Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the November 4th 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 November 4, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

5. Chair's Remarks

6. Interim Provost's Remarks

7. Presentation on Kognito (Deric Kenne, Associate Director, Division of Mental Health & Substance Use)

8. EPC Item:

   A. Action Item: Office of the Provost: Revision of 3342-3-01.1 Administrative Policy and Procedure Regarding Academic Requirements, Course Specifications and Course Offerings (Policy Register) and Catalog Rights and Exclusions policy (University Catalog). The revision updates language, clarify current procedures and practice, allow for consistent application and bring consistency with other policies and procedures. In addition, the name of the administrative policy is revised to Administrative Policy Regarding Academic Requirements, Courses and Policies. Effective Fall 2020.

9. Old Business
10. New Business:

   A. Action Item: Revisions to Existing University Policy 10-02 and New Policies 10-02.3 and 10-02.4 concerning Research Compliance.

   B. Discussion Item: Motion: Given the large number of adjunct faculty teaching at Kent State University, and given that about a third of our courses are taught by adjunct faculty, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee moves that the Faculty Senate a) establish an Adjunct Faculty Senate Observer Position and b) conduct the nomination and election process to identify an elected Adjunct Faculty Observer. Note: If passed, this motion will require a change in the Senate Charter and Bylaws.

11. Announcements / Statements for the Record

12. Adjourn
1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:22 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 (Sheehan/Piccirillo-Smith). The agenda was approved unanimously.
4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of October 14, 2019

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 14, 2019, Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Fenk/Mocioalca). Dean Smith offered corrections to the minutes that dealt with the explanation of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and how it relates to our Kent Core and a change to the name of the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Learning, which was not properly titled in the original document. A friendly amendment was proposed and seconded to offer the corrections as an addendum to the minutes so that both the accurate information and the words from the original transcript would be on the record (Kracht/Ciesla).

The minutes were approved with the addendum. [Attachment 1]

5. Chair’s Remarks

Chair Grimm delivered her remarks. [Attachment 2]

She then invited comments or questions.

There were no questions or comments.

6. President Diacon’s Remarks

President Diacon began by pointing out notable accomplishments in lifting our undergraduate success rates to historic highs. On the Kent Campus, our freshmen and sophomore retention rate is now 81.2 percent, our four-year graduation rate is now 50.8 percent, and our six year graduation rate is now 62.6 percent. He thanked the audience for the role they played in producing these results. He then asked how we could do even better. He said that if aspirational goals for retention and graduation are met, we would be national leaders. To get us there, he suggested that we would do well to become a student-ready college. He will explore this idea further at the Fall Retreat. He then read three quotes from *Becoming a Student-Ready College: A New Culture of Leadership for Student Success*: (1) “Imagine if every time we encountered a student in need of assistance we asked ourselves, if this were my son, daughter, friend or mentee, how would we want someone to help him or her?”; (2) “Becoming a student ready college requires each and every person who is part of the ecosystem to make a personal decision to take responsibility and ownership for student success;” and (3) “Let us dispel the idea that we want every educator to become a counselor for every student she or he encounters.” That is not our message, and that is an impossible aspiration given the limits on time and effort for most educators. Our message is that within our personal sphere of influence, how are our daily actions demonstrating compassion and empathy for students we encounter? He maintained that becoming a student-ready college flips on its head the notion of a “college-ready student” and that instead of working with a deficit mentality, we need to focus on what we can do to help students succeed. We need to meet students where they are and focus on designing programs to help them graduate. Many factors shape what students bring with them, and our task is to make Kent easier to navigate when they encounter us for the first time. More examples of this will be forthcoming at the retreat; the authors of the book call this “opportunistic self-awareness.” He
then said he looked forward to exploring the theme more at the Fall Retreat and thanked everyone who participated in his recent inauguration and wished everyone the best as we move into the final part of the semester.

He then invited comments or questions.

Senator Smith said that some of the initiatives sounded like very good goals, but she was concerned about how this mindset will make its way into the classroom; rules need to be set out clearly and followed. She told a story about a student who requested a second “final” deadline extension for an exam after being granted a first one, and suggested that we do students a disservice by erring entirely on the side of compassion and empathy; she said at some point they may need “tough love.”

President Diacon said that little of the book addresses what goes on in the classroom. He said that if students stub their toes academically, we want their first response not to be to leave the institution but to stay at the institution.

Senator Abraham asked whether faculty would be trained as mentors and counselors.

President Diacon said we cannot all be counselors, so instead, we should facilitate directing students to the help they need; we need to help students within our sphere.

Senator Sheehan added an example of social capital: all of us in the room who have children here have students with different experiences with entry into the university and different levels of access.

President Diacon thanked her for the good example.

Senator Tippey said that the student-centered focus is appropriate, but he suggested that we could be forgetting the faculty, staff, or alumni as centers for attention. He also had concerns about the website’s appeal to those over 18 years of age.

President Diacon thanked him and apologized for having to leave for another meeting in Cleveland.

Chair Grimm mentioned Senator Mocioalca’s concerns about making exceptions for students’ religious practices. One of her concerns, as an example, is that if you have a student who is participating in Ramadan and not able to eat through the day, you may reschedule an exam for that student to occur at nighttime. She then asked where the support is that allows the faculty member to direct the student to a proctor who can take care of that. There is a lot of recognition that these are the kinds of accommodations we should make to be student-centered, but they require some support. She asked again from where the support would be coming.

There were no further comments or questions.

7. **EPC Items:**

   A. **From the September 16, 2019 EPC Meeting:**
1. Support Material - Proposal from the URCC

The EPC had voted to endorse the URCC Report: Analysis of the Kent Core Assessment Method with a Plan for Reform. The drive from the HLC was to assess the core at the program level, not the individual course level. After extensive discussion at Senate, with the Executive Committee, and with the Chair of URCC, Dean Smith presented the following language for discussion and a vote. For more information on how and why the language was changed, please see the Support Material Proposal from the URCC that accompanied the Faculty Senate packet for the November 4th meeting.

There was a motion to approve the following four items (Wilson/Bagheri):

a. URCC proposes the adoption of paired assessment for core learning outcomes. Core learning outcomes would be assessed at two different periods of time (e.g. first semester and last semester).

b. URCC proposes that Kent State University adopt language provided by AAC&U describing four learning outcomes, referred to as LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, and that the eleven Kent State University learning outcomes be mapped onto the LEAP essential learning outcomes. The LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes provide standards that can be compared across institutions.

c. URCC proposes that Kent State University assess learning outcomes using VALUE rubrics available from the AAC&U designed to assess LEAP essential outcomes.

d. URCC proposes the establishment of a faculty-led Kent Core assessment council to review assessment data and provide feedback to appropriate parties regarding students’ learning in the core.

Senator Smith asked whether we were voting on the language of A through D or also approving the language of the paragraph above it.

Chair Grimm replied that we were voting on A through D.

Senator Smith noted that the word “changes” should be “changed” on the second line of page 2.

Senator Kracht said that this is a complex proposal and that she agreed with B, C, and D but was concerned with the language of “paired assessment” in item A. She could not find this as a requirement in HLC documents, even though it was presented that way to EPC. She believes it is aspirational to do paired assessment, but that in practice, it will not give us meaningful statistics to interpret. She said that if item A could be reworded or a practical way could be found to do a paired assessment, then she would support it.
Chair Grimm asked what Senator Kracht meant by “paired assessment’

Senator Kracht replied that her understanding was that there would be some sort of statistical sampling. She also pointed out that it was originally posed as occurring in the first major course not in the Kent Core, and that when we previously discussed some serious drawbacks about that, she had brought up anthropology where the first course in the major could be the last course in the major. She said that it had also been floated that we put the assessment in First Year Experience. To her, the major drawback with that is that there are two entirely different populations that are being sampled, so that comparisons cannot really be made. She suggested that there may be other ways to do it, but we had not come up with anything as a body, and she could not come up with anything on her own. She said she would not be willing to vote for it with the language of paired assessment because it was too restricting, and she could not find anywhere that it was required.

Chair Grimm asked Dean Smith to address the issue.

Dean Smith said that the letter written to President Warren in 2016 specified that a review of the assessment process needed to be made, and best practices recommended from HLC included best assessment, which the URCC discovered was a method used across the board in Ohio. Paired assessment was one on a short list of possibilities, but they did not directly use the term required; paired assessment is on the short list and picked up most often by universities. At least one best practice would have to be followed.

Chair Grimm said that the HLC is looking for evidence of growth over time, which implies assessment at different points in time and asked whether that was what concerned Senator Kracht.

Senator Kracht said that if we remove assessment from the Kent Core, then we cannot be assessing the Kent Core. We might be assessing the LEAP outcomes from AAC&U, but we would not be isolating the Kent Core. She did not see how you could disentangle the Kent Core from the major if assessments are done in freshman and senior year when 70% of their coursework is not in the core.

Senator Mocioalca said that senate was being asked to vote on paired assessment without having practical examples of how it could be done. She supported Senator Kracht’s ideas and wanted to know more about how it would be implemented.

Chair Grimm summarized that one of the concerns was that we do not know how the paired assessment would function. Another was that it was not separating out what students learned in the core versus what they learned in the major. She said she did not think that was possible because there are overlapping learning outcomes for both. She also suggested that for the purposes of HLC, isolating that is not especially important. She asked whether it would be possible to modify the language in some way that proposes adoption of assessment of core learning outcomes at different
periods of time, or different periods of time without specifying paired assessments—different periods of time or assessing the core in a way that demonstrates student growth in the core.

Senator Kracht said that the language change was fine if we are assessing the learning outcomes but not if we are assessing the Kent Core. She also asked whether the state of Ohio would complicate things further.

Chair Grimm said that the complexity of this is such that it is happening in stages and moving forward in stages. She said that the URCC wants to know that senate accepts moving forward with this general approach. There are, however, specifics and details they cannot resolve without extensive input from faculty, so once this would move forward, they would be coming back. Either next year or the year after, the URCC would be back to get our vote on additional clarification of what is happening. She agreed with Senators Kracht and Mocioalca that more detail would be desirable, but she maintained that more detail is not possible at this point because they need to move forward from this stage to another stage. For a change in the wording, she suggested “the URCC proposes the adoption for assessment for core learning outcomes that demonstrates growth in student learning.”

Senator Kracht said that she would prefer that language.

Chair Grimm asked whether anyone wanted to propose that change as an amendment.

Senator Kracht proposed the change.

Chair Grimm asked whether senate was ready to vote on the proposal to change item A.

Senator Smith asked whether we were deleting the entire second sentence that had a capital “C” in “Core” and the reference to two different periods of time.

Chair Grimm said that she got rid of all of the second sentence and made the rest one sentence.

Senator White pointed out that the second sentence had begun with the word core, so it had to be capitalized.

Chair Grimm thanked Senator White and asked for other questions or comments.

Dean Mistur said that some of the confusion is that items A and D were referring to Kent Core learning outcomes, and B and C were referring to Kent State University learning outcomes, and there is a distinction. He said that if we stayed with Kent State University learning outcomes, then they can be realized across all credits and not just in the core.
Chair Grimm agreed and asked what he was proposing as specific changes.

Interim Provost Tankersley added that what we are doing is assessing the core learning outcomes. The Kent Core is one aspect of the core learning outcomes of a Kent State degree because at the end, we are talking about the Kent Core, which is different from what she believes we are charged to assess, which is the core learning outcomes, which means your entire experience at Kent State, of which the Kent Core makes up 30 percent or 33 percent.

Senator Kaplan asked whether item D also needed to be changed in order to make that idea clear and suggested that there was a need for another amendment.

Senator Smith suggested a change to the wording in item D in order to make it align with the changes to item A. The suggested change was “URCC proposes the establishment of a faculty-led assessment of core learning outcomes to review assessment data.”

Chair Grimm and Senator Kaplan agreed with Senator Smith’s suggestion and asked Dean Smith whether this was consistent with the needs of the URCC in moving forward with HLC recommendations.

Dean Smith said that Kent calls the general education program the Kent Core, but what HLC was concerned about was the assessment of the general education program at Kent, so we should not get too bogged down in capital “C” versus small “c.”

Senator Smith said she had no solutions but wanted to articulate the problem. If the HLC wanted an assessment of our general education program, then we have Senator Kracht’s problem, and Senator Smith did not see how to resolve that. If they wanted an assessment of general core learning outcomes, some of which come from the general education classes and some of which come from major classes, then what we propose fixes that. To Senator Smith, the latter did not sound like it meets what HLC wants.

Chair Grimm asked Senator Smith whether she was referring to the problem that you cannot tease apart the general education courses and the major.

Senator Smith agreed.

Dean Smith suggested that the probable solution is that if we go with the proposed changes, then we are able to meet within the larger view of the Kent Core with the small c. In a larger view, we get to meet particular items that are of interest to HLC. She said she wanted to make clear that this all started over general education.

Chair Grimm said that what HLC was looking for is assessment of our general Education program.
Dean Smith replied that Chair Grimm was correct and that this is what the HLC’s charge to Kent State was.

Senator White explained that this would all be less confusing if we did not use the word “core” to describe the Kent Core and instead referred to it as “liberal education requirements.”

Senator Piccirillo-Smith said that everyone who hears “Kent Core” believes it is the core itself, not the core with a small c. She maintained that the language matters, and she was not sure if we could move forward. She suggested a need for a fix to the language so that people will know exactly what is being discussed.

Chair Grimm asked whether there were other questions or comments or whether it was even possible to proceed to a vote.

Senator Smith said that we could vote on A through D as amended by herself and Senator Kracht earlier, and it could work. She cautiously moved going forward.

Senator Kooijman seconded the motion.

Chair Grimm said the question was called and asked for a vote. The four items passed unanimously.

B. From the October 21, 2019 EPC Meeting:

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COUNCIL

1. Information Item: College of Arts and Sciences: Inactivation of the Integrated Life Sciences [ILS] major within the Bachelor of Science [BS] degree. Admission to the program was suspended fall 2019 (19 November 2018 agenda), although the last cohort was admitted in 2016. There are nine active students enrolled in the program, with expected graduation dates of Fall 2019, and Spring or Summer 2020. All ILS courses (seven) are being inactivated with the program. Effective Fall 2020.

   There were no comments or questions on this item.

2. Action Item: College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Geography: Establishment of an Environmental Studies [ENVS] minor to be offered at the Kent Campus and Stark Campus. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 18. Effective Fall 2020.

   Associate Dean Haley presented the item for Dean Blank. She then suggested that Senator Kaplan could introduce the topic and receive questions.

   Senator Kaplan gave a history of the environmental studies major and explained that there had been many requests for a minor now that many people were enrolled in the major. He invited questions or comments.
Senator Guercio said she heard the minor would be approved at the Kent and Stark campuses and wanted to be sure those were the only places.

Senator Kaplan said that she was correct.

There were no further comments or questions.

The proposal passed unanimously.

GRADUATE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COUNCIL

3. **Action Item:** College of Architecture and Environmental Design: Establishment of a Construction Management [COMA] major within the Master of Science [MS] degree, to be offered at the Kent Campus. Two courses (CMGT 62080, CMGT 65099) are established for the program. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 35. Effective Fall 2020 pending final approvals.

Senator Adamtey presented the motion. He said that the proposal reflects a transfer and renaming of an existing course. Currently the master’s program has been offered as a specialization (Master of Technology) in the College of Aeronautics and Engineering, so the goal was to move it to the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. The reason is because we have a Bachelor of Science in Construction Management in the College of Architecture, so moving it there is appropriate. The industry is looking for construction managers who are able to collaborate with architecture and other professionals, and this will offer us that experience. The College of Architecture and Environmental Design also has all the facilities to run this program effectively. They are proposing to change the name from the Master of Technology to Master of Science for similar reasons. If you look at Construction Management, it is a technical field that involves knowledge of estimating, surveying, and a lot of other technological competence, so the Master of Science is an appropriate designation rather than the Master of Technology. None of the construction management courses that have been accredited by ACCE (American Council for Construction Education) contribute to a degree called Master of Technology. All of them are Master of Science degrees, so it just makes sense to change the name. The changes will help align Kent’s program with industry standards and benefit students working in the field.

Senator Mangrum made two corrections for the record. He said that Construction Management is not a specialization under the Master of Technology, and there is a thesis available under the Master of Technology. He said that the College of Aeronautics and Engineering will not oppose the proposal.

There were no other questions.

The item passed unanimously.

4. **Action Item:** College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Geography: Revision of degree name for the Geography [GEOG] major within the Master of Arts [MA]
degree. Revised degree is Master of Science [MS]. Admission, course and graduation requirements are unchanged. Effective Fall 2020 pending final approvals.

Chair Grimm briefly described the proposal and there were no comments or questions.

The item passed unanimously.

8. Old Business

There was no old business.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Announcements / Statements for the Record

The Faculty Senate Fall Retreat will take place on November 22, 2019, from 12-2 at Laziza in downtown Kent. President Todd Diacon will be our special guest for the event.

VP Rathje explained the Blackboard outage on October 25th. This was a technical issue with the system that hosts the Blackboard application, not with Blackboard itself. The company running the system said that the system was in a self-healing mode and restoring data and letting things wait would work best. It was brought back online, but he apologized for not providing the level of service that people depend on. By 2020, we will have a full solution to the problem.

Senator Wilson asked whether data would be recoverable if Blackboard was pirated or afflicted with ransomware.

VP Rathje replied that disasters can come forward in many ways, but that ransomware might still be a problem; it is real, sophisticated, and something that Kent is addressing currently.

Assistant Dean Jewel on behalf of Dean Pringle announced that this week is “I Am First” week. Events will occur all week long and are co-sponsored by many departments. He offered t-shirts to anyone wanting to stop by the CUE. www.ken.edu/i-m-first.

Chair Grimm mentioned that cultural capital is different for first generation students, and we should be aware of that.

Senator Bagheri asked whether these events were at regional campuses.

Assistant Dean Jewell said that regionals should have been informed.

There were no further comments.
11. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate

Attachments (2)
Addendum to the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of October 14, 2019,
as proposed by Dean Alison Smith and Assistant Provost Susan Perry

1.) On page 3, in 7(a) at the end of the paragraph, the line reading “, and the HLC, that paired
assessments be part of the Core assessment process;” should be replaced with “; the expectations
from HLC are that our processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good
practice.”

2.) At the bottom of page 3, the sentence that reads “The report was submitted to the HLC in Spring
2019 and approved by them as a first step toward changes that may occur in the core” should be
replaced with “The URCC report was submitted to HLC as part of our 2019 Assurance Argument and
the peer reviewers acknowledged our use of data to inform these decisions and our commitment to
improving the Core.”

3.) At the bottom of page 3, the sentence that reads “General Education is also strongly structured
by the HLC—the accreditation body for many universities in the northern Midwest” should be
replaced with “Core component 3B describes HLC’s expectations regarding general education.
Institutions are free to arrive at these learning outcomes through a variety of approaches,
depending on which structure best aligns with the institution's mission and goals.”

4.) At the top of page 4, the term “HLC structure requirements” should be changed to “the HLC
expectations mentioned above.”

5.) At the top of page 4, the name “office of accreditation and assessment” should be replaced with
“office of Accreditation, Assessment and Learning (AAL).”
Chair’s Remarks for November 4, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

After I finished my comprehensive exams in 1990, I took a break to visit my friend Jagdish in Nepal. One day, we took a trip on the high road to China and went to a small village near Dhulikhel. We were just wandering around, checking out the scenery. We sat down on some rocks, and while I was admiring a baby goat, some young children came up and asked Jagdish if they could touch my hair and skin. Of course! Wow. I was the first white person they had seen and they wanted to know if my hair and skin felt the same. I was the “other” in the group.

I had a very different experience being the “other” about 4 years before that one. I’ve talked before about working at Ujima Theater. Ujima is a theater company with a mission to provide a platform for productions that speak to audiences of color and provide opportunities for artists of color. The quality of their productions was such that they appealed to a broad audience and anyone working in theater at that time was likely to end up either in or attending Ujima productions.

My other “other” experience came during the first season in our new space, TheaterLoft. I was ushering that night. I sat on the stairs and was counting stubs. As I was sitting there, a patron came up the steps. He paused and said “what are you doing here? You don’t belong here.”

It was not an especially traumatic experience for me because I knew that I did belong there. But it was troubling. It was also a good lesson. I like to think it helped me to know at least a little bit of what it’s like to be the unwelcomed minority in the room.

One of the things I love about Kent State is its priorities, especially our top priority – Students First. That priority is: “To provide an inclusive and engaged living-learning environment where all students thrive and graduate as informed citizens committed to a life of impact.” That priority is consistent with many of our core values, including “A living-learning environment that creates a genuine sense of place,” “Diversity of culture, beliefs, identity and thought,” and “Respect, kindness and purpose in all we do.”

Earlier this semester some students were telling me about an entertainment and event venue I’d never heard of. I wanted to understand the business model and asked if the venue had a liquor license. The answer was “no.” I asked who the current customer base is and I found out it was a lot of Kent State students. This confused me because, once they turn 21, Kent State students seem to like to go to venues that have the ability to serve alcohol. I asked if the venue was specifically targeting an under 21 group or families with young children and the answer was “no.”

I had looked at the social media for the venue and I noticed a lot of the photos featured people of color. A little light bulb finally went off. I followed up with the students and asked “does the venue cater specifically to people of color?” The answer was “yes.” And do the college age students go there because they feel it’s a safe place?” Again, the answer was “yes.” It suddenly became pretty clear. I probed a little more for specifics: Do they feel unsafe in downtown Kent? “yes, but also in their own apartments when they’re having parties. Why are there six police cars parked outside someone’s house when they’re having a party when there’s one police car parked outside a fraternity houses when they’re having a party?” Of course, it was understood that the someone was a someone of color.
After this revelation, I started talking to other faculty. Some had similar disquieting stories students had shared with them. These were stories of students feeling unsafe on campus and in classrooms. The anecdotal evidence I’m relaying here is confirmed in the results of the climate study.

I had no idea that some of our students don’t feel safe at Kent, downtown, in their own apartments or sometimes in the classroom. I don’t think I’m naive, but I didn’t see that coming. There is a gap between our stated values and beliefs and the reality at least some of our students (and faculty and staff) are experiencing.

The good news is that the Office of the Provost has been collecting and analyzing data and is making efforts to understand and address inequities on campus. The individual experiences of our students, faculty and staff are important and need to be explored. Problems need to be addressed.

But the role of the Faculty Senate in addressing inequities is pretty unique. I wanted to bring this idea to you because of the personal leadership each of you provides by virtue of your election as a Senator, but also because the Faculty Senate plays a pivotal role in the structures and processes that influence the day to day lives of our students.

Recent scholarship in higher education has been exploring ways in which structures and processes that are historical or traditional parts of higher education may inadvertently be contributing to systems that perpetuate inequities within our broader society, rather than reducing or eliminating those inequities. Individuals experience discrimination at a personal level, but we need to consider higher education at a systems level and try to grasp both the intended and unintended impact those systems have on our students.

President Diacon has recently initiated an effort to educate the cabinet on this issue, especially trying to understand the potential for systemic practices to act as barriers to equity in education. I’m grateful to him for also including me in this initiative.

I’m at a public university because I believe in the fundamental mission of public universities to make education accessible for all and facilitate the creation of a more just and equitable society. I’m guessing that many of you are at Kent State for the same reason. I hope that we can all think about the actions we take with this additional perspective, a perspective that includes a filter, like a polarized lens, to help clarify the impact our choices may have on our students. And yes, the irony of using a polarized lens to try to describe an orientation that should lead to less polarization in our Kent State University microcosm, and our society as a whole, hasn’t escaped me. I welcome any thoughts or suggestions on how the Faculty Senate might contribute to creating an environment and constructing a system that more closely matches our stated priorities and values. Are there any questions or comments?

Thank you.
Pamela E. Grimm
Chair, Faculty Senate
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Description of proposal:
This proposal seeks to revise the Catalog Rights and Exclusions policy as published in the University Catalog and the Administrative Policy and Procedure Regarding Academic Requirements, Course Specifications and Course Offerings as published in the Policy Register (3342-3-01.1). The revisions update language, clarify practice, allow for consistent application and bring consistency with other policies and procedures.
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Proposal Summary
Revision of Administrative Policy 3.01.1 in the Policy Register and Catalog Rights and Exclusions Policy in the University Catalog

Subject Specification
This proposal seeks to revise the Administrative Policy and Procedure Regarding Academic Requirements, Course Specifications and Course Offerings (3342-3-01.1) as published in the Policy Register and the Catalog Rights and Exclusions policy as published in the University Catalog. The revisions update language, clarify current procedures and practice, allow for consistent application and bring consistency with other policies and procedures.

Background Information
The Office of the University Registrar and the Office of Curriculum Services have been reviewing academic policies in the Policy Register to confirm they reflect current practices and procedures, while also comparing them to same policies in the University Catalog to ensure the policies do not contradict each other. In addition, since the timeline to approve policies in the Policy Register is longer with more steps than the timeline for the University Catalog, the two offices are attempting to revise academic policies in the Policy Register to be more overarching, making them less likely to be outdated and inaccurate in the future, with the University Catalog containing all the required procedural details necessary to implement and administer the policy.

Rationale for Action
The following is a summary of the changes to the Administrative Policy in the Policy Register:

- Renamed policy—from Administrative Policy and Procedure Regarding Academic Requirements, Course Specifications and Course Offerings—to Administrative Policy Regarding Academic Requirements, Courses and Policies. This simpler name reflects the policy no longer contains procedures and now includes information on policies.
- Removed introduction language, which is duplicated in other sections of the policy.
- Clarified further the meaning of a catalog year and how a catalog year is assigned to a student.
- Added the limitation that students cannot revert to an older year after updating their catalog year.
- Removed information on university orientation, which is outdated and refers to only one requirement for undergraduate students. A more updated policy exists in the Catalog.
- Removed details regarding students updating their catalog year. These procedural details are better defined in the University Catalog.
- Added a statement of the university’s rights to cancel courses and change the time, location or delivery of a scheduled course.
- Added a statement that academic policies not covered in the Policy Register are defined in the University Catalog per a recommendation from the Office of Legal Counsel.
The following is a summary of the changes to the Catalog Rights and Exclusion Policy in the University Catalog:

- Clarified further how a catalog year is assigned to a student, and the meaning of a catalog year.
- Added the limitation that students cannot revert to an older year after updating their catalog year.
- Replaced the term “in force” with “in effect” when referring to the current catalog. “In force” is not generally understood, and a review of other universities showed that most use the term “in effect.”
- Added a disclaimer that if changes to courses substantially disadvantage an enrolled student, the college may approve appropriate substitutions or waivers. This disclaimer is in the Administrative Policy.
- Added a statement of the university’s rights to cancel courses and change the time, location or delivery of a scheduled course.

Alternatives and Consequences

The alternative to this proposal is to take no action and keep policies with outdated language and not aligned with current practices and procedures.

Specific Recommendation and Justification

The recommendation is to revise the Administrative Policy and Procedure Regarding Academic Requirements, Course Specifications and Course Offerings (pages 2-5) and the Catalog Rights and Exclusions policy (pages 6-8) to update language, clarify practice, allow for consistent application and create consistency with other policies and procedures.

Timetable and Actions Required

Undergraduate Deans Council (approval) .......................8 October 2019  
Educational Policies Council (approval) .......................18 November 2019  
Faculty Senate (approval) ........................................9 December 2019  
Board of Trustees (notification) .................................4 March 2020  
Implementation in University Catalog .......................Fall 2020  
Implementation in Policy Register .........................20 August 2020 (fall 2020)
3-01.1 Administrative Policy – Mark-Up of Revisions

3-01.1 Administrative Policy and Procedure Regarding Academic Requirements, Courses and Policies, Course Specifications, and Course Offerings

(A) Policy. The university reserves the right to change academic requirements, course specifications, the time of meetings of a class, and to drop or add any course from the “Schedule of Classes.” These actions are normally taken when changes in certification or licensure standards mandate changes in academic requirements or in university programs, or when there is insufficient student demand or resources are unavailable; nevertheless, such changes should not be to the substantial disadvantage of a student during his/her continuous enrollment.

(B) Academic requirements.

(1) The student’s academic requirements for graduation are based on the university catalog year that is in force during the student’s first term of enrollment in a degree or certificate program at Kent State University. The student’s catalog year identifies the university catalog that contains the requirements for the student’s academic program.

(2) Students are permitted to complete an academic program (major, minor, certificate) under a more recent catalog year. When changing catalog year, students must comply with all of the requirements relevant to their program in the newer university catalog. After a catalog year is updated, students are not permitted to revert to an older catalog year.

(3) The university reserves the right to change academic requirements to keep programs in compliance with accreditation, certification, licensure or industry standards. Implementation of these changes may require that students update to a more recent catalog year.

(4) The university reserves the right to change academic requirements due to financial urgency, unavailability of faculty or unavailability of other instructional resources. In these instances, the dean of the students’ college will identify available alternatives for currently enrolled students to complete their declared programs(s) for the completion of program requirements.

(1) University orientation. Undergraduate students are required to complete the university orientation course. Adult students (twenty-one years or older at the time of admission) and transfer students entering with more than twenty-four semester hours (excluding post-secondary and dual-enrollment credit) are exempted from the requirement. Full-time students are expected to complete the university orientation course during their first full semester of enrollment. Part-time students are expected to complete the course before they attain sophomore standing. In addition to the course, all new undergraduate students are required to attend the university orientation program, which occurs just prior to the first week of class fall semester.

(2) Catalog in force.

(a) Student’s academic requirements are based on the catalog that is in force during the student’s first semester of enrollment in a degree or certificate program at Kent State University.

(b) Students may elect to complete an academic program (major, minor, certificate) under a more recent catalog. When changing catalog year, students must comply with all of the requirements relevant to their program in the newer catalog.

(c) Students may declare a different catalog for a minor, certificate or second major/degree; however, students must comply with all of the requirements relevant to the additional program in the different catalog.

(d) Catalog rights may be granted through inter-institutional curricular agreements. Such rights are subject to the same exclusions noted in this rule.

(e) Regardless of their first term of enrollment, students are governed generally by the university academic, administrative and operational policies in the catalog currently in force.
3-01.1 Administrative Policy – Mark-Up of Revisions continued

(f) Students who transfer to another university and return to Kent state university are readmitted under the catalog in force at the time of readmission.

(g) Dismissed students are readmitted under the catalog in force at the time of reinstatement.

(h) Undergraduate students who interrupt their enrollment at the university for one full academic year or longer, consecutively, including summer, are updated to the catalog in force at the time of their most recent reenrollment. Transient work and alternative credit do not qualify as enrollment at Kent state university.

(i) Kent state will not permit reentry into programs that are no longer offered at the time of the students’ most recent readmission, reinstatement or reenrollment.

(j) Undergraduate students who are enrolled continuously in a degree or certificate program in a catalog older than six years may be required to update to a more recent catalog.

(k) Changes in degree requirements will be made to keep programs in compliance with accreditation, certification, or licensure or industry standards. Implementation of these standards may require that students update to a more recent catalog.

(l) Program changes may be required by financial urgency, unavailability of faculty or unavailability of other instructional resources. In these instances, the dean of the students’ college will identify available alternatives for the completion of program requirements.

(B)(C) Courses. Course specifications. Course specifications such as title, credit hours, prerequisites, status (e.g., Kent core), etc., are based on the term for which the student registered for the course. If the course is revised after the student completed it, the student does not gain or lose anything with that revision. In the event that a change in prerequisite, for instance, would substantially disadvantage a continuously enrolled student by unreasonably adding one or more courses to that student’s degree requirements as specified in paragraph (B)(2) of this rule, dean’s offices may authorize course substitutions, waiver(s), or some other appropriate alternative.

(1) Course specifications such as title, credit hours, prerequisites, status (e.g., Kent core), etc., are based on the term for which the student registered for the course. If a course is revised after the student completed it, the student does not gain or lose anything with that revision. If a course is revised before a continuously enrolled student has attempted the course—a prerequisite for example—in the event that a change in prerequisite, for instance, would and the revision substantially disadvantages the a continuously enrolled student in completing the student’s declared program by unreasonably adding one or more courses to that student’s degree requirements as specified in paragraph (B)(2) of this rule, the college administering the student’s program dean’s offices may authorize a course substitution(s), waiver(s) or some other appropriate alternative.

(2) The university reserves the right to change course specifications; cancel a scheduled course; and change the time, location or delivery of class meetings for a scheduled course the time of meetings of a class, and to drop or add any course from the “Schedule of Classes.” If a course is canceled, every attempt will be made to contact the registered students. Students registered in canceled courses will be given the opportunity to change to another course with seats available.

(C) Policies.

(1) Academic policies not covered in the Kent state university policy register are defined by the university catalog.

(2) Students are governed generally by the university academic, administrative and operational policies in the university catalog in effect for the current academic year, currently in force, regardless of students’ their first term of enrollment.
3-01.1 Administrative Policy – Clean Version of Revisions

3-01.1 Administrative Policy Regarding Academic Requirements, Courses and Policies

(A) Academic requirements.

(1) The student’s academic requirements for graduation are based on the university catalog year that is assigned initially to the student’s first term of enrollment in a degree or certificate program at Kent State University. The student’s catalog year identifies the university catalog that contains the requirements for the student’s academic program.

(2) Students are permitted to complete an academic program (major, minor, certificate) under a more recent catalog year. When changing catalog year, students must comply with all the requirements relevant to their program in the newer university catalog. After a catalog year is updated, students are not permitted to revert to an older catalog year.

(3) The university reserves the right to change academic requirements to keep programs in compliance with accreditation, certification, licensure or industry standards. Implementation of these changes may require that students update to a more recent catalog year.

(4) The university reserves the right to change academic requirements due to financial urgency, unavailability of faculty or unavailability of other instructional resources. In these instances, the students’ college will identify available alternatives for currently enrolled students to complete their declared programs(s).

(B) Courses.

(1) Course specifications such as title, credit hours, prerequisites, status (e.g., Kent core), etc., are based on the term for which the student registered for the course. If a course is revised after the student completed it, the student does not gain or lose anything with that revision. If a course is revised before a continuously enrolled student has attempted the course—a prerequisite for example—and the revision substantially disadvantages the student in completing the student’s declared academic program, the college administering the student’s program may authorize a course substitution, waiver or some other appropriate alternative.

(2) The university reserves the right to change course specifications; cancel a scheduled course; and change the time, location or delivery of class meetings for a scheduled course. If a course is canceled, every attempt will be made to contact the registered students. Students registered in canceled courses will be given the opportunity to change to another course with seats available.

(C) Policies.

(1) Academic policies not covered in the Kent State University policy register are defined by the university catalog.

(2) Students are governed by the academic policies in the university catalog in effect for the current academic year, regardless of students’ first term of enrollment.
Catalog Rights and Exclusions – Mark-Up of Revisions

The university has established the following Catalog rights and exclusions relating to requirements for students in an academic program (major, minor, certificate). While these Catalog rights establish specific academic program requirements for students, the exclusions noted ensure that the knowledge and skills acquired by students will be current with the state of knowledge in their fields of study.

Rights

1. The student’s academic requirements for graduation are based on the Catalog year that is in force during their assigned initially to the student’s first fall, spring or summer term of enrollment in a degree or certificate program at Kent state university. The Catalog year identifies the University Catalog that contains the requirements for the student’s academic program.

2. Students are permitted to complete an academic program (major, minor, certificate) under a more recent Catalog year. When changing Catalog year, students must comply with all of the requirements relevant to their program in the newer Catalog year. After a Catalog year is updated, students are not permitted to revert to an older catalog year.

3. Students may declare a different Catalog year for a minor, certificate or second major/degree. However, students must comply with all of the requirements relevant to the additional program in the different Catalog year.

4. Catalog rights may be granted through inter-institutional curricular mutual agreements with other institutions. Such rights are subject to the same exclusions noted below.

Exclusions

1. Regardless of their first term of enrollment, students are governed generally by the university academic, administrative and operational policies in the Catalog currently in force, in effect for the current academic year, regardless of students’ first term of enrollment.

2. Students who transfer to another university and return to Kent State are readmitted under the Catalog-in-force in effect for the term at the time of readmission.

3. Dismissed students are reinstated under the Catalog in effect for the term in-force at the time of reinstatement.

4. Undergraduate students who interrupt their enrollment at the university for one full academic year or longer, consecutively, including summer, are updated to the Catalog in effect for the term-in-force effective at the time of their most recent reenrollment. Transient work and alternative credit do not qualify as enrollment at Kent State University.

5. Kent State will not permit admission or reentry into programs that are no longer offered at the time of the students’ most recent readmission, reinstatement or reenrollment.

6. Undergraduate students who are enrolled continuously in a degree or certificate program in a catalog older than six years may be required to update to a more recent Catalog year.

7. The university reserves the right to change academic requirements. Changes in degree requirements will be made to keep programs in compliance with accreditation, certification, licensure or industry standards. In these situations, the college administering the program Implementation of these standards may require that students update students to a more recent Catalog year.

8. The university reserves the right to change academic requirements due to Program changes may be required by financial urgency, unavailability of faculty or unavailability of other instructional resources. In these instances, the dean of the students’ college will identify available alternatives for currently enrolled students to complete their declared programs(s) the completion of program requirements.
Catalog Rights and Exclusions – Mark-Up of Revisions

9. Course specifications such as title, credit hours, prerequisites, status (e.g., Kent Core), etc., are based on the term for which the student registered for the course. If the course is revised after the student completed it, the student does not gain or lose anything with that revision. In the event that a change in prerequisite, for example, would substantially disadvantage a continuously enrolled student by unreasonably adding one or more courses to that student’s academic requirements, the college administering the student’s program may authorize course substitutions, waiver(s) or some other appropriate alternative.

10. The university reserves the right to change course specifications; cancel a scheduled course; and change the time, location or delivery of class meetings for a scheduled course. If a course is canceled, every attempt will be made to contact the registered students. Students registered in canceled courses will be given the opportunity to change to another course with seats available.
Catalog Rights and Exclusions – Clean Version of Revisions

Rights

1. The student’s academic requirements for graduation are based on the Catalog year that is assigned initially to the student’s first term of enrollment in a degree or certificate program at Kent State University. The Catalog year identifies the University Catalog that contains the requirements for the student’s academic program.

2. Students are permitted to complete an academic program (major, minor, certificate) under a more recent Catalog year. When changing Catalog year, students must comply with all the requirements relevant to their program in the newer Catalog year. After a Catalog year is updated, students are not permitted to revert to an older catalog year.

3. Students may declare a different Catalog year for a minor, certificate or second major/degree. However, students must comply with all the requirements relevant to the additional program in the different Catalog year.

4. Catalog rights may be granted through mutual agreements with other institutions. Such rights are subject to the same exclusions noted below.

Exclusions

1. Students are governed by the academic policies in the Catalog in effect for the current academic year, regardless of students’ first term of enrollment.

2. Students who transfer to another university and return to Kent State are readmitted under the Catalog in effect for the term of readmission.

3. Dismissed students are reinstated under the Catalog in effect for the term of reinstatement.

4. Undergraduate students who interrupt their enrollment at the university for one full academic year or longer, consecutively, including summer, are updated to the Catalog in effect for the term of their most recent reenrollment. Transient work and alternative credit do not qualify as enrollment at Kent State University.

5. Kent State will not permit admission or reentry into programs that are no longer offered.

6. Undergraduate students who are enrolled continuously in a degree or certificate program in a catalog older than six years may be required to update to a more recent Catalog year.

7. The university reserves the right to change academic requirements to keep programs in compliance with accreditation, certification, licensure or industry standards. In these situations, the college administering the program may update students to a more recent Catalog year.

8. The university reserves the right to change academic requirements due to financial urgency, unavailability of faculty or unavailability of other instructional resources. In these instances, the students’ college will identify available alternatives for currently enrolled students to complete their declared program(s).

9. Course specifications such as title, credit hours, prerequisites, status (e.g., Kent Core), etc., are based on the term for which the student registered for the course. If the course is revised after the student completed it, the student does not gain or lose anything with that revision. In the event that a change in prerequisite, for example, would substantially disadvantage a continuously enrolled student by unreasonably adding one or more courses to that student’s academic requirements, the college administering the student’s program may authorize course substitutions, waiver(s) or some other appropriate alternative.

10. The university reserves the right to change course specifications; cancel a scheduled course; and change the time, location or delivery of class meetings for a scheduled course. If a course is canceled, every attempt will be made to contact the registered students. Students registered in canceled courses will be given the opportunity to change to another course with seats available.
3342-10-02 University Policy Regarding Research Compliance

(A) Policy statement. The university, in the course of carrying out its teaching, research, and service missions, engages in research involving human subjects, vertebrate animals, and recombinant or synthetic nucleic acid molecules and bio-hazardous materials, agents, and toxins. To protect the rights, dignity and welfare of all human subjects participating in research conducted on behalf of Kent state, the university shall establish and maintain a human subjects protection program. To ensure that vertebrate animals used in research, testing and teaching at Kent state are treated humanely, the university shall establish and maintain an animal care and use program. To ensure that research and teaching involving recombinant DNA and bio-hazardous materials at Kent state are conducted using established safety standards, the university shall establish and maintain an institutional biosafety committee.

3342-10-02.3 Administrative policy regarding Institutional Biosafety Committee

(A) Purpose. Institutions that receive support from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for recombinant or synthetic nucleic research are required to establish and register an institutional biosafety committee (IBC) with the NIH Office of Biotechnology activities in compliance with the NIH guidelines.

(B) The vice president for research and sponsored programs is responsible for establishing an IBC, including appointment of IBC members, in accordance with NIH guidelines.

(C) The IBC activities, scope of review and operating procedures shall be governed by a charter developed by the IBC in accordance with NIH guidelines and approved by the vice president for research and sponsored programs.

3342-10.2.4 Administrative policy regarding Institutional Safety and Compliance Committee
(A) **Purpose.** In furtherance of ensuring a coordinated approach to research safety for researchers, students and participants, the vice president for research and sponsored programs shall establish an Institutional Safety and Compliance Committee (ISACC) to review, recommend and coordinate university-wide research safety procedures.

(B) The ISACC will include the following university representatives: (i) director, research compliance (ii) chair(s), institutional review board; (iii) chair, institutional animal care and use committee; (iv) chair, institutional biosafety committee; (v) director, environmental health and safety; and (vi) such other university personnel deemed necessary by the vice president for research and sponsored programs.

(C) The ISACC activities, scope of review and operating procedures shall be governed by a charter developed by the ISACC in accordance with university policy and approved by the vice president for research and sponsored programs.
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
October 7, 2019

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Molly Wang (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: Tracy Laux (At-Large), Denice Sheehan (Appointed)

Guests: President Todd Diacon, Interim Provost Melody Tankersley, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz (Director, Center for Teaching and Learning)

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:26 p.m. in the Urban Conference Room on the second floor of the library.

2. Review Topics for the President and the Interim Provost

   a. RA Food Plan
   b. Religious Holidays

3. Approval of Minutes: Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of September 19, 2019

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes (Vande Zande/Wang). The minutes were approved unanimously.

4. (3:30) Meet with President Diacon and Interim Provost Tankersley

Chair Grimm asked about alterations to the RA food plan. RA’s hours have been reduced from 28 to 20, which they agreed to in order to have international RAs. There was also a reduction in the food allowance for RAs because of this, and a faculty senator had expressed concern over this. USG and Kent Student Council are also asking about the meal plan reduction for RAs. Interim Provost Tankersley suggested that Interim Vice President for Student Affairs Hylton and Jill Jenkins (Executive Director, Residence Services) could be invited to address the issue with the Executive Committee. There is also a concern with some RAs having roommates (but not all) and the confidentiality issues that could be a problem because of this.
The Executive Committee also discussed a concern from a faculty senator over how religious holidays are explained and how procedures for working with those holidays are communicated to faculty and students. Interim Provost Tankersley pointed to Administrative Policy 3-01.2 that asks students to notify instructors as soon as possible about holidays and asks faculty to respond reasonably and appropriately with accommodations. There was also some discussion of how to have faculty discuss this with students. The Executive Committee agreed with the president and interim provost that for now, faculty should follow the university policy with their best discretion.

5. Fall Retreat Update

The retreat will take place on Friday, November 22, from 12:00-2:00 p.m. The location will be scheduled soon.

6. (4:30) Meet with Jennifer Marcinkiewicz about Great Place Initiative

Director Marcinkiewicz discussed the possibility of an ombuds position with the Executive Committee. There was also a discussion of adjunct faculty and the work that the Great Place Initiative is doing with regard to helping them. Director Marcinkiewicz said that the Faculty Subcommittee of the Great Place Initiative (GPI) had met and that the ombuds position was one of two priorities for the year. The chairs of the GPI as a whole had supported that the work still go forward even with the hiring freeze. The group had a consensus that there should be some research done before proposing the position, and contacting senate would also be a good idea for gathering more information. Some GPI members want a faculty/staff ombuds; others want the positions to be separate. No one was in favor of having one person cover all three (faculty/staff/students). There was also talk of holding focus groups across the university to see what concerns the faculty and staff may have. At the next GPI meeting, a former ombuds will address the committee, and there will be an effort to write up what the role of an ombuds at the university would be. The ombuds should both be able to point people to appropriate resources but also be able to mediate in situations to prevent problems from leading to grievances. Vice Chair Vande Zande suggested that in the short term (due to the hiring freeze) there could be a conflict resolution team from the faculty (volunteers) that could get mediation training and serve a similar function before formal grievances took place. This team could work with faculty to help avoid complaints to the Faculty Senate Ethics Committee or other sorts of formal complaints. Director Marcinkiewicz said that an ombuds would be an informal process, no records would be kept, and nothing would be discussed over e-mail which are advantages, but that the committee idea is something we will discuss at GPI. Vice Chair Vande Zande will attend the next meeting to help discuss it. GPI will also look into whether other universities have such a position. With regard to adjunct faculty, the Executive Committee also discussed their representation on Senate as observers and how we might look into that. A Center for Teaching and Learning project to help address adjunct faculty needs was also discussed.
7. Salary Redistribution

This will be postponed until the next meeting.

8. Paint and Carpet for the Office

Budgeting for possible replacement of the carpet in the Faculty Senate office was discussed.

9. Additional Items

a. Commission for Charter & Bylaws Provision

Secretary Dauterich will lead the commission. Chair Grimm will locate another person who is willing to serve. Secretary Dauterich will also look for two more people who would be willing to serve. Therese Tillett will be asked to work with the EPC portions of the changes to the bylaws.

10. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Minutes of the Meeting

October 24, 2019

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Molly Wang (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Guests: Dr. Deric Kenne, Interim Associate Provost Manfred van Dulmen

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Vande Zande called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room in 227 Michael Schwartz Center.

2. Approval of Minutes:

   a. Executive Committee meeting minutes of October 7, 2019

      A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting (Laux/Wang). The minutes were approved with two abstentions (Sheehan/Laux).

   b. Faculty Senate meeting minutes of October 14, 2019

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

3. EPC Items from the October 21, 2019 EPC Meeting

   Three items from the EPC meeting will be brought to the full Faculty Senate for approval (#2 from the undergraduate action items and #1 and 2 from the graduate action items. #1 from the undergraduate action items was moved and seconded for a vote (Wang/Laux). The item was passed unanimously.

4. Finalize Agenda for the November 4, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

   The agenda was finalized.
5. (3:00) Meeting with Dr. Deric Kenne

The Executive Committee met with Dr. Kenne to discuss Kognito (an on-line training initiative to address mental health issues) ([https://www.kent.edu/mhsu/kognito-facultystaff](https://www.kent.edu/mhsu/kognito-facultystaff)). Dr. Kenne presented handouts [attached] that explained the scope of mental health problems nationwide for college students, ways to address the issue, the available training from faculty and staff at Kent State University, and how the Kognito program has been used nationwide and in Ohio. He also mentioned the Hear to Help (H2H) initiative that works to create a network to improve student mental health in conjunction with those who have received Kognito training. There was also an explanation of the prevalence of mental health problems across campus, including depression, anxiety, eating disorders, suicidality and self-injurious behaviors. Kent has received federal grants which have helped fund the Kognito program, and all faculty and staff are encouraged to participate in the 40-minute training. Kognito is a role-playing training rather than a static PowerPoint, and it places those taking it into the role of a professor who works through three different mental health scenarios with students. There was also a discussion of mental health services that are available to students at the university.

6. (3:30) Meeting with Interim Associate Provost Manfred van Dulmen

The Executive Committee met with Interim Associate Provost van Dulmen to discuss the committee to assess the structure of graduate and professional education. He also briefly updated the Executive Committee about understaffing at UHS; they are developing short-term strategies with community partners to provide more resources for students in crisis. A resource document will be coming out shortly that will allow students to have access to needed assistance. The university is also working on a broader strategy to improve how we respond to mental health issues. More information will be forthcoming.

With regard to the assessment committee, Interim Associate Provost van Dulmen explained that we currently do not have a college or school of graduate studies at Kent State, and we may benefit from a more solid academic structure. Graduate student concerns and attrition have raised a concern, and at least indirectly, the lack of a structured graduate school may be a good idea. It is more difficult to promote programming and increase the size of programs themselves without one. The graduate studies program could also use a marketing person, but there is no one person doing this for the university as a whole; it is left to the departments to do this on their own. There is also no grievance policy for graduate students as a whole (as opposed to being dealt with by the department alone), and that needs to be worked with. Interim Associate Provost van Dulmen said that the university might create a group to assess the structure of graduate education to help identify where problems and solutions lie. He had consulted Chair Grimm about this, and between them, they examined possibilities for how this could work and also looked into what could be reconfigured in the existing structure and what other services could be offered or made more efficient. New administrative positions would not need to be added. Possibilities include a committee of administrators, an ad hoc committee of administrators and faculty, or a graduate council composed of...
administrators, faculty, and students to examine the situation. The Executive Committee agreed that it is important to explore this and that an ad hoc committee should be formed that includes administration, faculty, and students, which would be important for achieving the desired goals of filling gaps in what is offered to graduate students and in using what is available to help design a new structure or redesign existing structures for graduate education.

7. Identify Two Faculty to Serve on the Microcredentialing Vision Committee

Possible candidates were identified.

8. Call for Nominations for Promotion and Tenure Advisory Boards

Senator Laux will work on finding possible nominees from senate to serve on the boards to bring back to the Executive Committee for submission for PAB. Vice Chair Vande Zande will do this for TAB.

9. Replacement on the Advisory Committee for Academic Assessment

Mary Hricko was nominated.

10. Part-Time Communications

Tabled until the next meeting.

11. Fall Retreat Update – November 22, 2019, 12-2:00 p.m. at Laziza. There is no specific title or topic for the retreat, but President Diacon will be the guest speaker.

12. Additional Items

a. Items for the next meeting with the President and Interim Provost

There is a need for consultation before appointing interim administrators. There are also some questions about Human Resources that will be asked.

b. Planning for future P&P meetings

Support for faculty providing online education was discussed, as well as
issues with intellectual property in online courses and the pressure that the financial situation of the university places on the delivery of online instruction, often without input from the faculty.

13. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
November 8, 2019

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: Molly Wang (Appointed)

Guests: President Todd Diacon, Interim Provost Melody Tankersley

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 10:39 a.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room in 227 Michael Schwartz Center.

2. Review Topics for the President and the Interim Provost

Topics were chosen for the discussion.

3. Approval of the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of October 24, 2019

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting (Laux/Vande Zande). The minutes were approved.

4. (11:00) Meet with President Diacon and Interim Provost Tankersley

The Executive Committee had a discussion with the president and interim provost about reconsidering the role of Faculty Marshals at Kent State. There was also a discussion about the possibility of expanding the available times for Monday/Wednesday classes; Mary Parker (Vice President for Enrollment Management) and Interim Provost Tankersley will investigate this. The Executive Committee also talked with the president and interim provost about the economic relationship between the Kent campus and the regional campuses and the hiring practices at the university as a whole. Topics for future meetings were also suggested.
5. From Previous Executive Committee Meeting for Confirmation:
   a. Two Faculty to Serve on the Microcredentialing Vision Committee
      i) Blake Stringer has agreed to serve on the committee.
      ii) Other candidates were suggested and will be contacted.
   b. Nominations for Promotion and Tenure Advisory Boards
      Nominees were selected, and their names were forwarded to Faculty Affairs.
   c. Replacement on the Advisory Committee for Academic Assessment
      A nominee was selected.
   d. Nominees were also chosen for a graduate advisory committee being organized by Interim Associate Provost Manfred van Dulmen.

6. University Policy 3342-10-02 University Policy Regarding Research Compliance Changes and University Policy 3342-10-02.3 Administrative Policy Regarding Institutional Biosafety Committee
   A motion was made to approve changes to the policy (Vande Zande/Dauterich). The motion passed.

7. Adjunct Communications
   There have been issues among adjunct faculty who have reported that SSIs have been used to determine hiring/termination. There has also been some interest in developing a stronger relationship between adjuncts and Faculty Senate. Secretary Dauterich moved that given the large number of adjunct faculty teaching at Kent State University, and given that about 1/3 of our courses are taught by adjunct faculty, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee moves that the Faculty Senate a) establish an Adjunct Faculty Senate Observer position and b) conduct the nomination and election process for the Adjunct Faculty Observer position. Senator Laux seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously. There will be a need to change the charter and bylaws to make this happen.

8. Fall Retreat Update – November 22, 2019 at Laziza, 195 E. Erie Street
9. Additional Items

   a. Paint and Carpet for the Office
      Improvements will be made.

   b. Spending on Thank You from Senate for Schedulers in SSI Transition
      A small gift will be provided for the schedulers.

10. Adjournment

    The committee adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate