

Faculty Senate Agenda – December 13, 2021

Item No.	Item	PDF Pg. No.
1.	Call to Order	
2.	Roll Call	
3.	Approval of the Agenda	
4.	Approval of the November 8, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes (<i>forthcoming</i>)	2 - 9
5.	Chair's Remarks	
6.	President's Remarks	
7.	<p>Educational Policies Council (EPC) Action Items:</p> <p>7.a. <u>College of the Arts & Sciences</u>: Department of Geology – Renaming unit to the Department of Earth Sciences (Fall 2022). (Daniel Holm – Chair, Department of Geology)</p> <p>7.b. <u>College of Education, Health & Human Services</u>: School of Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies – Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology – Establish undergraduate major to be fully online and hybrid (Fall 2022). (Martha Lash – Interim Director, School of Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies and Marta Guivernau – Assistant Professor, School of Foundations, Leadership and Administration)</p>	<p>View</p> <p>View</p>
8.	<p>Old Business:</p> <p>Committee Description Updates: During the process of putting amendments in place and reviewing approved documents from the November meeting, several issues were identified, and changes are proposed. See attached memo describing specific changes and tracked FSBAC and FEC committee descriptions.</p>	10 - 14
9.	<p>New Business:</p> <p>Discussion Item: Draft Revisions to Policy 4-02.3 Administrative Policy and Procedure for Student Academic Complaints as approved by the Professional Standards Committee (Chair of the Professional Standards Committee, Deborah Smith, Professor, Philosophy)</p>	15 - 30
10.	<p>Announcements/Statements for the Record:</p> <p>Organization of Proctoring Responsibilities (John Rathje – Vice President for Information Technology)</p>	
11.	Adjourn	
	Additional Items:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of October 27, 2021 	31 - 32



FACULTY SENATE

Meeting Minutes

November 8, 2021

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Omid Bagheri, Jeffrey Child, Tammy Clewell, Timothy Culver, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Kimberly DePaul, Tracy Dodson, Yanhai Du, Julie Evey, Pamela Grimm, Mariann Harding, Todd Hawley, Edgar Kooijman, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Janice Kroeger, Velvet Landingham, Tracy Laux, Cathy Marshall, Karen Mascolo, Denise McEnroe-Petitte, Mahli Mechenbier, Oana Mocioalca, Deepraj Mukherjee, Abe Osbourne, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Helen Piontkivska, Susan Roxburgh, Athena Salaba, Murali Shanker, Denise Sheehan, Deborah Smith, Diane Stroup, Eric Taylor, Robin Vande Zande, Laurie Wagner, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Christopher Was, Haiyan Zhu, Melissa Zullo

Senators Not Present: Tina Bhargava, Omar De La Cruz Cabrera, Angela Guercio, David Kaplan, Vic Perera

Ex-Officio Members Present: Senior Vice President and Provost Melody Tankersley; Senior Vice President Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Sean Broghammer*, Doug Delahanty*, Amoaba Gooden, Rebecca Murphy*, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Peggy Shadduck, Jack Witt; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, Christina Bloebaum, Bryan Caldwell for Allan Boike, Ken Burhanna, James Hannon, Versie Johnson-Mallard, Mark Mistur, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk*, Diane Petrella, Eboni Pringle, Miriam Matteson for Amy Reynolds, Alison Smith, Deborah Spake, Manfred van Dulmen *Interim

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: President Todd Diacon; Senior Vice President Lamar Hylton; Vice Presidents: Valoree Vargo, Willis Walker

Observers Present: Paul Farrell (Emeritus Professor), Claire Jackman (GSS)

Observers Not Present: Brandon Allen (USS)

Guests Present: Emma Andrus, Aimee Bell, Nathaniel Cooper, Chris Dorsten, Jo Dowell, Feodor Dragan, Jennifer Hebebrand, Thomas Janson, Tess Kail, Karen Keenan, Jennifer Kellogg, Valerie Kelly, Javed Khan, Dana Lawless-Andric, Judy Lightner-Noll, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Shelley Marshall, Babacar M'Baye, Susan Perry, Amy Quillin, Jim Raber, Nathan Steele, Therese Tillett, Eric van Baars, Molly Wang, Deirdre Warren, Kevin West, Sonya Williams

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:22 p.m. in the Governance Chambers, Kent Student Center. Attendees were also present on Microsoft Teams.

2. Roll Call

Secretary Dauterich called the roll.

3. Approval of the Agenda

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve the agenda. A motion was made and seconded (Sheehan/Bagheri). The agenda was approved unanimously.

4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of October 11, 2021

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 11, 2021, Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Smith/Sheehan).

The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

5. Chair's Remarks

Chair Grimm delivered her remarks. [[Chair's Remarks](#)]

She then turned the microphone over to Provost Tankersley.

6. Provost's Remarks

Provost Tankersley began by discussing the state of higher education across the state. Cuts to the number of faculty, operating budgets, and the number of programs were made at Youngstown State and the University of Akron. Both schools also faced sharp enrollment declines. Demographically, half of the states in the country including Ohio are predicting a decline in university enrollment of at least 15% over the next eight years. She added that we should expect declines, but we will not be in the same position as other universities. We have strong shared governance which is keeping us afloat. Faculty have a strong critical voice that will be part of proactive strategies moving forward. She suggested that three ways to do this are as follows: (1) streamline yet maximize programs of study; (2) enhance our revenues; and (3) support our students' progress. She then elaborated on each way that was mentioned.

One way to streamline and maximize programs is to examine course offerings and ensure that enrollments are strong and that program requirements are current and updated. She suggested that it might help to deactivate courses that have not been offered for a few years, but she added that other opportunities might exist through cross-listing courses. She also mentioned the importance of investing more in programs that are in high demand, which would bring in more students and increase the university's revenue.

Provost Tankersley then discussed the need that students will have to supplement their education over the course of their careers after graduation. She said that the university is fortunate to have hired Dr. Peggy Shadduck as Vice President for Regional Campuses and the Dean of the College of Applied and Technical Studies. Vice President Shadduck will be leading new initiatives in the area of lifelong learning, including the development, where appropriate, of microcredentials and industry certifications.

She finished by placing an emphasis on the need for increasing our efforts to support students. One way to do this is to enhance their sense of belonging. She said that a sense of belonging is not simply about finding a group of friends or a club to attend; rather, it's the sense of belonging in the college classroom itself. Many of Kent State's students question whether they belong in the classroom. As an example, she pointed out that 42% of Kent State's students identify as the first in their families who will earn a bachelor's degree. They are first generation students, and they often need help navigating higher education. They do not have the role models or the encouragement that other students might have from their families.

She then suggested ways that faculty could enhance the sense of belonging for all students. These included small things like arriving to class a few minutes early to be available to answer questions, acknowledging the difficulty of the work in the course, or requiring students to come to office hours in order to demystify the act of asking for help. She added that research has shown that students who feel like they belong have more success and graduate at a higher rate than students who do not feel such a connection. She said that this was apparent from institutional data at Kent State; a key reason students consider leaving is because they lack a sense of belonging.

She then gave examples of other efforts to enhance students' sense of connecting to the university. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is currently engaging in a student belonging project, and many faculty members in the project are already sharing ways they enhanced belonging in their classrooms on the CTL website. The provost encouraged faculty members to add their voices to the discussion. She also mentioned an upcoming workshop on fostering student belonging; an email has gone out about the workshop, which will be directed by Dr. Lisa Nunn. More information on this is also available on the CTL website.

She finished by thanking the faculty for all their hard work, and she offered strong encouragement with regard to future success.

She then invited comments or questions.

Senator Roxburgh thanked the provost for her comments, but she said that sense of belonging might be a proxy for other student concerns. She said that many students were not handing in assignments, and that when she asked them why, it was clear that families and individuals at the graduate and undergraduate levels are under stress and may have mental health concerns due to economic realities as well as other problems.

Provost Tankersley thanked her for her comments and agreed that there are many mental health concerns being seen on campus. She also agreed that students are not following through with work at times and that they sometimes seem overwhelmed. She said we need to both help them know they belong and let them know that we have improved services for mental health if they need help.

Senator Roxburgh added that the economic piece is a large part of the problem because students work so much that they might not be able to take advantage of the efforts to help them feel like they belong.

Provost Tankersley agreed and said that belonging is more than friends and clubs. She repeated the idea that even small things that faculty can do to help during the school day would be worthwhile.

Vice Chair Laux mentioned upcoming decreases in enrollment and the financial impact it might have on the university; he wanted to address the debt the university is taking on. Across Ohio, universities having financial issues are often having them because they took on too much debt. He cautioned the university against incurring more debt than we can afford.

Provost Tankersley agreed and invited Senior Vice President Polatajko to speak about the matter.

Senior Vice President Polatajko emphasized that we have issued no new debt over the past couple of years and that no new debt is planned in the near term.

Provost Tankersley thanked Vice Chair Laux and Senior Vice President Polatajko for their comments.

Senator Piccirillo-Smith mentioned that many of our colleagues are experiencing problems with students similar to those that Senator Roxburgh had mentioned. She added that faculty are having problems trying to assist students with their difficulties in addition to being in front of a screen for the last eighteen months, and she said that this was probably lowering the quality of the students' educational experience. She added that there is also a concern over faculty burnout.

Provost Tankersley thanked her for her comments. She agreed that we cannot ignore the problem, and she said that we need to openly acknowledge the difficulties we are facing, so we can better address them.

Senator Wagner said that we need to reevaluate our approaches and stop pretending the pandemic is over. She argued that students need us to think about them in a much bigger way. She added that there is too much focus on technology and not enough on building relationships—too many students and faculty have been traumatized.

Provost Tankersley thanked her for her comments and agreed that trauma-based support is important.

There were no further comments or questions.

7. Educational Policies Council (EPC) Action Items:

- a. College of the Arts: School of Theatre and Dance – Acting-Intended for the Returning Professional - M.F.A.: Renaming the major to “Acting” per accreditor’s approval (Fall 2022). (Eric van Baars – Director, School of Theatre and Dance)

The director explained the rationale for the name change. The name is simply being changed to align with the national accreditation body’s recommendation.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the item (Sheehan/Piccirillo-Smith).

Chair Grimm then invited comments or questions.

There were no comments or questions.

The motion passed unanimously.

- b. College of Arts & Sciences: Department of Computer Science - Game Programming - Minor: Establishing 20-credit undergraduate minor (Fall 2022). (Javed Khan – Chair, Computer Science Department and/or Feodor Dragan – Professor and Curriculum Coordinator, Computer Science Department)

Chair Khan said this was an attempt to increase the disciplinary presence of the department. They are trying to attract some students outside of computer science to the minor. Sports administration and game design programs were in support of this.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the item (Dauterich/Kracht).

Chair Grimm then invited comments or questions.

There were no comments or questions.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Old Business: Discussion Item: UCT Remote Proctoring RFP Committee (Shelley Marshall – Chair, University Council on Technology and Jim Raber – Executive Director, Support, Infrastructure, and Research Technology)

Chair Marshall and Executive Director Raber gave an update. Executive Director Raber said that there is an RFP (request for proposal) rationale for selecting remote proctored testing services. The state requires competitive bidding for the technology, and current contracts expire in Summer 2022. There was also a 400% increase in usage at Kent State over the last three academic years. In addition, there has been a lot of innovation in available tools. ProctorU, Proctorio, and Respondus Monitor were all used in the past and are still being used. A committee will be created to collaborate with UCT (University Council on Technology), and its membership will be finalized by the end of November. Then, they will develop the committee's understanding of the requirements and decide on achievable dates. Information about the past RFPs will be collected and reviewed before Winter Break. Then, the RFP will be crafted. Market research, student surveys, faculty surveys, listening sessions, and constraints (security of data, accessibility, financial) will all be examined. The RFP and evaluation rubric will then be published. Responses will be reviewed, and finalists will be determined. Eventually, the successful vendor will be notified; the product will be configured and implemented, and training and rollout will begin. He showed senate the makeup of the committee and showed evidence that it included a strong faculty presence.

He then invited comments or questions.

Vice Chair Laux said he hoped there will be strong faculty input, but he added that there may be a problem at the end of the process; there may be no one-size-fits-all solution. A complaint could possibly come from senate.

Executive Director Raber agreed that many approaches are available, and he said that the committee would try to discuss this thoroughly.

Senator Mocioalca added that she prefers having multiple options as a faculty member. She added that a second platform could be helpful.

Executive Director Raber thanked her for her comments.

Senator Sheehan asked what the burden to and support for faculty would entail, and she said those considerations would be important.

Executive Director Raber agreed.

There were no further comments or questions.

9. New Business: Proposed Committee Description Changes:

a. Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FSBAC)

Vice Chair Laux (Chair of the Committee on Committees (COC)) presented the changes to FaSBAC. He said that the committee was no longer really giving advice; instead, faculty just listened to reports more than doing anything else. He said that Senior Vice President Polatajko has been very accommodating, but that the committee was not producing the advice it was charged to produce. He explained the charge of the committee, and he argued that a change in the makeup would help the committee achieve the goals outlined in the charge. Membership changes included a change to the number of ex-officio members. In the past, the number of administrators nearly equaled the number of voting faculty. The COC's suggestion is to make many of the administrators ex-officio members and to add some key administrators. Many other membership quotas (faculty, chairs and directors, etc.) remain the same in the proposal. In-house financial advisors for different areas are also no longer needed on the committee as members. Faculty members of the committee will also be reminded that they are not representing their areas, but rather the faculty as a whole. Members will also be required to complete training to help them understand the committee's work.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the change (Smith/Mocioalca).

Chair Grimm then invited comments or questions.

Senator Smith offered a friendly amendment to replace him/her with "their".

Vice Chair Laux accepted the amendment.

Vice Chair Laux added that there are no longer student members of the committee because it is a Faculty Senate committee that will advise faculty on the budget.

Ms. Jackman said that the Graduate Student Senate Executive Chair had been ex-officio and wondered whether it was a conscious decision to have that position removed.

Vice Chair Laux said it was.

Chair Grimm asked whether students could give any input if they are not allowed as ex-officio members.

Vice Chair Laux asked whether her question was leading toward a friendly amendment.

Chair Grimm said it could be.

Senator Smith said that it might not be friendly, but she would build the addition of ex-officio student members back into the membership. She withdrew her former motion and made the motion with the new addition. Senator Dauterich seconded the amended motion.

Vice Chair Laux approved.

Chair Grimm asked whether we should vote on the motion.

Senator Smith said that the information is in the old material. Since it was written, and we could see it in the old description, we should be able to vote on it.

There were no further comments or questions.

The amended motion passed unanimously.

Chair Grimm reported that the COC recommended changes to the following committees based on the need to include more NTE faculty as the demographics of faculty have changed over time. The Senate Executive Committee crafted the language.

Senator Smith proposed that all three committee changes be voted on as a block, and Faculty Senate accepted the proposal.

b. Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC)

Four NTE, at-large faculty have been added to the committee. Senior rank must be held for these faculty. TT faculty must have achieved tenure in order to serve. This aligns with the CBA. Tenured faculty will remain the majority on the committee. NTE faculty will not vote or comment on decisions about TT personnel. Consultation with the associate provost and the TT KSU AAUP president will be made if a decision needs to be reached about NTE faculty serving on a decision.

c. Professional Standards Committee (PSC)

This change simply made it possible for NTE faculty (no more than three each year) to serve. The chair will be a tenured or TT member of the senate.

d. University Libraries Advisory Committee (ULAC)

The change involved making any full-time faculty member eligible for the committee.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the three changes as a slate (Kristof/Kracht).

Chair Grimm then invited comments or questions.

Senator Salaba thanked the COC and wanted to know how members on the FEC could be informed they were not eligible for a case before the case was screened.

Chair Grimm said that there is a prescreening process.

Senator Smith added that if the respondent is TT, the NTE faculty cannot be involved in the case. She suggested the wording be changed to reflect that NTE members will not participate in a case where a TT is the respondent.

Chair Grimm changed the language of the document on the floor and said it was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Senator Smith also mentioned that the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) might not want NTE members voting on TT decisions.

Senator Laux argued that NTEs vote on senate, so they could also vote on PSC.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the amended motion (Sheehan/Kracht).

The motion to approve the changes to the slate of descriptions passed unanimously.

10. Announcements / Statements for the Record

Senator Mechenbier pointed out that mail was still taking too long to get to regional campuses and wanted to know what was being done about it.

Senior Vice President Polatajko thanked her for her comment and said he will investigate and respond to Chair Grimm as soon as possible.

11. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate

Cover Memo for FSBAC and FEC Committee Changes

In the process of putting your amendments in place and reviewing the approved documents from the November meeting, several issues were noted in each document. We have addressed those issues in the proposed descriptions you received. Below they are summarized:

Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FSBAC):

1. Correct the number of RCM Colleges (9, not 10).
2. Reconcile a conflict in the designation of terms by leaving the decision of term length up to the appointing body.
3. Clarifying the mechanism for selection of alternates.
4. Minor grammatical corrections.

Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC):

1. The proposal inadvertently and unintentionally eliminated the two at-large tenured faculty positions elected by the Senate. Those have been restored and the committee size has been increased to 13.
2. After discussion among the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the use of “at-large” for the non-tenure eligible faculty was deemed inaccurate and confusing. That term has been dropped as a descriptor for non-tenure eligible faculty representatives.
3. No mechanism for appointing the non-tenure eligible faculty members had been included in the document (how did we miss that????). The proposal here is that the Committee on Committees and the Non-Tenure Track Provost Advisory Council nominate members and those members be appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate.
4. Given that non-tenure eligible faculty cannot serve on the committee for any cases involving tenure track faculty, the chair of the committee must be a tenured faculty member.
5. Some minor editing and reorganization of language for further clarification.

Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FSBAC)

(Page 1 of 2)

CLASSIFICATION: Faculty Senate Committee

REPORTS TO: President of Kent State University

CHARGE: The Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee shall advise the president on budgetary issues at the university and division levels, which shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Periodically reviewing the impact of RCM's
 - a. Effect on academic quality
 - b. Effect on unit performance
 - c. Allocation procedures
2. Recommending funding priorities consistent with the University Strategic Plan
3. Reviewing requests submitted by all division for subvention or investment funds
4. Reviewing requests submitted by all divisions to increase overhead
5. Annually reviewing the University's performance according to established measures
6. Reviewing enrollment projections used for budget modeling
7. Reviewing the final draft of the University operating budget
8. Reviewing the performance of non-academic service and support units
9. Appointing sub-committees as necessary to improve aspects of the RCM model and its functioning, e.g., training

COMPOSITION:

Co-Chairs (2):

- Chair of the Faculty Senate or their designee (1) Normally the faculty co-chair shall have at least one-year prior experience as a FSBAC member
- Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration (1)

Faculty (At least 17):

- Faculty representatives from each of the colleges and the University Libraries (11)
- At least four faculty senators (4)
- At least two regional campus faculty (2)
- Chair of Faculty Senate (if not serving as co-chair) (1)

Ex officio members (non-voting) (~~19~~18):

- Senior Vice President and Provost or their designee (1)
- Vice President of Enrollment Management or their designee (1)
- Vice President for Regional Campuses or their designee (1)
- All RCM College Deans or their business officer designees (~~40~~9)
- Three Regional Campus Deans (3)
- Chairs/Directors (3)

Students (non-voting) (2):

- Undergraduate Student Senate Representative (1)
- Graduate Student Senate Representative (1)

QUALIFICATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS: Faculty members shall be full-time faculty with an interest in budget, finance, and planning issues. An effort should be made to identify faculty members from a broad range of academic units including the regional campuses and to appoint members ~~that who~~ shall serve as representatives of the entire university community and not merely as a representative of their specific academic unit. Members will be required to complete FSBAC training.

TERM: Faculty members of FSBAC shall serve a three-year term. Terms will be staggered so that approximately one-third of the membership is replaced annually. It shall be the responsibility of each appointing body to designate the length of the initial terms and to monitor on-going appointments so that appropriate continuity is assured. ~~Chairs and Directors and Regional Campus Deans serving as ex-officio members shall serve a three-year term. Other ex-officio members shall have continuous appointments to FSBAC.~~

Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FSBAC)

(Page 2 of 2)

MEANS OF APPOINTMENT: Faculty members shall be nominated by College Advisory Committees (CACs), the Regional Campus Faculty Advisory Council (RCFAC), and the Faculty Senate. Faculty members shall be appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Regional Campus Deans serving as ex officio members shall be selected by the Vice President for Regional Campuses. Chairs and directors serving as ex officio members shall be selected by the Chairs and Directors Council.

ALTERNATES: Two (2) faculty alternates will be selected ~~via the same process as described above for faculty members~~ by the Chair of Faculty Senate based on recommendations of the Committee on Committees. Alternates are invited to attend meetings regularly so they are familiar with current issues.

CALL: The committee shall be convened at the start of fall semester by one or both of the co-chairs. The committee will meet, at a minimum, four times a year: October, December, February, and April.

CHAIR: The Chair of the Faculty Senate (or their ~~designated~~ designee) and the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration shall serve as co-chairs of the committee. One or both of the co-chairs shall provide a written or oral report to the Faculty Senate no later than the last Senate meeting of the year. This report should summarize the issues addressed by the committee and any recommendations forthcoming over the course of the past year.

Approved by Faculty Senate, December 10, 2007; Revised by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, April 29, 2009 and November 18, 2009; Approved by the Committee on Committees, May 11, 2010; Approved by the Committee on Committees, October 23, 2015; October 11, 2018; Approved by Faculty Senate, November 8, 2021; (Proposed Changes 12-13-21)

Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC)

(Page 1 of 2)

CLASSIFICATION: Faculty Senate Committee

REPORTS TO: Chair of the Faculty Senate

CHARGE: The Faculty Ethics Committee serves as a screening and hearing body for any faculty member who wishes to lodge a charge of unethical professional practice against another faculty member. A charge may also be filed against an administrator with faculty rank only in relation to those responsibilities assigned as a faculty member. 'Unethical professional practice' is defined as a violation of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-6-17 of the University Policy Register). The Committee may also serve as a hearing body for faculty members who wish to request a hearing to respond to charges made against them.

COMPOSITION: The Committee shall consist of ~~eleven-thirteen (11-13)~~ faculty members. Four members shall represent the non-tenure eligible faculty ~~at-large~~. Two tenured members shall represent faculty at-large. One tenured faculty member ~~each~~ shall represent each of the following units: 1) Colleges of Architecture and Environmental Design and the Arts; 2) College of Arts and Sciences; 3) College of Business and Entrepreneurship; 4) College of Communication and Information; 5) College of Education, Health, and Human Services; 6) Regional Campuses (college and departmental affiliations shall be ignored); and 7) College of Aeronautics and Engineering, College of Nursing, College of Public Health, University Libraries.

QUALIFICATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS: Faculty nominated for election to this Committee must be full-time, holding senior rank (associate or senior lecturer, or associate professor or professor). Tenure-track faculty representatives must have achieved tenure in order to serve.

In all cases, tenured faculty members shall constitute a majority of the members of the Faculty Ethics Committee. Non-tenure eligible faculty members who are appointed to the Faculty Ethics Committee shall not participate in any case in which a tenure-track faculty member is named as a respondent.

TERM: Committee members will serve for two (2) years, with half the Committee elected in any year. Newly elected members shall begin their duties on the Committee on September 15.

MEANS OF APPOINTMENT: At least two candidates shall be nominated for each vacancy for an elected position. At-large tenured members shall be nominated and elected from and by the Faculty Senate. ~~At least two candidates shall be nominated for each vacancy.~~ The tenured representative members shall be nominated by the advisory councils of their respective units prior to March 15. Should they units fail to nominate candidates prior to the deadline, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall nominate representative candidates. Representative members shall be elected by the full-time faculty of the unit or units they represent. ~~At least two candidates shall be nominated for each vacancy.~~ In the case of Units 1, 6 and 7, each of its advisory councils shall nominate one candidate prior to March 15. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall ensure that nominees are from distinct Colleges/Regional Campuses. The faculty of each unit shall vote to select the unit's representative to the Committee.

Non-tenure eligible faculty representatives will be nominated by the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Non-Tenure Track Provost's Advisory Council, and appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate.

ALTERNATES: Alternates for unit and tenured at-large representatives shall be listed in descending order based on votes received. The term for alternates shall be for the remainder of the elected term.

CALL: The Committee shall be convened at the call of the Faculty Senate Chair shortly after the terms of the new members begin on September 15.

Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC)

(Page 2 of 2)

CHAIR: The Chair of the Committee shall be elected annually by the Committee at its first meeting from its membership. Only tenured members of the committee are eligible to serve as Chair of the Committee. By September 1 of each year, the Chair shall report to the Chair and Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate the number and type of cases presented during the previous year and its recommendation for each case.

COMMENTS: The election of members for this Committee shall be conducted in the spring semester, according to established Faculty Senate procedures.

Approved by Committee on Committees, April 11, 1984; Approved by Committee on Committees, April 29, 1998; Updated and Approved by Committee on Committees, May 11, 2010; Revised by the Committee on Committee, April 3, 2012; Approved by Committee on Committees, May 10, 2018; Approved by Faculty Senate, November 8, 2021; (Proposed Changes 12-13-21)

PSC Proposal Regarding Student Complaint Policies 4-02.3 (Kent Campus) and 8-01.4 (Regional Campuses), November 2021

Proposal:

Delete policy 8-01.4 from the Policy Register and Revise Policy 4-02.3 (see specific proposal) to cover academic complaints University-wide.

Substantive differences between 4-02.3 (Kent Campus) and 8-01.4 (Regional Campus) Policies

The Kent Campus policy is restricted to academic complaints. The Regional Campus policy also covers “complaints arising from the student’s relations with the university as a student employee.” [PSC went with Kent model in its current draft of a combined policy.]

The Regional Campus policy has a role for a “campus complaint advisor.” This person not only serves as a mediator during the informal part of the process, but also chairs the committee as a non-voting member and is in charge of preserving a record of formal complaints. On the Kent Campus, there is no complaint advisor and the committee elects its own chair from among its members. [The PSC went with the Kent model. There is no role for a complaint advisor.]

The faculty members of the Regional Campus committee are appointed by the dean. On the Kent campus, the faculty members of the committee are the faculty advisory committee or a sub-committee to which that committee delegates its duties. [The PSC went with something closer to the Kent model. The FAC (or CAC of a college without departments/schools) would determine the faculty members serving on an academic unit committee, but the members selected wouldn’t need to be members of the FAC/CAC. Similarly, the FC would determine the faculty members serving on a regional campus committee.]

The Kent campus policy has the committee consisting of 3-5 faculty and at least one student (although both an undergraduate and graduate student are identified to serve on undergraduate and graduate complaints respectively). The Regional Campus policy has a committee consisting of 3 faculty and 2 students (I assume that both students hear all complaints). [PSC went with 3-5 faculty members and 1-2 students. Individual academic units and campuses would determine the specific number of faculty and students hearing a complaint.]

The Regional Campus policy has the faculty members of the committee appointed at the end of the spring semester. The KC policy is silent on this. [PSC went with the Regional Campus model on this so that the committee would be up and running at the beginning of Fall semester to hear any formal complaints filed at the end of Spring semester or during the summer. This also minimizes the likelihood that a committee could be cherry picked to hear a specific complaint given that the committee would have been formed before any formal complaints that it would hear had been filed.]

4 - 02.3

Administrative policy and procedure for student academic complaints

- A. Purpose. This administrative policy and procedure is established to provide an appropriate framework and method to resolve student complaints of an academic nature. As such, this policy is specifically designed to maintain the integrity of the academic environment and to ensure that the rights of students in such matters are clearly stated and protected.
- B. General guidelines.
1. In initiating a complaint and throughout the formal appeals process, students may seek the counsel of the office of the student ombuds. The student ombuds will provide information, clarify procedures, and facilitate communication as requested.
 2. This student academic complaint policy, upon its approval, will become a part of the handbook for each academic unit and regional campus as the applicable student complaint policy and procedure for the unit.
 3. The appropriate jurisdiction for initiating an academic complaint (where a complaint must be filed and which academic unit or regional campus controls the complaint process) is determined first by the location from which the course offering emanates. Academic complaints concerning courses offered by a regional campus will be initiated with the regional campus offering the course. Academic complaints concerning courses offered by a Kent campus academic unit or the College of Applied and Technical Studies will be initiated with the academic unit offering the course. In the case of a course offered by a Kent campus academic unit that is cross-listed with other academic units, academic complaints will be initiated with the academic unit of the instructor.
 4. It is understood that some issues may involve one or more policies which, because of either the nature of the academic complaint or the status of the complainant, may be related to university offices which have separate responsibilities for such policies. Appeals of sanctions applied for cheating or plagiarism should be addressed under policy 3-01.8, administrative policy regarding student cheating and plagiarism. Non-academic student complaints should be addressed under policy 4-02.102, operational policy regarding general nonacademic grievance procedure for students.
 5. There shall be no retaliation against the student or abridgment of a student's rights resulting from the use of this policy.
- C. Definition of terms.
1. "Student" is defined as any person enrolled at the university in a course offered for credit.
 2. "Instructor" is defined as any person who is authorized to teach any course offering of the university, who is involved in a professional capacity as a thesis or dissertation committee member, or who evaluates student academic work.

3. "Academic unit" is defined as an academic department headed by a chair, a school headed by a director, or a college without departments or schools headed by a dean.
4. "Regional campus" is defined as a campus of Kent State University other than the Kent campus.
5. "Local administrator" is defined as the chief administrative officer of an academic unit or regional campus whose position is that of a first organizational level academic leader with a teaching faculty (i.e., the chair of a department, the director of a school, the dean of a college without departments or schools, or the dean of a regional campus). In the case of a college without departments or schools or a regional campus, and with the exception of the role identified for the local administrator in sub-sections E.2.g-h and in section F below, the dean may delegate the role of the local administrator to an assistant or associate dean.
6. "Faculty advisory body" is defined as the Faculty Advisory Committee of a department or school, the College Advisory Committee of a college, or the Faculty Council of a regional campus.
7. "Student academic complaint" is defined as a formalized complaint regarding those aspects of the educational process involving student performance, evaluation, or grading in courses.
8. "Student complaint procedure" is defined as the process by which a student may resolve an academic complaint.
9. "Respondent" is defined as that person or persons named by the student when filing a written academic complaint.
10. "Complainant" is defined as the student who files an academic complaint.
11. "Student academic complaint committee" is defined as the academic unit or regional campus committee whose responsibility is to review and make recommendations to the local administrator with regard to student academic complaints.
12. "Student ombuds" is defined as the university official charged with the responsibility to assist students by providing an individualized information and referral system. The student ombuds informs students of procedures for processing student complaints and acts as a facilitator upon request.
13. "Academic administrator at the next level of governance" is defined as the college dean (or their designee) in the case of a department chair/school director, the provost (or their designee) in the case of a dean of a college without departments or schools, or the chief

administrative officer for regional campuses (or their designee) in the case of a regional campus dean

14. All references to "days" refer to weekdays during Fall and Spring semesters on which classes are conducted, excluding examination week.

D. Student academic complaint committee.

1. Each academic unit and regional campus shall establish a standing student academic complaint committee which shall be composed of three to five full-time faculty members from the academic unit or regional campus and one to two students. All members shall participate fully in committee deliberations and shall vote on the recommendation to be forwarded to the local administrator.
2. In all cases, faculty members of the student academic complaint committee will be selected by the faculty advisory body of the academic unit or regional campus at the end of the Spring semester for the next academic year.
3. At the beginning of each academic year the student academic complaint committee shall elect one of its full-time faculty members to serve as chairperson.
4. The student member(s) of the committee will be selected by the local administrator after consultation with the faculty advisory body and relevant student organizations. As applicable, one undergraduate major and one graduate student in good standing shall be appointed by the local administrator on or before September fifteenth of each year. The undergraduate student will sit on complaints about undergraduate courses, and the graduate student will sit on complaints about graduate courses.
5. If a member of the student academic complaint committee or a spouse, domestic partner, or relative of any member of the committee is named as a respondent or complainant, that member shall be excluded from deliberating or voting on that complaint. In such cases, the members of the student academic complaint committee, through its chairperson, may replace any member excluded by this provision.
6. Neither the local administrator nor any administrative delegate thereof is a member of the student academic complaint committee, nor does the local administrator or any administrative delegate thereof participate in its deliberations.

E. Complaint procedure.

1. Informal resolution.
 - a. The student is expected first to review the matter with the course instructor in an attempt to resolve the issue immediately.

- b. If the matter is not resolved immediately, the student may discuss the matter with the local administrator of the academic unit or regional campus offering the course before lodging a formal complaint.
- c. The student may also consult with the student ombuds.

2. Formal complaint.

- a. If attempts at informal resolution are unsuccessful, the student may lodge a formal complaint by submitting said complaint, in writing, to the local administrator. (See section G below for time limits.) In the case where a complaint is lodged against the local administrator, the complaint will be submitted to the chair of the student academic complaint committee.
- b. The written complaint submitted by the student should include the nature of the complaint, the facts and circumstances leading to the complaint, reasons in support of the complaint, and the remedy or remedies requested. The complaint statement submitted by the student becomes the basis for all further consideration of the matter. The written complaint should also note what attempts were made at informal resolution and should include any evidence pertinent to the issues identified.
- c. Upon receipt of the complaint, the local administrator shall refer it to the student academic complaint committee for consideration. A copy will be made available to the respondent(s) who shall respond in writing to the complaint and include any information or documentation related to the response. A copy of the respondent's written response shall be forwarded to the complainant.
- d. If the committee determines that two or more complaints against an instructor are substantively the same, the committee may, with the concurrence of the complainants, choose to combine the complaints.
- e. The conduct of matters brought before the student academic complaint committee shall be non-adversarial in nature. The committee shall examine and evaluate fully the written allegation and response, including any supporting documentation submitted by the complainant or respondent. The complainant and the respondent will be invited to appear before the committee. The committee may also invite testimony from any other persons who, in the judgment of the committee, may assist in its examination and evaluation of the complaint.
- f. In each case brought before the committee, the student complainant may bring a non-attorney adviser (e.g., a parent, fellow student, another instructor) to observe, assist, and counsel. Such advisers shall not participate directly in the hearing.
- g. After completion of its review and examination and following appropriate deliberation, the committee shall forward to the local administrator a written recommendation, which becomes part of the record.

- h. Upon receipt of the written recommendation from the student academic complaint committee, the local administrator shall provide a written decision to the complainant and the respondent, with a copy going to the members of the committee and the academic administrator at the next level of governance. In arriving at a decision, the local administrator, besides reviewing the recommendations provided by the committee, may consult with the parties to the complaint or others who the local administrator believes may assist in the review of the matter. The written decision should contain a summary of the complaints and of the committee's recommendation, and the reason(s) for the decision rendered.
- i. In the event that the decision requires a change in a student's academic record, and neither party appeals the decision of the academic unit or regional campus, it is the responsibility of the local administrator to initiate such a change, following established university procedures.

F. Appeal of academic unit or regional campus decision.

- 1. The complainant or respondent may appeal the decision made at the academic unit or regional campus level to the academic administrator at the next level of governance.
- 2. The appellant shall clearly state in writing the reasons why the academic unit or regional campus decision is being appealed. The appeal must be based on procedural reasons or substantive issues that were not properly dealt with in the original complaint. In no case will the appeal be a complete rehearing of the original complaint.
- 3. A copy of the appeal statement must be sent to the other party (complainant or respondent) and the local administrator of the academic unit or regional campus.
- 4. The review of any appeal by the academic administrator at the next level of governance will normally consist of the review of the written documents. At the discretion of the academic administrator at the next level of governance, the review may include interviewing the principal parties, discussing the matter with the local administrator and members of the student academic complaint committee, and/or consulting with any others deemed relevant to the review of the appeal.
- 5. Upon completion of the review, the academic administrator at the next level of governance will make the final decision.

G. Time limits.

- 1. The following time limits pertain to all parties. If conditions or causes exist requiring a modification of the time limits, it shall be the responsibility of the local administrator to assess such circumstances and causes and determine the nature or extent of any such modification. If the local administrator determines that modification is required, the parties shall be informed immediately by the local administrator.

2. Following an unsuccessful attempt at informal resolution, a written complaint must be submitted within fifteen (15) days after the occurrence of the event. If the event occurs at or after the end of a regular semester or during a summer session, a student will have up to fifteen (15) days from the start of the next semester to submit a complaint to the local administrator. An exception to this rule is in effect if the student is scheduled to graduate and the event does not delay graduation. In such cases, the written complaint must be filed within thirty (30) days following the last day of finals week, if the event occurs during the regular semester, or within thirty (30) days following the last day of classes of the final summer session, if the event occurs during summer session.
 3. The local administrator must provide a copy of the complaint to the respondent and members of the student academic complaint committee within ten (10) days of receipt of the complaint.
 4. The respondent has ten (10) days from the date of receipt of the complaint, if the complaint was submitted during the fall or spring semesters, or ten (10) days from the start of the next semester, if the complaint was submitted during the summer or winter breaks, to provide a written response to the local administrator, with a copy to the complainant and to the members of the student academic complaint committee.
 5. The student academic complaint committee is expected to conduct its review as expeditiously as possible. In no case, however, is the committee expected to conduct its review outside of the regular academic year (Fall and Spring semesters). The student academic complaint committee, through its chair, must forward a written recommendation to the local administrator within fifteen (15) days of completion of its review.
 6. The local administrator will normally provide a written decision within ten (10) days of receipt of the student academic complaint committee's recommendation.
 7. If either party decides to appeal the local administrator's recommendations, the appeal must be submitted in writing to the appropriate academic administrator at the next level of governance within ten (10) days of receipt of the academic unit or regional campus decision. A copy of the written appeal must also be sent to the other party and to the local administrator of the academic unit or regional campus.
 8. Unless extensive further review is required, the academic administrator at the next level of governance shall normally provide a decision to the appellant within fifteen (15) days. A copy of the decision shall be sent to the other party and to the local administrator.
- H Records. The records and disposition of any complaint, including those appealed to the academic administrator at the next level of governance, shall be maintained by the academic unit or regional campus in a student academic complaint file for a minimum of seven years.

- I. Exceptions. It is recognized that, because of the nature of a complaint or the possibility of persons normally involved in the process being subject to a complaint themselves, exceptions to these procedures may have to be made. In any such case, the matter should be brought to the attention of the office of the provost in the case of complaints originating on the Kent campus, or the chief administrative officer for regional campuses in the case of complaints originating on a regional campus.

Policy Effective Date: Mar. 01, 2015

Policy Prior Effective Dates: 5/6/1987, 1/25/1991, 5/8/1995, 3/7/2000, 6/1/2007

4 - 02.3

Administrative policy and procedure for student academic complaints

- A. Purpose. This administrative policy and procedure is established to provide an appropriate framework and method to resolve student complaints of an academic nature. As such, this policy is specifically designed to maintain the integrity of the academic environment and to ensure that the rights of students in such matters are clearly stated and protected.
- B. General guidelines.
1. In initiating a complaint and throughout the formal appeals process, students may seek the counsel of the office of the student ~~ombudsman~~ombuds. The student ~~ombudsman~~ombuds will provide information, clarify procedures, and facilitate communication as requested.
 2. This student academic complaint policy, upon its approval, will become a part of ~~each departmental/independent school unit's~~the handbook for each academic unit and regional campus as the applicable student complaint policy and procedure for the unit.
 3. The appropriate jurisdiction for initiating an academic complaint (where a complaint must be filed and which academic unit or regional campus controls the complaint process) is determined first by the location from which the course offering emanates. Academic complaints concerning courses offered by a regional campus will be initiated with the regional campus offering the course. Academic complaints concerning courses offered by a Kent campus academic unit or the College of Applied and Technical Studies will be initiated with the academic unit offering the course. In the case of a course offered by a Kent campus academic unit that is cross-listed with other academic units, academic complaints will be initiated with the academic unit of the instructor.
 34. It is understood that some issues may involve one or more policies which, because of either the nature of the academic complaint or the status of the complainant, may be related to university offices which have separate responsibilities for such policies. ~~For example, an allegation of discrimination or sexual harassment could be reviewed separately by the office of affirmative action~~ Appeals of sanctions applied for cheating or plagiarism should be addressed under policy 3-01.8, administrative policy regarding student cheating and plagiarism. Non-academic student complaints should be addressed under policy 4-02.102, operational policy regarding general nonacademic grievance procedure for students.
 45. There shall be no retaliation against the student or abridgment of a student's rights resulting from the use of this policy.
- ~~C. Regional campus academic complaints filed at a regional campus are covered by rule 3342-8-01.4 of the Administrative Code.~~
- ~~D.C.~~ Definition of terms.

1. "Student" means defined as any person enrolled at the university in a course offered for credit.
2. "Instructor" means defined as any person who is authorized by appointment to teach in any course offering of the university; ~~or, who is involved in a professional capacity as a thesis or dissertation committee member, or in other types of assessment or evaluation of who evaluates~~ student academic work.
3. "Academic unit" is defined as an academic department headed by a chair, a school headed by a director, or a college without departments or schools headed by a dean.
4. "Regional campus" is defined as a campus of Kent State University other than the Kent campus.
35. "Chair" means "Local administrator" is defined as the chief administrative officer of a department, school, or program an academic unit or regional campus whose position is that of a first organizational level academic leader with a teaching faculty. In the case of undergraduate programs in an independent school, an assistant dean shall serve in (i.e., the capacity of chair with regard to this procedure. In the case of graduate programs in an independent school, the dean serves in the capacity of chair with regard to this procedure. of a department, the director of a school, the dean of a college without departments or schools, or the dean of a regional campus). In the case of a college without departments or schools or a regional campus, and with the exception of the role identified for the local administrator in sub-sections E.2.g-h and in section F below, the dean may delegate the role of the local administrator to an assistant or associate dean.
4. ~~"Dean" means the chief administrative officer of a college who has programmatic administrative authority for the unit in which the action took place. The deans of the graduate school of education, the graduate school of management, and the graduate college shall be the appropriate dean for those respective graduate programs. The dean may designate an assistant or associate dean to fulfill the duties required by this procedure.~~
5. ~~"Department" means an academic unit headed by a chair, a dependent school headed by a director, or for purposes of implementation of this policy, an independent school headed by a dean.~~
6. ~~"College" means an academic unit headed by a dean and made up of several departments or dependent schools.~~
6. "Faculty advisory body" is defined as the Faculty Advisory Committee of a department or school, the College Advisory Committee of a college, or the Faculty Council of a regional campus.

Draft Revisions as Approved by PSC November 23, 2021

7. "Student academic complaint" is defined as a formalized complaint regarding those aspects of the educational process involving student performance, evaluation, or grading in courses.
8. "Student complaint procedure" is defined as the process by which a student may resolve an academic complaint.
9. "Respondent" is defined as that person or persons named by the student when filing a written academic complaint.
10. "Complainant" is defined as ~~that person~~ the student who files ~~an~~ academic complaint.
11. "Student academic complaint committee" ~~refers to the department~~ is defined as the academic unit or regional campus committee whose responsibility is to review and make recommendations to the ~~chair~~ local administrator with regard to student academic complaints.

~~12. All references to "days" refer to weekdays during fall and spring semesters in which classes are conducted, excluding examination week.~~

~~13. "Student ombudsman" is~~

12. "Student ombuds" is defined as the university official charged with the responsibility to assist students by providing an individualized information and referral system. The student ~~ombudsman~~ ombuds informs students of procedures for processing student complaints and acts as a facilitator upon request.

13. "Academic administrator at the next level of governance" is defined as the college dean (or their designee) in the case of a department chair/school director, the provost (or their designee) in the case of a dean of a college without departments or schools, or the chief administrative officer for regional campuses (or their designee) in the case of a regional campus dean

14. All references to "days" refer to weekdays during Fall and Spring semesters on which classes are conducted, excluding examination week.

~~ED. Departmental/independent school-s~~ Student academic complaint committee.

1. Each academic unit and regional campus shall establish a standing student academic complaint committee which shall be composed of ~~departmental~~ three to five full-time faculty and at least one student. The departmental faculty advisory committee, with the addition of at least one student, may constitute the student members from the academic complaint committee; ~~or, the faculty advisory committee may designate or create another standing committee as the student academic complaint committee~~ unit or regional campus and one to two students. All members shall participate fully in committee deliberations and shall vote on the recommendation to be forwarded to the ~~chair~~ local administrator.

2. In all cases, faculty members of the student academic complaint committee will be selected by the faculty advisory body of the academic unit or regional campus at the end of the Spring semester for the next academic year.
23. At the beginning of each academic year the student academic complaint committee shall elect one of its full-time faculty members to serve as chairperson.
3. ~~In the case of units where the faculty advisory committee is a committee of the whole, the departmental faculty will select three to five of its members to serve as the student academic complaint committee.~~
4. The student member(s) of the committee will be selected by the ~~chairperson from at least two nominees chosen by the departmental student organization that the chairperson~~local administrator after consultation with the faculty advisory body and the faculty advisory committee identify as being most reflective of the academic mission of the department. Two relevant student organizations. As applicable, one undergraduate ~~nominees~~major and ~~two~~one graduate ~~nominees who are majors~~student in good standing ~~in the unit~~ shall be ~~forwarded to~~appointed by the chairpersonlocal administrator on or before September fifteenth of each year. ~~In the event the nominations are not received, the chairperson shall select an undergraduate and a graduate student, who is a major in good standing, to serve.~~ The undergraduate student will sit on complaints ~~from~~about undergraduate courses, and the graduate student will sit on complaints ~~from~~about graduate courses.
5. If a member of the student academic complaint committee or a spouse, domestic partner, or ~~a~~ relative of any member of the committee is named as a respondent or complainant, that member shall be excluded from deliberating or voting on that complaint. In such cases, the members of the student academic complaint committee, through its chairperson, may replace any member excluded by this provision.
6. ~~When sitting as~~Neither the local administrator nor any administrative delegate thereof is a member of the student academic complaint committee, the chairperson (independent school assistant dean for undergraduate complaints/independent school dean for graduate complaints) is not a member of the committee, nor~~nor~~ does the ~~chairperson~~local administrator or any administrative delegate thereof participate in its deliberations.
7. ~~In each individual case brought before the committee, the student complainant may bring a non-attorney adviser to observe, assist, and counsel. Such advisers shall not participate directly in the hearing.~~

FE. Complaint procedure.

1. Informal resolution.
 - a. The student is expected first to review the matter with the course instructor in an attempt to resolve the issue immediately.

- b. If the matter is not resolved immediately, the student may discuss the matter with the ~~departmental chairperson~~local administrator of the academic unit or regional campus offering the course before lodging a formal complaint.
 - c. The student may also consult with the student ~~ombudsman in an attempt to achieve informal resolution~~ombuds.
2. Formal complaint.
- a. ~~If the~~ attempts at informal resolution are unsuccessful, the student may lodge a formal complaint by submitting said complaint, in writing, to the ~~department chairperson~~local administrator. (See section G below for time limits.) In the case where a complaint is lodged against the ~~department chair~~local administrator, the complaint will be submitted to the chair of the student academic complaint committee.
 - ab. The written complaint submitted by the student should include the nature of the complaint, the facts and circumstances leading to the complaint, reasons in support of the complaint, and the remedy or remedies requested. The complaint statement submitted by the student becomes the basis for all further consideration of the matter. The written complaint should also note what attempts were made at informal resolution and should include any evidence pertinent to the issues identified.
 - bc. Upon receipt of the complaint, ~~it~~the local administrator shall ~~be referred~~refer it to the student academic complaint committee for consideration. A copy will be made available to the respondent(s) who shall respond in writing to the complaint and include any information or documentation related to the response. A copy of the respondent's written response shall be forwarded to the complainant.
 - d. If the committee determines that two or more complaints against an instructor are substantively the same, the committee may, with the concurrence of the complainants, choose to combine the complaints.
 - ee. The conduct of matters brought before the student academic complaint committee shall be non-adversarial in nature. The committee shall examine and evaluate fully the written allegation and response, including any supporting documentation submitted by the ~~appellant~~complainant or respondent. The complainant and the respondent will be invited to appear before the committee. The committee may also invite testimony from any other persons who, in the judgment of the committee, may assist in its examination and evaluation of the complaint.
 - f. In each case brought before the committee, the student complainant may bring a non-attorney adviser (e.g., a parent, fellow student, another instructor) to observe, assist, and counsel. Such advisers shall not participate directly in the hearing.

eg. After completion of its review and examination and following appropriate deliberation, the committee shall forward to the ~~department chairperson~~local administrator a written recommendation, which becomes part of the record.

eh. Upon receipt of the written recommendation from the student academic complaint committee, the ~~department chair~~local administrator shall provide a written decision to the complainant and the respondent, with a copy going to the members of the committee and the ~~dean~~academic administrator at the next level of governance. In arriving at a decision, the ~~department chairperson~~local administrator, besides reviewing the recommendations provided by the committee, may consult with the parties to the complaint or others who the ~~department chairperson~~local administrator believes may assist in the review of the matter. The written decision should contain a summary of the complaints, and of the committee's recommendation, and the reason(s) for the decision rendered.

fi. In the event that the decision requires a change in a student's academic record, and neither party appeals the ~~department~~decision of the academic unit or regional campus, it is the responsibility of the ~~chairperson of the department~~local administrator to initiate such a change, following established university procedures.

GE. Appeal of ~~department~~academic unit or regional campus decision.

1. The complainant or respondent may appeal ~~to the appropriate dean~~ the decision made at the ~~department~~academic unit or regional campus level to the academic administrator at the next level of governance.

12. The appellant shall clearly state in writing ~~to the dean~~ the reasons why the ~~departmental~~academic unit or regional campus decision is being appealed. The appeal must be based on procedural reasons or substantive issues that were not properly dealt with in the original appeal complaint. In no case will the appeal be a complete rehearing of the original complaint.

23. A copy of the ~~appeals~~appeal statement must be sent to the other party (complainant or respondent) and the ~~chairperson~~local administrator of the ~~department~~academic unit or regional campus.

34. The review ~~by the dean~~ of any appeal by the academic administrator at the next level of governance will normally consist of the review of the written documents ~~and may, at~~. At the discretion of the ~~dean~~academic administrator at the next level of governance, the review may include interviewing the principal parties, discussing the matter with the ~~department chairperson~~local administrator and members of the student academic complaint committee, and/or ~~consultation~~consulting with any others ~~who the dean believes may assist in~~deemed relevant to the review of the appeal.

45. Upon completion of the review, the ~~dean~~academic administrator at the next level of governance will make the final decision.

HG. Time limits.

1. The following time limits pertain to all parties. If conditions or causes exist requiring a modification of the time limits, it shall be the responsibility of the ~~chairperson~~local administrator to assess such circumstances and causes and determine the nature or extent of any such modification. If the ~~chairperson~~local administrator determines that modification is required, the parties shall be informed immediately by the ~~chairperson~~local administrator.
42. Following an unsuccessful attempt at informal resolution, a written complaint must be submitted within fifteen (15) days after the occurrence of the event. If the event occurs at or after the end of a regular semester or during a summer session, a student will have up to fifteen (15) days ~~at~~from the start of the next semester to submit a complaint to the ~~department~~local administrator. An exception to this rule is in effect if the student is scheduled to graduate and the event does not delay graduation. In such cases, the written complaint must be filed within thirty (30) days following the last day of finals week, if the event occurs during the regular semester, or within thirty (30) days following the last day of classes of the final summer session, if the event occurs during summer session.
23. The ~~department chairperson~~local administrator must provide a copy of the complaint to the respondent and members of the student academic complaint committee within ten (10) days of receipt of the complaint.
34. The respondent has ten (10) days from the date of receipt of the complaint, if the complaint was submitted during the fall or spring semesters, or ten (10) days from the start of the next semester, if the complaint was submitted during the summer or winter breaks, to provide a written response to the ~~department chairperson~~local administrator, with a copy to the complainant and to the members of the student academic complaint committee.
45. The student academic complaint committee is expected to conduct its review as expeditiously as possible. In no case, however, is the committee expected to conduct its review outside of the regular academic year (Fall and Spring semesters). The student academic complaint committee, through its chair, must forward a written recommendation to the ~~department chairperson~~local administrator within fifteen (15) days of completion of its review.
56. The ~~chairperson~~local administrator will normally provide a written decision within ten (10) days of receipt of the student academic complaint committee's recommendation.
67. If either party decides to appeal the ~~chairperson's~~local administrator's recommendations, the appeal must be submitted in writing to the appropriate ~~dean~~academic administrator at the next level of governance within ~~five~~ten (10) days of receipt of the ~~departmental~~academic unit or regional campus decision. A copy of the written appeal

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Draft Revisions as Approved by PSC November 23, 2021

must also be sent to the other party and to the ~~chairperson~~local administrator of the ~~department~~academic unit or regional campus.

~~78.~~ Unless extensive further review is required, the ~~dean~~academic administrator at the next level of governance shall normally provide a decision to the appellant within fifteen ~~(15)~~ days. A copy of the decision shall be sent to the other party and to the ~~department chairperson~~local administrator.

~~44.~~ Records. The records and disposition of any complaint, including those appealed to the ~~dean~~academic administrator at the next level of governance, shall be maintained by the ~~department~~academic unit or regional campus in a ~~separate~~ student academic complaint file for a minimum of seven years.

~~J1.~~ Exceptions. It is recognized that, because of ~~organizational structure~~, the nature of a complaint, or the possibility of persons normally involved in the process being subject to a complaint themselves, exceptions to these procedures may have to be made. In any such case, the matter should be brought to the attention of the office of the provost ~~and vice president for enrollment management and student life for disposition~~in the case of complaints originating on the Kent campus, or the chief administrative officer for regional campuses in the case of complaints originating on a regional campus.

Policy Effective Date: Mar. 01, 2015

Policy Prior Effective Dates: 5/6/1987, 1/25/1991, 5/8/1995, 3/7/2000, 6/1/2007



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
October 27, 2021**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Tracy Laux (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Darci Kracht (At-Large), Angela Guercio (Appointed), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. in 227 Schwartz Center.

2. Approval of Minutes

- a. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of September 29, 2021
- b. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of October 11, 2021
- c. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of October 20, 2021

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as a slate (Laux/Guercio). The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

3. Finalize Agenda for November 8, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

The agenda was finalized.

4. Call for Nominations – Tenure and Promotion Advisory Boards

Recommendations were made for both boards.

5. University Accreditation & Accountability Committee (UAAC)

The committee is still waiting to hear which candidates are willing to run for election.

6. Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FSBAC) Description Proposed Changes

The Executive Committee went over the proposed list of changes. The changes will be taken to the next full Faculty Senate meeting as an action item.

7. Proposed Changes for Other Committee Descriptions

- a. Faculty Ethics Committee
- b. Professional Standards Committee
- c. University Libraries Advisory Committee

The Executive Committee also decided to add changes to the committee descriptions of these committees to the next full Faculty Senate meeting as action items.

8. Final Plans for Fall Retreat—Friday, October 29, Laziza, 12:00-2:00 p.m.

Senator Kracht volunteered to moderate the retreat. Prizes were selected, and the owner of Laziza has agreed to judge the costume competition. Surveys about the retreat will be provided to senators who attend in person. Those who cannot attend will be sent a Qualtrics survey where they can express their concerns to the Executive Committee about which issues are important for Faculty Senate to focus on in the upcoming year.

9. Additional Items

There was a brief discussion of possible starting times for Executive Committee meetings in Spring 2022.

10. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate