TO: Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests

FROM: Deborah C. Smith, Chair of the Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Agenda and Materials for the December 12, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting

DATE: December 5, 2016

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the December 12th 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 14, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
5. Chair's Remarks
6. President's Remarks
7. EPC Items:
   a. (Action Item) Office of the Provost: Revision of policy and procedures for temporary suspension of admission to an academic program. Current policy allows faculty three years for a program to be suspended before admission is to be reopened or the program to be inactivated. Proposed policy increases the suspension to five years, after which the program will declared inactivated. Effective Fall 2017.
   b. (Action Item) Office of the Provost: Revision of administrative structure of the School of Digital Sciences, from a school independent of a college to a dependent school within the College of Communication and Information. Moving to the college are the following: school adjunct faculty and full-time staff; Digital Sciences major within the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science and Master of Digital Sciences degrees; Digital Sciences minor; Enterprise Architecture graduate certificate; 20 undergraduate and 17 graduate DSCI courses. Effective Fall 2017.
   c. (Action Item) College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology College of Architecture and Environmental Design: Revision of administrative oversight of construction management faculty, programs and courses, from the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology to the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. Moving are the following: full-time construction management faculty; Construction Management major within the Bachelor of Science degree; Construction Management minor; 31 undergraduate and 11 graduate CMGT courses. Effective Fall 2017.
d. (Action Item) College of Communication and Information School of Library and Information Science:

i. Establishment of Health Informatics major within the Master of Science degree. Program currently exists as a concentration within the Information Architecture and Knowledge Management major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 36. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approvals.

ii. Establishment of Knowledge Management major within the Master of Science degree. Program currently exists as a concentration within the Information Architecture and Knowledge Management major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 36. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approvals.

iii. Establishment of User Experience Design major within the Master of Science degree. Program currently exists as a concentration within the Information Architecture and Knowledge Management major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 36. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approvals.

iv. Inactivation of Information Architecture and Knowledge Management major within the Master of Science degree. The program will be replaced by the proposed Health Informatics, Knowledge Management and User Experience Design majors. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approvals.

e. (Information Item) College of Arts and Sciences Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies: Revision of name of the Spanish Literature, Culture and Translation major within the Bachelor of Art degree. Name changes to Spanish. Minimum total hours to program completion is unchanged at 120. Effective Fall 2017.

f. (Information Item) College of Education, Health and Human Services School of Lifespan Development and Educational Sciences: Revision of name for the Counseling and Human Development Center. Name changes to the Counseling Center. Effective Fall 2017.


8. Old Business:

a. Professional Standards Committee: Revision of the Operational Procedures and Regulations Regarding Faculty Office Hours (Policy 6-18.101)

b. Continued Discussion of Part-time Adjunct Faculty Representatives on Faculty Senate

9. New Business: Discussion of Proposed Changes to the Administrative Policy Regarding Student Cheating and Plagiarism (Policy 3-01.8)

10. Announcements / Statements for the Record

11. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment
FACULTY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
November 14, 2016


Senators Not Present: Ann Abraham, Jeffrey Child, Farid Fouad, Lee Fox, Pamela Grimm, Bruce Gunning, Todd Hawley, Jay Jahangiri, Jihyun Kim, Cynthia Kristof, Tracy Laux, Larry Osher, Carol Robinson, Arden Ruttan, Andrew Shahriari, David Smeltzer, Robert Twieg, Robin Vande Zande

Ex-Officio Members Present: Senior V.P. for Academic Affairs and Provost Todd Diacon; Senior V.P. for Finance and Administration Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Paul DiCorleto, Charlene Reed, Nathan Ritchey, Todd Ryan for Ed Mahon, Justin Hilton for Rebecca Murphy; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Bracken, Barbara Broome, John Crawford-Spinelli, Mark Kretovics, Robert Sines, Melody Tankersley, Mary Ann Haley for James Blank, Elizabeth Sinclair for Deborah Spake

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: President Beverly Warren; Vice Presidents: Alfreda Brown, Shay Little, Stephen Sokany, Willis Walker, Jack Witt; Deans: Allan Boike, Mark Mistur, Donald Palmer, Eboni Pringle, Amy Reynolds; Director Jeffrey Fruit

Observers Present: Jerry Feezel (Emeritus Professor), Nicholas Peters (USS)

Observers Not Present: Fritz Yarrison (GSS)

Guests Present: Sue Averill, Janis Crowther, Melissa Hunter, Joan Inderhees, Lynette Johnson, Tess Kail, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Gail Rebata, Charity Snyder, Cynthia Stillings, Therese Tillett

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:21PM in the Governance Chambers, Kent Student Center.

2. Roll Call

Senator Kerns called the roll.
3. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of October 10, 2016

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 10 Faculty Senate meeting. Senator Norton-Smith asked whether a quorum was present, and Secretary Kerns confirmed there was a quorum. A motion was made and seconded (Garrison/Rollick). No corrections to the minutes were offered. The minutes were approved as written.

4. Provost’s Remarks

Provost Diacon and Vice President Richey presented information on trends in hiring of full-time (TT, NTT) faculty from 2008-2016. Provost Diacon noted that the number of TT faculty on the Kent campus has decreased from 669 to 597, and the number of NTT faculty has increased from 235 to 376. The total number of faculty increased from 904 to 973, but he noted there is an obvious shift toward fewer TT faculty. The proportion of full-time faculty who are TT has declined from 74% in 2008 to 61% in 2016. The Provost stated that the goal is for TT faculty to be 65% of the full-time faculty on the Kent campus by 2021, and that with current numbers that would require hiring an additional 35 TT faculty members in addition to replacement hires. He suggested that 65% was a doable goal, and that increasing the number of TT faculty was consistent with the university’s goal of increasing external research funding. Data from 2014 that provides comparisons to our peer institutions (Western Michigan, University of Houston, Utah State, Ohio University, University of North Texas, and Georgia State University) shows we were at the bottom of the list. At the time, TT faculty were 65% of all full-time Kent faculty), Western Michigan was highest at 90%, and Ohio University which was in the middle of the distribution was at 73%. Comparisons with our aspirational institutions (Clemson University, University of South Florida, Temple University and Virginia Commonwealth), who reported 45 – 78% TT faculty are more favorable, although some of these institutions are low due to the presence of a medical school. In response to a question from Senator Williams, Provost Diacon indicated that student enrollment increased by over 20% from 2008 to 2016.

Vice President Richey presented information on current percentages of TT faculty at the different regional campuses. He noted there is substantial range, from 68% at Stark to 23% at Geauga, and that some of the differences are due to the programs and degrees offered at different campuses; Stark offers 4 Masters, 19 Bachelor, and 3 Associate degrees; Trumbull offers 1 Masters, 8 Bachelor, and 18 Associate degrees (56% of faculty at Trumbull are TT); and East Liverpool has 5 Bachelor and 9 Associate degrees (36% TT faculty). Across all regional campuses 50% of full-time faculty are TT, and Vice President Richey suggested that this lower percentage at regional campuses in comparison to the Kent campuses might be appropriate given the differences in degrees offered. He also indicated he intends to develop a plan for future hires that will include consideration of adding more programs at the regional campuses (e.g., Twinsburg), and that adding new programs may lead to greater investment of resources.

Senator Kracht asked about the number of part-time instructors. Chair Smith stated she would discuss this later in the meeting. Senator Kerns asked whether there would be a freeze on NTT hires until the goal for TT faculty is met, as otherwise 35 new hires will not be enough if there are additional NTT hires. Provost Diacon agreed that was a consideration, and also stated that about 12 of the 35 new hires would be part of an initiative by VP DiCorleto and President Warren that involves hiring faculty members who would bring external funding with them. Senator Uribe commented that units vary in their emphasis on research and teaching, which should be considered
when making new hires. The Provost concurred, and added that some associate degrees depend on hiring practitioners with the relevant skills. Senator Garrison asked how racial and ethnic balance will be considered in future hiring plans, given that racial minorities are 12% of the population in Ohio yet are only 5% of KSU faculty. Provost Diacon agreed that this needed to be addressed, and noted that this fall 16 new underrepresented minority faculty have been hired which represents a 28% increase. Senator Williams expressed a concern about focusing on externally funded research, noting that a great deal of unfunded but high quality research is conducted on campus. Provost Diacon agreed and noted that he and VP DiCorleto are aware that grants in some disciplines may be small in size even though they are prestigious. Senator Roxburgh asked about the long term goal for hiring of TT faculty, and Provost Diacon indicated that once we reach 65% he would be interested in moving the goal to 70%.

There was no slide show with the presentations due to technical issues, but Chair Smith indicated the slides would be sent to Senators after the meeting (see attached).

5. Chair’s Remarks

Chair Smith presented her remarks, which focused on the work of Faculty Senate committees (see attached). Senator Roxburgh indicated that, in addition to the items Chair Smith mentioned, the Professional Standards Committee would be reviewing the tolling policy that has now been in place for a few years. Senator Garrison asked the Executive Committee to consider taking 4 additional actions, following the recent contentious elections, that would be in response to incidents that have been occurring on campuses across the U.S. Specifically, he asked that: 1. the Executive Committee request that the VP of Student Affairs send a strong message of zero tolerance for incidents of racial or ethnic intolerance; 2. that a message of reassurance be sent to Muslim students; 3. that the chiefs of the KSU and Kent City police departments be invited to come and discuss their policies and procedures currently in place to mitigate racial and ethnic incidents; and 4. after expressing appreciation for President Warren’s recent message to the community, that she follow up with an additional message to everyone stating that incidents of racial harassment, threats, and violence will not be tolerated and will be dealt with in accord with our university policies. Chair Smith reported that the Executive Committee had asked that an e-mail of support with information about available services be sent to international students, and this has already been done. Senator Stoker asked when the pilot program for the new student evaluations of Instruction (SSIs) would begin. Chair Smith indicated that an e-mail about the changes to the norming group will be sent out soon, and she is working with CTL Interim Director Marcinkiewicz to work out details for the pilot. The plan for the pilot will be to give the new instrument in addition to the current SSI form and to try to involve a diverse set of classes. Small changes to the form have already been made for the fall semester and norming group means will no longer be reported. Senator Uribe asked the purpose of the new form, and Chair Smith indicated that the purpose to evaluate teaching from the student’s perspective has not changed. Senator Uribe indicated he thought the SSIs would not be used for evaluations such as promotion, but Chair Smith indicated that was not part of the changes approved by Faculty Senate.

6. Report: Faculty Senate Fall Retreat

Senator Fenk provided a brief summary of activities that occurred at the October 28, 2016 Fall Senate retreat. He noted that VP Richey was the speaker, and that he discussed progress on the recommendations from the One University report and answered questions. VP Richey also
expressed the importance of good communication between the Kent and RC campuses, the benefits of an RCM environment, and his goal to build on the strengths of the RC campuses. Senator Fenk also thanked Tess Kail, Tracy Laux and Theresa Walton-Fisette for their work in organizing the retreat, and Chair Smith thanked Senator Fenk for his contributions.

7. **EPC Items:**

   a) **Action Item - Office of the Provost:** Revision of Dismissal policy for undergraduate students. Revision includes clarifying that the policy applies to all students in their first semester at Kent State (including College Credit Plus students); subjecting students to dismissal if they earn below a 2.000 overall GPA with 90 or more GPA hours; and limiting dismissal for students who earn a specific number of credit hours of failed coursework only to those in their first semester or on academic probation. Effective Fall 2017.

   This item was presented by Associate Provost Melody Tankersley. Senator Kracht asked why the language for dismissal was permissive rather than stating that a student would be dismissed. Associate Provost Tankersley indicated that students are typically dismissed but the language allows the Provost latitude in case there are some extenuating circumstances, and he can decline to dismiss even in the absence of an appeal by the student. Senator Stoker asked what circumstances would lead a student to be dismissed after only 1 semester, and Associate Provost Tankersley indicated that the criteria would be the grade averages named in the policy (#3 and #4). Provost Dinacon indicated that the policy is already in place, and the changes are designed to clarify the language. He also noted that the guidelines for student dismissal are based on internal research showing that students with very low GPA have a very low success rate, and dismissal prevents the student from incurring additional loans. The hope is the student will take a break or attend community college and return to Kent State later when they are ready. A motion to approve the changes was made (Kooijman). The changes were approved.

   b) **Information Item - Regional College:** Revision of instructional delivery for the Information Technology for Administrative Professionals [ITAP] major* within the Associate of Applied Business [AAB] degree. Delivery will be 100 percent online in addition to blended online/on-ground. The major is offered at the Ashtabula, Salem, Trumbull and Tuscarawas campuses; the 100 percent online program will be administered through the Tuscarawas Campus. Admission, course and graduation requirements are unchanged. *Name change to Office Technology [OTEC] effective for fall 2017. Effective Fall 2017.

   This item was listed on the agenda as an information item; there was no discussion.

8. **Old Business: Faculty Census**

Chair Smith distributed a handout that includes the number of TT, NTT, and part-time (adjunct) faculty on the Kent and Regional Campuses (see attached). She reported that the numbers represent a small net gain in TT and NTT faculty from 2015. She also noted there are a large number of part-time faculty (1,347), and she is awaiting information on how many credit hours are taught by these faculty. Senator Kracht asked if graduate assistants are included in the part-time numbers, and Chair Smith indicated they are not. Chair Smith also suggested that given the large number of part-timers, the Senate may want to move to electronic voting if it modifies its charter to allow for
representation of part-time faculty, assuming we can find a system that is secure and allows for the single transferable voting system used for Senate elections.

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

Senator Wilson announced that results from the climate survey would be shared soon. The university will receive 3 reports, one for Kent campus, one for the RC campuses, and one system wide. The consulting firm will be on campus January 23 and 24 to present the findings in a number of venues. The presentations will be live streamed, and the reports will be made available to everyone.

10. **Adjournment**

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 4:31PM.

/attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kent Campus Goal – 65% TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>% TT Faculty</th>
<th># TT Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Additional 35 tenure track faculty would reach 65% TT faculty goal in 2021.
## Regional Campus Faculty (Full-Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Liverpool</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscarawas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Total</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Twinsburg Regional Academic Center.
November 14, 2016 Chair’s remarks

In my remarks, this afternoon I want to update you on the work being done by a number of Faculty Senate Committees:

**Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FaSBAC)**
Faculty Senate’s Budget Advisory Committee, which advises the President on budgetary issues at the university and division levels, met as a committee of the whole on October 27th and will meet again on December 15th. Although we are still waiting for nominations from the College of Architecture and Environmental Design and from the College of Podiatric Medicine, I’m pleased to say that FaSBAC’s faculty membership is as complete as it has been in several years.

FaSBAC now has three separate sub-committees working on various issues:

- **RCM 2.0**: This committee is continuing its work reviewing the RCM model and making recommendations for changes in its implementation. This year, it will be looking at (i) the 80/20 split, (ii) the allocation of undergraduate scholarships, (iii) graduate fee waivers, and (iv) the way that research is funded in an RCM model.
- **Subcommittee #1**: This subcommittee (which I hope will get a sexier title later) will be reviewing and making recommendations concerning (i) the size of fund balances in the service centers (non-responsibility centers), (ii) service chargebacks, and (iii) auxiliary operations.
- **Subcommittee #2**: This subcommittee will be reviewing and making recommendations concerning (i) the structure, membership and functions of FaSBAC and (ii) the ongoing review of RCM.

I’d like to take this opportunity to publically thank Senior Vice President Polatajko for the financial transparency he has brought to FaSBAC and for truly treating me as Co-Chair of FaSBAC. This may be the first year in anyone’s memory that FaSBAC has lived up to its official charge.

**Professional Standards Committee (PSC)**
The Professional Standards Committee is concerned with standards, policies, and procedures concerning faculty rank, promotion, appointment, leave, privileges, tenure, evaluation of academic units, and the quality of instruction.

PSC recently completed what we hope will be the last draft of a proposed revision to the Operational Procedures and Regulations Regarding Faculty Office Hours (6-18.101). You’ll recall that the PSC has been working on this policy for a number of years and that a draft was shared with Faculty Senate last year. PSC has incorporated language to address concerns expressed by Senators into the latest draft. We anticipate that the draft will be on the agenda for the December Faculty Senate meeting.

PSC is continuing to work on a draft policy concerning consensual relationships and conflicts of interest. A very preliminary draft was shared with Faculty Senate last year. The PSC hopes to have a revised draft to share with the Faculty Senate later this academic year.
As I announced at the last Faculty Senate Meeting, I have charged PSC with conducting a review of the FlashFolio system. I believe that the plan is to send out a communication to full-time faculty, chairs, directors, and deans asking for feedback on the functionality of the system. In the meantime, please send any thoughts you have on the functionality of FlashFolio for various purposes to either myself or Sue Roxburgh, Chair of PSC.

**Committee on Administrative Officers (CAO)**
The Committee on Administrative Officers has been very active in the first few months of this semester. The University Policy and Procedures Regarding Search Procedures for Major Academic Administrative Officers (6-06) specifies that the CAO will nominate faculty to serve on the search committee for a variety of academic administrative positions. This semester, the CAO has been involved in nominating faculty to serve on the following committees:
- Search committee for the Dean of EHHS,
- Search committee for the Assistant Provost for Accreditation, Assessment, and Learning,
- Search committee for the Dean of Honors College.
The Policy also specifies that the CAO and Provost are to collaborate on finalizing search committee members for Kent Campus Deans and for Vice Provosts and Vice Presidents reporting to the Provost. I’d like to take this opportunity to publically thank Karen Keenan, Melody Tankersley, and Provost Diacon for helping to insure that that aspect of the policy has been honored this year.

The University Policy and Procedures Regarding Search Procedures for Major Academic Administrative Officers specifies that the CAO will have an opportunity to interview the finalists for various academic administrative positions. This semester, the CAO has reviewed finalists for the following positions:
- Student Ombuds,
- Assistant Provost for Accreditation, Assessment, and Learning.

I’m pleased to report that, although not required by policy, the CAO was also asked to interview the finalist for:
- Senior Vice President of Strategic Communication and External Affairs
and I was asked to interview the finalists for:
- Associate Vice President for University Budget and Financial Analysis.
I’m not entirely sure who to thank for this opportunity, but I am thankful that there has been interest in consulting the CAO on these finalists.

Finally, per the policy governing Administrative Review of Academic Officers (6-05.3), the CAO was asked to nominate faculty to serve on:
- The Provost Review Committee.
I look forward to that committee’s report.

**Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC)**
The Faculty Ethics Committee, which had been somewhat moribund for some time, has been convened and charged this semester. While preparing to charge the FEC, I learned that their procedures document had not been updated since the 80s. We did find a draft of proposed
changes to the procedures document made in the early 2000s, but there was no evidence that it had ever been approved by FEC and was never presented to the Faculty Senate. This year, I’ve charged the FEC with updating the procedures document to ensure that it contains adequate due process rights for both the complainant and respondent.

**University Research Council (URC)**

Although it isn’t a Faculty Senate Committee, I wanted to report on some positive changes at the University Research Council. The URC (along with the UTC and the CTL) had its budget increased as a result of the last round of TT negotiations. The URC has voted to use the increase as follows:

- The budget for travel to conference support was doubled: an increase of $85,000.00 overall. Individual support increased to $750.00.
- A seed grant initiative of $10,000.00 for eight grants was created.

That concludes my remarks. I’d be happy to field any other comments or questions at this point.

Deborah Smith
## Fall 2016 Faculty Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured &amp; tenure track faculty</th>
<th>Full-time non-tenure eligible faculty*</th>
<th>Total full-time faculty</th>
<th>Percentage of full-time faculty that are TT</th>
<th>Part-time faculty</th>
<th>Total faculty</th>
<th>Percentage of faculty that are full-time</th>
<th>Percentage of faculty that are TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent Campus</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On the Kent Campus, this includes 16 CPM faculty*
In accordance with Faculty Senate Bylaws, I formally convey to you, with this memorandum, the following motion passed on 21 November 2016 by the Educational Policies Council for appropriate review by the Faculty Senate. Although the Senate may not want to review this item, it is helpful to have the Senate’s consideration.

Office of the Provost

1. Revision of policy and procedures for temporary suspension of admission to an academic program. Current policy allows faculty three years for a program to be suspended before admission is to be reopened or the program to be inactivated. Proposed policy increases the suspension to five years, after which the program will declared inactivated.
   Effective Fall 2017 | Proposal

2. Revision of administrative structure of the School of Digital Sciences, from a school independent of a college to a dependent school within the College of Communication and Information. Moving to the college are the following: school adjunct faculty and full-time staff; Digital Sciences major within the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science and Master of Digital Sciences degrees; Digital Sciences minor; Enterprise Architecture graduate certificate; 20 undergraduate and 17 graduate DSCI courses.
   Effective Fall 2017 | Proposal

College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology

College of Architecture and Environmental Design

3. Revision of administrative oversight of construction management faculty, programs and courses, from the College of Applied Engineering, Sustainability and Technology to the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. Moving are the following: full-time construction management faculty; Construction Management major within the Bachelor of Science degree; Construction Management minor, 31 undergraduate and 11 graduate CMGT courses.
   Effective Fall 2017 | Proposal

College of Arts and Sciences

Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies

4. Revision of name of the Spanish Literature, Culture and Translation major within the Bachelor of Art degree. Name changes to Spanish. Minimum total hours to program completion is unchanged at 120.
   Effective Fall 2017 | Proposal
College of Communication and Information  
School of Library and Information Science

5. Establishment of Health Informatics major within the Master of Science degree. Program currently exists as a concentration within the Information Architecture and Knowledge Management major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 36. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approvals | Proposal

6. Establishment of Knowledge Management major within the Master of Science degree. Program currently exists as a concentration within the Information Architecture and Knowledge Management major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 36. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approvals | Proposal

7. Establishment of User Experience Design major within the Master of Science degree. Program currently exists as a concentration within the Information Architecture and Knowledge Management major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion is 36. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approvals | Proposal

8. Inactivation of Information Architecture and Knowledge Management major within the Master of Science degree. The program will be replaced by the proposed Health Informatics, Knowledge Management and User Experience Design majors. Effective Fall 2017 pending state and accreditor approvals | Proposal

College of Education, Health and Human Services  
School of Lifespan Development and educational Sciences

9. Revision of name for the Counseling and Human Development Center. Name changes to the Counseling Center. Effective Fall 2017 | Proposal

INFORMATION ITEM

Office of Students Affairs  
Office of the General Counsel  
Office of the Provost

1. Establishment of university policy regarding electronic and information technology accessibility (policy 3342-4-16). Effective Spring 2017 | Policy

EC: Todd A. Diacon, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost  
Teresa L. (Tess) Kail, secretary, Faculty Senate  
Karen M. Keenan, project director for academic affairs  
Emily S. Myers, assistant to the senior vice president for academic affairs
Current Policy

6 -18.101
Operational procedures and regulations regarding faculty office hours

(A) Each faculty member is required to have stated office hours published in the departmental office. Instructors should notify each class of hours during which they are available for conferences.

(B) It is expected that each faculty member will hold a minimum of five office hours per week.

Effective: June 1, 2007

Policy Revision Draft 5 - Professional Standards Committee – November 2, 2016

6 -18.101
Operational procedures and regulations regarding faculty office hours

The principal goal of office hours is to allow students access to faculty members. Given this goal, the following guidelines are offered for office hours. However, given the variations in time, location, and modality of courses (traditional, online or blended), it is possible that some flexibility within these guidelines may best serve student needs for access to faculty.

(A) During each regular academic year semester, summer session, or intersession in which a faculty member is the instructor of record for one or more courses (other than thesis, dissertation, or individual supervision), he/she is required to have office hours posted in the departmental office from the beginning of classes until the completion of the final assessment for the course. The instructor should notify each class of the hours during which he or she is available for consultation. A faculty member may have fixed hours each week, or may offer flexible times for students.

(B) During a regular academic year semester, it is expected that each faculty member who is the instructor of record for one or more courses (other than thesis, dissertation, or individual supervision) will be available for consultation either in person or electronically for a minimum of five (5) hours per week. During a summer session or intersession, it is expected that each faculty member who is the instructor of record for one or more courses (other than thesis, dissertation, or individual supervision) will be available for consultation either in person or electronically for a minimum of three (3) hours per week.

(C) For full-time faculty teaching three (3) credits or fewer in any regular academic year semester or in any summer session or intersession and for part-time adjunct faculty, the expectation of availability may be adjusted upon consultation with the appropriate faculty governance body of the unit.

(D) In the case of distance learning courses or other courses that are offered off-campus, it is recognized that availability may more appropriately be facilitated via electronic means. Faculty are encouraged to offer at least some of their office hours in a way that is consistent with the instructional modality of the course.
Summary of adjustments Administrative policy regarding student cheating and plagiarism, 3-01.8

Overall, the process has allowed for better educational interventions for students who demonstrate misunderstanding through honest error or ethical breach. The motivating factors for updating this policy are based on feedback from faculty, students, and the Office of Student Conduct (OSC) who have been working through the existing process since 2012. They include:

- Re-ordering and streamlining the policy to be consistent with the intended process
- Clarifying elements identified as challenging by faculty, students, or OSC
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“Significant” changes

Section (A): Purpose

- Updates language in the statement on integrity to read, “It is expected that students and instructors uphold the highest of standards with respect to academic integrity and report all situations using this policy where violations may have occurred. All forms of intentional and unintentional academic cheating and plagiarism may compromise the honor of an individual and the university and shall be addressed by the policy and procedures herein.”

Section (C): Definitions

- Updates the original section on definitions to add terms regarding the process and delete terms that were unnecessary or redundant. Examples of additions include roles for involved persons (Academic Hearing Panel [AHP] Convener, AHP Member, Complainant/Respondent Advisor, Witness, etc.) and processing information (Preponderance of the evidence, etc.). Deleted from the original policy were definitions for Chairperson, Dean, Department, Independent College, Regional campus, etc.
- In the definition for “Cheat,” the sentence structure was updated; sections (j) and (k) were added to give clarification regarding collaborative work.
- Adds (6)(i) Presenting falsified information in order to postpone or avoid examinations, tests, quizzes, or other academic work.
- Section (C)(15) Sanction was reformatted, has adjusted language (replaced “requirements” with “consequence”), and created subset (a) degree sanction.
Section (D): Expectations pertaining to academic cheating and plagiarism

- This new section clarifies what is expected of instructors and students.
- Instructors are expected to provide clear goals, materials, and guidelines for students, including addressing consequences for academic misconduct, that are consistent with academic departmental decorum; and should be prepared to report, appropriately participate, and retain relevant information regarding the academic cheating and plagiarism processes.
- Students shall refrain from acts of academic cheating and plagiarism; be aware of the course syllabus, and other guidelines provided by instructors; be prepared and appropriately participate in classroom activities and discussions; report to instructors any observed acts of academic cheating and plagiarism; be prepared to appropriately participate in the academic cheating and plagiarism processes if applicable.

Section (E): Academic administrative procedures for assigning sanctions

- Section (E)(1)(a) and (1)(b) updates so that the instructor must have a preponderance of the evidence to assign a sanction.
- Section (E) (1)(b)(i) adds “(allowing for partial credit at the discretion and direction of the instructor).”
- Section (E) (1)(d) adds and addresses what will occur if a student withdraws from a course in which they have violated this policy.
- Section (E) (1)(e) updates the process significantly. The original policy required the instructor to submit the incident to OSC, have OSC attempt to obtain verification/approval from the instructor’s chair or dean, and after that, send the incident report to the student. The updated policy does not require verification/approval from the instructor’s chair or dean.
- Deans may no longer invoke degree sanctions.

Section (H): Academic hearing panel

- Significant updates to the (3) composition of AHP. The original pool of members (10) is eliminated and no specific number is left in place. Updates also allow an OSC staff member to substitute as an academic hearing officer if necessary.
- Section (H)(2) eliminates the opportunity for a chair/dean to refer an incident to an AHP.
- Section (H)(10) Sanctions uses the original policy as a base, updates sanction types, and eliminates sanctions that were designed for behavior not associated with academic cheating or plagiarism (such as psychological services referral, monetary penalty, persona non grata status, etc.). Updates to (c) coursework sanction include allowing partial credit (i) and grade reduction (iii).

Section (I): Appeals

- Eliminates “severity of the sanction” as an appeal option after an academic hearing panel

Section (J): Invoking a degree sanction
• The original policy pertaining to the process for degree sanctions did not specify options for the provost, or due process for an instructor/respondent. Updates include due process clarification. If the provost decides that there is sufficient information, the incident may be forwarded to an AHP for adjudication.
• Section (J)(3) updates authorization for an AHP to recommend a degree sanction.

"Minor" changes

Section (B): Intent and scope of the policy

• Updates language in (1), (2), (3), (4).

Section (C): Definitions

• Updated formatting to include a hyphen and remove the word “means” from each definition
• Section (C)(10) Instructor – removed “Any decision by such a committee shall be by majority vote.”
• Section (C)(11) Plagiarism – removed “in the absence of full and”; replaced with “, or without citing”

Section (E): Plagiarism school

• Added (E)(3)(i) allowing for an academic hearing panel to assign plagiarism school

Section (F): Academic administrative procedures for assigning sanctions

• Section (F)(1)(d)(i) – added clarification for the office of student conduct communicating with chair/dean of instructor and/or student

Section (G): Appeal of instructor’s finding of responsibility or sanctions.

• Section (G)(2) updates the time for a student to appeal from “15 working days” to “7 calendar” days.
• Adds (3) “The due date for an appeal may be extended at the discretion of the director of student conduct (or designee).”

Section (H): Appeal of instructor’s finding of responsibility or sanctions.

• Section (H)(2)(a), (b), and (c) are represented in the original through multiple sections. Updates consolidate and clarify why an AHP may be convened.
• Section (H)(4) original sections of “training” and “eligibility” are combined into (H)(4) eligibility.
• Section (H)(4)(a) updates so that the director of student conduct (or designee) may replace and academic hearing officer if there is a conflict of interest.
• Section (H)(5)(b) updates language regarding legal counsel.
• Section (H)(6) and (7) are represented in the original policy in the same section. Updates create separate sections for clarification. Records retention from the original policy in this section is included in section (L) of the updated policy.
• Section (H)(8) and (9) replace the original policy “all matters pertaining to the conduct of the appeal hearing shall be under the sole authority of the academic hearing panel” for clarification.
• Section (H)(9) updates AHP proceedings to include clarification, such as key elements of the hearing process.
• Section (H)(10)(iv) removes the original policy regarding disciplinary dismissal stating, “Might be required to leave the land and/or premises of the university effective the date of dismissal. Permission may be granted by the vice president for enrollment management and student affairs for entrance of the student to university premises for a specified purpose and time.”
• Section (H)(11), (a), and (b) adds a statement about multiple students being permitted in the same hearing for the same case accusations, postponement of decisions, and separate hearings.
• Section (H)(12) adds a statement that an AHP may continue if a student and/or instructor fail to appear for the hearing.

**Section (H):** Appeal of instructor’s finding of responsibility or sanctions.

• Adds section (I)(4), (5), and (5)(a) to clarify the role of the provost pertaining to an appeal.

**Section (K):** Academic calendar and timelines.

• Adds section (K)(1)(a)(i) and (K)(1)(b) to clarify timelines for complaint submission A complaint must be submitted within one calendar year of last day of the respective fall, spring, or summer registration of the course for which the accusation has been made, with the exception for degree sanction. For degree sanctions, there is no end date to submit an accusation.
• Adds section (K)(b) regarding the academic cheating and plagiarism process continuing regardless of the student’s registration status.

**Section (L):** Records and expunction.

• Adds section (L)(1) and (L)(2) to clarify the maintenance of records and expunction process for academic cheating and plagiarism incidents.
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Administrative policy regarding student cheating and plagiarism

(A) Purpose. Students enrolled in the university, at all its campuses, are to perform their academic work according to standards set by faculty members, departments, schools and colleges of the university. It is expected that students and instructors uphold the highest of standards with respect to academic integrity and report all situations using this policy where violations may have occurred. All forms of intentional and unintentional academic cheating and plagiarism may compromise the honor of an individual and the university and shall be addressed by the policy and procedures herein.

(B) Intent and scope of the policy.

(1) In providing this policy, the university affirms that acts of cheating and plagiarism by students are in conflict with the goals of the institution, have no place in the university and are serious offenses to academic goals and objectives, as well as to the rights of fellow students.

(2) It is the intent of this policy to provide appropriate due process, and when applicable, to provide fair and realistic sanctions for any student found responsible for academic cheating or plagiarism.

(3) This policy applies to all students of the university, graduate and undergraduate, full or part-time, whose conduct is of such a nature prohibited by the policy. Other offenses of a nonacademic nature are addressed in rule 3342-4-02, the university policy regarding administration of student conduct.

(4) Ordinarily, students sanctioned under this policy may not seek to remove such sanction by invoking their rights under other university policies (such as the administrative policies addressing student complaints found in rule 3342-4-02.3 or 3342-8-01.4 of this Administrative Code) but may appeal a finding of responsibility or process error according to sections (G) and (I) of this rule, respectively.

(C) Definitions. As used in this rule:

(1) Academic Hearing Panel (AHP) – An academic hearing panel is the University’s trained hearing body specifically established to address concerns pertaining to the academic cheating and plagiarism policy.

(2) Academic Hearing Panel Convener – Director of Student Conduct (or designee) responsible for logistics and procedures associated with the academic cheating and plagiarism process.
(3) Academic Hearing Panel Member – any Kent State University instructor or student who has been appointed by the provost (or designee) and trained for an academic cheating and plagiarism decision-making role by the University.

(4) Appeal – the method by which due process or a decision regarding academic cheating or plagiarism can be challenged. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Office of the Provost (or designee) or the Office of Student Conduct as appropriate. An appeal may be deemed invalid if it is not in accordance with the university administrative policy on academic cheating and plagiarism (3-01.8); see sections (G) and (I) of this rule for further explanation.

(5) Assignment – any academic work that is required or voluntarily submitted to or presented for an instructor for review and/or academic credit.

(6) Cheat – to intentionally misrepresent or disregard the source, nature, or other conditions of academic work so as to accrue undeserved credit. Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

(a) Obtaining or retaining partial or whole copies of examinations, tests or quizzes before these are distributed for student use;

(b) Using notes, textbooks or other information in examinations, tests and quizzes, except as expressly permitted;

(c) Obtaining confidential information about examinations, tests or quizzes other than that released by the instructor;

(d) Securing, giving or exchanging information during examinations, tests, or quizzes without authorization from the instructor;

(e) Presenting data or other material gathered by another person or group as one's own;

(f) Falsifying experimental data or information;

(g) Having another person take one's place for any academic performance without the specific knowledge and permission of the instructor;

(h) Using a substantial portion of a piece of work previously submitted for another course or program to meet the requirements of the present course or program without notifying the instructor to whom the work is presented.

(i) Presenting falsified information in order to postpone or avoid examinations, tests, quizzes, or other academic work.
(j) Presenting a substantial portion of a piece of work by two or more students without acknowledging the collaboration.

(k) One student presenting a substantial proportion of a piece of work resulting from a collaborative effort with another person as one’s own contradictory to the assignment and/or without acknowledging the collaboration.

(l) Cooperating with another to do one or more of the above.

(7) Cheating/Plagiarism Sanction Form – the form instructors fill out and distribute each time they impose a sanction on a student for cheating or plagiarism.

(8) Complainant – person providing information in a cheating/plagiarism sanction form alleging that a student or students violated the University administrative policy on academic cheating and plagiarism.

(9) Complainant / Respondent Advisor – any person who accompanies a complainant or respondent regarding university policies or procedures regarding academic cheating and plagiarism. A complainant / respondent advisor is not permitted to participate or represent any party at any time during the academic cheating and plagiarism process.

(10) Instructor – any person employed or appointed to teach in any course or program offering of the university, or a committee appointed to assess, evaluate, or grade a thesis, dissertation or work.

(11) Plagiarism – to take and present as one's own a material portion of the ideas or words of another or to present as one's own an idea or work derived from an existing source, or without citing proper credit to the source of the ideas, words, or works. As defined, plagiarize includes, but is not limited to:

   (a) The copying of words, sentences and paragraphs directly from the work of another without proper credit;

   (b) The copying of illustrations, figures, photographs, drawings, models, or other visual and nonverbal materials, including recordings, of another without proper credit; and

   (c) The presentation of work prepared by another in final or draft form as one's own without citing the source, such as the use of purchased research papers.

(12) Plagiarism School Form – the form signed by an instructor and student agreeing to a remedial, private session for a student sanctioned for plagiarism in return for a mitigation of the sanction. This form may be imbedded in the Cheating/Plagiarism Sanction Form.
(13) Preponderance of the evidence – the standard in determining if a student is responsible for a violation; the complainant must be able to show that it is “more likely than not” that the alleged behavior occurred and was in violation of this rule.

(14) Respondent – a student who has been accused of violating the University administrative policy on academic cheating and plagiarism.

(15) Sanction – consequence set forth upon a finding or acceptance of responsibility for a violation of this rule; see sections (F)(1)(c) and (H)(10) of this rule for further explanation.

   a) Degree sanction – revocation of a conferred degree, or other previously certified academic award or achievement; see section (J) of this rule for further explanation.

(16) Student – any person admitted or enrolled at the university in any of its courses, programs, campuses or offerings, including, but not limited to, cooperative programs or offerings with other institutions for whom a record is made at the university by the registrar or which is submitted to the university for admission or transfer credit.

(17) Witness – any person who has direct information regarding an accusation of academic cheating or plagiarism as defined in this rule.

(D) Expectations pertaining to academic cheating and plagiarism. It is the responsibility of students, instructors, AHP members and conveners to be aware of the university administrative policy on academic cheating and plagiarism. Lack of awareness or unfamiliarity with the policy is not an adequate or appropriate justification for violations.

(1) Instructors.

   a) Should provide clear goals, materials, and guidelines for students, including addressing consequences for academic misconduct, that are consistent with academic departmental decorum;

   b) Should be prepared to report, appropriately participate, and retain relevant information regarding the academic cheating and plagiarism processes;

(2) Students.

   a) Shall refrain from acts of academic cheating and plagiarism;

   b) Should be aware of the course syllabus, and other guidelines provided by instructors;

   c) Should be prepared and appropriately participate in classroom activities and discussions;
(d) Should report to instructors any observed acts of academic cheating and plagiarism;

(e) Should be prepared to appropriately participate in the academic cheating and plagiarism processes if applicable.

(E) Plagiarism school. As a means to address less severe cases of student plagiarism (acts that may be considered by the instructor to be unintentional), the instructor may request that the student attend a remedial, private session administered by university libraries regarding acceptable ways to document research.

(1) Plagiarism school will only be offered to students not previously sanctioned for plagiarism.

(2) The instructor must fill out the cheating/plagiarism sanction form before referring a student to plagiarism school.

(3) Plagiarism school may be offered when the instructor, student, a representative from the university library (plagiarism school instructor) agree to the conditions provided on the plagiarism school form.

(i) Plagiarism school may be assigned by an academic hearing panel.

(4) Upon successful completion of plagiarism school instructor will notify the referring instructor to carry out the mitigated sanction as indicated in the form.

(F) Academic administrative procedures for assigning sanctions.

(1) If an instructor directly observes, identifies, or is informed of an act of academic cheating or plagiarism (including by or from a third party), the instructor should inform the student as soon as is practical of the belief that an act of cheating or plagiarism has occurred. If the student cannot be reached in a reasonable period of time, the instructor may proceed with sanctions, notifying the student in writing as promptly as possible of the belief and the procedural steps the instructor has taken.

(a) If an instructor determines there is a preponderance of the evidence that a student, in a course or program under the instructor's supervision, presented work for university credit which involves an act of cheating, plagiarism or cooperation in either, the instructor shall assign one or more of the following academic sanctions:

(i) Course sanction of refusal to accept full credit for the assignment, quiz, or exam (allowing for partial credit at the discretion and direction of the instructor)
(ii) Course sanction of a zero or "F" for the assignment, quiz, or exam

(iii) Course sanction of "F" for the course

(iv) Referral to an academic hearing panel

(b) The instructor shall submit the cheating/plagiarism sanction form through their FlashLine portal.

(c) If a sanction of "F" for the course is assigned, it will not prohibit a student from withdrawing the course. However, the record of academic cheating and plagiarism will remain on file according to record retention policy.

(d) Notice. The office of student conduct will process the information supplied by the instructor from the cheating/plagiarism sanction form. The office of student conduct will inform the student of the allegations within seven (7) calendar days of receiving the cheating/plagiarism sanction form from an instructor. The office of student conduct will provide the student or students, in writing, the description of the incident, any evidence supplied by the instructor, appeal procedures, and the due date for an appeal to be submitted; see sections (G) and (I) of this rule pertaining to appeals.

(i) Once the instructor selects a sanction, the office of student conduct will communicate with the chair/dean of the instructor and/or student as appropriate.

(G) Appeal of instructor's finding of responsibility or sanctions.

(1) If a student has been accused of a violation of the academic cheating or plagiarism policy disagree with the finding of responsibility and/or the sanctioning assigned by an instructor, that student may appeal to convene an academic hearing panel.

(2) All appeals of an instructor’s finding of responsibility or sanction for accusations of academic cheating and plagiarism must be submitted in writing to the office of student conduct within seven (7) calendar days of notification from the office of student conduct. Appeals may include a rationale and any evidence available.

(3) The due date for an appeal may be extended at the discretion of the director of student conduct (or designee).

(4) All accepted appeals will result in an academic hearing panel; see Section (H) of this rule for further details.

(H) Academic hearing panel.
(1) Purpose. The purpose of an academic hearing panel is to determine, using a preponderance of the evidence standard, by a simple majority, whether an act of academic cheating or plagiarism occurred; and if a violation is deemed to have occurred, to apply sanctioning as defined in this rule. Decisions of an academic hearing panel are final, pending the appeal process.

(2) An academic hearing panel is convened due to the following:

(a) An instructor determines a finding of responsibility for an act of academic cheating or plagiarism and refers the case to an academic hearing panel.

(b) A student may appeal a finding of responsibility and/or sanctions imposed by an instructor after provided notification through the Office of Student Conduct.

(c) A student has multiple violations of the academic cheating or plagiarism policy.

(3) Composition of academic hearing panel. A pool of academic hearing officers appointed to one-year terms by the provost (or designee) must include representatives from current university faculty, and students employed and/or enrolled in undergraduate and graduate studies and may be from any Kent State University campus. If a panel member is not available to serve on an academic hearing panel, office of student conduct staff may substitute as necessary. The assignment and scheduling of academic hearing officers to participate in an academic hearing panel will be coordinated by the office of student conduct. An academic hearing panel will be composed of three academic hearing officers, one of whom shall be a student.

(4) Eligibility. All academic hearing officers may serve on an academic hearing panel after completing one training session through the office of student conduct. After successful completion of the training session, the office of student conduct will submit the name(s) of those trained for official appointment by the provost (or designee).

(a) The director of student conduct (or designee) may replace an academic hearing officer if there is a conflict of interest.

(5) Written notice of the date, time, and location of an academic hearing panel, accused violations, and any evidence provided by the instructor shall be provided to the accused student minimally three days in advance of an academic hearing panel. The written notice shall contain a link to the academic cheating and plagiarism policy (3-01.8) and the opportunity to attend an academic hearing panel with an advisor.

(a) If the respondent and complainant are agreeable to an earlier hearing date, the three day notice requirement may be waived.
(b) A respondent or complainant may be accompanied by one advisor as defined in Section (C)(10) of this rule during any phase of the academic cheating and plagiarism process.

(6) All hearings are digitally recorded. Recordings may be listened to or viewed by students wishing to appeal a decision. Recordings will be provided to the complainant or respondent only at their expense.

(7) All hearings are closed to the public.

(8) The academic hearing officers and/or the academic hearing panel convener are responsible for overall decorum of the academic hearing panel process, and may reasonably:

(a) Remove any person in attendance they deem to be disruptive, distracting, or inhibiting the process in any way.

(b) Limit the time of any person presenting to the academic hearing panel if they deem that the information is repetitive or irrelevant to the academic hearing panel process.

(c) Limit the number of witnesses if they deem that the witness does not have direct information, or if they deem the information the witnesses intend to share is repetitive or irrelevant to the academic hearing panel process.

(9) Academic hearing panel proceedings. During the course of an academic hearing panel:

(a) The complainant and respondent will be given a reasonable opportunity to share evidence.

(b) The complainant and respondent will be given a reasonable opportunity to question each other pertaining the evidence presented.

(c) Hearing officers may question anybody in the hearing at any time.

(d) The convener ensures the policy is being followed accordingly and may remove anybody who is disruptive to the hearing process.

(e) Deliberation and decision(s). The academic hearing panel and academic hearing panel convener will deliberate in private following the academic hearing panel. A written decision shall be supplied within seven calendar days to the respondent(s), complainant(s), and department chair (or designee) except in situations where multiple respondents are not heard at the same time; see section (H)(11) of this rule for further details. The written decision shall include:
(i) Whether or not a preponderance of evidence was achieved to result in a violation of the academic cheating and plagiarism policy; and

(ii) Sanctions applied if a finding of responsibility was achieved; and

(iii) Appeal procedure for the respondent and complainant.

(10) Sanctions.

(a) The following sanctions are provided by this rule for when a student or students are found responsible by a preponderance of the evidence to have violated the academic cheating and plagiarism policy. The list of sanctions is not exhaustive.

(b) Status sanction. A status sanction reflects the eligibility of a student to remain or be separated from the university. Status sanctions may have an effect on ability to participate with, in, or at recognized University groups, clubs, events, activities, etc.

(i) Warning. Written confirmation that a violation occurred.

(ii) Probation. This sanction is one that places the student in serious jeopardy with the university. This sanction is invoked for a specified period of time. Students on academic probation might be subject to automatic dismissal or suspension if found responsible for any further violation of the academic cheating and plagiarism policy.

(iii) Suspension from a department, school, or the university. This sanction is one of involuntary separation of a student or students from a department, school, or the university for a specified period of time.

(a) If a grade was assigned at the time the violation occurred, it shall remain on the transcript.

(iv) Dismissal from the university. This sanction is one of involuntary separation of the student from the university.

(v) If a grade was assigned at the time the violation occurred, it shall remain on the transcript.

(c) Coursework sanction. A course sanction explains direct adjustment pertaining to a grade for a specific course.

(i) Refusal to accept full credit for the assignment, quiz, or exam. This allows for partial credit at the discretion and direction of the instructor.
(ii) Zero or "F" or for the assignment, quiz, or exam.

(iii) Reduction of credit / grade for the course

(iv) "F" for the course.

(d) Degree sanction. A degree sanction may be invoked through section (J) of this rule.

(i) Decertification

(ii) Rejection of thesis/dissertation

(iii) Degree Revocation

(e) Educational Sanctions. Other learning opportunities, workshops, or reflection assignments as determined by an academic hearing panel.

(11) Multiple students. When multiple students are involved in the same alleged act(s) of academic cheating or plagiarism, one academic hearing panel may be held for more than one of the accused students.

(a) The academic hearing panel reserves the ability to postpone decisions for situations where multiple respondents are involved in the same accusations of academic cheating or plagiarism until the academic hearing panel conducts hearings for all involved respondents.

(b) In proceedings involving more than one respondent, a separate hearing may be requested by a respondent or complainant, and granted at the discretion of the director of student conduct (or designee).

(12) Failure to appear. If a respondent or complaint fails to appear for an assigned academic hearing panel, the hearing will continue in accordance with section (H) of this rule pertaining to academic hearing panels. The respondent(s) and complainant(s) will be provided the decision in writing. All findings and sanctions are binding, pending the appeal process.

(1) Appeals of academic hearing panel decision.

(1) Respondents, complainants, and deans may appeal the decisions of the academic hearing panel to the provost. No additional appeal will be heard.

(2) Appeals are limited based on the following rationale:

(a) The decision is not in accordance with the evidence presented; and/or
(b) The decision was reached through a procedure not in accordance with this rule; and/or

(c) New information is available which may suggest modification of the decision.

(3) An appeal must be in writing, must state clearly the rationale for the appeal and must be submitted within seven (7) calendar days of the date of the decision.

(4) Appeals may be rejected by the provost (or designee) if submitted after seven (7) calendar days past the academic hearing panel decision, and/or if not in accordance with section (1)(2) of this rule pertaining to appeal rationale. The due date for an appeal may be extended by the provost (or designee).

(5) All accepted appeals will result in a review by the provost (or designee). The appeal decision by the provost (or designee) will be supplied in writing to the respondent, complainant, dean or departmental chair (as appropriate), and the office of student conduct within thirty (30) days of receipt by the provost. An appeal decision from the provost (or designee) is final.

   (a) The response for an appeal by the provost may be extended by the provost (or designee) on the basis of extenuating circumstances.

(J) Invoking a degree sanction.

(1) If an instructor, chair, or dean identifies or is aware of academic cheating or plagiarism that occurred while a person was registered as a student such that the effect is to compromise the validity of a conferred degree or previously certified academic award or achievement, the process for invoking a degree sanction may be initiated.

(2) The instructor, chair, or dean shall provide all information available along with a written recommendation for a degree sanction to the provost (or designee).

   (a) If the provost finds that there is insufficient information or that the situation warrants degree sanctions, the instructor may still follow section (F) of this rule pertaining to administrative procedures for assigning sanctions.

   (b) If the provost finds that there is sufficient information and that the situation warrants possible degree sanctions, the provost will forward the information to the office of student conduct to process and convene an academic hearing panel; see section (H) of this rule regarding academic hearing panel.

(3) If an academic hearing panel determines a finding of responsibility for violating academic cheating and plagiarism and applies a degree sanction, the academic hearing panel will forward the decision to the provost for review, pending the appeal process in
section (I) of this rule. If the provost approves a degree sanction, the provost will forward a written recommendation to the president for review. If the president approves a degree sanction, the president will forward a written recommendation to the board of trustees. The board of trustees will review the recommendation from the president and determine final approval and revocation of a conferred degree or other previously certified academic award or achievement as necessary.

(K) Academic calendar and timelines.

(1) Timeline for processing of cases.

(a) A complainant must submit an accusation of academic cheating or plagiarism within one calendar year of last day of the respective fall, spring, or summer registration of the course for which the accusation has been made, with the exception for degree sanction; see section (J) of this rule pertaining to degree sanction for further information.

(i) There is no end date to submit an accusation of acts of academic cheating or plagiarism in which a dean (or designee) recommends a degree sanction.

(b) The academic cheating and plagiarism process may continue regardless of the student’s registration status.

(L) Records and expunction.

(1) All student academic cheating and plagiarism records are maintained by the office of student conduct in accordance with the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, all state of Ohio laws, and the Kent State University records retention policy; see University administrative policy regarding public records (5-15.1) for further details.

(2) A current or former student may request in writing to the office of student conduct that their academic cheating and plagiarism record be expunged upon proof of graduation or official notice discontinuing student status. Decisions regarding expunction made by the provost (or designee) are final and not subject to appeal, and may be based on behavior subsequent to the original violation, the nature of the original violation, and/or other relevant information or factors.

(M) This policy will be effective August 1, 2017.
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
October 31, 2016

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

Excused: Theresa Walton-Fisette (Appointed)

1. Call to order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:10PM in the Faculty Senate office.

2. Approval of Minutes

a) The committee reviewed and made corrections to the October 10, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Wilson/Kerns). The minutes were approved.

b) The committee reviewed and made corrections to the October 19, 2016 Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Wilson/Laux). The minutes were approved.

3. Review of EPC Items for November 14, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting

a) Office of the Provost: Revision of Dismissal Policy. The committee reviewed the proposed policy revision and designated this as an Action Item for the Faculty Senate meeting.

b) Regional College: Revision of instructional delivery for the Information Technology for Administrative Professionals major. The committee decided this would be listed as an information item for the Faculty Senate meeting.

4. Draft of Policy on Faculty Office Hours

The committee discussed the draft version of a proposed Policy on Office Hours that had been circulated by Chair Smith and finalized the proposed wording changes. Chair Smith will send the suggested revisions to the Professional Standards Committee.
5. Provost Tenure Advisory Board (TAB) and Promotion Advisory Board (PAB) Nominations

Associate Provost Averill had requested that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee provide nominations of people to be considered for appointment to the Provost’s TAB and PAB. It was requested that nominations be provided for faculty in all of the colleges. A list of eligible faculty was reviewed and a list of nominees was generated. Chair Smith will send the nominations to Associate Provost Averill after consulting with the absent member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

6. Nomination to FaSBAC

Chair Smith announced that the Regional campus has nominated Peter Dorff to serve as the RCFAC representative to FaSBAC. A motion was made to approve the nomination (Wilson/Fenk). The nomination was approved. Chair Smith noted that she is still waiting for FaSBAC nominations from the College of Architecture and Environmental Design and the College of Podiatric Medicine.

7. Census for Part-Time (Adjunct) Faculty

Chair Smith received the requested list of part-time faculty for all Kent State campuses. This fall semester, there are 1,347 part-time faculty. We did not receive information regarding how many credit hours are taught by these faculty. As Faculty Senate considers adding part-time faculty representation at Senate, it would also be helpful to know how many of the adjuncts are employed for consecutive semesters. Chair Smith will request this information. There was also discussion regarding whether, for an election of part-time representatives, it would be beneficial to do electronic balloting (e.g., Qualtrics).

8. Review of Agenda for November 14, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting

The committee reviewed a proposed agenda submitted by Chair Smith. It was decided to include on the agenda a report on the Fall Faculty Senate retreat (from Tracy Laux) and information on the census of part-time faculty (from Chair Smith). A motion was made to approve the proposed agenda (Fenk/Wilson). The motion was approved. The committee also discussed possible topics for future meetings. Members of the Executive Committee have been hearing of multiple concerns regarding Human Resources. It was decided to raise these concerns at the next meeting with the President and Provost.

9. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:37PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
November 9, 2016

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

Guests: President Warren, Provost Diacon

1. Call to order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:01PM in the Urban Conference Room.

2. Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed and made corrections to the October 31, 2016 Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes (Laux/Wilson). The minutes were approved.

3. Review of Agenda for Meeting with President and Provost

Chair Smith presented a draft agenda for the meeting with the President and Provost. The items were discussed, and 2 additional items were added to the agenda.

President Warren and Provost Diacon arrived.

4. Outreach to International Students

Chair Smith raised the question of whether it might be helpful, as a follow up to the recent national election, to contact KSU international students for purposes of making them aware of resources on campus. The Provost indicated he thought it was a good idea and would follow up.

5. Proposal to Meet with New Vice President of Human Resources

Chair Smith asked whether the new VP of Human Resources, Jack Witt, could attend a Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting. The purpose would be to hear his plans for Human Resources and to discuss concerns that have been raised about HR. President Warren indicated she had already asked a consultant to evaluate HR earlier in her tenure and thus was aware of some concerns. It was agreed to invite VP Witt to a future executive committee meeting.
6. Academic Presence Verification

Chair Smith asked whether information could be shared from faculty reporting of student academic presence (i.e., how many students had not started a class). She also asked whether changes to the system had been made, noting a concern that students reported as absent were blocked out of Blackboard. Provost Diacon reported that he was very pleased with the high faculty participation rate, and that one change to the system is that students will no longer be blocked from Blackboard when reported as not attending a course. He also agreed to provide data on rates of starting/not starting at a future meeting.

7. Faculty Representation at Board of Trustees

Chair Smith provided minutes from a Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting on August 20, 2014. Mr. Dennis Eckert, who was Chair of the KSU Board of Trustees at the time, had attended the meeting. One item discussed was the possibility of having a faculty representative on the Board of Trustees, although a question was raised at the time as to whether this would be allowed at KSU given that there is collective bargaining at KSU for faculty. Chair Smith stated it has since been learned that other Ohio universities, including some that have a CBA, do have faculty representation on their Board of Trustees, so apparently it is possible under Ohio law. She also noted that having faculty representation on the Board is considered a “best practice” by AAUP. President Warren indicated that it has been valuable to have undergraduate and graduate student representatives on the Board, and offered to facilitate contact with the Board to further discuss this option. Chair Smith will develop a list of other Ohio institutions that have both a CBA and a faculty representative on their Board of Trustees.

8. President Reception with Faculty

Chair Smith asked President Warren if she could clarify who is invited to the faculty reception she has planned for December 12. President Warren indicated that this reception is for all faculty members.

9. Library Budget Reductions

Provost Diacon announced that President Warren had found a way to avoid making a second round of $400,000 cuts to the library budget. He further indicated that, although the overall library budget will not be cut, there will still be a $400,000 cut to the library collections budget, and Dean Bracken will allocate those funds in ways that align with the strategic roadmap. The executive committee raised some concerns. They asked what role the Senate library committee would play in advising on the allocation of the restored funds. It was also noted that restoring the funds but using them for a different purpose does not address the underlying concern (i.e., cuts to the collections budget). It was agreed to invite Dean Bracken to a future executive committee meeting to discuss his plans for allocating the restored funds.
10. Changes to the Center for Applied Conflict Management

Provost Diacon explained that an external review of the Political Science department noted that the Center for Applied Conflict Management is a quality program but that it might be better served if it were separated from the department and made its own program. A proposal to do that is being prepared for EPC. The changes also include renaming the center a School of Conflict Analysis and Peaceful Change. There is also an intention to hire some new faculty and invite current KSU faculty to affiliate with the program. The new school will be involved in planning for the 50th anniversary of May 4, 1970.

11. Provost Topic for November Faculty Senate meeting

The Provost indicated that he and VP Ritchey will speak at the upcoming November 14 Faculty Senate meeting on the topic of faculty numbers and future goals for faculty hiring.

12. MAC Leadership Development Initiative

Provost Diacon announced that he has been part of a 3 person team that is developing plans for a MAC group that would focus on professional development opportunities for academic leaders at MAC institutions. This consortium would focus on academic leadership and not athletics, and would be modeled after similar groups that already exist for the SEC and Big Ten conferences. Provost Diacon suggested each institution would likely have 3 fellows who would participate in periodic consortium meetings. The meetings would be hosted by one of the MAC institutions and focus on a specific theme. He suggested that the KSU team might include the chair of Faculty Senate, a dean, and a department chair. The group might also sponsor an award such as MAC professor of the year. The goal is to have the consortium hold its first meeting in Fall 2017.

13. National Landmark Status for KSU

Provost Diacon indicated that KSU is seeking to be designated as a National Historic Landmark in connection with the May 4, 1970 shooting. He was part of a team that recently traveled to Washington, D.C. to present and answer questions for the application. KSU has not yet heard whether we will receive this designation.

14. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:42PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate