Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the March 13th Faculty Senate meeting. As always, we will meet in the Governance Chambers at 3:20 p.m. Refreshments will be provided.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Approval of the February 13, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
5. Chair’s Remarks
6. President’s Remarks
7. Elections of Senate Representative to the Faculty Ethics Committee
8. Report: Dix Stadium Commencement (Given by Lashonda Taylor, Director of University Ceremonies)
9. EPC Items from the February 20, 2017 EPC Meeting:
   a. Action Items
      1. **College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology**: Revision of the name of the college to the College of Aeronautics and Engineering. Effective Fall 2017.
      2. **College of Education, Health and Human Services**: Establishment of an Athletic Training major within the Master of Science degree in the School of Health Sciences. The program, designated as entry-level professional, eventually will replace Kent State’s bachelor’s degree in the discipline. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 60. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approval.
b. Information Item

1. University College: Revision of University Readiness Standards and Placement Assessment policy to add the new SAT suite of standardized tests and remove the Compass tests, among other revisions. Effective Fall 2017.

10. Old Business: Kent State United Document / Sanctuary Campus

11. New Business

12. Announcements / Statements for the Record

13. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment
FACULTY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
February 13, 2017


Ex-Officio Members Present: President Beverly Warren; Senior V.P. for Academic Affairs and Provost Todd Diacon; Senior Vice Presidents: Karen Clarke, Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Dana Lawless-Andric for Alfreda Brown, Doug Delahanty for Paul DiCorleto, Shay Little, Ed Mahon, Charlene Reed, Nathan Ritchey, Willis Walker; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Blank, Allan Boike, James Bracken, Barbara Broome, John Crawford-Spinelli, Mark Kretovics, Mark Mistur, Donald Palmer, Eboni Pringle, Amy Reynolds, Robert Sines, Deborah Spake, Melody Tankersley

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Vice Presidents: Stephen Sokany, Jack Witt; Director Jeffrey Fruit

Observers Present: Wilma Crawford for Jerry Feezel (Emeritus Professor), Kate Klonowski (GSS), Natalia Roman (USS)

Guests Present: Kendra Albright, Megan Ayscue, Patrick Coy, Janis Crowther, Laurie Donley, Lisa Echeverry, Larry Froehlich, Julie Gabella, Thomas Jefferson, Lynette Johnson, Tess Kall, Michael Kavlic, Karen Keenan, Mark Lewis, Eric Mansfield, Emily Morris, Tracey Motter, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Rebecca Murphy, David Ochmann, Susan Perry, Gail Rebata, Jim Sewell, Molly Spillman, Therese Tillett, Aimee VanDomeelen, Sonya Wisdom

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:20PM in the Governance Chambers, Kent Student Center.

2. Roll Call

Senator Kerns called the roll.

3. Approval of the Agenda

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the agenda. A motion was made and seconded (Fenk/Rollick). No changes were offered and the agenda was approved.
4. **Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of December 12, 2016**

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 12 Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Gunning/Dauterich). No corrections were offered and the minutes were approved.

5. **Chair's Remarks**

The Chair’s remarks are attached [Attachment A]. There was no discussion.

6. **President's and Provost's Remarks**

President Warren spoke about her concerns regarding the sanctuary campus petition, and she presented an alternative statement (Kent State United). See [Attachment B] for her remarks.

Provost Diacon discussed actions the university has taken to support students following the executive order from the President that banned entry of students from several countries. See remarks [Attachment C].

Senator Williams asked how the university should respond when laws or policies are immoral, and whether civil disobedience is ever an option. President Warren stated that individuals can decide about engaging in civil disobedience but the university will not break the law although the university can advocate and speak out for changing the law. Senator Stoker indicated he agreed with the President’s comments, and thus thought that the sanctuary petition was too strongly worded. He asked whether KSU could be a sanctuary campus without invoking language of civil disobedience. President Warren expressed the opinion that the sanctuary campus designation does little to help and could hurt the university. Senator Stoker indicated he disagreed and felt the alternative statement the president offered would be ignored. Senator Dauterich appreciated President Warren’s caution about violating the law but asked how the alternative statement would be promoted. President Warren noted that when she responded to the official in Michigan who called for “another Kent State” that her response was retweeted more than 800 times, perhaps because it was from our university, so she expected the statement would have impact because it was coming from KSU. Senator Theresa Walton- Fisette asked for more information about the Scholar at Risk initiative. Provost Diacon explained the program is for scholars who feel threatened in their home countries, and provides them a semester or longer appointment at a U.S. institution. KSU last hosted a scholar two years ago. Senator Earp expressed appreciation for the alternative document provided by President Warren. She also noted she sees a lot of international people in her workplace (the library) and would not want to interfere with their work. Senator Vande Zande expressed support for President Warren’s documents and asked what positive lessons KSU might have to share based on our experiences. President Warren stated that KSU does have positive lessons to offer regarding community and civil discourse. She also noted that the Michigan official resigned his position after the response to his remarks. Ms. Roman asked how KSU would respond to a speaker who advocated for actions against undocumented students. President Warren stated she did not think the university would invite such a speaker, but a student group might. She noted that last year when the LGBTQ community wanted a speaker banned, they were advised to speak up when the speaker was considered. She did note that a university is a place for people to be intellectually challenged.
At the same time, there is a public safety team on campus whose job is to ensure everyone’s safety, and they would step in if a speaker became threatening.

7. Reports

a) Report on Changes in Student Surveys of Instruction given by Jennifer Marcinkiewicz (Interim Director - Center for Teaching & Learning)

Interim Director Marcinkiewicz noted that the format for the reports of the SSI ratings from a course has changed. Course norms and instructor means and standard deviations are no longer provided. Instead, instructors receive a printout showing the distribution of responses for each rating for each item. She provided a sample output [Attachment D]. Departments can request distributions for all classes or class subsets (e.g., Kent core courses). She stated that the change was in response to concerns about the use and interpretation of the SSI in personnel decisions. She also noted that course ratings based on small samples can be highly variable (i.e., not reliable) and that a focus on whether an instructor is simply above or below a norm is too simplistic for evaluating teaching. Best practices call for examining distributions for individual items as a way of evaluating whether or not instructors are performing well and focusing on items where a large number of students either agree or disagree. She also noted the importance of examining response rate as a single poor rating can skew the results when there are a small number of ratings, and she discouraged the use of the “overall learning experience” rating as an index of teaching as it may be influenced by other things such as the time the course was offered. Other recommendation are to develop department guides for evaluating ratings (e.g., what percent of agree responses is viewed as acceptable) and augmenting student evaluations with other sources of information about an instructor’s teaching such as the instructor’s reflections on their performance and consideration of context (e.g., is this the first time the instructor taught the course). The focus could be on patterns of responses, as single responses might reflect biases in evaluation (e.g., due to gender or race). Finally, there are also efforts underway to test the viability of a new SSI instrument recommended by the SSI committee last year. This instrument is to be delivered electronically.

Senator Jennifer Walton-Fisette asked how the changes might affect the way faculty are evaluated for promotion, and whether candidates and faculty reviewers will receive information about how to evaluate candidates who have both the “old” and “new” ratings. Interim Director Marcinkiewicz said there would be information sessions offered to departments, and that departments also should evaluate criteria in their handbooks to determine whether changes are needed (e.g., if handbook refers to course means). Senator Piccirillo-Smith said many people just look at the summary item, and asked why it is included if it is problematic to interpret. Interim Director Marcinkiewicz suggested focusing instead on the summary of instructor characteristics (based on questions 7 – 16) that is provided. Chair Smith noted that an entirely new SSI instrument that does not include that question has been developed and is being tested. Interim Director Marcinkiewicz elaborated that there would be only 4 standard questions for all classes, and departments will be able to add additional questions they want answered. Senator Child asked whether there is a recommendation about examining an instructor’s grade distributions when evaluating student ratings. Interim Director Marcinkiewicz stated the literature is not consistent in finding a link between grade distributions and student ratings. Students will still provide information about their anticipated course grade so committees will be able to consider that
information. Senator Vande Zande noted it can be difficult to get students to complete the SSIs. Interim Director Marcinkiewicz stated that the paper SSIs are expensive, and suggested that some of the savings from switching to electronic SSIs could be used for student incentives (e.g., items in a drawing). Students could also complete them during designated class times. There are concerns about incentives such as extra credit or delaying grades so they will not be used to motivate responses. Senator Vande Zande clarified that she was primarily concerned about obtaining SSIs for online courses, and Interim Director Marcinkiewicz noted that incentives such as drawings could still be used with these students. Senator Minnick asked when the electronic pilot will happen, and Interim Director Marcinkiewicz said she should know soon.

b) Climate Study Report given by Vice Chair Kathryn Wilson (Professor of Economics)

Senator Wilson presented findings from the Climate Study that was conducted last year. See findings [Attachment E]. There are separate reports for all participants, Kent campus, and Regional campuses. The latter two include qualitative data. Due to time constraints Senator Wilson focused on the findings for faculty (n = 940 responses). The responses rates were higher for tenure track faculty (55.3%) and NTT (51.2%) so their findings are more generalizable than those for part-time faculty (18.1% response rate). In general, faculty perceptions of climate were in the range typically found for at universities with over 70% reporting comfort with the climate. A general pattern for the survey is adjuncts rated the climate the most favorably, followed by NTT and then TT faculty. About 24% of faculty reported they had experienced exclusionary, intimidating, or offensive conduct (e.g., feeling disrespected). Both faculty and graduate students reported that faculty members were most often the source of this type of behavior directed toward them, whereas undergraduate students reported that other undergraduates were most often the source of exclusionary or offensive behavior with faculty the second most common source. The individual items suggest faculty have some concerns about workload, career opportunities, and work life balance. On a more positive note, faculty report not feeling judged and feeling valued by students and department colleagues. Faculty felt less positively about whether their voices are valued in shared governance and have concerns about the fairness of merit. They do feel supported when requesting leaves or sabbaticals. Women reported less clarity about tenure and greater burden from service responsibilities. NTT faculty did not feel burdened by service but they had concerns regarding their representation, pressure to do service, and TT faculty understanding of their work. Both TT and NTT faculty had concerns about promotion practices, especially concerning whether standards are applied equitably. Finally, staff views of how they are treated by faculty are much less positive than student views of faculty treatment.

8. EPC Items:

a) Action Items:


Professor Mark Lewis explained that the new course was proposed to fill a new requirement in the transfer module. Universities are required to have a course in
quantitative reasoning in addition to courses for STEM majors (e.g., calculus) and
statistics courses. Senator Kerns asked how the proposed course differs from the
Exploration in Modern mathematics course, and Professor Lewis stated the proposed
course has more of an emphasis on communications in mathematics. A motion was
made to approve the new course (Stoker). The motion was passed.

2. **College of the Arts:** Consolidation of Crafts and Fine Arts majors into one major—
renamed Studio Art—within the Master of Fine Arts degree in the School of Art. The
Studio Art major will have eight concentrations: Ceramics; Drawing; Glass; Jewelry,
Metals and Enameling; Painting; Print Media and Photography; Sculpture; and
Textiles. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 60. Effective Fall 2017.
The Senators were briefly entertained by a barbershop quartet that was delivering a
singing valentine. Following this, Dean Crawford explained that the proposed changes
better reflect the discipline in that they allow for more interdisciplinary work. The
changes also reduce duplication and bring the program in greater alignment with
discipline standards. A motion was made to approve the change (Vande Zande). The
motion passed.

3. **College of Arts and Sciences:** Administrative restructure and revision of name of the
Center for Applied Conflict Management. The center will move out of the Department
of Political Science and become a separate school in the College of Arts and Sciences.
The new name is School of Peace and Conflict Studies. The Applied Conflict
Management major within the Bachelor of Arts degree, the Applied Conflict
Management minor, all (20) CACM courses and center faculty and staff will move to
the new school. Effective Fall 2017.
Professor Patrick Coy provided information on the history of the establishment of the
Center for Applied Conflict Management. The center was initially under the Provost’s
office but moved to Political Science in 1994. The number of students taking courses
has grown, and there are plans to hire additional faculty. The proposal to move the
program from Political Science to a school within Arts and Sciences is being done as a
way to distinguish Kent State as there are very few schools that have Peace and
Conflict Studies Schools. A motion was made to approve the proposal (Laux).
Senator Laux asked about the makeup of the faculty that would be moving from
Political Science to the new school. Professor Coy responded that all faculty are in the
discipline of peace and conflict studies, and there are currently 5 faculty (2 TT and
3NTT) with plans to hire 3 more TT faculty. Senator Williams asked why the new unit
is being established as a school rather than as a department. Professor Coy said it is
being done partly to better showcase the program externally, and to parallel
programs at other universities. Dean Blank noted that with a school there is an
opportunity for faculty in other colleges to participate. The motion passed.

4. **College of Nursing:** Establishment of Nursing for Registered Nurses major within the
Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree. The major will be offered online-only,
administered through the Kent Campus, for students who hold an active registered
nurse license. The program currently exists as a concentration within the Nursing
major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 120. Effective Fall 2017
pending Higher Learning Commission approval.
Dean Broome explained that RN Nursing degrees have been available at the regional
campuses since 2009. The plan is to make the program 100% online to allow more
students to enroll. A motion was made to approve the change (Dauterich). Senator
Laux asked if most RNs already have a Bachelor's degree. Dean Broome said most do not, but hospitals increasingly want to hire nurses who have a Bachelor's rather than an Associates degree, and there currently is a shortage of nurses with Bachelor's degrees. Senator Williams asked how clinical courses are delivered online. Dean Broome indicated that preceptors at local hospitals will provide the clinical experiences, and hospitals are willing to participate as it helps them to recruit nurses. The motion passed.

b) Information Items:

Chair Smith indicated that the information items primarily involve name changes or inactivations and had already been approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on behalf of Faculty Senate.

1. **College of Communication and Information**: Revision of name of the School of Library and Information Science. The new name is School of Information. Effective Fall 2017.

2. **College of Education, Health and Human Services**: Inactivation of Curriculum and Instruction—Junior High/Middle School major within the Master of Arts and Master of Education degrees in the School of Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies. The curriculum for the programs is duplicated in the MEd degree in Curriculum and Instruction, Middle Childhood Education concentration. Effective Fall 2017.

3. **College of Education, Health and Human Services**: Inactivation of Educational Administration—K-12 Leadership major within the Master of Arts degree in the School of Foundations, Leadership and Administration. The major will continue to be offered within the Master of Education degree. Effective Fall 2017.


5. **College of Nursing**: Revision of name of the Advanced Practice Nursing major within the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree. Name reverts to Nursing. Effective Fall 2017.


9. **Old Business: Follow up to the Survey on Part-Time Faculty Representation**

Chair Smith provided an update on the survey taken at the December Faculty Senate meeting. Senators had been asked to indicate their level of support for a proposal to allow 1 – 2 part-time faculty representatives at Faculty Senate. Doing so would require a change to the charter and bylaws. Chair Smith indicated that 18 of 29 Senators indicated support for the proposal. Given that two thirds support is needed, and part-time faculty have not attended meetings the last few months, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee decided not to pursue this change at this time.
10. **New Business: Sanctuary Campus Petition**

Chair Smith announced that Faculty Senate had been asked to endorse the sanctuary campus petition [Attachment F]. She noted that President Warren preferred the Kent State United document and also suggested the two documents were not mutually exclusive. A motion was made to table the item (Stoker/Williams).

Senator Williams spoke for tabling the petition, noting it would give the parties who developed the two documents time to collaborate to try to produce one document. Chair Smith indicated it might be difficult to contact the students who wrote the petition. Senator Kairis asked whether there was anyone present who could speak on behalf of the petition. Ms. Klonowski stated that she could not speak on behalf of the undergraduate students, but she noted that the Graduate Student Senate had unanimously endorsed the petition. This was done at a time when the Graduate Student Senate thought there was a need for quick action. She endorsed the Kent State United statement, but also stated that students knew the sanctuary petition was a stronger statement and they wanted to support it. Ms. Klonowski indicated that the Graduate Senate would be willing to work with other groups to try to come to agreement on a statement. Senator Kerns asked President Warren whether she had had conversations with students groups and shared the Kent State United statement with them. President Warren indicated she had, and that she would be having more conversations soon. In response to a question, President Warren indicated she had received the sanctuary petition. Senator Piccirillo-Smith asked what would be the legal ramifications for students if KSU was a sanctuary campus, and indicated her primary concern was for student safety. Chair Smith clarified that the Senate’s role is to decide whether to endorse the petition and that it would be up to President Warren whether or not to accept it. Senator Mangrum spoke against tabling the motion, stating that there is not such a thing as a sanctuary campus. Chair Smith indicated sanctuary campus is not a legal status but there are campuses and cities that have self-designated as a sanctuary campus or city. She also noted that the petition describes the specific actions KSU would take as a university if the petition were adopted. President Warren stated that anyone endorsing the petition is supporting the nine specific actions described in the petition, and she further stated 6 of those require disobeying the law. A vote was taken, and the motion to table endorsement of the sanctuary petition was passed.

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

Senator Wilson announced that the yearly survey asking about interest in committee service will be distributed to faculty soon, and she asked everyone to encourage faculty members to participate.

Senator Kerns announced that ballots for the Faculty Senate elections are due on Friday.

Ms. Klonowski announced that the graduate research presentation day is April 21.

12. **Adjournment**

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 5:37PM.

/attachments
Chair’s Remarks for February 13, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting

We have a fairly full agenda today and I want to keep my remarks brief. Once again, I want to emphasize that I am speaking on behalf of myself and myself alone.

But today I want to talk about that thing. You know, that thing that is hanging over our heads, threatening so much of what we value as a University such as access to important Federally collected data used in a wide range of research and the very existence of the National Endowment for the Humanities. That thing that is causing sixty or so of our international students to worry about whether they will be able to return to finish their studies if they go home to visit their families.

I think that for many (if not all) of us these are challenging times. And, at least among my intimates, there seem to be two psychological strategies for dealing with the times. The first is to minimize one’s access to external information, news, punditry, propaganda, alternative facts, etc. and focus on what is immediate and local—one’s family and beloved friends, one’s occupational calling, one’s health. After all, these are the things that truly matter in one’s life.

The second strategy is to actively engage externally, to be vocal and public, to really put oneself out there in a way one might not have done in years past. Many of us, myself included, have oscillated in between these two strategies over the last year or so. At the moment, I’m in a phase of activism, writing my congressmen every week, attending rallies, signing petitions, and attempting to motivate others to do the same.

I recently had a friend (she knows who she is) ask me a question that I often ask myself: aren’t you worried that you’ve become obsessed with that thing? If I’m being totally honest with myself, I would have to admit that I have. I am obsessed. And don’t get me wrong, I fully understand that obsession is not a healthy reaction.

But it occurs to me that there is a fine line between being suitably vigilant and being obsessed. In these times, we cannot afford to fail to be vigilant. It is absolutely imperative that we remain vigilant in the face of something that is such a threat to our values. I recognize that right now I am generally overshooting the mark of vigilance and erring on the side of obsession. But, my own sense is this: It is better to miss the target high than to miss it low and, in times such as these, we as members of this academic community are morally obligated to take aim at the target and let our arrows fly.

Thank you. I’d be happy to entertain any comments, questions, or criticisms.

Deborah Smith
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Monday, February 13, 2017  
President Beverly Warren

- Good afternoon, and thank you for this opportunity to share some observations and to request your good thinking on issues that are central to our mission and values.

- One week ago today, we celebrated the arrival of our Ph.D. student, Mansoureh Shasti and her one-year-old daughter, Kiana, at the Akron-Canton Airport. Her visa renewal had been denied a week earlier as a result of the executive order affecting immigrants from seven countries, including her native Iran. We are delighted to have her back home in Kent where she will resume her program of study in physics.

- As you may know, I received a petition several days ago from the Graduate Student Senate with more than 400 signatures of students, faculty and staff in our community asking me to designate Kent State as a “Sanctuary Campus.”

  o I know there are some among us today who signed their name to the petition. I want to express my appreciation for those who brought the petition to my attention and for the earnest thought and energy that was dedicated to this expression of what it means to live by our core values.

  o I am seeking your input prior to responding to the Graduate Student Senate and have garnered input previously from our USG president and interim director of the GSS.

- We have been reviewing, for some time now, the challenging national climate that has resulted in requests for consideration as Sanctuary Cities and Sanctuary Campuses. Here is what we have learned:

  o A sanctuary campus is described in many ways, but generally calls for protecting the privacy of students including their immigration status, refusing to provide information to state and federal authorities, instructing campus police to uphold university commitments to protect students, and to withhold cooperation with federal efforts to identify and deport students or faculty.

  o The “sanctuary” designation does not come with any legal status, and there is no law or additional protection afforded a campus that declares itself a sanctuary. In fact, there may be disadvantages as expressed by Harvard University President, Drew Faust. President Faust indicated her belief that this designation risks drawing special attention to international or undocumented students in ways that could put their status in greater jeopardy. Some believe it might actually endanger students rather than protect them, and may create a false sense of security.
○ On the other hand, declaring a university a sanctuary campus makes a statement about the belief in the worth of every member in a community and serves as a public statement of solidarity and support, particularly for our international community and those who are undocumented residents.

• As we considered what the Sanctuary Campus designation actually means in comparison to the policies and value structure Kent State already has in place, we gave deep scrutiny to the tangible evidence of affirmative advocacy and protection for all members of our community, a community shaped by our unique history and long-standing commitment to human rights.

• And, when we lined up our portfolio alongside those at other leading institutions in the country, we discovered that we are aligned with and in some cases exceed the practices of institutions that both have and have not made the sanctuary campus designation.

○ We developed a table assessing the actions and policies of other universities similar to our university – research universities that are committed to the contribution of international students and scholars in advancing learning and new knowledge, and share a strong belief in the power and creativity of a diverse community. [HANDOUT]

○ Additionally, we noted that no university has noted a refusal to comply with the law.

• What this tells me is that we have the opportunity to make a truly meaningful statement about our values—and what we have learned about the power of affirmative voices and practices to create and sustain change.

○ Many of you may be aware of the statement made recently by a GOP leader in Michigan—who invoked an indefensible reference to May 4 in a social media post. Our response was an affirmative response. We made him aware of the impact of that statement on our community and invited him to learn more about what happened on May 4. This affirmative stance made a difference. It was civil, it created meaning and understanding, and it quickly shifted the conversation.

• Following this model of proactive dissent and a belief in the unique voice of Kent State as a national convener on critical issues and the value of civil discourse, we have drafted a Kent State United Pledge that both addresses the issues of concern that were expressed in the petition submitted by community members and identifies additional measures underway at Kent State. It also outlines a full range of systems and services that exist.
• I am asking the Faculty Senate to consider endorsing this pledge as our distinctive statement of inclusive excellence and a commitment to support and protect all members of our community.

• The circulated petition requests that we "declare Kent State University systems a sanctuary campus that will actively refuse to comply with immigration authorities regarding deportations or raids." And "refusing to honor or recognize federal, state, or regional laws, statutes, or regulations that target students of color, ...international students..., the LGBTQIA+ community..., specific religious communities... and students with disabilities..." 

• The petition also asks us to "continue and further our commitments" that exist to protect underrepresented and underserved populations, including those with an immigration status and those who are undocumented. We are exploring the strengthening of specific actions and programs in response to the requests mentioned in the submitted petition.

• But, what we know-- in ways that few other colleges or universities can know -- is that breaking the law is among the least effective ways to protect our students and effect change. It is simply an unacceptable strategy to suggest that a state university -- or any university for that matter -- should refuse to comply with the law as a statement of solidarity. Such actions place all community members at risk, particularly those groups we desire to protect and support.

• I look forward to working with you and with our student leaders, with the support of our considerable intellectual and legal resources, to ensure that Kent State University remains a safe haven for students and scholars alike -- as it has been for decades.

• We are committed to supporting and protecting all members of our Kent State community. It is my belief that we can be a unique example of a community united in its solidarity to be a welcoming environment for all. We can do that most effectively, not by joining a movement that lacks clarity of definition but by being uniquely and definitively that special community who has lived through the pain and shares the special story that we are indeed Kent State United.

• Our commitment to that identity remains steadfast and unshakable.

• Thank you for listening. I would like to invite Provost Todd Diacon to the microphone to share with you specific actions recently taken in support of our students.

• Following the Provost's remarks, we will respond to any questions or comments you wish to share.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or University</th>
<th>Self-described sanctuary</th>
<th>Will campus police actively request immigration status?</th>
<th>Protect student privacy and immigration status</th>
<th>Non-discrimination policy covers national origin and/or immigration status</th>
<th>Scholars at Risk member</th>
<th>Refuse to comply with the law</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;We are monitoring this fluid situation on a daily basis and advocating for policies that secure our nation and our campuses while also welcoming international students and scholars.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Virginia attorney general's office is guiding the state universities not to specifically designate themselves as sanctuary campuses, primarily because of legal ambiguities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;Unless a serious crime has been committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, unless required by a warrant; unless presented with valid legal process.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus is on undocumented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KENT STATE UNITED

An Affirmation of Our Shared Commitment

We, the people of a united Kent State community, remain committed to our core values that frame our work and our actions as we strive to live our vision of bettering society. We value diversity of culture, beliefs, identity and thought. We value freedom of expression and the free exchange of ideas. We value a collaborative community. And, above all, we value respect, kindness and purpose in all that we do. Our values provide the cornerstone for our work together as a united community.

Grounded in our values, we believe in being a safe place, where all are welcomed to live and learn and grow together. Our non-discrimination statement is broad and inclusive and serves as one of the most inclusive statements of non-discrimination in higher education:

Kent State University’s policy sets forth the expectations and responsibilities for maintaining an educational and employment environment free of unlawful discrimination and harassment. This policy “prohibits unlawful discrimination based on race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, disability, genetic information, age, military status, or identity as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era, recently separated veteran, or other protected veteran. Harassment directed toward an individual or a group, through any means, including electronic, and based on any of these categories is a form of unlawful discrimination. The university encourages an atmosphere in which the diversity of its members is understood and appreciated, free of discrimination and harassment based on the above categories. Thus, all members of the university are expected to join in creating a positive atmosphere in which individuals can learn and work in an environment that is respectful and supportive of the dignity of all individuals.

Based on our core values and our commitment to being a welcoming community that strives to provide intellectual challenge in a physically safe environment, we support the following actions and policies:

- Student records are subject to strict privacy protections under university policy and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Kent State University will only release protected student information, including immigration status, in accordance with state and federal law or if public safety is in jeopardy.
• Kent State University will remain engaged with the Scholars at Risk initiative. Scholars at Risk protects international scholars facing serious threats to their lives, liberty and well-being from their home country, in part by arranging for positions at institutions in the network for those forced to flee.

• University Administration and our Department of Public Safety are committed to respect for all individuals and will adhere to our non-discrimination statement and our policies on protection of individual rights.

• Kent State does not use E-verify for any purposes other than to comply with longstanding federal law regarding employment eligibility.

• Kent State will remain a strong proponent of freedom of expression and the free exchange of ideas. As such, we are a community that engages in conversations and discussions where civil discourse and freedom of speech are a hallmark of this ideal.

Kent State University has joined public statements of support, including:

• As a member of the Inter-University Council of Ohio, Kent State has publicly supported the Bridge Act, which would provide undocumented immigrant students with work authorization and a "provisional protected status" from deportation. It would help alleviate the immediate concerns regarding their status while the nation continues to pursue a long-term solution to immigration reform. This letter, signed by dozens of university presidents including Kent State, was sent to members of Congress, including Ohio's congressional delegation.

• Kent State University signed on to a letter organized by the American Council on Education that expressed concerns about the impact of the Jan. 27, 2017 executive order on international students, faculty, researchers and staff on our campuses. The letter, addressed to U.S. Department of Homeland Security Secretary Kelly, acknowledges the need to safeguard our nation and also the need for the United States to remain the destination of choice for the world's best and brightest students, faculty, and scholars. International exchange is a core value and strength of American higher education.

• City of Akron Mayor Daniel Horrigan invited Kent State to sign its Open Letter in Support of Our New American Neighbors. President Warren signed the letter, which stated "whether you are foreign born or home grown, there is a place for you here."

The following resources are available for the united Kent State community and will be strengthened with more clear and public dissemination of those resources available:

• Students who are currently covered through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Executive Order (DACA) have access to resources and support through the Division of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and the Division of Student Affairs. In cases where legal counsel is requested, DACA students will be connected with pro bono legal services available in the local community.
• Staff from the Office of Global Education are available to help navigate resources available to international students, faculty and staff who have questions regarding immigration status and visa status. In cases where legal counsel is requested, international students will be connected with pro bono legal services available in the local community.

• University Stewards will continue as an available resource for all students. University Stewards are members of the Kent State faculty and staff who serve as points of support, resource and referral for students, particularly related to campus climate concerns. The Division of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion provides clear and public contact information for access to a University Steward at http://www.kent.edu/universitystewards.

• Psychological Services provides individual therapy for students and offers student support groups, including the International Student Success support group. More details are available at http://www.kent.edu/psych. Additional resources for each campus location are highlighted at www.kent.edu/stepupspeakout. Select ‘campus resources’ at your primary campus location.

• Faculty and staff can access psychological counseling support through Impact Solutions. For more details, visit: https://www.kent.edu/hr/benefits/employee-assistance-program-impact-solutions.

We will continue to advocate for actions that provide support for all students and that exemplify the community of caring that is representative of Kent State values. Our #KentStateUnited initiative will provide opportunities for our community to openly share that we are a community where all are welcomed and supported. This pledge of unity in our diversity reinforces our commitment to ensuring a place for all points of view to be expressed and for all persons to be valued and respected. It calls for us to choose pathways of inclusion and civility and to serve as a national model for civil discourse and a positive learning environment.

Discussion Draft
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Teaching and Educational Efforts, Involving Kent State Faculty and Administrators, Both Before and After the Issuance of the Executive Order Banning Entry by Residents of Seven Countries

1. In direct response to the Executive Order, and just days after it was issued, Associate Provost and Office of Global Education Director Marcello Fantoni and I organized an informational meeting with our international students

   • 80 students attended. We expressed our support for the students, and answered questions for nearly two hours. More than 70 residents from the seven countries attend Kent State. Associate Counsel Mike Pfahl walked us through the Executive Order as best we understood it at that point
   • We established drop in, no appointment needed, immigration counseling in the OGE office for students from the seven countries, and as time permitted extended this to all international students
   • We also let our international students know that several local attorneys were offering their pro bono services should they need them
   • Our lone student who was outside of the U.S., and not permitted to enter because of the Executive Order, did obtain entry, and is back at Kent State. Marcello and I attended a moving welcome back ceremony for this graduate student in her home department, and it was gratifying to see the support she received from faculty, staff and students. The student went out of her way to express her appreciation for this support
   • A special thanks to Nick Gatozzi, Kent State’s Executive Director of Government and Community Relations, for leading our efforts to inform our elected officials about this student’s plight

2. Our School of Journalism and Mass Communication held a panel discussion on “Journalism’s Way Forward”

   • A standing room only crowd packed the auditorium in Franklin Hall to hear Kent State professors and NE Ohio journalists discuss journalism in the wake of the presidential election
   • Kent State professors Cheryl Ann Lambert, Jacquie Marino, Chance York, and the Kent State Professional in Residence, Pulitzer Prize-Winning columnist Connie Schultz, discussed “fake news,” the challenges of reporting on this year’s presidential election, and the media’s way forward now that critics are questioning journalists’ relevance and integrity
• They were joined by Henry Garcia, a reporter for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and Russ Mitchell, anchor of WKYC news in Cleveland
• I attended this very impressive event, and was glad that I did. I learned valuable information from our Kent State professors...and I know our students did, as well

3. Richard Serpe, Chair of the Department of Sociology, led a Kent Talks event with students entitled “Let’s Talk Trump”
• Dr. Serpe reported to me that over sixty students attended the conversation
• He noted that students felt safe in this environment, and that many in attendance spoke and shared their opinions, including students in favor of President Trump and the Executive Order

4. On a date still to be determined we will hold a panel discussion on free speech in a university context, to be entitled “When We Disagree: Promoting Free Speech and Promoting Community at Kent State”
• Amoaba Gooden, Chair of the Pan-African Studies Department has graciously agreed to moderate this event
• I will speak on last fall’s student petition to remove the Golda Meir portrait and quotation from a wall in Bowman Hall, and our decision not to remove either for the time being, but to remove all quotations from Bowman as we renovate the HVAC system in Bowman this summer. More importantly, I will discuss the trolling the student petitioners were subjected to in the aftermath of submitting their petition
• Amy Reynolds, Dean of the College of Communication and Information, and a noted expert on First Amendment law, will speak on the First Amendment as it applies to college campuses
• Mark Goodman, the Knight Chair in Scholastic Journalism at Kent State, will present ways that students, and all of us, can protect ourselves from trolling

Thank you, as always, for all that you do to educate our students, our community, and each other

Provost Todd Diacon
Recommendations for Using Student Surveys of Instruction for Personnel Decisions

1. Evaluators should review the distribution of results in the summary of instructor characteristics as a first step in gaining an overall impression of instructional quality. Examining individual instructor items may be used to provide a finer grain analysis to explain the results of the summary of instructor characteristics.

2. Evaluators should pay special attention to the number of students returning surveys. In small classes, one or two negative SSI results can skew the overall distribution of scores to a large extent.

3. The summary question, “Overall, how would you rate your learning experience in this course?” should not be used to evaluate effectiveness of instruction because a student’s learning experience is influenced by many factors outside of an instructor’s control (e.g. class size, course delivery method, classroom characteristics, course content).

4. Evaluators should pay particular attention to the distribution of responses that are generally favorable (% agree + % strongly agree) and to the distribution of responses that are generally unfavorable (% disagree + % strongly disagree). If a large proportion of students have registered unfavorable responses, this would be cause for concern. A large proportion of students returning favorable responses indicates meritorious teaching. Small differences in student ratings between courses or instructors should not be overemphasized.

5. Student evaluations should not be the sole source of information on the quality of an instructor’s teaching. Evaluators should seek to determine whether concerns raised in student surveys are echoed by peer reviews and within the instructor’s statement on teaching. Consider whether the instructor has made a substantive effort to respond to concerns raised by student surveys or peer reviews. This requires that evaluators read the instructor’s teaching statement.

6. Multiple sets of ratings should be considered (e.g. multiple courses, multiple terms), rather than relying solely on the most recent term.

7. Contextual data should be considered carefully. Context includes disciplinary field, class size, required course or elective, course level (lower-division, upper-division, graduate).

8. Contextual information provided by the instructor should also be considered. This might include special circumstances such as a new course prep, introduction of an innovative teaching method, shifts in student demographics, etc.

9. Written comments provided by students are primarily helpful to instructors for improving course performance; however, they should be used with caution in personnel decisions, and only when a clear and recurring pattern occurs.

10. Each instructor should be evaluated as an individual. Comparison with a norming group was eliminated because there are problems associated with comparing instructors to each other, including different course types, bias (gender, ethnicity, etc.) and inexplicable variability in scores such as those observed within a single lecture course taught by a single instructor with SSI results reported for 8 different sub-sections (see Appendix I).
Examples of Interpretation of SSI Results

Instructor A: Lower-division History course, Kent Core. 115 students enrolled, 100 surveys returned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Item</th>
<th>% Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Neither A/D</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations were clear to me throughout the course</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structure/organization of the course helped me learn.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course materials/activities helped me learn.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assignments and tests allowed me to demonstrate what I learned.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received feedback about my progress throughout the course.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor gave clear written/oral explanations.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor motivated me to think about the subject.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor showed respect for students.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was available for individual consultation.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Instructor Items</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- High rate of student survey return, sufficient class size to interpret results.
- Summary of results
  - 60% positive (strongly agree + agree) impressions of instructor characteristics.
  - 26.5% neutral impressions of instructor characteristics
  - 13.5% negative (disagree + strongly disagree) impressions of instructor characteristics
- What are the main sources contributing to the negative impressions? (20% or higher disagree + strongly disagree)
  - Structure/organization
  - Course materials/activities
  - Availability for individual consultation
- Do the instructor and/or peer reviewers comment on any of these aspects? Does the instructor include concrete actions to take to address these or other areas of teaching?
- No immediate cause for concern, but room for reflection, improvement in future.
Instructor B: Upper-division nursing course (clinical), 12 students enrolled, **10 surveys returned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither A/D</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations were clear to me throughout the course</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structure/organization of the course helped me learn.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course materials/activities helped me learn.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assignments and tests allowed me to demonstrate what I learned.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received feedback about my progress throughout the course.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor gave clear written/oral explanations.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor motivated me to think about the subject.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor showed respect for students.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was available for individual consultation.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of Instructor Items</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- High return rate, but small class size. Small numbers of students—use caution in interpreting results.
- Summary
  - 64% positive
  - 15% neutral
  - 21% negative
- Should look at peer reviewer comments about course materials/activities, assignments and tests. Does the instructor reflect on these aspects of the course and propose a concrete plan to address these areas?
- There is a somewhat high rate of negative perceptions, BUT this represents only one or two students for most categories. (Note that if 1 student out of 10 rates the instructor poorly, that would be 10% of the course.) This may be the result of 1 or 2 students that are performing poorly. Other courses and other semesters should also be considered when evaluating this instructor’s performance.
Instructor C: Upper Division Business course, 55 students enrolled, 50 surveys returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither A/D</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations were clear to me throughout the course</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structure/organization of the course helped me learn.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course materials/activities helped me learn.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assignments and tests allowed me to demonstrate what I learned.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received feedback about my progress throughout the course.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor gave clear written/oral explanations.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor motivated me to think about the subject.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor showed respect for students.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was available for individual consultation.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of Instructor Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- High return rate, adequate class size for interpretation.
- Summary
  - 30% positive
  - 32% neutral
  - 38% negative
- Significant cause for concern, but further information should be sought.
- Examine instructor statement for context—for example was this a new prep? First time teaching an upper division course? Etc.
- Read instructor narrative thoroughly to determine whether they have a **concrete** action plan for addressing all issues.
- Triangulate results with peer reviews—are they consistent? Are any concerns noted?
- Is this course evaluation consistent with other course evaluations?
Appendix I:

Faculty Senate has approved a new report format, as recommended by the SSI Review Committee. The new format has eliminated means, standard deviations and norming group data.

Summary of Committee Findings:
- The use of means and standard deviations of Likert-scale questionnaires (ordinal data) is not the best practice (McCullough & Radson, 2011; Sullivan & Artino, 2013). Examining the distribution of responses is a valid practice (e.g. 30% of students “strongly agree”, 25% “agree”, etc.).
- The use of means and standard deviations is particularly troubling in cases of small sample size.
- Comparing SSI summary data with a norming group is an equally invalid practice as exemplified in the chart below which shows the results of 8 “different” sections of a course. An RTP committee using these data would probably evaluate Instructor 4 as a superior instructor compared to Instructor 3 and better, on average, than the norming group. This conclusion would be erroneous since the 8 sections were, in fact, subsections of a single lecture section with a single faculty member teaching all 8 sections simultaneously. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GYUuijnsrt4 for more details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2013 Courses with Same Norming Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I did the required preparations for each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I learned valuable information/skills from this course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Expectations were clear to me throughout the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The structure/organization of the course helped me learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The course materials/activities helped me learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The assignments and text allowed me to demonstrate what I learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I received feedback about my progress throughout the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The instructor gave clear written/oral explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The instructor motivated me to think about the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 The instructor showed respect for the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 The instructor was available for individual consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Total of 7-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The classroom and physical facilities support the learning activities in this course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Equipment and technology used supported the learning activities in this course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Overall how would you rate your learning experience in this course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Our Voices Count
Faculty Response Rates

- 940 faculty (36% response rate)
- By Position
  - 426 Tenure Track (55.3% response rate)
  - 283 NTT (51.2% response rate)
  - 231 Part-time/adjunct (18.1% response rate)
Faculty Comfort with Climate

Climate in Department

- TT: 33%
- Adv: 32%
- Adjunct: 45%

Overall Climate

- Very Comfortable: 46%
- Comfortable: 26%
- Neutral: 16%
- Uncomfortable: 11%
- Very Uncomfortable: 1%
Personal Experience of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct

- 24% of Faculty experienced conduct
- Main reasons for conduct (entire sample)
  - Position (23.1%)
  - Gender/gender identity (18.6%)
  - Age (18.5%)
- Main Form of Conduct (entire sample)
  - "I was disrespected" (62.6%)
  - "I was ignored or excluded" (47.9%)
  - "I was isolated or left out" (38.1%)
  - "I was intimidated/bullied" (37.4%)
Personal Experience of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct (con’t)

Note: Responses with $n < 5$ are not presented in the figure.

Figure 36. Source of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct by Student Position Status (%)
Personal Experience of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct (con’t)

Note: Responses with n < 5 are not presented in the figure.

Figure 37. Source of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct by Faculty Position Status (%)

Legend:
- Dept Chair/Head/Director
- Sr Admin
- Coworker
- Student
- Faculty
- Adjunct/Part-Time Faculty respondents
- Non-Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
- Tenure-Track Faculty respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Workplace Climate &amp; Work-life Balance Questions</th>
<th>% Agreeing</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sign. Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People without children are more burdened with work</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TT&gt;NTT&gt;Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues provide me career opportunities as much as others</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate access to admin. support to do my job</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adjunct&gt;NTT&gt;TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have peers/mentors who provide guidance when needed</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload is reasonable</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adjunct&gt;NTT&amp;TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. provides resources to pursue professional development Opportunities</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus &amp; College awards, stipends, grants, and professional development funds are awarded fairly</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adjunct&gt;NTT&gt;TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-related work valued for prom./tenure/review.</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department provides adequate resources to manage work-life balance</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adjunct&gt;NTT&gt;TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I perform more work to help students than colleagues</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NTT&gt;TT&gt;Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. Climate &amp; Value</td>
<td>% Agr.</td>
<td>% Neith.</td>
<td>% Disag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chair pre-judges my ability based on my ident./back.</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued by students in the classroom</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. in dept. pre-judge my ability based on my ident./back.</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chair pre-judges my abilities based on faculty status</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued by faculty in my department</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued by my department chair</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my teaching is valued</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. in dept. pre-judge my ability based on my fac. status</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the University values academic freedom</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my service is valued</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including diversity-related information in my teaching/pedagogy/research is valued</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate encourages free and open discussion</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my research is valued</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel faculty voices are valued in shared governance</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU senior admin. is genuinely concerned with my welfare</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Faculty Questions</td>
<td>% Agreeing</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Sign. Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. supportive of taking leave</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of FMLA disadvantages in P&amp;T</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point of view taken into account for course assignments and scheduling</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU supportive of sabbatical</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/promotion process clear</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Woman&lt;Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable teaching load to colleagues</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/promotion process reasonable</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Woman&lt;Man, LGBQ&lt;Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured to change research agenda</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdened by service beyond colleagues</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Woman&gt;Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdened by service responsibilities</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service contributions important to T&amp;P</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>LGBQ&lt;Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T standards are applied equal to all faculty</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit is awarded fairly</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>LGBQ&lt;Heterosexual; Disability&lt;No Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT Faculty Questions</td>
<td>% Agreeing</td>
<td>Sign. Differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of FMLA disadvantages in P&amp;T</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Woman &lt; Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input in course assignments and scheduling</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>Woman &gt; Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdened by service beyond colleagues</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development funds fair and accessible</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal/promotion process reasonable</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdened by service responsibilities</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable teaching load to colleagues</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal/promotion process clear</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured to do service &amp; research</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>Woman &gt; Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal/Prom. standards applied equally to all faculty</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>Woman &gt; Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT equitably represented at departmental level</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>Woman &gt; Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable workload to TT</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>Woman &gt; Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured to do work/service without compensation</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>Woman &gt; Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI colleagues understand my work</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT equitably represented at university level</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observed Employment Practices That Were Unfair or Unjust, or Would Inhibit Diversifying the Community

- **Hiring Practices**
  - TT Faculty: 27%
  - NTT Faculty: 17%
  - Adjunct Faculty: 13%

- **Disciplinary Actions**
  - TT Faculty: 20%
  - NTT Faculty: 12%
  - Admin. with Faculty Rank: 4%

- **Promotion/Tenure**
  - TT Faculty: 49%
  - NTT Faculty: 34%
  - Adjunct Faculty: 17%
  - Admin. with Faculty Rank: 24%
NTT Faculty Views of Renewal and Promotion Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Equally</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure Track Faculty Views of Tenure and Prom. Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Equally</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"I feel valued by Faculty"

- Lower rate of agreeing for:
  - Black/African American and Multi-racial students
  - Students with multiple disabilities

- Higher rate of agreeing for:
  - Low income students
  - Asian/Asian Am. students
Very General Summary

1. Faculty are generally comfortable with the climate at KSU and in their department.
2. About a quarter of faculty have experienced exclusionary behavior in the last year, and faculty are the main offenders.
3. Where there are statistically significant differences, it is usually adjunct most satisfied, followed by NTT, then TT.
4. Faculty generally find promotion/tenure/renewal standards clear and reasonable, but not the implementation.
5. Faculty influence climate as well as experiencing it.
6. There is a LOT of information – take a look for yourself!
Petition for Kent State Campuses to be Declared Sanctuary Status Places/Spaces
(https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeh6BCjGstmWQLZ034ldUWnn0RIPHPaeQ_Qb7oCS36wi6A3A/viewform).

Dear President Warren, Provost Todd Diacon, and Members of the Board of Trustees:

Kent State University has a unique place in United States history, first as a normal school established to provide teachers for a burgeoning educational system and then as a touchstone for social justice and non-violence before and after the events of May 4, 1970. We are proud of Kent State’s historical role and current place in the world as a vibrant, intellectual community committed to inclusivity, diversity of thought, and passionate discourse. It is in this spirit of thought, care, and justice that we write you today.

The University Policy Regarding Equal Opportunity (6-02) states:
In academic and student programs. It is the policy of this university that there shall be no unlawful discrimination against any student or applicant for admission as a student because of race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, military status, or identity as a veteran with a disability or veteran of the Vietnam era. Such policy shall apply to, but not necessarily be limited to, the following: recruiting, admission, access to programs, financial aid, and social, recreational and health programs. This policy shall be applicable to all campuses and units of the university. This policy also shall apply with reference to discrimination on a basis of age insofar as required by law.

In employment. It is the policy of this university that there shall be no unlawful discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of age, race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, military status, or identity as a veteran with a disability or veteran of the Vietnam era. Such policy shall apply to, but not necessarily be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. This policy shall be applicable to all campuses and units of the university. This policy also shall apply with reference to discrimination on the basis of age insofar as required by law.

We applaud the university for its establishment of these conditions. However, there remains a loophole in our policy in the phrase “insofar as required by law.” In response to promises and threats made throughout the election process that potentially undermine our current policies and practices—responses that include verbal and physical threats, violence, and aggression throughout the recent presidential election season with a steep rise in such aggressions since the election both on and off campus—we the undersigned students, faculty, staff, and community members at Kent State are calling on the university to implement a plan declaring all campuses of Kent State University sanctuary spaces.

As further outlined below, we understand the schools in our campus system to be safe spaces for undocumented and DACAmented students, staff, and their families who face deportation; students of color; international students; LGBTQIA+ students; Islamic, Jewish, and all other religious groups; all veterans regardless of their status; and individuals who might require services for their needs as they pertain to their “disabilities.”
It is our belief that this action is in keeping with our current status and policies at Kent State as our requests simply extend policies and practices that are already in place. In so doing, not only do we align ourselves with our university’s stated mission, we also reassert Kent State’s longstanding positions towards inclusion, diversity, and social justice.

According to an internal memo presented to the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in 2011, ICE officers are subject to certain restrictions upon entering college campuses without authorization (See: https://www.ice.gov/doclib/ero-outreach/pdf/10029.2-policy.pdf). We see establishing the Kent State system as sanctuary campuses as a concrete action the university can take to support and protect our community.

We ask that you implement the following actions before February 20, 2017:

1. Declare Kent State University systems a sanctuary campus that will actively refuse to comply with immigration authorities regarding deportations or raids.

2. Guarantee student privacy by refusing to release information regarding the immigration status of our students and community members to any government agency.

3. Publicize resources available to undocumented students, with a staff member in the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion who is specifically trained to aid undocumented students, and offer free on-campus access to legal counsel.

4. Identify particular spaces on campus where those who feel threatened can seek refuge and protection, such as safe areas where trained staff and faculty are available to aid and engage students who are undocumented.

5. Continue and further current commitments to students of color on campus by ensuring the rights and safety for students of color on our campus by refusing to honor or recognize federal, state, or regional laws, statutes, or regulations that target students of color.

6. Continue and further current commitments to and international students on our campus by refusing to honor or recognize federal, state, or regional laws, statutes, or regulations that target international students.

7. Continue and further current commitments to the members of the LGBTQIA+ communities by refusing to honor or recognize federal, state, or regional laws, statutes, or regulations that target members of the LGBTQIA+ community.

8. Continue and further current commitments to Islamic, Jewish, and all other religious communities by refusing to honor or recognize federal, state, or regional laws, statutes, or regulations that either express a preference for a particular religion and/or target specific religious communities (students, faculty, staff, etc).

9. Continue and further current commitments to students with disabilities by refusing to honor or recognize federal, state, or regional laws, statutes, or regulations that target students with disabilities.
In accordance with Faculty Senate Bylaws, I formally convey to you, with this memorandum, the following motions passed on 20 February 2017 by the Educational Policies Council for appropriate review by the Faculty Senate. Although the Senate may not want to review these items, it is helpful to have the Senate’s consideration.

1. **College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology:** Revision of the name of the college to the College of Aeronautics and Engineering. Effective Fall 2017. [Proposal]

2. **College of Education, Health and Human Services:** Establishment of an Athletic Training major within the Master of Science degree in the School of Health Sciences. The program, designated as entry-level professional, eventually will replace Kent State’s bachelor’s degree in the discipline. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 60. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approval. [Proposal]


As an information item, below is a revision to the state-mandated policy for remediation-free standards in undergraduate course placement.

4. **University College:** Revision of University Readiness Standards and Placement Assessment policy to add the new SAT suite of standardized tests and remove the Compass tests, among other revisions. Effective Fall 2017. [Proposal]

EG: Todd A. Diacon, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost
    Teresa L. (Tess) Kail, secretary, Faculty Senate
    Karen M. Keenan, project director for academic affairs
    Emily S. Myers, assistant to the senior vice president for academic affairs
    Office of Curriculum Services
    Division of Graduate Studies
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Proposal Name Revision of College Name

Description of proposal:
Revise the name of the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology (AT) to the College of Aeronautics and Engineering. The name change better reflects the programs of study and the future direction of the college.

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and staffing considerations; need, audience)
No impact: Only name is changing

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):
Provost: name change affects only the college and does not affect programs, campuses or units outside the college.

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

Department Chair / School Director

Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

College Dean (or designee) 2182017

Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (or designee)
Proposal Summary to Change the Name of the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology

This proposal seeks to change the name of the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology (CAEST) to the College of Aeronautics and Engineering (CAE), effective July 1, 2017. The new name of the college will better reflect the programs of study within the college. The current name of the college was adopted in 2011.

History of College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology

The technology programs at Kent started as early as 1913 when space was allocated on campus for "manual training" as an integral component for the preparation of teachers at Kent State Normal school. The School of Technology was a dependent school in the College of Fine and Professional Arts until November 1995 when it became an Independent School of Technology within the Regional Campus System.

The School of Technology consisted of three academic program areas, namely: (i) Aeronautics, (ii) Applied Business and Technology, and (iii) Applied Science and Technology. In 2006 the School of Technology achieved College status and became the College of Technology. In 2011 all technology programs associated with regional campuses separated from the College of Technology and became part of the newly formed Regional College.

In July 2012 the name of the College of Technology was changed to the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability, and Technology to reflect the changing mission of the College toward development of new applied engineering and sustainability programs. A name change proposal was submitted in 2014 to reflect the growing viability of aeronautics program. The request for a name change was approved by EPC and Faculty Senate however a decision was made to stop the request before final approval in order to thoroughly review the mission and future of the college. The review has been completed hence this proposal for a name change.

1. QUALITY OF THE FACULTY, STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS

The college currently is comprised of three major curriculum areas, Aeronautics and Aerospace Engineering, Applied Engineering, and Construction Management. Construction Management will be administratively transitioned to the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED), effective Fall 2017. Therefore the remainder of this proposal will address only the two remaining program areas within the College. At the present time there are 530 Aeronautics majors, 18 Aerospace Engineering majors and 314 Applied Engineering majors. There are also 177 students in the Masters of Technology program. These numbers reflect the Fall 2016 15th day headcount.
There will be twenty three full time faculty members remaining in the college after the transfer of the Construction Management faculty to CAED. There are eleven full-time faculty in the Aeronautics program; one tenured, four tenure-track and six full time non-tenure track; all hold a terminal degree in their respective fields. The Aeronautics program has an on-going search for one additional full-time tenure-track faculty expected to begin employment for the 2017 fall semester. The Applied Engineering program has twelve full time faculty; four full time tenured, two tenure-track, and six full time non-tenure track faculty. All tenure and tenure-track faculty hold terminal degrees in their respective fields.

The college has seen consistent enrollment growth over the past 8 years. Even with the loss of the 186 Construction Management students the college will still maintain a healthy enrollment of over 1000 students.

2. CENTRALITY AND COHERENCE TO THE MISSION AND STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF THE UNIVERSITY AND OTHER ACADEMIC UNITS

The proposed name change of the college is requested due to the fact that fifty percent of the undergraduate enrollments are in the aeronautics program. The inaugural class of Aerospace Engineering began in the fall 2016 semester. As such, the present name College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability, and Technology does not reflect the constituent academic units in the college.

On the engineering side, in August 2016 one of the concentrations in the aeronautics major, Aeronautical Systems Engineering Technology (AESE) earned full accreditation by ABET, making it the only aeronautical/aerospace engineering technology program to be so accredited in the state of Ohio and only the third in the country. Additionally, in fall 2016 the College began offering the first pure engineering curriculum at Kent State in the field of Aerospace Engineering. Further enhancing the argument for a name change to reflect “engineering” in the title, another prominent program in the College, Applied Engineering, offers four concentrations in various engineering technology fields along with a growing concentration in mechatronics. Finally, plans are underway to create a second pure engineering program in the area of mechatronics. Although the current inclusion of “applied engineering” in the name of the college does reflect some of the engineering programs, it does not reflect the two pure engineering programs, titling the College Aeronautics and Engineering will encompass all programs within the College.

The aeronautics and engineering programs are a very vibrant part of the college and it is important from a market standpoint that both be appropriately and accurately represented in the name of the college.

3. COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE VERSUS OTHER STRUCTURES

College level unit is appropriate.
4. UNIT PARTICULARLY APPROPRIATE FOR KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

With an enrollment of over 1000 students the college has a comparative size to other professional colleges in the university.

5. DEMAND FOR THE UNIT AND FOR THE GRADUATES OF THE UNIT

The Aeronautics program enrollment has grown significantly over the past decade. It is the only aeronautics program in Ohio, and one of 34 nationwide to be accredited by the Aviation Accreditation Board International (AABAI). The program recently brought forth a second undergraduate major, Aerospace Engineering, which is the only such program offered by a public institution in Northeast Ohio. Additionally, the Aeronautical Systems Engineering Technology program earned full accreditation by ABET, making it the only aeronautical/aerospace engineering technology program to be so accredited in the state of Ohio and only the third in the country.

Aeronautics recently established bridge agreements with five regional air carriers, several of which not only guarantees graduates preferential interviews but also guarantees the graduate a job (upon admission and completion of the program). All agreements have been initiated by the regional air carriers with whom the agreements are held; every student that has applied has been accepted.

Ohio ranks fourth across the country for the highest employment level of aerospace engineers, and tenth nationwide for the highest concentration of aerospace engineering jobs and location quotients.

Applied Engineering enrollment has steadily grown over the past few years. As of Fall 2016 15th day headcount there are 314 majors in the Applied Engineering degree program. It is anticipated that with the concentrations (Applied Engineering and Technology Management, Computer Engineering Technology, Mechanical Engineering Technology, and Mechatronics) continued growth will occur well into the future.

Recent surveys of graduates from the Applied Engineering program and to employers of these graduates show overall satisfaction with the level of instruction. Employers showed a degree of satisfaction with the level of preparation of the graduates in the program between very good and excellent. The applied engineering program is Foundry Educational Foundation (FEF) certified and has been accredited by FEF since 1969. Students who participate in the Kent State University chapter of the American foundry Society (AFS) are highly sought after upon graduation. One hundred percent of the graduates from the 2015-16 academic year who participated in KSU AFS were employed with an average starting salary of over $50,000.

6. DUPLICATION AND INTERRELATEDNESS OF THE UNIT’S PROGRAM(S) WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY, STATE AND REGION
This proposal to change the college’s name is to reflect the viability and anticipated growth of current and future programs. The focus of the college is to continue growth in the aeronautics programs and the development of additional pure engineering degrees.

7. EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UNIT IN LEVERAGING EXISTING RESOURCES AND EXPANDING NEW RESOURCES

The college programs have been as efficient and effective as possible in leveraging existing resources. With the recent hires in the college and pending searches the college is preparing for future growth and expansion. Over $1.4 million has been spent upgrading the laboratories in the Aeronautics and Technology building. Transition to a new college name will support solicitation of funds from outside revenue sources to help address other equipment needs by elevating the name and stature of all the college programs. In addition, it may help with naming rights for future academic spaces.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTING STRUCTURE

There will be no change in the reporting structure.

9. SPACE AND CAPITAL BUDGET NEEDS

The name change will not have an effect on space requirements or budget needs. However as the college brings on additional engineering degrees there will be a need for additional laboratories and equipment. There is an immediate need to upgrade the academic facilities at the airport.

10. A PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET WITH ANY ONE-TIME RESOURCE NEEDS

Request to change the name of the college has no effect on budget or one-time resource needs. The college has the necessary resources to handle all the incidental cost associated with a name change.

11. EVALUATION PROCEDURES INCLUDING ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

Previously established procedures will not change with the transition to a new name.

12. A TIMETABLE FOR PROPOSAL IMPLEMENTATION

It is proposed that the effective date of the name change to College of Aeronautics and Engineering (CAE) coincide with the beginning of the next university fiscal year (July 1, 2017)
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Proposal Establish program

Description of proposal:
This action establishes an M.S. Athletic Training major. This is a 60-credit hour, 2-calendar year
program that will fulfill the degree change edict delivered by the Commission on the Accreditation
of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) in May, 2016 that changes the entry-level degree for the
athletic trainer from the B.S. to the M.S. level. This major will be a professional preparation program
that targets students wanting to pursue national certification in athletic training.

Does proposed revision change program's total credit hours?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Current total credit hours: 0  Proposed total credit hours 60

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and
staffing considerations; need; audience; prerequisites; teacher education licensure):
Kent State University currently has a B.S. Athletic Training major that will run concurrently as the
MS ATTR program builds. It will become obsolete and will be removed from the curricular
offerings once the full transition is complete to the MS degree. Additionally, the existing M.S.
EXPH ATTR major will continue to run - it is not a duplication as it is a post-professional program
that targets already certified practitioners.

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):
School of Health Sciences, College of Podiatric Medicine, Biological Sciences, Exercise
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Prepared by Kimberly S. Peer, EdD, ATC, FNATA in consultation with KSU
ATTR Faculty and the KSU Office of the Provost
Preface

This proposal is designed to establish the need, content, and implementation plan for the MS in Athletic Training at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio. It intends to provide supporting evidence that we are qualified and prepared to offer a rigorous academic program that not only meets accreditation standards, but exceeds them by integrating research across the curriculum to develop strong clinical practitioners who can critically analyze and perform research in the discipline. The ultimate goal of this program is to provide a challenging yet supportive program that facilitates transition to practice once the students graduate the program and advance to either full-time employment or continued educational programming such as PhD programs and/or clinical residency programs.
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The faculty at KSU would like to thank the professionals who reviewed our preliminary prospectus. Your input and comments helped us to design a clearer, more precise proposal for consideration. As a collective group of experts, the perspectives regarding educational programming and curricular content help us as a profession to create stronger programs to enhance the profession as a whole. We are indebted to your insights as we strive to work together to develop the next generation of athletic training professionals and researchers.
New Graduate Degree Program Full Proposal
Master of Science in Athletic Training

Background
A major shift in athletic training education occurred in May 2015 in which a formal declaration by the strategic alliance partners in the professional organizations governing athletic training specifies that the new entry-level degree for athletic training will be a master’s degree program. There are three degree designations from the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE): Professional Programs (prepare students to challenge the Board of Certification [BOC] examination at the baccalaureate and masters levels); Post-Professional Programs (post certified, advanced track degrees); and Post-Professional Residency Programs (advanced training). According to an accreditation directive, BS ATTR programs must cease to exist by 2022.

Kent State University (KSU) currently offers the Professional Program through the Bachelor of Science Athletic Training [BS ATTR] major and also a non-accredited Post-Certification program through the Master of Science Exercise Physiology major with a concentration in Athletic Training [MS EXPH ATTR], both housed in the School of Health Sciences [HS] within the College of Education, Health and Human Services [EH]. The BS ATTR program will be phased out (allowing for current student completion only) when the MS ATTR program is approved.

The purpose of this proposal is to establish a new Master of Science Athletic Training [MS ATTR] major to be designated as an Professional Program as specified by CAATE and to demonstrate that Kent State University is prepared and qualified to offer this program. The BS ATTR and MS EXPH ATTR majors will not change at this time. The designation of the MS is supported through the research courses including a methods course, required research projects throughout the curriculum, implementation of evidence-based practice principles, and a culminating extensive capstone thesis.

Need:
Elevating this degree program to include extensive research and integration of clinical research supports the transition to the MS program. This degree program emphasizes the need to competently evaluate and produce quality research in the discipline rather than simply elevate clinical skills. Through the implementation of research throughout the entire curriculum and the completion of research projects and a comprehensive capstone thesis/project, research is central to the mission of this program.

As a program, we are strongly suited to deliver and support an MS program with a research focus. Our faculty (see below table) has extensive research experience and clinical experience to support MS projects and thesis work. Our faculty and facilities are well-established and comprehensive to challenge students to expand
their mastery in the discipline through cutting-edge research projects using state-of-the-art equipment to gather meaningful data.

The MS program will be substantially different than the BS program in areas beyond the development of research proficiency. The MS program will integrate content areas and focus on the synthesis of best practice/evidence-based practice in synthesizing clinical skills whereas the BS programs takes topics in isolation and focuses more on fundamental skill development rather than integrated, comprehensive approaches to discipline specific material. This integrated approach will require mature critical thinking skills and the ability to critically analyze the knowledge and contemporary literature/research to create new knowledge in the field.

The need for athletic trainers is expanding and expected to do so in the coming years. Employment opportunities in athletic training are one of the fastest growing health care fields through 2018 according to Job Outlook 2022. As a profession, we have many expanding opportunities for athletic training professionals including military, surgical, emergency medicine, and industry evolving. Moreover, KSU has had a strong history of nearly 100% employment or post-graduate education following graduation from our BS ATTR program for nearly a decade. We anticipate this trend will continue with the Professional MS ATTR program. Employer surveys generated from the UG program has yielded positive feedback regarding our graduates. According to the NATA Career Center, there were 2193 new job postings in 2014 for athletic training positions.

Additionally, a needs analysis was administered to 117 students at Kent State University in the Health Sciences programs. Of these students, 53% were freshman or sophomores and 47% were juniors or seniors. 69% of the students were ATTR majors with 19% replying being in Exercise Physiology major, 9% in other majors (not defined), and 3% not responding. 91% of the students surveyed said they were interested in graduate studies and 83% indicated that they would be interested in hearing more about the MS ATTR in more detail. Approximately 69% indicated that if they got a graduate degree, they would be interested in staying at KSU for their program. Of interest, just 7% indicated that they would not be interested in pursuing a master's degree program at all. The majority of students (48%) who responded to interest hearing about the options wanted to hear about both options while 33% and 18%, respectively, wanted to hear about the 4/1-3/2 option and 2 year options. Approximately 1% did not respond to this question. An exciting finding was that of the respondents, 67% indicated that they knew someone who would be interested in this degree program at Kent State University.
## TABLE COMPARING CURRENT BS ATTR TO NEW MS ATTR PROGRAM

### BS ATTR
- Comprehensive, Individualized content courses
- Limited Research Opportunities
- Kent Core
- Foundational Clinical Skills Courses with no Immersion
- Didactic Anatomy Experience

### MS ATTR
- Synthesized, Integrated Content Courses
- Extensive Research Across the Curriculum with Culminating Research Capstone/Thesis project
- No General Education Requirements - Focused Discipline Content
- Integrated Clinical Skills with Immersion Experience
- Cadaver Anatomy to Integrate Complex Critical Application of Structure and Function to Synthesize for Clinical Practice and Research
- Required Pre-requisite course completion for admission to demonstrate foundational knowledge in required science and related prerequisites (see prerequisite list)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester One [15 Credits]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 15001 Introduction to Clinical Athletic Training I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 25036 Principles of Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 10097 Destination Kent State: First Year Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Two [14 Credits]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 15011 Introduction to Clinical Athletic Training II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 25057 Human Anatomy and Physiology I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 10050 Fundamentals of Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HED 14020 Medical Terminology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 23511 Science of Human Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Three [17 Credits]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements: minimum overall 2.500 GPA; first aid and CPR certification; acceptance to the profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 15092 Practicum in Athletic Training I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 25037 Physical Assessment Techniques for the Lower Extremity and Spine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR 35040 Strength and Conditioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Four [15 Credits]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 25038 Physical Assessment Techniques for the Upper Extremity, Head and Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 25092 Practicum in Athletic Training II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 35039 Therapeutic Modalities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR 35054 Biomechanics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 11762 General Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Five [15 Credits]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 35092 Practicum in Athletic Training III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 45039 Therapeutic Rehabilitation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR 25058 Human Anatomy and Physiology II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXSC 35068 Statistics for Exercise Scientist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Six [15 Credits]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 35037 Advanced Physical Assessment Techniques</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 35050 Neurological Process for the Healthcare Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 45041 Advanced Therapeutic Interventions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 45192 Practicum in Athletic Training IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Seven [15 Credits]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 45017 Professional Development in Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 45038 Organization and Administration of Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 45040 Pathology and Pharmacology for Allied HealthCare Providers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ATTR 45292 Internship in Athletic Training I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXSC 45080 Physiology of Exercise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Semester Eight [15-16 Credits] |  |  |
| Note: apply for the Board of Certification (BOC) and Ohio Athletic Training licensure examinations |  |
| ! ATTR 43018 Ethics for Allied Health Professionals | 3 |
| ! ATTR 45392 Internship in Athletic Training II | 3 |
| IHS 44010 Research Design and Statistical Methods in the Health Professions (3) or SOC 32220 Data Analysis (3) and SOC 32221 Data Analysis Laboratory (1) | 3-4 |
| General Electives | 6 |
### MS ATTR - Departmental Requirements (60 credit hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Year One</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadaver Anatomy &amp; Applied Assessment</td>
<td>ATTR 60000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Agents in AT and SM</td>
<td>ATTR 65037</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Injury Dx/Tx/Mgmt</td>
<td>ATTR 61000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Year One</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Pract I - Prevention and Wellness</td>
<td>ATTR 65001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Rehabilitation in ATTR and SM</td>
<td>ATTR 65039</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clin Inquiry</td>
<td>ATTR 62016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Year One</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clin Practice II - Adv H/N/Ortho</td>
<td>ATTR 65002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological Concept for the HCP</td>
<td>ATTR 65050</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant and Research Methods in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR/EXPH</td>
<td>EXPH 65031</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Year 2</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>ATTR 63098</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics For HCP</td>
<td>ATTR 63018</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Capstone</td>
<td>ATTR 69999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Year 2</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Practice III - Gen Med</td>
<td>ATTR 65003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Clin Procedures in AT/SM</td>
<td>ATTR 65041</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Concepts for HCP</td>
<td>ATTR 65038</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Year 2</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Practice IV - Advanced Comps</td>
<td>ATTR 65004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathopharmacology for HCP</td>
<td>ATTR 65040</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>ATTR 62010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, Kent State University has had a strong tradition of athletic training education programs for decades. Originally established in the 1980’s as an internship program, the current undergraduate program has evolved into a fully accredited Professional BS ATTR major which has undergone two highly successful accreditations. With the evolution of the single route to certification announced in 2015, Kent State University has worked rigorously to create a new major at the master degree Level. The focus of the new program is to build upon foundational knowledge from undergraduate degree programs, typically in the health sciences, to prepare students to fill professional positions in a variety of health care employment settings available to the certified athletic trainer. **This program has been highly successful to date. To date, we have a national first time exam pass rate exceeding the national average (Approximately 90% 3-year aggregate) and have 100% placement into either job or graduate programs within 2 years of graduation. Further, the success of our**
program is supported by community partners who actively seek KSU ATTR graduates to fill their open positions.

The MS curriculum will focus on building clinical and didactic knowledge and skills anchored in evidence-based practice while developing strong research skills by developing not only critical analysis skills, but equally important, investigative research skills. Although accreditation will dictate the content areas for competency in the new program, KSU is committed to infusing research across the curriculum to develop these fundamental research skills necessary to expand the existing body of literature in the profession and to effectively transition to clinical practice. Therefore, this program will focus on developing the student’s skills and evidence-based knowledge in the domains specified in the Board of Certification’s Role Delineation and Practice Analysis (currently in the 7th edition) to allow them to transition directly to practice in the field after successfully challenging the Board of Certification’s national credentialing exam. These domains that prepare the student to practice as a safe and competent entry-level athletic trainer currently include: Injury/Illness Prevention and Wellness Protection, Clinical Evaluation and Diagnosis, Immediate and Emergency Care, Treatment and Rehabilitation, and Organizational and Professional Health and Well-Being (See Appendix A: Role Delineation Study/Practice Analysis, Sixth Edition Content Outline Domain Descriptions and Task Statements; Seventh Edition released prior to writing of proposal).

The course curriculum with be framed to address the core competencies but will do so through the integration and development of research throughout the curriculum to develop critical scientists who can discern scientific literature and contribute to the existing body of knowledge in the field through substantive research. The program will include the CAATE’s competencies as based on the development of the current knowledge, skills, and abilities, as determined by the Commission (currently the 5th Edition of the NATA Athletic Training Education Competencies) and will integrate the changing content as it emerges as new competencies. The knowledge and skills identified in the current competencies consist of 8 content Areas:

1. Evidence-Based Practice
2. Prevention and Health Promotion
3. Clinical Examination and Diagnosis
4. Acute Care of Injury and Illness
5. Therapeutic Interventions
6. Psychosocial Strategies and Referral
7. Healthcare Administration
8. Professional Development and Responsibility

The disciplinary purpose of this MS degree program is to challenge the students to consider the domains in light of contemporary health care settings and to prepare them for the dynamic career they are about to enter. Further, this program will prepare them to contribute to and expand the existing body of literature through meaningful research in the profession. Through a rigorous yet supportive program,
the students will be exposed to and actively engage with state-of-the-art equipment in professional health care facilities and be mentored by highly recognized professionals. This program will also foster inter-professional collaboration to promote professional development for the students who will be practicing and researching in inter-disciplinary teams.

Program Learning Outcomes
Graduates of the MS ATTR program will be able to:
1. Successfully challenge the BOC Certification Exams
2. Demonstrate understanding of and competency in the domains of athletic training as defined by the BOC Practice Analysis and Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) Curriculum Content.
3. Demonstrate competency in evaluating and completing scientific research and evidence-based practice as evidenced in research projects and a comprehensive capstone research thesis.
4. Demonstrate competency in engaging in a variety of clinical practice settings related to athletic training with engagement in an inter-professional environment.
5. Apply the principles of the research process in athletic training by engaging with faculty and clinical staff in graduate research initiatives
6. Engage health care professionals and apply the knowledge gained, through their education in both the classroom and clinical settings.
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Formal Proposal
1. Academic Quality: Provide analysis on competency, experience and number of faculty and adequacy of students, curriculum, computational resources, library, laboratories, equipment and other physical facilities, needed to mount the program.

Faculty Competency, Experience and Number
Kent State University Athletic Training program currently has six full-time faculty with support from five teaching assistants. All faculty members hold a degree from a regionally or nationally accredited institution recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or equivalent as verified by a member of the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services Inc.

TABLE 1: The full-time faculty qualifications are summarized in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name/Title</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Years Certified*/KSU</th>
<th>Areas of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Chinn Custer; Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD – University of Virginia, Athletic Training/Biomechanics MS – Valparaiso University, Athletic Training BS – University of Wisconsin – Madison, Athletic Training</td>
<td>13/5</td>
<td>Biomechanics, Assessment, Rehabilitation, EBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Hale; Lecturer</td>
<td>MS – Indiana University, Athletic Training BS – Indiana University, Athletic Training</td>
<td>23/16</td>
<td>Anatomy and Physiology, General Medical Conditions, Pharmacology, First Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Huston; Associate Lecturer &amp; UG/Grad Program Coordinator</td>
<td>EdD – Capella University, Educational Leadership (Anticipated Degree - May 2017) MS – West Virginia University, Athletic Training BS – Heidelberg University, Athletic Training</td>
<td>15/11</td>
<td>Anatomy and Physiology, Neural Function, Educational Theory, Organization and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Jonas; Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>PhD – Kent State University, Exercise Physiology (Anticipated Degree – May 2017) MEd – University of Virginia, Athletic Training BS – Marietta College, Athletic Training</td>
<td>18/10</td>
<td>Biomechanics, Rehabilitation, Modalities, Graston Technique, Human Anatomy and Physiology, Exercise Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Peer; Associate Professor</td>
<td>EdD – University of Akron, Higher Ed Administration/Health Care Management MA – Western Michigan University, Athletic Training BS – Kent State University, Secondary Education/Athletic Training</td>
<td>29/17</td>
<td>Health Care Ethics, Professional Development, Leadership, Education and Supervision, Curriculum Design, Educational Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Reed; UG Clinical Coordinator and Lecturer</td>
<td>PhD – Kent State University, Curriculum and Instruction (Anticipated Degree - ) MS – University of Kentucky, Athletic Training BS – Central Michigan University, Athletic Training</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>First Aid and Immediate/Emergent Care, Assessment, Clinical Athletic Training, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Years experience reflects all professional experience since BOC certification

Core faculty consists of (2) terminally degreed professionals, (3) who will complete their terminal degree by Fall 2017, and (1) who is MS trained with substantive continuing education. Kent State University has a full-time designated Program Coordinator and Clinical Coordinator for the athletic training program. Full-time faculty are engaged in teaching far greater than the required 60% of the core degree curriculum. KSU has approximately 12-5 student to 1 full-time faculty ratio (anticipating 20-30 graduates and 45 undergraduates in ATTR courses each semester). Although our faculty is reflective of the KSU profile for students having approximately 50% female and 16% ethnic diversity, our goal is to continue to improve our diversity as part of the broader KSU initiatives.
In addition to the degree and experience credentials, our faculty have been active in local, district, national and international conferences as presenters on athletic training domains. Additionally, the faculty have published in peer-reviewed journals and have been recognized for their contributions to professional organization. Further, the faculty of Kent State University have been selected to represent professional organization through their service, including but not limited to: NATA Executive Committee on Education, CAATE site visitors, Graston Instructor, American Red Cross Instructor/Instructor Trainer, Ohio OT/PT/AT Board for state licensure, and Editor and/or Reviewers for athletic training peer reviewed publications. *See Appendix B: CVs for full-time faculty which reflect the depth and breadth of the faculty accomplishments.

Kent State University also employs adjunct faculty (number varies per year) to primarily assist with entry-level laboratory instruction, competency assessment and clinical supervision. Our adjuncts hold minimally a master's degree and have been certified and practicing in the field of athletic training. These professionals have varied work experiences including the primary employment settings for athletic trainers, including but not limited to, high school, intercollegiate athletics, clinical, industrial, physician office, and professional sports. All hold a national athletic training certification and state license to practice. Moreover, each is obligated to maintain currency of credentials through required continuing education courses.

**Adequacy of students**

Kent State University has graduate program acceptance standards. Minimum requirements for entry into the MS ATTR program is a 3.0 GPA (4.0 scale); either a minimum GRE score of the 50th percentile or a MCAT score of the 50th percentile; an undergraduate degree with completion of the prerequisite coursework with a grade of “C” or better; official transcript(s); goal statement, and two letters of recommendation. Due to the highly prescriptive program requirements, students cannot transfer coursework from other institutions directly into the MS ATTR program. All MS ATTR students must also complete the “Technical Standards Document” prior to commencing in the program. All students are required to do an immersive clinical capstone in their program.
Curriculum

The proposed curriculum is a two-calendar year program with 60 total credit hours. The program of study consists of a series of prerequisite admission content areas including coursework in Biology, Basic Athletic Training, Biomechanics, Anatomy and Physiology including Exercise Physiology, Chemistry, Research, Physics, Nutrition and General Psychology) which are detailed in the admission materials and evaluated prior to admission and a 3.0 cumulative grade point average for consideration. The curriculum involves summer academic work for both semesters. The first summer is to prepare the student with intensive content knowledge and cadaver anatomy which will be collaborative with KSU's College of Podiatric Medicine. This is followed by Fall and Spring semesters in which Clinical Practice (I/II), Physical Rehabilitation, Neurological Concepts, and two Research courses (Methods and Clinical Inquiry) are taught. The second summer is to allow for an “immersion” experience through a clinical capstone as recommended by the CAATE where a comprehensive research project/thesis will be completed along with an Ethics course. The last year Fall and Spring will emphasize additional Clinical Practice (III/IV), Advanced Clinical Procedures, Administrative Concepts, Contemporary Issues and Pathopharmacology as students prepare to challenge the BOC credentialing exam at the end of their program. The program requires evidence-based practice research papers and other research activities as part of the required courses to fully develop the research across the curriculum as a foundation of the program. As a MS Program, research will be integrated into each of the courses through evidence-based science and will culminate in the Capstone experience where a full research project will be completed. Students will have the ability to critically evaluate and complete scientific research at the end of their academic program. (See Appendix C: Proposed Curriculum for the MS ATTR Program).

Computational resources and library

Kent State University has outstanding computer and library resources. In addition to the computer stations at the main library, the College of Education, Health and Human Services has dedicated computer resources including an Instructional Resource Center in its building (White Hall) as does the main building for the athletic training program (MACC Annex). Ample hard copy and electronic resources are available through KentLink, OhioLink and Interlibrary Loan. Further, Kent State University has wide access to computer technical assistance and library support through full time employees in these units. The library also offers services to students such as textbook reserve, library instruction and tutorials, plagiarism school, statistical consulting, and student multimedia studios.

Laboratories and equipment and other physical facilities, needed to mount the program.

The facilities, classroom, and competency lab were renovated within the last few years. We are currently running the professional program at the undergraduate level and we do not anticipate an increase in need for facilities in the short-term because we will be phasing out the undergraduate program as the MS ATTR program reaches capacity.
Our classroom is dedicated to athletic training and consists of a 40 x 40 space with tables and chairs in the front and teaching lab space in the back to provide seamless transition to practice skills. The adjacent laboratory space is the same size with two sections: one for competency assessment and skills practice and the larger section for rehabilitation and research space. A large storage area adjoins these spaces ensuring security for our equipment and supplies. As a CAATE-accredited program, we have a wide range of equipment and supplies to meet the needs of the students. In addition, intercollegiate athletics recently acquired space next to our labs in an expansive renovation and will have exceptional equipment resources such as underwater treadmill, cryochamber, anti-gravity treadmill, laser, and other innovative devices for instructional purposes.

Off-campus facilities are also exceptional. We currently have clinical site relationships with the major hospitals, high schools, emergency care facilities, physician offices, and clinics in the surrounding areas including Akron, Cleveland, and Canton. We have expanded our outreach while maintaining a high level of clinical faculty expertise as our undergraduate program has had a long, strong, and positive tradition. As the residency portion of this program is in the summer and the undergrads do not complete summer clinicals, there will be no overlap even as the programs transition completely. During the academic year, we will have some overlap of undergraduate and graduate students but the number and quality of the facilities and clinical faculty with whom we have relationships will support both programs until the undergraduate program has dissolved. *See Appendix D for Clinical Sites and Preceptor Chart*

a In addition to this analysis, for entry level graduate degree programs, academic quality assessment will focus on the adequacy of the answers provided in response to the following questions:

i Is the program distinctly different, both conceptually and qualitatively, from the undergraduate degree programs in the same or related disciplines? If so, is there a detailed listing of the specific differences?

Yes, the program is different conceptually and qualitatively from the undergraduate degree programs in the same or related disciplines. As the new MS ATTR emerges (fall, 2018), the undergraduate program will be phased out. Not only will it help students prepare for the MS ATTR professional program, but it can service students who cannot or do not want to become an athletic trainer who are interested in other health care professions. The MS ATTR will use integrated competency content (as required for accreditation) with a strong influence of research methods and evidence-based integration of research across the curriculum and culminating on a best-practices capstone research thesis/project. The courses will focus on higher order learning skills (integration, synthesis, creation, evaluation) and will be anchored in the science of the discipline and the development of research skills.
Further, this MS program is distinctly different than the MS/PHD EXPH ATTR major in that our core content (curriculum) and expected outcomes (employment and advanced degree opportunities) are diverse. Exercise Physiology graduates will pursue PhD programs and/or employment in the wellness/fitness, cardiac rehabilitation, or Exercise Physiology domains.

MS ATTR graduates will pursue employment as a certified, licensed athletic trainer in venues within the scope of their practice as defined by state and federal regulations and/or pursue doctoral studies or clinical and research residencies in athletic training or related fields. The differences in curricula are highlighted. *See Appendix E for MS ATTR curriculum and MS EXPH curriculum tables

ii Does the program emphasize the theoretical basis of the discipline as expressed in the methods of inquiry and ways of knowing in the discipline?

Yes, it emphasizes both theory and clinical practice domains and skills related to the profession of athletic training. There are varied educational methods used in the curriculum and research is emphasized throughout to promote critical thinking and inquiry. Evidence-based practice is integrated throughout the curriculum to develop a strong foundation in the scientific research guiding clinical practice *See Appendix F for course descriptions

iii Does the program place emphasis on professional decision making and teach the use of critical analysis in problem solving?

Yes, professional decision making is emphasized throughout the curriculum. The courses focus on professional decision making though a formal course in Ethics which has a strong critical analysis and problem solving foundation as the methodology for course delivery. Additionally, students will actively engage in critical thinking tasks in their didactic courses and especially in the clinical elements of the program as they work with patients and clinical supervisors. Lastly, with research infused throughout the curriculum, students will develop a strong sense of professional decision making and critical analysis as they embark upon and complete multiple research projects including a comprehensive capstone research project/thesis.

iv Is the program designed to educate students broadly so that they have an understanding of the major issues and concerns in the discipline or professional area?

Absolutely. A major portion of our curriculum integrates contemporary issues into the instruction of each course. For example, Ethics will address headline issues facing the profession; Contemporary Issues addresses broad issues taken from the professional organizations website and activities; and other courses address core issues associated with the changing professional role of the athletic
trainer through various instructional strategies including role play, case analysis, and other contemporary modes. Additionally, evidence-based principles will be used to guide instruction and research to promote transition to practice relative to contemporary and scientific foundations.

v Is there an adequate description of the required culminating experience such as an exit project (which would not necessarily be a research experience)?

Students will complete a culminating capstone research project as part of the immersion experience. This capstone experience will be research based and will also integrate the "Reflective Practice Cycle" model for reflection. It will be broad and encompass scientific research processes, evidence-based practice, professionalism (as a construct), clinical practice elements, and professional development.

vi Does the proposed program identify faculty resources appropriate for the research component of the program?

Yes. 5 of the 6 core faculty have expansive research experience. One tenured faculty member (Peer) has published and presented extensively and serves as the Editor-in-Chief for a professional research journal (Athletic Training Education Journal) as well as editorial board member/reviewer for other professional journals. Custer (Chinn) is a tenure-track faculty who has also published and presented research and serves on review boards for several professional journals. Three other faculty (Huston, Jonas, Reed) are currently pursuing their terminal degrees and are trained in various research aspects for their dissertations – Huston (Action Research); Jonas (Quantitative); and Reed (Qualitative/Mixed Methods).

vii Does the program curriculum offer what students need to know for competence at the expected level of professional expertise?

Yes, the curriculum is anchored in the domains of athletic training as established by the Board of Certification through the Role Delineation/Practice Analysis of Athletic Training (7th Edition) and the current and proposed Competencies for Athletic Training. As an entry-level, professional program yet MS level program, both theory and clinical skills are emphasized to ensure competence as reflected by passage of the BOC exam and to protect the public. Specific emphasis on the development of research methods and skills will add to the professional expertise of the students in the program.

viii What plans have been made to address standards and guidelines for professional accreditation, if applicable? What are the core courses required for the program?

This program aligns with CAATE standards for entry-level programs. It has integrated the proposed changes that are currently open for public comment to
ensure it is integrating current and proposed content. *See Appendix C for core courses in the Curriculum plan*

2. **Need.** Examples of potential metrics of program need include:
   a. **Student interest and demand; potential enrollment; ability to maintain the critical mass of students.**

   The need for a new degree program is quite clear if Kent State University wants to continue to offer athletic training as an academic program. In May 2015, the Strategic Partners governing the athletic training profession declared that the new degree program for the entry-level professional would be the master’s program only. Extensive review by various constituents in the profession yielded several reports: Health Care Economist Report, CAATE Open Comment Report, and National Athletic Trainers’ Association (NATA) Focus Group Final Report. The announcement from the Athletic Training Strategic Alliance for the transition in degree level was announced publically May 2015. The deadline for this change has been formalized as 2022 with all UG professional programs ceasing after that date. *(See Appendix 3: Joint Statement from the Strategic Alliance).*

   There are currently 24 Professional undergraduate programs in the state of Ohio, including Kent State University. Of these Professional undergraduate programs, there is one (Xavier) pending transition into the Professional master’s program as of this date, as evidenced on the CAATE website. According to the CAATE Website, 6 of these programs are on probation and one is seeking initial accreditation.

   There is currently only one Professional Master’s program in the state of Ohio – University of Findlay which is located in NW Ohio. Additionally, there are only 41 Professional master’s programs nationally. As a national organization, the NATA is organized be geographic regions. Ohio is within District IV of the NATA that is comprised of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Within District IV of the NATA, there are only 5 Professional master’s programs with current good standing (1 each in MI, WI, IN, MN, OH). Of the surrounding states of West Virginia and Pennsylvania, there are only 4 additional Professional MS programs (3 in PA; 1 in WV).

   *(See Appendix I for the CAATE program statistics for the entry-level undergraduate programs in Ohio, MS Programs in Ohio, and MS programs nationwide, respectively)*

   As a selective admission program, we will admit approximately 15-20 students per year in each cohort which will keep the total program number at approximately 30-40 students, the capacity for our didactic and clinical sites. This will ensure optimal exposure during clinical rotations. **This is important as we anticipate smaller classes while we phase out the BS ATTR major as the Professional athletic training program to “teach out” all existing BS ATTR students which is anticipated to cease with admitting BS ATTR students upon implementation of the MS ATTR program (Fall 2019).**
b Institutional need; plan for overall development of graduate programs at the proposing institutions.

At this current time, KSU is highly competitive in athletic training education at the undergraduate level. As a strong program in the state and a program that currently has the faculty and staff to pursue the change to the MS level, we would anticipate being one of the first few to transition. Since there is only one other program at the Professional Master’s level in Ohio, we would be competitive for students in the state as well as in the district. Duplication regionally would be hard to predict as most programs are currently evaluating the feasibility of transitioning (due to the recent announcement), yet few are acting to transition through formal proposals within the state and district/region as of yet. As of August 2016, of the 24 Ohio Bachelor Level Programs, 6 were on probation and one was seeking accreditation at the Bachelor Level. Similarly, only two other programs had pursued Professional master’s approval (Xavier – degree change pending and Youngstown State – seeking accreditation). As a doctoral-granting university, our program will also likely be attractive to those who would like to pursue a Ph.D. after graduation.

Kent State University is a doctoral-granting institution and graduate education is part of the university strategic plan which is supported by the university as a whole.

c Societal demand; intellectual development; advancement of the discipline; employment opportunities.

Relative to employment opportunities, athletic training is one of the fastest growing health care fields through 2018 according to Job Outlook 2022. As a profession, we have many expanding opportunities for athletic training professionals including military, surgical, emergency medicine, and industry evolving. Moreover, KSU has had a strong history of nearly 100% employment or post-graduate education following graduation from our BS ATTR program for nearly a decade. We anticipate this trend will continue with the Professional Master’s program. Employer surveys generated from the undergraduate program has yielded positive feedback regarding our graduates. According to the NATA Career Center, there were 2,193 new job postings in 2014 for athletic training positions.

Further, Ohio is a strong region for athletic training. Within a six county radius (Summit, Portage, Stark, Wayne, Medina, Cuyahoga), there are approximately 181 high schools, 10 colleges and universities and 10 major hospital systems and affiliates which employ athletic trainers. This does not include those employment venues beyond the local region and in other athletic training career settings and/or graduate programs/residencies.

d Scope; local, regional and national needs; international need.

Athletic training is projected to be one of the fastest growing professions through 2020 as indicated above. Ohio has a rich employment ground for athletic trainers as reflected in the above regional and local numbers. Further, the expanding job
opportunities for athletic trainers beyond high school, college and clinic continue to expand exponentially.

3. Access and Retention of Underrepresented Groups
   a. Plan to ensure recruitment, retention and graduation of underrepresented groups within the discipline.

   Kent State University is non-discriminatory in its admission. KSU will actively engage in recruitment and retention initiatives to ensure representation of underrepresented groups.

   The minority representation in the National Athletic Trainers’ Association is relatively low despite efforts to promote diversity recruitment and retention in the profession. For the purposes of potential students to recruit and retain, the numbers are encouraging. There was an increase in student membership in 2014 trending upward by 6.5% in national membership to just over 8,000 students. When looking at the categories, approximately 1,300 of those 8,000 are already certified. As a Professional program, we would then have a potential total pool of approximately 6,700 students nationwide.

   Nationally, there are approximately 1,500 ethnically diverse students in the national organization. As reflected in the numbers listed below, there is a slight increase in diversity in the student population from the past years.

   Our plan at Kent State University is specific and focused. We have the potential to actively recruit and retain through our efforts at regional, state and national recruitment events for several reasons. First, we have been awarded two national grants (Ethnic Diversity Enhancement Grants) over the past decade to help support our initiatives to recruit diverse students into our program. The exposure we gained from our grant programs (High school AT camp, HS recruitment events and programs, Shadow an AT experience for HS students, Leadership Anthology for Ethnically Diverse ATs, research publications and State and National Poster presentations on the initiatives). Second, the reputation of the faculty and through many national and international presentations and publications, students of all ethnicities will be intrigued to collaborate with our faculty throughout their educational program. Third, as an undergraduate program, we have maintained a strong tradition in retaining and recruiting ethnically diverse students in our current BS ATTR program and boast a current student enrollment of at least 10% which is above the national average in the profession. Lastly, we plan to actively recruit through direct information via marketing to HBCU, Offices of Diversity and Inclusion, and graduate fair programs around the state and at the university.
TABLE 2: Total Members by Category in National Athletic Trainers' Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Type</th>
<th>Members (2014)</th>
<th>Change from 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified</td>
<td>32651</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td><strong>8057</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41420</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certified Members by Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Type</th>
<th>Members (2014)</th>
<th>Change from 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Regular</td>
<td>27714</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Starter</td>
<td>2347</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Certified</strong></td>
<td><strong>1309</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Certified</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Certified</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32651</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.

**Ethnicity 2011-2014 Membership Trend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 # of Minority Members</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2013 # of Minority Members</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2012 # of Minority Members</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>1571</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1444</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1150</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Members</td>
<td>4063</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>3924</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>3512</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Members**</td>
<td>5634</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>5481</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4771</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*5.0% of Students do not provide ethnicity data
** 5.6% of All Members do not provide ethnicity data

Accessed at: [http://members.nata.org/members1/documents/membstats/2014E0Ystats.htm](http://members.nata.org/members1/documents/membstats/2014E0Ystats.htm)

Provide as background a general assessment of:

- Institution and departmental profiles of total enrollment and graduate student enrollment of underrepresented groups within the discipline.

TABLE 3: Graduate Profiles KSU and EHHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's (KSU)</td>
<td>4381</td>
<td>3988</td>
<td>4547</td>
<td>4087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's EHHS</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>1621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://www.kent.edu/facts-figures](http://www.kent.edu/facts-figures)
http://www.kent.edu/facts-figures

Compare underrepresented groups degree recipients from the department and university at all levels compared to national norms. Supply data by group where available.

According to the KSU Office of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE), the following response was given to our request for this information:

"We are not aware of any source for national data on Masters level retention and graduation rates. Retention and grad rates at the graduate level are not tracked at the same level as undergrad. A standard graduation rate, like the 6-yr number for undergrad, is not even consistent across sources."

Special efforts to enroll and retain underrepresented groups in the given discipline.

Please see comments regarding KSU’s success relative to recruitment and retention of ATTR majors who are under-represented including two funded grants from the NATA Ethnic Diversity Enhancement Committee. KSU as a university also has widespread initiatives for recruiting and retaining under-represented students.

2. **Statewide Alternatives**
   
   a  Programs available in other institutions.
Currently, there is only 1 Professional master’s program in athletic training at the University of Findlay. Of recent, Youngstown State University was approved to commence an MS ATTR program. Although there are 25 undergraduate programs in Ohio, it is uncertain how many will begin transition to the MS degree track.

b Appropriateness of specific locale for the program.

Kent State University is located in northeast Ohio with easy access to several large cities, including but not limited to, Akron and Cleveland. KSU has maintained strong presence in athletic training as an undergraduate program in this area and with the elimination of the undergraduate programs, it is anticipated that KSU will be able to support the MS ATTR program. As indicated above, there are 25 undergraduate programs in the area and the majority concentrated above the central Ohio region. It is anticipated that KSU will be competitive with recruiting graduate student from above the state based upon graduate student statistics for the university as a whole. *See graduate student demographics Table above

c Opportunities for inter-institutional collaboration.

Kent State University has prided itself on inter-institutional collaboration in athletic training. Although the curricular offerings do not cross institutions, our faculty collaborate at the state level on an educational program (Ohio Athletic Training Program Symposium) and at the local level with continuing educational (Summa Health Systems Continuing Education Program) and clinical experiences (Akron Marathon coverage). Opportunities for inter-institutional collaborations will have the potential to emerge as other programs in the area determine the direction for their respective programs.

d Institutional Priority and Costs

i Support and commitment of the proposing institution’s central administration.

This program has support from the School of Health Sciences, College of Education, Health and Human Services, and the University Provost as evidenced by endorsement and approval of the curricular changes. *See Appendix J for letters of support

Drs. Stephen Mitchell and Lynne Rowan, Associate Graduate Dean, College of Education Health and Human Services and School Director, School of Health Sciences respectively, have endorsed this program. Additional letters of support are provided from several affiliate sites and the College of Podiatric Medicine (for the Cadaver Anatomy Course). These are included in Appendix J.

ii Adequacy of available resources committed for the initiation of the program.

Initially, this program will not require additional resources with the exception of the cadaver anatomy course which will require the purchase of cadaver specimens and equipment. Space is provided through Kent State University
College of Podiatric Medicine. Anticipated expenses for the course materials will be offset by a lab fee associated with that specific course. The other resources exist within the School, College and University. Community outreach resources only complement our already strong resources including faculty, equipment, lab space, library and computational resources. An estimated cost analysis is provided for consideration in Appendix L.

3. **External Support**

   a. *Community, foundation, governmental and other resources.*

   This program has community support in the sense that it will utilize clinical sites in the surrounding areas as evidenced in the Affiliate Site Chart (Appendix D). Additional support of their preceptors and administration strengthens our external support. There are no external funds supporting this program; however, faculty grants support additional initiatives and research projects.
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Proposal Summary for a Policy
English Proficiency Requirements at Kent State University

Subject Specification:
This proposal is meant to make current English proficiency guidelines into an official policy to ensure all students applying with international credentials are adequately prepared for academic coursework in English instruction at Kent State University. It will also guarantee consistency in the requirements set for those applying with international credentials.

Background Information:
Until this time, there has been no formal policy regarding English proficiency for students with international credentials at Kent State University. There have been standards in place but as they were never officially approved and made into policy, there have been inconsistencies in English proficiency requirements, waivers, application reviews and decisions directly related to the aptitude of a student’s English skills.

The approval of this policy will ensure consistency and accuracy in regards to English proficiency requirements for applicants and academic programs. It will also allow us to remain strategically paralleled with peer and aspirational institutions as well as regional competitors. According to IIE’s Open Doors report fact sheet for the state of Ohio, Kent State University ranks third in the number of international students following The Ohio State University and the University of Cincinnati. This policy is necessary to the continued growth and success of our global competitiveness amongst other universities in Ohio. It is also required in order to align with the third priority of Kent State University’s Strategic Roadmap, Global Competitiveness. The English Proficiency policy will ensure a foundation of English proficiency to increase enrollment of international students, enhance their education experience through academic excellence and success as well as positively impact student retention and recognition among international partners. A consistent and decisive English proficiency policy, process and strategy forms clear expectations campus wide for all involved in the internationalization initiative of the university.

Creating an official policy will allow programs and applicants consistency in requirements and ensure students are prepared with the necessary English proficiency skills to be successful in academic program of study. The findings and implementation of this policy were based on review of the existing procedures in place as well as comparison and analysis to other universities and colleges throughout the United States, institutions as defined by President Warren in her Strategic Visioning as Selected Peer Institutions and Selected Aspirational Institutions.

Selected Peer Institutions per this Strategic Visioning include:

Georgia State University
University of Houston
Western Michigan University
Ohio University
University of North Texas
Utah State University
Selected Aspirational Institutions per this Strategic Visioning include:

Clemson University  
Pennsylvania State University  
University of South Florida  
Temple University  
Virginia Commonwealth University

Regional/Comparable Institutions researched in development of this proposal include:

Case Western Reserve University  
The Ohio State University  
Bowling Green State University  
Cleveland State University  
Wright State University  
University of Cincinnati  
Kansas State University  
Wichita State University  
Webster University  
Indiana State University  
Indiana University  
Ball State University  
Ferris University  
University of Pittsburgh  
University of East Kentucky  
Purdue University  
University of Colorado

The research and analysis of these institutions with Kent State University English proficiency processes revealed that our standards parallel with set policy of most other institutions of similar size, recognition and international aspirations. Most institutions have a university standard or minimum and then graduate programs or colleges within the institution may choose to set a higher English proficiency requirement.

Also found to be common among these institutions was the waiving of the English proficiency requirement for students that had already obtained a U.S. degree. It has been confirmed through this research that all Peer and Aspirational institutions as well as other regional and comparable institutions waive the English proficiency requirement for those that have received a degree or completed at least two years of full time academic study at a U.S. institution.

Research also demonstrated that our current country list (see pages 4-5) with regards to English proficiency waivers is comparable with other institutions. For international applicants who have been primarily educated within certain countries, there is a waiver for the English proficiency requirement. The chart on the next page shows prospective countries that other universities waive the English requirement for, of which we have added South Africa, Zimbabwe, Fiji and Nigeria to Kent State University’s existing list.
The current standards that have been in place for students with international credentials align with the proposed policy. The existing procedures are outlined in subsequent pages of this policy with new additional items highlighted in yellow. The proposed policy includes additional countries that have not previously been a part of the English proficiency standards, a proposed higher PTE minimum and implementation of an internal English Proficiency tier system for Academic programs.

**English Language Proficiency Current Standards**

**Undergraduate**
All undergraduate applicants must obtain a minimum TOEFL score of 525 (71 on the Internet based version), minimum MELAB score of 75, IELTS score of 6.0, or **PTE Academic score of 50**, or Complete the ELS level 112 Intensive Program. Those who do not meet the minimum score for admission may be admitted conditionally if they meet academic requirements—Conditional Admission means students will take English language classes at our ESL Center before entering their programs.

**Graduate**
All graduate applicants must submit an English language proficiency test score to be considered for a graduate program. Graduate programs set their own English requirements, please review Graduate Program English Requirements before submitting your application.

**Waive English Language Requirement**

All international applicants whose education has been primarily outside the United States of America must provide objective evidence of proficiency in the English language. However, the following exceptions apply:

1. **Applicants primarily educated in the following countries/territories:**
   - Anguilla
   - Antigua & Barbuda
   - Australia
   - Bahamas
   - Barbados
   - Belize
   - British Virgin Islands
   - Canada (except Quebec)
   - Cayman Islands
   - Dominica
   - Falkland Islands
   - Fiji
   - Ghana
   - Gibraltar
   - Grenada
   - Guernsey
   - Guyana
   - Ireland
   - Isle of Man
   - Jamaica
2. Applicants who have recently completed three years of full-time study at a secondary institution in the U.S. may be exempted from this requirement after supporting academic records have been reviewed by the Admissions Office.

3. Applicants who have received a U.S. Bachelor’s or U.S. Master’s degree or who have completed two years of full-time academic study at an accredited post-secondary institution within the U.S.

4. International Baccalaureate (IB) applicants to Kent State may satisfy this requirement by attaining a minimum score of 5 in the Diploma Programme higher level or a minimum score of 6 in the standard level English language examinations. Or, applicants who have completed the ELS level 112 will be considered as met the English language requirement for undergraduate applications.

Any request for a waiver of the English language proficiency requirement must be submitted in writing to the Admissions Office with any supporting documentation.

Kent State University reserves the right to require evidence of English language proficiency for all applicants, the adequacy of which shall be at the sole discretion of Kent State University.

There are four different English proficiency exams that Kent State University will receive for consideration for admission if a student has international credentials and does not meet any of the English waiver conditions. These exams are the TOEFL, IELTS, PTE and MELAB. The following provides a brief description of each of these exams which are widely used among universities and colleges throughout the world as an indicator of a student’s English proficiency.

**TOEFL**
This exam is described as “the most widely respected English-language test in the world” and is recognized by over 9,000 institutions in over 130+ countries. There are two basic types, paper-based referred to as pBT and internet based, iBT. The pBT is not as common as the iBT. At Kent State University we only accept pBT if it is our own ESL Center’s institutional paper-based test. All other TOEFL scores must be submitted officially and electronically to us from the testing organization ETS. The range for pBT is 310 – 677 and the range for iBT is 0-120.

[https://www.ets.org/toefl/ibt/about](https://www.ets.org/toefl/ibt/about)
IELTS
The International English Language Testing System or IELTS is said to be “the world’s most popular English language test for higher education and global migration with over 2.7 million tests taken last year in 140 countries.” There are two basic types, Academic and General Training and Kent State University accepts only the Academic IELTS, which is the most common and widely used for English proficiency consideration. It is based on an easy-to-use 9 band scale which ranges from 1-9, non-user to expert respectively. IELTS is available at more than 1,100 locations worldwide and includes a face-to-face speaking component as part of the assessment. At Kent State University, we accept a copy of the official report from the student and verify the score through an online portal provided by IELTS.
https://www.ielts.org/

PTE
Pearson Test of English Academic or PTE is the world’s “leading computer-based test of English” for those that are studying abroad or migrating. They are known for their fast results, within five business day, and for their flexible test dates as they run 363 tests a year in more than 200 locations worldwide. This exam has become increasingly popular and is accepted by thousands of institutions worldwide, including Harvard Business School, INSEAD and Yale. The PTE score range is from 10-90 points. At Kent State University, we accept a copy of the official PTE report from the student and verify the score through an online portal provided by Pearson.
http://pearsonpte.com/

MELAB
The Michigan English Language Assessment Battery is another English proficiency standardized examination. This exam is recognized by thousands of institutions both for academic and professional purposes. As stated in the MELAB 2015 Report, it is aimed at the B1-C1 levels of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR, Council of Europe) and the report ranges from 0-99. Of the four English proficiency exams received at Kent State University for admission consideration, MELAB is the least common and is verified by an official report mailed directly to the International Admissions Office at Kent State University.
http://cambridgемichigan.org/institutions/products-services/tests/proficiency-certification/melab/

Given the diversity of these exams and the range of their score equivalencies, an English Proficiency Tier chart has been developed to allow for a benchmark and comparison of these scores. The chart will serve as an internal guide and sets the English Proficiency exams in tiers. By choosing a tier, the academic programs will have the option to choose the range that best suits their individual program needs. It should be considered while setting the English Proficiency requirement for an academic program that English ability does not fully assess or measure the academic ability or skill of the student. The English proficiency tiers include text to briefly describe and outline the overall English proficiency and ability of the student at that specific level. It should be noted that deviations from the tiers could lead to inconsistency of English proficiency among admitted students. This is to be used as an internal document only for guidance and policy purposes.
## English Proficiency Tiers for Academic Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>TOEFL iBT</th>
<th>TOEFL PBT</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>MELAB</th>
<th>PTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>71-78</td>
<td>525-549</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>74-76</td>
<td>50-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tier A</strong> Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Recommended for programs that aren’t writing intensive, often in STEM fields.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>79-93</td>
<td>550-586</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>77-81</td>
<td>58-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tier B</strong> Can exchange factual information on familiar routine/non-routine matters within his/her field with some confidence. Can pass on a detailed piece of information. Recommended for programs with a moderate amount of writing, often in master’s level business and education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>94-101</td>
<td>587-609</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>82-85</td>
<td>65-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tier C</strong> Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialization. Recommended for writing intensive programs, often in communication and medical fields, especially PhDs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>102+</td>
<td>610+</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>86+</td>
<td>73+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tier D</strong> Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options. Recommended for heavily writing and research intensive PhDs across all disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternatives and Consequences:
This policy once approved will allow accuracy and consistency in the English proficiency requirements as well as ensure students are adequately prepared to enter into their academic studies. It will also align Kent State University English proficiency policy with peer and aspirational institutions. The result of falling behind with respect to English proficiency requirements and waivers would be detrimental to the sustained growth and academic success of our international student population as well as prevent our institution from receiving the quality applicants that our competitors would readily consider for admission.

### Specific Recommendation and Justification:
The English proficiency proposal, once approved as official policy will effectively define the English proficiency requirements for students, faculty and staff. It will serve to safeguard applicants from beginning academic study until they have a proficient grasp of English to be successful in their program. The policy will also guide departments in choosing which English proficiency requirements they need in place for academic success and retention of international students. It will also ensure those students who have received academic credentials which waive the English requirement are recognized so that we are aligned in our English proficiency policy with peer, aspirational and regional institutions.
Timetable and Actions Required:
This proposal will be presented to Graduate Studies Administrative Advisory Committee (GSAAC) for approval in fall of 2016 semester. Once approved, International Admissions will coordinate efforts with each academic department to review the policy and provide training as needed regarding the English proficiency exams and ranges so that they choose which English proficiency tier they will adopt for their program(s).

The proposal will go to GSAAC for review and approval, but after that, it must also go to the Educational Policies Council (EPC) and Faculty Senate for their respective approvals. After GSAAC approves the proposal as policy, the associate deans of the committee would work with academic colleges to revise admission criteria for each graduate program to correspond with the new tier system. EPC would then be notified of revised program admission criteria before implementation within the University Catalog.

There will be ongoing review of resources used in research to confirm that our English proficiency policy is aligned with the most up to date and accurate information.

With the implementation of the new CRM system at Kent State University, International Admissions will be able to track the English proficiency scores of applicants. The database will allow us to closely monitor the types of exams being submitted and the score ranges of students that are being admitted. This information will be gathered regularly and internal data collected, reviewed and strategically evaluated to remain current with best practices for English proficiency exams among peer, aspirational and regional institutions.

Sources

https://www.ets.org/toefl/institutions/scores/compare/
http://pearsonpte.com/institutions/scores/
https://www.ets.org/toefl/ibt/about
https://www.ielts.org/
http://pearsonpte.com
http://cambridgemichigan.org/institutions/products-services/tests/proficiency-certification/melab/
http://www.hhl.de/fileadmin/texte_relaunch/Conversion_Table_TOEFL_(PBT,CBT,iBT).pdf
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
January 30, 2017

Present: Deb Smith (Chair), Kathy Wilson (Vice Chair), Kathy Kerns (Secretary), Theresa Walton-Fisette (Appointed), Chris Fenk (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Excused: Tracy Laux (At-large)

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:05PM in the Faculty Senate office.

2. Approval of Minutes

a) The committee reviewed and made corrections to the December 12, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Wilson/Walton-Fisette). The minutes were approved.

b) The committee reviewed and made corrections to the December 14, 2016 Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Fenk/Wilson). The minutes were approved.

3. Review of Items from EPC

The committee reviewed items from EPC and discussed which to place on the agenda for the February Faculty Senate meeting. After discussion, a motion was made to place items 1, 2, 3, and 9 from the January 23, 2017 EPC meeting on the agenda as action items (Fenk/Walton-Fisette). The items involve: designation of Kent core status to a new course, MATH 10051, Quantitative Reasoning; consolidation of Crafts and Fine Arts majors into a new major called Studio Art; restructuring and renaming the Center for Applied Conflict Management, which would leave the Political Science department to become a school within Arts and Sciences; and establishment of a Nursing major for registered nurses that would be an online only degree administered through the Kent campus. The motion was approved.
4. Approval of EPC Items by Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Several items from the January 23, 2017 EPC meeting involved small changes; Chair Smith suggested they could be approved by Faculty Senate Executive Committee acting on behalf of Senate. Four of the changes involved renaming programs: School of Library and Information Science within CCI would be renamed School of Information; in the College of EHHS, the Educational Administration- K – 12 Leadership Masters and Ph.D. degrees would be renamed K – 12 Education Leadership; in the College of Nursing, the Advanced Practice Nursing major within the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree will be renamed Nursing; and in the Regional College, the Human Services Technology major will be renamed Human Services. EHHS is also proposing to inactivate two graduate majors that are duplicated elsewhere in the college. A motion was made to approve all of these items (Wilson/Kerns). The items will appear as EPC information items on the February Faculty Senate meeting agenda.

5. Sanctuary Campus Petition

Chair Smith announced that a student group, working with a faculty member in CCI, has written a petition requesting that KSU be designated a sanctuary campus. The organizers are asking members of the KSU community to sign the petition. After discussion it was decided to invite the petition organizers to present at the February Faculty Senate meeting.

6. Discussion of Climate Study Results

Vice Chair Wilson, who has been co-chair of the Climate Study Steering Committee that conducted the Climate Study last Spring, provided a brief report of results from the survey. There was discussion of some of the findings that pertain to faculty, and it was decided to have Vice Chair Wilson provide a brief summary of findings from the Climate Study at the February Faculty Senate meeting.

7. Changes in Student Surveys of Instruction (SSIs)

Chair Smith reported that Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Interim Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, has been providing updates on changes to the SSIs to different groups on campus. The changes being made were approved last year by Faculty Senate. It was decided to invite Director Marcinkiewicz to the February Faculty Senate meeting to provide Senate with an update on the implementation of the changes in SSIs.
8. Agenda for February 13, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting

The committee reviewed a draft agenda prepared by Chair Smith. After some modifications, a motion was made to approve the agenda (Walton-Fisette/Fenk). The agenda was approved.

9. Update on Faculty Workload Data

Vice Chair Wilson has been analyzing data on faculty workload, which includes making comparisons based on campus and faculty status (i.e., TT, NTT, part-time). She indicated she will be sending more information soon. The data will be discussed at a future Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting.

10. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:17PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
February 22, 2017

Present: Deb Smith (Chair), Kathy Wilson (Vice Chair), Kathy Kerns (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-large), Theresa Walton-Fisette (Appointed), Chris Fenk (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Guests: Dean Bracken, Assistant Dean Burhanna, Associate Provost Tankersley

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:04PM in the Faculty Senate office.

2. Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed and made corrections to the January 30, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Walton-Fisette/Wilson). The minutes were approved.

3. Review of Agenda for Discussion with Associate Provost Tankersley

The committee decided on items to discuss with Associate Provost Tankersley.

4. Updates from Chair Smith

a) Ballots from the Faculty Senate elections are being processed. Results will be announced next week.

b) Dave Smeltzer, Vanessa Earp, and Thomas Norton-Smith have all agreed to serve on the nominating committee. They will be asked to identify at least 2 candidates for each office of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

c) The committee preference questionnaire will be sent out in March. Vice Chair Wilson will remind Faculty Senate committees to send in their year end reports. She will also be meeting with the Committee on Committees before the end of the semester.

d) Senate members to the Faculty Ethics Committee will be elected at the March Senate meeting. One candidate has been identified, and at least one more nominee is needed to fill out the slate. Election of Ethics Committee members for units 1, 3, and 7 will be conducted by mail. Chair Smith will be requesting nominations for these positions soon.
e) March 20 has tentatively been floated for the President’s reception for Faculty Senators at the President’s residence.

f) SSI results from Fall semester were delayed in their distribution but should be received by faculty soon. The new standard items will be piloted with some course sections this spring, with further piloting this summer of additional items that can be chosen by the department and/or the instructor.

Dean Bracken, Assistant Dean Burhanna, and Associate Provost Tankersley joined to the meeting.

5. Update on Library Funding

Dean Bracken provided information on library funding for fiscal year 2017 (see attached). The library has been under financial pressure due to a requested reduction in the library budget from the provost’s office (approximately $500,000) and increases in prices for journal subscriptions. The library has been buffered and avoided layoffs of staff in part by spending money from their fund balance account. In addition, the library usually has ended the year under budget, and the plan for next fiscal year is to use those funds for new strategic initiatives. The collections budget is expected to stay the same, although if journal costs increase this will lead to some cuts in journal subscriptions. Members of the executive committee expressed concern that the library budget has been affected in the RCM redistribution of funds. They further noted the library is an important resource for faculty, and faculty input is needed when cuts are being planned.

Dean Bracken and Assistant Dean Burhanna left the meeting.

6. Discussion of Kent State United Draft

Chair Smith asked Associate Provost Tankersley what steps have been taken to talk to students and incorporate their feedback into the Kent State United statement. She also offered to share comments she had received from students and members of Faculty Senate with the President. One of the student proposals is to include immigration status in KSU’s discrimination policy. Associate Provost Tankersley indicated that President Warren has meetings scheduled with students, and plans to revise the draft in light of their suggestions. The document is a priority for President Warren and she intends to submit a revised document for consideration by Faculty Senate at the March meeting. The document focuses on principles, and there was also discussion of concrete steps the university could take to support international students.
7. Updates on Hiring Initiatives

Chair Smith asked whether the Executive Committee could receive an update on the status of current hiring initiatives. Associate Provost Tankersley indicated she would follow up on the request. There was also discussion of where authority for faculty hires lies, and the mixed messages faculty have received about this.

8. Academic Presence Verification

Associate Provost Tankersley stated that faculty participation was very high (about 90% of sections reported). The system has been modified so that students marked as not present will no longer be blocked from Blackboard. Associate Provost Tankersley also indicated she can provide information about the percent of students who were verified.

9. Updates on Visitors to Faculty Senate Meetings

Chair Smith inquired about whether meetings of Faculty Senate Executive Committee with KSU Board Chair Pollack and Human Resources VP Witt had been scheduled. In addition, there was also a request for Vice Presidents Little or Brown to inform Faculty Senate on actions that have been taken to combat hate speech and promote a more welcoming atmosphere for foreign students. Associate Provost Tankersley indicated she would follow up on these requests.

10. EPC Attendance

Associate Provost Tankersley expressed concerns about the declining number of faculty representatives that have been attending EPC and the minimal discussion of many EPC items. There was discussion of how to address the problem. One suggestion was to have staggered deadlines to avoid high workload EPC meetings, which would allow for more discussion of items. It was also noted that it would be beneficial if there were better communication between EPC and Faculty Senate, and it was suggested this could be facilitated by the Faculty Senate representatives on EPC.

11. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 6:21PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
February 27, 2017

Present: Deb Smith (Chair), Kathy Wilson (Vice Chair), Tracy Laux (At-large), Theresa Walton-Fisette (Appointed), Chris Fenk (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Excused: Kathy Kerns (Secretary)

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:12PM in the Faculty Senate office.

2. Review of Items from EPC

Chair Smith reviewed items from the February 21, 2017 EPC meeting. A motion was made to add the items to the agenda of the March Faculty Senate meeting (Wilson/Fenk). Three items (renaming the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability, and Technology; establishment of an Athletic training major; establishment of a university wide policy on English proficiency for foreign students) were proposed as action items, and one item (revision of university readiness standards and placement assessments) as an information item. There was some discussion of the new policy on English proficiency, and areas of the policy that might need to be clarified at the Senate meeting (e.g., is it a recommendation or binding). The motion was approved.

3. Review of Agenda for March 13, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting

The committee reviewed a proposed agenda provided by Chair Smith. There will be a report on the proposed changes to Commencement ceremonies. The President is also likely to have an updated Kent State United document for review. The FaSBAC Committee will be issuing a report later in the semester, and when it does that will be an agenda item at a future meeting. A motion was made to approve the agenda (Laux/Wilson). The motion was approved.

4. Spring Faculty Senate Forum

The Faculty Senate Spring Forum will be planned by Senators Laux, Fenk, and Walton-Fisette. There was discussion of focusing the forum on the results of the climate study. All faculty (not just members of Senate) will be invited to the forum.
5. Updates from Chair Smith

   a) Ballots from the Faculty Senate elections for 2017 – 2018 have been counted and the results will be announced to faculty this week. Chair Smith and Secretary Kerns have reviewed the description of the vote counting procedure in the by-laws, and they will be updating it to be a more complete description of the process used (i.e., Fractional Single Transferable Vote System, as named in the by-laws).

   b) The Professional Standards Committee will be meeting this semester. Chair Smith will ask if there is an update on the review of Flash Folio.

   c) The nominating committee is working on the slate for Faculty Senate executive offices for next academic year. Elections will be held during the April Faculty Senate meeting.

6. Adjournment

   The committee adjourned at 3:58PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate