Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the December 10th Faculty Senate meeting. As always, we will meet in the Governance Chambers at 3:20 p.m. Refreshments will be provided.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Approval of the November 5, 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
5. Chair’s Remarks
6. Provost’s Remarks - defer to Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning) to introduce:
   a. Creating a Climate of Caring in Concepts (presented by Mary Beth Rollick, Mathematical Science)
   b. Strategies for Student Success in Intuitive Calculus (presented by Tuyet Pham, Mathematical Science)
7. Report: Design Innovation Initiative (presented by J.R. Campbell - Executive Director, Design Innovation Initiative)
8. EPC Action Items:
   a. College of Aeronautics and Engineering: Establishment of an Aviation Management and Logistics major within the Master of Science degree to be offered online-only in an accelerated delivery (18 months including summers). Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 33. Effective Fall 2019 pending state and accreditor approvals.
   b. Regional College: Revision of the name of the Regional College to the College of Applied and Technical Studies. Effective Fall 2019 (1 July 2019).
9. Old Business

10. New Business: Research Misconduct Policy (presented by Deborah Smith, Professional Standards Committee)

11. Announcements / Statements for the Record

12. Adjournment
FACULTY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
November 5, 2018

Senators Present: Simon Adamtay, Patti Baller, Kathy Bergh, Rachael Blasiman, Sheryl Chatfield, Jeffrey Child, Michael Chunn, Jeffrey Ciesla, Ed Dauterich, Tameka Ellington, Jean Engohang-Ndong, Christopher Fenk, Farid Fouad, Lee Fox, Pamela Grimm, Todd Hawley, Robert Kairis, David Kaplan, Edgar Kooijman, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Tracy Laux, Mahli Mechenbier, Oana Mocioalca, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Carol Robinson, Mary Beth Rollick, Susan Roxburgh, James Seelye, Denice Sheehan, Deborah Smith, Brett Tippey, Robin Vande Zande, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Molly Wang, Donald White, Kathryn Wilson, Melissa Zullo

Senators Not Present: Ann Abraham, Sue Clement, Alice Colwell, Jennifer Cunningham, Vanessa Earp, Richard Mangrum, Kimberly Peer, Rocco Petrozzi, Blake Stringer, Robert Twieg

Ex-Officio Members Present: President Beverly Warren; Executive Vice President and Provost Todd Diacon; Senior Vice Presidents: Karen Clarke, Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Alfreda Brown, Shay Little, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Nathan Ritchey, Stephen Sokany, Jack Witt, Douglas Delahanty for Paul DiCorleto; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Blank, Christina Bloebaum, Allan Boike, Barbara Broome, James Hannon, Eboni Pringle, Alison Smith, Deborah Spake, Melody Tankersley, Kara Robinson for Ken Burhanna, Cynthia Stillings for John Crawford-Spinelli, Bill Willoughby for Mark Mistur, Miriam Matteson for Amy Reynolds

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Vice President Willis Walker

Observers Present: Thomas Janson (Emeritus Professor), Mark Rhodes (GSS)

Observers Not Present: Thomas Watral (USS)

Guests Present: Julie Aune, Sue Averill, Megan Dawson, Larry Froehlich, Mary Ann Haley, Lynette Johnson, Tess Kail, Karen Keenan, Valerie Kelly, David Ochmann, Susan Perry, Jim Raber, Gail Rebeta, Ruth Washington

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 (Rollick/Smith). Chair Grimm then called for a vote and the agenda was approved unanimously.
4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of October 8, 2018

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 8 Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Adamtey/Kracht). The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

5. Chair’s Remarks

Chair Grimm delivered her remarks. [attached]

Chair Grimm asked for questions and comments. There were no questions or comments.

6. President’s Remarks

President Warren thanked the chair and began by referencing her upcoming retirement. She was touched by the support, encouragement, and levity of the faculty. She stated that she was honored to serve, and she thanked the senate for the opportunity. While pointing out that we have not agreed on everything, the value of trust and shared governance have been elevated since she began at Kent State. She appreciates all the candid discussions which have made us a unique community that shares ideas while challenging one another to find the best solutions. On Wednesday, she will deliver the state of the university address, and she hopes that senators will be able to join and celebrate the accomplishments. She brought up the Kent Core and explained that now is a great time to approach that challenge; she expressed confidence that the faculty will do it well. She remarked that she is committed to collective action and knows faculty are as well. Presidents come and go, but she hopes we better value the potential and strength of a one university system that has no regional or branch campuses—those are dated terms. We must also own our May 4th legacy and speak through the wound to enlighten others about civil discourse. Over the next 8 months, there is much to accomplish, but she invites us all to join together to work on a few things: (1) Phase One projects in the Gateway Plan—a new airport academic center, getting rid of dated trailers; (2) the completion of the final stages of the Design Innovation Initiative by 2020; (3) 8 million dollars in research lab improvements to complete the Integrated Sciences building; and (4) the College of Business Administration is relocating, but it will take all of us working together to transform our learning environments. This will take a great effort, but Vice President Sokany will help the faculty to raise the funds the students and the university deserve. We have 50 microprograms designed to raise funds on Giving Tuesday. President Warren challenged the Kent State community to raise more than the 1 million dollars raised last year. She encouraged all of us to vote for the new governor and general assembly. The university will be advocating for the state operating budget for the next two years during the Spring semester. Kent State hired our first Vice President for Enrollment Management. Information Technology services have improved with Vice President Rathje in the lead; the search engine for Kent’s website will be improved. She has seen the beta test, and it will work. We must work hard to implement RCM 2.0 if we are to move forward. RCM is not going away; it is being redefined, so the budget will make sense. We are also working toward the 50th commemoration of May 4th, and she looks forward to having the university lead through ways we have never led to commemorate and share with the world what we have to say about peaceful resolution of conflict. She looks forward to working with us. She invited comments and questions.

Senator Vande Zande told President Warren we wish she could stay and thanked her.
President Warren thanked her for her remark.

There were no further comments or questions.

7. **Report: Learning Management System** *(Presented by James A. Raber, Executive Director for Information Services and Valerie L. Kelly, Interim Associate VP of Continuing & Distance Education)*

Executive Director Raber and Associate Vice President Kelly spoke about the process for finding a new learning management system (LMS). We have had Blackboard Learn for quite some time and extended the contract with them a few times. Due to regulations, a new RFP is required. The spending for the system has been around a million dollars, so due to regulations, an RFP is necessary, but also technology has changed, so it is time to make sure we have the right tool. The committee making the decision about the LMS was chosen by reaching out to as many colleges and campuses as possible. It is a subcommittee of the University Council on Technology (UCT). They also reached out to deans for suggestions about committee membership. All people asked to join the committee accepted, and the committee is enthusiastic. No meetings have been held yet, but they will look at gaps and successes in current implementation. One thing to consider is that there are over 1000 instructors using the LMS, and 47% are not full-time faculty; the adjunct faculty and full-time faculty need to be reached in order to get their input. Faculty and student surveys will be sent out as well, and they will hold listening events where many colleagues across the spectrum will be approached. To evaluate the LMS, they will work with UCT, and once there are RFP finalists, there will be road shows, webinars, and conversations with stakeholders. There will also be a website with updates about what is occurring. All recommendations will be aggregated before being presented to the university community. After the LMS is chosen, testing and rollout will take place over 12-18 months, and resources and training for faculty will be provided. Accessibility will also be addressed before and after the LMS is chosen. Testing will occur with feedback during the pilot. There is a tentative timeline: (1) define the makeup of the committee (done); (2) engage procurement and establish process requirements and dates (mid-November); (3) define requirements (end of December); (4) publish the RFP (January); (5) review responses and determine finalists (end of February); (6) proof of concept for finalists (end of Spring semester); and (7) award the contract and begin implementation (Spring 2019-Spring 2020).

The speakers then invited questions and comments.

Senator Tippey commented that the composition of the committee lacked members from the creative professions. In CAED there was reluctance to go on Blackboard because it does not work well in a visual field. He encouraged that a committee member be chosen from a creative field.

Associate Vice President Kelly replied that they will take it under consideration and do focus groups with members of those fields.

Miriam Matteson (representing Vice President Reynolds) asked whether open source platforms can participate in the bid.

Executive Director Raber said that they would be allowed to participate.
There were no further questions or comments.

8. **Old Business: Revised AY 16/17 Faculty Senate Status Report**

A revised status report was presented. In the previous report, there was a gap in item 33, which was a resolution that had been passed by the Faculty Senate requesting that the transparency of FlashFolio be made to mirror that of FolioWeb as closely as possible. Senate had not heard back from the administration on that at the time, but when they did, it was explained that our current vendor is not able to provide that level of transparency. We are already in the RFP process for a new system, and Chair Grimm made it clear that faculty would like to have a more transparent process and that this desire should be reflected in the RFP.

Chair Grimm asked whether there were any other items of old business to be discussed.

Emeritus Professor Janson asked whether the name of the Faculty Institute for Student Success (FISS) had been renamed, given the previous concerns about what constitutes an institute at Kent State.

Dean Pringle responded that the name has been changed to the Faculty Academy for Student Success (FASS).

There were no further items of old business.

9. **New Business: AY 17/18 Faculty Senate Status Report**

The status report was presented.

Chair Grimm called for questions or comments. There were no questions or comments.

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

Chair Grimm called for announcements or statements for the record.

Senator Kooijman said that two concerns needed to be raised. He requested that Faculty Senate hold a formal poll with respect to the openness of the RTP process. He knows that there is conflict among faculty about who can access documents in the process, and a poll of senate would help.

Senator Smith replied that one of the ideas would be to allow people to volunteer to make their own files open; it would be built into the system to allow it to happen. If we had a new system that could do this, it would be good. Ideally, the university will look into it in the RFP.

Senator Kooijman than asked Vice President Polatajko about international wire transfers. Kent State faculty lead study abroad programs and do international work. The senator and others have had issues with sending money internationally, and it came to the point that while they were in Africa, money asked for a month in advance had not yet been sent. A process needs to be designed to make this more efficient. One problem is that domestic tax documents are being sent.
to international partners who do not understand them. Also, e-mails are not always received properly by partners.

Chair Grimm asked for clarification about which tax documents caused concern.

Senator Kooijman replied that it was the W-8.

Vice President Polatajko said it is in our best interest to have efficient processes, and he will reach out to Senator Kooijman for more consultation.

There were no further questions or comments.

11. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate

attachment
Chair’s Remarks for November 5, 2018 Senate Meeting

A lot has changed since our last meeting!

But I’m going to talk about Kindergarten. Still my favorite grade. At least so far.

I went to a Catholic all-day kindergarten. It was in a huge old house on Main Street in Buffalo. I don’t remember much from kindergarten. But I do remember the naps we used to take after lunch. Each kid had their own rug. I still remember the blue color of my rug.

I’m sure I learned a lot in kindergarten, but there’s only one thing I specifically remember having learned there. It was a prayer that Sister Agnes Marie taught us. She taught us this prayer specifically for those times when we heard sirens. That was often because my kindergarten was across the street from a hospital. I’m not one for much in the way of traditional praying, but I still use this one. The prayer is: Dear God, help those who are in trouble. Amen. That’s it. That’s all there is.

I’m not sure when the full import of this simple prayer really hit me. Maybe when I was a tween or a teen. I’m not sure. But there came a time when I realized the real beauty of this prayer is its suitability for all occasions and all people. It works for the police and firemen who face danger, it works for the sick people being transported in ambulances. But it also worked for the criminals who are being pursued or who have been caught by police. It’s an equal opportunity prayer. It demonstrates respect and speaks to the value of all people. All in seven words. Not bad.

As we look around us, there seems to be a lot of hostility and disrespect happening out there. I say “out there” because I think that Kent State University has actually managed to go in a different direction. There was a time in the not-distant past that bad behavior was tolerated at Kent State. If you’ve been on Senate long enough you may remember that truly stunning moment when we members of the faculty senate were told that one of our VPs was not guilty of harassment based on gender, because he harassed all his staff equally and so was an equal opportunity harasser. And apparently that was OK.

In a conversation this past week, several of us were reflecting on some of the toxic aspects of our culture under a previous administration. In the course of that conversation, my colleague Tracy Laux observed that perhaps Bev Warren’s most impressive achievement is the change she has made in the culture of Kent State University. I agree, and I believe that cultural change is attributable to her own demonstration of respect and value for all the members of our Kent State University community.

The Board of Trustees and the search committee they assemble will soon begin the work required to identify a new president. I don’t think I’m going out on a limb when I say we would like our next president to embody the same cultural values that have become so well established in such a short time under President Warren’s leadership. I would also like to suggest that the process by which Kent State University identifies a new president is an opportunity for the people who construct that process to respect the role of the Kent State community in that search. That respect has not been universally accorded in all searches. It certainly wasn’t in our last presidential search. Again, if you’ve been on faculty senate long enough you may remember President Warren having to field fairly hostile questions at the very beginning of her tenure at Kent State University regarding that search process. Yet, transparency in process and input at the final stage is clearly still the norm in State schools in Ohio and around the country. So, while Cleveland State chose not to make public a list of finalists in their search process conducted in late 2017-early 2018, Ohio University made its list of four finalists publicly available toward the end of its search process in January 2017. With Sunshine laws in force in Ohio, it is only through what I consider unethical, though not illegal means that release of finalist names can be blocked. I don’t know how else you can characterize actions that violate the spirit but not the letter of the law.
It is my hope that this time, the process we engage in to identify a new president will include the opportunity for our community to meet with finalists prior to a new president being identified. I would like to see the culture of respect and value that has been a cornerstone of President Warren’s leadership carried forward as part of the bridge that helps us transition to our new leadership next year.

The search for a new president has obvious ramification for the long-term well-being of KSU. However, Kent State goes on while we are engaged in the search process and it is not the only matter that has a strong impact on us. I would like to thank those of you who attended the Faculty Senate Retreat on October 26 “A Liberal Arts Education and the Kent Core.” There is no question that the Core, and our purposeful consideration of the core and what we want it to do for our students, is an important matter. Tracy Laux, our At-Large Executive Committee member who organized the retreat will report more fully on thoughts shared by faculty at the retreat during our December meeting.

In the meantime, I’d also like to let you know that URCC will be conducting a survey to assess faculty views on the core. That should be in your mailboxes soon. I ask that you please take the time to respond to it and encourage your colleagues to do so as well. The Core is something that touches every single student a Kent and understanding how faculty think about it is important.

There is a final point that may seem minor but which, if successful, will mark the beginning of a new way of handling Faculty Senate elections. Two KSU voting units will be electing new Joint Appeals Board members. We will conduct this election electronically. Emails will be sent to all eligible voters in each unit with information on the charge of Joint Appeals Board and a link to the ballot. Further, each eligible voter will receive a confirmation email when their vote is registered and will also receive two reminder emails if they haven’t voted. The two voting units are Unit 2 - College of Business Administration and Unit 6 – the Colleges of Nursing, Aeronautics & Engineering, Public Health, and University Libraries. The emails will be coming from noreply@kent.edu with a subject line of Joint Appeals Board (JAB) election. I’m asking that those of you in the units that will be voting encourage your colleagues to participate in the election. I also ask that representatives from these units please let us know if you hear any reports of problems accessing the ballots or voting. The Executive Committee will review the process after the elections are completed to determine whether electronic voting can be used for the Faculty Senate Representative elections in the spring.

In keeping with past practice, I will be limiting the number of EPC items presented at any given Faculty Senate meeting to five. If you have items you’d like to complete this academic year, please don’t wait until the last moment to submit them.

Finally, I’d like to congratulate US for our hire of Mary Parker for the inaugural VP of Enrollment Management. As you know, I have concerns regarding the cost of this hire, but feel it’s necessary and believe that, with transparency in our budgeting, we’ll be able to see if the goal of funding this position almost entirely with existing money is achieved.

Are there any questions or comments?

Pamela E. Grimm
Chair, Faculty Senate
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date 13-Nov-17    Curriculum Bulletin _________
Effective Date Fall 201X    Approved by EPC _________

2019 pending final approvals

Department AERN
College AR - Aeronautics and Engineering
Degree MS - Master of Science
Program Name Aviation Logistics and Management

Concentration(s) None    Concentration(s) Banner Code(s)
Proposal Establish program

Description of proposal:
Establish an Aeronautics specific Logistics and Management MS to support the growing need for logistics in NE Ohio and nationally.

Does proposed revision change program’s total credit hours? □ Yes □ No
Current total credit hours: 33    Proposed total credit hours

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and staffing considerations; need; audience; prerequisites; teacher education licensure):
The program combines Aeronautics unique management education with existing MIS courses through the COB. There are no duplication conflicts. Staffing will include the eventual need for faculty as enrollment grows and some online education support. This will be provided by a vendor or internally. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects a 7% growth in logistics through 2025 and most of that growth is due to transportation of goods and people. The audience is working aeronautics professionals wishing to advance their career and current undergraduate AERN students. Prerequisites are standard as set by Graduate Studies. Faculty experience will be graduate faculty qualified AERN faculty and some industry professional adjuncts; initially until faculty hiring.

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):
College of Business, MIS, Dr. Pratim Datta, consulted for inclusion of some MIS courses in the program.

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

Department Chair / School Director

Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

College Dean (or designee)

Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

11/14/17

11/14/2017

11/14/17
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date
Effective Date Fall 2019
Curriculum Bulletin
Approved by EPC

Department
College RE - Regional College
Proposal Revise Academic Unit
Proposal Name College name change

Description of proposal:
The Regional College administration is proposing the name of the college be changed to the College of Applied and Technical Studies

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and staffing considerations; need, audience)
This change will have no financial or staffing effects to the college but better represents the college, it’s faculty, programs, and students.

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):
Regional College CAC, other academic college Deans, EPC, Faculty Senate, Board of Trustees

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

Department Chair / School Director

Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

College Dean (or designee) 10/26/18

Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (or designee)
Proposal Summary to Establish or Revise an Academic Administrative Structure

Change the name of the Regional College to the College of Applied and Technical Studies

The following is from 3343-2-03 University Policy Regarding the Establishment or Revision of Academic Administrative Structures.

1. The quality of the faculty, students and programs.
   The Regional College has a long history of maintaining high quality faculty and programs, preparing students to be successful in their chosen fields. This will not change with a new name.

2. Centrality and coherence to the mission and strategic directions of the university and other academic units.
   The name change will not disrupt our commitment to the mission and/or strategic directions of the university or any other academic units.

3. Comparative advantage versus other structures.
   The current structure (described below) is the most efficient. It will continue to function as a college without departments, but the name change will better represent the college, its faculty, programs, and students.

4. What makes the unit particularly appropriate for Kent State University?
   The name change will better represent the body that oversees and administers the Associate degrees and the Bachelor degrees granted by Kent State, offered on all campuses. Currently Regional College programs such as MAGC (CDAG), Computer Forensics minor, and the Police Academy certificate are offered on the Kent Campus, along with the Regional Campuses and we anticipate additional Kent Campus offerings in the future.

5. Demand for the unit and for the graduates of the unit.
   Current demand will continue or increase due to this proposal. It may provide the Regional College programs with more visibility and assist in recruiting students. According to the Fifteenth Day Enrollment Statistics 8 – Campus System Report from Institutional Research, the Regional College preponderant enrollment is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>6191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>6026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>5945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>5756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Institutional Research, the Fifteenth Day Enrollment Statistics 8 – Campus System Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics and Engineering</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll of Arch and Env Design</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll of Ed Health Human Svcs</td>
<td>5,868</td>
<td>5,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>8,554</td>
<td>8,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Admin</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>3,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Comm and Info</td>
<td>3,559</td>
<td>3,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Podiatric Medicine</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Public Health</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Arts</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional College</td>
<td>6,026</td>
<td>6,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall - Total</td>
<td>39,367</td>
<td>38,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This name change will better describe the college, its faculty, programs, and students. The Regional College is the second largest college at Kent State University with over 6,000 students. Historically, there has been and continues to be confusion between the Regional Campuses and the Regional College. The Regional Campuses have faculty and students from various Colleges, including the Regional College, but many from Arts & Sciences, Business Administration, Education, Health and Human Services, etc. The Regional College has faculty, students, programs that are independent from the other colleges. The new name will help differentiate the “College” from the “Campuses”. The Regional College faculty are teaching in and students are majoring in programs that are either “Applied” programs or “Technical” programs. The name Applied and Technical Studies broadly describes who we are.

6. Duplication and interrelatedness of the unit’s program(s) within the university, state, and region

There are no new programs in this proposal, no duplication, or interrelatedness issues.

7. Efficiency and effectiveness of the unit in leveraging existing resources and expanding new resources.

The Regional College will continue to work closely with the various campus administrations to maximize efficiency and effectiveness, this proposal will not alter that long standing relationship with the campuses. The Vice President for Kent State System Integration will also be the Dean
of the College of Applied and Technical Studies, therefore reducing the cost of a separate college Dean.

8. Administrative reporting structure.

The college would continue to have 3 divisions, which house the various academic programs and faculty. Each program has a Program Lead Faculty or Program Coordinator or Program Director, depending on the size of the program, accreditation requirements, etc. Programs have curriculum committees, usually composed of all program faculty. Program/curriculum changes are approved by the program, reviewed by the appropriate campus or campuses Faculty Council, the Regional College Curriculum Committee, then EPC and Faculty Senate. Budgets are the responsibility of the individual campuses, not programs. Currently, the approval of adjunct faculty starts with the program’s recommendation to the Regional College Interim Dean for final approval. This would not need to change other than the final approval would be by the Dean of the College of Applied and Technical Studies. Faculty search committees include both program faculty as well as regional campus faculty, final decision is currently made by the Interim Regional College Dean in collaboration with the appropriate Regional Campus Dean or Deans. The Vice President for Kent State System Integration will serve as the Dean of the College of Applied and Technical Studies. Since this is one of the largest colleges at Kent State University, and continues to increase in enrollment, the college will be best served by having as a full-time Assistant Dean.

9. Space and capital budget needs.

The Regional College programs will continue to utilize space on all Kent State University campuses, no new space is needed at this time, due to this proposal.

10. A proposed operating budget with any one-time resource needs.

At this time the operating budget remains the same, there will be no change due to this proposal. As the second largest college at Kent State University there may be the need in the near future for additional administrative support.

11. Evaluation procedures including academic assessment procedures.

The use of Regional College Program Reviews, accreditation affiliations, TaskStream, etc. will continue to assure the quality of the academic programs.


Regional College CAC, EPC, Faculty Senate approvals Fall 2018, Board of Trustees, Spring 2019, change effective July 1, 2019
Academic Programs and Courses Offered by the Regional College

PROGRAMS BY LEVEL

Bachelor's Degree Majors

- Agribusiness - BS
- Engineering Technology - BS
- Horticulture - BAH
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Insurance Studies - BS
- Modeling, Animation and Game Design - BS
- Radiologic and Imaging Science - BRIT
- Respiratory Care - BS
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS

Associate Degree Majors

- Accounting Technology - AAB
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Business Management Technology - AAB
- Computer Design, Animation and Game Design - AAS
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS
- Early Childhood Education Technology - AAS
- Electrical/Electronic Engineering Technology - AAS
- Engineering of Information Technology - AAS
- Enology - AAS
- Environment Management - ATS
- Environmental Health and Safety - AAS
- Horticulture Technology - AAS
- Human Services - AAS
- Individualized Program - ATS
- Information Technology - AAB
- Legal Assisting - AAS
- Mechanical Engineering Technology - AAS
- Nursing ADN - AAS
- Occupational Therapy Assistant Technology - AAS
- Office Technology - AAB
- Physical Therapist Assistant Technology - AAS
- Radiologic Technology - AAS
- Radiologic Technology - ATS
- Respiratory Therapy Technology - AAS
- Veterinary Technology - AAS
- Viticulture - AAS

Minors

- Computer Forensics and Security
- Game Design
- Help Desk Support
- Insurance Studies
- Modeling and Animation
- Software Development

Undergraduate Certificates

- Business Management Technology
- CAD for Manufacturing
- Computer Forensics and Information Security
- Computer-Aided Drafting/Design Technician
- eBusiness
- Entrepreneurship
- Floriculture
- Greenhouse Production
- Hospitality Management
- Medical Billing
- Office Software Application
- Peace Officers Training Academy

Courses

- Accounting Technology (ACTT)
- Agribusiness (AGRI)
- Allied Health Sciences (AHS)
- Aviation Maintenance Tech (AMRT)
- Business Management and Related Technologies (BMRT)
- Early Childhood Education Technology (ECET)
- Electrical Engineering and Related Technologies (EERT)
- Engineering Technology (ENGT)
- Enology (ENOL)
- Environmental Health and Safety (EVHS)
- Green and Alternate Energy (GAE)
- Horticulture (HORT)
- Human Services (HSRV)
- Information Technology (IT)
- Insurance Studies (INS)
- Mechanical Engineering and Related Technologies (MERT)
- Modeling, Animation and Game Creation (MAGC)
- Nursing Technology (NRST)
- Occupation Therapy Assistant Technology (OCAT)
- Office Technology (OTEC)
- Peace Officers Training Academy (POTA)
- Physical Therapist Assistant Technology (PTST)
- Radiologic and Imaging Sciences (RIS)
- Radiologic Technology (RADT)
- Regional College (RC)
- Respiratory Care (RSPC)
- Respiratory Therapy Technology (RTT)
- Technical and Applied Studies (TAS)
- Veterinary Technology (VTEC)
- Viticulture and Enology (VIN)

* Pending approval for fall 2019
Academic Programs Offered by the Regional College

PROGRAMS BY DELIVERY/LOCATION

**Fully Online**
- Accounting Technology - AAB
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Environment Management - ATS
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Information Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Insurance Studies - BS
- Insurance Studies - minor
- Office Technology - AAB
- Medical Billing - certificate
- Respiratory Care - BS
- Software Development - minor
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS

**East Liverpool Campus**
- Accounting Technology - AAB
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Business Management Technology - AAB
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Individualized Program - ATS
- Information Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Nursing ADN - AAS
- Occupational Therapy Assistant Technology - AAS
- Physical Therapist Assistant Technology - AAS
- Software Development - minor
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS

**Ashtabula Campus**
- Accounting Technology - AAB
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Business Management Technology - AAB
- Business Management Technology - certificate
- Computer Forensics and Information Security - certificate
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Computer-Aided Drafting/Design Technician - certificate
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Enology - AAS
- Entrepreneurship - certificate
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Hospitality Management - certificate
- Human Services - AAS
- Individualized Program - ATS
- Information Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Nursing ADN - AAS
- Occupational Therapy Assistant Technology - AAS
- Office Software Application - certificate
- Office Technology - AAB
- Physical Therapist Assistant Technology - AAS
- Radiologic Technology - AAS
- Respiratory Therapy Technology - AAS
- Software Development - minor
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS
- Veterinary Technology - AAS
- Viticulture - AAS

**Geauga Campus**
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Floriculture - certificate
- Greenhouse Production - certificate
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Individualized Program - ATS
- Information Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Nursing ADN - AAS
- Software Development - minor
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS

**Geauga - Twinsburg Location**
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Business Management Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Nursing ADN - AAS

**Kent Campus**
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Game Design - minor
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Modeling, Animation and Game Design - BS *
- Modeling and Animation - minor
- Software Development - minor
- Peace Officers Training Academy - certificate

* Pending approval for fall 2019
Academic Programs Offered by the Regional College

PROGRAMS BY DELIVERY/LOCATION

**Salem Campus**
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Business Management Technology - AAB
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Early Childhood Education Technology - AAS
- Floriculture - certificate
- Greenhouse Production - certificate
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Horticulture - BAH
- Horticulture Technology - AAS
- Human Services - AAS
- Individualized Program - ATS
- Information Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Insurance Studies - BS
- Medical Billing - certificate
- Office Technology - AAB
- Radiologic and Imaging Science - BRIT
- Radiologic Technology - AAS
- Radiologic Technology - ATS
- Software Development - minor
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS

**Stark Campus**
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Modeling, Animation and Game Design - BS *
- Software Development - minor
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS

**Trumbull Campus**
- Accounting Technology - AAB
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Business Management Technology - AAB
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Electrical/Electronic Engineering Technology - AAS
- Environment Management - ATS
- Environmental Health and Safety - AAS
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Individualized Program - ATS
- Information Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Legal Assisting - AAS
- Mechanical Engineering Technology - AAS
- Office Technology - AAB
- Peace Officers Training Academy - certificate
- Software Development - minor
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS
- Veterinary Technology - AAS

**Tuscarawas Campus**
- Accounting Technology - AAB
- Agribusiness - BS
- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science
- Business Management Technology - AAB
- Business Management Technology - certificate
- CAD for Manufacturing - certificate
- Computer Design, Animation and Game Design - AAS
- Computer Forensics and Information Security - certificate
- Computer Forensics and Security - minor
- Criminology and Justice Studies - AAS *
- Early Childhood Education Technology - AAS
- eBusiness - certificate
- Electrical/Electronic Engineering Technology - AAS
- Engineering of Information Technology - AAS
- Engineering Technology - BS
- Game Design - minor
- Help Desk Support - minor
- Individualized Program - ATS
- Information Technology - AAB
- Information Technology - BSIT
- Mechanical Engineering Technology - AAS
- Medical Billing - certificate
- Modeling and Animation - minor
- Modeling, Animation and Game Design - BS *
- Nursing ADN - AAS
- Office Software Application - certificate
- Office Technology - AAB
- Software Development - minor
- Technical and Applied Studies - BTAS
- Veterinary Technology - AAS

* Pending approval for fall 2019
3342-10-07.1 Administrative policy and procedures regarding allegations and instances of misconduct in research and scholarship

(A) Purpose. Recognizing a responsibility for the proper and ethical conduct of research and scholarship by all its personnel, and further recognizing that allegations or instances of conduct inconsistent with accepted standards may occur, the university is committed to providing maximal opportunity for fairness and due process. Toward this end the procedures stated herein shall be applied when misconduct is alleged.

(B) Requirement. As a recipient of federal grants and contracts, particularly from the national science foundation (NSF) and the public health service (PHS), including the national institutes of health, the university is bound by regulations requiring that procedures be established for inquiry into and investigation of alleged or apparent misconduct in scientific activities conducted, funded, or regulated by these agencies. In order to establish a consistent and comprehensive procedure for the university, the procedures set forth below shall apply to all instances of alleged or apparent misconduct in research, scholarly and creative activities regardless of funding or source.

(C) Definitions. The following key definitions apply to the implementation of the requirement in paragraph (B) of this rule.

(1) “Misconduct” means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, conducting, or reviewing research and other forms of scholarship, or in reporting research results.

(a) Any finding of research misconduct shall fulfill three requirements:

(i) There shall be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and

(ii) The misconduct shall be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly, and

(iii) The allegation shall be proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

(2) “Fabrication” means making up data or results and recording them.
(3) “Falsification” means manipulating research materials, equipment, or failure to meet other material legal requirements governing research and scholarship processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

(4) “Plagiarism” means the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, words, or artistic works without giving appropriate credit or the republication of one’s own previously published work without appropriate acknowledgement.

(5) “Inquiry” means preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of misconduct warrants an investigation, or other measure, such as referral to the faculty senate ethics committee when appropriate.

(6) “Investigation” means a formal collection and examination of the relevant factual record to determine whether or not misconduct has occurred. If following an inquiry pursuant to Section (E).3 below, potential misconduct has been discovered, investigations assess its extent and consequences and/or determine appropriate action. An investigation may be conducted simultaneously with an inquiry if circumstances warrant.

(7) “Research Record” means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific or other scholarly inquiry, including but not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles, or other publications.

(D) Confidentiality. Subject to applicable law and administrative rules, disclosure of the identity of respondents and complainants in research misconduct proceedings is limited, to the extent possible, to those who need to know, consistent with a thorough, competent, objective, and fair research misconduct proceeding, and as is allowed by law. Subject to applicable law, confidentiality shall be maintained for any records or evidence from which research subjects might be identified.

(E) Procedures

(1) Accusation. All accusations of misconduct in research or scholarship shall be lodged by the accuser in writing with the
chairperson/director/dean of the respondent's academic unit. All
accusations shall be submitted with supporting evidence.

(2) Notification. Upon reception of a complaint, the
chairperson/director/dean shall immediately notify the vice president for
research and sponsored programs, the appropriate undergraduate and
graduate dean(s), and the provost.

(a) Should a chairperson or director be the respondent, the dean of the
college shall be the first point of contact and shall notify the vice
president of research and sponsored programs, the appropriate
graduate dean, and the provost.

(b) Should an independent school director, collegial dean, regional
campus dean, or dean of university libraries be the respondent, the
first point of contact shall be the vice president for research and
sponsored programs.

(3) Inquiry. The vice president for research and sponsored programs (after
appropriate consultation with the chairperson/director/dean, and the
faculty advisory committee of the respondent's academic unit) shall
select an inquiry committee of no less than three tenured faculty
members who have no direct interest in the case but who are otherwise
closest in specialty to the area of work of the respondent. The inquiry
committee shall be impaneled to identify and review supporting
potential evidence of research misconduct and to determine whether an
investigation is warranted. This process shall be conducted in the
strictest of confidence.

(a) No later than seven (7) business days after being notified of the
complaint, the vice president of research and sponsored programs
shall notify the respondent in writing and provide the respondent
with any materials supportive of the complaint. Any subsequently
identified additional respondents shall also be notified in writing and
provided any materials supportive of the complaint within seven (7)
business days of the identification of such respondents.

(b) The inquiry committee shall promptly undertake all reasonable and
practicable steps to obtain custody of all the research records and
evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding.
inventory the records and evidence, and sequester them in a secure manner.

(c) The inquiry committee shall use the following criteria to determine whether an allegation warrants an investigation:

(i) A reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls under the definition of research misconduct exists; and

(ii) Preliminary information-gathering and fact-finding indicate that the allegation may have substance.

(d) The inquiry committee shall prepare a written report of the inquiry to submit to the relevant granting authority if required by law or regulation.

(e) The inquiry committee shall provide the respondent an opportunity to review and comment on the inquiry report and attach any comments received from the respondent to the report.

(f) The inquiry shall be completed within sixty (60) calendar days of its initiation unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. If the inquiry takes longer than sixty (60) calendar days to complete, then the inquiry report shall contain documentation of the reasons for exceeding this period.

(g) If the inquiry committee decides not to investigate, then the vice president for research and sponsored programs shall preserve sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry proceedings.

(4) Notice. The vice president for research and sponsored programs shall notify the respondent whether the inquiry found that an investigation is warranted no later than seven (7) business days from the completion of the inquiry. The notice shall include a copy of the inquiry report and a copy of university policies regarding research misconduct.

(a) The university shall notify the complainant whether the inquiry committee found that an investigation is warranted no later than seven (7) calendar days from the completion of the inquiry.
(5) Investigation. Should the majority of the inquiry committee agree that research misconduct is clearly plausible, then the provost, in consultation with the vice president for research and sponsored programs and other appropriate members of the university community, shall form an investigation committee from within, and if necessary and/or appropriate, from without the university.

(a) The committee of investigation shall be appointed by the vice president for research and sponsored programs and shall consist of at least five full-time university employees with faculty rank:

(i) one of which shall be the vice president for research and sponsored programs as convener;

(ii) one of which shall be a representative of the undergraduate and graduate dean(s) of the respondent;

(iii) and at least two of which shall be ordinarily chosen from the membership of or upon the recommendation of the university research council.

(iv) Additional members may be appointed to provide scientific, legal, or other scholarly expertise required by the nature of the research or scholarship under investigation.

(6) Duties of the Investigation Committee.

(a) The committee shall begin the investigation within thirty (30) calendar days after the inquiry committee determined that an investigation was warranted.

(b) The investigation committee shall notify the relevant federal authority of the decision to begin the investigation on or before the beginning of the investigation.

(c) The investigation committee shall notify the respondent in writing of the allegations within seven (7) business days after beginning the investigation.

(d) The investigation committee shall make diligent efforts to ensure the thorough and sufficient documentation of all research records and
evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of the allegations.

(e) The investigation committee shall take all reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation.

(f) The investigation committee shall interview the respondent, the complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation. Each interview shall be recorded or transcribed, the record or transcription shall be provided to the interviewee for correction, and the interview shall be included in the record of the investigation.

(g) The investigation committee shall complete all aspects of the investigation within 120 calendar days of beginning it, including conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing a draft report for comment to the respondent, and sending the final report to the relevant federal authority.

(h) If unable to complete the investigation in 120 calendar days, the report shall include an explanation for the extension.

(i) The investigation committee shall provide a written draft of the investigation report to the respondent, who shall be permitted to submit comments within thirty (30) calendar days from its reception.

(j) A final institutional investigation report shall be submitted to the relevant federal authorities and shall:

   (i) Describe the nature of the allegations of research misconduct;

   (ii) Describe and document the type of federal support received including relevant information such as grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing federal support;

   (iii) Describe the specific allegations of research misconduct for consideration in the investigation;

   (iv) Include a copy of the university policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted;
(v) Identify and summarize the research records and evidence reviewed, and identify any evidence taken into custody but not reviewed;

(vi) For each separate allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation, provide a finding as to whether research misconduct did or did not occur, and if so:

(1) Identify whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism, and whether it was intentional, knowing, or in reckless disregard;

(2) Summarize the facts and analyses which support the conclusion and consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent;

(3) Identify the specific federal support received;

(4) Identify whether any publications need correction or retraction;

(5) Identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and

(6) List any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent has pending with other federal agencies;

(vii) Include and consider any comments made by the respondent and the complainant on the draft investigation report;

(viii) Maintain and provide records to the relevant federal agency upon request all relevant research records and records of the institution’s research misconduct proceeding, including results of all interviews and the transcripts or recordings of each interview.

(F) Sanctions. Upon completion of its deliberations and in accord with the sanctions for cause provisions of the appropriate current collective bargaining agreement, the investigating committee may recommend sanctions against the employee(s) found guilty of research misconduct.
(1) A recommendation of sanctions along with the investigation report shall be provided in writing to the provost as well as to the faculty or staff member(s) to whom the recommended sanctions would apply.

(2) Possible sanctions recommended by the investigating committee may include:

(a) A letter of concern;

(b) Censure;

(c) Direct the vice president for research and sponsored programs to:

(i) Terminate a research grant or contract involved in the misconduct;

(ii) Withdraw research grants or contract proposals connected with the research misconduct;

(iii) Suspend academic year or summer research/creative activity appointments to the faculty member;

(iv) Deny, permanently or temporarily, access to research services and facilities of the office of research and graduate studies;

(v) Deny access for the purposes of university approved research to human subjects or laboratory animals;

(vi) Notify appropriate federal, state and local agencies as may be required;

(vii) Notify journal editors, book publishers, etc., as appropriate and necessary.

(d) Direction to the dean of the appropriate graduate school to conduct an immediate review of the faculty member's graduate faculty status;

(e) Direction to the dean of the appropriate collegial/independent school/campus unit to:
(i) Place the employee(s) on appropriate probation;

(ii) Reduce pay and/or benefits;

(iii) Suspend the employee(s);

(iv) Initiate termination of employment.

(3) If adopted, all of these recommended sanctions are to be carried out in accord with the sanctions for cause article of the appropriate current collective bargaining agreement and the appropriate sections of this policy register and the administrative code.

(G) Appeals. Subjects of investigation who are found guilty of research misconduct may appeal the findings of the committee of investigation to the provost within ten business days of receipt of the decision and recommendations of the investigation. Upon completion of the appeal, the vice president of research and graduate studies shall report the final results to any relevant agency and the provost shall take final action in the case, as appropriate.

This policy formerly numbered 3342-3-05.1.
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Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
October 22, 2018

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, Executive Director James Raber, Associate Vice President Valerie Kelly

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. in the Urban Conference Room on the second floor of the Library.

2. Meeting with Executive Director James Raber and Associate Vice President Valerie Kelly to Discuss Learning Management Systems

Executive Director Raber and Associate Vice President Kelly gave background information on our current learning management system (LMS). Since signing the original request for proposal (RFP) for Blackboard Learn, the university has signed a number of waivers to continue using the LMS, but because of procurement rules, state law requires a new RFP. In addition, many changes have come to the LMS market, so it would be worth evaluating whether Kent State is best served by using Blackboard Learn. A committee to select a new LMS has been formed, and it is composed of representatives from different colleges and campuses, with a high number of faculty who use Blackboard regularly. Many members are people in instructional design who work closely with faculty. Associate Vice President Kelly and Executive Director Raber are co-chairs; they are experienced with procurement processes, and they want to make sure key dates for the RFP are collected and functioning requirements are made clear to the committee, and they want to make it work with the infrastructure we have. The choice of the LMS will be guided by the committee as a whole. Training and outreach efforts will be made to try to get any new system established in 18-24 months. The Blackboard contract waiver will need to be changed in the next 18-24 months, and they are hoping to set a 4-5 year goal with an option to renew with the next LMS. The RFP should be published in January of 2019. Responses will be sent in mid-spring. Pilots of the chosen system will take place in the summer. Users can start opting in during the fall. Timelines are tentative and may be pushed back if the committee feels it is necessary. Faculty and students will be surveyed about their experiences with the new system, and results will be presented to and discussed with the University Teaching Council. Goals and standards for pedagogy will
also need to be developed for use with the new system, and plans for course rollovers, new development, training, and maintenance will be addressed as well. Departments and individual faculty will have the opportunity to see what resources and possibilities for change are available. These will not be dictated from above. All of these will be discussed by the committee and in consultation with faculty outside of the committee, and the university will be careful not to let technology dictate pedagogy. If all goes well, a full rollout could happen as soon as 2020.

The Executive Committee invited the speakers to give a brief presentation at the November 5, 2018, Faculty Senate meeting to share the process with all of Faculty Senate and to make it clear that the faculty have a strong role in the process. Chair Grimm suggested that a sheet be provided to senators to allow them (or other possibly interested faculty parties) to volunteer to participate in the process. Associate Vice President Kelly suggested the committee could also provide a public posting of the process.

3. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the September 28, 2018, Executive Committee meeting (Laux/Stringer). The minutes were approved unanimously.

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the October 8, 2018, Faculty Senate meeting (Laux/Vande Zande). The minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Items for Discussion with the President and Provost

Items for discussion with the President and Provost were finalized.

5. Meet with the President and Provost (3:00 p.m.)

Chair Grimm suggested making the academic calendar for the Fall Break more specific in order to make it clear what days were included. The Provost said that this will be corrected for future official calendars. The Executive Committee also requested data supporting the mental health need for the Fall Break, and asked for information to indicate that the break did indeed help with mental health. The Provost suggested that it may be too soon to judge the effectiveness of the break. The Executive Committee also asked whether it is possible to look into unintended absences occurring before and after the break. The Provost suggested that he could poll the faculty to see whether this was more than an anecdotal problem. Immediate Past Chair Smith gave a report on the activities of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC), including making possible revisions to the research misconduct policy, examining distance learning policies, and getting clarity for a policy on instructor credentialing. The Provost mentioned that the audiology/speech partnership with the University of Akron will continue, but joint doctoral degrees with sociology and nursing are being discontinued. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) has approved of this change.
6. Finalize Agenda for November Faculty Senate Meeting

A motion was made to approve the agenda for the November 5, 2018, Faculty Senate meeting (Wang/Vande Zande). The agenda was finalized.

7. JAB Elections

Four candidates were suggested for upcoming Joint Appeals Board (JAB) positions. A motion was made to contact nominees from the College of Business Administration about their willingness to run (Wang/Vande Zande). The motion passed. Unit 6 nominees for JAB were also suggested. A motion was made for Chair Grimm to contact the nominees about their willingness to serve (Dauterich/Wang). The motion passed.

8. TAB and PAB nominations

The Executive Committee will send recommendations for the Tenure Advisory Board (TAB) and the Promotion Advisory Board (PAB) to Vice Chair Vande Zande before November 1, 2018.

9. Additional Items

a. The October EPC meeting was canceled.
b. The Faculty Senate Fall Retreat is expected to have 33 attendees.
c. The 2019 Executive Committee Spring meeting schedule was distributed.
d. Chair Grimm updated the committee on a future online voting system for JAB and other elections.
e. The URCC survey for faculty on revamping the Kent Core was discussed, and recommendations will be sent to the URCC.
f. Chair Grimm spoke about the possibility of reinstating faculty marshals with the purpose of providing a space where people can discuss important topics of the day under faculty guidance while also ensuring that people in the discussion bring facts, evidence, and data.

10. 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 9, 2018

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: J.R. Campbell (Executive Director of Design Innovation Initiative), Swathi Ravichandran (Associate Professor), Marcello Fantoni (Associate Provost), Kara Robinson (Interim Assistant Dean for Engagement & Outreach)

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office in Room 227, Schwartz Center.

2. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the October 22, 2018, Executive Committee meeting (Laux/Vande Zande). The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. 12:00 – Meeting with J.R. Campbell, Executive Director, to Discuss Design Innovation Initiative

Executive Director Campbell presented information on the Design Innovation Initiative to the Executive Committee. The Design Innovation Team began about five years ago. They saw an issue with different departments buying the same equipment across the university, and they also noticed that there was a strong interest in creating venues for students to have better access to current technology and to practice practical problem-solving skill across disciplines. A grant was written that led to the Design Innovation Ecosystem Map. Each dot on the map represents a shared resource facility in the university; faculty and students outside the major have access to the equipment. It was a student-focused initiative that had a lot of buy-in from faculty, and more spaces may be joining the Ecosystem. The group is currently a mix of 25 faculty, staff, and administrators with a goal of thinking systematically of how we support the Ecosystem for students. They have a website (https://www.kent.edu/designinnovation). The Initiative’s vision, mission, values, and upcoming activities, as well as staff can be found there, as can the expanded version of the Initiative’s programs and philosophies.
Chair Grimm asked whether the swipe mechanism to enter the space will be used in the new Dining Services area in the Hub. Executive Director Campbell said that the new meal plan will use the swipe cards but will also provide retail food spaces without swipe access, so flow to the design areas will not be completely inhibited, and there will be plenty of collaborative spaces for students and faculty.

The Executive Committee asked about the roof and how the architects will address it. Campbell responded that the goal is to turn flat roof segments into garden roofs. Clerestory windows and inverted roof segments will be kept intact as much as possible.

The Executive Committee asked how open the space will be. Campbell responded that in the long term, they would like the building to have as much access as possible to the green space surrounding the building.

The Executive Committee invited Executive Director Campbell to speak at the December Faculty Senate meeting, and he agreed to do so.

4. 12:30 — Meeting with Swathi Ravichandran, Associate Professor, and Marcello Fantoni, Associate Provost, to Discuss Internationalization Efforts and the Global Initiative on Campus

Associate Professor Ravichandran and Associate Provost Fantoni discussed internationalization efforts on campus with the Executive Committee. Associate Provost Fantoni explained that the ACE internationalization laboratory began at the request of President Warren. The goal is to find out how the university can enhance its international profile and activities. This will take about 18 months, and we are just finishing the first year. The university has a committee of faculty, staff, and administrators that attend. Internationalization on campus is uneven across the board, and the committee is working to see whether it should become more homogenous. The university will establish pillars of internationalization. They have chosen strategic areas to expand as pillars; education abroad, international recruitment, faculty engagement and training, and branding.

Internationalization has only been measured with enrollment numbers for years, and this is a mistake. We do need the enrollment numbers for revenue, but if we do not integrate and serve international students well, and they do not succeed, we will fail in our educational mission, so internationalization needs to become something engrained in our culture rather than represented as an enrollment tally. We should see the new students as a resource for our own students; they can provide our students with broader knowledge of the world if we encourage that mindset. We need to focus on synergy for our domestic and international cohorts on campus. We also need to rethink study abroad/away programs. They cannot continue to increase by 5% every year. 70% of study abroad students go to Western Europe; this is not broad enough. In addition to Geneva and Florence, we need to provide more diverse opportunities that are academically relevant, rather than just tourist destinations. We need to work with academic units on this; we can work more closely to increase faculty-led programs and to increase our strategic partnerships around the world. We have also greatly increased our number of international scholars, but because they do not always bring revenues, they often go
unnoticed. Overall, there is a comprehensive plan for internationalization that will be clear at the end of the ACE laboratory.

The Executive Committee mentioned that we have a lot of international faculty already on campus and asked what we are doing to support them. Associate Professor Ravichandran said one of our pillars is faculty/international engagement, and a big part of what they look at there is how can we utilize resources that already exist to implement ways for Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) faculty from other universities to come to our campus. Another pillar is partnerships and collaborations; working in this area would also be beneficial. Faculty could help get students recruited through international contacts of their own.

The Executive Committee suggested that we should also quantify the number of contact hours spent between international and domestic students.

Associate Provost Fantoni said that every year we do a survey (International Barometer) that all international students take about their overall experiences at Kent. It shows good results (92% appreciation), but he suspects only the happiest students are filling out the survey. We need more advisors who are experts on visas, and we need more domestic students to serve as ambassadors to help engage international students. Faculty also need to become more involved.

The Executive Committee suggested that getting chairs and directors more involved would help. Associate Professor Ravichandran said that their survey has shown that there are actively engaged people and that many want to learn more, so she agreed that seeking assistance from chairs and directors would be a great place to encourage involvement.

Associate Provost Fantoni also addressed online education. The number of students attending in the US has decreased 41% since 2016. We have gone to offering many sections online, but in some countries, this is next to impossible. We have gone to partners with ad hoc contracts with foreign entities to get specific degrees and certificates from Kent State for their students. Public health and accounting are two places we are currently working on this with in India. Potential for expanding online education abroad is huge. Many international students are taking programs from Kent, but customized programs need to be designed that are in line with their countries’ own regulations. Faculty need to be willing to rework their programs toward this goal. Our market is Africa, South America, and India, but they don’t have money for our fees, so we must restructure that in some way.

Chair Grimm proposed that Faculty Senate should be partners in helping with internationalization efforts since many have experience with study abroad efforts and interests in internationalization on other levels. The speakers welcomed the gesture and said they would like this to continue past the ACE process. The Executive Committee agreed that this is what should be done. We may invite both speakers to talk about internationalization at Faculty Senate in the future.
5. 1:00 – Meeting with Kara Robinson, Interim Assistant Dean for Engagement & Outreach to Discuss Accessibility of Study Carrels for Students

Interim Assistant Dean Robinson spoke with the Executive Committee about study carrels. The masterplan for redesigning the library is being updated to address issues about space for students. Floors 4-11 used to have research carrels on each floor, but over half of them have been lost. Carrels need to be made more available. The old policy for carrels says only doctoral candidates working on dissertations and faculty can get carrels. In recent years, mostly faculty are using the carrels. Graduate students want additional study rooms. All the current study rooms are full or booked constantly. More students also need closed spaces to take exams, and many have sensory issues where they need an isolated environment. There are 46 research carrels left in the tower, and policy about who gets them and what the makeup of the rooms are needs to be changed. The rooms should be made available as individual study rooms open to anyone when not in use rather than dedicated for whole semesters to individual faculty or graduate students. Ultimately, they would like to change the programming for the carrels so that one floor is for faculty only, one for graduate students only, and the other two for anyone; rooms would be reserved in four-hour blocks or some other time frame, rather than for whole semesters. Opaque glass should get replaced with clear glass. The doors on the carrels all have physical locks that they want to remove as well.

The Executive Committee suggested that storage space might be needed in carrels. Interim Assistant Dean Robinson said that the corner carrels could be turned into rooms with lockable shelves for storage. She will continue to research the issue in the Spring Semester, and the first of any possible changes will begin in the Summer Semester.

6. Tentative Agenda for the December Faculty Senate Meeting

Items were proposed for the agenda for the meeting.

7. Discussion of Electronic Voting

Electronic voting options were discussed. Suggestions were made for improvement to the electronic system that has been briefly tested.

8. Discussion of Faculty Marshals

Ideas for the purpose and practices for bringing back the Faculty Marshals program that previously existed was discussed. Further discussion will continue at the next meeting.
9. Discussion of Possible Topics to Discuss with the President and the Provost for the November 26, 2018, Executive Committee Meeting

Topics for discussion with the president and provost were discussed. An open set of finalists for the presidential search will be of particular importance assuming it does not conflict with policy.

10. Additional Items

The Regional College representative for Faculty Senate is Mary Ann Harding.

11. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 2:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate