Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the March 11th Faculty Senate meeting. As always, we will meet in the Governance Chambers at 3:20 p.m. Refreshments will be provided.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Approval of the February 11, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
5. Chair’s Remarks
6. President’s Remarks
7. Election of At-Large Member for the Faculty Ethics Committee Candidates are Ann Abraham and Jeff Ciesla
8. Report: Internationalization Efforts and the Global Initiative on Campus (presented by Associate Provost Marcello Fantoni and Associate Professor Swathi Ravichandran)
9. Old Business
10. New Business:
   b. Discussion Item: Nomenclature Recommendation for Fall Term Weeks (presented by Deborah Smith, Professional Standards Committee)
11. Announcements/Statements for the Record
12. Adjourn
FACULTY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
February 11, 2019

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Simon Adamtey, Kathy Bergh, Rachael Blasiman, Sheryl Chatfield, Jeffrey Child, Michael Chunn, Jeffrey Ciesla, Alice Colwell, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Jean Engohang-Ndong, Christopher Fenk, Farid Fouad, Lee Fox, Pamela Grimm, Mariann Harding, Robert Kairis, David Kaplan, Edgar Kooijman, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Tracy Laux, Richard Mangrum, Mahli Mechenbier, Oana Mocioalca, Kimberly Peer, Rocco Petrozzi, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Mary Beth Rollick, Susan Roxburgh, Denice Sheehan, Deborah Smith, Blake Stringer, Brett Tippey, Robert Twieg, Robin Vande Zande, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Molly Wang, Donald White, Melissa Zullo

Senators Not Present: Patti Baller, Vanessa Earp, Tameka Ellington, Todd Hawley, Carol Robinson, James Seelye, Kathryn Wilson

Ex-Officio Members Present: Senior Vice Presidents: Karen Clarke, Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Mary Parker, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Nathan Ritchey, Jack Witt, Lamar Hylton for Shay Little; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Blank, Christina Bloebaum, Allan Boike, Barbara Broome, Ken Burhanna, John Crawford-Spinelli, James Hannon, Mark Mistur, Eboni Pringle, Alison Smith, Elizabeth Graham for Amy Reynolds, Cathy DuBois for Deborah Spake

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: President Beverly Warren; Executive Vice President and Provost Todd Diacon; Vice Presidents: Alfreda Brown, Paul DiCorleto, Stephen Sokany, Willis Walker; Dean Melody Tankersley

Observers Present: Lowell Zurbuch (Emeritus Professor), Morgan Marshall (USS)

Observers Not Present: Mark Rhodes (GSS)

Guests Present: Steven Antalvari, Sue Averill, Aimee Bell, Michael Bruder, J.R. Campbell, Amrita Datta, Keiran Dunne, Jill Folk, Larry Froehlich, Nick Gattozzi, Mary Ann Haley, Lynette Johnson, Tess Kail, Malak Kamal, Doug Kubinski, Dana Lawless-Andric, Mark Lewis, Allyn Marzulla, Steve Mitchell, Tracey Motter, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Amy Nethken, David Ochmann, Doug Pearson, Jennifer Piatt, Sydney Purtee, Amy Quillin, Gail Rebeta, Beverly Reed, Lauren Sasala, Jordan Stewart, Cynthia Stillings, Therese Tillett, Manfred van Dulmen, Joseph Young, Yao Zhang, Abigail Zirzow

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

Secretary Dauterich called the roll.
3. Approval of the Agenda

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve today’s agenda. A motion was made and seconded (Mocioalca/Kracht). Chair Grimm then called for a vote and the agenda was approved unanimously.

4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of December 10, 2018

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 10, 2018, Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Sheehan/Rollick). The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

5. Chair’s Remarks

Chair Grimm delivered her remarks. [Attachment]

Chair Grimm invited questions or comments. There were no questions or comments.

6. President’s Remarks

Senior Vice President Polatajko introduced Executive Director Michael Bruder, who delivered remarks in place of President Warren, who was unable to attend. Senior Vice President Polatajko mentioned that the Kent Gateway Plan would be addressed and would include parking, animations of the CBA building, and external and interior views of the Design Innovation Hub. Executive Director Bruder began with the parking update. Three parking structures were originally planned, but it has been determined that two would work better. One will be on the northwest area of campus on 59 and Midway and will hold 1,100 cars. Executive Director Bruder then showed a video that visualized the new CBA building and deck from all possible approaches. The CBA building is in the design phase. Construction will begin in late summer or early fall of this year. Occupancy is scheduled for the Fall semester of 2021. Green space will be added to this area of campus because of the new parking deck and the removal of former surface parking. Executive Director Bruder also explained the makeup of the new CBA building and showed designs for how it would appear upon completion. He also discussed the Innovation Design Hub building and explained the aspects of that building. Senior Vice President Polatajko invited questions.

Senator Vande Zande expressed pleasure with the aesthetic appeal of the building and asked about the safety features of the building based on the large amount of open glass featured in the design. Senior Vice President Polatajko responded that ingress and egress were priorities. Executive Director Bruder said that they worked closely with Kent State police and that the open environment is actually safer because of the greater visibility.

Senator Tippey thanked the group for increasing the parking on campus but asked about pedestrian access on the esplanade crossing Lincoln. He also expressed concern over the intersection at Lincoln and Summit and asked about what could be done to make it safer for pedestrians. He recommended an all-stop for pedestrians to cross. Senior Vice President Polatajko thanked Senator Tippey, recognized that the issue was a problem, and said they will consider it further as they move forward.
Senator Smith said that originally White Hall was supposed to get a new façade as part of the project and asked whether it was still part of the project. Senior Vice President Polatajko said that the video only focused on Phase One of the project and that Phase Two would show more about White Hall.

Senator Kaplan asked whether Kent had talked to the city about making the intersection at East Main near the new garage look better. Senior Vice President Polatajko said that they have been engaging the community routinely about “boulevarding” Main Street and about the overall appearance of the area.

Senator Chunn asked how the new parking garage would affect the lot between Nixon and the CPA. Senior Vice President Polatajko said that the size and position of the deck would make those areas even more accessible. Chunn asked the question again for clarification. Executive Director Bruder said that the number of spaces will fold into the current lot, and the old lot will disappear. The driveway between Nixon and CPA will be maintained. There may be an interior connection from the deck to the CPA if there is funding available.

Senator Walton-Fisette asked about changes to the accessibility to White Hall after the new deck is built. Executive Director Bruder said the area between White Hall and the new CBA will feature a dedicated accessible lot.

Senator Piccirillo-Smith asked about the total number of spaces at the end of the new project vs. the number of spaces in the present setting. Executive Director Bruder responded that there are currently 860 spaces and that the new construction will increase that number to 1100. The number of available faculty/staff permits on the deck has not been determined yet, but they will work with Parking Services on how to reserve spaces for constituents.

Senator Chunn asked what would happen when the CPA lot is gone, and the new deck is not built yet. Executive Director Bruder responded that it would be inconvenient. 400-500 spaces will be missing for two academic years. It is likely that students in residence halls will have their parking moved to the stadium, and commuter spots in the area will be shifted. In addition, Parta may increase routes to alleviate the situation.

7. Report: Design Innovation Initiative (presented by J.R. Campbell - Executive Director, Design Innovation Initiative)

Executive Director Campbell reported on the specifics of the Design Innovation Hub. He pointed out that he had brought students from his class who would also be able to answer questions and recognized members of the Design Innovation team and thanked them. He then pointed out the Design Innovation website and moved into a presentation which gave the history of the Design Innovation Initiative and the purpose of connecting different aspects of the university and generating new opportunities that curtailed “siloing” at the university for both students and faculty. There are a number of shared resources across the university system that are open to all students, but many are unaware of these resources; the Design Innovation initiative looked to raise that awareness and help connect the resources. They looked for formal means of connecting all these elements. Executive Director Campbell stressed that this is not meant to be a degree-offering concept. Instead design should be an entry point for developing cross-disciplinary interactive teams for students. Goals of the initiative include the following: (1) to support and
enable a Design Innovation ecosystem, (2) to engage students/faculty/staff to address Design Innovation, and (3) to develop a model of national impact. The new Design Innovation Hub will be built in the place of the old art building, and Director Campbell detailed the spaces that will be available in the Hub for the university community. It is intended to be accessible 24 hours a day. He also offered examples of how this collaboration would look from a student’s perspective. The Hub will be complete in August 2020. Courses are currently being piloted in the Design Innovation area. He then invited questions and comments.

Senator Twieg asked how community engagement, particularly for young people, connects to the Design Innovation Initiative. Executive Director Campbell responded that recruitment and collaboration with pre-collegiate students is a strong focus of the initiative. Summer workshops have already occurred, and more outreach is planned.

Senator Kaplan thanked the director and asked how these things would be implemented in the curriculum. He asked specifically whether it would be a co-major. Executive Director Campbell said the possibilities are still evolving, but it may be more likely that taking the Design Innovation courses would lead to some kind of distinction at graduation instead of being considered a major. There may also be a stronger future link to the Kent Core.

Emeritus Senator Zurbuch mentioned a program in industrial design from the past that had ended and wondered whether this could be revived as part of the Design Innovation Initiative. Executive Director Campbell said that industrial design is an opportunity but is not currently part of the initiative.

There were no further questions or comments.

8. EPC Action Items:

Action Items:

a. **EPC Task Force**: Revision of the structure of the Educational Policies Council *(presented by Ed Dauterich)*

Secretary Dauterich reported on the changes to the EPC that were suggested by the ad hoc council tasked by Provost Diacon to redesign the committee. Notable changes include reducing the size of the committee, increasing the number of faculty, decreasing the number of administrators, and creating an EPC Executive Committee as part of the approval process. Secretary Dauterich said that the process would go forward with making the changes, provided that the Senate voted for the ad hoc council to continue the work.

Chair Grimm remarked that the changes put the responsibility back on the faculty when it comes to curriculum and provides for more honest debate over curricular matters.

Senator White asked what was being voted on.

Senator Smith explained that the recommendations would require changes to charter and by-laws for Faculty Senate, so the ad hoc EPC Task Force would have to bring back specific language to the senate to make changes to the charter and by-laws. She said that the committee is simply looking to see whether this should continue to be pursued.
Senator Kracht asked about timelines in connection with the addition of an Executive EPC. Secretary Dauterich acknowledged that this could extend the time frame for some decisions. Associate Vice President Tillett explained that the executive layer will be examined in greater detail when it comes to timelines.

Senator Roxburgh asked what the function of the EPC Executive Committee would be.

Secretary Dauterich explained that I think the executive group would review changes briefly before forwarding them to EPC, to prevent matters from going forward that should not be brought to the committee. The Executive EPC might also approve matters that did not need the consideration of the entire committee. This change was made in response to the concern that EPC members received more materials than they needed for consideration. The Executive EPC could possibly shorten the time needed for some curricular decisions. Associate Vice President Tillett added that one of the things that the committee wanted to do with EPC is educate them about the strategic mission of the university, the goals, and prevent the silo effect. The committee decided that one of the roles of the Executive EPC would be to deliberate what we should be discussing at EPC, not only just the curriculum coming forward, but, for example, perhaps inviting a vice president to come and talk about what is taking place in that division, what are the strategic priorities in that division, or anything occurring at the state level. Having that background might help when the committee is deliberating on items. Overall, the Executive EPC would decide who is going to come and present at full meetings and what will be on the agenda.

Dean Mistur suggested that it would be important for administrators to be at EPC when they present their proposals, so EPC could hear the rationale behind them.

Chair Grimm agreed with the Dean and asked for a motion to move forward with the work of the ad hoc EPC Task Force.

A motion to approve the item was made and seconded (Kaplan/Smith).

The motion passed unanimously.

b. EPC Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Policies: Revision of the Course Repeat policy to allow all repeated undergraduate courses to be eligible for GPA recalculation for graduation. Currently, only lower-division courses are eligible. Students may repeat an undergraduate course only two times (maximum three attempts of the same course). Effective Fall 2019.

Dr. Jill Folk (Psychology) presented the item and explained the policy and how the revision would assist students by better reflecting their program emphasis. The proposal states that only the student’s GPA for graduation would be associated with the change. Courses can only be attempted three times, regardless of the grade earned. Programs can still alter the access to this if necessary for accreditation or if they have it in the program policy.

Senator Tippey asked whether there is a message being sent that students can always try again if they do not pass the first time. Dr. Folk said that due to funding, students are often discouraged from retaking courses. She maintained that the psychology of individual students cannot be known but the rationale behind the change is that it is better to have them retake a core area course and master it than to retake lower division courses.
Senator Piccirillo-Smith asked about the examples provided in the handout, which did not suggest that students retaking courses showed mastery of the subject. She asked whether the data supports that, overall, people are not manifesting mastery, but rather just scraping by. Dr. Folk said that she did not have the data to support that.

Senator Smith said that we moved from Freshman Forgiveness to recalculation in lower level courses because of a software problem rather than a pedagogical issue. She also expressed the concern over which GPA will appear and be emphasized on the students' transcripts. She suggested that it makes more sense to have something like Freshmen Forgiveness because freshmen do not always have an initial understanding of the college environment, and that she was more sympathetic to allowing freshmen to retake a course and have the grade replaced. She expressed concern that allowing students at higher levels to retake courses does not teach them that there are consequences to the decisions they make. Dr. Folk replied that our aspirational and peer universities are not making the upper/lower course distinction and that so many students are coming into the university with many earned credits that it makes it difficult to judge who is truly at the freshman level.

Senator White agreed that the problem came about because of software, but the problem now is that under Freshmen Forgiveness you could only get a grade replaced in your first 30 hours, so once that point was passed, a student could not go back and take a course that was taken during the first year. This is now allowed by the current system. If a student is trying to raise their GPA, then that student can go back and retake a lower division course with a lower grade, as opposed to taking one of the upper division courses that would actually help the student.

Dean Pringle said that course failure was not only related to students being naïve or being novices in a discipline, and that it may be the result of circumstances outside of student control. The current policy does not address these situations.

Chair Grimm said that while she dislikes replacing grades for upper division students, it is worse that they are taking lower-division courses instead of taking classes that would make them more competent.

There were no further questions.

A motion to approve the item was made and seconded (Peer/Kooijman).

The motion passed unanimously.

c. University Requirements Curriculum Committee: Inclusion of three new courses in the Kent Core mathematics and critical reasoning category: MATH 10040 Introductory Statistics Plus (5); MATH 10050 Quantitative Reasoning Plus (5); and MATH 10675 Algebra for Calculus Boost (5). In addition, MATH 12001 is removed from the Kent Core mathematics and critical reasoning category (course is being inactivated). Effective Fall 2019.

Dean Smith and Associate Professor Beverly Reed presented the proposed changes. ODHE is driving the changes by mandating that remedial math courses be removed from college curricula. The math department developed a new model, which was approved by URCC and
EPC. Associate Professor Reed explained how students would benefit from the new course design. Students can complete gateway college level math in one semester instead of two, and it satisfies the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM).

There were no questions or comments.

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

The motion passed unanimously.

d. College of Education, Health and Human Services: Establishment of an Interprofessional Leadership major and establishment of a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in the School of Foundations, Leadership and Administration. The cohort-based program will be offered online-only in an accelerated delivery (five years with summers). Minimum total credit hours for program completion are 60. Effective Fall 2019 pending state and accreditor approvals.

Associate Dean Mitchell from EHHS presented the item and explained the rationale for the changes.

Senator Vande Zande said that someone getting this degree should need field experience, and she asked how this can happen if the program is 100% online. Associate Dean Mitchell responded that field experiences will be built into the courses at the students’ workplaces and that supervision of those experiences would happen virtually.

Senator Roxburgh asked what a typical graduate of the program would be doing. Associate Dean Mitchell said they will most likely be administering athletic training education programs in colleges and universities, which is one of the program areas that really needs this, because the accrediting body now requires that anybody who is going to become a Certified Athletic Trainer must do so at the master’s level. So, all university-level training education programs must now be coordinated and administered by somebody with a doctoral degree.

Senator Adamtey asked what research was done to determine how many schools are offering different programs from the one proposed and what the difference is. Associate Dean Mitchell said that they looked at other schools, and only one has a similar program that is 100% online. Many of these programs are in Educational Leadership, but the proposed program features development of cognate areas where within each cohort, students will be brought together with students in the core courses from different disciplines, which distinguishes the program from others.

Senator Sheehan asked what a capstone project might look like for students. Associate Dean Mitchell said it will most likely be a dissertation in practice which would be a piece of field-based research.

A motion to approve the item was made and seconded (Peer/Bergh).

The motion passed unanimously.
e. University College: Revision of the University Readiness Standards policy. Revisions include updating test scores to comply with state mandates, eliminate the writing challenge for English placement, and revising foreign language policy to include more options for waiving foreign language placement. Effective Fall 2019.

The item was presented by Director Steven Antalvari on behalf of Dean Pringle. The proposal ensures that Kent State complies with state mandates.

Senator Kaplan asked about including more options for waiving language placement. Director Antalvari responded by saying that in the past there were many individual options for waiving language requirements, but the new proposal is more proactive and updates the method to the 21st century rather than spending time considering each individual situation.

Chair Keiran Dunne (MCLS) pointed out that he had to sign multiple native speaker waivers every week because of the lack of a formal mechanism for capturing information if somebody has had their secondary education in another language. Putting a flag in the system so that somebody has a score on file when they apply makes things easier for everybody, because otherwise the students must find the form, print it, bring it to the department for approval, get it signed, and wait for further bureaucratic developments.

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

The motion passed unanimously.

Information Items:


g. College of Arts and Sciences: Revision of name for the French Literature, Culture and Translation major within the Bachelor of Arts degree in the Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies. Name is reverted to French. Effective Fall 2019.

9. Old Business

a. SSI Update (presented by Pamela Grimm - Faculty Senate Chair)

The SSI group is working on implementation and will come later this semester for a longer update.

b. Policy 10-07.1 “Administrative policy and procedures regarding allegations and instances of misconduct in research and scholarship” (presented by Deborah Smith, Professional Standards Committee)
Senator Smith presented the reworked draft of the policy. She also addressed how it would apply to students involved in grant-funded research in conjunction with federal policy. Other minor changes were also explained.

There were no comments or questions.

A motion to approve the item was made and seconded (Child/Kairis).

The motion passed unanimously.


    Senator Stringer reported that an ad-hoc committee had been established to update policy on unmanned aircraft on campus, so that a safer but less restrictive policy may be developed.

11. **Announcements / Statements for the Record**

    a. Senator Kristof announced that the Affordable Course Materials Summit will take place on Friday, March 1st.

    b. Chair Grimm announced that the Dr. Dolores Noll Memorial had been rescheduled to 5:00 on Monday, February 11, in the LGBTQ Student Center to accommodate any Senators who may wish to attend.

    c. Faculty Senate Election Update - Elections are being conducted electronically, and the process is going well. Votes have increased with the exception of NTT At-large ballots.

    d. Great Place Initiative Excellence in Faculty Mentoring Award - Secretary Dauterich explained that the reward and announced that it is open to all faculty (tenure-track, non-tenure track, and adjunct) who have served as mentors to other faculty at the university and are currently working at the university. It comes with a certificate, a cash reward, and recognition at an honors ceremony. Calls for nominations will go out on February 12th. The deadline for submitting nominations is March 18th.

12. **Adjournment**

    Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate

attachment
Chair’s Remarks for February 11, 2019 Senate Meeting

I would like to welcome Undergraduate Student Senate Representative Morgan Marshall, Director of Academic Affairs for the Undergraduate Student Senate. Welcome Morgan!

I loved Math when I was in grade school and for my first two years in high school. I had two amazing teachers for Geometry and Algebra, Mr. Alessi and Mr. Petho. They were both brilliant. They made Math class fun, engaging, interesting and stimulating. I loved it. I did pretty well on my NY Regents Geometry exam but was really excited when I got a 98 on my Regents Algebra exam. I remember going home and telling my mother about my grade. Her response was: “why didn’t you get 100%?” Yea. That was almost 50 years ago and I still remember it.

You’ve all heard me talk about my mom. She is one amazing human being and someone who would literally give the shirt off her back to help another human being. However, she had and continues to have one major flaw. That flaw is perfectionism and it’s pretty much the source of any flaw she has. And since it is contagious, it has also been the basis for many of my flaws.

Today, I think we all know that this is not the way to encourage a child. Yet, the motivation was well meaning and sincere. My mother sincerely wanted me to be the best at Math I could possibly be and mistakenly thought that pointing out that I fell two points shy of 100% was the way to do it. Yet, as my mother she saw herself as responsible for setting some sort of standards for me.

I am so honored to be chairing this body and I have learned so much more about Faculty Senate and shared governance in the last 5 months than I have in the past 25 years. I have come to more fully understand that we, the faculty, are largely responsible for ensuring that Kent State University continues to fulfill its mission and does so through development and adherence to standards. As a collective body, I think we are much more effective than any single individual would be at setting goals and developing the mechanisms for achieving them. The goal is always to ensure a high-quality education for our students and the creation of high-quality research and creative endeavors. As a research institution, we, more than most, understand that these two endeavors – teaching and scholarly activity – are intrinsically tied.

Later this afternoon, we will be discussing revisions to the course repeat policy and you may think this story is a lead up to that issue. I look forward to our discussion of the revisions to the policy, but my discussion of faculty responsibility right now is focused in a very different direction. It is focused about 200 miles southwest of Kent State University.

This is not the first time I’ve been updating my Chair’s Remarks pretty close to the start of a Faculty Senate meeting, but this is definitely the happiest reason for doing so. On January 22, 2019, the faculty at Wright State University went on strike. Today, what would have been their 21st day of the strike, they announced a tentative agreement with the administration.

Wright State is in a difficult financial position – one I believe was brought on by extremely poor management and oversight. The response was the creation of a contract so devoid of benefit for faculty, in both financial and shared governance terms, that acceptance of such a contract would be likely to lead to a diminution in the quality of faculty that Wright State is able to retain or recruit. It would also have eroded or eliminated the ability of the faculty body to meet its responsibility for ensuring quality research and education. I am grateful that Wright State
University's faculty was unwilling to accept such a contract and took a stand, not only for themselves, but also for quality and the long-term academic health of the institution.

Yet the cost of this strike has been high. I'm incredibly sad for the students and faculty at Wright State. But I'm also left wondering who in the administration will be held accountable for choosing a strategy that was almost guaranteed to fail and that imposed huge costs on students, faculty, department chairs and the reputation of Wright State; a reputation which may be irrevocably damaged. Accountability isn't or shouldn't be about pointing fingers. It should be about learning and improving. I can't help but wonder if anyone in Wright State University's administration has learned anything. I hope so.

I want to move up one announcement. You should all have received the attachment regarding the passing of Dr. Dolores Noll. Dr. Noll was a national pioneer in LGBTQ rights and the field of LGBTQ Studies. I want to let you know that the memorial, which was originally scheduled to start at 4:00 today in the Kent State LGBTQ Student Center, is actually being postponed to a 5:00 start so that any members or guests of the Senate who wish to attend may do so.

Finally, I had emailed all senators a memo from Jack Witt explaining the sequence of events that led up to a delay in receiving our insurance cards from Medical Mutual. Are there any questions or comments regarding that communication, the insurance cards or any other items in my remarks?

Thank you.
Pamela E. Grimm
Chair, Faculty Senate
10 - 04.1
ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY ON FINANCIAL INTEREST IN SPONSORED PROJECTS

(A) In accordance with state and federal regulations, the university is required to manage, reduce or eliminate any actual or potential conflicts of interest that may be presented by a significant financial interest of an investigator. Thus, the university requires that investigators disclose all significant financial interests that may present an actual or potential conflict of interest in relation to a sponsored project, as defined in rule 3342-10-03.1 of the Administrative Code. Sponsored projects for the purpose of this policy includes all direct awards and subawards.

(B) Definitions.

(1) "Conflict of interest" occurs when the relationship between an individual's private interests and his or her professional obligations to the university is such that an independent observer might reasonably question whether the individual's professional actions or decisions are determined by considerations of personal gain, financial or otherwise. An "actual" conflict of interest depends on the situation and not on the character or actions of the individual.

(2) "Investigator" means the principal investigator/project director, and co-principal investigator. "Investigator" also means any other person who is responsible for or involved in the design, conduct, or reporting of research, instructional or service activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor. For the purposes of the requirement relating to financial interest, investigator includes spouses and dependent children.

(3) "Project" means any externally funded scholarly activity such as basic, applied, or developmental research, instructional or curricular activities, student aid, career development, or other activity conducted by faculty or staff members on behalf of the university.

(4) "Significant financial interest" means anything of monetary value or potential monetary value held by an investigator, investigator's spouse, and dependent children, that reasonably appears to be related to the investigator's institutional responsibilities, including:

(a) For Public Health Service (PHS) Funded Projects (PHS includes, but is not limited to NIH, SAMHSA, HRSA, CDC, AHRQ and, for the purpose of this policy, any other funding sponsor that adopts PHS regulations, and including all subawards originating from PHS or a funding sponsor adopting PHS regulations):

(i) With regard to any publicly traded entity, combined financial remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure and the value of any equity interest in the entity as of the date
of disclosure that exceeds $5,000. Remuneration includes salary, any payment for services not identified as salary, equity interests and ownership interests;

(ii) With regard to any non-publicly traded entity, combined financial remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure that exceeds $5,000, or when the investigator holds any equity interest (e.g., stock, stock option, or other ownership interest), regardless of the equity value; or

(iii) Intellectual property rights and interests (e.g., patents, copyrights), upon receipt of income related to such rights and interests; or

(iv) Any reimbursed or sponsored travel exceeding $5,000 from the same entity in the aggregate (i.e., travel is paid on behalf of the investigator and not reimbursed to the investigator so that the exact monetary value may not be readily available) related to the investigator's institutional responsibilities must be disclosed. Disclosure of this interest will include the purpose and duration of the trip, the identity of the sponsor/organizer, and the travel destination.

(b) For all other funding (all non-PHS funded research including, but not limited to National Science Foundation (NSF) Funding):

(i) With regard to a publicly traded entity, combined financial remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure that exceeds $10,000. Remuneration includes salary, any payment for services not identified as salary, equity interests and ownership interests;

(ii) With regard to any non-publicly traded entity, combined financial remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure that exceeds $10,000, or when the investigator holds any equity interest (e.g., stock, stock option, or other ownership interest), regardless of the equity value; or

(iii) A 5% ownership interest in a single publicly traded entity; or

(iv) Intellectual property rights and interests upon receipt of income related to those rights and interests that exceeds $10,000 during the prior twelve (12) month period.

(5) "Significant financial interests" do not include:

(a) Salary, royalties, or other remuneration paid by the university to the investigator if the investigator is currently employed or otherwise appointed by university; or
(b) Intellectual property rights assigned to the university and agreement to share in royalties related to such rights; or

(c) Income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute affiliated with an institution of higher education (this exception does not apply to foreign institutions of higher education or governments of another country); or

(d) Income from service on advisory committees or review panels for a Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an institution of higher education (this exception does not apply to foreign institutions of higher education or governments of another country).

(6) "Financial conflict of interest ")FCOI) means a significant financial interest that is related to externally funded university research (i.e., the interest reasonably appears to be affected by the research or is in an entity whose financial interest reasonable appears to be affected by the research) and that could directly and significantly affect the design, conduct, or reporting of research.

(C) Requirements for Financial Interests.

(1) Disclosure requirements. All investigators must submit a listing of the following significant financial interests:
Any significant financial interest that would reasonably appear to be affected by the research, instructional or service activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor; or any significant financial interest in an entity whose financial interest would reasonably appear to be affected by the research, instructional or service activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor.

(2) Regardless of the above minimum requirements, a faculty or staff member, in his or her own best interest, is encouraged to disclose any other financial or related interest that could present an actual conflict of interest or be perceived to present a conflict of interest.

(D) Procedures for Disclosure of Financial Interests.

(1) Special requirements/disclosures for PHS-funded research. Pursuant to public health service (PHS) regulations (42 CFR 50) institutions receiving funds from any PHS agency [PHS agencies include NIH, SAMHSA, OPHS, IHS, HRSA, FDA, CDC, AHRQ] or other agencies adopting PHS financial conflict of interest
policies, must comply with the following requirements:

(a) Each investigator who is planning to participate in PHS-funded research is required to disclose to Kent state university officials the investigator’s significant financial interests reasonably related to the investigator’s institutional responsibilities (and those of the investigator’s spouse and dependent children) no later than the time of application for PHS-funded research. Each investigator must complete the appropriate certification process required by the university.

(b) Each investigator who is participating in PHS-funded research is required to complete an updated certification either within thirty days of discovering or acquiring a new significant financial interest, or at least on an annual basis during the period of the PHS funding award.

(c) Disclosure of all externally-funded travel reimbursements: PHS-funded investigators must disclose all travel reimbursements that are either sponsored by (that is paid by an outside entity directly to the investigator) or reimbursed directly to the investigator from an outside entity, with some exceptions. Exception include: travel reimbursements from an institution of higher education, a federal/state/local government, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute affiliated with an institution of higher education. This disclosure requirement does not apply to funding provided to the investigator by the university (for example as part of sponsored research projects, paid from departmental discretionary or gift funds). Travel reimbursements must be reported within thirty days of its occurrence.

(d) Mandatory training requirements: All PHS-funded investigators must complete online FCOI training provided by Kent state university prior to the expenditure of funds of any newly-funded projects, including noncompeting continuation awards. Training must be completed at least every four years. For the purposes of mandatory training, the term "investigator" includes the principal investigator (PI) and any other person (regardless of title or position) that the PI identifies as independently responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of the research.

(E) Disclosure Statement Reviews.

(1) Review by conflict of interest review committee. The vice president for research and sponsored programs, or official designee, will conduct an initial review of all disclosure statements submitted to determine whether a FCOI exists and, if so, determine what actions should be taken by the university to manage, reduce, or eliminate the FCOI. If a determination is made that there may be a potential or actual FCOI, the investigator, in cooperation with his/her dean, chair or director, will develop and present to the vice president for research and
sponsored programs a plan to manage, reduce or eliminate any potential or actual FCOI presented by the disclosed significant financial interest.

(2) The proposed plan shall be referred to the university conflict of interest review committee (CIRC) which will advise the vice president for research. The CIRC shall consist of five faculty members representing a cross section of academic disciplines and up to three tenured administrators with faculty rank. Committee members are appointed by the vice president for research and sponsored programs. The CIRC will select its own Chair from among its members.

(3) The CIRC shall review the plan and recommend it as presented, or suggest conditions or restrictions which may include the following:

(a) Public disclosure of FCOI;

(b) Monitoring of the research by an independent reviewer;

(c) For research projects involving human subjects research, disclosure of FCOI directly to participants;

(d) Modification of the research plan;

(e) Disqualification from participation in all or the portion of the funded research that would be affected by the significant financial interest;

(f) Divestiture of significant financial interests; or

(g) Severance of relationships that create conflicts.

(4) If the CIRC determines that imposing conditions or restrictions would be inequitable, or that the potential negative impacts that may arise from a significant financial interest are outweighed by interests of scientific progress, technology transfer, or public health and welfare, then the CIRC may recommend that the research go forward without imposing such conditions or restrictions.

(5) The plan, if approved by the vice president for research and sponsored programs, will be incorporated into a memorandum of understanding that details the conditions or restrictions imposed upon the investigator in the conduct of the project and/or the relationship with the business enterprise or entity. The memorandum of understanding shall be signed by the investigator and the investigator's cognizant university official (usually a dean, chair or director) and the vice president for research and sponsored programs. The university shall monitor compliance with the plan on an ongoing basis until completion of the funded research project.
(6) Actual or potential conflicts of interest must be satisfactorily managed, reduced, or eliminated in accordance with these guidelines prior to expenditure of any funds under the award. If actual or potential conflict cannot be satisfactorily managed, the sponsoring agency must be informed.

(F) Failure to Comply.

(1) Non-compliance. When an investigator is found to have violated this policy or the terms of the memorandum of understanding, the CIRC may recommend to the appropriate vice president that sanctions be imposed consistent with procedures established by university policy and/or an applicable collective bargaining agreement affecting the employee and his/her employment relationship with the university. Disciplinary action may range from a letter of reprimand to dismissal and termination of employment. If the violation results in a collateral proceeding under university policies regarding misconduct in science, the CIRC shall defer a decision on sanctions until the misconduct in science process is completed. In cases of violation, the vice president for research and sponsored programs will notify the appropriate funding agency.

(G) University Reporting and Records.

(1) Reporting. The university will provide initial and ongoing reports of its management of FCOI to external sponsors of university research as required by law and in accordance with this policy.

(2) Records. Records relating to all investigator disclosures of significant financial interests and the university's review and management of such disclosures, will be maintained by the university in the case of externally-funded research for (a) three years from the date of submission of the final expenditures report (in the case of grants and cooperative agreements); or (b) three years from the final payment (in the case of research contracts), or (c) resolution of any government action involving the records, or (d) as otherwise required by law.
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ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY ON FINANCIAL INTEREST IN SPONSORED PROJECTS

(A) **Purpose.** In accordance with state and federal regulations, the university is required to manage, reduce or eliminate any actual or potential conflicts of interest that may be presented by a significant financial interest of an investigator. Thus, the university requires that investigators disclose all significant financial interests that may present an actual or potential conflict of interest in relation to a sponsored project, as defined in rule 3342-10-03.1 of the Administrative Code. These requirements apply to all recipients of Sponsored projects for the purpose of this policy includes all direct awards and subawards.

(B) Definitions.

(1) "Conflict of interest" occurs when the relationship between an individual's private interests and his or her professional obligations to the university is such that an independent observer might reasonably question whether the individual's professional actions or decisions are determined by considerations of personal gain, financial or otherwise. An "actual" conflict of interest depends on the situation and not on the character or actions of the individual.

(2) "Investigator" means the principal investigator/project director, and co-principal investigator, and, "Investigator" also means any other person who is responsible for or involved in the design, conduct, or reporting of research, instructional or service activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor. For the purposes of the requirement relating to financial interest, investigator includes spouses and dependent children.

(3) "Project" means any externally funded scholarly activity such as basic, applied, or developmental research, instructional or curricular activities, student aid, career development, or other activity conducted by faculty or staff members on behalf of the university.

(4) "Significant financial interest" means anything of monetary value or potential monetary value held by an investigator (and by the investigator's, investigator's spouse, and dependent children), and that reasonably appears to be related to the investigator's institutional responsibilities, as follows:

(a) For Public Health Service (PHS) Funded Projects (PHS includes, but is not limited to NIH, SAMHSA, HRSA, CDC, AHRQ and, for the purpose of this policy, any other funding sponsor that adopts PHS regulations, and including all subawards originating from PHS or a funding sponsor adopting PHS regulations):

(i) With regard to any publicly traded entity, combined financial
remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the
disclosure and the value of any equity interest in the entity as of the date
of disclosure, when aggregated, that exceeds ten thousand (for PHS-
funded research, this amount is five thousand). For purposes of the
definition of significant financial interest, remuneration $5,000.
Remuneration includes salary and any payment for services not otherwise-
identified as salary (e.g., consulting fees, honoraria, paid-
authorship), equity interest includes any stock, stock option, or other
interests and ownership interest, as determined through reference to public
prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value interests.

(bii) With regard to any non-publicly traded entity, the value of
any combined financial remuneration received from the entity in the
calendar year twelve months preceding the disclosure, when aggregated,
that exceeds ten thousand (for PHS funded research, this amount is five
thousand), or $5,000, or when the investigator holds any equity interest
(e.g., stock, stock option, or other ownership interest), regardless of the
equity value; or

(e-iii) Intellectual property rights and interests (e.g., patents, copyrights),
upon receipt of income related to such rights and interests; or

(d) A position giving rise to a fiduciary duty, such as director, officer, partner,
trustee, employee, or any position of management.

(e) For investigators applying for or conducting research funded by the PHS,
any reimbursed or sponsored travel exceeding $5,000 from the
same entity in the aggregate (i.e., travel is paid on behalf of the
investigator and not reimbursed to the investigator so that the exact
monetary value may not be readily available) related to the
investigator’s institutional responsibilities must be disclosed.
Disclosure of this interest will include the purpose and duration of the trip,
the identity of the sponsor/organizer, and the travel destination.

(b) For all other funding (all non-PHS funded research including, but not limited
to National Science Foundation (NSF) Funding):

(i) With regard to a publicly traded entity, combined financial remuneration
received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure that
exceeds $10,000. Remuneration includes salary, any payment for services
not identified as salary, equity interests and ownership interests;

(ii) With regard to any non-publicly traded entity, combined financial
remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the
disclosure that exceeds $10,000, or when the investigator holds any equity
interest (e.g., stock, stock option, or other ownership interest), regardless.
of the equity value; or

(iii) A 5% ownership interest in a single publicly traded entity; or

(iv) Intellectual property rights and interests upon receipt of income related to those rights and interests that exceeds $10,000 during the prior twelve (12) month period.

(5) "Significant financial interests" do not include:

(a) Salary, royalties, or other remuneration paid by the university to the investigator if the investigator is currently employed or otherwise appointed by university; or

(b) Intellectual property rights assigned to the university and agreement to share in royalties related to such rights; or

(c) Income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute affiliated with an institution of higher education (this exception does not apply to foreign institutions of higher education or governments of another country); or

(d) Income from service on advisory committees or review panels for a Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an institution of higher education (this exception does not apply to foreign institutions of higher education or governments of another country).

(6) "Financial conflict of interest" (FCOI) means a significant financial interest that is related to proposed externally funded university research (i.e., the interest reasonably appears to be affected by the research or is in an entity whose financial interest reasonably appears to be affected by the research) and that could directly and significantly affect the design, conduct, or reporting of research.

(C) Requirements for Financial Interests.

(1) Disclosure requirements. All investigators must submit a listing of the following significant financial interests:

Any significant financial interest that would reasonably appear to be affected by the research, instructional or service activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor; or any significant financial interest in an entity whose financial interest would reasonably appear to be affected by the research,
instructional or service activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor.

(2) Regardless of the above minimum requirements, a faculty or staff member, in his or her own best interest, is encouraged to disclose any other financial or related interest that could present an actual conflict of interest or be perceived to present a conflict of interest. Disclosure is a key factor in protecting one's reputation and career from potential embarrassing or harmful allegations of misconduct.

(D) Procedures for Disclosure of Financial Interests.

(1) Special requirements/disclosures for PHS-funded research. Pursuant to public health service (PHS) regulations (42 CFR 50) institutions receiving funds from any PHS agency [PHS agencies include NIH, SAMHSA, OPHS, IHS, HRSA, FDA, CDC, AHRQ] or other agencies adopting PHS financial conflict of interest policies, must comply with the following requirements:

(a) Each investigator who is planning to participate in PHS-funded research is required to disclose to Kent state university officials the investigator's significant financial interests reasonably related to the investigator's institutional responsibilities (and those of the investigator's spouse and dependent children) no later than the time of application for PHS-funded research. Each investigator must complete the appropriate certification process required by the university.

(b) Each investigator who is participating in PHS-funded research is required to complete an updated certification either within thirty days of discovering or acquiring a new significant financial interest, or at least on an annual basis during the period of the PHS funding award.

(c) Disclosure of all externally-funded travel reimbursements: PHS-funded investigators must disclose all travel reimbursements that are either sponsored by (that is paid by an outside entity directly to the investigator) or reimbursed directly to the investigator from an outside entity for travel that occurs after August 24, 2012, with some exceptions. Exception include: travel reimbursements from an institution of higher education, a federal/state/local government, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute affiliated with an institution of higher education. This disclosure requirement does not apply to funding provided to the investigator by the institution or university (for example as part of sponsored research projects, paid from departmental discretionary or gift funds). Travel reimbursements must be reported within thirty days of its occurrence.

(d) Mandatory training requirements: All PHS-funded investigators must
complete online FCOI training provided by Kent state university prior to the expenditure of funds of any newly-funded projects, including noncompeting continuation awards. This applies to all PHS sponsored research projects as of August 24, 2012. Training must be completed at least every four years. Online training is available for KSU personnel. Current PHS awards are not subject to these new requirements until for the noncompeting continuation award. For these purposes of mandatory training, the term "investigator" includes the principal investigator (PI) and any other person (regardless of title or position) that the PI identifies as independently responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of the research.

(2E) Disclosure Statement Reviews.

(1) Review by conflict of interest review committee. The vice president for research and sponsored programs, or official designee, will conduct an initial review of all disclosure statements submitted to determine whether a financial conflict of interest (FCOI) exists and, if so, determine what actions should be taken by the university to manage, reduce, or eliminate the FCOI. If a determination is made that there may be a potential or actual FCOI, the investigator, in cooperation with his/her dean, chair or director, will develop and present to the vice president for research and sponsored programs a plan to manage, reduce or eliminate any potential or actual FCOI presented by the disclosed significant financial interest.

(32) The proposed plan shall be referred to the university conflict of interest review committee (CIRC) which will advise the vice president for research. The CIRC shall contain, at a minimum, consist of five faculty members representing a cross section of academic disciplines, and up to three tenured administrators with faculty rank. Committee members are appointed by the vice president for research and sponsored programs. The CIRC will select its own Chair from among its members.

(43) The CIRC shall review the plan and recommend it as presented, or suggest conditions or restrictions which may include the following:

(a) Public disclosure of FCOI;

(b) Monitoring of the research by an independent reviewer;

(c) For research projects involving human subjects research, disclosure of FCOI directly to participants;

(d) Modification of the research plan;

(e) Disqualification from participation in all or the portion of the funded
research that would be affected by the significant financial interest;

(e) Divestiture of significant financial interests; or

(g) Severance of relationships that create conflicts.

§4 If the CIRC determines that imposing conditions or restrictions would be inequitable, or that the potential negative impacts that may arise from a significant financial interest are outweighed by interests of scientific progress, technology transfer, or public health and welfare, then the CIRC may recommend that the research go forward without imposing such conditions or restrictions.

§5 The plan, if approved by the vice president for research and sponsored programs, will be incorporated into a memorandum of understanding that details the conditions or restrictions imposed upon the investigator in the conduct of the project and/or the relationship with the business enterprise or entity. The memorandum of understanding shall be signed by the investigator and the investigator's cognizant university official (usually a dean, chair or director) and the vice president for research and sponsored programs. The university shall monitor compliance with the plan on an ongoing basis until completion of the funded research project.

6 Actual or potential conflicts of interest must be satisfactorily managed, reduced, or eliminated in accordance with these guidelines prior to expenditure of any funds under the award. If actual or potential conflict cannot be satisfactorily managed, the sponsoring agency must be informed.

7(F) Failure to Comply.

1 Non-compliance. When an investigator is found to have violated this policy or the terms of the memorandum of understanding, the CIRC may recommend to the appropriate vice president that sanctions be imposed consistent with procedures established by university policy and/or an applicable collective bargaining agreement affecting the employee and his/her employment relationship with the university. Disciplinary action may range from a letter of reprimand to dismissal and termination of employment. If the violation results in a collateral proceeding under university policies regarding misconduct in science, the CIRC shall defer a decision on sanctions until the misconduct in science process is completed. In cases of violation, the vice president for research and sponsored programs will notify the appropriate funding agency.

§(G) University Reporting and Records.

1 Reporting. The university will provide initial and ongoing reports of its management of FCOI to external sponsors of university research as required by
law and in accordance with this policy.

(92) Records. Records relating to all investigator disclosures of significant financial interests and the university's review and management of such disclosures, will be maintained by the university in the case of externally-funded research for (a) three years from the date of submission of the final expenditures report (in the case of grants and cooperative agreements); or (b) three years from the final payment (in the case of research contracts), or (c) resolution of any government action involving the records, or (d) as otherwise required by law.
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Whereas the Fall semester schedule was extended so as to include the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Welcome Week in order to accommodate the Fall Break;

Whereas many instructors of regular 15 week semester courses refer to the weeks by number on their syllabi;

Whereas no guidance has been given for how to refer to classes that occur on the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Welcome Week on syllabi;

Whereas there was no consistency on how classes that occurred on the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Welcome Week were referenced on syllabi in Fall Semester 2018;

Whereas students expressed confusion given this lack of consistency;

Whereas standard semester classes are widely referred to as 15 week classes and Spring semester continues to have only 15 weeks of instruction:

Faculty Senate’s Professional Standards Committee hereby recommends that the term ‘Week 1’ be reserved for the first full-week of instruction in Fall Semester and that the half week of classes that occurs during Welcome Week be referred to either as ‘Week 0’ or as ‘Welcome Week’.

Faculty Senate’s Professional Standards Committee further recommends that instructors not wishing to follow this convention provide specific dates on their syllabi for Fall Semester.
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
January 16, 2019

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Blake Stringer (Appointed), Molly Wang (Appointed), Deborah Smith (Ex-Officio), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Guests: President Beverly Warren, Provost Todd Diacon

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. in the Urban Conference Room on the second floor of the Library.

2. Review Topics for the President and the Provost

The Executive Committee reviewed the topics to be discussed with President Warren and Provost Diacon.

3. Meeting with the President and Provost

The Executive Committee, President Warren, and Provost Diacon discussed the current state of the Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) at Kent State, the delivery of medical insurance cards, and concerns about the bookstore’s advertising and delivery of information on their online site. President Warren also talked about the large upcoming attendance for the future MLK day celebration and how it may necessitate moving the gathering to a larger venue. There was also a discussion of how to help students whose funding is affected by the government shutdown. There was also a brief discussion of the future of the Kent CORE.

4. Approval of Minutes:

a. Executive Committee meeting minutes of December 7, 2018

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the December 7, 2018, Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting (Laux/Stringer). The minutes were approved unanimously.
b. Faculty Senate meeting minutes of December 10, 2018

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the December 10, 2018, Faculty Senate meeting (Laux/ Vande Zande). The minutes were approved unanimously.

c. Executive Committee meeting minutes of December 19, 2018

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2018, Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting (Laux/Stringer). The minutes were approved unanimously.

5. Tentative Agenda for the February Faculty Senate Meeting

The Executive Committee set the agenda for the February 11, 2019, Faculty Senate meeting.

6. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
January 23, 2019

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Blake Stringer (Appointed), Molly Wang (Appointed), Deborah Smith (Ex-Officio)

Guests: Shawn Riley (Board of Trustees and Chair of the Presidential Search Committee)

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. in the Urban Conference Room on the second floor of the Library.

2. Meeting with Trustee Shawn Riley

The Executive Committee discussed the current university presidential search with Trustee Riley, chair of the search committee.

3. Discussion of Possible Policy on Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems

The Executive Committee discussed the drone-safe zones on campus, how the existence of them is communicated and regulated, liability issues, and the possibility of establishing both collaboration between different colleges that use drones in courses and a clearer university-level policy on unmanned aircraft and its use in university courses to avoid pitfalls in these areas. It was suggested that a working group from departments and groups interested across the university be formed to help Kent State become more consistent with other universities. The committee designated Blake Stringer to form the committee to examine the potential policy.

4. Discussion of SSIs

Chair Grimm discussed the current state of the changes to SSIs. Areas of concern are the faculty’s ability to provide their own questions and the templates that must be added to allow this, and whether the types of questions should be limited. Another concern is when and how long should SSIs be delivered when classes are shorter than the typical 15-week
duration. Other concerns were which types of classes do evaluations and what the reasons are for completing them or not, and how long reports are available to individual faculty.

5. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate