TO: Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests  DATE: December 5, 2017
FROM: Deborah C. Smith, Chair of the Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Agenda and Materials for the December 11, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the December 11th Faculty Senate meeting. As always, we will meet in the Governance Chambers at 3:20 p.m. Refreshments will be provided.

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of the Agenda

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

5. Chair’s Remarks

6. President’s Remarks

7. Report: Update on the Revised Student Survey of Instruction Pilot
   (Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Director Center for Teaching and Learning)

8. EPC Items:
   a. Action Items:
      (1) Office of the Provost: Revision of Definition of Instructional Arrangements and Guidelines for the Awarding of Academic Credit policy to provide more guidance and code consistency in course development. Effective fall 2018.

      (2) College of Aeronautics and Engineering: Establishment of a Mechanical Engineering Technology major within the Bachelor of Science degree, to be offered at the Kent Campus. The major replaces the Mechanical Engineering Technology concentration within the Applied Engineering major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 120. Effective fall 2018 pending final approval.
(3) **College of Aeronautics and Engineering:** Establishment of a Mechatronics Engineering major within the Bachelor of Science degree, to be offered at the Kent Campus. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 121. Effective fall 2018 pending final approval.

(4) **College of Aeronautics and Engineering:** Establishment of a Mechatronics Engineering Technology major within the Bachelor of Science degree, to be offered at the Kent Campus. The major replaces the Mechatronics concentration within the Applied Engineering major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 120. Effective fall 2018 pending final approval.

(5) **College of the Arts:** Consolidation of the Crafts major and Fine Arts major into one major—renamed Studio Art—within the Master of Arts degree in the School of Art. Effective fall 2018 pending final approval.

(6) **College of Arts and Sciences:** Restructure of the Liquid Crystal Institute to be more inclusive and include materials science research. The institute will be renamed Advanced Materials and Liquid Crystal Institute. Effective fall 2018.

(7) **Regional College:** Establishment of an Information Technology major within a Bachelor of Science in Information Technology degree. The proposed program replaces five computer technology concentrations within the Technical and Applied Studies major. The program will be offered fully online and hybrid online/on-ground at all seven regional campuses and the Twinsburg Regional Academic Center. The Trumbull Campus will be the admitting campus for first-time applicants to the online program. The major will comprise six concentrations: Networking, Internet/Multimedia, Application Development, Health Information Technology, Integrated Information Technology and Applied Computer Security and Forensics. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 120. Effective fall 2018 pending final approval.

b. **Information Items:**

(1) **College of Arts and Sciences:** Revision of name of the Biological Sciences—Cell Biology major within the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy degrees in the Department of Biological Sciences. Revised name is Biological Sciences—Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics. Effective fall 2018.

(2) **College of Arts and Sciences:** Revision of name of the Biological Sciences—Ecology major within the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy degrees in the Department of Biological Sciences. Revised name is Biological Sciences—Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. Effective fall 2018.
(3) **College of Arts and Sciences:** Revision of name of the Biological Sciences—Physiology major within the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy degrees in the Department of Biological Sciences. Revised name is Biological Sciences—Integrative Physiology and Neurobiology. Effective fall 2018.

(4) **Regional College:** Revision of name of the Computer Technology major within the Associate of Applied Business degree. The revised name will be Information Technology. Effective fall 2018.

(5) **Regional College:** Inactivation of the Legal Assisting Technology major within the Associate of Applied Science degree on the East Liverpool Campus. The program has had no enrollment for several years, and there are no faculty associated with the program on the campus. The program is and will continue to be offered at the Trumbull Campus. Effective fall 2018.

9. **Old Business**

10. **New Business:** Faculty Ethics Committee Purposes and Procedures  
(Michael Byron, Chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee)

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

12. **Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment**
FACULTY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
November 13, 2017

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Patti Baller, Rachael Blasiman, Jeffrey Child, Michael Chunn, Jeffrey Ciesla, Jennifer Cunningham, Christopher Fenk, Mary Lou Ferranto, Farid Fouad, Lee Fox, Pamela Grimm, Todd Hawley, Albert Ingram, Robert Kairis, David Kaplan, Kathy Kerns, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Tracy Laux, Richard Mangrum, Mahli Mechenbier, Stephen Minnick, Rocco Petrozzi, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Carol Robinson, Mary Beth Rollick, Susan Roxburgh, James Seelye, Andrew Shahriari, Denice Sheehan, Deborah Smith, John Stoker, Robert Twieg, Terrence Uber, Robin Vande Zande, Jennifer Walton-Fisette, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Molly Wang, Linda Williams

Senators Not Present: Vinay Cheruvu, Ed Dauterich, Vanessa Earp, George Garrison, Bruce Gunning, Edgar Kooljman, Blake Stringer, Kathryn Wilson

Ex-Officio Members Present: Executive Vice President and Provost Todd Diacon; Senior Vice Presidents: Mark Polatajko and Rebecca Murphy for Karen Clarke; Vice Presidents: Alfreda Brown, Shay Little, Nathan Ritchey, Coleen Santee, Jack Witt; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, Allan Boike, Barbara Broome, Ken Burhanna, James Hannon, Robert Sines, Alison Smith, Deborah Spake, Melody Tankersley, Cynthia Stillings for John Crawford-Spinelli

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: President Beverly Warren; Vice Presidents: Paul DiCorleto, Charlene Reed, Stephen Sokany, Willis Walker; Deans: James Blank, Mark Mistur, Eboni Pringle, Amy Reynolds

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

Guests Present: Sue Averill, J.R. Campbell, David Cummings, Cesquinn Curtis, Larry Froehlich, Julie Gabella, Mary Ann Haley, Nicholas Hunter, Lamar Hylton, Lynette Johnson, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Catherine Leslie, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, David Ochmann, Susan Perry, Jennifer Piatt, Swathi Ravichandran, Gail Rebata, Jeffrey Stone, Aimee VanDomeleon

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 as noted. A motion was made and seconded (Vande Zande/Piccirillo-Smith). No additional changes to the agenda were offered. The agenda was approved.
4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of October 9, 2017

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 9, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Sheehan/Rollick). No corrections to the minutes were offered. The minutes were approved.

5. Chair’s Remarks

Chair Smith commented on KSU’s recent efforts at branding (Attachment A). Senator Roxburgh mentioned that she saw the Kent student center on a TV show, and she wondered whether the university has to grant permission for this type of video, whether we received any money for allowing access, and if so, where does the money go in the budget. Associate VP Rebecca Murphy indicated that anyone can come on campus to film, and that she would have to check whether KSU received any payment. Senator Seelye received the message “that’s undeniably disappointing” when he clicked on a broken KSU link, and he asked who came up with that and why that message persists (even though KSU is moving away from the tag line, “Undeniably Kent State”). Chair Smith agreed that linking Kent State and disappointment was unhelpful. Senator Twieg suggested that members of the KSU community could have come up with better branding slogans, and Chair Smith noted that would have been cheaper as well.

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

VP Shay Little provided an update on KSU’s partnership with Aramark (Attachment B). She acknowledged that Aramark’s performance has been far below expectations. In response, she has constructed KSU-Aramark co-teams that have been meeting weekly to improve services, and there also have been meetings among high level administrators. The university is also meeting with local businesses to explore how they can be included in the partnership. Sherwood Lincoln, district manager for Aramark, then outlined changes Aramark has made. These include increased hiring and workforce training, assuring food safety, building an engaged team, and focusing on accountability for their daily execution. They have also brought in new leadership, including a new catering director who will start on November 27 and a new person to oversee services at regional campuses. They have also been conducting quality assurance audits at their locations. They also are developing a Voice of the Consumer program that provides a way for customers to provide feedback to Aramark. Some new locations for food service have been opened, and they are working on additional ways that they can include local businesses in their food program and have more flexibility in the catering policy. VP Little concluded by stating that KSU and Aramark are committed to having high quality service, and they welcome feedback from customers.

Senator Kaplan noted that expansion of the Kent downtown is a recent and positive change, and he expressed concern that the Aramark agreement may have damaged the local business community. VP Little responded that she agreed, and they are working on ways to include local businesses more. Senator Williams asked whether she can order from local pizza restaurants. VP Little indicated there is a waiver for pizza orders. They are also working to clarify what qualifies as a university event. Requests for an exception can also be made to use other vendors and they are working to streamline that process. Aramark does not have to be used if people are paying out of pocket. Senator Child stated that events in his college have been more expensive than the past with lower quality food, and he asked whether any changes in these areas are planned. VP Little indicated that they are still
discussing with Aramark how to address those concerns, including a consideration of which services are best provided by Aramark. Chair Smith noted that Faculty Senate paid $6 for 3 gallons of water last year but this year is charged $14.97 for the same amount. VP Little indicated that, under the agreement, prices were to remain the same this year and that Aramark should be issuing credits in those cases where there is an overcharge. Senator Stoker expressed the concern that providing services for KSU might be beyond Aramark’s capacity. Senator Grimm suggested that human resources issues, specifically staff turnover in full-time employees and delays in hiring students, might have contributed to problems in service quality and understaffing. Senator Kerns questioned the economic benefits of the Aramark contract, in that the university might have received financial incentives but departments now have to pay more for food.

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.

      Director Campbell indicated that the changes are being made to better align the program with disciplinary requirements. After discussion at EPC, the proposal was modified to drop one elective course proposed, FDM 65075 Consumer Demands and Data Analytics in the Fashion Industry, which is being re-evaluated for potential overlap with other university courses. A motion was made to approve the proposal as amended (Williams/Grimm). The motion was approved.

   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.

      Dean Alemagno indicated that the proposal is based on suggestions from the college’s External Advisory Committee. The new program will better prepare students who will be employed to carry out clinical trials. A motion was made to approve the proposal (Piccirillo-Smith). Senator Laux asked whether a private company (Everspring) would administer this online degree program, and if so, what would happen if there were performance concerns. Dean Alemagno indicated that Everspring runs some of the college’s other online programs, but other are run without Everspring and the college could run the proposed program without Everspring if needed. Everspring provides marketing and online help but is not involved in teaching or advising as that is done by the college. Senator Laux also asked whether the arrangement was financially beneficial, and Dean Alemagno indicated they have had positive experiences with Everspring. The motion was approved.
b. Information Items:

There was no discussion of the information items that had been previously approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

8. New Business:

a. Revision of Tenure Policy to include a commercialization track per Section 3345.45 of the Ohio Revised Code

Chair Smith introduced a proposed revision to the tenure policy (Attachment C). The change is intended to bring our tenure policy in line with a new state law that requires states universities to have a commercialization pathway for tenure. Chair Smith explained that commercialization activities involve generating income based on existing intellectual property. The proposed revision takes the law into account by adding “commercialization activities relevant and appropriate to the discipline” to the definition of scholarship in Section D of the tenure criteria. Chair Smith pointed out that the language about “appropriate to the discipline” was intended to refer to commercialization activities but could be read as applying to all scholarship activities listed in the sentence.

Senator Theresa Walton-Fisette raised a concern regarding how the language about a faculty member’s discipline might be interpreted in cases where a faculty member does interdisciplinary research. Chair Smith responded that it might depend on what is viewed as relevant to the discipline. Senator Twieg noted that the language in the law also states that a person’s contribution can be in any of the areas, so it is not necessary to add commercialization as an option. Chair Smith agreed the language in the statute is permissive but suggested it was important to address the spirit of the law to avoid losing state dollars. Senator Twieg also noted that, by definition, “academic” does not refer to practical activities but to educational institutions and theoretical ideas. Chair Smith concurred that the language does not reflect a good understanding of institutions of higher education, and she suggested that senators contact their legislators to provide them with feedback on the language of the new law. She also stated that the university needs to be in compliance with the law by July 2018 to ensure access to state research funds.

Senator Roxburgh suggested editing the language, with the new information about commercialization in a separate sentence, so that it would be clear that the language about relevant discipline applied to commercial activities. Chair Smith suggested she make a motion to amend the language. A motion was made (Roxburgh/Williams). Senator Vande Zande stated that she thought the language about “relevant and appropriate to the discipline” should apply to all scholarship activities. Chair Smith noted that that had been a point of discussion at the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting when they reviewed the proposed language. The concern is that adding the additional language could be viewed as a change to the entire policy and be seen as supporting a narrow interpretation of work in the discipline (e.g., work must be published in a discipline specific journal). Senator Kerns commented that in the RPT process she had seen people apply such an interpretation of relevance to the discipline as a way to exclude consideration of a faculty member’s work. Senator Twieg reiterated his point that the language of the statute allows but does not require that the university include commercialization activities in the tenure policy, and Chair
Smith stated that she was concerned the law may be interpreted differently and that even if the university decided to sue there would be a time period when the university would lose access to research funds.

Senator Kairis asked whether the Board of Trustees could modify the policy without Faculty Senate input, and Chair Smith noted that would be a violation of the TT faculty contract which states that the tenure policy needs to be approved by Faculty Senate. Senator Grimm asked whether commercialization activities include only products developed at the university or also those developed independent of university funding. Chair Smith suggested that those details would need to be clarified in department handbooks. Senator Laux asked whether the law ever came up at IUC meetings (i.e., meetings for state provosts). Provost Diacon indicated that it did, and that provosts had discussions that were similar to the one happening today at Faculty Senate. In his view, the language under consideration by Senate is clearer than the language in the law. Provost Diacon also noted that this law was part of House Bill 49 which included four pages of mandates to public universities. Chair Smith stated that a number of other, more problematic bills that addressed tenure did not pass in the legislature. The Ohio Faculty Conference has been trying to lobby legislators to help them better understand tenure. Senator T. Walton-Fisette noted that the law asks for this language only for tenure and not for promotion. Senator Robinson stated that the meaning of commercialization is vague and it could be advantageous to clearly state what is meant by the term. She also expressed a concern that the language would lead to asking whether a professor is profitable. Chair Smith suggested the vague language in the policy will allow units to define the term in their handbook. Senator Roxburgh suggested that Chairs and Directors be told that commercialization applies only to patents as has been stated by RASP, and Chair Smith added they can also be informed that no unit has to build in commercialization language. Senator Twieg stated that the language as amended is an improvement.

Chair Smith called for a vote on the motion to approve the language for the tenure policy as amended at Senate. The motion was approved.

b. Tax Exempt Textbook Resolution

The Faculty Senate considered a resolution, largely written by the Ohio Faculty Council, calling for the state government to make purchases of textbooks tax exempt (Attachment D). The state assembly is currently considering a bill that would do this. A motion was made to approve the resolution (Stoker/Roxburgh). There was no discussion and the motion was approved.

9. Announcements / Statements for the Record

Mr. Rhodes, Executive Chair of the KSU Graduate Student Senate, expressed concern that the proposed tax changes under consideration in the U.S. House of Representatives call for treating tuition waivers as taxable income. The Senate bill does not include this provision. Mr. Rhodes asked Faculty Senators to express their concerns about this potential tax change.

10. Adjournment

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 4:47PM.
Chair’s Remarks for November 13, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting:

Last week, Kent State hosted the first ever Mid-American Conference Academic Leadership Development Program (MAC-ADLP) Workshop. One of the panel sessions of that workshop was entitled “The ‘B’ Word: Branding the University” and featured Senior Associate Provost Melody Tankersley, Vice President Char Reed, Senior Vice President Karen Clarke, and Matt Yuskewich, CCO of the branding agency 160over90 discussing the process involved in developing the Kent State brand. Knowing that I am something of a critic of the branding campaign Kent State has been undertaking the last few years, Provost Diacon invited me to be a part of the panel and to share my perspective. Today, I want to present to you the remarks I gave as part of that panel.

However, before I do, I want to briefly share how surprised I was at some of the individual feedback I got from the MAC-ALDP Fellows. Several of the Fellows described me as ‘brave’ or said it took courage to give the presentation I had given. One went so far as to say I was his “new hero.” This caught me off guard as I didn’t take myself to be doing anything that took a particular amount of courage. Even more of the fellows expressed surprise that I had even been invited by the Provost to give critical remarks and noted that Melody, Char, and Karen seemed to take the remarks in stride. Each of these individuals opined that we have something that shouldn’t be, but is in fact is, very rare here at Kent State: a relationship between the upper administration and the faculty that genuinely fosters the free exchange of ideas and respect for our colleagues even when we disagree with each other. I agree that that is very special and I want to thank President Warren and Provost Diacon. Their leadership has helped us cultivate a culture in which genuine academic freedom is not merely permitted, but allowed to flourish.

With that said, here are the remarks I gave on our branding campaign.

To be clear, I am not a critic of branding in and of itself. Branding is effective. Just a few weeks ago, I was driving North on Highway 271 (something I do roughly every two weeks) and, out of the corner of my eye I saw that one of the billboards had been changed. I knew instantly, just from that brief glance, that the new billboard was for Kent State University. The color scheme, font, and overall layout acted on me in an almost subliminal way. That is the effect of branding and it is a powerful one.

What I am critical of is the use of a national branding agency, such as 160over90, by a public university that has as much in house talent as does Kent State and the other MAC institutions. Kent State University has a College of the Arts; it has a College of Communication and Information. The faculty in these colleges are experts in their respective areas and the undergraduate and graduate students they teach are experts-in-training. I have no doubt that the faculty in our School of Visual Communication and Design and perhaps other schools in the College of Communication and Information and in the College of the Arts are aware of the latest research in the science of branding. More importantly, they know Kent State University and what makes us unique in a way that no external agency ever could.

To be sure, when 160over90 came to Kent State in 2015, they undertook an extensive listening campaign. They met with our faculty, with administrators, with students, and staff. They did their best to get a handle on what makes Kent State University tick. I was a member of our Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee at that time it met with 160over90. We emphasized the importance
of developing a brand that couldn’t have been the brand of just any university—a brand that was unique and specific to Kent State.

For better or for worse, there is one thing that anyone who knows anything about Kent State University knows: on May 4, 1970, our campus was the site of a national tragedy. Four students died at the hands of the National Guard and nine other were wounded. That event changed the way our nation saw itself and the consequences of that event are still felt today nearly 50 years later. It is no surprise that this site has been declared a National Historical Landmark.

Another thing that everyone who knows anything about Kent State can infer is that this event did not break us. It challenged us to “Inquire, Learn, and Reflect.” We emerged from this tragic history stronger, more unified, and today we are a major research University serving over 41,000 students and with a foot print of eight campuses spanning across much of North East Ohio.

It is unfortunate that a certain for-profit institution has a corner on the phoenix metaphor—rising from the ashes of tragedy—because that would have been a perfect brand for Kent State. But there are similar words and images that can and should be part of our brand: Kent State is brave; Kent State is resilient; Kent State is engaged with the larger world.

It is clear that 160over90 heard this message because there are glimmers of it in the internal document, “Guide to Brand Version 1.0: Kent State University: Illuminating Our New Brand.” (By the way, I found this through a simple search on Google using the words ‘Kent State University’ and ‘branding’). I was able to find similar documents for a variety of other Universities that contract with 160over90. For example, on p. 6, this document states (with emphasis added):

“At Kent State University, we accept you for who you are but provoke you to discover what more you can become. All individuals are embraced for what makes them unique and are encouraged to express themselves in ways they never have before. But along the way, our welcoming hug becomes a transformative push as we give you the strength to stand for what matters and take meaningful action for change.”

The highlighted part does a fairly nice job of subtly invoking our history.

On p. 5, a list of the “core attributes” of the institution include the phrases (with added emphasis):

- “A Climate for Collaboration: We create engagement that inspires positive change.”
- “A Source for Social Good: We’re home to a diversity of culture, beliefs, identity, thought—where there’s freedom of expression and the free exchange of ideas.”

But somehow, these more relevant phrases get buried in an avalanche of meaningless Corporate speak. On p. 4, the document reads (with added emphasis):

“The branding position statement is meant to convey the collective mindset of the people of Kent State. It’s meant to communicate that the university is a community of change agents, whose collective commitment to learning sparks epic thinking, meaningful voice and invaluable outcomes to advance our society.”

When President Warren first previewed the branding recommendations of 160over90 to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, it was the language of ‘change agents’ and ‘epic thinking’ that was emphasized. These aren’t words that invoke Kent State in the minds of individuals who know the University best. These are the sorts of words one uses when one plays “management jargon bingo” at meetings.
When you Google ‘epic thinking’, the very first item you get is this image.

When you Google ‘change agents’, you get a long list of change agents in nursing, change agents in business, change agents in ... And you get this:

There is a clear lesson to take away by any institution engaging in a branding exercise: Have someone whose sole purpose is to Google every catch phrase that is brought to you as a slogan or tagline. Is that tagline already in wide use? Do you really want to be associated with the entities and images that come up on a Google search of that tagline?

Happily, most of what has been produced for Kent State by 160over90 isn’t full of this silly corporate lingo. As the branding document states (p.1), “Good branding distinguishes us from the other 4,140 colleges and universities in the U.S. It makes Kent State memorable—unique.”

But, does our new brand actually accomplish that? When the University community asked for a brand that would reflect Kent State and its unique history, the overarching slogan we got is “Undeniably Kent State.” But, you don’t create a slogan that is unique to an entity by slapping the word ‘uniquely’ or some near synonym in front of the entity’s name. The ‘Undeniably [blank]’ slogan could have been given to any academic institution: Undeniably UCLA, Undeniably Florida Gators, Undeniably Phoenix. Indeed, it so generic that it could have worked for any non-academic entity: Undeniably Starbucks, Undeniably McDonalds, Undeniably Preparation-H.
When you look at the brands developed by 160over90 and other branding agencies for universities across the country, there is an unmistakable sameness about the brands developed. Here is a page from the branding document for UCLA, also a 160over90 client.

**OVERVIEW**

**Copy Tone**

Bruins are optimists who believe anything is possible and frequently prove it. That unflappable willingness to buck the status quo is what allows UCLA and those who pass through it to impact the world so powerfully in every field.

This message is achieved not only through words and images, but through tone. In copy, tone is crafted through word choice, sentence structure and point of view. And, of course, while the tone of your communication should vary according to the specific audience you are addressing whether it’s advertising, email, a press release or any other form of communication—always keep the UCLA brand in mind.

You may not be able to read the text on this slide, but the first paragraph reads:

“Bruins are optimists who believe anything is possible and frequently prove it. That unflappable willingness to buck the status quo is what allows UCLA and those who pass through it to impact the world so powerfully in every field.”

Let’s face it, that isn’t so different from the description developed for Kent State University. The visual isn’t very different either (and not just because UCLA and KSU use blue and gold as their colors). National branding agencies use a sort of formula in developing brands for their clients and it shows.

Even setting aside the concerns that the overarching branding strategy given to us by 160over90 isn’t sufficiently unique, many faculty members and others in the University community have concerns about some of the specific taglines that have been developed as part of this strategy.
• “The future should prepare for you.” Really? I thought our role as a University was to prepare our students for the future. If the future has to prepare for them, then what do we really have to teach them? What could they possibly learn from us?

• “Go by leaps and boundless.” I understand that this is trying to be a cute take on the phrase ‘go by leaps and bounds’. But it’s ungrammatical. What is it doing on a banner outside of Satterfield hall which houses our departments of English and of Modern and Classical Languages?

• “Leave no mold unbroken.” Okay, I actually like the content of this one. But why is the highlighted word ‘mold’? This seems like a serious branding faux pas. We don’t want people to think about mold when they think about Kent State. ‘Unbroken’ would have been a much better word to highlight and would have rung with echoes of our history. Clearly this was a lost opportunity.

Another key lesson in the vicinity is this: Spend a lot of time thinking about how a new slogan can be turned into a pejorative. Under our previous president, we adopted the slogan “Excellence in Action.” This had a nice ring to it but was quickly undermined as “Excellence? ... Inaction.” We hadn’t been using the slogan “Undeniably Kent State” for more than a few months before people began to use it in unfortunate circumstances. Something goes wrong and, well, that’s undeniably Kent State. Perhaps there is no way to avoid a slogan from being turned into a pejorative. But one wonders how much thought actually went into such a possibility in the case of our most recent slogans.

I want to be clear; I’m not saying that these or other issues would have been wholly avoided by making use of in house talent in developing our brand. (Though, greater consultation with the faculty on the beta versions of taglines and banners would have been appreciated.) I’m just asking whether jumping on what has become a nation-wide band wagon and going with a branding agency like 160over90 is really worth it. To date, Kent State has agreed to pay 160over90 almost two and a half million dollars to develop our brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KSU Contracts with 160over90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2015 - July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2015 - September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2015 - May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I realize that developing a brand using the in house talents of faculty, staff, and students is easier said than done. A brand doesn’t just involve catchy slogans. A brand involves color schemes and fonts. It involves photo and layout styles. It also doesn’t involve just a one-time investment given that a brand needs to be able to evolve over time. But it does seem like we could have started with some sort of internal competition to create a branding strategy—one with a generous prize of, say, $20,000. For the money we’ve already spent on our contract with 160over90, we could have run such a competition every year for the next 100 years!
I want to conclude with a slide that illustrates some of the great design work that Kent State is capable of doing in house.

These are posters designed by the School of Communications and Visual Design in 2015 and by the College of Arts & Sciences Communications team in 2017 to advertise the biannual “In a New Generation Conference” hosted by Kent State’s Department of Philosophy. The artwork on these posters isn’t merely eye catching; it also symbolizes elements of the respective philosophies of Sellers and Husserl.

As expert as companies like 160over90 are at their craft, I can’t escape the sense that we could have invested much less money and gotten a much more bespoke product had we utilized the talent we have right here at Kent State University. And I’m certain that the same is true with respect to each of the Universities that make up the mighty MAC.

Thank you.
I will now be happy to entertain any comments, questions, or complaints.
Reconstruction of the Aramark - Kent State University Strategic Partnership
Faculty Senate Update – Talking Points
November 2017

Thank you, Chair Smith for the opportunity to share an update regarding the partnership between Aramark and Kent State University.

This fall, the Kent State community experienced dining and catering service far below our collective aspirations and expectations and also below the promises made by the Aramark team during the lengthy bid evaluation process. Those high expectations for a transformed dining program completely unraveled in the months to come. As I have heard from many students, faculty and staff, our Fall 2017 start of the school year with our new dining services partnership was an exceptionally challenging one.

Our students and our community deserve much better.

As a result, about 8 weeks ago, I instituted a process to literally reconstruct the Aramark-Kent State partnership.

My first step was to establish teams focused on the following areas:
Catering
Kent Campus Operations
Regional Campus and CPM Operations
Information Technology/Point-of-Sale Devices
Personnel
Finances
Quality
Marketing and Communications

These teams are led by co-chairs representing Aramark and Kent State with the primary goal to reconstruct the partnership. In the past 2 months, these teams have met weekly and team leaders reported progress. Myself, along with Mark Polatajko, Nate Ritchey, and Jack Witt met with 4 executives from Aramark to outline our specific concerns and discuss operations. Further, President Warren called Aramark President Pat Boggs to a meeting to discuss the operational concerns and asked him to pledge his personal commitment to significant improvements to our dining services. Further, we arranged a meeting between Aramark VP Tammy Sumpter and the dining stakeholder team, a group of regular catering users, students, and the dining services team to listen to concerns and share updates. I have met with student leaders on several campuses about this transition and will travel again to CPM this week.

In addition, university leaders met with Kent business owners to explore opportunities to extend the Aramark partnership to local businesses, similar to the Fresco and Grazer’s partnerships. We have also convened meetings at several regional campuses with local businesses near those locations.

We have clearly heard your concerns and disappointment, and have deployed multiple teams to aggressively address these concerns. This update today outlines the process behind the dedicated work of both the Kent State dining team members and Aramark to dramatically improve our dining and catering services. In the room with me today are David Cummings, Strategic Partnerships Director, the lead Kent State employee supporting the dining partnership. Also, we have Jeff Stone, Resident District Manager who oversees the dining services program on all Kent State campuses. Aramark – at their expense – brought in Sherwood Lincoln, a Senior Resident District Manager, to serve as the counterpart to Cesquinn Curtis, who I appointed as the day-to-day Student Affairs lead during this reconstruction process.
I would now like to ask Sherwood to share a couple successes since this reconstruction process has begun.

Sherwood Lincoln:

My efforts with the team at Kent State have been primarily focused on simplifying the agenda and assuring that we concentrate on our key priorities which include hiring and training our workforce; assuring that they are working in a safe manner in safe work areas; building an engaged team; and driving accountability around daily execution of our program at every location.

We have also identified a couple of key leadership roles on campus where we needed to make changes and starting on November 27 a new catering director with a tremendous amount of experience, will be joining us. Aimee Huard who is currently the Catering Director at Ole Miss will be joining our team to oversee Kent State catering operations.

Additionally, we have reassigned Curt Hershberger to oversee our services at the regional campuses and are very pleased with the work that he is doing to improve our program.

So that we stay focused on driving executional excellence, we have several things in place that allow us to understand where we need to focus to get better. We are completing quality assurance audits and have engaged a third-party to evaluate our locations this week. We are conducting daily audits of our menu and nutrition program at every location; we are conducting service excellence training and observations at every location weekly; and we are building a dashboard that will benchmark and provide data around our Voice of the Customer program. All of these efforts are designed to help us better understand where we need to focus so that we can continuously improve.

Here are a couple of recent highlights about our program:

- We had a very successful grand opening of a new food service program at the Salem Campus
- We successfully opened a full Starbucks location in the library and are currently planning a second location on the esplanade
- And plans are currently underway for a major renovation this summer of Eastway.

As Dr. Little mentioned, we recognize the importance of inclusion of local partners in the program here at Kent State and at the regional campuses and we are working through the details of a plan to address these needs now so that we can allow for more flexibility in the catering policy as an example.

Thank you for the opportunity to highlight the work that my team and I have been focused on and the opportunity to exceed customer expectations for all of Kent State.

Like ALL partnerships, this is a continuing process in which both parties are fully committed to delivering the high quality services our community expects and deserves. We want to hear from you – both your concerns as well as your positive experiences.

What can you do?
Voice of the Customer cards
Share your feedback with the dining team and pass along this update
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.
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/
1. PURPOSE

Per Faculty Senate Bylaws (F) (3) (f): the Faculty Ethics Committee ("the Committee") serves as a screening and hearing body for any faculty member who wishes to lodge a charge of unethical professional practice against another faculty member. A charge may also be filed against an administrator with faculty rank only in relation to those responsibilities assigned as a faculty member. 'Unethical professional practice' is defined as a violation of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-6-17 of the University Policy Register). The Committee may also serve as a hearing body for faculty members who wish to request a hearing to respond to charges made against them.

2. MEMBERSHIP

Membership shall be determined by the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Alternates for a unit and at-large alternates shall be listed in descending order according to the number of votes received. The term for the alternate shall be for the remainder of the elected term.

The Chair of the Committee shall be elected by the Committee from its membership.

3. RECUSAL AND REMOVAL OF MEMBERS

   A. Any members of the Committee who are directly involved in a case before the Committee or who judge that they cannot render impartial judgment in a case shall recuse themselves from all Committee activities pertaining to the case. Members may recuse themselves at any time during the proceedings.

   B. The Committee may by a vote of three-fourths (3/4) of the members remove a member who, in the judgment of the other members, has or may have a conflict of interest or other consideration that likely impairs the member’s impartiality. A member may be removed at any time during the proceedings.

   C. In the event of a member’s recusal or removal, the Chair of the Committee, with the approval of a majority of Committee members, shall select a unit alternate to serve on the Committee for the duration of that case. If the recused or removed member is Committee Chair, then the remaining members of the Committee shall elect an interim chair to serve for the duration of that case, including the selection of an alternate member.

4. SCREENING PROCEDURE

   A. A faculty member ("Complainant") who is lodging a charge of unethical professional conduct against another faculty member ("Respondent") shall prepare a file consisting of all documents the Complainant would like considered and a list of witnesses the Complainant wishes to give testimony at a hearing and shall submit the file to the Chair of the Committee.

   B. The written complaint submitted by the Complainant should include the nature of the complaint, the facts and circumstances leading to the complaint, and reasons or evidence in support of the complaint. The written complaint shall present the charge in terms of violating stated provisions of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-6-17 of the University Policy Register). The file submitted by the Complainant becomes the basis for all further consideration of the matter.

   C. The complaint shall include a statement indicating how the Complainant has used the consultative procedures at the departmental, college, or regional campus levels such as FAC, CAC, or FC, as appropriate for the case. The Committee shall normally decline to hear ethical disputes without documented evidence of a bona fide attempt at resolution at the unit, college, or regional campus level. If, however, a dispute involves parties in different colleges or at different campuses, the dispute is of highly sensitive nature, or for other good cause, a majority of Committee members may vote to hear the complaint without a prior attempt at resolution.

   D. No more than thirty (30) calendar days may elapse from the time of final unsatisfactory resolution of a charge through consultative procedures for the matter to be filed with the Committee. If the final unsatisfactory resolution occurs during Finals Week or after the end of a regular semester or during a summer session, the Complainant shall have up to fifteen (15) calendar days at the start of the next semester to submit a complaint.
E. The Committee, upon receiving the file, shall meet in a timely manner and review the documents to determine whether the charge is within the purview of the Committee. If a majority of the Committee membership agrees that a case is within the purview of the Committee, a hearing shall take place following the procedures below. If a majority of the Committee judges that a charge is not within the purview of the Committee, the Complainant and, when appropriate, the Respondent, shall be notified, in writing, within seven (7) working days.

F. If the Committee rules that a complaint is within the purview of the Committee, the Complainant and Respondent shall be notified in writing within seven (7) working days. If they have not already received them, the parties shall be sent copies of the Faculty Code of Ethics along with a copy of this Committee’s Purposes and Procedures. The Respondent shall also receive copies of all documents included in the complaint.

G. Upon receipt of notification that the Committee will hear the complaint, the Respondent shall have fifteen (15) calendar days to submit a written response with supporting documentation to the Committee. The Chair of the Committee shall provide written notification of the date, time, and place of the hearing to the parties and to the Committee members no less than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the hearing. The Chair shall also provide, in a timely manner, copies of all documents related to the complaint to both parties and to all members of the Committee.

H. The hearing shall be held at a mutually agreed upon date no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the notification of the Complainant and Respondent. In extraordinary circumstances and with proper written substantiation requesting an extension by one of the parties, the Committee members may determine that an extension is warranted.

5. HEARING PROCEDURE

A. The conduct of matters brought before the Faculty Ethics Committee shall be non-adversarial in nature. The hearing shall be closed to all but those necessary for a full and complete hearing. The Complainant and the Respondent shall be invited to appear before the committee. Each party may bring one (1) faculty advocate, such as an AAUP-KSU representative. The committee may also invite testimony from any other persons who, in the judgment of the committee, may assist in its examination and evaluation of the complaint. Legal counsel is excluded.

B. The Complainant and Respondent shall each have up to forty-five (45) minutes for their respective presentations. For a period after the presentations not exceeding thirty (30) minutes, the members of the Committee may question any person who has presented information at the hearing. Each party to the hearing shall then have the opportunity to give a final summation of at most ten (10) minutes, concluding with the summary of the Respondent.

C. Following the hearing, the Committee shall have fourteen (14) working days to produce a written recommendation concerning the charge. The question before the committee is whether a preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusion that the Respondent committed a violation of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-6-17 of the University Policy Register). An affirmative answer to this question and any subsequent recommendation shall require a two-thirds majority of the vote of the Committee. The Committee may recommend that the Provost pursue disciplinary actions consistent with the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreements or University Policy. The Committee’s report of the vote and any recommendation shall be sent to the Chair of Faculty Senate and to both Complainant and Respondent.

D. In Committee deliberations pertaining to a Complaint, the Chair of the Committee will have a vote.

E. As the Committee’s hearings yield only recommendations and not sanctions or censure, no formal appeal process attaches to this procedure.
F. If any members of the Committee, including the Chair, are involved in hearing a case when their terms of office end, they shall continue hearing that case until it is terminated. No newly elected member of the Committee shall join a case in progress.

G. The proceedings of this Committee are confidential as provided by the Faculty Code of Ethics, Faculty Senate By-Laws, and other applicable policies and practices.

6. REPOSITORY OF THE DOCUMENTS
Copies of all documents used in the hearing, including the final report, shall be filed for safekeeping with the Secretary of the Faculty Senate following Faculty Senate archiving procedures.

7. REPORT OF THE FACULTY ETHICS COMMITTEE TO THE FACULTY SENATE
By May 1 of each year, the Committee shall report to the Chair and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate a summary report of the Committee’s activities during the academic year.
Approved by
Board of Trustees
March 11, 1987
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT, OHIO

FACULTY ETHICS COMMITTEE

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Faculty Senate Bylaws (F) (3) (f), the Faculty Ethics Committee is to "serve the Committee" as a screening and hearing body for any faculty member(s) who wishes to lodge a charge of unethical professional practice against another faculty member. A charge may also be filed against an administrator with faculty rank only in relation to those responsibilities assigned as a faculty member. "Unethical professional practice" is defined as a violation of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-6-0517) of the University Policy Register. The Ethics Committee may also serve as a hearing body for faculty members who wish to request a hearing to respond to charges made against them. (Faculty Senate Bylaws (F) (3) (f)).

2. MEMBERSHIP

Membership shall be determined by the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

The election for members of the Committee shall be conducted in the spring semester according to established Faculty Senate procedures. The newly elected members shall begin their duties on the Committee at the start of the following fall semester. The Chairman of the Committee shall be elected by the Committee from its membership.

Alternates for a unit and at-large alternates shall be listed in descending order according to the number of votes received. The term for the alternate shall be for the remainder of the elected term.

DISQUALIFICATION OF MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY ETHICS COMMITTEE

If any member(s) of the Committee shall be disqualified for any reason, a vote of three-fourths of the members present shall be held to elect a replacement.

3. RECUSAL AND REMOVAL OF MEMBERS

A. Any members of the Committee who are directly involved in a case before the Committee shall be disqualified automatically. If a member believes he/she is disqualified or that they cannot render an impartial judgment, that member shall disqualified him/herself from hearing a particular case. In a case shall recuse themselves from all Committee activities pertaining to the case. Members may recuse themselves at any time during the proceedings.

B. The Committee may by vote of three-fourths of the members remove a member who, in the judgment of the other members, has or may have a conflict of interest or other consideration that likely impairs the member's impartiality. A member may be removed at any time during the proceedings.

C. In such cases the event of disqualification, member's recusal or removal, the Chairman of the Committee, with the approval of a majority of Committee members, shall assign select a unit alternate to hear the particular cases on the Committee for the duration of that case. If the recused or removed member is Committee Chair, then the remaining members of the Committee shall elect an interim chair to serve for the duration of that case, including the selection of an alternate member.
4 SCREENING AND HEARING PROCEDURE

A. The faculty member ("Complainant") who is lodging a charge of unethical professional conduct against another faculty member ("Respondent") shall prepare a file consisting of all documents the Complainant would like considered and a list of witnesses he/she the Complainant wishes to present give testimony at a hearing and shall submit two copies of such documents and list the file to the Chairman, Part Chair of the Committee.

B. The written complaint submitted by the Complainant should include the nature of the documentation complaint, the facts and circumstances leading to the complaint, and reasons or evidence in support of the complaint. The written complaint shall present the charge in terms of violating stated provisions of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-6-17 of the University Policy Register). The file submitted by the Complainant becomes the basis for all further consideration of the matter.

C. The complaint shall include a statement indicating how the faculty member lodging the charge has utilized the established procedures at the departmental and collegial levels, college, or regional campus levels such as FAC, CAC, or FC, as appropriate for the case. The Committee shall normally decline to hear ethical disputes without documented evidence of a bona fide attempt at resolution at the unit, college, or regional campus level. If, however, a dispute involves parties in different colleges or at different campuses, the dispute is of highly sensitive nature, or for other good cause, a majority of Committee may vote to hear the complaint without a prior attempt at resolution.

D. No more than thirty (30) working calendar days should elapse from the time of final unsatisfactory resolution of the charge through established channels consultative procedures for the matter to be filed with the Ethics Committee. If the final unsatisfactory resolution occurs during Finals Week or after the end of a regular semester or during a summer session, the Complainant shall have up to fifteen (15) calendar days at the start of the next semester to submit a complaint.

The Committee will evaluate upon receiving the file, shall meet in a timely manner and review the documents to determine whether the charge is within the purview of the Committee. If the majority of the Committee membership agrees, that a case is within the purview of the Committee, a hearing shall take place.

E. When the Committee rules that a charge of unethical professional conduct is within the purview of the Committee, the faculty member lodging the charge and the faculty member so charged shall be notified, in writing, within two working days. If the Committee rules following the procedures below. If a majority of the Committee judges that a charge is not within the purview of the Committee, the faculty member lodging the charge, Complainant and if, when appropriate, the faculty member so charged, Respondent shall be notified, in writing, within two working days.

F. If the Committee rules that a complaint is within the purview of the Committee, the Complainant and Respondent shall be notified in writing within seven (7) working days. If they have not already received them, the parties shall be sent copies of the Faculty Code of Ethics along with a copy of this Committee's Purposes and Procedures. The Respondent shall also receive copies of all documents included in the complaint.

G. Upon receipt of notification that the Committee will hear the complaint, the Respondent shall have fifteen (15) calendar days to submit a written response with supporting documentation to the Committee. The Chair of the Committee shall provide written notification of the date, time, and place of the hearing to the parties and to the Committee members no less than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the hearing. The Chair shall also provide, in a timely manner, copies of all documents related to the complaint to both parties and to all members of the Committee.
H. The hearing shall be held at a mutually agreed upon date no later than twenty working thirty (30) calendar days after the notification of the faculty Complainant and Respondent. In extraordinary circumstances and with proper written substantiation requesting an extension by one of the parties, the Committee members may determine that an extension is warranted.

The Chairman of the Committee shall make available copies of all documents related to a particular case to all members of the Committee and the faculty member who has been charged with unethical professional conduct.

The Committee shall request any and all parties to submit evidence related to a charge and to seek testimony from witnesses.

The Committee will have 10 working days at the conclusion of a hearing to produce a written recommendation concerning the charge. The Committee is empowered to make the following recommendations:

to the Faculty Senate to censure,

A. to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Personnel to impose sanctions;
B. other actions deemed appropriate.
C. Three-fourths of the membership must be in agreement for any recommendation.

If the Chairman is involved in hearing a case when his/her term of office ends, he/she will continue to chair the hearing of that case until it is terminated. If a member of the Committee is involved in hearing a case when his/her term of office ends, he/she will continue hearing that case until it is terminated. No newly elected member of the Committee will join a case in progress.

CONDUCT OF HEARING

The Chairman of the Committee shall be responsible for notifying all parties of the date and time of the hearing and ensuring that copies of documents submitted are made available to the members of the Committee. (Notification)

5. HEARING PROCEDURE

The conduct of matters brought before the Faculty Ethics Committee shall be made two weeks prior to the scheduled hearing.)

1. The hearing shall be non-adversarial in nature. The hearing will be closed to all but those necessary for a full and complete hearing. The Complainant and the Respondent shall be invited to appear before the committee. Each party may bring one (1) faculty advocate, such as an AAUP-KSU representative. The committee may also invite testimony from any other persons who, in the judgment of the committee, may assist in its examination and evaluation of the complaint. Legal counsel is excluded.

2. -
Faculty Ethics Committee
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Formal The Complainant and Respondent shall each have up to forty-five (45) minutes for their respective presentations shall ordinarily not exceed one and one-half hours with up to 45 minutes presentation for the faculty member who had lodged the charge and up to 45 minutes for the faculty member who has been charged.

B. For a short period after the presentations, ordinarily not exceeding one-half hour thirty (30) minutes, the members of the Committee may question any person who has presented information at the hearing. Each party to the hearing will then have the opportunity to give a final summation of at most ten (10) minutes, concluding with the summary of the accused faculty member/Respondent.

C. All proceedings, except deliberations by the Committee, will be tape-recorded.

5. Following the hearing, the Committee will issue a recommendation as stipulated in this document.

C. Following the hearing, the Committee shall have fourteen (14) working days to produce a written recommendation concerning the charge. The question before the Committee is whether a preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusion that the Respondent committed a violation of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-4-17 of the University Policy Register). An affirmative answer to this question and any subsequent recommendation shall require a two-thirds majority of the vote of the Committee. The Committee may recommend that the Provost pursue disciplinary actions consistent with the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreements or University Policy. The Committee's report of the vote and any recommendation shall be sent to the Chair of Faculty Senate and to both Complainant and Respondent.

D. In Committee deliberations pertaining to a Complaint, the Chair of the Committee will have a vote.

E. As the Committee's hearings yield only recommendations and not sanctions or censure, no formal appeal process attaches to this procedure.

F. If any members of the Committee, including the Chair, are involved in a hearing case when their terms of office end, they shall continue hearing that case until it is terminated. No newly elected member of the Committee shall join a case in progress.

G. The proceedings of this Committee are confidential as provided by the Faculty Code of Ethics, Faculty Senate By-Laws, and other applicable policies and practices.

6. Repository of the Documents

The original of the tape recording of the hearing and copies of all documents used in the hearing, including the final report, will be filed for safekeeping with the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Copies of the tape recording may be obtained by any party to the case. Copies will be made under the supervision of the Secretary of the following Faculty Senate at the Kent State University Library at the expense of the party requesting the tape. Transcripts of the hearing, if made by any party to the hearing, will be made available to all other parties to the hearing for a copying charge only. Archiving procedures.

The tapes of the hearing and two copies of other pertinent documents are to be retained and secured in the Faculty Senate Office until the Senate Chairperson is advised by the Office of Legal Affairs that it is no longer necessary to retain them under the statute of limitations. All other copies of the documents will be destroyed.
REPORT OF THE FACULTY ETHICS COMMITTEE TO THE FACULTY SENATE

By May 1 of each year, the Committee shall report to the Chairperson and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate a summary report of the number and type of cases presented Committee’s activities during the academic year and its recommendations for each case.
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
October 30, 2017

Present: Deb Smith (Chair), Kathy Wilson (Vice Chair), Kathy Kerns (Secretary), Ed Dauterich (at-Large), Robin Vande Zande (Appointed), Farid Fouad (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:02PM in the Faculty Senate office.

2. Approval of Minutes

a) Members of the executive committee reviewed the October 9, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes as revised (Dauterich/Vande Zande). The minutes were approved.

b) Members of the executive committee reviewed the October 18, 2017 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes as revised (Wilson/Fouad). The minutes were approved.

3. Review of Items from October 16, 2017 EPC Meeting

Chair Smith presented items from the October 16, 2017 EPC meeting. Chair Smith suggested that the executive committee could approve the first item, Inactivation of the Technology major in the College of Aeronautics and Engineering, on behalf of Senate. A motion was made to approve this item (Wilson/Kerns). The motion was approved. The remaining two action items and the three information items will appear on the agenda for the November 13, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting.

4. Review of Professional Standards Committee (PSC) Proposed Revisions to the Tenure Policy

The PSC had been asked to propose language that would bring KSU in compliance with a state mandate to include commercialization activities as a consideration for tenure. The executive committee reviewed the proposed language. There was discussion of whether the language added to refer to “activities relevant and appropriate to the discipline” created an additional change to the policy beyond the inclusion of commercialization activities. It was decided to move forward with the proposed language although Chair Smith will explain the concern at Faculty Senate when this item is considered.
5. Agenda for the November 13, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting

Chair Smith presented a draft agenda for the November 13, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting. Provost Diacon had been invited to make remarks given that President Warren is not available for the meeting, but he has not yet responded to the offer so this item was removed from the proposed agenda. A motion was made to approve the proposed agenda as revised (Dauterich/Fouad). The motion was approved.

6. Nominations for Promotion, Tenure, and Joint Appeals Boards

a) Chair Smith distributed the list of nominees that had been generated by members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the Provost’s Promotion Advisory Board (PAB) and Tenure Advisory Board (TAB). A few changes to the nominations were suggested. A motion was made to approve the revised list (Vande Zande/Wilson). The motion was approved.

b) The committee also reviewed the proposed nominees for the Joint Appeals Board (JAB). Decisions were made about how to rank order the nominees, and Chair Smith will contact people to see if they are willing to be listed on the ballot. Two nominees will be provided for each election. A motion was made to approve the list of nominees for JAB (Fouad/Wilson). The motion was approved.

7. Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC) Statement of Purpose and Procedures

Chair Smith distributed the most recent draft of the FEC’s document outlining the committee’s purpose and procedures. The FEC has substantially revised the document to provide more detail about committee procedures. Some questions were raised regarding the order of the steps outlined in the section on screening procedures. Questions were also raised about procedures for the hearing, specifically whether the parties could be allowed to bring a faculty member with them. Another concern regarding this section is that the list of recommended actions for the hearing procedure may need to be altered to ensure consistency with the sanctions clause of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and to remove censure by Faculty Senate as that option would not be applicable unless the Respondent was a member of Faculty Senate. Chair Smith will communicate this feedback to the FEC.

8. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 4:47PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
November 15, 2017

Present: Deb Smith (Chair), Kathy Wilson (Vice Chair), Kathy Kerns (Secretary), Ed Dauterich (at-Large), Robin Vande Zande (Appointed), Farid Fouad (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Guests: President Beverly Warren, Provost Todd Diacon, Interim Dean Ken Burhanna, Professor Francoise Massardier-Kenny

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of Minutes

Members of the executive committee reviewed the October 30, 2017 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes as revised (Dauterich/Fouad). The minutes were approved.

3. Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC) Procedures

Chair Smith distributed an updated draft of FEC procedures. This document will be discussed at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

4. Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) Pilot Results

Chair Smith reported that the summer pilot data on the new SSI form has been analyzed. There was a good response rate, similar to what has been found in the past using the paper forms. The hope is to implement the revised form in all courses by Fall 2018. The new form allows the flexibility to add questions to supplement the small number of standard questions. The SSI committee will make a presentation on the pilot results at the February 2018 Faculty Senate meeting.
5. Professional Standards Committee (PSC) Updates

Chair Smith reported that the PSC has been working to revise current policies for Tenure, Promotion, and Topping. The committee has almost completed work on revisions to the tolling policy. They have also made progress in revising the tenure and promotion policies. The PSC has also continued to work on developing a new Conflict of Interest Policy, although this policy may be developed to include all KSU employees and not just faculty.

6. Review of Items for Discussion with President and Provost

The committee discussed items they wanted to raise with President Warren and Provost Diacon.

Interim Dean Burhanna, Professor Massardier-Kenny, Provost Diacon, and President Warren joined the meeting.

7. Proposed Global Distinction Program

Interim Dean Burhanna and Professor Massardier-Kenny presented information about a new undergraduate degree distinction that a university committee is developing. The Global Distinction Program is intended to prepare students to become global citizens by providing them intercultural skills and knowledge. The program can augment any degree path, and the proposal is for the program to include coursework, an immersive experience, and a culminating presentation. The committee is developing course learning outcomes and a process for deciding which courses will be designated as globally distinct courses. There may be opportunities for faculty to develop new courses. The members of the executive committee were supportive of the proposal. The proposal will be reviewed by the Provost’s office, EPC, and Faculty Senate. President Warren reported that KSU is also participating with other universities to develop an internationalization plan.

Interim Dean Burhanna and Professor Massardier-Kenny left the meeting.

8. Update on Transparency of FlashFolio

Chair Smith asked President Warren for an update on the university response to Faculty Senate’s request to make FlashFolio more transparent. President Warren indicated that she is leaning toward having an “opt in” policy which would allow faculty members to indicate that they want their tenure or promotion file to be made available to all faculty once the review of their file is complete. Access to files for faculty members not choosing this option would have to be made through a records request.
9. KSU Exclusive Contracts

Chair Smith noted that the university is signing an increasing number of exclusive contracts with vendors. She asked whether more information could be shared about these contracts (e.g., how many we have, nature of the financial incentives). President Warren reported that the Aramark contract calls for Aramark to spend $20,000,000 to upgrade dining facilities. Chair Smith noted these contracts may be good for the university but are not necessarily beneficial for departments or students, and if they increase costs, they may result in draining money out of the academic sector. There was discussion of inviting VP Polatajko to a Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting to discuss these contracts or to have the topic discussed at FaSBAC. President Warren reported she has been meeting with local business leaders as well as Aramark to talk about the implementation of the contract.

10. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:26PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate