



FACULTY SENATE

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate & Guests **DATE:** December 3, 2012
FROM: Paul Farrell, Chair of Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Agenda and Materials for the December 10, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the December 10th Faculty Senate meeting. As always, we will meet in the Governance Chambers at 3:20 p.m. Please join us, if you can, for a few minutes of informal conversation prior to the meeting.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the November 5, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
4. Provost's Remarks
5. Chair's Remarks
6. Presentation: ADA Advisory Committee (Dean Laura Dzurec)
7. Old Business (Action Items):
 - a. University Policy Regarding Administration of Student Conduct (Vice President Greg Jarvie)
 - b. Change to Faculty Senate Bylaws to Permit On-Line Voting
8. Announcements / Statements for the Record
9. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment



FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of the Meeting
November 5, 2012

Senators present: Ann Abraham, Madhav Bhatta, David Dees, Vanessa Earp, Jean Engohang-Ndong, Paul Farrell, Rick Feinberg, Steve Fountain, Lee Fox-Cardamone, George Garrison, Mack Hassler, Min He, Barb Hipsman, Thomas Janson, Robert Kairis, Deborah Knapp, Ralph Lindeman, Richard Mangrum, Stephen Minnick, Stephen Paschen, David Riccio, Susan Roxburgh, Carol Sedlak, Vilma Seeberg, Jonathan Selinger, Deborah Smith, Fred Smith, James Tyner, Terry Uber, Roberto Uribe-Rendon, Robin Vande Zande, Christopher Was, Donald White, Linda Williams

Senators not present: Brian Baer, Patti Baller, Mary Ferranto, Kimberly Garchar, Susan Iverson, Tracy Laux, Daniel Roland, John Stoker, Jarrod Tudor, Will Ward, Susan Weaver, Kim Winebrenner

Ex-Officio Members present: President Lester Lefton; Provost & Senior V.P. for Academic Affairs Todd Diacon; Executive Director Deborah Huntsman; Deans: Timothy Chandler, Doug Steidl, Stanley Wearden, Kathryn Wilson, Mark Pike for James Bracken, Ralph Lorenz for John Crawford; Director Robert Walker

Observers present: Michael Allen (GSS), Larry Osher (Podiatric Medicine), Myra West (Emeritus Professor), Breanne Yonkof (USS)

Guests present: Sue Averill, Elsa Barletta, Kaylan Baxter, Lisa Delaney, Keli Greene, Mary Ann Haley, Tess Kail, Char Reed, Jennifer Sandoval, Therese Tillett

1. Call to Order

Chair Farrell called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Governance Chambers, second floor, Kent Student Center.

2. Roll Call

Secretary Earp called the roll.

3. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of November 5, 2012

Chair Farrell called for corrections to the minutes of the Faculty Senate general meeting of October 8, 2012.

The minutes of the October 8, 2012 meeting were approved unanimously (Feinberg/Lindeman).

4. President's Remarks

President Lefton congratulated the football team on their season so far. He also mentioned that he receives emails every day from students thanking him for the work that faculty do. He congratulated the six faculty members who were recognized by the University Teaching Council for their excellence in teaching. The Distinguished Teaching Award winners were Cynthia Barb from

Mathematical Sciences, Don-John Dugas from English, and Alexander Seed from Chemistry. There were three award winners for the Outstanding Teaching Award, David Graff from Justice Studies, Fetna Mikati from Modern and Classical Languages, and Mary Beth Lukach from Nursing.

President Lefton encouraged the faculty to participate in the strategic planning process for Academic Affairs that Provost Diacon is overseeing. He stated that the strategic planning process is not simply an exercise and that all faculty need to have their voices heard. President Lefton mentioned that the university is on the bubble of many retirements that will take place over the next few years and now is a good time for faculty and departments and schools to think about whom they want to hire and in what fields they want to hire.

President Lefton encouraged everyone to vote. One important issue at stake in this election and the federal budget negotiations to come is the funding for Pell Grants. Nearly half of our students, in fact 48% of all Kent State students, rely upon Pell Grants. Changes in Pell Grants affect access, debt, and ability to attend college. It is a major issue for our students and we need to monitor the situation closely. In Ohio we are at a strategic moment in how the state instructional support is going to be determined. President Lefton stated that we currently get less than 20% of our budget from the state, however that is still \$86 million and any change to the State Share of Instruction (SSI-Subsidy) funding would have significant impact. He reported that Governor Kasich has asked the college presidents to come up with a new formula for SSI that places greater emphasis on student retention and graduation.

Questions for President Lefton:

Senator Hassler asked about a rumor on possible freezing of tenure-track hires. Provost Diacon responded that was not correct and in RCM the deans have control of their money and are able to hire faculty. There is no central freeze, there is no freeze of any kind, he only asks that deans be strategic about their hiring.

Senator Garrison then asked if the decision about which departments are allowed to recruit and which ones are allowed to hire rests solely in the hands of deans. President Lefton replied that the dean does not have the sole discretion of what positions to hire. He stated that the dean in consultation with department chairs and school directors come up with a set of recommendations based upon the strategic needs of the college and comes up with a hiring plan. That plan is then presented to the Provost and the Provost signs off on the plan. President Lefton stated that normally the Provost would not alter the plan unless it did not make sense. Senator Garrison expressed concern and confusion because some departments are allowed to go forward with hires while others are not and there does not seem to be a clear strategy in place.

5. Chair's Remarks

Chair Farrell read his remarks.

6. EPC Item

Revision of the Policy on Instructional Delivery and Credit-to-Contact Hours – Therese Tillett

Ms. Tillett explained that this change was being mandated by the Federal Government and that our accrediting body, The Higher Learning Commission, was requesting the revision as well. For the most part the policy we had was in good shape; however there were some areas like internships, practicums, and field experiences that were a bit inconsistent. This provided the university the chance to align itself with how other universities are handling some situations. The main change was in setting minimum standards or baseline expectations for these types of courses.

Questions:

Senator Williams asked if this changed any units for classes like labs. Ms. Tillett responded that there was no change to lecture or lab hours in the policy revision.

Senator Fred Smith stated that his colleagues in the School of Art felt that three clock hours is on the low side. He requested that the policy make it very clear that the hours listed are minimum and that the programs can require more hours. Ms. Tillett responded that they could put a statement in the policy somewhere that makes it very clear that the numbers listed are the minimum.

Senator Janson asked if departments and schools have had an opportunity to work on this document. He also requested that whenever a 30 minute lesson is mentioned in the document it be replaced by "a minimum of 30 minutes" as this would be similar to what other Schools of Music across the state have. Ms. Tillett replied that language could be added. Dean Lorenz commented that the revised policy did go out to the college early in the process and went to the college curriculum committee.

Senator Williams asked for clarification about the accreditation visit that Ms. Tillett mentioned in her remarks. Chari Farrell responded that our accrediting body, The Higher Learning Commission, holds a site visit every seven-years. Senator Williams responded that she thought our participation in AQIP meant we would not have the seven-year accreditation cycle. Senator Dees replied that in 2000 The Higher Learning Commission gave universities a choice between a stand alone 10 year visit or participation in the AQIP model, which allowed the university to work on a yearly project that was taken and tied to the larger vision of the university. Participation in AQIP requires a site visit every seven-years.

The motion to approve the policy revision passed unanimously.

7. Report: Progress on the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan

Dean Wearden updated Senate on the progress on the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan. The initial consultation phase of the plan starts today and ends on December 14th. There are various ways that the university community can provide feedback. The university is using a site called the Civic Commons (www.theciviccommons.com/kentstate) where faculty can create an account and comment on the questions that the subcommittees created. There is also a form on the site that can be printed out and filled out anonymously. There will also be a series of 13 roundtables, including one at each of the regional campuses.

8. Elections for Faculty Handbook Committee

Senators Vande Zande and Deborah Smith had been nominated and agreed to serve prior to the meeting. Chair Farrell opened the floor up to additional nominations. There were no further nominations. The nominees were approved by acclamation.

9. Old Business: Reapproval of the Faculty Senate bylaw revisions approved by Faculty Senate in March 2007

Chair Farrell introduced the reapproval of the Faculty Senate bylaw revisions. He stated that although the Senate approved the changes in 2007 they were not forwarded to the Board of Trustees due to some complications related to EPC changes that were going to be made in the following year.

Senator Janson inquired why the changes needed to be reapproved by Senate since they were already approved by the Senate in 2007. Chair Farrell explained that President Lefton felt they should come back to Senate since it has been almost 5 years since they were written.

Senator Deborah Smith moved that items 1-4 on page 2 of the attachment be made action items. Senator Janson seconded the motion. Chair Farrell restated the motion "The proposal is to bundle items 1-4 as a single action item." The motion to make this an action item passed unanimously.

Senator Deborah Smith moved that Senate approve the bundled items 1-4 and they be sent to the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded by Senator Dees. The motion passed unanimously.

10. New Business: Approval of change to Faculty Senate bylaws to permit electronic voting

Chair Farrell stated that the Executive Committee felt it would be a good idea to allow for the possibility of to electronic voting, however this would require a change in the current bylaws.

Senator Williams asked what was prompting this change. Chair Farrell responded that the hope is to increase the response rate and that the request for duplicate ballots would be reduced. There is also the cost of the paper and envelopes that could be saved by moving to an electronic system. Ms. Kail also responded that it would save time. This will be placed on the December agenda as an action item.

11. Announcements / Statements for the Record

Chair Farrell reminded the Faculty to vote and to encourage their students to vote as well.

12. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,
Vanessa J. Earp, Secretary Faculty Senate

Policy 3342-4-02 University policy regarding administration of student conduct

(A) Purpose.

- (1) The University board of trustees is responsible by law for regulating the use of the grounds, buildings, equipment and facilities of the university. The board of trustees is also responsible for assuring that the conduct of the students, staff, faculty and visitors to the campus permits the university to pursue its educational objectives and programs in an orderly manner.

(B) Requirements.

- (1) To meet these responsibilities, the board of trustees shall adopt standards of conduct for the students, faculty, staff, and visitors to the campus and may provide for suspension from classes or employment, expulsion from the university, and/or ejection from university property of persons who violate such regulations.
- (2) The board of trustees shall provide for the administration and enforcement of its rules and may authorize the use of state university law enforcement officers and other university officials to assist in enforcing university policy and the law on the campus.

(C) Scope.

- (1) In accordance with university policy, the president shall have the responsibility and authority for the discipline of all students. The authority to impose the formal sanctions specified in this rule may be delegated to university officials or hearing ~~boards~~ panels by the president. Disciplinary action under this rule may be taken against a person who has applied for admission ~~been admitted~~ as a student to the university, whether or not the individual is registered for classes. Disciplinary action may also be taken against student organizations. The president (or designee), on his/her own initiative, may review any case which comes within the purview of ~~this rule~~ the University policy regarding administration of student conduct.
 - (a) The code of student conduct ~~policy~~ shall apply to conduct occurring on University premises, at University sponsored activities, and to off-campus conduct that adversely affects the University community and/or the pursuit of its objectives. Each student shall be responsible for his/her conduct from the time of application for admission through the actual awarding of a degree, even though conduct may occur before classes begin or after

classes end, as well as during the academic year and during periods between terms of actual enrollment. The code of student conduct shall apply to a student's conduct even if the student withdraws from the University while a disciplinary matter is pending.

- (D) Procedural standards. The operational procedures for the administration of student conduct (this rule or 3342-4-02.101 of the Administrative Code) shall be readily accessible to all students and student organizations and shall adhere to the following procedural standards:-
- (1) The hearing panel or hearing officer shall conduct hearings in accordance with this student conduct policy.
 - (2) Action. Formal disciplinary action shall be instituted against a student only after a designated university official has determined that such action, rather than medical or counseling, or mediation referral, is appropriate.
 - (3) Notice. A student against whom a complaint has been made under this policy will be informed in writing at least seventy-two hours in advance, excluding weekends, of the complaint and the time, place, and circumstances of the hearing.
 - (4) ~~Severance~~ Separate hearings. In proceedings involving more than one accused student, ~~severance separate hearings, if requested in writing,~~ may be granted by the director of student conduct (or designee) officer, hearing panel chair, or hearing officer. Also, upon reasonable request submitted in writing, a delay in the hearing may be granted by the conduct officer, hearing panel chair, or hearing officer. In all cases, the proceedings may be delayed no more than two times, each for a period of no longer than five working days.
 - (5) Due process rights. The student against whom a complaint has been made is entitled to know the nature and source of evidence; to question witnesses; to present evidence, including witnesses on the student's own behalf; and to be informed of appropriate sanctions and appeal routes. No counter-charges regarding the same incident shall be permitted to be filed pending final disposition of the original charge.
 - (6) Conduct advisor. The student against whom a complaint has been made shall be offered the opportunity at the hearing to appear alone or with another person, who may serve in an advisory capacity. A person serving in an advisory capacity may not participate directly in the hearing or address the panel on behalf of the student unless, in the sole discretion of

the hearing panel or hearing officer, there exists a communication difficulty sufficiently severe as to prevent a fair hearing.

- (7) Impartial hearing. Either of the principal parties appearing at a hearing may question a member of the hearing panel or hearing officer regarding that person's ability to participate fairly in the hearing. Questions should be directed to the director of student conduct, who will decide whether or not to remove himself/herself or dismiss a panel member. In the event that the chair rules against the student, the hearing will begin immediately.
 - (8) Failure to appear. If a student fails to appear or refuses to waive his or her right to restrict disclosure of disciplinary information, the hearing will proceed. ~~The hearing officer or hearing panel chair will also give consideration to victims and witnesses of offenses to ensure that the hearings and the disclosure of information would not be hurtful to the victims and/or witnesses.~~
 - (9) Standard of review. The hearing panel or hearing officer shall evaluate the points of view presented by the parties in conflict and shall determine by a preponderance of the evidence if it is more likely than not that the accused student engaged in behavior that is a violation of university rules. The consideration of information presented will be conducted in closed session.
 - (10) A copy of the findings, including the procedures for appeal, shall be given to the accused student.
 - ~~(11) In cases involving an alleged violation of an original sanction, the student against whom a complaint has been made shall, if possible, appear before the original hearing officer or panel for resolution of the charges.~~
- (E) Offenses.
- (1) Behavior in violation of university policies or procedures. These policies shall be published in a manner reasonably designed to come to the attention of students.
 - (2) Behavior in violation of the terms of sanctions imposed under the code of student conduct ~~this policy~~.
 - (3) Behavior deemed detrimental or disruptive to the university community and/or prohibited by local, state, or federal laws.

(F) Sanctions: Individuals.

- (1) Interim suspension. The president and/or designee may impose an interim suspension on any student arrested for violation of the Ohio Campus Disruption Act or who has committed an act which is in violation of paragraphs (E)(1), (E)(2) ~~and or~~ (E)(3) of the code of student conduct this rule, and when there is basis to believe the student would commit further acts of similar character. A student placed on interim suspension shall be given prompt notice of charges and an opportunity to appear for a hearing within a reasonable period of time after the imposition of the interim suspension.
- (2) Disciplinary probation. This sanction is one that places the student in serious jeopardy with the university. This sanction is invoked for a specified period of time ~~but not to exceed twelve months from the date of sanction~~. Notification of sanctions ~~will~~ shall be made to appropriate university offices, including the student's academic college or school. Students on disciplinary probation:
 - (a) Might not be permitted to participate in an official non-curricular capacity such as intercollegiate athletics, intramurals, fine arts activities, or as an officer of a student organization, etc.
 - (b) Might be restricted from entering or remaining in selected campus buildings or in specified university facilities.
 - (c) Might be subject to automatic dismissal or suspension if found responsible of any act of misconduct, including violation of the terms of the disciplinary probation.
 - (d) Shall be assessed a cost of thirty dollars if found responsible of any alleged violation.
- (3) Disciplinary suspension. This sanction is one of involuntary separation of the student from the university for a period not to exceed twelve months from the date of sanction. Notification of sanctions ~~will~~ shall be made to appropriate university offices, including the student's academic college or school. Students suspended:
 - (a) Shall be assigned grades or marks which would be appropriate if they were withdrawing voluntarily.
 - (b) Might be required to leave the land and/or premises of the university effective the date of suspension. Permission may be

granted by the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs for entrance to university premises for a specified purpose and time.

- (c) Shall receive any refund of money in accordance with the refund schedule in effect at the time of suspension if the suspension exceeds four weeks in duration.
 - (d) Shall be assessed a cost of thirty dollars if found responsible of any alleged violation.
- (4) Disciplinary dismissal. This sanction is one of involuntary separation of the student from the university. Such separation shall be for not less than twelve months following the date of sanction. Notification of sanctions ~~will~~ shall be made to appropriate university offices, including the student's academic college or school. Students dismissed:
- (a) Shall be assigned grades or marks which would be appropriate if they were withdrawing voluntarily.
 - (b) Might be required to leave the land and/or premises of the university effective the date of dismissal. Permission may be granted by the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs for entrance of the student to university premises for a specified purpose and time.
 - (c) Shall receive any refund of money in accordance with the refund schedule in effect at the time of dismissal.
 - (d) Shall be reinstated only by the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs, who shall establish criteria for readmission.
 - (e) Shall be assessed a cost of thirty dollars if found responsible of any alleged violation.
- (5) Additional sanctions. Additional sanctions are the prerogative of the hearing officer or panel. They may be mandated as part of the sanctions listed above and a student shall be assessed a cost of thirty dollars if found responsible of any alleged violation. Some options for additional sanctions ~~that may be considered~~ are as follows:
- (a) Counseling;

- (b) Room or hall changes;
- (c) Restitution for damages;
- (d) Educative/rehabilitative program referral;
- (e) Monetary penalty (not to exceed \$200);
- (f) Letter of apology;
- (g) Warning;
- ~~(h) Other as deemed appropriate through the disciplinary process~~
- (h) No contact order;
- (i) Persona Non Grata status;
- (j) Campus access restrictions;
- (k) Other as deemed appropriate through the disciplinary process.

(G) Sanctions: Residence Halls.

- (1) Residence hall warning letter and behavioral contracts. These are not formal conduct sanctions; however, these constitute written notice to the student that his or her behavior is inappropriate to the community living situation and in violation of residence hall rules. Students receiving a residence hall warning letter:
 - (a) Shall be given an opportunity for a discussion with the resident director regarding the rule infraction.
 - (b) Shall be given the opportunity to work out arrangements with the resident director regarding the rule infraction.
 - (c) Shall be told that the residence hall warning letter may be used by a hearing officer of board in the event that the student is found responsible of a subsequent conduct violation.
 - (d) Might be formally counseled, referred to an educative or rehabilitative program or have a residence hall privilege revoked.

- (e) Similar subsequent offenses shall be referred to the formal conduct system.
- (2) Strict disciplinary probation. This sanction is one that may be placed on a student as a result of action taken under the Ohio Campus Disruption Act, section 3345.22 of the Revised Code. The terms of such probation shall be outlined by the referee appointed by the Ohio board of regents, and subsequent violations of such terms shall result in automatic suspension. Notification of such action ~~will~~ shall be made to appropriate university offices, including the student's academic college or school.
- (3) Cancellation of residence hall contract. This sanction is one that is given to those in situations in which the department of residence services has determined that the students should not be allowed the privilege of living in university residence halls. Students receiving this sanction:
 - (a) Shall be given an opportunity to discuss the situation with a designated residence services official;
 - (b) Shall be advised of appropriate administrative appeal procedure;
 - (c) Might not be allowed to enter any residence unit or cafeteria for a period not to exceed twenty-four months from the date of sanction;
 - (d) Might be suspended or dismissed from the university;
- (H) Sanctions: For organizations registered with the university.
 - (1) Disciplinary admonition. "Admonition" is a written statement of warning to the organization to take necessary corrective action to bring the organization into compliance with university policy. Organizations on disciplinary admonition:
 - (a) Might lose selected privileges accorded registered groups;
 - (b) Might lose privileges of entering selected campus facilities or meeting in specified university buildings;
 - (c) Shall make restitution (reimbursement for damage to, destruction of, or misappropriation of university property or property of any other person on university premises);
 - (d) Shall receive such additional sanctions as are consistent with the nature of the offense, the organization's own objectives, and the

goals and mission of the university. This may be assessed against the group and/or against individuals who constitute the group's membership;

- (e) Might be subject to either disciplinary probation or disciplinary dismissal if involved in any subsequent act of misconduct including violation of the terms of the admonition.
- (2) Disciplinary probation. This sanction is one that places the organization in severe jeopardy with regard to its continued existence on the premises of the university. Organizations on disciplinary probation:
- (a) Shall receive temporary suspension of charter and/or registration status;
 - (b) Shall lose selected privileges accorded registered groups;
 - (c) Might lose privileges of entering selected campus facilities or meeting in specified university buildings;
 - (d) Shall make restitution (reimbursement for damage to, destruction of or misappropriation of university property or property of any person on university premises);
 - (e) Shall receive such additional sanctions as are consistent with the nature of the offense, the organization's own objectives, and the goals and mission of the university;
 - (f) Might be subject to disciplinary dismissal if involved in any subsequent act of misconduct, including violations of the terms of this probation.
- (3) Disciplinary dismissal. This sanction is one that causes the organization to cease all activity on the property of or in facilities of the university. This sanction shall be for not less than one calendar year following the effective date. Organizations on disciplinary dismissal:
- (a) Shall receive suspension of charter and/or registration status;
 - (b) Shall make restitution (reimbursement for damage to, destruction of or misappropriation of university property or property of any person on university premises). This may be assessed against the group and/or against individuals who constitute the group's membership;

- (c) Shall receive such additional sanctions as are consistent with the nature of the offense, and the goals and mission of the university;
 - (d) Shall be reinstated only by the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs, who shall establish appropriate criteria for readmission.
- (4) Additional sanctions are the prerogative of the hearing panel or officers. They may be mandated as a part of the disciplinary sanctions listed above. Examples might include loss of funding or performing appropriate service projects.
- (5) Nothing in the organization sanctions listed above precludes individual members or organizations from being responsible for their own acts in violation of university policy.
- (I) Limitations on sanctions.
 - (1) The sanctions outlined in paragraphs (F), (G), and (H) of the code of student conduct ~~this rule~~ may be imposed on a student organization by or in the name of the university only as stipulated by the code of student conduct ~~this policy~~. Sanctions shall be commensurate with the seriousness of the violations. Subsequent violations ~~shall~~ may result in dismissal or suspension from the university.
 - (2) Decisions and associated sanctions take effect immediately.
 - (3) Sanctions of disciplinary suspension or dismissal may be instituted only in the following cases:
 - (a) Academic dishonesty;
 - (b) Falsification of university documents;
 - (c) Offenses against people or property, or the possession of items (including but not limited to weapons, firearms, fireworks, etc.) that could be used in offenses against people or property;
 - (d) Disruptions of university process; (including numerous and/or repeat violations);
 - (e) Possession or use of marijuana, or any narcotic, hallucinogenic, or other drug except as provided by law;

- (f) Trafficking in drugs, specifically, no person shall knowingly sell, offer to sell, prepare for shipment, transport, distribute, cultivate, offer money or other items of value to obtain controlled substances as comprehensively defined in section 2925.03 of the Revised Code;
 - (g) Offenses considered felonies under local, state, or federal law;
 - (h) Violations of a previously imposed sanction.
- (J) The sanctions described above and in the procedures established by the code of student conduct ~~this policy~~ are not intended to limit or otherwise apply to those steps which may be taken by an individual instructor in the exercise of his or her professional obligations. The sanctions do, however, apply to any disciplinary action sought by an instructor beyond those for which an instructor is professionally responsible; for example, dismissal or suspension or any other action which would affect the status of a student in the general university community.
- (K) Appeals.
 - (1) Students and student organizations may appeal the decisions of the hearing panel or officers to the appeal panel which will provide a recommendation to the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs. The vice president for enrollment management and student affairs will make the final decision. No additional appeal will be heard.
 - (2) Appeals are limited to the following reasons:
 - (a) The decision is not in accordance with the facts presented;
 - (b) The decision was reached through a procedure not in accordance with the code of student conduct ~~this rule~~;
 - (c) New information is available which may suggest modification of the decision;
 - (d) To determine whether the sanction(s) imposed were appropriate for the conduct violation which the student was found to have committed;

- (3) An appeal must be in writing, must state clearly the rationale for the appeal and must be submitted within seven calendar days of the date of the decision;
- (L) Hearing panel. University hearing panels shall be established, the number to be determined by the designated university conduct officer.
 - (1) Hearing panels shall be composed of an odd number of hearing officers containing at least one current Kent State University student and one Kent State University faculty or staff.
 - (a) Student members shall be appointed by their respective student government;
 - (b) Faculty members shall be appointed by the faculty senate and staff members shall be appointed by the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs.
 - ~~(c) The appointing bodies shall appoint alternate members, the number to be determined by the designated university conduct officer.~~
 - ~~(d) The chair of each hearing panel shall be a faculty or staff person who will be selected by the university conduct officer.~~
 - (e) (c) All decisions of the board shall require a majority vote of the members present.
- (M) Hearing officers. The ~~president~~ vice president for enrollment management and student affairs will appoint several hearing officers for one year terms. The ~~president vice president for enrollment management and student affairs~~ may appoint additional hearing officers when necessary.
- (N) Responsibility for administration of this policy. The primary responsibility for the supervision of student conduct at the university has been delegated to the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs. The vice president for enrollment management and student affairs may establish such administrative procedures as are necessary to fulfill the intent of the code of student conduct ~~this policy~~. These administrative procedures shall be in writing and published in conjunction with the code of student conduct ~~this policy~~.
- (O) Revisions.

- (1) Updates and other changes to the code of student conduct shall be submitted to the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs, ~~annually, by June 1st~~. The vice president for enrollment management and student affairs retains the authority to immediately enact and enforce changes to the code of student conduct.

Effective: ~~October 14, 2010~~ September 28, 2012

Prior Effective Dates: 11/4/1977, 9/11/1979, 1/25/1980, 8/7/1985, 8/30/1985, 10/2/1986, 10/16/1988, 2/24/1992, 10/14/1992, 9/17/1993, 10/28/1994, 5/8/1995, 1/25/1996, 2/14/1997, 9/26/2005, 6/1/2007, 10/14/2010

Related Forms:

Change to Faculty Senate bylaws to permit electronic voting

Amend Section (6)(a) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws

"Mailed ballots shall be sent directly to each member of the electorate no later than Wednesday of the third week of the spring term. Each voter shall receive one ballot for election of at-large representatives and, if appropriate, one ballot for election of academic unit representatives. Ballots shall be returned to the faculty senate office in a signed and sealed envelope no later than Monday of the fifth week of the spring term."

to read as follows

"Ballots shall be sent directly to each member of the electorate no later than Wednesday of the third week of the spring term either by physical mail or using electronic means that guarantee the same level of security and anonymity. Each voter shall receive one ballot for election of at-large representatives and, if appropriate, one ballot for election of academic unit representatives. In the case of ballots mailed physically, ballots shall be returned to the faculty senate office in a signed and sealed envelope no later than Monday of the fifth week of the spring term. In the case of electronic ballots, they will be returned by electronic means to a designated web site no later than Monday of the fifth week of the spring term."

Read line version

"~~Mailed~~ Ballots shall be sent directly to each member of the electorate no later than Wednesday of the third week of the spring term either by physical mail or using electronic means that guarantee the same level of security and anonymity. Each voter shall receive one ballot for election of at-large representatives and, if appropriate, one ballot for election of academic unit representatives. In the case of ballots mailed physically, Ballots shall be returned to the faculty senate office in a signed and sealed envelope no later than Monday of the fifth week of the spring term. ~~In the case of electronic ballots, they will be returned by electronic means to a designated web site no later than Monday of the fifth week of the spring term."~~



Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes of the Meeting

October 22, 2012

Present: Paul Farrell (Chair), Don White (Vice Chair), Vanessa Earp (Secretary),
Lee Fox-Cardamone (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: George Garrison (At-Large), David Dees (Appointed)

Guests: President Lester A. Lefton and Todd Diacon, Provost and Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs, Melody Tankersley - Provost's Fellow and Lifespan
Development & Educational Sciences

1. Call to Order

Chair Farrell called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m. in the Urban Conference Room, second floor Library.

2. President Lefton, Provost Diacon, and Melody Tankersley joined the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at 4:04 p.m.

President Lefton reported that homecoming went well. He also provided an update on the construction plans for the Kent campus. There will be a juried competition to select the architects for the Architecture Building. He also mentioned that the city is looking into the possibility of installing a round-a-bout on Haymaker in the downtown area.

Provost Diacon mentioned that he and Chair Farrell had a meeting scheduled to select members for the ad-hoc academic policies committee. The Provost would like that committee to get started as soon as possible.

The Provost had three items he wanted to discuss with the Executive Committee:

- a. He would like to move the Faculty Professional Development Center (FPDC) to report to Associate Provost Averill. The FPDC currently reports to Associate Provost Booth. He has already discussed this with the Provost Advisory Committee and they are in favor of this change. The Provost stated that it makes sense to have all faculty resources housed in the Faculty Affairs office. Currently faculty may have a negative opinion of this office since they only deal with RTP issues and he would like faculty to see the office as a place to go for help. There has been some talk about relocating the FPDC but there has not been a decision made. The Provost also mentioned that the FPDC needs a director.

Chair Farrell replied that some faculty members might have concerns about this, especially because Sue is not an academic and has never been a faculty member. Also due to past experiences faculty may suspect that the administration has a nefarious purpose for the move. Provost Diacon responded that he would make sure the new director would be an academic and that there were not ulterior motives for moving the FPDC. They would not be “spying” on faculty.

- b. Provost Diacon reported that Sue Averill mentioned faculty members who have recently been asked to serve on committees have inquired if they would get a load lift for their service. When they found out that they would not, they declined to serve on the committees. The Provost expressed his concern over what he believes to be the confusion of what service is. He feels that if it is service there should not be any type of additional compensation. If you are compensated then it is no longer service but part of your job.

Chair Farrell stated that he felt this was a result of RCM, faculty members are being told they have to teach to bring money into the unit. The apparent lack of tangible recognition for service by the administration was also discussed. Provost Diacon stated that service is the price we pay for faculty governance and that the administration should value service. The Provost would like to see the university move away from the “what will this get me” mentality. It was also mentioned that faculty feel disenfranchised because they have served on committees in the past and the administration has disregarded their recommendations, so the faculty felt it was a waste of their time. The Provost responded that his definition of consensus is that “not everybody is going to agree but everyone had a meaningful opportunity to influence the outcome.” He also stated that he felt he had inherited some ad-hoc committees that had not been formed in the best manner. The Provost was asked by the Executive Committee how big of an issue this was. He stated that he was not sure and he would look into it. We will continue this discussion at a later meeting once we have more data.

- c. The Provost requested that when the Committee on Administrative Officers (CAO) forwards their reviews to him they not rank the candidates. He felt that only having 40 minutes with a candidate does not provide enough time for this type of evaluation. None of the other groups who meet with the candidates rank them, so this would keep all the groups on the same page. He would like the CAO to write a descriptive narrative on the candidates and include any information they feel is important. They should provide specific examples of things they liked and things they disliked. Chair Farrell stated that he would inform CAP of the Provost’s request.

3. Questions for the Provost:

- a. Chair Farrell asked if there was a separate committee for the Regional Campus JAB. Provost Diacon responded he would check with Associate Provost Averill.

- b. Chair Farrell mentioned that he had received an email from a faculty member who had seen an article about Kent approving 3 year degree programs. The faculty member was concerned that this had not come to Senate. The Provost replied that no degree plans had been changed, that students would have to enter the university with some credits already completed, take additional classes each semester or take classes in the summer.

President Lefton, Provost Diacon, and Melody Tankersley left the meeting at 4:45.

4. Nominations for JAB

These Faculty members are nominated by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, however they are elected by the Faculty in the individual units. The Executive Committee reviewed the names put forward. We need to nominate candidates from Unit 2 (College of Business Administration) and Unit 6 (College of Nursing, College of Technology, and University Libraries). We need at least 2 candidates for each unit. We will contact additional Faculty to see if they are interested in being nominated since there was not a lot interest expressed on the faculty committee interest forms.

5. Provost Tenure & Promotion Advisory Boards

Chair Farrell distributed a listing of faculty members who expressed interest in serving on these committees on their committee preference form. The Executive Committee reviewed the names and voted to forward them to the Provost for his consideration.

6. Adjournment

Chair Farrell adjourned the meeting at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Vanessa J. Earp,
Secretary of Faculty Senate

Next Meetings: Executive Committee Meeting
Wednesday, October 24, 2012
3:30 pm, Faculty Senate Office

Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, November 5, 2012
3:20 pm, Governance Chambers



Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes of the Meeting

October 24, 2012

Present: Paul Farrell (Chair), Don White (Vice Chair), Vanessa Earp (Secretary),
David Dees (Appointed), Teresa Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: George Garrison (At-Large), Lee Fox-Cardamone (Appointed)

1. Call to Order

Chair Farrell called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room, 227 Schwartz Center.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the September 24, 2012 Executive Committee Meeting were approved as amended (Dees/White).

The minutes from the General Faculty Senate Meeting of October 8, 2012 were approved as amended (White/Dees).

3. EPC Items - T. Tillett's transmittal memo for EPC Meeting of October 15, 2012

Revision of the policy for instructional activities and the credit hour. This item will be placed on the Senate agenda as an action item.

4. Nomination for JAB, the University Handbook Committee, and Ad-hoc Committee on Policies and Student Success

The executive committee discussed the need for representation from the College of Business Administration on JAB.

Two names were put forward as nominations for the University Handbook Committee. Those Faculty members will be contacted to see if they are willing to stand for election at the November Faculty Senate meeting.

The executive committee reviewed the names of faculty members who were nominated to serve on the Ad-hoc Committee on Policies and Student Success.

5. Set Agenda for the November 5, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting

The agenda for the November 5, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting was set. This included adding an action item on voting for members of the Ad-hoc Committee on Policies and Student Success. There will also be a discussion item on electronic voting for faculty senators.

6. Adjournment

Chair Farrell adjourned the meeting at 5:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Vanessa J. Earp,
Secretary of Faculty Senate

Next Meetings: Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, November 5, 2012
3:20 pm, Governance Chambers

Executive Committee Meeting w/Provost Diacon
Wednesday, November 14, 2012
3:30 pm, Faculty Senate Office