



**KENT STATE**  
UNIVERSITY

**FACULTY SENATE**

---

**TO:** Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests      **DATE:** September 8, 2015  
**FROM:** Linda Williams, Chair of the Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Agenda and Materials for the September 14, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting

---

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the September 14<sup>th</sup> 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 July 20, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
4. President's Remarks
5. Chair's Remarks
6. Old Business:
  - A. Anonymous Signatures
  - B. RCM Discussion:
    1. Who has the power to hire tenure track faculty
    2. Transparency in administration monies
7. New Business: Revisit Charter
  - A. Summer meeting
  - B. Updating language
  - C. Eligibility for Faculty Senate
8. Announcements / Statements for the Record
9. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment



**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
July 20, 2015

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Governance Chambers located on the second floor of the Kent Student Center. She noted that this academic year, only the Senators, the President and the Provost's names will be read in order to speed things up.

**2. Roll Call**

Senator Deborah Smith is filling in for Secretary Farrell and called the roll.

**3. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of May 11, 2015**

Chair Williams called for a motion to approve the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of May 11, 2015.

A few minor corrections were made. A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded (Kristof/Mocioalca). The minutes of the May 11, 2015 meeting were approved as amended.

**4. Chair's Remarks**

Chair Williams made her remarks. [Attachment A]

Senator Roxburgh added to the chair's comment about the issue with RCM, stating that she felt the failure begins when the incentives are narrowly defined. She believes we need more broadly defined incentives that would contribute to the betterment of the institution.

President Warren agreed and wanted to share that she has some of the same general concerns about RCM. She plans to form a committee to closely look at the review of the RCM model. She wants the committee to define how RCM supports the university's priorities, while focusing on quality and excellence as well as looking at numbers of students. Her hope is that the committee comes up with recommendations to present to FaSBAC and to the Faculty Senate because it really is time to look at how RCM advances our priorities.

**5. Report: University Policy (3342-3-09) Regarding Use of Copyright-Protected Works**  
(Presented by Cynthia Kristof, Associate Professor, University Libraries)

Senator Kristoff presented a draft of the university's copyright policy [Attachment B] and explained why we need the policy in order to uphold The Teach Act, which is a part of the US copyright law. Because the university uses third party licensed and/or copyrighted material, University Libraries Copyright Services will ensure we follow the law by providing informational materials to faculty, students, and staff members.

Copyright Services will also locate copyright owners and provide clearance services for third party copyrighted materials for a variety of uses, while protecting the university as well.

In addition, Senator Kristof provides instructional sessions for classes or meetings, such as the First Amendment class that's taught in the College of Communications. She also offers a talk about the use of graphics and instructional design in businesses. The ultimate goal is to help people use materials to enrich their courses to the fullest extent they can under the copyright law.

The Faculty Senate will have pamphlets provided by the University Libraries Copyright Services should anyone want to pick one up. Alternatively, one can visit the University Libraries Department and ask for Cindy Kristof, Head of Copyright and Document Services.

## **6. EPC Action Item:**

EPC Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Policies - Revision of Midterm Evaluation policy to (a) open midterm grading to all students enrolled in 00000-, 10000- and 20000-level courses—rather than to students with freshman status only—and to (b) extend the midterm grading period to start in the fourth and end in the seventh week for full-semester courses (midterm grades are given in seventh week only in current policy). Effective Fall 2016.

The EPC Action item was introduced by University College Dean, Eboni Pringle. Senator Fred Smith made a motion to put the revision to the midterm evaluation policy on the floor for discussion and it was seconded by Senator Uribe.

Many questions were asked by the Senators and clarifications were made by both Dean Pringle and Curriculum Services Director, Therese Tillett. Because some Professors have literally hundreds of students, a concern about workload was brought up. Senator Kracht advocated for an improved interface when adding grades and suggested that it would make a huge difference when entering hundreds of grades if there were a way to upload a spreadsheet instead.

Dean Pringle was happy to share that there have been conversations about making the interface more efficient. At this point, they would like to bring in some faculty senators to come up with a design for a process that would allow for the uploading of a spreadsheet. The plan is to have this process in place by Fall 2016.

Several suggestions were made by the senators. A motion was made to approve the originally presented revision, but with the added amendment that there be a two-year pilot during which data, including withdrawal rates, will be collected and reviewed after two years to find out what effect the revision has, if any, on the students.

Chair Williams called for a vote. The revision of the midterm evaluation policy to open midterm grading to all students enrolled in 00000-, 10000- and 20000-level courses and to extend the midterm grading period to start in the fourth and end in the seventh week for full-semester courses with the added amendment for a pilot to collect and review the data after two years passed unanimously. The motion carries.

## **7. Old Business**

There was no old business.

**8. New Business**

There was no new business.

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

No announcements or statements were made.

**10. Adjournment**

Chair Williams adjourned the meeting at 4:17 p.m.

Tess Kail for Paul Farrell, Secretary  
Faculty Senate

attachment

## **Faculty Senate Meeting of July 20, 2015 Remarks from Chair Linda Williams**

First, I want to welcome all new and returning senators. Thank you for coming to the summer Faculty Senate meeting. I know it's a hardship sometimes.

I want to talk about what's coming up in the next academic year particularly for Faculty Senate. Probably the biggest concern is what's happening after the RCM report. By the way, you should all have a copy. If there are any new senators who don't have a copy, please email Tess and she will email you a copy of the report.

I wanted to summarize the suggestions of the faculty who met with us at the spring faculty retreat and their suggestions about the RCM to get you thinking about where we're going with this.

The first recommendation was to have a faculty co-chair for FaSBAC and committees that look at that.

The second recommendation is to have greater transparency regarding where our supposed tax dollars go. Just recently, we have had a just off the top amount taken off before any taxes have been applied and we'd like transparency as to where those monies go.

Thirdly, there was a concern about an increase of TT hires and a decrease in professional staff. I would like to encourage the President to review the administrative structure and see where there is overlap and possible reduction in administrative and professional staff.

Hey! Maybe there can be a salary freeze for administrators making over a certain amount?

Fourth, we'd like to address the disincentive for issuance of external grants. It used to be that overhead money came back to the department. That no longer happens so there's some concern by faculty on that.

Fifth, that we get back to making policy decisions based on the criteria of quality and pedagogical enhancement rather than profit making. There is a real problem with RCM always making departments think about profit, profit, profit. And then making decisions based solely on that criteria rather than what would be intellectually best for the student. We're still reeling over a class on Adam Sandler. It's because I dislike him so much! Anyway, we don't want to dumb down classes just so we get more people in the seats and for RCM reasons.

The last suggestion was to make a pie chart where the student's tuition dollar went. What part went to administration, what percentage when to faculty, and these kinds of things.

I don't know if I could do a very good pie chart but if anybody wants to volunteer to do any of that, Senator Laux, then that would be great! I think it would be interesting.

Those are the suggestions from the spring Faculty Senate retreat, and I think that we're going to try to move on with those and talk about them in the upcoming meetings.

The next thing I want to talk about is that there are two searches for deans - one for dean of architecture and one for education. If you would like to volunteer to be on the list for consideration for a search committee, just let me know.

Lastly, we lost our Ohio Faculty Counsel person. This is the person who goes down to Columbus once a month and convenes with other OFC people. They talk about what's coming out of Columbus in terms of higher education. We would love someone to volunteer for that. At one point, we had two people interested. They did a tag team approach. One went one month, and the other went the next month. That worked. Anyone who would like to do that, let me know. We need at least one.

3342-3-09 University policy regarding use of copyright-protected works

(A) **Policy statement.** It is the policy of the university to respect, and comply with, the copyright laws of the United States (Title 17 of the United States Code, or the "Copyright Act"). Accordingly, members of the university community desiring to use copyrighted materials are responsible for complying with the Copyright Act in good faith.

(B) **Implementation.** Office of General Counsel in cooperation with University Libraries' Copyright Services.

(C) **Scope.** This policy shall apply to all university faculty, staff, and students seeking to use copyright-protected works.

(D) **Use of a Copyright-protected work.**

(1) Unless a work is in the public domain or available for use under a Creative Commons or other public copyright license, it should be generally assumed that the work is copyright-protected. If there is no applicable license, exemption, or exception to permit use of a copyright-protected work, permission must be obtained from the copyright holder or a representative of the copyright holder. Faculty, students, and staff members are individually responsible for assessing whether a copyright-protected work is available for use, and if required, ensuring that the appropriate permission is obtained from the copyright holder or a representative of the copyright holder prior to use of the work.

(2) **Limitations on exclusive copyright.** Permission to use a copyright-protected work is not required in accordance with certain limitations to exclusive rights to copyright set forth in the Copyright Act. Such limitations include, but are not limited to, the exemptions set forth in this section below. Faculty, staff and students should refer to <http://www.library.kent.edu/copyright> for detailed information, guidance, and resources on copyright exemptions prior to relying on any exemption for use of a copyright-protected work.

(a) **Public domain.** A public domain work is a work that is not protected by copyright and which may be freely used. Works in the public domain include works published in the U.S. before January 1, 1923, most works owned by the federal government, or,

prior to 1989, works for which an author has failed to satisfy a statutory formality required in the Copyright Act.

(b) Classroom exemptions. Section 110 of the Copyright Act allows for performance and display of a lawfully made copy of a copyright-protected work by instructors or students in the course of teaching activities (not entertainment) in a classroom (physical or virtual, or similar place devoted to educational instruction) as part of a curriculum.

(c) Fair use. If no other exemption is available, the fair use provisions set forth in Section 107 of the Copyright Act allow for a limited use of a copyright-protected work without permission from the copyright holder. Prior to relying on fair use, a fair use analysis must be completed in good faith and on a case-by-case basis by the individual utilizing the copyright-protected work.

(E) Permissions and licensing

- (1) Permissions must be obtained by the faculty, student, or staff member in all instances when it is determined that use of a copyright-protected work does not fit within an exemption or that the desired use exceeds fair use.
- (2) Faculty, staff, and students may contact University Libraries' Copyright Services for assistance in obtaining permissions from the copyright holder.