read her request for either the March or April meeting! Tess put her on the March agenda tentatively. The upcoming Feb exec meeting can reflect the change, or I imagine we could just say that we approved adding Ms. Crutchfield to an upcoming Senate agenda. Whatever you think … my mistake.

4. Copyright Information

   The University faces possible problems in complying with the "Teach Act." The Technology, Education and Copyright Harmonization Act (TEACH) of 2002 is an act of the United States Congress that clarifies what uses are permissible with regard to distance education. Under the requirements of the TEACH Act, an accredited nonprofit educational institution must institute policies regarding copyright.

In order to assure compliance, Professor Cindy Kristof (University Libraries) and Doug Kubinski (University Council) proposed University Policy 3342-3-09 and 3342-3-09.1, Administrative policy regarding use of copyright-protected works. The proposed policy was circulated to the Executive Committee who recommended that the two policies be combined into one policy numbered 3342-3-09. Professor Kristof will be invited to a future meeting of the Executive Committee.

5. Anti-bullying

A professor contacted the Faculty Senate Office requesting discussion concerning the formation of an anti-bullying policy. The e-mail request was not shared in print with the Executive Committee, however, two articles appended to the faculty member's e-mail were shared. The two articles are Virginia Myers, "Confronting," AFT on Campus, November/December, 2011; and Clara Wajngurt, "Prevention Bullying," Academe, May-June, 2014.

It was confirmed that the University Policy Register does not include such a policy; however, the Faculty Senate Ethics Committee is available to the faculty to air such concerns. The Executive Committee suggests that faculty file complaints with the Faculty Ethics Committee when bullying is perceived.

6. Ohio Faculty Council

Professor John Marino, the KSU representative to the Ohio Faculty Council, shared information concerning a pending Ohio House legislation on proprietary textbooks. He also forwarded a resolution from the faculty at the University of Cincinnati which was approved by the UC Faculty Senate on December 11, 2014. (attached document) In the UC resolution, the Faculty Senate does not support legislation restricting proprietary textbooks in Ohio colleges and universities.

7. Educational Policies Council, Agenda items from the January 26, 2015 EPC meeting

   A. The following items were moved to the Consent Agenda; motion by Senator Deb Smith, second by Senator Janson.

      1. College of Arts and Sciences / College of Business Administration, Inactivation of Financial Engineering major within the Master of Science degree, jointly offered by the Department of Finance and the Department of Mathematical Sciences. Admission to this program has been suspended since fall 2012. Effective Fall 2015.

      2. College of Education, Health and Human Services, Revision of major name for the Counseling and Human Development Services major within the Doctor of Philosophy degree. The name changes to Counselor Education and Supervision. Effective Fall 2015

B. The following items were approved for placement on the February Faculty Senate meeting agenda; motion by Senator Deb Smith, second by Senator Janson.

1. University Requirement and Curriculum Committee (URCC), Designation of Kent Core status to the following two new courses in the basic sciences category: BSCI 21010 Anatomy and Physiology I (4) and BSCI 21020 Anatomy and Physiology II (4). Effective Fall 2015.

2. URCC, Designation of Kent Core status to new course CHEM 10055 Molecules of Life (3) in the basic sciences category. Designation of temporary Kent Core status to AS 10095 Special Topics: Molecules of Life (3) in the basic sciences category. AS 10095 is the pilot version of CHEM 10055. Effective Spring 2015.

3. URCC, Designation of Kent Core status to the following four new courses in the mathematics and critical reasoning category: MATH 10771 Basic Mathematical Concepts I Plus (5); MATH 10772 Modeling Algebra Plus (5); MATH 10774 Algebra for Calculus Stretch II (3); and MATH 10775 Algebra for Calculus Plus (4). Effective Fall 2015.

4. URCC, Authorization of dean of Undergraduate Studies to approve non-course Experiential Learning Requirement (ELR) applications for all undergraduate students; and authorization of any full-time faculty member to approve and supervise non-course ELR applications. The full-time faculty member does not need to have an appointment in the student's major department. Effective Fall 2014.

5. College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology, Establishment of Aerospace Engineering major within the Bachelor of Science degree to be offered at the Kent Campus. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 128. Effective Fall 2015.

6. College of Business Administration, Establishment of General Business major within the Bachelor of Business Administration degree to be offered on-ground at the Kent Campus. The last two years of the program may be taken 100 percent online, in addition to on-ground, for completer students. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 120. Effective Fall 2015.

7. College of Education, Health and Human Services, Establishment of Advanced Pedagogy in Physical Education and Sport major within the Master of Education degree. The program will be offered 100 percent online only through collaboration with the University of Wollongong in New South Wales, Australia. Students will apply and be admitted to one university and complete half the coursework (6 courses) at each university. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 36. Effective Fall 2015.

8. Division of Undergraduate Studies, Revision of academic structure, from Division of Undergraduate Studies to University College. Effective Fall 2015.

9. Division of Undergraduate Studies, Formalization of Cooperative Education Program, which was piloted fall 2014 through the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology. Effective Fall 2015.

8. Spring Faculty Forum

Each spring the Faculty Senate hosts a faculty forum open to the entire KSU faculty membership. Several ideas were floated by committee members. Additional discussion will follow at the next meeting.

9. Old Business:

A. Student Survey of Instruction

There was discussion of ending the on-going pilot of the SSI online, titled Flash Survey by the administration, by Faculty Senate at the conclusion of spring 2015 semester (May 2015).

B. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion History

A request from Chair Fox to Associate Provost Sue Averill was sent asking for historical data on cases that were denied at the Provost's and/or President's level from AY 2006-07 to the present. In response to this request, six charts were produced: Kent Reappointment, Regional Reappointment, Kent Campus Tenure, Regional Campus Tenure, Kent Campus Promotion, and Regional Campus Promotion. As requested by Chair Fox, the data includes names of appellants and demographics, the year of denial, a record of the votes at all levels including the Provost's level, and appeals to the JAB (Joint Appeals Board) and the President's final judgement.

The data provided by the Provost's Office was discussed. Collection of this data was originally requested by Senator George Garrison at a recent Faculty Senate meeting.

C. From the December 2014 Faculty Senate Meeting

The proposal from the College of Education, Health and Human Services to create a non-degree four-year program for mentally disabled college-age adults was discussed. Several unanswered questions remain, including power of attorney for decisions beyond the parents' decisions concerning health issues; for example, are the prospective students legally competent for self-decision making including on- and off-campus activities and behavior. The Executive Committee first agreed to place the original proposal on the Faculty Senate agenda with the priviso that the Dean, College of Education, Health and Human Services present the proposal and answer any and all questions from the Senate (only one representative). The discussion will lie solely with the Faculty Senate and not the college representatives

who attended the December 2014 Faculty Senate meeting. Secondly, a well-versed representative from the Office of University Counsel must be present to answer questions from the Senate.

10. Additional Items

A. Call for a Proposal, Senator Wilson

In order to mitigate potential conflicts of interest, it was proposed that a policy be written to ban professors from dating students over whom the professors can reasonably be expected to have authority. A motion was approved (Senator Fred Smith/Senator Dees) to send the matter to the Professional Standards Committee.

B. FolioWeb Update

Senator Dees announced that the University is contracting a replacement for FolioWeb titled "Faculty 180." Senator Dees discussed the new features of the software. A public roll-out date has not been set pending approval the business contract.

C. Retirements

Senator Farrell expressed the need to inform faculty covered by STRS who have attained 35 plus years in the system that the rules have changed. He also suggested that STRS be invited to campus for personal consultations.

11. Set Agenda for the February 9, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting

The committee approved a proposed agenda.

12. Adjournment

Chair Fox adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Tom Janson, Secretary
Faculty Senate