Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the November 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 October 9, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

5. Chair’s Remarks

6. Report: Update on Aramark (Given by Shay Little, Vice President of Student Affairs)

7. EPC Items:
   a. Action Items:
      1. College of the Arts: Revision of the major and degree names and course requirements for the Fashion major within the Master of Fashion degree in the School of Fashion and Merchandising. Name changes to Fashion Industry Studies major within the Master of Fashion Industry Studies degree. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are unchanged at 30. Effective Fall 2018.

      2. College of Public Health: Establishment of a Clinical Epidemiology major within the Master of Science degree. The program will be offered fully online and hybrid online/on-ground at the Kent Campus. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 36. Effective Fall 2018 pending final approval.
b. Information Items:

1. **College of Aeronautics and Engineering**: Inactivation of the Technology major within the Bachelor of Science degree. Admission to the degree program was suspended spring 2018. Effective Fall 2018.

2. **Office of Global Education**: Establishment of new instructional delivery location and extension of the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees to be offered at the Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUCPR) in Curitiba, Brazil. Coursework required for the following 17 bachelor’s degree majors will be offered at PUCPR as part of the associate degree, which will enable students to transfer to the Kent Campus after earning the associate to complete a bachelor’s degree in two years: English, History, Sociology, Economics, Geography, Psychology, Philosophy, Anthropology, General Business, Political Science, Paralegal Studies, Pan-African Studies, Communication Studies, International Relations, Applied Conflict Management, Criminology and Justice Studies and Teaching English as a Second Language. Effective Fall 2018.

3. **Office of the Provost**: Revision of the Dismissal, Appeal and Reinstatement policy. Revision is housekeeping, to revise formatting and language that more effectively clarifies intent of the revisions approved by EPC (October 2016) and Faculty Senate (November 2016). Effective Fall 2017.

4. **University College**: Revision of the University Readiness Standards and Placement Assessment policy. These revisions are in response to a mandate from the Ohio Department of Higher Education in regards to what exam areas and SAT scores can be used to determine college readiness. Effective Fall 2017 (Fall 2018 University Catalog).

8. Old Business

9. New Business:
   a. Revision of Tenure Policy to include a commercialization track per Section 3345.45 of the Ohio Revised Code
   b. Tax Exempt Textbook resolution

10. Announcements / Statements for the Record

11. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment
FACULTY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
October 9, 2017


Senators Not Present: Ann Abraham, Rachael Blasiman, David Kaplan, Carol Robinson, Denice Sheehan, Jennifer Walton-Fisette

Ex-Officio Members Present: Senior V.P. for Academic Affairs and Provost Todd Diacon; Senior Vice President Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Paul DiCorleto, Shay Little, Charlene Reed, Nathan Ritchey, Coleen Santee, Stephen Sokany, Jack Witt; Deans: James Blank, Barbara Broome, Ken Burhanna, James Hannon, Mark Mistur, Robert Sines, Alison Smith, Deborah Spake, Melody Tankersley, J.R. Campbell for John Crawford-Spinelli, Brent Robinson for Eboni Pringle, Jeffrey Fruit for Amy Reynolds

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: President Beverly Warren; Senior Vice President Karen Clarke; Vice Presidents: Alfreda Brown, Willis Walker; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, Allan Boike

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

Observers Not Present: Haley Foster (USS)


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/Laux). The agenda was approved.

4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of September 11, 2017

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the September 11, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Kracht/Kristof). No corrections to the minutes were offered. The minutes were approved.

5. Chair’s Remarks

In her remarks, Chair Smith discussed the concept of tenure in general as well as how it is instituted at KSU (Attachment A). Because the tenure and promotion policy was an item on the agenda under new business, Chair Smith asked that Senators hold questions or comments on policy until that item was discussed later. There was no discussion.

6. Provost’s Remarks

Provost Diacon began by indicating he endorsed Chair Smith’s remarks about tenure. He also commented that the language regarding tenure in KSU handbooks is clearer than the language he has seen at other institutions which does help when making tenure decisions.

Provost Diacon then discussed faculty and staff hiring procedures. He noted hiring is taking place through four separate initiatives. The first is replacement hires in connection with the Staff University Early Separation Plan (UESP). Per agreement with the Board of Trustees, replacements are being vetted centrally. A three-person committee (Provost Diacon, VP Polatajko, VP Witt) reviews all requests, and costs are a central factor given that the purpose of the plan was to meet efficiency and effectiveness requirements from the state. When the university realized there would be a decline in income due to a drop in enrollment, it was decided that all staff hires (including those not linked to a vacancy) would undergo this review (now called the Position Control Review). This was done to help balance the budget. Grant funded positions go through this process but are approved as a matter of routine. The third initiative is the Faculty UESP; all savings from faculty retirements will be used to hire additional tenure track faculty. It is expected that every two retirements will produce enough funding for three Assistant Professor positions. Retiring faculty can come back to teach one class a semester, but it will delay payment of the separation benefit. Some faculty in the UESP may delay their separation for a semester or a year. Finally, he noted that the procedure for faculty hires from the UESP follows a different process than staff hires. Vice-Presidents Polatajko and Witt are not involved; instead, colleges are being asked to submit strategic hiring plans to the Provost. The funds from retirements will be centralized in the Provost’s office and then freed up for colleges based on the review of the college plans. The Provost apologized that changes to RCM were made without consultation with FaSBAC. Both the Provost’s office and the President will be involved in hiring decisions. Decisions about hires from the UESP funds will take into consideration other hiring that colleges are requesting to make with college funds. If college hires outside the UESP are not approved, those funds would stay with the colleges.
Senator Laux asked whether there is a time limit on how long faculty can come back to teach if they take the UESP plan. Provost Diacon indicated there was no firm time limit. Senator Baller asked whether funds saved from retirement of NTT faculty would be used to hire TT faculty, and Provost Diacon indicated that was the case. Senator Ferranto asked whether that also applied to retirements at regional campuses, and Provost Diacon indicated that it did. Senator Grimm asked whether the requirement to replace with TT faculty only applied to money garnered through the UESP, and Provost Diacon affirmed that was the case. Senator Twieg asked why it was necessary to have such a long form for postdoc hires if they were going to be routinely approved. Provost Diacon indicated that it is being done to comply with the university’s commitment to the Board of Trustees and the process is likely to continue for at least the next several months. Senator Roxburgh asked how faculty can get a delay in retirement under the UESP. Provost Diacon said it would be done on a case-by-case basis, in response to a request from a Dean, and he indicated that externally funded grants or programmatic needs are examples of when a delayed retirement might be approved. Provost Diacon stated that the university cannot make a faculty member stay. Senator Gunning asked whether Regional College faculty who retire would be replaced in the Regional College rather than with other regional campus positions. Provost Diacon noted that it was important to have TT faculty at the regional campuses, and he also noted that it would be Vice President Ritchey’s decision. Vice President Ritchey responded that the budget and enrollments at campuses would be taken into consideration in allocating hires.

Provost Diacon then introduced the Comprehensive Office Print Initiative (COPI) which is another program being put in place to comply with the state’s effectiveness and efficiency mandate to reduce costs. This initiative is looking at purchase, use, and placement of office copy machines and desktop printers. One proposal for desktop printers is that they will not be removed, but university funds cannot be spent on maintenance costs such as print cartridges (faculty would self-fund if they want to keep their desktop printer). There will also be a reduction in the number of office machines (e.g., the Provost’s office has been renting two but will now have one instead).

Vice President Polatajko provided more information about the initiative. He is co-chairing the team that is working to implement the change. The goal is to improve service and to cut costs through reducing redundancy and changing how printing is done (e.g., two sided copying as a default). The cost savings are projected to be around $400,000 and those funds will stay at the RCM unit. The university has already finalized a contract with ComDoc/Xerox. Many details of the implementation have not been worked out yet, and the team is looking for input. The committee includes 10 – 20 people of which two are faculty members (one in the College of Education and the Director of the CTL). The team will do a comprehensive review of all spaces served by printers, then will make a proposal to the department which can offer input on the proposal to try and reach consensus. The team recognizes that in some cases (e.g., research labs) there may be special needs to take into consideration. Information about the initiative was distributed at the meeting (Attachment B). Feedback on the proposal can be sent to COPI@kent.edu.

Senator Laux asked whether the $400,000 estimated savings is system wide. Vice President Polatajko indicated that it was, and that it will take 12 – 18 months to fully implement the initiative. It is expected that there will be improvements in service and performance with the new copiers in addition to cost savings. Senator Kairis asked whether there will be a move away from printing documents to scanning them instead. Vice President Polatajko said that it is about managing documents and indicated that would also be part of the initiative. Senator Roxburgh asked what most departments would have, giving the example of a department that currently has two large copiers and desktop printers in offices. Vice President Polatajko said it would depend on department
need but likely the costs for the desktop printers would be absorbed by individuals. Requests for exceptions can also be made to a stakeholder review committee. Senator Roxburgh asked whether savings would go to the department given that cartridge costs currently come out of their budget. Vice President Polatajko said yes, although Chair Smith pointed out that he had stated the funds would be retained by the RCM unit, which is the college rather than the department or school. Provost Diacon clarified that the details would be worked out with the deans. Senator Roxburgh also asked why people would be asked to pay for expenses that are part of their routine job duties. Vice President Polatajko responded that the university will offer accessible print options, but the use of a desktop printer would be a personal choice. Provost Diacon added that desktop printers are the most expensive options, and the new machines are both cheaper and an upgrade relative to current equipment. Chair Smith expressed a concern about confidentiality and compliance with FERPA if sensitive student information is sent to a central printer used by many. Provost Diacon explained that the machines have the capability to not print a job until the user is at the machine, so there is security in the printing. Senator Grimm pointed out that the contract is already signed and asked whether it is just the details that are being worked out. Vice President Polatajko indicated that that is correct. Senator Child suggested that there will be a need to educate people about things such as how to maintain privacy with printing. Provost Diacon asked what would happen if someone went to print, but the machine was down. Vice President Polatajko stated that the system is set up so the print job could be sent to a different printer in the system. Senator Wilson noted that in economics there are many examples of how to reduce costs without impacting quality of life.

7. **Report: Update on the Library Collections Budget**

Interim Dean Ken Burhanna provided an update about the library (Attachment C). He began by reviewing how the library engages faculty when making decisions about collections. Many of the librarians involved have faculty status, and they also work with department faculty representatives. Library administrators also communicate with Chairs and Directors, obtain user data, are available to present at Faculty Senate, consult with a Faculty Senate Advisory Committee, and they are going to restart having annual meetings with library representatives and chairs. Interim Dean Burhanna also provided an update on the collections budget, which is around $5,300,000. OhioLINK is a big investment that saves money over individual subscriptions. They are not expecting budget cuts although they are planning for 5-7% inflation. Money allocated for books is declining, and allocated funds are not always spent as some fields are emphasizing books less. The library is trying a pilot this year where there will be a central book fund instead of individual department funds. It is hoped that this will ensure there are enough funds for those fields that do need more money for books. They will report on the pilot at the end of the year. The library has been working to distribute information, but a challenge is that many faculty are not around in summer when the library is preparing for the new year. Another new initiative is the piloting of a strategic collections fund. Units or individual faculty can request large funds for purchases that align with strategic priorities. They would also have to propose how they would measure the impact of the investment. Decisions for how to allocate the $250,000 will be made by the end of the year. He mentioned Linda.com as an example of a project where the library helped co-fund collaboratively with other units. The last new program is the Affordable Course Materials Initiative. The intent is to provide more affordable course materials to students through reserving materials, purchasing licensed materials, and collecting open educational resources (e.g., open access publishing platform Digital Commons could be used by faculty to publish their own text). They are creating a web site with the resources and holding a summit on the topic with faculty and other departments on November 3. OhioLINK is also making a push for more open and affordable course materials.
Senator Vande Zande asked whether the university is planning to sell off the books that are currently stored off site. Interim Dean Burhanna responded that half of our collections are stored off site. Although usage of these materials is currently being monitored, we have a contract with vendors to store these materials, and so no changes will happen immediately. Senator Smith said the graphic presented implies a high level of faculty input, but she noted that the decision to change how money for books is allocated was made before informing the Faculty Senate Library Advisory Committee, so there was little opportunity for faculty input prior to the decision. Interim Dean Burhanna said that was a fair point, and that they want to have the advisory body meet more often to improve consultation. Senator Kerns noted that departments were required to cut many journals last year, and she asked whether the strategic funds can be used to fund collections. Interim Dean Burhanna indicated a request could be made but commented that the strategic funds are for this fiscal year and intended for one time rather than ongoing purchases. He also noted the library did make some cuts this year based on an analysis of costs and usage. RefWorks was cut because there are open access resources that can be used, and the library had a transition program to help users switching to the new software. Senator Kairis asked what criteria would be used to evaluate the success of the change to a single fund for books. Interim Dean Burhanna said that they would look at whether demand outstrips funds and whether some units received a disproportionate share.

8. **New Business: Discussion of Potential Changes to Tenure and Promotion Policies**

Chair Smith initiated the conversation by explaining that Provost Diacon had asked that the Professional Standards Committee be charged with considering changes to the Tenure and Promotion policies. These include whether tenure and promotion to Associate Professor decisions should be linked, clarifying the meaning of the term “sustained” in the policy, and clarifying the process for conferring early tenure and promotion. The conversation was intended to gauge enthusiasm for the proposed changes and to see whether there are other concerns about the policies that should be addressed. Senators can also send comments to the committee chair, Susan Roxburgh. Any proposed changes that are acceptable to the Provost and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be brought to the Faculty Senate under the two-meeting rule, so there will be plenty of time for additional discussion before any action is taken.

Chair Smith noted that the first proposal is to link tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to combine what are currently two separate decisions into one process. Faculty would therefore no longer be able to receive tenure without promotion. Senator Williams asked whether people who were very good teachers but not producing research could be offered an NTT contract. Chair Smith indicated that this has happened in the past, but it is not part of any policy. Senator Williams suggested that a policy is needed for this case if it is an accepted practice, and Chair Smith responded that it is not yet an accepted practice. Senator T. Walton-Fisette noted that one complication would be the case where a faculty member is hired at the Associate rank but without tenure, and Chair Smith agreed the process for these cases and others with an abbreviated probationary period would need to be clarified. Senator Garrison spoke against linking the tenure and promotion decisions given that teaching is important but may receive less weight in promotion decisions. He expressed concern that the Hall of Honor for teachers that was near the Schwebel room has been removed, and advocated for finding ways to retain good teachers at the university. Chair Smith noted that the promotion policy as written already requires sustained and distinguished teaching, although she noted that practice may differ, which suggests the need for a change in academic culture. Senator Garrison responded that the decision of the local unit should carry heavy weight given that we are a diverse institution. Senator Child commented that his unit lists a common
set of criteria for tenure and promotion, and he suggested checking to see whether this is common in other handbooks. Senator Kairis asked whether language could be added to the policy acknowledging that regional campus faculty have higher teaching and service requirements, and Chair Smith agreed it could be a good idea. Senator Vande Zande stated that the university has changed how publications under contract are considered, so there may be less differentiation between the tenure and promotion policies than in the past. Chair Smith concurred. Senator Roxburgh suggested that tenure is based on work at KSU and a prediction of future work whereas promotion is based on the entire record of accomplishment, so different things are currently considered for the two. Senator T. Walton-Fisette said that the point about work at KSU is in the guidelines but not in the policy, so that needs to be clarified. Senator Twieg expressed concern about having any changes communicated to candidates, and Chair Smith said that last time there was grandfathersing language for probationary faculty who had already been here before the change. Senator Grimm voiced support for a single process but also suggested looking at reasons why in the past people have been tenured but not promoted. Chair Smith noted that Senator Roxburgh will be requesting data to look at that.

Chair Smith next asked for comments on the intent of the word “sustained” in the tenure and promotion policies. Some faculty and administrators have interpreted the language to mean that any multi-year gap in productivity would prevent a faculty member from ever achieving promotion. Another unintended interpretation has been that faculty who change research topics are not showing a sustained research focus. Chair Smith indicated that neither of these was intended when the Professional Standards Committee made the last revision of the policy. Senator Kerns reported that she was aware of a case where the policy language had been cited in ballots when a faculty member had a gap in the record followed by a clear pattern of productivity for several years after that. Another issue with a gap is that in some cases faculty reviewers may expect a certain rate of productivity across the time period, and this makes it impossible for a person to catch up to the expectations. Chair Smith concurred and noted that this concern comes up mostly in the case of promotion to Professor. She also commented that any promotion to Professor that is not done early is on time; there is no such thing as untimely promotion. Senator Wilson suggested checking handbooks, as some of them might list rate of publication rather than number in their criteria. Senator Williams spoke for including language about a gap in the policy rather than relying on handbooks. She also noted that a gap in productivity can occur when a faculty member has been working (e.g., is moving into a new field or due to long delays in publication at journals). Chair Smith agreed that publication dates can be misleading. Senator Garrison stated another issue with the policy is whether the voice of the administration can veto the voice of the faculty. Senator Roxburgh endorsed the idea of not expecting prorated productivity for faculty who have a gap when considered for promotion to Professor. She stated that women are less successful when applying for promotion to Professor, and they may get discouraged if they have a gap in their record. Senator Roxburgh also indicated that it would be good to look at the details of some of the cases where a sustained focus was cited as a concern to understand how the sustained language was applied.

Chair Smith explained that the third set of proposed revisions pertain to cases of early tenure and promotion. A successful early decision is linked to higher standards of performance in the promotion policy but to the same expectations in a shorter time period in the tenure policy. The different standards would have to be reconciled if tenure and promotion decisions were linked. In addition, the meaning of higher standards is often not defined in handbooks. The President has also suggested that candidates be allowed one application for tenure or promotion regardless of whether or not they apply early (in current policy, a candidate unsuccessful in requesting early tenure or promotion can reapply later if denied). Senator Wilson spoke in favor of removing the language about extraordinary circumstances and allowing a person to only apply once for tenure.
and promotion. Senator Williams stated that service is given little consideration in decisions about promotion to Professor, and she suggested the policy might be modified to give more weight for service contributions. Chair Smith noted that the policy refers to scholarship, teaching, and service although she agreed that in practice research and teaching are the main factors considered.

9. Announcements / Statements for the Record

Observer Janson read a statement for the record regarding recent Senate achievements including efforts to improve student evaluations of instructors at KSU (Attachment D). He then asked for an update on changes to student evaluations that had been discussed recently at Senate. Chair Smith stated that a committee had proposed several changes. Some small changes to the evaluation form have already been implemented, and more substantial changes including a new pool of questions were piloted this past summer. A working group will analyze the data and bring recommendations to Faculty Senate for discussion later this academic year.

Senator Dauterich reminded senators that the Faculty Senate Fall Retreat will take place this year on October 27 from noon to 2PM at the Bistro on Main restaurant. The topic is student resilience and how to encourage student success while maintaining academic rigor.

10. Adjournment

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 5:35PM.

attachments
Chair’s Remarks for October 9, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting:

In my remarks today, I’d like to reflect on the concept of tenure both in general and as instituted here at Kent State University.

Despite what is often reported in the media and what some State Legislators seem to think, tenure is not a guarantee of lifetime employment. Tenured faculty members can be and have been separated from the University for cause. Under the Collective Bargaining Agreement, tenured faculty members can be (but historically have not been) separated from the university due to significant changes in the mission of the university, in cases of financial exigency, or in other “extraordinary circumstances” as well.1 According to the University Policy Regarding Faculty Tenure, tenure does confer “a right of a faculty member to continuous appointment to a professional position of specified locus in the university” that “may be terminated by the university only under policies stated in the sanctions for cause and retrenchment articles of the applicable collective bargaining agreement.”2 So, tenure is not a guarantee of lifetime employment, but rather a set of due process rights designed to ensure that a tenured faculty member will not be removed arbitrarily and can be removed only through a very specific and rigorous set of procedures.

Tenure exists primarily as a means of ensuring academic freedom. Academic freedom is often interpreted as a sort of free-speech right for faculty members. But, as I have mentioned in past remarks, academic freedom benefits students as well. It guarantees that the instructor of record for a particular class will be able to bring the full extent of his/her academic expertise to the classroom and will not be limited to a previously determined set of course materials or fully canned content.

Academic freedom also extends outside of the classroom. It is what gives us the freedom to speak our minds and vote our conscious in this and other faculty bodies. Without it, the faculty side of shared governance would be little more than a rubber stamp for the purely administrative side of university governance.

I confess that I am always disappointed when tenured faculty—and especially tenured full professors—essentially forfeit their academic freedom out of fear of potential adverse consequences. It is true that an unethical administrator could retaliate in a variety of ways against a tenured faculty member who votes against the administrator’s interests or otherwise makes controversial, but protected remarks inside or outside the classroom. It is within the power of such an unethical administrator to assign a faculty member an undesirable teaching schedule, withhold merit raises, and recommend against promotion. And, while such retaliatory behavior would clearly violate section A of the University Policy Regard Faculty Professional Code of Ethics,3 retaliation is often difficult to prove. All of that is true. But at the end of the day, the administrators who would act in such an unethical manner are few and far between. Moreover, the retaliatory actions such an administrator could take are temporary setbacks and pale in significance to what could happen were we at-will employees without the protections of tenure. When a tenured faculty member is too fearful to exercise his or her academic freedom, it sets us all back.

Happily, at Kent State, for every example of a tenured faculty member who essentially forfeits the rights that tenure confers, there is an example of a not-yet-tenured or non-tenure-eligible faculty member taking on leadership roles and speaking out. Ironically, this too is the result of the role of tenure in ensuring academic freedom.

---

1 TT Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article X, Section 1.A.
2 University Policy 6-14, Section B.
3 “The faculty of the university subscribes to the principle of the 1940 ‘Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure’ adopted by the American association of university professors. Within the rationale in the AAUP statement, it is emphasized that academic freedom is necessary to the mission of the faculty of a university, since it is eminently in the interest of society that, without fear of retribution, the professor should be free to conduct research and make public its results and to teach his/her subject in the classroom. Professional responsibility is a logical correlative of this freedom.”(Policy 6-17, Section A.)
freedom. Once a culture of academic freedom is instilled at a university, it protects those not yet tenured and those not tenure eligible.

At every university, the tenure review process is a rigorous one. That is particularly true at Kent State University where tenure-track faculty undergo not just the traditional rigorous review after three years in the probationary period, but a rigorous review every single year leading up to the tenure decision in the sixth year of service. According to the University Policy and Procedures Regarding Faculty Reappointment, the guiding question in each reappointment review is: "Given the years of service to date and the number of years until mandatory tenure review, it is reasonable to expect that the probationary faculty member will eventually undergo a successful tenure review." Because the years until the mandatory tenure review shrink with each reappointment review, the bar for reappointment gets higher each year of the probationary period. When we senior colleagues cannot answer 'yes' to that guiding question, the right thing to do is to vote 'no' on reappointment.

To be sure, predictive judgements, such as the one involved in the reappointment decision are probabilistic and there are bound to be candidates that fall into a gray area where it is unclear what it is reasonable to expect. For that reason, our reappointment policy allows the possibility of a vote of 'yes with reservations'. Although such a vote counts as a 'yes', it carries with it "an additional message of concern." At the tenure decision, there is no possibility of voting 'yes with reservations'. And yet, there are still gray areas because excellence is itself a fuzzy concept. In these cases we must rely on our substantive academic judgment to decide whether or not a specific individual should be awarded tenure.

At most universities, the tenure decision is up or out. At Kent State, a probationary faculty member who does not receive tenure is indeed "out" and receives a terminal year contract that provides time to look for employment elsewhere. However, under our current policies, a successful tenure review does not always result in the upward movement of promotion to Associate Professor. The two are separate processes governed by separate policies. They are partially linked in that promotion to Associate Professor does require a successful tenure review. But, unless explicitly stated otherwise in an academic unit handbook, tenure does not require a successful review for promotion to Associate Professor.

As we will discuss later today under 'new business', at the request of the Provost, I have instructed the Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee to explore revising our tenure and promotion policies to fully combine the decisions regarding tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. I want to make clear that this would only affect non-tenured faculty members who have tenure-track appointments. There are distinct but homonymous titles of 'Associate Professor' that are conferred on faculty in the full-time non-tenure-track bargaining unit and the professional faculty at the College of Podiatric Medicine. Those would not be affected by this potential change in University policies 6-15 and 6-16.

I want to take this opportunity to say that I am personally in favor of fully linking tenure and promotion. I believe that, too often, the fact that these are distinct decisions is used as a way to resolve the gray area tenure cases. I believe that, too often, we decide to tenure but not promote faculty who may come close to meeting but do not clearly meet the criteria for tenure contained in the relevant academic unit handbook. That seems to me to be wrong-headed. It is tenure and not promotion that is the true prize. In my opinion, we shouldn’t be conferring indefinite tenure on someone who after completing five years in the probationary period has not demonstrated that he or she has satisfied the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.

My hope is that, in combining the two decisions, we will effectively be raising the bar ever so slightly for tenure and ensuring that tenure is never awarded as a sort of consolation prize. My fear is that we will instead

---

1 University Policy 6-16, Section D.
2 University Policy 6-16, Sections F.10, G-10, and H.4.
6 University Policy 6-15, Section B.1.b.
be effectively lowering the bar for promotion to Associate Professor. I doubt that there is much that can be done at the University-wide policy level to address such a fear. It must be addressed more generally in our academic culture and more specifically in our individual academic unit handbooks.

If we are to undertake this change in policy and attendant change in culture, it is vital that we not forget our regional campus tenure-track colleagues. In particular, we need to ensure that we have clear handbook language applying to regional campus faculty who, given their greater teaching load and service expectations, cannot reasonably be held to the same productivity expectations for research and creative activity as are Kent campus faculty. We need to ensure that such a policy change would not have the effect of essentially phasing out tenured positions at the regional campuses over time.

Anyway, that’s my more than two cents on the matter of tenure. Thank you.

Since we’ll have a robust discussion under ‘New Business’ concerning possible changes to the tenure and promotion policies later in the agenda, I’ll ask you to hold off on any comments and questions about that. However, I’d be happy to entertain any comments, questions, or complaints about other aspects of my remarks at this time.

Chair Smith
Kent State University
Comprehensive Office Print Initiative
Program Guidelines

Xerox MFD Default Settings

In order to remain aligned to the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency and the subsequent IUC Cooperative Purchasing Vehicle, as well as to use financial resources efficiently, default settings will be utilized for multi-function devices (MFDs) across campus. With sustainability and financial responsibility as goals, all Xerox MFDs default:

- to double-sided print;
- to black and white print, where color print is an option;
- to energy saver mode when not in use (sleep mode).

For one-sided print and color (where applicable), the default settings can be manually changed for a specific print job but will default back to original settings when the end user closes out of the file and application.

Personal Printers

To achieve benefits of the optimized print program, personal desktop printers will no longer be purchased or supported by the university. Employees who retain personal printers will be responsible for providing toner and other parts and supplies for the device. Bringing personally owned printers on campus is discouraged.

There may be instances or exceptions where a personal printer/local printing device is needed. These devices are the most expensive document output processes as they use more energy and supplies. Any individual or department that can justify the current print device or that requests a new print device, including a desktop or inkjet, must obtain formal approval from the COPI committee. An online form with the established criteria is being developed.

Exceptions

Business critical cases for retaining personal desktop printers will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and must follow the appropriate process (see Personal Printers section). Exceptions will only be reviewed if the enterprise wide program is deemed to not be inclusive of your specific need and/or is out of scope.

The funding for an approved, local desktop device (and associated parts or supplies) will be the financial and budgetary responsibility of the individual department or office making the request.
Confidential Printing

All employees occasionally have the need to print a confidential document. Confidential printing needs are not a justification for a personal printer. The Xerox MFD’s in KSU’s fleet will provide capabilities for secure printing.

COPI Committee

Co-Chairs:
Todd Diacon, Provost and Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mark Polatajko, Sr. Vice President for Finance and Administration

Members:
Jona Burton, Information Services
Janet Cash, Institutional Advancement
Scott Cornell, College of Arts and Sciences
Kelly Crislip, University Communications and Marketing
Peta Denno, Finance and Administration
Christine Hill, Regional Campuses
Tim Konczal, Procurement
Mark Kretovics, College of Education, Health and Human Services
Elizabeth Lee, Human Resources
Jenny Marcinkiewiz, Center for Teaching and Learning
Michelle McGregor, College of Business Administration
Larry McWilliams, Procurement
Andrea Nunley, Information Services
Michael Perdue, Information Services
James Raber, Information Services
Jeannie Reifsnyder, Finance and Administration
Carmen Roberts, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
Allison Smith, Residence Services
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Kent State University
Comprehensive Office Print Initiative
FAQs

Q: What is the Comprehensive Office Print Initiative (COPI)?
A: COPI is a program to assess office copier/printer practices across all campuses, and identify potential efficiencies by modifying current equipment and printing practices.

Kent State is implementing COPI as part of its strategic response to the Governor’s Affordability and Efficiency Report.

Q: What vendor will provide the printer services?
A: ComDoc/Xerox was selected as the vendor, with an initial contract of five years. The contract provides for a new printer model which allows for “per click” pricing.

Q: What services will ComDoc/Xerox provide?
A: ComDoc/Xerox will provide services for all of Kent State’s copiers and printers. The vendor also will lead an assessment of printers and copiers in departments across all Kent State campuses.

Q: What will the assessment mean for departments?
A: The assessment will help determine if existing devices in a department needs to be replaced, removed or relocated, as well as removing printing devices that are underutilized. The assessment will include networked devices as well as personal printers in individual offices or work areas.

Q: How will the process work?
A: A ComDoc/Xerox team will perform site visits to gather all current inventory by location, establish a current average month volume and average monthly service costs. Based on that information a recommendation will be made on the number of copiers/printers needed for an office or department.

Q: When can I expect the ComDoc/Xerox team to be in my area?
A: Departments will be given advance notice before a ComDoc/Xerox representative visits your department; the representatives will work with each area to find a time that is convenient.

Q: How long will the transition take?
A: A pilot program began in Fall Semester 2017, and the program will expand to the rest of the university beginning early in Spring Semester 2018. The transition and is expected to take 12-18 months to complete.
Q: *What are the benefits of COPI?*
A: This initiative will provide departments with newer and more efficient printing technology; reduce print output costs with an estimated savings of $400,000 annually; improve the quality of services; and reduce energy consumption by as much as 50 percent.

Q: *Can I keep my personal printer?*
A: To achieve benefits of the optimized print program, personal desktop printers will no longer be purchased or supported. Employees who bring printers to campus will be responsible for providing their own toner.

Employees may retain an individual desktop printer if it is approved by Human Resources as an appropriate accommodation for a documented disabling condition.

Q: *Will personal printers be removed from offices?*
A: No, but the devices will no longer be supported by the department and the individual will be responsible for providing toner and other parts and supplies. Please see the next FAQ regarding requests for exceptions.

Q: *Are there exceptions to the personal printer rule?*
A: There may be business-critical instances or exceptions for retaining personal desktop printers. Those exceptions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and the individual or department must submit a request form. The form will be available on the COPI website and will include the criteria for requesting an exception.

The funding for an approved, local desktop device and the associated parts or supplies will be the financial responsibility of the department or office making the request.

Q: *Who do I contact for more information or with questions?*
A: Send your questions to COPI@kent.edu or contact Procurement at 330-672-2276.
University Libraries Update to Faculty Senate
Ken Burhanna, Interim Dean
9 October 2017

1. Welcome
2. Libraries' Model of Faculty Engagement (Handout A.)
3. Collection Budget Update
   a. No substantial cuts foreseen over the next year.
   b. We anticipate our normal 5% to 7% inflation
   c. (Handouts B. & C.)
4. Shared Monograph Fund (Pilot)
   a. Increase efficiency
   b. Allow funds to flow freely to areas that need them
   c. (Handouts D. & E.)
5. Strategic Collections Fund (Pilot)
   a. Alignment with strategic priorities
   b. Measuring RIO / Impact
   c. (Handout F.)
6. Affordable Course Materials Initiative and Summit
   a. Providing resources and service to help faculty identify affordable course materials.
   b. Affordable Course Materials Summit 3 November @ University Library
FY18 University Libraries Collection Budget / $5,302,638.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$467,655.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Subscriptions</td>
<td>$2,307,711.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OhioLINK</td>
<td>$1,925,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan - Document Delivery</td>
<td>$181,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Support Services</td>
<td>$399,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>$21,722.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,302,638.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Libraries Collection Distribution FY09 - FY18

- Books
- OhioLINK
- Local Subscriptions

FY09 | FY10 | FY11 | FY12 | FY13 | FY14 | FY15 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
$3,000,000.00 | $2,500,000.00 | $2,000,000.00 | $1,500,000.00 | $1,000,000.00 | $500,000.00 | $0.00 |
Dear Department Chairs and Library Representatives:

I am writing to let you know about a change to how University Libraries will manage monographic funds (or what we call one-time acquisitions). This year we will pilot one shared fund for monograph orders. We believe this funding structure will help us all manage our monographic collection needs more efficiently and do a better job of helping you acquire the materials you need for teaching and research.

Why Was Change Needed?

Overtime changing collections needs and inflation has diminished the overall funds available for monographs. Here are some facts that have made us consider this new approach.

- Over the last ten years our funds dedicated to monographic purchasing have dropped from roughly $950,000 to $500,000. This is largely due to inflation on recurring collections expenses (i.e., journals), but has also been influenced by increasingly available online content (e.g., eBooks, streaming media, etc.).
- As this decrease has happened, we have seen new acquisitions patterns emerge at the departmental level. Some departments have increasingly become less dependent on monographs, while others have maintained quite a healthy demand. This has resulted in funds sometimes going unspent in some areas, while other areas have wanted to overspend. We believe that a shared monograph fund will enable us to actually spend all of our monograph funds for needed resources, allowing available funds to more easily flow to areas that need them.
- Interdisciplinary needs have also emerged over the last several years. These needs have often times resulted in confusion. Which fund should this be purchased from? Should this really be debited to another area? This single fund will do away with these confusions. We will just go ahead and try to get the materials, if they’re needed.
- Redirecting our conversation from spending to specific limits to focusing on curricular and research needs will be healthy for everyone. This is not to say that “need” hasn’t always been an important factor, but sometimes we spend to our budget levels, rather than our need levels. We think this shared approach will help keep the focus on our needs.
- Managing multiple small funds is simply not efficient. One shared fund will be more easily managed and allow for increased flexibility.

What Will Change?

- Library representatives will no longer receive monthly allocation statements.
- We just want to hear what you need and how the requested items help support those needs, which by the way, is what we have always wanted to hear from you.
- We will continue to depend upon department library representatives to help subject librarians select resources for their discipline, that communication and ordering process will remain the same.

This is a pilot

We have only committed to try this out. If it doesn’t work, we certainly will try another approach. We welcome questions throughout the year and will report back in May on how this has worked. For
additional information, including frequently asked questions, please see our shared mono web page: www.library.kent.edu/sharedmono.

Please direct questions to Kay Downey, interim head of collections & technical services (mdowney1@kent.edu) or to your subject librarian.

Best regards,

Ken
Department Book Fund Spending Patterns FY12 - FY17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% OVERSPENT</th>
<th>% UNDERSPENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

September 25, 2017

Re: University Libraries Strategic Fund Designation

University Libraries will pilot a new fund that focuses on the acquisition of resources that support university-level priorities. The Strategic Collections Fund supports the planned and cooperative selection of strategic resources for the library collection. It has been created using existing library collection funds and is generally reserved for costlier acquisitions.

When submitting resources for consideration the requesting unit will need to show that the utility aligns with one of the five university priorities:

1. Students First
2. A Distinctive Kent State
3. Global Competitiveness
4. Regional Impact
5. Organizational Stewardship.

The requesting unit must also provide an assessment plan to help determine return on investment and impact of the strategic collections investment. Subject and Collections Librarians will be available to consult on assessment plans. Purchased resources typically will be for a one-year commitment, pending assessment review and availability of funds.

Requests for new acquisition may be made through the library web site here. After having received the request the library will research cost and licensing. Once that information is obtained library administration, subject librarians and the requesting unit will work together to decide on the purchase. Shared funding models may be explored for major purchases.

One example of a resource that qualifies for Strategic Funds is Lynda.com as it supports distance education and aligns with the Students First university priority. Data has shown a significant upward trend in usage. Additionally, the annual cost is shared between the library and two other units.

The Strategic Collections Fund is a pilot. We will evaluate the program at the end of the year and determine whether it will move forward.

Please contact me, your Subject Librarian or the Collection Management Librarian, Kay Downey, mdowney1@kent.edu if you have any questions about the program.
October 9, 2017

Faculty Senate: Statement for the Record

Professor Emeritus Thomas Janson

Many senators and a few administrators and staff present here today will remember the many years during which I served the College of the Arts as a faculty senator. These years included my service as Chair of the Faculty Senate, and before and after, as Secretary. It is with great pride in the Senate’s accomplishments that I am here this academic year as the representative of the KSU Retired Association.

My tenure as chair of the senate saw the retirement of President Cartwright, whom I now greet weekly on Sunday mornings, as well as the arrival and departure of the Lefton-Frank administration, followed by service on both the Provost and the Presidential Search Committees which brought our illustrious President Warren and Provost Dicon to campus. My desire during those tumultuous years was to act as a “voice of reason” amid the seemingly endless turmoil. Despite the prevalent agitation back then, the Faculty Senate created, discussed and implemented many new policies and procedures including our policies on reappointment and promotion which appear on today’s agenda.

Another policy that the Senate tackled back then targeted the university-wide student evaluation of teaching. The first of two parts to the revision involved the implementation of totally on-line student evaluation. This pilot program was built upon the initiative of the School of Nursing which had begun the process slightly earlier. The pilot ran its course and the Senate made a final decision as to its effectiveness. The second part of the initiative to update the effectiveness of student evaluations was the need to rewrite the questions to which students were asked to respond.

At that time the university was asking all students a set of general questions prepared for Senate approval by my former student and later colleague, Denise Seachrist. Her Faculty Senate committee’s work was approved by the Senate; the list of questions were posed to students for many years. When online education first appeared the Senate quickly acknowledged that a new component of teaching and learning was being ignored by the evaluative process. Therefore, new or additional evaluation questions were sorely needed. Some departments/schools and even whole colleges attempted to fill that void on their own initiative. But I felt strongly that the need to act on behalf of the university as a whole should prompt the Senate to formally recreate the instrument.

My question today is, what is the current state of action on the long-needed update to our student evaluation process and procedures? Has the Senate taken serious and appropriate action or has it placed this important evaluative tool on the back burner?
Dear Valued Customer,

Thank you for your feedback over the past few weeks on our dining program. We are working to incorporate your input and wanted to update you on the latest actions that we are taking in order to provide you with the best catering experience.

As of Monday, Oct. 9, Chuck Berry is now temporarily serving as the Director of Catering until we hire and fully acclimate a new catering director. Chuck has extensive knowledge and experience with catering operations and execution. It is our great pleasure to support Chuck as he leads the catering team to a path of success here at Kent State University. We know he will make a fantastic addition to our team and will work to ensure we exceed expectations for all your catered events and programs.

In the past few weeks we have hired an additional catering supervisor with more than 20 years’ experience as well as a catering executive chef who comes to us after spending nearly 10 years working in New York City including at The Boat House in Central Park. Additionally, we are continuously working to hire and train the right staff to ensure service excellence. Service excellence is more than just providing great customer service. It also means using time-tested best practices and proven processes every day, everywhere, and in everything that we do. It’s also about striking the perfect balance between doing something well over and over again and being responsive enough to the changing needs of you, our clients and customers.

We thank you again for your patience and understanding. As we continue to take action, we will be sure to communicate with you the updates that are taking place. If you have any questions or feedback, please feel free to reach out directly to me, Jeffrey Stone at jstone32@kent.edu.

Regards,

Jeffrey Stone
Resident District Manager

David Cummings
Strategic Partnerships Director

University Dining Services
104 Kent Student Center • P.O. Box 5190 • Kent, Ohio 44242-0001
(330) 672-2592 • Fax: (330) 672-3291 • http://www.kent.edu

Item 6.
Proposed change in the tenure policy:

6 - 14

UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING FACULTY TENURE

D. Tenure criteria. For the purposes of this policy "scholarship" is broadly defined to include research, scholarly and creative work, and commercialization activities relevant and appropriate to the academic discipline. For the purposes of this policy "service" is broadly defined to include administrative service to the university, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of professional expertise to public and private entities beyond the university.

Relevant new language in Section 3345.45 of the Ohio Revised Code:

(C)(1) The board of trustees of each state university shall review the university's policy on faculty tenure and update that policy to promote excellence in instruction, research, service, or commercialization, or any combination thereof.

(2) Beginning on July 1, 2018, as a condition for a state university to receive any state funds for research that are allocated to the department of higher education under the appropriation line items referred to as either "research incentive third frontier fund" or "research incentive third frontier-tax," the chancellor shall require the university to include multiple pathways for faculty tenure, one of which may be a commercialization pathway, in its policy.

Item 9.a.
STATE SALES TAX EXEMPTION FOR TEXTBOOKS

Whereas, Public institutions of higher education across the state of Ohio are committed to increasing the fraction of working age citizens with certificates and degrees by providing opportunities for high quality, affordable education;

Whereas, Textbook costs have increased by more than four times the rate of inflation since 2006 and by 945% since 1978;

Whereas, The U.S. Public Interest Research Group has found that nationwide textbook costs are approximately 26% of the cost of tuition at state universities and 72% of the cost of tuition at community colleges¹;

Whereas, A 2017 survey of more than 1,000 students from four-year colleges in the US and Canada found that 85% had delayed or avoided purchasing textbooks for their courses even though half did so expecting that their grades would be negatively impacted by their decision²;

Whereas, College and university students in Ohio paid between $25 and $30 million in sales tax on textbook purchases during the 2015-2016 academic year;

Whereas, Many states (e.g. Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia) specifically exempt textbook purchases for secondary education from sales tax³; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Kent State University Faculty Senate strongly supports legislation such as the 131st Ohio General Assembly’s HB 308⁴ and the 132nd Ohio General Assembly’s HB 337⁵ that would specifically exempt post-secondary textbooks from state sales tax as a means of making it easier for students at Ohio’s public institutions of higher education to obtain a high quality education at an affordable price.

³ https://trustfile.avalara.com/blog/state-sales-tax-rules-for-textbook-purchases/

Item 9.b.