I. Call to Order: 2:00 PM

II. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

III. Absent: None

IV. Guests: D. Warren, R. Kairis, C. Post, L. Engelhardt

V. Ex-Officio: Dean Walter Wagor, Assistant Dean A. Bathi Kasturiarachi

VI. Approval of Agenda
Motion to approve: Councilor Lloyd
Second: Councilor Heaphy
Discussion: None
Vote to approve the agenda: 17 Y, 0 N

VII. Approval of November 15, 2013 minutes
Motion to approve: Councilor Heaphy
Second: Councilor Moneysmith
Corrections:
  Chairs Report: Campus wide forum to discuss strategic plan was held Dec. 6th at 2:00 PM.
  Dean Wagor’s Report, bullet 4, Correction of Board of Regents to Board of Trustees.
  Dean Wagor’s Report, bullet 6, “bad debt” was substituted for “this” to clarify the reference.

Vote to approve the minutes with corrections: 17 Y, 0 N

VIII. Chair’s Report:
Chair Norton Smith welcomed council members to the new semester and reminded members that simplified reviews of five NTT faculty members will take place Jan 24th at 8:00 AM. The spring full faculty meeting will take place on March 7th at 2:00 PM
Report from RCFAC (Nov. 22, 2013):
  • L. Fox visited RCFAC and discussed the KSU presidential search
  • T. Kandakai and D. Palmer fielded questions regarding undergraduate research
  • The Provost’s report restated the fact that he does not favor conversion of an NTT line to a TT line.
  • Discussion of the regional campuses’ 14% service fee: when the question was posed at RCFAC re. “What is it for”, no individual at the meeting could provide an explanation.
In response to the question concerning the nature of the 14% service fee, Councilor Fox moved that:

Chair Norton-Smith ask Dean W. Thomas to provide a detailed description of what the 14% service fee covers.
Second: Councilor Hovhannisyan
Vote: 17 Y, 0 N

IX. Dean’s Report
The Dean began by stating (in response to RCFAC discussion presented by Chair N-S.) that the RCs pay two fees to Kent: 1) the 14% service fee and 2) The fee that covers regional campuses’ structure, i.e. administrative salaries, RC architect, etc.)

Other points raised:
- Thank-you to faculty for Fall commencement participation.
- The science building construction time clock started Mon., 1-13-14. The first construction task is to cut off the chiller line. Also, the equipment package for the new building is being finalized.
- This fiscal year we will be permitted to budget 1.5X our bad debt burden from last year.
- In response to a question from the Nov. 15th council meeting it was explained that invitations to the featured speaker presentations will be offered to faculty council members (although they were not for Billy Jean King) for Jodi Picoult. Point of clarification: it is policy to invite only cabinet members to special seating at the presentations. The mix-up regarding BJK was attributed in-part to a personnel change in the office of external affairs.

X. Assistant Dean’s Report
- Thank-you to faculty and coordinators for staffing spring 2014 classes
- Syllabi are being handed-in and archived.
- An RFP for the Farris Family Awards has been sent to all pre-tenure faculty.
- Music and English search announcements are posted. Biology and HDFS will be posted soon. The Math and UG Studies position are under consideration with approval expected. Search committees will be charged Jan 24th, 2014.
- Assigning/processing the IN grade is undergoing revision.
- The Assistant Dean’s office is currently evaluating the use of Banner and Cognos for scheduling purposes.

XI. Committee Reports:

a. PAAC
   i. This academic year PAAC has approved funding 50 travelers, 8 this semester.

b. Committee II
   i. None

c. Colloquium Committee
   i. Nov. 15th colloquium was attended by 23 individuals. The audience reacted positively to the 5PM start time. Next colloquium on March 7th at 5:00 PM.

d. Treasurer/Social Committee
   i. The date for the spring dinner will be available next month.

e. Handbook Committee:
   i. Work has begun. Corrections suggested by S. Averill are being incorporated. Other inconsistencies in the document will be corrected.
f. Technology Committee:
   i. The committee is currently reviewing one request.
   ii. The interactive projector in FA 30 has been approved for purchase.
   iii. All DVD/VHS players have been removed from classrooms.

XII. Old Business
    None

XIII. New Business
    Consideration of the revised campus strategic plan:
    Motion to endorse the plan: Councilor Moneysmith
    Second: Councilor Birch
    Discussion: Discussion was spirited and at times convoluted, thus the minutes will reflect a compilation/reordering of the major points discussed and concerns raised.
    • Initial comments addressed the next steps following council's vote: The Strategic Plan Committee (SPC) will identify bulleted points that can be addressed in the next 18-24 months. Appropriate consultation will then be made with affected individuals to insure proper planning. This is a "plan" thus will take time to be put in place.
    • What does endorsement mean? Because the SPC is not a committee of council the plan will move forward regardless of the vote. It should be noted that certain aspects of the plan will come back to council at some point.
    • This version of the SP was formulated using a variety of previous plans/surveys and documents as well as input from a variety of stakeholders at both public (2011 campus retreat) and private meetings. The academic affairs strategic plan informs much of what the document says about faculty work.
    • The plan seems to aim high—but with limited detail. Many bulleted points will require additional faculty work—how do we plan for this? Comment: Faculty are the heart of the university and may need to take on new tasks in response to the plan.
    • Is this a plan, a vision, or a dream? (…and dreams should be ambitious!) Was the old strategic plan fulfilled? Comment: No because these documents are often wish-lists.
    • This plan SHOULD NOT dictate what faculty do in the classroom or in their area of research. In a related comment, the document seems to assume that we are not doing many of the things that are mentioned (with the assumed intent of the comment to say that we are).
    • Q. Does the existence of the document better enable us to request support from the BOTs, the public, or politicians. Comment: yes it would seem so. This document was requested by the BOTs.
    • One council member saw this as a way to "collect and summarize accomplishments and put forth plans for the future".
    • Question regarding recent revision of plan details—why was the bullet regarding release time for faculty eliminated? Comment: The bullet information was modified in response to comments noting that identifying which faculty members are "scholars" is difficult and divisive; thus, a more generic statement to support faculty research with load lifts was substituted.
    • Question regarding the absence of any plan to emphasize/mention the URA program in the document. Comments: has the URA program been appropriately analyzed (data generated, goals/outcomes established/fulfilled) to suggest that it should be "codified" in a document?

Vote via paper ballot to endorse the strategic plan: 16Y, 1 Abstention, 1 No
(Note in explanation of vote tally—the sum of 18 votes is different from earlier meeting tallys due to the late arrival of a councilor)
XIV. Announcements:
Councilor Heaphy will email a new link with information about the student research conference. The deadline to submit for presentations/posters is Mon., March 24th, 2014. Councilor Heaphy encouraged submission and attendance. On a related note the Stark campus student conference has a link on the Kent campus Student Conference web site.

XV. Adjournment: 4:15 PM