

Faculty Senate Agenda – February 14, 2022

Item No.	Item	PDF Pg. No.																																	
1.	Call to Order																																		
2.	Roll Call																																		
3.	Approval of the Agenda																																		
4.	Approval of the December 13, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes	3–7																																	
5.	Chair’s Remarks																																		
6.	President’s Remarks																																		
7.	<p>Educational Policies Council (EPC) Action Items:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"> <th style="text-align: center;">Item</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Proposal</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Overview</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">7.a. DIVISION OF GRADUATE STUDIES – <i>Dean Manfred van Dulmen</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Division of Graduate Studies</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">View</td> <td style="width: 52%;">Restructure and revise name; new name is the Graduate College (<i>fall 2022</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">7.b. OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS – <i>Interim Associate Vice President Lana Whitehead</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Admission of Graduate Students</td> <td style="text-align: center;">View</td> <td>Revise policy to align with policies at other Ohio public institutions, emphasize holistic review of applications and expand access to graduate programs (<i>fall 2022</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">7.c. COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES – <i>Department Chair Richard Adams</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Department of Sociology</td> <td style="text-align: center;">View</td> <td>Revise name to Department of Sociology and Criminology (<i>fall 2022</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">7.d. COLLEGE OF APPLIED AND TECHNICAL STUDIES – <i>Program Consultant Matthew Butler</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social Work - B.S.W.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">View</td> <td>Establish major/degree hybrid online/on-ground on Ashtabula, Salem and Tuscarawas campuses (<i>fall 2022</i>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">7.e. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE – <i>Placement & Testing Coordinator Jessica Cervenak</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>University Readiness Standards and Placement Assessment</td> <td style="text-align: center;">View</td> <td>Revise policy to adhere to new test-optional admissions (<i>fall 2022</i>)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Proposal	Overview	7.a. DIVISION OF GRADUATE STUDIES – <i>Dean Manfred van Dulmen</i>			Division of Graduate Studies	View	Restructure and revise name; new name is the Graduate College (<i>fall 2022</i>)	7.b. OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS – <i>Interim Associate Vice President Lana Whitehead</i>			Admission of Graduate Students	View	Revise policy to align with policies at other Ohio public institutions, emphasize holistic review of applications and expand access to graduate programs (<i>fall 2022</i>)	7.c. COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES – <i>Department Chair Richard Adams</i>			Department of Sociology	View	Revise name to Department of Sociology and Criminology (<i>fall 2022</i>)	7.d. COLLEGE OF APPLIED AND TECHNICAL STUDIES – <i>Program Consultant Matthew Butler</i>			Social Work - B.S.W.	View	Establish major/degree hybrid online/on-ground on Ashtabula, Salem and Tuscarawas campuses (<i>fall 2022</i>)	7.e. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE – <i>Placement & Testing Coordinator Jessica Cervenak</i>			University Readiness Standards and Placement Assessment	View	Revise policy to adhere to new test-optional admissions (<i>fall 2022</i>)	
Item	Proposal	Overview																																	
7.a. DIVISION OF GRADUATE STUDIES – <i>Dean Manfred van Dulmen</i>																																			
Division of Graduate Studies	View	Restructure and revise name; new name is the Graduate College (<i>fall 2022</i>)																																	
7.b. OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS – <i>Interim Associate Vice President Lana Whitehead</i>																																			
Admission of Graduate Students	View	Revise policy to align with policies at other Ohio public institutions, emphasize holistic review of applications and expand access to graduate programs (<i>fall 2022</i>)																																	
7.c. COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES – <i>Department Chair Richard Adams</i>																																			
Department of Sociology	View	Revise name to Department of Sociology and Criminology (<i>fall 2022</i>)																																	
7.d. COLLEGE OF APPLIED AND TECHNICAL STUDIES – <i>Program Consultant Matthew Butler</i>																																			
Social Work - B.S.W.	View	Establish major/degree hybrid online/on-ground on Ashtabula, Salem and Tuscarawas campuses (<i>fall 2022</i>)																																	
7.e. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE – <i>Placement & Testing Coordinator Jessica Cervenak</i>																																			
University Readiness Standards and Placement Assessment	View	Revise policy to adhere to new test-optional admissions (<i>fall 2022</i>)																																	
8.	Old Business / Action Item – Motion: Delete Policy 8-01.4 from the Policy Register and approve the revisions to Policy 4-02.3 (see specific proposal) to cover academic complaints University-wide. Draft Revisions to Policy 4-02.3 Administrative Policy and Procedure for Student Academic Complaints as approved by the Professional Standards Committee on January 3, 2022 (Deborah Smith – Chair of the Professional Standards Committee and Professor of Philosophy)	<p>Redline 8–15</p> <p>Clean 16–22</p>																																	

9.	New Business: a. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Syllabus Statement from the Anti-Racism Task Force Transition Team Subcommittee for DEI Syllabus Statement (Nicole Willey – Professor of English) b. Faculty Senate Resolution in Support of the Diversity Syllabus Statement (Chair Grimm)	23 24
10.	Announcements / Statements for the Record: a. Elections Update b. Survey on Student Expectations	
11.	Adjourn	
	Additional Items:	
	• Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of November 17, 2021	25 – 26
	• Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of November 22, 2021	27 – 30
	• Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of December 8, 2021	31 – 32
	• Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of January 7, 2022	33 – 34
	• Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of January 26, 2022	35 – 36

Revised 2/14/22

EPC Information Items		
Educational Policies Council (EPC) Information Items:		
Item	Proposal	Overview
a. COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES		
Department of Mathematical Sciences		
Mathematics for Secondary Teachers - M.A.	View	Revise major name to Mathematics for Secondary School Teachers (<i>fall 2022</i>)
b. COLLEGE OF APPLIED AND TECHNICAL STUDIES		
Occupational Therapy Assistant Technology - A.A.S.	View	Revise major name to Occupational Therapy Assistant (<i>fall 2022</i>)
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES		
Department of Biological Sciences		
c. Biological Sciences–Botany - M.S.	View	Inactivate major (<i>fall 2022</i>)
d. Biological Sciences–Botany - Ph.D.	View	Inactivate major (<i>fall 2022</i>)
COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION		
School of Emerging Media and Technology		
e. Digital Sciences - B.A.	View	Inactivate major (<i>fall 2022</i>)
f. Digital Sciences - M.D.S.	View	Inactivate major/degree (<i>fall 2022</i>)



FACULTY SENATE

Meeting Minutes

December 13, 2021

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Omid Bagheri, Tina Bhargava, Tammy Clewell, Timothy Culver, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Omar De La Cruz Cabrera, Kimberly DePaul, Tracy Dodson, Yanhai Du, Pamela Grimm, Angela Guercio, Mariann Harding, Todd Hawley, Edgar Kooijman, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Janice Kroeger, Tracy Laux, Cathy Marshall, Karen Mascolo, Denise McEnroe-Petitte, Oana Mocioalca, Deepraj Mukherjee, Abe Osbourne, Vic Perera, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Helen Piontkivska, Susan Roxburgh, Athena Salaba, Deborah Smith, Diane Stroup, Eric Taylor, Robin Vande Zande, Laurie Wagner, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Christopher Was, Haiyan Zhu, Melissa Zullo

Senators Not Present: Jeffrey Child, Julie Evey, David Kaplan, Velvet Landingham, Mahli Mechenbier, Murali Shanker, Denice Sheehan

Ex-Officio Members Present: President Todd Diacon; Senior Vice Presidents: Lamar Hylton, Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Sean Broghammer*, Doug Delahanty*, Amoaba Gooden, Rebecca Murphy*, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Peggy Shaddock, Jack Witt; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, Christina Bloebaum, Ken Burhanna, James Hannon, Versie Johnson-Mallard, Mark Mistur, Diane Petrella, Alison Smith, Deborah Spake, Manfred van Dulmen *Interim

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Senior Vice President and Provost Melody Tankersley; Vice Presidents: Valoree Vargo, Willis Walker; Deans: Allan Boike, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk*, Eboni Pringle, Amy Reynolds *Interim

Observers Present: Claire Jackman (GSS)

Observers Not Present: Paul Farrell (Emeritus Professor), Brandon Allen (USS)

Guests Present: Aimee Bell, Bryan Caldwell, J.R. Campbell, Alicia Crowe, Chris Dorsten, Jo Dowell, Christopher Fenk, Jennifer Hebebrand, Daniel Holm, Thomas Janson, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Valerie Kelly, Insook Kim, Martha Lash, Dana Lawless-Andric, Kerri Lochmueller, Parry Lopez, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Miriam Matteson, Bryan Molnar, Aaron Mulrooney, Susan Perry, Liz Piatt, Amy Quillin, Therese Tillett, Sue Wamsley, Zhiqiang (Molly) Wang, Deirdre Warren, Kevin West

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Laux called the meeting to order at 3:21 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

Vice Chair Laux 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 November 8, 2021

Vice Chair Laux asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the November 8, 2021, Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Mocioalca/Smith).

The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

5. Chair's Remarks

There were no Chair's Remarks for this meeting.

Vice Chair Laux then turned over the microphone to President Diacon.

6. President's Remarks

President Diacon thanked everyone for teaching, mentoring, and doing research during the pandemic. He specifically acknowledged Julie Volcheck who will be retiring. He also thanked three professors in Public Health for pandemic help, the Faculty Senate, the Kent State AAUP, and Associate Provost van Dulmen for their work. He then gave numbers relating to the pandemic. He said that there is a 17.5% positivity rating in Portage County with 127 new cases per day over the last seven days. Kent State numbers are up, but not at the level of Portage County or the state. Positivity at Kent is 2.93%. There were 77 positive cases last week at the university. 55 of these were students and 22 were employees. He noted that this was a doubling of October's numbers and that there were currently 24 students in isolation. Concerning vaccinations, he mentioned that 85% of residence hall students are vaccinated in addition to 89% of full-time faculty. Regarding approved exemptions, there have been 205 (5% of staff and 6% of students).

He then invited comments or questions.

Senator Piccirillo-Smith mentioned that the mask mandate at basketball games was not being followed well, and this dissuades her from attending. She asked what could be done to address this.

President Diacon said that he has attended many events, but he will talk to the new athletic director and see what can be done.

Senator Mocioalca mentioned that many students have received the Johnson & Johnson vaccine and it has low efficacy. She asked whether other vaccines might be offered to students, and what the capacity for boosters was.

President Diacon turned the question over to Associate Provost van Dulmen.

Associate Provost van Dulmen said booster services are available at the DeWeese Health Center and that the university will continue to encourage boosters and full vaccination.

Senator Kaplan asked about the plan for non-vaccinated members of the KSU community.

President Diacon said that a texting/calling campaign has begun to contact every student without evidence or an exemption.

There were no further comments or questions.

7. Educational Policies Council (EPC) Action Items:

a. College of the Arts & Sciences: Department of Geology – Renaming unit to the Department of Earth Sciences (Fall 2022). (Daniel Holm – Chair, Department of Geology)

Chair Holm explained the name change. The change follows national trends.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the change (Kooijman/Roxburgh).

Senator Du asked whether any courses or other aspects of the program were changing.

Chair Holm said there were not.

There were no further comments or questions.

The motion passed unanimously.

b. College of Education, Health & Human Services: 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)

Assistant Professor Guivernau explained the proposal.

A motion was made to approve the proposal (Dauterich).

Vice Chair Laux then asked for comments or questions.

There were no comments or questions.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Old Business: Committee Description Updates

Vice Chair Laux reminded senate of the changes to the committee descriptions from the last meeting and pointed out the housekeeping changes that had been put forth by the Executive Committee since the last full senate meeting.

Vice Chair Laux asked for a motion and a second to approve the changes.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the items as a slate (Smith/Kaplan).

There was no discussion about considering the items as a slate, and it passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded to approve both items (Sheehan/Smith).

There was no discussion on either item.

The items were approved unanimously.

9. New Business

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)

Senator Smith explained the proposal. There have been two complaint policies—one for Kent and one for regional campuses. A single policy would be optimal. The proposal going forward would be to delete the regional campus policy from the register and revise the Kent campus policy to reflect the regional campus needs. Revisions will focus on academic complaints rather than complaints covered by other university policies. The regional campus role of campus complaint advisor will be removed from the new policy if approved. Faculty members appointed to deal with complaints will make sure committees for complaints will consist of 3-5 faculty and 1-2 students (left to the discretion of individual campuses—this should be delineated in unit handbooks). Faculty members, in the proposed changes, will be appointed to the committee at the end of the Spring semester. She also highlighted housekeeping questions and concerns, which were provided in documents distributed before the meeting.

She then invited comments or questions.

Senator Guercio asked about the delegation of work to assistant deans. She said that even associate and assistant deans may not be able to devote the necessary amount of time to the question and that maybe they should be able to send it to another administrator.

Senator Smith said she will take the question to the PSC.

Senator Zhu brought up the structure of the complaint process on regional campuses and said that things are often resolved informally and that it would be good if there was still room for this. She also asked a question about who would have jurisdiction over certain complaints.

Senator Smith explained the proposed unified procedure for addressing complaints and said that the campus offering the class would be the campus where the jurisdiction would reside. She added that it is always suggested that students first start with communicating with their instructors before filing a student complaint. No mediation would be necessary if complaints were resolved at this stage.

Senator Zhu thanked her for her comments.

Senator Bagheri asked for some clarification about the number of faculty members required as well as the informal role that some faculty could play in the past toward mediating the situation and how CATS would work with this policy since it has no specific campus.

Senator Smith clarified the concerns about faculty members and said that she may need to work with making the language more specific when it applies to CATS; she suggested that PSC will need to look at how to reword the policy about jurisdiction since CATS is an academic unit.

Senator Sheehan asked about whether the committee had considered allocations of TT/NTE members on a committee.

Senator Smith said that would be up to individual academic units.

Senator Guercio asked again about the number of faculty and students on the complaint committees and said that she would like to see more students involved.

Senator Smith responded that at least one student perspective would be involved, and she added that another would be possible but would probably not be made a requirement if the committee reconsidered it.

Senator Guercio stated that she believed more student representation is important, so there will be more balance at complaint hearings.

Senator Smith replied that she will bring those concerns back to the PSC.

There were no further comments or questions.

10. Announcements / Statements for the Record

Vice President Rathje said that he and the provost have agreed that the budget and supervision of online proctoring will move from the Office of Continuing and Distance Education to Information Technology and will be under Executive Director James Raber's direction.

11. Adjournment

Vice Chair Laux adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate

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 (i.e., where a complaint is filed and which academic unit or regional campus controls the complaint process) is determined first by the academic unit or campus scheduling the course offering. Academic complaints concerning courses scheduled by an academic unit will be initiated with the academic unit offering the course. Academic complaints concerning courses scheduled by a regional campus will be initiated with the regional campus offering the course. In the case of a course scheduled by an academic unit which is cross-listed with other academic units, an academic complaint will be initiated with the academic unit of the instructor. In the case of a course scheduled by a regional campus that is cross-listed with another campus, an academic complaint will be initiated with the primary campus of the instructor of record.
 34. It is understood that some ~~issues~~student academic complaints 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~~with separate responsibilities for such policies. ~~For example, a~~An allegation of discrimination or sexual harassment ~~eshould be reviewed-referred separately by-to~~the office of compliance, equal opportunity, and 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.

Commented [D1]: This has been revised to align with a recommendation by VP Shaddock.

Commented [D2]: This was added at the recommendation of VP Shaddock.

Draft Approved by PSC 1/3/2022 (reflecting comments received at the 12/13 Senate Discussion)

~~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~~ is defined as any person enrolled at the university in a course offered for credit.
2. "Instructor" ~~means~~ is 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~~ 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 a college or campus administrator with faculty rank.~~
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.~~

Commented [D3]: 'Assistant or Associate Dean' has been replaced with 'college or campus administrator with faculty rank' at the request of a Senator.

Draft Approved by PSC 1/3/2022 (reflecting comments received at the 12/13 Senate Discussion)

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 ~~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-sStudent 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~~

Draft Approved by PSC 1/3/2022 (reflecting comments received at the 12/13 Senate Discussion)

~~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 chairperson local 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.

Draft Approved by PSC 1/3/2022 (reflecting comments received at the 12/13 Senate Discussion)

- 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.
 - 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, ~~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.
 - 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 ~~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.

Draft Approved by PSC 1/3/2022 (reflecting comments received at the 12/13 Senate Discussion)

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.~~

~~dg.~~ 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.

~~GF.~~ 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.

~~2.~~ The appellant shall clearly state in writing ~~to the dean~~ the reasons why the ~~department~~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.

~~3.~~ 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.

H.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 ~~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.

12. 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.

Draft Approved by PSC 1/3/2022 (reflecting comments received at the 12/13 Senate Discussion)

~~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 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~~chairpersonlocal administrator.

~~4H.~~ 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.

~~4I.~~ 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

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 (i.e., where a complaint is filed and which academic unit or regional campus controls the complaint process) is determined first by the academic unit or campus scheduling the course offering. Academic complaints concerning courses scheduled by an academic unit will be initiated with the academic unit offering the course. Academic complaints concerning courses scheduled by a regional campus will be initiated with the regional campus offering the course. In the case of a course scheduled by an academic unit which is cross-listed with other academic units, an academic complaint will be initiated with the academic unit of the instructor. In the case of a course scheduled by a regional campus that is cross-listed with another campus, an academic complaint will be initiated with the primary campus of the instructor of record.
 4. It is understood that some student academic complaints 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 with separate responsibilities for such policies. An allegation of discrimination or sexual harassment should be referred to the office of compliance, equal opportunity, and 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.
 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 a college or campus administrator with faculty rank.
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

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statement for Syllabi

From the Anti-Racism Task Force Transition Team
Syllabus Statement Subcommittee

Kent State University is committed to the creation and maintenance of equitable and inclusive learning spaces. This course is a learning environment where all will be treated with respect and dignity, and where all individuals will have an equitable opportunity to succeed. The diversity that each student brings to this course is viewed as a strength and a benefit. Dimensions of diversity and their intersections include but are not limited to: race, ethnicity, national origin, primary language, age, gender identity and expression, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, mental and physical abilities, socio-economic status, family/caregiver status, and veteran status.

Faculty Senate Resolution in Support of the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Syllabus Statement

Whereas the values expressed in the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Syllabus Statement are in full accord with Kent State University's core values;

Whereas Faculty Senate recognizes the importance of conveying our institutional commitment to live by those values to all members of our community; and

Whereas the classroom, real and virtual, is the primary meeting place where students and faculty are called upon to undertake their scholarly endeavors within the context of our values; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate:

1. endorses the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Syllabus Statement developed and presented to this body; and
2. recommends the adoption of the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Syllabus Statement by individual faculty in their syllabi as well as by unit administrators who develop checklists for faculty to utilize in preparing their syllabi.



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
November 17, 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 3:06 p.m. in 227 Schwartz Center. Some members of the committee attended on Microsoft Teams.

2. Approval of Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of October 27, 2021

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

3. Decisions on Committee Descriptions/Memberships

It was decided that in regard to the Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FaSBAC), deans listed on the committee membership should not include the dean of Podiatric Medicine, who functions more as a regional campus dean than an RCM dean. Faculty members from Podiatric Medicine will be included on the faculty list of recommended members. Faculty members from all colleges can have stipulated terms, but other members' (students, chairs, administrators) length of term will be determined by the appointing body. Wording of the description will also be changed to show that alternates will be selected by the chair of the senate based on recommendations from the Committee on Committees (COC).

For the Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC), it was decided that the description needed to stipulate that only a tenured faculty member could serve as chair. It was also decided that the COC will consult with the NTT Provost Advisory Council (NPAC) and pass on names of eligible NTE faculty to the chair of senate for appointment.

4. Additions to the University Requirements Curriculum Committee (URCC) Core Committee

The URCC has asked senate for recommendations of more faculty to serve on the committee. The Executive Committee suggested possibilities for serving on the committee based on their surveyed interest in the URCC.

5. Updates from Senator Survey

Responses to the Fall Retreat survey are being compiled. The committee agreed to look over the results and discuss them at the next meeting.

6. Draft Agenda for the December 13, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

A tentative agenda will be drafted at one of the next two Executive Committee meetings.

7. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

8. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
November 22, 2021**

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

Not Present: Ed Dauterich (Secretary)

Guests: Provost Melody Tankersley, Associate Provost Kevin West

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room located in the Schwartz Center, Room 227.

2. Discuss Topics for President Diacon and Provost Tankersley

The Executive Committee was notified that President Diacon would not be attending today. Additionally, Associate Provost Kevin West will be attending to discuss Ombuds.

Some topics to discuss include: (a) Consider, in consultation with student governance bodies, ways we can provide students with clear information regarding faculty expectations of students; (b) Discuss functioning of the Academic Calendar Sub-Committee of EPC; and (c) Confirm that President Diacon will be making the remarks for the December 13 Faculty Senate meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes

No meeting minutes were approved at this meeting.

4. EPC Items from the November 15, 2021 Educational Policies Council Meeting

After some lengthy discussion and genuine concerns, the Executive Committee decided the following two items will be added to the agenda as action items for the December Faculty Senate meeting.

- a. College of Arts & Sciences: Department of Geology – Renaming unit to the Department of Earth Sciences (fall 2022). [View](#)
- b. College of Education, Health & Human Services: School of Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies – Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology –

Establish undergraduate major to be fully online and hybrid (fall 2022 pending final approvals). [View](#)

5. Meet with Provost Tankersley and Associate Provost Kevin West

The Executive Committee met with Provost Tankersley. Provost Tankersley brought Associate Provost Kevin West with her to speak on the topic of Ombuds. Other topics that were discussed included: remarks for the December Faculty Senate meeting; clear information regarding faculty expectations of students; food services; and the Academic Calendar Sub-Committee of EPC.

Remarks for the December Faculty Senate meeting – Although President Diacon is not attending today, Provost Tankersley was able to confirm that President Diacon will present his remarks at the December Faculty Senate meeting since she will be out of town during that time.

Clear Information Regarding Faculty Expectations of Students – The Executive Committee reminded Provost Tankersley that they want some action regarding ways to convey to all students exactly what faculty expectations are of them so that they have a full understanding. That would first require us to make sure that everyone does completely understand exactly what the faculty do expect from their students. Then perhaps, working with student governance bodies, we could locate any gaps between what faculty expect and what students think is reasonable.

Provost Tankersley questioned if this would be better coming from the Center for Teaching and Learning and Director, Jenny Marcinkiewicz. The Executive Committee agreed and Chair Grimm will email Jenny Marcinkiewicz to advise her of this discussion noting Provost Tankersley's willingness to provide support for this endeavor. Additionally, the Executive Committee will ask Jenny to lead a group to put out a survey, a focus group, or perhaps a town hall meeting on the topic.

Food Services – The Executive Committee brought up the topic of Food Service. There are still issues with not having enough food choices, not having enough places open, and not having enough workers. Provost Tankersley mentioned that they try every other week at Job Fair to get students to come in. However, she will share our concerns with Senior Vice President, Lamar Hylton.

Ombuds – Associate Provost Kevin West spoke about the value of having an Ombuds, as being able to provide faculty with a safe place to address issues. We want someone who's able to work with faculty and the direct them, someone that can manage the process, but also have a really strong relationship with the AAUP. Questions to ask should be "How do you fund this position?" and "Who does this position report to?"

Further qualifications and issues were discussed by the Executive Committee and Associate Provost Kevin West and they agreed they would like to see a description of tasks to round out a full-time position. A job description reporting to the Faculty Affairs Office to show the advantages of having an Ombuds position and all that we are considering for this position.

It was discussed that we should start up some internal structure for feedback that we would want from Faculty Senate. This would have a direct reporting line to Kevin and up through the Provost Office. But I believe we would want to have feedback from the two unions as well, and perhaps input from the Chairs and Directors so it's in alignment with our goal, which is to increase the positive climate work environment of all of our faculty and all of our academic units, which would be our students, our administrators, and our staff. We believe then the next step is developing the proposal and presenting it.

Academic Calendar Sub-Committee of the EPC – Some issues with the Academic Calendar Sub-Committee of the EPC were also discussed and resolved.

6. Discussion: Goals & Priorities for 21-22

This item was postponed until the next Executive Committee meeting.

7. Final Review of Changes to FSBAC and FEC Committee Descriptions

The Executive Committee carefully deliberated over the changes needed in order to finalize the committee descriptions for both FSBAC and FEC at the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting in December.

In the process of putting the amendments in place and reviewing the approved documents from the November meeting, several issues were noted in each committee description. The Executive Committee worked diligently to address those issues and the following proposed changes are summarized below:

Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FSBAC):

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

Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC):

- a. 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.
- b. 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.
- c. 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.

- d. 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.
- e. Some minor editing and reorganization of language for further clarification.

The above summarized list will be incorporated into the committee descriptions via tracked changes and forwarded to the Faculty Senate for final approval at the December Faculty Senate meeting.

8. Finalize Agenda for December 13, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting

The Executive Committee discussed the items that should be on the agenda for the December Faculty Senate meeting. The minutes from the November Faculty Senate meeting are not yet ready for review, so the Executive Committee decided to approve them via email. The two EPC items noted above will be added to the agenda. Committee description updates for both FSBAC and FEC will also be added to the agenda as old business to clean up and finalize document approved at the November Faculty Senate meeting. The Executive Committee also intend to include a special Announcements/ Statements for the Record regarding the organization of proctoring responsibilities. Pam will email John Rathje and Melody Tankersley to confirm that.

9. Committee Memberships for FSBAC, FEC, PSC, and ULAC

The Executive Committee discussed the various committees that would be affected by their respective committee description changes. Membership for FSBAC will go into effect immediately. Reviewing membership changes for FEC, PSC, and ULAC is evidently not necessary at this time and can wait until the Spring.

The Executive Committee reviewed and finalized a letter to send to the current FSBAC members that would be affected by, and removed from, the committee due to the changes in the FSBAC committee description.

10. Additional Items

There were no additional items discussed.

11. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Tess Kail
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
December 8, 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)

Guests: Associate Provost Manfred van Dulmen, Dean Alison Smith

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in 227 Schwartz Center. Some members of the committee attended on Microsoft Teams.

2. Approval of Minutes

- a. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of November 8, 2021
- b. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of November 17, 2021
- c. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of November 22, 2021

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

3. Calendar

The committee discussed the process to be followed for examining and approving the university calendar.

4. EPC Items from the December 6, 2021, Educational Policies Council Meeting

The Executive Committee voted to approve the six proposed changes approved by the Educational Policies Council for processes to be followed concerning different types of transfer credit.

5. Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FaSBAC) Membership

Associate Professor Mark Lyberger has been appointed to FaSBAC as a non-senator representative. He was appointed by the Faculty Senate Chair in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

6. Distribution of Online Links to Public Meetings

The committee discussed whether to send out links to Senate meetings and meetings of committees and councils that are normally open to the public. Links will not be sent out in the Spring 2022 semester.

7. (4:35) Meet with Associate Provost van Dulmen and Dean Smith Regarding Re-Envisioning the Kent Core

Associate Provost van Dulmen and Dean Smith met with the Executive Committee to discuss moving forward with possible changes to the Kent Core. The Executive Committee agreed that they should continue to move forward with the work.

8. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

9. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
January 7, 2022**

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)

Guest: President Todd Diacon

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. (2:30) Meet with President Diacon

The Executive Committee discussed the current state of the pandemic with President Diacon. The university will still be opening for in-person classes with safety protocols in place. The university has a testing capacity of around 6,000 people per week. Kent State will also continue to follow CDC guidelines. There is also a movement to try to reinforce the importance of wearing masks at athletic events.

The Executive Committee also asked President Diacon about a problem with some necessary communications from the university coming out later than normal this year. Communications that needed to be updated between Christmas and New Year's Day were not updated.

President Diacon said that they did not want to send out communications on reopening too early. A communication will be sent to students, faculty, and staff on Monday, January 10th.

President Diacon added that our persistence rate is down 3.6% from last year.

He also added that we started an academy in Brazil a couple of years ago, and enrollment is improving in the program.

He finished by adding that regional enrollments are down again.

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of December 13, 2021
- b. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of December 8, 2021
- c. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of December 22, 2021

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as a slate (Sheehan/Laux). The minutes were approved with some minor changes.

4. Faculty Senate Meetings for Spring 2022

The committee discussed whether to continue the HyFlex model for senate meetings and whether there should be changes to protocol for the meetings. There may be changes to favor in-person attendance in the future depending on the pandemic situation.

5. Faculty Senate Elections Update

The Executive Committee went over the list of candidates. The committee suggested some possible candidates to add in order to fill out slates from different areas.

6. Discussion: Goals and Priorities for AY 2021-22

Topics for the discussion included faculty mentoring, setting clear expectations for students, exploring childcare options for the university community, moving forward a proposal for a faculty ombuds position, increasing the affordability of education for students, upholding academic standards (especially in online courses), finding out more about the state of multidisciplinary programs, inquiring about graduate student stipends, continuing involvement with the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey, expanding programming specific to regional campuses, and preventing and mitigating climate change.

7. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

8. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
January 26, 2022**

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)

Guests: President Todd Diacon, Provost Melody Tankersley

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Discuss Topics for the President and the Provost

Topics included daycare on campus, an online petition concerning student safety during the pandemic, whether transcripts are withheld for non-payment, and the bookstore status.

3. Approval of Minutes

a. Correction to Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of December 13, 2021

A correction was made to the minutes to reflect that Chair Grimm did not deliver remarks at the meeting.

b. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of January 7, 2022

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting (Laux/Guercio). The minutes were approved unanimously with one correction.

4. (3:30) Meet with President Diacon

President Diacon and Provost Tankersley answered questions from the Executive Committee about the possible renewal of the bookstore contract, the withholding of transcripts, their reaction to how the first week went for the university this semester, an online petition concerning safety during the pandemic, the pausing of the Intergenerational Village Project, and the availability of childcare on campus.

5. Final Decisions for Spring Faculty Senate Meetings

HyFlex meetings will continue to be held, but priority for the right to the floor will be given to in-person senators followed by senators who are attending remotely. Meeting in person will be an option for ex-officio members as well as guests.

6. Review Agenda for February 14, 2022, Faculty Senate Meeting

The Executive Committee reviewed the agenda. More EPC items may be added before the senate meeting.

7. Elections Update

The slate for the senate election is almost complete.

8. Update on Goals and Priorities for AY 21-22

The first goal was addressed when the committee consulted with the president and provost about childcare. Provost Tankersley said she will investigate the need for increased childcare services for faculty, staff, and students.

Chair Grimm announced that a committee on sustainability is being formed in response to a second senate goal.

A third goal, interdisciplinary work, has not yet been further discussed with administration.

In addressing a fourth goal, Chair Grimm has reached out to Kevin West, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, for feedback on the ombuds position.

Additionally, Chair Grimm will contact Senator Deborah Smith about having the Professional Standards Committee review standards for online courses.

There was also a discussion of how to find ways for students to know what to expect from their professors.

9. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

10. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate