Tuscarawas Campus Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
September 09, 2015

**Faculty Present:** Akpan, Baker, Bears, Bihn-Coss, Birlin, Brindley, Feng, Fenk, Galati, Graff, Green, Harding, Hediger, Hoffman, Jones, Kang, Keiller, Koptur, Li, McEnroe-Petitte, Minnick, Misko, Newman, Osikiewicz B., Patterson, Rajagopal, VanFossen, Willey

**Administrators Present:** Bielski, Conrad

**I  Call to Order**

Minnick called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm.

**II  Approval of April 08, 2015 minutes**

Unanimous approval of the April 08 minutes

**III  Treasurer’s Report**

The balance of the flower fund as of April 08, 2015 (last faculty council meeting) was $1,271.71. Since then we’ve no deposits into the account but several withdrawals totaling $504.29. The expenses were as follows (April 2015: $42 and $50; May 2015: $38, $16.85, and $252.20 & 67.24 for rentals for spring picnic $67.24; August 2015: $38). This leaves the balance at $767.42.

Donations of $20 are still being accepted by Akpan. You can pay by cash or check. Please make checks payable to "Tuscarawas Campus University Foundation".

**IV  Chairperson’s Report**

The chair’s report follows:

A. President’s proposed visit: President Warren is scheduled to visit Tuscarawas campus on September 10, 2015. Faculty and staff are encouraged to attend as schedules shall permit.

B. RTP Reviews: The committee to meet Wednesday, September 16, after perusing the external references for the three (3) tenure/promotion candidates.

C. RCFAC: Meeting on Friday, September 11, 2015.

D. Electronic SSIs: Electronic SSIs are gone for good. However, there will be one year monitoring and winding down process.

E. Representative FC: Will be revisiting before being mandated by necessity. For
example, the requirement to maintain at least 50% of TT: NTT faculty ratio for the campus. At present, there is a shortfall of 3 TT Faculty at Tuscarawas.

V Faculty Senate Report

Minnick’s report is attached as an addendum to this minutes.

VI Committee Reports: There were no committee reports as the committees were just being constituted during the week and no meetings had taken place as yet.

Standing Committee Reports:

A. Academic Affairs – no report

B. Faculty Affairs – no report

C. Electronic Communications - no report.

D. Library – no report

E. Student Affairs – no report

Ad Hoc Committees

A. Guest Lecture Committee – no report

B. Diversity Committee – no report

C. Community Engagement (now incorporates service learning) – no report

VII Unfinished Business - no unfinished business.

VIII New Business

A. Curriculum Changes Deadlines

Proposals for curriculum changes to the EPC of the Faculty Senate is September 16th 2015 for changes expected be considered in the October EPC meeting. The committee may limit the review of proposals to five (5) per meeting. The last EPC meeting to consider Curriculum changes is Nov 16, 2015.
B. OBR Changes to Tech Programs

Proposal to make changes to the Tech programs including modification of the roadmaps, changes to the credit hours was presented by Bears.

A motion by Bears/Jones asking the faculty council to support the idea of moving forward with the proposed changes was unanimously approved with a vote of 25 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstentions.

C. Standing Committee Reports During FC Meetings

A proposal was discussed requesting committee chairs to send respective reports to FC Vice Chair for circulation two (2) days prior to FC meetings. The purpose is to save time during the FC meetings. Members will still be able to ask questions arising from the committee reports. This was unanimously approved with a vote of 25 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstentions.

D. FC Meetings Agenda: Faculty wishing to suggest items for FC meeting agenda in the future can send same to the Vice Chair prior to the agenda being circulated.

IX Administrator Reports

A. Dean’s Report

1. Dean Bielski began his report by addressing the status of several current searches and also discussed the hiring plan for the academic year. He noted that a search was in progress for the Director of Engineering Technology, which is chaired by Chitra Rajagopal. Members of the search committee include Lovejoy Das, Jill Chen and Mike Czayka. Also in progress is the General Manager of the Performing Arts Center, chaired by Chad Conrad. Faculty representatives to that search committee are Kathy Davis-Patterson and Bill Auld. Dean Bielski also reported that Dr. Kimberly Routh accepted an appointment as interim Director of the Veterinary Technology program for the academic year. A search for the permanent director will occur in the spring.

2. Dr. Bielski also reported, due largely to retirements, the number of full time faculty had declined this year. Many of those were tenure track positions. Dean Bielski reported that in consultation with the academic areas, it was determined that a replacement hire in Psychology and one replacement hire in English were not needed at the present time. It was Dean Bielski’s plan to move forward with replacements in several other areas (e.g., English, Chemistry and Agribusiness) as tenure track positions. Dean Bielski also acknowledged that he had heard informally, through members of the campus, that tenure track hires will require
additional justification. Dean Bielski also noted he had not been given notification of this to date. He was also asked about a failed search in nursing over the summer. It was suggested that a change from NTT to TT may help remedy the difficulty in hiring the position.

3. Dean Bielski also reminded the faculty of President Warren’s visit on the 18th. He encouraged faculty to take advantage of this unique opportunity.

E. **Assistant Dean’s Report** - no report

F. **Other Administrator Reports**

X **Announcements:**

- President Warren visiting Tuscarawas campus on September 10, 2015

XI **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm (Fenk/Li)

Respectfully submitted,

Justice Akpan

Tuscarawas FC Secretary/Treasurer

Addendum:

Faculty Senate Report/Summary.
Summary of Senate issues for the 9 September 2015 Faculty Council Meeting:

Faculty Senate Report

At the April 13, 2015 meeting, Faculty Senate:

- heard Provost Diacon read prepared remarks (Attachment A) on his role in the Tenure and Promotion process.

- elected Faculty Senate Executive Committee members for AY 15-16:

  Chair: Dr. Linda L. Williams, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Kent Campus
  Vice-Chair: Dr. Deborah C. Smith, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Kent Campus
  Secretary: Dr. Paul A. Farrell, Professor of Computer Science, Kent Campus
  Member At-Large: Dr. Christopher J. Fenk, Professor of Chemistry, Tuscarawas Campus

- discussed and passed unanimously a revision to the Senate Resolution Regarding the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process (Attachment B)

- approved adding the following courses to the Kent Core effective Fall 2015:
  - BSCI 21010 Anatomy & Physiology (4)
  - CHEM 10055 The Molecules of Life (3)

- approved removing the following courses from the Kent Core effective Fall 2016:
  - BSCI 20020 Biological Structure & Function (5)
  - CHEM 10054 General & Elementary Organic Chemistry (5)

- approved a Motion Regarding eSSI’s (Attachment C) which, in part, ends the pilot program effective Summer 2015 and returns to all paper evaluations except for online courses.

At the May 11, 2015 meeting, Faculty Senate:

- voted unanimously to establish a policy for undergraduate students who want to enroll in graduate courses.

- heard a report from FaSBAC on the review of the performance of the RCM model at Kent State.

- voted unanimously on changes to University Policy 6-14 & 6-15 regarding Faculty promotion and tenure:
  - Removed the “double voting” ability of Faculty on the Provost’s Tenure and Promotion Advisory Boards. If you voted on a candidate at a lower level of review, you cannot then vote again at the Provost’s level.
  - Added a phrase to prevent an untenured or lower ranked Faculty Chair on a Regional Campus RTP committee from voting on records for campus candidates with tenure or who are higher ranked.
- discussed a petition presented by Senator George Garrison for a vote of No Confidence in Provost Diacon (Attachment D). It was brought to the Chair’s attention that for such a petition to move forward, among other issues, that the Senate Charter and By-Laws would need to be amended, as a petition of this nature had not been recently addressed and the rules for handling it were unclear. Additionally, the handling of anonymous signatories to the petition had never arisen before and rules needed to be written to verify their validity. The Senate voted to discuss these necessary changes at a future meeting (not over the summer) before voting on the No Confidence petition. The motion passed, but not unanimously.

At the July 20, 2015 meeting, Faculty Senate:

- discussed and voted to pass a revision to the Midterm Evaluation policy to (a) open midterm grading to all students enrolled in 00000-, 10000- and 20000- level courses – rather than to students with freshman status only – and to (b) extend the midterm grading period to start in the fourth and end in the seventh week for full-semester courses (midterm grades are given in the seventh week only in current policy) effective Fall 2016. This change is to ensure all at-risk students in lower division courses receive early assessment for intervention regardless of class status.

Note: A significant amount of Senate discussion has been left out of this report due to time constraints. Anyone wishing to read the entire Senate Meeting minutes can contact Dr. Stephen Minnick (sminnick@kent.edu) and have a copy sent to them via email or hardcopy.
The Role of the Provost in Tenure and Promotion
Presentation to Faculty Senate, April 13, 2015

Today I wish to speak to the Faculty Senate about my role in, and my approach to, tenure and promotion decisions. These remarks build upon a presentation I made on this subject nearly three years ago in a faculty senate fall retreat, at which Dean Dan Mahoney and I provided the administration's perspective. Thank you for allowing me to speak further on this topic, as it is one of the most, if not the most important activity I, and we, engage in at Kent State University. Our decisions in such matters literally shape the university for a generation or more.

I will begin with a couple of general observations. At Kent State University, and indeed at nearly every institution of higher education with which I am familiar, tenure and promotion votes are advisory to the provost and to the president. I suspect there are precious few trustees at this and at other universities that would consider a different approach. Secondly, and more importantly, in the vast majority of tenure and promotion cases the role of the provost, and by extension the president, is a non-issue. At Kent State more than 85% of the candidates achieve tenure. Let me repeat this statistic: at Kent State University more than 85% of the candidates are awarded tenure. And far from indicating a lack of selectivity or rigor, this number instead reflects the quality and accomplishments of our outstanding faculty, a point I will return to later in this address.

My approach to tenure and promotion cases is as follows. I read every tenure and promotion file carefully. I read every ballot narrative at every voting level. I read the summaries written by departmental chairs and school directors, and the deans' summaries. I consider carefully the opinions of the external reviewers, and before I read them I read the vitas of these reviewers. I examine very carefully the curriculum vitae of the candidate, as well as the student surveys of instruction. I peruse candidate publications, and in part I do this because I want to familiarize myself with the exceptional work produced by Kent State professors. Along these lines please note that this is absolutely the best part of my job as provost--learning about the amazing creative work, research and publications of our professors. I always conclude the tenure and promotion season even more energized and more excited about our institution and its, that is to say YOUR, excellence.

Most importantly in this process I read very, very carefully the written tenure and promotion guidelines of each academic unit. Indeed, this is the first thing I read in each case. I read these guidelines usually two or three times, take notes on them, and usually I sketch out a summary of the requirements BEFORE I begin reading the rest of the file. This means that my participation in tenure and promotion is grounded in, and is driven by, one thing, primarily: the academic unit's written guidelines. I also pay particular attention to determining if what is presented as evidence of meeting requirements actually does so. For example, if peer-reviewed publications are required for tenure, are the publications that are submitted as evidence of meeting that standard indeed peer-reviewed? You might be surprised, by the way, at how difficult it can be at times to make this determination--and how reasonable people can and do disagree on whether or not a publication is peer reviewed.
Negative decisions that are appealed generate another level of review, and even more important information to digest. I attend all candidate appeal hearings made to the Provost's Appeal Board (PAB). These presentations last for an hour or longer, and often are followed by extensive conversation between PAB members and myself. Each appeal generates a dozen PAB votes, and I read very carefully the ballot narratives at this level. All of the above information, which regularly amounts to hundreds of pages in each case, informs my decisions.

Please allow me to conclude today with four observations. First, when I overturn a decision, I do so driven entirely by the written guidelines of the academic unit. Since my arrival at Kent State I have overturned two negative tenure decisions, and one unanimously positive decision. In all cases I was driven to do so by a defense of the academic unit's own guidelines, which I felt in each case were ignored in the voting. My primary commitment, in short, is to defending the tenure and promotion guidelines of the academic unit, which are composed by the professors of that unit.

Secondly, tenure decisions are judgements. As such they involve complicated levels of evidence and argumentation, and when we enter into such realms we enter into a world in which intelligent, well trained and hard working individuals will come to different conclusions. I always respect the opinions of others even when I do not agree with them, and it has been my experience at Kent State that the reverse is also true.

Thirdly, Kent State faculty experiencing negative tenure decisions enjoy one more level of appeal than I have experienced elsewhere: the Joint Appeal Board (JAB). This extra level of commitment to faculty governance speaks well of the faculty, and of the institution, and I am glad we have this as part of our procedures. In these cases the faculty members making the appeal have the opportunity to make a presentation to the four JAB members (all tenured faculty, two of whom currently are serving as administrators). In addition, faculty advocates also make presentations in support of the faculty member. Then I as provost, and Sue Averill as the associate provost make our presentations, and JAB members subsequently ask their questions. The faculty member is represented at these hearings by the AAUP. The JAB members vote on the case and then send their recommendation to the president.

Fourth, please bear in mind the figure I presented at the beginning of my presentation: 85% of all candidates earn tenure at Kent State. While of vital importance, the procedures outlined above rarely come into play in tenure and promotion cases.

Finally, it is impossible for me to stress sufficiently my appreciation for the work done by the members of the Provost’s Appeal Board, and by the members of the Joint Appeal Board. These faculty members prepare diligently for these appeals. Each time it is gratifying to see just how closely the faculty members have read the materials, and I always am impressed by the level of discussion in these cases. Their due diligence informs my decisions even when, unusually, I might in the end disagree with their decisions. To me, these professors’ efforts are where the rubber really hits the road in faculty governance, and I’ll conclude today by honoring their service. Thank you.

Provost Diacon
April 13, 2015
RESOLUTION (2): REGARDING THE REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION PROCESS

1. Whereas, Kent State University recognizes that members of the faculty are uniquely qualified to participate in the governance of the University, particularly with respect to academic matters;

2. Whereas, faculty participation in University-wide academic affairs is exercised primarily through the elected Faculty Senate and the several committees, commissions, and councils established by or in accord with the Charter and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate;

3. Whereas, faculty participation in academic unit, campus, and college affairs is exercised primarily through the established Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), Faculty Council (FC), and College Advisory Committee (CAC) of each unit, campus, and college and through the several committees established by each FAC, FC, and CAC;

4. Whereas, the reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes are among the most important personnel decisions affecting tenured and tenure track faculty;

5. Whereas, policies regarding faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion have been developed by the Faculty Senate’s Professional Standards Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees;

6. Whereas, the reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies provide that criteria for assessing the quality of scholarship, teaching, and service shall be developed by the appropriate faculty body and administrator of each academic unit and regional campus and clearly specified in the handbook of each unit and campus;

7. Whereas, reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies provide for faculty input at the academic unit, campus, college, and provost levels of review;

8. Whereas, the tenure and promotion policies make clear that the essential phases in the tenure and/or promotion consideration occur at the unit level and regional campus (if applicable) and that assessments and recommendations beyond these levels should reflect due regard for the professional judgment and recommendations made at the unit and regional campus levels;

9. Whereas, of the six candidates receiving a negative tenure decision from the Provost between 2012 and 2014, three received positive recommendations from their academic units with no more than a single ‘no’ vote, including one that was unanimously positive at all levels of review prior to the Provost’s decision, and a fourth candidate received unanimous ‘yes’ votes at all levels of faculty review.

10. Whereas, a policy regarding modification of the faculty probationary period (“tolling”) has been developed by the Professional Standards Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees that acknowledges that from time to time personal and/or family circumstances arise such that an untenured faculty member may need to request that the probationary period be extended;

11. Whereas, the policy regarding modification of the faculty probationary period expressly states that a candidate who has had his or her probationary period extended by one or two years under the policy shall not be expected to meet higher or more rigorous standards than the standards applied to individuals who have followed the normal probationary period;

Approved unanimously by the Faculty Senate, 4/13/2015
12. Whereas, of the six candidates receiving a negative tenure decision from the Provost between 2012 and 2014, two had been granted a one year extension of their probationary period and both were among those receiving unanimous ‘yes’ votes at all levels of faculty review.

13. Whereas, Kent State University believes in the value of a diverse faculty and has a policy prohibiting discrimination against any employee because of age, race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, military status, or identity as a veteran with a disability or veteran of the Vietnam era;

14. Whereas, unlawful discrimination includes intentional and unintentional acts that adversely treat or impact an individual in a protected category of employment, or in academic or non-academic decision making based on the protected category;

15. Whereas, membership in a protected category may have subtle, unconscious, and/or unrecognized effects on how faculty are evaluated during the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process;

16. Whereas, conflicts of interest (real or plausibly perceived) in those evaluating a given candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion may be plausibly perceived as being incompatible with providing an objective assessment of a candidate’s record;

17. Whereas, reappointment review is a deliberate and important process during which the appropriate academic administrators communicate to both the probationary faculty and to the evaluators a clear understanding about the requirements and conditions for tenure such that at the time of tenure review all parties should be sufficiently informed of these requirements and conditions and the process occurs in an atmosphere of fairness and is based on well-documented employment practices;

18. Whereas, integrity in the RTP process is necessary to a fair and just outcome;

Be it resolved that:

A. The Faculty Senate requests that, when any administrator at any level makes a decision regarding reappointment, tenure, or promotion that is contrary to the recommendation from the faculty advisory body advising that administrator, the administrator will appear before that faculty body to explain why he or she did not accept the recommendation.

B. It is the position of the Faculty Senate that unit and, where applicable, campus level decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion in which there is clear, overwhelming sentiment on the part of the unit and campus faculty and administrator should only be overturned at higher levels of review in extraordinary circumstances and only when a higher burden of proof can be met.

C. It is the position of the Faculty Senate that, on any occasion in which the Provost makes a decision that is contrary to the unanimous recommendation from the unit, the Provost explain not only to the candidate involved but to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee the nature of the extraordinary circumstances leading to that contrary decision and the factors suggesting that the higher burden of proof has been met.

D. It is the position of the Faculty Senate that, when a candidate receives unanimous positive reappointment reviews without reservations throughout the probationary period but receives a negative decision regarding tenure, this does a disservice to our reappointment process.
E. It is the position of the Faculty Senate that reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions involving faculty who have been granted an extension of their probationary period be handled with particular care to ensure that such candidates are not being held to higher or more rigorous standards given the extra years in the probationary period.

F. The purpose of the tolling policy is to ensure that time taken off for a qualifying event is not held against the faculty member when evaluating their record for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Therefore, Faculty Senate's Professional Standards Committee shall revise the University Policy and Procedure Governing the Modification of the Faculty Probationary Period to make clear that the personal and/or family circumstances that gave rise to the need to extend the probationary period may result in gaps in productivity, and that such gaps shall not be used as the sole basis for holding that the candidate is unlikely to continue and sustain, in the long term, a program of high quality scholarship, teaching and service.

G. It is the position of the Faculty Senate that reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions involving faculty who are members of a protected class based on age, race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, military status, or identity as a veteran with a disability or veteran of the Vietnam era be handled with particular care to ensure that such candidates are not unduly impacted by their membership in the protected category.

H. The Faculty Senate charges its Professional Standards Committee with reviewing the reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies with an eye toward strengthening the language concerning when a faculty member or administrator should recuse him/herself from reviewing a particular candidate.

I. The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost charge all administrators involved in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes to re-familiarize themselves at the end of each Spring semester with the details of the reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies as they pertain to the appropriate governance level.

J. It is the position of the Faculty Senate that all faculty involved in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes re-familiarize themselves at the beginning of each Fall semester with the details of the reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies as they pertain to the appropriate governance level.

K. The Faculty Senate requests that everyone involved in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes recommit themselves to the principle of due process as provided for in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies.
Motion Regarding eSSI's

For the past two years we have conducted a large pilot study of the online Student Surveys of Instruction for in person classes. One of the findings of this pilot study is that our current survey questions no longer align with the various teaching practices utilized by the faculty. Therefore, we, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, move that:

1) The pilot program be ended following the completion of summer term courses 2015.

2) For AY 15/16, Student Surveys of Instruction be conducted in paper format for all in person classes in all colleges.

3) A representative ad hoc committee be appointed as soon as feasible to complete a comprehensive review of the current Student Survey of Instruction. This committee should examine all elements including:

   a) identifying questions appropriate for face to face and online environments,

   b) best practices for the online delivery of student surveys,

   c) best practices for the timing and delivery of student surveys, and

   d) interpretation practices that provide a better understand of the survey findings.

4) The ad hoc committee review will be presented to the Faculty Senate at the April 2016 Faculty Senate meeting, or an earlier meeting if possible. The Senate will then decide on a further plan of action.

Approved by the Faculty Senate, 4/13/2015
PROVOST PETITION: NO-CONFIDENCE

(10 May 2015)

We, the undersigned, petition KSU Faculty Senate to:

HOLD A REFERENDUM—A NO-CONFIDENCE VOTE—ON THE PROVOST, Dr. Todd Diacon. THE EVIDENCE, AND THEREFORE THE JUSTIFICATION, IS CLEAR:

- For Egregiously inconsistent, arbitrary and capricious decisions in the RTP process;
- For Violation of KSU’s Tolling Policy;
- For Disregard for the well-established Shared Governance Model;
- For Blatant disregard of the expertise, assessment and judgement of the faculty, and the role they play in the RTP process;
- For autocratic decision making that ignores the expertise, knowledge, experience, intelligence, and sound judgement of the faculty;
- For the erosion of good faith, confidence, and trust between the faculty and the Provost;
- For the loss of integrity within the RTP process, caused by his method of decision making.

The current approach and philosophy of the Provost severely compromises the RTP process, creates unnecessary doubt in the minds of the faculty—both the applicants and evaluators—and makes suspicious a fair outcome. We must, through this petition, and subsequent vote of No-Confidence, proclaim that we are fully aware of the failure of this system of RTP on our campus, and strongly reject the autocratic decision making that the Provost has injected into this process. It is unfair, counter to the core values, ethical principles, sound academic philosophy generally associated with the academy. We further make it clear, through this petition and the subsequent No-Confidence Vote, that we want the integrity, goodwill, and trust which reflect the campus character at this institution reaffirmed and continued.

Signatories

George R. Garrison, Professor, Pan African Studies Department
Linda Walker, Professor, School of Music
Carol Salus, Associate Professor, School of Art
Diane Scillia, Professor, School of Art
J. David Glass, Professor, & K.S.U. Distinguished Scholar, Department of Biological Sciences
A Bennett Whaley, Journalism and Mass Communication
Frank Lambert, Assistant Professor, Library and Information Science
Roberto M. Uribe, Professor, College of Applied Engineering Sustainability and Technology
Joel Hughes, Associate Professor, Department of Psychological Sciences
Cynthia Kristof, Associate Professor, University Libraries
Kazadi wa Mukuna, Professor, Ethnomusicology, School of Music
Sara Newman, Professor of English
Joseph Drew, Associate Professor, Political Science
Beatrice Turkoski, RN, PhD, College of Nursing
Sharon Campbell, Associate Professor, Theater and Dance
William E. Sledzik, Associate Professor, School of Journalism & Mass Communication
Sevim McCutcheon, Associate Professor, Kent State University Libraries
Wesley Raabe, Associate Professor, Department of English
Susanna Fein, Professor, Department of English
Srinivasan Vijayaraghavan, Professor, Biology
Jennifer Larson, Professor of Classics, Modern and Classical Language Studies
Michael Lynch, Associate Professor of English, Trumbull campus
Yoshinobu Hakutani, Professor, English Department
Brian Huot, Professor of English
Pamela R. Mitchell, Associate Professor, Speech Pathology and Audiology
Lew Fried, Emeritus Professor of English
Satyendra Kumar, Professor, Physics
D. Mark Manley, Professor, Department of Physics
Karl Idsvoog, Associate Professor, Journalism and Mass Communication
Andrea Shearer, Dance Program Director, Associate Professor-School of Theatre and Dance
Barbara A. Verlezza, Associate Professor, Dance Division, School of Theatre & Dance
Christopher Williams, Former Dean, Pan African Studies Department
Joe Altobelli, Kent State University at Trumbull
Noelle Bowles, Associate Professor of English, KSU-Trumbull
Joan Meggitt, Assistant Professor, School of Theatre and Dance
Deborah C. Smith, Associate Professor of Philosophy
Navjotika Kumar, Assistant Professor, Modern & Contemporary Art, School of Art
Spyridon Margitis, Professor, Physics
Ann Schierhorn, Professor, School of Journalism, and Mass Communication
Claire Culleton, Professor, English Department
Ann Abraham, Associate Professor, Chemistry, Ashtabula Campus
Mary Parr, Associate Professor, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management
Susan H. Taft, Associate Professor and Director, College of Nursing
Darice Polo, Associate Professor, Drawing and Painting, School of Art
Patti Capel Swartz, Associate Professor of English, Kent State University East Liverpool
Sharon Bell, Assistant Professor, Modern and Classical Language Studies
Barbara Drew, Associate Professor, College of Nursing
Derek Damron, Professor, Biological Sciences
Robert Twieg, Professor, Chemistry & BioChemistry
Josna Neuman, Kent State University at Trumbull
Edgar Kooijman, Associate Professor, Biological Sciences
Brett Elliman, Associate Professor, Physics
Lawrence Del Pizzo, Assistant Professor, Mathematics, Trumbull
Kara Robinson, Associate Professor, University Libraries
Cynthia Roller, Associate Professor, College of Nursing
Aroon Manoharan, Assistant Professor, Political Science
Angela Neal, Professor, Psychological Sciences
Martin Ball, Associate Professor, School of Art
Susan Iverson, Associate Professor, College of Education, Health and Human Services
Note: Due to the legitimate fear of retaliation in the future RTP process, the following faculty votes are submitted with the promise of anonymity (Proof is available to the Faculty Senate, upon request):
This roadmap is a recommended semester-by-semester plan of study for this major. However, courses and milestones designed as critical (!) must be completed in the semester listed to ensure a timely graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester One [17 Credits]</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Course Subject and Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Min. Grade</th>
<th>Major GPA</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! CADT 22005 Multimedia and Game Design remove sem 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>content to be combined w CADT 22000 Engineering Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! IERT 12005 Applications in Computer-Aided Design remove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! MERT 12000 Engineering Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EERT 21010 Engineering and Professional Ethics (3) remove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming elective remove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 10097 Destination Kent State: First Year Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Two [17 Credits]</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Course Subject and Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Min. Grade</th>
<th>Major GPA</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! CADT 22000 Advanced CAD major elect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ART 10023 3D Composition (3) or CADT 22002 CAD: Civil Applications (2) remove</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! Major elective *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERT 11000 Introduction to Business (3) or BUS 10123 Exploring Business (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADT 22007 3-D Modeling Project move sem 3 - CADT 12001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>revise combine CADT 22008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 20002 Introduction to Technical Writing (3) or ENG 20021 or ITAP 26638 Business Communications (3) remove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>move sem 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Three [18 Credits]</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Course Subject and Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Min. Grade</th>
<th>Major GPA</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! CADT 22001 CAD: Architecture major elect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! ARTF 14000 Drawing I (3) or EERT 22014 Microprocessors and Robotics (3) remove or TECH 33010 Computer Hardware (3) remove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADT 22008 Project in Texture and Material Creation remove</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 15000 Introduction to Human Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 10022 2D Composition (3) or ERT 22006 Economic Decision Analysis (3) or TECH 33095 Special Topics: Applied Science and Technology (3) remove all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 11010 Algebra for Calculus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KMC move sem 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Four [18 Credits]</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Course Subject and Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Min. Grade</th>
<th>Major GPA</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>! CADT 22003 Solid Modeling (3) or TECH 34002 Advanced CAD II (3) major elect</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! CADT 22004 Computer Animation and Gaming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! CADT 22095 Special Topics in Computer Animation and Game Design Technology * (3) move sem 2 and sem 4 or COMT 20011 Java Programming (3) or COMT 20095 Special Topics in Computer Technology * (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTF 1400T Drawing II (3) major elect or CADT 22009 Applied Engineering Software (3) or COMT 21010 Workgroup Productivity Software (3) remove or TECH 22100 Training Topics in Technology (3) remove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADT 21092 Animation and Game Design Practicum (1 - 3) major elect or COMT 21092 Computer Practicum (2) remove or ERT 22016 Productivity Software for Industry (1) remove</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Core ARCH, ARTH, MUS or THEA course remove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kent Core Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation Requirements Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Total Hours</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major GPA</td>
<td>Overall GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Programming elective (3 credit hours) remove programming electives

Choose from the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMT 11002 Visual Basic Programming (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 10061 Introduction to Computer Programming (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSCI 15310 Computational Thinking and Programming (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. US 10097 is not required of transfer students with 25 credits (excluding College Credit Plus and dual-enrollment) or students age 21+ at time of admission.

3. Major electives (3 credit hours) Revise all - see attachment

Choose from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CADT 22095</td>
<td>Special Topics in Computer Animation and Game Design Technology *</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERT 12001</td>
<td>Computer-Aided Drafting</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 22095</td>
<td>Special Topics in Technology</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EERT 22095</td>
<td>Special Topics in Electrical/Electronic and Related Engineering Technologies *</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 23581</td>
<td>Computer-Aided Engineering Graphics</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 33095</td>
<td>Special Topics: Applied Science and Technology *</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See program advisor for appropriate topics.

4. See program advisor for appropriate topics.

PHY 11030 Seven Ideas that Shook the Universe is recommended to meet Kent Core Basic Sciences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester One</th>
<th>Course Subject and Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CADT 12000 2D Graphics &amp; Animation Technology (new course)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERT 12000 Engineering Drawing or TECH 13580 Engineering Graphics I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMRT 11000 Introduction to Business or BUS 10123 Exploring Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 10097 Destination Kent State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARTF 14000 Drawing I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Two</th>
<th>Course Subject and Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>MERT 12001 Computer Aided Design or CADT 22003 Solid Modeling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CADT 22095 Special Topics in Computer Animation &amp; Game Design or TECH 26310 Web Design &amp; Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MATH 11010 Algebra for Calculus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Major Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Three</th>
<th>Course Subject and Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CADT 12001 3D Modeling &amp; Texturing (revise 22007) (pr CADT 12000)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 15000 Introduction to Human Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMT 20001 C++ or COMT 20011 Java Programming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 20002 Intoduction to Technical Writing or ENG 20021 Introduction to Creative Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Major Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Four</th>
<th>Course Subject and Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CADT 22095 Special Topics in Computer Animation &amp; Game Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CADT 22004 Computer Animation and Gaming (PR CADT 12001)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CADT 22009 Applied Engineering Software</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>CADT 22005 Multimedia &amp; Game Design (PR CADT 12000 &amp; COMT 20001 or COMT 20011)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total credit hours 64

** Major electives (choose 9 hours):

- ARTF 14001 Drawing II 3
*CADT 22000  CAD Applications (change title)  3

CADT 21092 Animation and Game Design Practicum  1-3

*CADT 22001  CAD: Architecture  3
*TECH 34002 Advanced CAD II  3

***
*CADT 22003 Solid Modeling or  3

***
* MERT 12001 Computer Aided Design
COMT 36302 C Sharp Programming  3
EERT 22018 PC/Network Engineering  3

*note - students choosing 9 hours of CAD courses will receive the CAD for Mfg certificate

*** note - students may choose one as major required and one as major elective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title change in MERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise CADT 22007 to combine content of CADT 22007 &amp; CADT 22008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change hours - change pr - update course content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>