Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the May 8th 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 April 10, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
5. Chair’s Remarks
6. President’s Remarks
7. Elections: Committee on Administrative Officers (CAO)
   a. Senator Candidates:
      - Richard Mangrum (FTNTE CAEST)
      - Terrance Uber (TT CAED)
      - Robin Vande Zande (TT Arts)
   b. Non-Senators Candidates:
      - Kimberley Cleveland (FTNTE Nursing)
      - Oliver Ruff (TT Stark/A&S)
      - Mark Whitmore (FTNTE Business)
8. Reports:
   a. FaSBAC Annual Report (Given by Mark Polatajko, Senior Vice President of Finance and Co-Chair of FaSBAC)
   b. Flash Folio Review Results (Given by Susan Roxburgh, Chair Professional Standards Committee)
9. EPC Items:
   
a. Action Items - **College of Public Health**: Inactivation of all departments within the College of Public Health. The inactivated departments are Social and Behavior Sciences; Health Policy and Management; and Biostatistics, Environmental Heath, and Epidemiology. Effective July 2017.
   
b. Information Item - **Regional College**: Inactivation of Emergency Medical Services Technology major within the Associate of Technical Study degree. The degree program, offered at the Trumbull Campus, has no dedicated faculty and low enrollment over the past several years. Effective Fall 2017.
   
10. Old Business: Summary from the Spring Forum “The Climate Study and Faculty's Impact on Others”

11. New Business

12. Announcements / Statements for the Record

13. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment
FACULTY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
April 10, 2017


Senators-Elect Present: Jeffrey Ciesla, David Kaplan, Rocco Petrozzi

Senators Not Present: Ann Abraham, Mary Lou Ferranto, Pamela Grimm, Bruce Gunning, Albert Ingram, Jay Jahangiri, Larry Osher, Arden Rutman, Denice Sheehan, David Smeltzer, Jennifer Walton-Fisette

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: Alfreda Brown, Paul DiCorleto, Shay Little, Charlene Reed, Nathan Ritchey, Andrea Nunley for Ed Mahon; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Blank, Allan Boike, John Crawford-Spinelli, Mark Kretovics, Mark Mistur, Donald Palmer, Eboni Pringle, Robert Sines, Deborah Spake, Melody Tankersley; Ken Burhanna for James Bracken

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Vice Presidents: Stephen Sokany, Willis Walker, Jack Witt; Deans: Barbara Broome, Amy Reynolds; Director Jeffrey Fruit

Observers Present: Jerry Feezel (Emeritus Professor), Kate Klonowski (GSS)

Observers Not Present: Natalia Roman (USS)

Guests Present: Megan Ayscue, NaBria Beasley, Janis Crowther, Laurie Donley, Larry Froehlich, Nick Gattozzi, Mary Ann Haley, Thomas Jefferson, Lynette Johnson, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Karen Keenan, Jennifer Kellogg, Iris Mirelez, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Jameka Peake, Susan Perry, Jennifer Piatt, Gail Rebeta, Cynthia Stillings, Therese Tillett, Aimee VanDomelen, Lowell Zurbuch

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 (Earp/Kristof). No changes to the agenda were offered. The agenda was approved as written.

4. **Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of March 13, 2017**

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the March 13 Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Rollick/Vande Zande). No corrections to the minutes were offered. The minutes were approved as written.

5. **Chair’s Remarks**

Chair Smith’s remarks focused on the effect of the RCM budget model on the Kent campus budget (see attached). Senator Roxburgh asked what explained the shifting of funds away from the colleges and into the service units. Chair Smith stated that she thought it was unintentional and resulted from the fact that no one was looking at the relative impact of RCM on the colleges and the service units. FaSBAC only recently received the information about the fund balances accounts and were surprised by the data.

6. **Election of Officers**

Senator Garrison and Senator Smith were on the slate for Faculty Senate Chair. No additional nominations were made from the floor. A motion was made to close the nominations (Roxburgh/Kristoff). The motion was approved. Senator Smith did not make further remarks. Senator Garrison spoke on what he sees as the core duties of Faculty Senate. He noted the importance of shared governance and collaboration between the faculty and administration. He also noted that the Senate is a democratically elected faculty body with a responsibility to pursue what is best for the institution and to have good communication with faculty and students. In addition, the Senate has a duty to serve as a “weathervane” regarding whether or not university policies (e.g. RTP) are administered ethically and fairly. Another responsibility is overseeing the curriculum and updating it as needed to ensure that it is innovative and incorporates new directions. Protecting academic freedom is another responsibility of Senate. Senator Garrison concluded his remarks by noting that while it would be an honor to serve as Senate Chair, he endorsed his opponent.

A vote was held, with all continuing Senators and Senators-elect eligible to vote, and Senator Smith was re-elected as Chair of Faculty Senate.

Subsequent elections were held throughout the meeting. Senator Kristoff and Senator Wilson were on the slate for Vice Chair. No additional nominations were made from the floor. A motion was made to close nominations (Earp/Dauterich). A vote was held, and Senator Wilson was re-elected as Vice Chair of Faculty Senate.

Senator Kerns and Senator Piccirillo-Smith were on the slate for Secretary. No additional nominations were made from the floor. A motion was made to close nominations (Child/Kracht). A vote was held, and Senator Kerns was re-elected as Secretary of Faculty Senate.
Senator Dautorich, Senator Fenk, and Senator Vande Zande were on the slate for At-Large representative. No additional nominations were made from the floor. A motion was made to close nominations (Piccirillo-Smith/Rollick). Senators were instructed to rank order the candidates. A vote was held, and in an extremely close vote Senator Dautorich was elected as the At-Large representative to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

7. Provost’s Remarks

Associate Provost Mandy Munro-Stasiuk indicated that a new “One Stop” center will be opening on the first floor of the library on June 5. This new office is part of the Students First initiative and will be the place students can go first if they have questions about registration or financial aid, want to pay bills, or want to discuss their finances (e.g. debt management). The idea has been in development for two years with input from many students and staff. One focus of study was how this office would interconnect with other offices on campus. The staff in “One Stop” will be cross-trained to have knowledge of many areas of student services. The intent is to treat students like “customers” and provide good customer service. Iris Mirelez has been hired as the Director of the center and Jameka Peake has been hired as the Associate Director. Ms. Mirelez announced that faculty are still welcome to contact home offices (e.g. registrar) directly without going through the One Stop office. The One Stop office will be open to students Monday through Friday from 9am to 5PM. Staff training will occur from 8 – 9am. One Stop will be sharing a welcome desk with library staff. Students can sign up for appointments online and will receive texts when they are next in line.

Ms. Mirelez described the layout of the space and indicated that there will be some enclosed rooms that can be used for private conversations. She also noted that staff on the fifth floor will take calls that previously went to the home offices. All of the staff have been hired. Ms. Peake described plans for training the staff, which includes content areas as well as training on customer service and diversity training. There will also be a new website for the office, social media pages, and virtual chat. Ms. Peake stated that faculty can send students to the One Stop office to get their questions answered, but faculty can contact home offices directly. Ms. Peake also clarified that One Stop would be working with the home offices rather than filling the student requests directly so there will be a delay in the student’s getting their request fulfilled. Students will no longer go directly to offices (e.g., bursar) to take care of requests.

A Senator wanted clarification on whether the office would do academic advising, and Ms. Mirelez stated that they would not although they could advise the student on procedures for how to drop or add a class. The Senator also asked how the students would be informed regarding when to go to One Stop vs. when to seek out an academic advisor, and Ms. Mirelez said a communications plan will be going out soon. Senator Vande Zande asked whether it will be convenient to have “One Stop” in the library if students still have to go to the Michael Schwartz building to complete their transactions. Ms. Mirelez indicated that the student would need to go to the home office only in rare cases; it is expected that most times the student will make the request at One Stop and the staff there would submit the request to the home office. There will also be a dropbox for payments. Senator Vande Zande also asked whether alums would be able to contact the office for advice on how to pay back student loans, and Ms. Mirelez indicated that is a possibility for the future. There will be an evaluation of One Stop which may also lead to some changes in the program.
8. **EPC Items:**

a) Discussion item - Establishment of a two-day fall break in October, and revision of Thanksgiving break to become three full days in November. Effective Fall 2017.

Chair Smith indicated this was originally an action item from EPC, but the Provost's office requested that it be changed to a discussion item instead. She indicated there would be a presentation and discussion, followed by a formal vote to refer the item back to committee.

Associate Provost Tankersley explained that, while EPC had approved the proposal, the Provost's office decided that they wanted more input from faculty members on the Fall break proposal before proceeding. She summarized the proposal, which included a new Fall break on the Thursday and Friday of the eighth week of the semester and extending the half day break on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving to a full day break. Classes would be canceled, but university offices would be open. The main reason for the proposal was a concern that Fall semester is an especially stressful time for students (e.g., there is an increase in student use of psychological services). The fall break is viewed as an opportunity for students to pause, catch up on coursework, and seek assistance with any problems. A steering committee was assembled, and they reviewed what is done at peer and aspirational institutions. The committee rejected the possibility of lengthening the semester one week to account for additional missed days because of concerns for how that might affect the rest of the academic calendar (e.g., summer term, welcome week, time between semesters for paperwork). The break is scheduled at mid-semester around midterms. A Thursday-Friday break was chosen as it was seen as having the least impact on scheduled classes. Associate Provost Tankersley then reviewed data on peer institutions (see attached slides) which showed that Kent was in the middle with respect to instructional time.

Senator Child stated that some universities free up more instructional time by condensing final exams into three days. Senator Baller indicated that additional lost days would be problematic for clinicals and courses that only meet for a few weeks of the semester. She also cautioned that the data are ambiguous as it is unclear which students were going to the health center (e.g., were they freshman), why they were going there (e.g., perhaps they needed to refill maintenance medicines), or whether the increase could be due to the rise in student enrollment. Senator Baller also indicated that she had polled the nursing faculty and almost all of them were opposed to the proposed fall break. Senator Stoker stated that he was opposed to the break as there are already a number of holidays in fall that limit instructional time, and he asked what the faculty who were consulted had said. Associate Provost Tankersley responded that the committee had representatives from AAUP and faculty Senate, but realizes now that the representation could have been much broader. Senator Kracht reported that she had polled her colleagues in Math and they were not supportive of the proposal as many math classes are prerequisites for additional classes, and thus it is critical that instructors cover the material for their class. She also noted that the course content for freshman math courses is dictated by the state so topics cannot be cut, and cuts in instructional time could be especially detrimental to students in developmental math courses. She also stated that faculty were not opposed to having the Wednesday before Thanksgiving be a full day break as it is typically wasted class time. Senator Uribe-Rendon suggested that it would be less disruptive to take a full week break at Thanksgiving, and there may be other ways to help students relieve stress. He also noted international students will not be able to return home during the proposed break. Associate Provost Tankersley agreed with the latter, but said students would still get a needed break to catch up. Senator Piccirillo-Smith spoke in favor of finding alternative ways to help
students cope with stress (e.g., more hours offered for counseling), and suggested that learning to manage demands is part of what college students have to learn. She also pointed out that, in spring semester, the break occurs late in the semester so perhaps the Fall break could occur during Thanksgiving week. She also agreed with the comment that an additional break disrupts the flow of learning. Senator Wilson expressed concern about the fact that fall semester would be a week shorter than spring. She also suggested examining whether the summer schedule could be modified so a week could be added to the Fall. Senator Theresa Walton-Fisette suggested that, in the fall semester, school could start on the Thursday of what is currently Welcome Week to add more days, and she asked what evidence there is that a fall break improves student physical and mental health. Associate Provost Tankersley stated that the studies do not always control for other variables and do not support the claim that there is a causal relationship, but she also noted that giving a fall break is something that the university can control. Senator Roxburgh asked whether the reduced instruction time could affect accreditation, and she also expressed concern about the strength of the data. Senator Williams echoed the concerns about accreditation, and noted the spike in health visits might be due to students receiving midterm grades at that time. Senator White expressed concern that students might take off even more than the two day fall break, as often happens now around the Thanksgiving break, and that the breaks interrupt the rhythm of the semester. Dean Mistur suggested that the Thursday Friday classes for the fall break could be moved to a different day that week.

Chair Smith asked for a formal motion to refer the proposal back to the committee. A motion was made (Dauterich/Kracht). Chair Smith clarified that it would go back to the ad hoc committee that worked on the proposal, and then be voted on again by EPC before coming back to Senate. Senator Williams asked whether the proposal could be killed, but Chair Smith pointed out that another motion with higher priority was already on the floor. Senator Stoker endorsed the motion. Senator Piccirillo-Smith asked whether the motion could be divided to separate the Thursday-Friday break and the proposal for a full class break on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. Chair Smith noted that a motion to refer an item back to committee has precedence over a motion to divide, but suggested that making a motion to endorse the change for Wednesday could be done after a vote on the current motion. The motion to refer back to committee was passed.

A motion was then made to change the Wednesday before Thanksgiving to a full day rather than half day break (Piccirillo-Smith/Uribe-Rendon). Senator Wilson questioned whether there was a need for more consultation before voting on the motion. Senator Williams asked whether taking off the rest of the day Wednesday would affect accreditation, and also suggested waiting on making the change. Senator Kerns spoke for the motion given the low student attendance Wednesday morning, and asked whether Associate Provost Tankersley could comment on accreditation concerns. Associate Provost Tankersley indicated that they had looked into accreditation questions and there are no concerns there. Senator Roxburgh endorsed the motion. Senator White suggested some students might take off additional days if classes met only on Monday and Tuesday. The motion to extend the Wednesday before Thanksgiving to a full day break was passed.

b) Information Items - Regional College: Inactivation of Allied Health Management Technology major within the Associate of Technical Study degree and Inactivation of Industrial Trades Technology major within the Associate of Technical Study degree. Both effective Fall 2017.

There was no discussion of these items.
9. **New Business: Discussion of Faculty Senate Attendance Policy**

Senator Kerns provided information on current Faculty Senate bylaws language regarding faculty absences from Senate. Senators who will be absent for a whole semester due to a time conflict or sabbatical can inform the Faculty Senate secretary, and one of the alternates will be appointed as a temporary replacement. The by-laws (D2) also state that, if a Senator is absent from 3 consecutive meetings, then the secretary is to notify the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and report it in the faculty senate meeting minutes (see attached). Senator Kerns provided aggregate data on how many Senators had missed none, 1-2, or 3 or more meetings, and noted 15 senators had missed 3 or more meeting since September (half the meetings) although in most cases there were not consecutive absences. Senators were then asked to provide their comments on the “3 in a row” rule, how they interpret the language to report faculty absences (where to report, what to report), and whether they wanted any changes to the by-laws language.

Chair Smith explained that changes to the by-laws would require approval by 2/3 of senators. Senator Dauterich spoke for the “3 in a row” rule, assuming that the absent senator has not contacted the executive committee about their absence. He suggested reporting only how many missed 3 meetings in a row rather than specific names. Senator Laux stated that, even if names are not in the minutes, constituents might want to know that their representative has been absent as that might influence whether they would want to re-elect the person. Senator Roxburgh suggested the rule be changed to 3 meetings a year rather than 3 in a row. Senator Elect Kaplan asked whether alternates are asked to fill in when a senator is missing just 1 meeting, and Chair Smith clarified that, in that case, we do not call an alternate in although some senators ask a colleague to come and take notes (that person is not allowed to speak or vote at the meeting). Senator Kairis noted that the “3 in a row” rule is common for boards, and he suggested that following the by-laws would help create accountability. Chair Smith suggested the executive committee could be more proactive and contact individuals who have missed two meetings in a row. Senator Theresa Walton-Fisette asked whether Senators with 3 absences would merely be named or also removed from Senate. Chair Smith said that they would be named and notified, but not removed from Senate at that point. Senator Mechenbeier expressed concern with the Faculty Senate playing an “early alert” role to senators who have missed two meetings as senators should know when the meetings are held. Chair Smith indicated that many senators may not be aware of the bylaws language regarding absences. Senator Piccirillo-Smith pointed out the Senate meeting minutes state who was absent, and asked whether there would be additional reporting beyond that. Chair Smith noted that we do not indicate in the Senate minutes how many times a person has been absent over the year, although Senators do receive the minutes from executive committee, and absences could be reported there. Senator Piccirillo-Smith also asked for clarification of when an alternate is appointed, and Chair Smith indicated that it is when a Senator will be absent for an entire semester. The senator can still serve the rest of his/her term. Senator Kristoff suggested that information about absences could be reported for senators up for re-election, and Chair Smith noted that, while that procedure is not required in the bylaws, Senate could decide to follow that procedure as not all procedures are specified in the bylaws. Senator Stoker suggested a notice could be sent to the representative bodies to let them know when their representative has been absent as they might want to contact the person. Chair Smith stated the executive committee would consider the feedback.

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

   a) Chair Smith announced that the Spring Faculty Forum, sponsored by Faculty Senate, will take place on April 28. The topic will be the recent climate study.
b) Observer Klonowski encouraged faculty to volunteer to serve as judges for the upcoming graduate student symposium.

c) Observer Feezel announced that the governor is considering contracting with an out of state university to offer courses for students who have left a state university or college without finishing their degrees. He also noted that an organization called POP has been contacting retirees, claiming that their organization protects retirees. Mr. Feezel stated that there are concerns about the legitimacy of this organization, and noted that there are other organizations already working to protect pension benefits, including the Ohio Council of Higher Education Retirees which has representatives from all the Ohio universities.

11. Adjournment

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 5:44PM.
Chair’s Remarks for April 10, 2017 Senate Meeting

It is traditional for candidates for election to Faculty Senate Chair to give brief remarks before the vote. Since I will be giving my standard remarks as Chair today, I do not intend to give an additional set of remarks as a candidate. So, you’ll only have to hear from me once.

This will not be one of my sexier talks because I want to talk about our budget model. The Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee, affectionately known as ‘FaSBAC’, will provide a more complete report-out at our May meeting. Today, I want to highlight what FaSBAC and its various subcommittees have discovered over the last two years or so about the ways that budgetary resources have been slowly (and almost certainly unintentionally) shifted out of the academic sector. These shifts put great stress on our ability to fully enact President Warren’s vision of Kent State University as a top tier research institution offering excellent graduate and undergraduate education that she outlined in her remarks last month.

The University’s budget has many moving parts: auxiliaries, plant, debt services. But at the heart of the budget is the Educational and General Budget (often called the E&G budget). The E&G budget is divided into different parts covering the Kent Campus, the Regional Campuses, and the College of Podiatric medicine.

I want to focus on the Kent Campus E&G budget today. The College of Podiatric Medicine joined the KSU family after the Responsibility Center Management (RCM) budget model had been adopted. Although there were some minor changes to the budgets for the Regional Campuses made when KSU adopted RCM, there is a real sense in which the regional campuses had always been on an RCM model. So, the main effects (both positive and negative) of the move from a centralized budget model to RCM have primarily been on the Kent Campus.

The Kent Campus E&G budget covers two broad types of structures: (i) Responsibility Centers and (ii) Service Units. The Responsibility Centers are made up of the nine colleges plus the independent school of digital sciences (which will soon become a dependent school in the College of Communication and Information). The largest scale service units include:

- The remainder of Academic Affairs once one excludes the responsibility centers,
- Business & Finance,
- Central University,
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion,
- General Counsel,
- Human Resources,
- Information Services,
- Institutional Advancement,
- The President’s Area,
- Research and Sponsored Programs,
- Student Affairs, and
- University Relations.

Many of these service units are overseen by a Vice President and almost all have a myriad of sub-budgets.

As responsibility centers, the colleges are responsible for generating all of the revenue that comes into the Kent Campus E&G RCM budget. Those revenues have to cover the expenses of all of the colleges as well as all of the service units. To fund the service units, the colleges are assessed an administrative overhead fee generally known as the “tax.” Between FY 2010 when RCM was first implemented and FY 2016, the tax was, at least on paper, a constant 42.3%. However, from the very beginning, there were
funds taken off the top from each college before the tax was even assessed. This portion of a college’s revenue was essentially taxed at 100% and the funds were largely (though not exclusively) used to create scholarships for our students. Over the years, the percentage of funds taken off the top grew in ways that the colleges could not predict and that made budgeting difficult.

In academic year 2015/2016, a subcommittee of FaSBAC known as ‘RCM 2.0’ discovered that, when you took into account both the revenue taken off the top each year and the 42.3% tax on the remaining revenue, the effective tax rate on the colleges had grown from 46.6% in FY 2010 to a projected 50.8% for FY 2017. That’s right—the effective tax rate had grown to the point that over half of the revenue generated by the colleges would be transferred out of the colleges and into the service units! In essence, overhead costs were taking up more than 50% of our revenue leaving less and less money to fund our academic mission. (I should pause here to note that both the library and RASP, although located in the service units, are integral to our teaching and research missions.)

This shift was by no means intentional. It occurred because it made sense to increase the number of scholarships and, until the RCM 2.0 subcommittee started looking into it, no one asked the question how continuing to fund the scholarships by taking money off the top would impact the effective tax rate on the colleges.

The RCM 2.0 subcommittee made a recommendation to eliminate the practice of taking revenues off the top and to instead recalculate an “all-in” tax to be assessed on the colleges. It also recommended a service unit budget reallocation that would take place over two fiscal years and allow the all-in tax to be reduced to 48.7% by FY 2018—roughly half way between the initial effective tax rate of 46.6% and the projected rate of 50.8% for FY 2017. President Warren accepted this recommendation and the initial phase of the reallocation occurred this fiscal year (FY 2017). The second phase will be completed in FY 2018. This was a good first step in realigning our budgetary priorities with our academic mission that would not have been possible without the budgetary oversight and recommendatory role of FaSBAC.

This year, another subcommittee of FaSBAC has discovered that a similar shift away from colleges and toward service units since the implementation of RCM has taken place with respect to fund balances. As most of us know, when a college is in the black for a fiscal year, the excess revenues are placed in a fund balance which, at least in theory, the college dean can use to enact his or her priorities.

I know that there are quite a lot of numbers on the chart I am showing you now, but please bear with me. This chart, which contains combined data for the nine colleges, has two large columns representing FY 2010 when RCM was first implemented and FY 2016, the last year for which we have data. Each of these columns is divided into a section representing the combined budgets of the colleges and a section representing the combined fund balances of the colleges.

In FY 2010, the combined budget for the colleges was just under $144,000,000 (144M). The combined fund balance for the colleges was roughly 16.7M. So, the monies contained in the fund balances were the equivalent of 12% of the fiscal year budget.

In FY 2016, the combined budget for the colleges was just over 190M and the combined fund balance for the colleges was roughly 24.9M. So, the monies contained in the fund balances were the equivalent of 13% of the combined fiscal year budget.

The far right column shows the compound annual growth rate of both the budget and the fund balance between FY 2010 and FY 2016. This is the number that we get when we engage in the fiction that the growth in the budget or the fund balance is smooth over the years and ask: at what percentage did the budget or fund balance have to grow each year to account for the difference between FY 2010 and FY
2016? In this case, the combined budget for the colleges grew at a compound annual growth rate of 4.76% and the combined fund balance for the colleges grew at a compound annual growth rate of 6.88%.

Now let’s take a look at analogous data for the service units. (Here, I’ve separated out RASP given that it is largely financed by indirect costs from grants rather than by the tax.) In FY 2010, the combined budget for the service units was just under 117M and their combined fund balance was roughly 28.6M. So, the monies contained in the fund balances were the equivalent of 24% of the fiscal year budget—twice the percentage for the colleges.

In FY 2016, the combined budget for the service units was just over 170M and their combined fund balance was just over 84M. So, the monies contained in the fund balances were now the equivalent of 49% of the fiscal year budget—over three times the percentage for the colleges.

The combined budget for the service units grew at a compound annual growth rate of 6.45% between FY 2010 and 2016 and their combined fund balance grew at rate of 19.67%.

So, again, we see that the RCM years have been more generous to the service units than to the colleges despite the fact that it is the colleges that enact the core academic mission of the university.

Between 2010 and 2016, the percentage of the Kent Campus E&G budget dedicated to the colleges shrank from 55% to 52%. To be sure, the budget reallocation already put in place should go some way toward addressing this situation. However, it may not be enough all by itself to prevent a situation down the road where more than half of the Kent campus E&G budget is spent essentially on overhead costs.

When we look at the fund balances, the percentage of the Kent Campus E&G fund balances residing in the colleges shrank from 35% to 22% between FY 2010 and FY 2016. The recent reallocation will do absolutely nothing to address this shift in funds away from the colleges under RCM.

Once again, this shift was not intentional. It occurred because, until the subcommittee of FaSBAC started looking into fund balances this year, no one had really looked at the data from this perspective.

We are very much at the beginning of this process and right now there are more questions than answers. However, it is my hope that FaSBAC will eventually be in a position to make a set of recommendations concerning these fund balances that will allow more of these reserves to directly serve the academic mission of the university.

If I am re-elected Chair of Faculty Senate, one of my main goals will be to ensure that FaSBAC continues its important work of investigating the impact of RCM on the colleges and making recommendations to better align the budget with our goals as a university. If we are to position ourselves to enact the bold vision President Warren has outlined, it is vital that we move away from a budget model in which our academic ideals are too frequently compromised to fit budgetary realities and toward a budget model that puts our money where our mission is.

I’d like to conclude by thanking my fellow Executive Committee members this year: Vice Chair Kathy Wilson, Secretary Kathy Kerns, Elected At-Large Member Tracy Laux, and Appointed At-Large Members Chris Fenk and Theresa Walton-Fisette.

Thank you.
I will now entertain questions, comments, and criticisms.
Chair Smith
Faculty Senate Meeting
April 10, 2017

Tax on the Colleges to Fund Service Units FY 2010-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges (Responsibility Centers)</th>
<th>Service Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCM Revenue Funds taken off the top (essentially taxed 100%)</td>
<td>Funded by the Responsibility Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining RCM Revenue Funds &quot;Taxed&quot; at 42.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FaSBAC's RCM 2.0 subcommittee discovered that the effective (total) tax rate had crept up from an initial 46.6% in FY 2010 to a projected 50.8% in FY 2017.

Tax on the Colleges to Fund Service Units Beginning FY 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges (Responsibility Centers)</th>
<th>Service Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in &quot;Tax&quot; rate for FY 2018: 48.7%</td>
<td>Funded by the Responsibility Centers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a recommendation by FaSBAC's RCM 2.0 subcommittee, President Warren has authorized a budget reallocation over two years that will reduce the effective tax rate to 48.7%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th></th>
<th>Compound Annual Growth Rate FY 2010-2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleges/Revenue Centers</strong></td>
<td>143,858,077</td>
<td>16,676,863</td>
<td>190,120,273</td>
<td>24,855,318</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund balance as a % of budget</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Units (minus RASP)</strong></td>
<td>116,984,209</td>
<td>28,632,401</td>
<td>170,173,534</td>
<td>84,113,949</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>19.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund balance as a % of budget</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational &amp; General RCM</strong></td>
<td>262,467,785</td>
<td>47,636,068</td>
<td>362,175,252</td>
<td>111,719,902</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
<td>15.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Combined Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Colleges + Service Units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund balance as a % of budget</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**College/Revenue Centers as a</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total RCM budget**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall Break Proposal

Proposal

- To establish a fall break—a two-day class recess to be implemented on Thursday and Friday in the eighth week of the fall semester.
- Additionally, to make the half-day class break on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving week a full-day class break.
- During the fall break and the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, classes will be cancelled but offices will remain open so that all services will continue to be available.

The Issue

University Health Services
Appointment Totals: Medical & Psychological Services
FY14 - FY17

UHS Psychological Services Appointments
Number of Out-of-State UG Students on the Kent Campus has More Than Doubled in the Past Ten Years

What We Noticed
- October seems to be our students’ most difficult—and increasingly more difficult—month
- Students currently have 11 weeks of continuous academic scheduling between beginning of the semester and Thanksgiving Break
- Worried that the length of time without opportunity for a sanctioned break may be contributing to student stress

What to Do?
- Met with Representatives from: AAUP (Tenure and NTT units), Faculty Senate, Advisors, UG Student Senate, Graduate Student Senate, Systems Integration, Chairs & Directors, Assistant & Associate Deans, Curriculum Services, Residence Services, Dining, Bursar, Registrar, Financial Aid, Global Education, UG and Graduate Admissions, Facilities, Finance, IS, Parking, HR, University Health Services, Athletics, Ceremonies, UCM, IR, Ombuds...
- Looked for options
- Reviewed Peer, Aspirant, Ohio Universities

Options Considered to Implement a Fall Break
- Increase Fall Semester from 16 weeks to 17 weeks by beginning the semester earlier (15 wks classes + 1 wk exams + 1 wk recess)
  - Decrease length of winter break from 4 to 3 weeks
  - Decrease length of summer term from 13 to 12 weeks
- Keep length of fall semester, thereby decreasing overall available class time (14 wks class + 1 wk exam + 1 wk recess)
Overarching Priority: Find a break time that occurs early enough in the semester to be meaningful and have the least impact on class days

- Use a holiday to account for one or more day (Labor Day, Columbus Day, Veterans Day)
- Make Thanksgiving a full week break
- Just a one day break
- Why Thursday and Friday? Fewer courses were affected by a Thursday-Friday break than any other combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall % of classes offered</th>
<th>Number of once/wk classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday (45%)</td>
<td>Monday (451)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday &amp; Wednesday (44%)</td>
<td>Tuesday (530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday (42%)</td>
<td>Wednesday (461)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday (18%)</td>
<td>Thursday (362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday (214)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Would We Compare?

- We reviewed calendars of 30 of our peer, aspirational, benchmark, and fellow Ohio public universities
- 57% (n=17) have a total full week fall break (either break in October and Thanksgiving or full week at Thanksgiving)
- Of those, 13 have a fall break in October
- 7 of those break at the beginning of the week (Monday-Tuesday break) and 6 break at the end of the week (Thursday-Friday)

Number of Instructional Weeks

- 15.4
  - Ball State
  - Bowling Green
  - Oklahoma-Norman
  - Youngstown
- 14.7-14.6
  - Cerritos
  - Southern Mississippi
  - Texas-Arlington
  - Toledo
- 14.6
  - Ohio State
- 14.4
  - Akron (no Fall Day)
  - KENT STATE (current)
  - Virginia Commonwealth
  - Wright State
- 14.3
  - Georgia State
  - Houston
  - Ohio University
  - SUNY-Albany
- 14.1
  - Cincinnati
  - Cleveland State
  - Northern Illinois
  - Utah State
- 14.0
  - KENT STATE (proposed)
  - Mississippi
  - North Texas
  - South Florida
- 13.9
  - Temple
  - UNC-Greensboro
- 13.6
  - Miami of Ohio
  - Texas Tech
- 13.4
  - Memphis
  - Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- 13.3
  - Western Michigan

5/1/2017
Bylaws

(D) Elections.

1. Term of office.
   a. The term of office of an elected representative shall be three years except in such instances as provided for in this rule.
   b. If it is known or anticipated that an elected representative will be absent from, or unable to discharge his or her responsibilities to, the faculty senate for an entire academic semester (including summer) or longer, the representative's place on the faculty senate shall be filled during his or her absence by an alternate. The alternate will serve with full privileges and responsibilities of an elected representative until the return of the representative he or she replaces or until the completion of that representative's term.
   c. The secretary of the faculty senate is responsible for determining whether an alternate representative is needed and for initiating actions necessary to implement the appointment.
   d. The faculty senate executive committee shall render decisions when questions are raised regarding the seating of an alternate representative.
   e. A representative will be replaced by the highest available alternate from the immediately preceding election held by the electorate which selected the representative.
   f. If no alternate is available from the most recent senate election in that unit to replace a representative therefrom, it shall be the responsibility of the highest elected faculty body of that unit to provide for a representative. For at-large vacancies the faculty senate shall provide for a representative.

2. Removal and recall of elected representatives.
   a. When an elected representative has been absent from three consecutive regular meetings of the faculty senate without provision for temporary replacement by an alternate (as provided in paragraph (D)(1)(c) of this rule), the secretary of the senate shall notify the faculty senate executive committee of this fact and report same in the minutes of the faculty senate.
   b. After reviewing the circumstances and discussing them with the affected senator, the faculty senate executive committee may recommend that the senator be removed from office and his or her place in the faculty senate assumed by the highest available alternate from the most recent election of the academic unit (or at-large), the alternate to serve for the remainder of the term of the removed senator or until the next regular election for faculty senate representatives, whichever comes first.
   c. Removal shall be effected or disapproved by majority vote of members present and voting of the faculty senate at a meeting to which the senator whose removal has been recommended has been invited and availed both the right of the floor and of the vote, to both of which as an elected representative to the faculty senate he or she is entitled.
   d. Upon receipt of a petition containing the valid signatures of full-time faculty members comprising twenty per cent of the eligible electorate of that constituency, the secretary of the faculty senate shall, within thirty days, conduct a special recall election among the electorate of the constituency which selected the senator whose recall is being requested.
   e. A two-thirds majority of eligible faculty voting in the recall election shall effect the removal of the senator, his or her place in the faculty senate to be assumed by the highest available alternate from the most recent faculty senate election of that unit.
   f. If no alternate is available, the faculty senate may advise the executive committee to fill the vacancy in accord with the provisions of paragraph (D)(1) of this rule.
   g. Representatives elected by an academic unit who during their term of office change their assigned academic unit shall be ineligible to complete their elected term, and their place on the senate shall be filled according to the provisions of paragraphs (D)(1)(e) and (D)(1)(f) of this rule.
MEMO
FlashFolio Review

April 28, 2017

To: Faculty Senate Executive

From: Professional Standards Committee

At our first meeting in the fall semester, Chair Deb Smith charged Professional Standards with completing a user’s review of FlashFolio. In December, we sent an e-mail to all faculty requesting feedback regarding their use of FlashFolio. The spreadsheet that follows is the result of that request. The spreadsheet is a summary – verbatim comments are in italics – of all the responses that were received. It is organized into six categories; transparency, user friendliness, organizational issues, functionality, training issues, notifications, and miscellaneous.

After the results had been compiled and analyzed, the Chair of PSC met with the FlashFolio committee in March to review. The FlashFolio committee (Kevin Van Bell, Chair) is an offshoot of the original RFP committee which selected our current vendor. They meet every two weeks to discuss user issues and review their work with the vendor. The third column of the spreadsheet includes the results of discussion with the FlashFolio committee and their input on possible solutions and in some cases, ongoing discussions with the vendor about improvements.

Based on our review, PSC recommends that Faculty Senate consider a resolution that requests that the transparency of FlashFolio be improved so that it more closely resembles the transparency that was available on the previous FolioWeb system.

Respectfully submitted,

Professional Standards Committee

Susan Roxburgh (Chair)
Christopher Fenk
Kimberly Garchar
Oana Mocioalca
Thomas Norton-Smith
Kara Robinson
Joanne Trzeciak Huss
Gina Zavota
Folio Review: E-Mail Responses, 2016-2017 AY

**Type of Problem**

**Lack of Transparency**
(N=11/29)

**Specific Problem/Issue**

- Inability to see own ballot once it’s submitted
- Inability to see previously submitted ballots.
- Inability to see other ballots (CAC and department)

**Response**

- Recommend that Faculty Senate pass a resolution requesting that the transparency of Flashfolio mirror that of Followeb as closely as possible.
- Concerning ballots submitted, an evaluator can see their ballot submitted in the previous year (and all other materials that were part of previous year’s evaluation). However, the current system does not allow for a review of a ballot once it’s been submitted.
- Given the current level of transparency, we recommend that evaluators save their ballots in a doc or excel spreadsheet.

**User Friendliness**

- Too many clicks (multiple respondents). Sample comment: *I have to click so many times on so many different links in order finally to get access to a document, such as a vita or a narrative statement.*
- Font size: e.g., menu that lists all of the candidate’s files is rather small.
- Letters from external reviewers are hard to find.
- Text editor sometimes changes format of text.
- Too many windows need to be opened to review a single file.
- The 5 p.m. deadline seems arbitrary. Why is it not midnight of the day the submission is due?

**Response**

- Discussions about improving this are ongoing with our vendor.
- This issue can be solved by zooming in.
- External letters now appear in the section below the faculty uploaded documents (e.g., CV, Narrative, SSI’s, etc).
- This may be a specific user issue – generally speaking, the system doesn’t change formatting.
- Because we use an activities-based system as an upload system, this is necessary.
- This is required because of staff availability.
Can’t convert PDF’s with links in them on MAC

This problem is independent of FlashFolio. Converting the document to a pdf on a PC (or PC window) is the best solution.

Make it so you don’t have to select the semester and year for each type of item added, given that you’re already within the specific submission.

Proprietary coding default issue.

Have the URLs generated bear some resemblance to the original file name for each file so, again, you don’t have to keep on downloading the file again each time to check you linked to the right file: you can just hover and check the URL instead (which is currently just a long string of code).

String has to be unique.

Simplify the process for sharing your submission with someone i.e. just have a button right there on the top-level page for the submission.

This functionality has been requested.

What is the function of the box with the big label saying ‘don’t click this’ at the top of the screen?

This is a necessary design feature given some unique features of our use of the system.

Organizational Issues

There’s a lot of scrolling down when vetting files, especially for appeals cases. Rather than embedding appeals materials way down in the long list of votes/items/actions, I think it would be more efficient to have a heading in the items column for appeals (up there with Narrative, CV, SSI’s, etc.).

This can be done by sorting on name of process (e.g., ‘appeal’) or name of candidate.

Enable the user to reorder files uploaded under a category e.g. ‘Other supporting documents’ once those files are in the system.

Can’t be done.

Have an option to preview files uploaded rather than having to download them each time to view them and check they’re correct (N=2).

Because we use an activities-based system as an upload system, this function can’t be added.

Be able to give URLs uploaded a file name too.

See above – unique identifiers assigned by the system.
Functionality

If the files are identical, would it be possible to avoid submitting the same materials twice for tenure & promotion?

Once a personnel action is completed, although one can view the files from that action, one can no longer see the links to the individual files. So for example if I wanted to link to any of the documents I uploaded from a previous promotion or review, I could not do so unless I had already saved the links in another document. There is no way to access the links to individual items on FlashFolio.

Would it be possible to download everything at once? The way it's set up now, it is easy to overlook portions of the review and difficult to find documents you've already looked at and then saved or closed.

Addition of FTNTT Professional Development Proposals?

This functionality has been requested.

Kevin Van Bell will follow up on this issue.

Kevin Van Bell will follow up on this issue.

This is in development.

Training Issues

It would be nice to have the ability to create training documents that are tailor-made for unit or for training session.

Judy Lightner will work with units to create tailor-made documents.

Notifications & Ex- system

Communication Issues

Because there are no email notifications that a review is complete, I missed the deadline to appeal my promotion denial.

This is an older issue – notifications have been turned on.

Could the candidate be notified when materials are added?

This is an older issue – notifications have been turned on.

Notifications look like phishing messages

Has been fixed.

CAC members reviewing a lot of files receive too many e-mails – could these be batched? (multiple)

Has been fixed – only one e-mail per action is sent.

Multiple requests are not labeled specifically: When I login to FlashFolio, I see anywhere from 6 to 12 entries, most having exactly the same title, namely ‘Complete Evaluation: College Advisory Committee Review and Ballots’. To find out what is in each one

As an evaluator with multiple evaluations, please click on the fourth option “Evaluations” on the teal column on left of the Dashboard screen. While the Dashboard Action Items links do not
(Kent campus, or Regional, or tenure, or promotion, or first year reappointment, etc., etc.) I actually have to click and wait for a new window to come up. This is analogous to a library that puts the same text on the spine of every volume, so you need to take the book off the shelf and open the cover to find out what it's about!

Miscellaneous

Takes too long to see the results of my reappointment. Example: library sciences: deadline for Dean is late October but comments were not available until January. We conveyed our concern about this after the first year the system was in place and were told that there would be changes to the system and this year the same thing happened again.

Workload tracking: I wish there was a feature on FF that would allow me to select something like ‘department colleague’ (as opposed to ‘yes’, ‘yes with reservations’, ‘no’, so that those in my department would disappear from my FF workflow once I’ve selected “department colleague.” For faculty in large departments with many evaluations to write, this feature would help me track my workflow more efficiently.

Folios are grouped by action P, T, RC, Kent etc. Yet the grouping is not apparent when one looks at the listing on flashfolio—ie. I have to open 3-4 lists before I actually find the group of faculty (e.g., RC Tenure only) I am looking for. It would be easy to make this apparent in the listing that appears—ie. ‘RC Tenure’, or ‘Kent BSCI Reappointment’, or ‘Kent Promotion to Professor’.

provide detailed information, clicking on “Evaluations” will give you much more information. This is explained in the training documents.

This problem is specific to some units with unique organizational features. There is no one obvious solution.

This issue comes up largely in the case of evaluators who inadvertently vote twice—through training and CAC orientations, faculty need to be reminded that if they have voted at the department level, they do not vote again at other levels in the review process (e.g., CAC)

For evaluators with multiple evaluations, please click on the fourth option “Evaluations” on the teal column on the left of the Dashboard screen. While the Dashboard Action Items links do not provide detailed information, clicking on “Evaluations” will give you much more information. Please refer to training document.
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Department
College PH - Public Health
Proposal Revise Academic Unit
Proposal Name Proposal to merge existing departments in the College of Public Health into a college of the whole structure

Description of proposal:
The Department of Biostatistics, Environmental Health and Epidemiology, The Department of Health Policy and Management, and The Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences will combine to form one administrative unit in the College of Public Health.

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and staffing considerations; need, audience)
This is internal to the College of Public Health and will not impact other units.

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):
N/A

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

Department Chair / School Director

Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

College Dean (or designee)

Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

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

Proposal to merge existing departments in the College of Public Health to a college of the whole structure

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

1. The quality of the faculty, students and programs.

The proposed change to merge the Department of Health Policy and Management, Department of Biostatistics, Environmental Health and Epidemiology and the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences to revise the structure of the College of Public Health to a college of the whole structure is guided by four major considerations including compliance with University Policy regarding Faculty Tenure (6-14), changes at the national level in accreditation requirements of the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) which include an entirely new set of requirements for accredited schools, considerations of efficiency within CPH, and revising the structure to facilitate CPH meeting the University Priorities (please see #3 below related to Comparative advantage versus other structures). The quality of faculty, students and programs in CPH is high and will continue to be so under the new structure.

Our strategic efforts in CPH to develop interdisciplinary courses, integrated core curricula for all concentrations and specializations in the BSPH and MPH, and interdisciplinary research for faculty and students will be facilitated by the college of the whole structure. This is likely to impact not only our ability to maintain accreditation, but to be amongst the accredited colleges worldwide who are moving to new models using integrated team-taught courses and case studies related to real-world public health problems. This will result in quality improvement throughout CPH.

2. Centrality and coherence to the mission and strategic directions of the university and other academic units.

Under a college of the whole, we will be able to fund, without additional resources, two additional college-wide administrators. At this time, we have the dean and an associate dean for graduate studies and research. One new administrative position will assist college-wide efforts to coordinate the 7 concentrations in the BSPH. We will also add a dedicated college-wide administrator who will have time to recruit students internationally, develop affiliation agreements with institutions worldwide, and facilitate faculty exchange programs. It is also likely that coordinating experiential learning at the college level will allow for more interdisciplinary approaches for internships and practicums that include group approaches.
3. **Comparative advantage versus other structures.**

There are five major advantages to the proposed college of the whole.

a. Moving from a hierarchical to a flatter organization

The proposed change is supported by 2/3 department FACs (total votes across FACs **xx**, supported by all three existing department chairs, and unanimously supported by the CAC. There is a majority opinion in CPH that we were better able to meet the challenges related to building an interdisciplinary, accredited college when we were able to relate directly with each other on a daily basis and our students interacted with each other more. As an example, there is a better use of faculty time to meet together in college-wide committees, rather than having three departmental committees feed into a college-wide committee (reducing meeting burden from four meetings to one meeting). CPH has a challenge to understand and meet the new CEPH accreditation for schools and we will be better prepared to use time if we can work together in interdisciplinary teams of faculty and students.

b. Meeting new CEPH accreditation requirements

Having just recently met the requirements for full accreditation, the new guidelines will be a challenge to implement. Many requirements have changed, but the criteria related to the Foundational Public Health Knowledge are most relevant. Examining the MPH requirements below, one can see how all of the disciplines in CPH (Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Environmental Health, Health Policy and Management, Social and Behavioral Sciences) will need to work together to create integrated assignments, courses and programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession &amp; Science of Public Health Foundational Public Health Knowledge (MPH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explain public health history, philosophy and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify the core functions of public health and the 10 Essential Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Explain the role of quantitative and qualitative methods and sciences in describing and assessing a population’s health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. List major causes and trends of morbidity and mortality in the US or other community relevant to the school or program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discuss the science of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention in population health, including health promotion, screening, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Explain the critical importance of evidence in advancing public health knowledge Factors Related to Human Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Explain effects of environmental factors on a population’s health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Explain biological and genetic factors that affect a population’s health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Explain behavioral and psychological factors that affect a population’s health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Explain the social, political and economic determinants of health and how they contribute to population health and health inequities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Explain how globalization affects global burdens of disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Explain an ecological perspective on the connections among human health, animal health and ecosystem health (e.g., One Health)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also important to note that there are many new data templates required for accreditation and a college of the whole structure will facilitate compliance with a centralized accreditation data coordinator.

c. Efficiency

CPH will no longer need three department chairs. We anticipate the need for two centralized administrators that will replace the chairs. This will be a savings of 1 FTE administrator.

d. Compliance with University Policy 6-14

For the past four years, CPH has not been able to meet the requirements for Faculty Tenure in 6-14 because we have not had four members for each of the three department tenure committees. University Policy does allow a special procedure for enlarging the committing requiring the borrowing of faculty from other units as approved by the FAC, college dean and provost. This process, however, does not provide for a consistent committee to guide junior faculty in CPH. The college of the whole structure will result in a tenure committee sufficiently large to meet university requirements under University Policy 6-14.

e. Meeting University Priorities

The new structure will free up one of the existing department chairs to devote time to our global initiatives, including recruiting international students, implementing our online programs in international settings, facilitating agreements with international institutions, and developing student and faculty exchange programs.

The new structure will also promote college-wide implementation of the two research centers in CPH: The Center for Public Policy and Health and the Center for Public Health Preparedness. CPH recently moved these two centers from the department to the college level and the new structure will facilitate implementing interdisciplinary faculty and student research teams.

4. What makes the unit particularly appropriate for Kent State University.

There are other colleges at Kent State University that thrive without a department structure, however, the most notable are those related to health professions (College of Nursing and College of Podiatric Medicine).

5. Demand for the unit and for the graduates of the unit.

The proposed structural change will not change the increasing demand for graduates from CPH.
6. Duplication and interrelatedness of the unit's program(s) within the university, state, and region

We are not proposing changes to the programs offered in CPH.

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

As described above, we do envision a greater competitiveness for research with the college of the whole structure.

8. Administrative reporting structure.

The major administrative change is that there will no longer be a reporting structure through department chairs. We will implement University Policy regarding Units without Departments. Faculty will report directly to the college dean.

9. Space and capital budget needs.

There will be no change in space and capital needs.

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

There are no additional one-time resource needs. The proposed CPH operating budget for AY 2017-2018 is attached.

11. Evaluation procedures including academic assessment procedures.

The assessment process in CPH is twofold: University assessment and CEPH accreditation. This will continue the same under the proposed college of the whole.


The college of the whole structure will begin Fall, 2017.
## College of Public Health
### FY2018 Projected Budget
with Consolidated Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>FY18 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Revenue</td>
<td>5,127,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI Revenue</td>
<td>4,354,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>859,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10,342,098</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Overhead Expense</td>
<td>3,920,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>5,643,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Salary Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>872,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10,436,679</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue over Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(94,581)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College of Public Health

CAC Meeting Minutes

March 25, 2017

Present: Drs. Alemagno, Smith, Jefferis, Hoornbeek

Special meeting regarding restructuring of CPH to a college of the whole

Dr. Hoornbeek moved

"Given recent input from the Provost and the Dean, the CAC supports moving to a College of the Whole for a period of two years, after which there would be a review of the structure of the College of Public Health which would include the Provost, the Dean, and faculty representatives from the College Advisory Committee. The review would evaluate the merits of the new structure and consider alternatives going forward."

Dr. Jefferis second

Dean Alemagno reviewed the rationale for moving to a college of the whole including the following points:

Compliance

Compliance with University Policy re Faculty Tenure 6-14

Accreditation

Compliance with required faculty in interdisciplinary degree tracks as primary instructors

As major accredited schools move to integrated core curricula based on case studies, we will have the ability to work on integrated core curricula for BSPH and MPH with case studies and team teaching meeting the requirement for innovation in teaching

Interdisciplinary internship and practicum initiatives have less administrative obstacles

Centralized data collection, career services, practica coordination, and alumni tracking, all issues flagged by CEPH

Efficiency

Reduction of full time administrators 1.FTE as three department chairs become two centralized administrators

Consolidation of administration of online masters programs under one administrator = one primary contact for EverSpring programs
Meeting University Priorities

Global: Resources are freed up for assigning one centralized administrator to global education and global recruitment

Research: Department based research center now at college level can recruit faculty to interdisciplinary research with the goal of increasing proposal productivity

Vote: 3 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain

Motion approved by CAC.
HPM FAC Meeting March 23, 2017 (Held virtually through the HPM listserv)

Listserv attendees: Alemagno, Brewer, Fischbein, Kenne, Hoornbeek, Lanese, Leahy, Slenkovich, Staley, VanGeest, and Zakariasen

Listserv Members Not voting: Alemagno, Slenkovich, and Zakariasen (Additionally, Fischbein had previously told me three weeks ago that she would not be attending FAC meetings anymore as she is separating from the University. This may mean that she may also not vote.)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Woolverton indicating a single business item, that of the College of Public Health structure. Discussions had taken place at previous meetings.

Member Hoornbeek moved

“Given recent input from the Provost and the Dean, the Health Policy and Management Department supports moving to a College of the Whole for a period of two years, after which there would be a review of the structure of the College of Public Health which would include the Provost, the Dean, and faculty representatives from the College Advisory Committee. The review would evaluate the merits of the new structure and consider alternatives going forward.”

The motion was seconded by Peter Leahy.

No discuss was had on the motion. Hearing none, the Chair call the vote. A ballot of “support, oppose, or abstain” was used to tally the votes. An anonymous vote was taken by physical paper or email ballot to Ms. Baker, who collated the de-identified votes.

The votes were: support, 6; oppose, 1, abstain, 0.

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned.
Attendees FAC: Peggy Stephens, Eric Jefferis, Mary Step, Kristina Knight, Sheryl Chatfield 
Other attendees: Ken Zachariasen;

Others present: Jeff Hallam

The motion drafted by John Hoornbeek on March 22, 2017 (wording in italics below) to consider moving from departments to a college of the whole, was distributed by EJ, who asked whether there was a motion to consider this motion. SC motioned to consider; PS seconded. EJ asked whether there was discussion in support of the motion.

**Hoornbeek Motion:**
Given recent input from the Provost and the Dean, the SBS Department supports moving to a College of the Whole for a period of two years, after which there would be a review of the structure of the College of Public Health which would include the Provost, the Dean, and faculty representatives from the College Advisory Committee. The review would evaluate the merits of the new structure and consider alternatives going forward.

*Please register your vote by placing a check mark on the space that best reflects your preference:*
*(the alternatives were for support, oppose, abstain)*

Discussion: SC stated in support that she heard yesterday in an information session held by the Dean that the low number of tenured faculty by department limits the ability of the College to have full representation at university level on RTP committees. SC stated that the motion was crafted carefully to allow the faculty the right to reconsider structure in two years.

The FAC agreed to vote. PS counted the votes; SC concurrently counted as a double check.

**The votes were 2 for supporting the motion above and 3 for opposing the motion. Motion not carried.**

The FAC agreed to continue discussion about considering whether to submit an alternative proposal.

A motion was drafted by members of the SBS FAC (wording below) that proposed:

**SBS FAC Motion:**
The SBS department supports moving into a two-department college. SBS will collaborate with BEHE and HPM to craft the most beneficial structure for the college. 
*(the alternatives were for support, oppose, abstain)*

EJ made a motion to vote on this proposal; MS seconded.

**The votes were 3 for supporting the motion and 2 for opposing this motion. Motion carried.**

EJ will take the results of both votes to the CAC.
Please find the minutes of the BEHE FAC meeting below:

The FAC of the Department of Biostatistics, Environmental Health Sciences, and Epidemiology convened to vote on the following motion to restructure the College of Public Health as a "College of the Whole".

Motion:

Given recent input from the Provost and the Dean, the BEHE Department supports moving to a College of the Whole for a period of two years, after which there would be a review of the structure of the College of Public Health which would include the Provost, the Dean, and faculty representatives from the College Advisory Committee. The review would evaluate the merits of the new structure and consider alternatives going forward.

The results of the election were as follows:

Approve: 3
Oppose: 1

FAC Compliance Addendum [03/24/17, 11:14 am]:

We realized that we were out of compliance with our department handbook for the vote that was just taken. The issue is that we were supposed to have one NTT voice/vote to represent all of the NTTs rather than what occurred. One way to address this would be to have the FAC vote that they will accept the process of having one NTT vote representing all NTTs to ratify yesterday's vote, and to bring BEHE into compliance with the handbook.

Please reply to this email: approve, oppose, abstain to the motion once it has been made and seconded.

I will make the motion to have one NTT vote represent all NTTs.

Abbey Eng
Seconded.

Tara Smith
The vote regarding the motion to have one NTT vote representing all NTTs to ratify yesterday’s vote is as follows:

Approve: 9
Oppose: 0
Abstain: 2

Therefore, yesterday’s vote has been ratified and stands as final:

Approve: 3
Oppose: 1

Minutes respectfully submitted,

Mark James
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Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
March 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: President Warren, Provost Diacon

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:02PM in the Urban Conference Room.

2. Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed and made corrections to the February 13, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Wilson/Walton-Fisette). The minutes were approved.

3. Review of Administrative Revisions to Office Hours Policy

Chair Smith explained that administrators had made some wording changes in the Office Hours Policy approved by Senate which they viewed as “housekeeping” changes. She asked whether the Senate Executive Committee had any concerns about the changes, which had been distributed prior to the meeting. There were concerns that one change was substantive in nature, and committee members agreed on some revisions to the language. A motion was made to endorse the version with the additional revisions made by the Executive Committee (Wilson/Laux). The motion was approved. Chair Smith will discuss the revisions with Karen Keenan and Michael Pfahl.

4. Proposed Revision of CV for Candidates for Elected Senate Officers

Chair Smith shared the slate for elected Faculty Senate offices that had been prepared by the Nominating Committee. She also shared a revision to the CV form for candidates that included some changes suggested by Secretary Kerns. The main change is to allow candidates to provide more qualitative information about their record as a faculty member. A motion was made to approve the revised form (Walton-Fisette/Laux). The motion passed.
5. Review of Agenda for Discussion with President and Provost

Chair Smith shared the items she wished to discuss with President Warren and Provost Diacon. No items were added to the list.

6. Review of EPC Items

Chair Smith presented the items recently passed at EPC that need to now be considered by Faculty Senate. There was discussion of which items the executive committee could approve on behalf of Senate, and which needed to be on the agenda as action items for the April Faculty Senate meeting. It was decided that two items regarding inactivation of programs (Allied Health Management Technology and Industrial Trades Technology) could be approved by the executive committee. A motion was made to approve these items (Wilson/Laux). The motion passed. It was decided that one item, establishment of a Fall break, should be an action item at the April meeting. One other item involved a program inactivation (Emergency Medical Services Technology), and it was decided to seek additional information about the impact of inactivation for students who are in the program before making a decision about the item.

President Warren and Provost Diacon joined the meeting.

7. Items from the Provost:

a) Textbook Policy - Provost Diacon suggested KSU might want to consider having a textbook policy. He distributed a textbook policy from Miami University, and asked the Executive Committee to review and provide feedback at a later date.

b) Standards for Early Tenure and Promotion - Provost Diacon indicated that he was reviewing several cases this year that involved requests for early tenure or promotion. There was discussion of whether the university has clear standards for how to evaluate these cases, and whether there is a need to address this in university policy or department handbooks. Provost Diacon also indicated that people have different interpretations of the “sustained” language in the promotion policy. Chair Smith suggested that the Professional Standards Committee could be asked to review the tenure and promotion policies next academic year.

c) Provost Time at April Faculty Senate meeting - The Provost indicated he would like to use his time at the April Faculty Senate meeting to have a presentation on the “1 Stop Shop”.
8. Requests for Updates

Chair Smith asked for updates on some requests made earlier by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Provost Diacon indicated he will obtain data on how many students were reported absent as part of the Fall academic presence verification reporting. President Warren indicated she has spoken with the Chair of the KSU Board, and suggested it may be possible to arrange for him to meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee around the time of the Board’s May meeting. She will also follow up on the request for VP Witt to meet with the executive committee. President Warren suggested that VPs Little, Brown, and Willis could be invited to give a report on the university’s response to hate speech at the May Faculty Senate meeting.

Provost Diacon left the meeting.

9. RCM and FaSBAC Committee

There was discussion of upcoming planned changes to RCM, as well as the limitations in what those changes will achieve. It is likely that additional changes will need to be proposed in the future so that the incentives of the system are in better alignment with university priorities. A revision of RCM might also make it easier to consider whether changes could be made to include more interdisciplinary courses in the Kent core.

10. Follow-up to KSU United Pledge

Now that the KSU United pledge has been endorsed by Faculty Senate, President Warren asked for discussion of additional follow-up actions the university could take. Ideas offered included publicizing the pledge, adding immigrant status as protected statuses in university policy, and finding ways to help students develop resilience around politically charged conversations.

President Warren left the meeting.

11. Agenda for the April 10 Faculty Senate Meeting

The committee discussed a draft agenda that had been prepared by Chair Smith. A motion was made to approve the agenda (Laux/Wilson). The motion was approved.

12. Faculty Senate Attendance Policy

Secretary Kerns provided the executive committee with information about faculty absences from the 7 Faculty Senate meetings that have taken place so far in the 2016 – 2017 year. A few members of Senate who are not on sabbatical have missed 3 meetings
in a row. The committee reviewed the section of the Faculty Senate by-laws (D1 and D2) that explains how consecutive absences from Senate meetings by faculty senators is to be handled. It appears that Senate’s practices have been out of compliance with the by-laws, and most Senators are probably unaware of what the by-laws say. It was agreed that the policy should be discussed at an upcoming Senate meeting to inform Senators of the by-law language and to see whether Senators wish to keep current language or revise the by-laws. Information about faculty absences will also be provided. A motion was made to amend the approved agenda for the April Faculty Senate meeting to include discussion of this section of the by-laws as new business (Kerns/Laux). The motion was approved.

Tess Kail left the meeting.

13. Executive Session

A motion was made to enter executive session to discuss an employment matter (Laux/Wilson). The motion was approved. After discussion, a motion was made to leave executive session (Fenk/Laux). The motion to end executive session was approved.

14. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 6:27PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
April 19, 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: Provost Diacon

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of Minutes

   a) The committee reviewed and made corrections to the April 10, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Wilson/Fenk). The minutes were approved.

   b) The committee reviewed and made corrections to the March 22, 2017 Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Walton-Fisette/Laux). The minutes were approved.

3. EPC Item: Inactivation of Emergency Medical Services Technology Program

Chair Smith presented an item recently passed at EPC (3/22) that involves inactivation of the program, Emergency Medical Services Technology. Chair Smith indicated that all students currently in the program will be able to finish their degree, and she proposed that the executive committee approve the item on Senate’s behalf. A motion was made to approve the item (Kerns/Laux). The motion was approved.

4. Nominations for Committee on Administrative Officers (CAO)

Chair Smith announced that the Executive Committee will need to make nominations of faculty members for the CAO at the next Executive Committee meeting, and she asked that people consider who we want to nominate. We need two nominees for each position as these are contested elections. One seat is for members of Faculty Senate, and the other is open to any faculty member. Elections will take place at the May Faculty Senate meeting.
5. Proposed Senate Meeting Dates

Chair Smith distributed a list of proposed dates for Faculty Senate meetings in academic year 2017-2018. A motion was made to approve the dates (Wilson/Laux). The motion was approved.

6. Representative on Ohio Faculty Council (OFC)

Chair Smith announced that she will serve on this committee next year, but Senator Fox-Cardamone will not be serving again and thus we will need to replace her. The committee meets in Columbus about once a month on Fridays. There was discussion of the time commitment, and whether it might be possible for a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to serve on the OFC. Further discussion will take place once the appointed members of the executive committee for next year are known.

President Diacon joined the meeting.

7. Follow-up on Previous Requests from Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Chair Smith asked about the following items:

a) Data from academic presence verification: What were results from Fall re: student absences? Provost Diacon indicated he would request the information.

b) Meeting of Senate Executive Committee with President of KSU Board of Trustees: Provost Diacon said it was in the works, and suggested that Chair Smith follow up with Char Reed.

c) Request to have VPs Little and Shay present at May meeting to present on KSU’s responses to hate speech: Provost Diacon recommended following up with President Warren.

8. Fall Break Proposal

Provost Diacon indicated that there has been discussion of revising the proposal for a Fall Break. The change is to start the semester two days earlier (on a Thursday) so there will be no loss of class time when the two day Thursday/Friday Fall Break is implemented. There was discussion of the rationale for the proposal, and the strength of the evidence on whether a fall break has a positive effect on student mental health. Regardless, Provost Diacon noted that students and faculty could benefit from a “catch up” time. It was suggested that the working group consult with faculty in the sciences on any revised proposal. The proposal will go back to EPC for a new vote, and if approved by EPC will be voted on at Faculty Senate.
9. Item from EPC: Continuous Graduate Enrollment

Provost Diacon indicated that there was discussion at EPC about the university requirement that graduate students be continuously enrolled. The current policy counts enrollment in at least one semester per year as “continuous enrollment” (although some colleges require enrollment every semester). There was discussion of the university policy, and whether it is the best policy given that some students are continuing their work on graduate study requirements when not enrolled (e.g., may be collecting data, taking candidacy exams). There were concerns raised about students completing work when not enrolled as it might compromise their access to resources available only to enrolled students.

Provost Diacon left the meeting.

10. Faculty Senate Spring Forum

Tess Kail announced that over 35 people have registered for the Spring Forum, which will take place on 4/28 from 11:30AM to 1:30PM in Room 306 of the Student Center. Lunch will be served. There was discussion of how the discussion will be structured. Kathy Wilson will be presenting results from the Climate Study and leading discussion.

11. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 4:49PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate