



FACULTY SENATE

Meeting Minutes

October 13, 2025

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Loretta Aller, Bob Antenucci, Omid Bagheri, Tina Bhargava, Casey Boyd-Swan, Matt Butler, Jennifer Cunningham, Mark Dalman, Ed Dauterich, Omar De La Cruz Cabrera, David Dees, Vanessa Earp, Julie Evey, Michele Ewing, Michael Fisch, Michelle Foster, Tianyuan Guan, David Kaplan, Sean Kennedy, Terri Kent, Janice Kroeger, Velvet Landingham, Richard Mangrum, Mahli Mechenbier, Taraneh Meshkani, Oana Mocioalca, Ashley Nickels, Vic Perera, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Helen Piontkivska, Lockwood Reynolds, Lydia Rose, Susan Roxburgh, Athena Salaba, Jim Seelye, Deborah Smith, Gregory Smith, Eric Taylor, Brett Tippey, Francisco Torres, Ikram Toumi, Lauren Vachon, Laurie Wagner, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Christopher Was

Senators Not Present: Kyle Winkler

Ex-Officio Members Present: President Todd Diacon; Kevin West for Executive Vice President and Provost Melody Tankersley; Senior Vice President Eboni Pringle; Senior Vice President Jeannie Reifsnyder*; Vice Presidents: Sean Broghammer, Doug Delahanty, Amoaba Gooden, Doug Kubinski, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Randale Richmond, Peggy Shadduck, Valoree Vargo, Stephen Ward; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, Christina Bloebaum, Allan Boike, Ken Burhanna, Alicia Crowe*, Mark Mistur, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Diane Petrella, Elizabeth Piatt*, Amy Reynolds, Scott Sheridan*, Alison Smith, Deborah Spake

*Interim

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Dean Versie Johnson-Mallard

Observers Present: Emeritus Professor Janson, Ms. Shiza Nisar (GSS)

Observers Not Present: Ms. Hanna Sietz (USG)

Guests Present: Jake Ball, Micheal Beam, Autum Boone, J.R. Campbell, Sue Clement, Frank Congin, Lauren Copeland, Andrew Cranford, Paul Creed, Chris Dorsten, Shannon Driscoll, Aimee Dudas, Jay

Frye, Nick Gatozzi, James Hannon, Tony Hardin, Torsten Hegmann, Ben Hollis, Eric Johnson, Lynette Johnson, Michael Kavulic, Jennifer Kellogg, Dana Lawless-Andric, Joanna Liedel, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Julie Mazzei, Jennifer McDonough, Emily Metzgar, Amy Nuesch, Brady Oxender, Susan Perry, Amy Quillen, James Raber, Kara Robinson, Susan Rossi, Sarah Smiley, Rob Sturr, Adil Wadia, Zhiqiang Wang, Deirdre Warren, Kevin West, Nicole Willey, Sonya Williams, Sharon Wohl

1. Call to Order

Chair Kaplan called the meeting to order at 3:21 p.m. in the Governance Chambers, Kent Student Center.

2. Roll Call

Secretary Dauterich called the roll.

3. Approval of the Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda (Fisch/Tippey). The agenda passed unanimously.

4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of September 8, 2025

Chair Kaplan asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Torres/Cunningham).

The minutes were approved with one content correction.

5. Chair's Remarks

Chair Kaplan delivered his remarks. He spoke about SB 1 and the different aspects of academic life that it covers. He mentioned that it comes with a threat of financial loss over non-compliance and that it threatens sanctions for individual faculty, which could lead to dismissal. He said he read the law, and some of it makes sense. He said he likes the civics class and wishes some of the legislators had taken one. He dislikes what the bill does and how it makes us feel. It provokes anxiety and fear, and it puts us in danger of hindering our fundamental mission as teachers and faculty. He added that we are here to help students realize their dreams, and he offered several examples of the importance of students realizing their own efficacy because of higher education.

So far, he has been happy with the response of the administration to the law. They are allowing professors to teach and inspire. He said that no one can do their job if they are tied too tightly to a script, and they need to be able to speak out about issues of their expertise that are relevant to classes they are teaching. He stated that he has looked through SB 1 and believes that it provides universities with ways to deal with the regulations in their own way if they comply with the law. He said that we need to maintain flexibility while complying with the law. He finished by saying that Kent State needs to develop policies that reflect what works at our university.

There were no comments or questions.

6. President's Remarks

President Diacon delivered his remarks. He said he had intended to speak about budget reductions in units outside of academic affairs, but he decided to hold off for a later meeting because of a question from a faculty member at the last meeting: "What are you going to do to protect us?" He said that even the perceived need to ask the question shows the societal and legal changes that have taken place and the anxiety caused by the changes. President Diacon argued that the question implied that administrators can protect faculty in a deep and meaningful way, but he warned that this depends on what "protect" means; he gave the American Heritage Dictionary's definition of the word ("to keep from harm, attack, or injury" with a synonym being "to shield").

He then said that faculty should contact the Kent State police if they feel physically threatened. He followed this by reading the 1940 AAUP statement on academic freedom, which reads as follows:

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

President Diacon continued by saying that teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom. He told a story about speaking out against Iraq when he was in the classroom and said it was inappropriate in hindsight. He also reiterated that the AAUP mentions faculty as citizens and explains how they could be judged as such. He added that faculty should only use their Kent email for university business and interactions. He then talked about qualified immunity in the state of Ohio and what it means; employees are immune from personal liability unless they are operating out of their scope of employment. He then added information from section 9.86 of the Ohio Revised Code from March 13, 1980 (Immunity of public officers and employees) which states, "Except for civil actions that arise out of the operation of a motor vehicle and civil actions in which the state is the plaintiff, no officer or employee shall be liable in any civil action that arises under the law of this state for damage or injury caused in the performance of his duties, unless the officer's or employee's actions were manifestly outside the scope of his employment or official

responsibilities, or unless the officer or employee acted with malicious purpose, in bad faith, or in a wanton or reckless manner.” President Diacon said that no one at Kent determines qualified immunity; the Attorney General of the state gets to determine who has it. He finished by responding to the senator’s question: follow AAUP and use the Kent email for nothing but official business. Shielding yourself is the first step toward protection. He also said he is not giving legal advice, and he does appreciate the feelings at the moment. He praised faculty for improving lives and teaching for being a noble profession.

He then invited comments or questions.

Chair Kaplan said that he is guilty of using email for non-business reasons, and many people may take a while to extract themselves from this use. It will be hard for older faculty.

President Diacon repeated that faculty need to get their own personal email accounts.

There were no further comments or questions.

7. **Action Items from the Professional Standards Committee (presented by Senator Casey Boyd-Swan):**

a. Faculty Annual Performance Review Policy ([View](#))

Senator Boyd-Swan first gave an overview of the goals of the PSC and the policy language they constructed. She said that much of the language was already in place and agreed on by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). She said the policy is not perfect and could be amended in the future, but this is a unique moment when SB 1 requires the policies to be on the books by the end of the year. She said the PSC saw the proposed policy as our chance to have a voice and recommended that changes could easily be advised on and considered in the future. She said to work for substantive changes now might not be the best way forward, and she referred to Winston Churchill’s idea that “Perfection is the enemy of progress.”

She then explained the policy.

A motion was made to approve the policy (Fisch).

Chair Kaplan then invited comments or questions.

Senator Bhargava asked for a clarification of the motion.

Chair Kaplan said the motion was to approve the policy under question.

Senator Bhargava asked for clarification in section C and asked whether the list in that section was exhaustive or not.

Senator Boyd-Swan said she did not believe the list was exhaustive.

Senator Deborah Smith said that the law requires that anyone who gets 1.5 credits of workload or more needs to be evaluated. She said there were things added to the language and that more clarification could be added in the future.

Senator Bhargava suggested that adding “such as” wording would help.

Senator Walton-Fisette said adding “such as” wording could create confusion and asked whether most faculty would be assessed on service if they did not receive workload for it.

Senator Boyd-Swan replied that they would not be evaluated for it if they were not getting 1.5 hours of credit.

Senator Salaba said that the unit handbook was not mentioned, so she wondered how the assessment is done and how the measurable metrics mentioned in the policy would apply to all units.

Senator Boyd-Swan said universal metrics would be impossible, so metrics would be developed at the unit level in consultation with the Faculty Senate. Units would need to define the metrics, and then, the metrics would move to Faculty Senate.

Senator Deborah Smith said that most of the wording comes from the state law itself.

Senator Fisch said he was concerned about using the same methods on the regional and Kent campus for individual units, but he understood the law dictated the wording.

Chair Kaplan said that the unit handbooks should have explanations of the expectations of Kent Campus faculty vs. faculty on regional campuses.

Senator Deborah Smith said that this will probably be a simple “meets or doesn’t meet expectations” type of review rather than a substantive in-depth review. The review may be fairly thin.

Senator Tippey asked whether there was a timeline for when these policies and their metrics would have to be in place. He said he assumes they should be in place before a review happens.

Senator Boyd-Swan said units should do it as soon as possible.

Dean Mistur suggested that given the gravity of the situation and the different categories being reviewed, waiting to create the categories and how they are evaluated is important.

Senator Bhargava asked whether the language will be adjusted to reflect the expected changes about the list being exhaustive. She suggested adding “and other categories as appropriate” as a friendly amendment after the list.

Senator Vachon said that the list looks much more substantial than Senator Deborah Smith suggested, and she wondered whether there was any thought about ways to streamline the

submission process. She said this was similar to the three-year NTT review and wondered whether the process could be made more efficient.

Senator Deborah Smith said the PSC was attempting to write a policy where NTTs did not have to submit anything more than they already must.

Senator Mangrum said that if SSIs are required, the university already has them, and he suggested the university supply those for faculty being reviewed.

Senator Boyd-Swan said the unit chair would need to provide the SSIs.

Senator Vachon said the policy is unclear about who has to submit what.

Senator Boyd-Swan replied that a CV and a narrative would be supplied by the faculty member; the rest should come from the chair.

Senator Piccirillo-Smith said NTE faculty tend to have a heavier teaching load, and they may be teaching a variety of different courses. She said that we need to be aware that preparation of materials takes more time for NTEs than for TTs.

The friendly amendment was accepted by all parties.

There were no further comments or questions.

The motion passed unanimously as amended.

b. Post-Tenure Review Policy ([View](#))

Senator Boyd-Swan explained the policy.

A motion was made to approve the policy (Earp).

Senator Deborah Smith said most of the language in the proposed policy was borrowed from the Faculty Senate Ethics Committee, and there is room for changes down the road.

Chair Kaplan then invited comments or questions.

Senator Fisch asked what policy “XXXXX” was in section B.

Senator Deborah Smith said it was a placeholder for whatever that policy will be when it is created.

Senator Earp asked for clarification that faculty would not go through a post-tenure review unless they received two negative annual performance reviews in a three-year period.

Senator Boyd-Swan agreed that this was correct.

Senator Deborah Smith added that the law also allows the administration to call for a post-tenure review.

Chair Kaplan said he assumed that if someone was receiving workload release for other duties (e.g., graduate coordinator) and did not fulfill their duties well, they should probably not continue with that duty, and the chair could make that decision. He suggested the law had to do more with teaching performance.

There were no further comments or questions.

The motion passed unanimously as written.

c. Retrenchment Policy ([View](#))

Senator Boyd-Swan explained the policy. She said it was lifted almost verbatim from the CBA with modifications to match SB 1.

A motion was made to approve the policy (Fisch).

Chair Kaplan then invited comments or questions.

Senator Rose asked about the regional campuses being designated as one academic unit in the policy in section A.

Senator Deborah Smith said this is the language that has been in the current procedure since 1978, and she said that the language makes it more difficult for the university to invoke retrenchment.

Senator Landingham asked what would happen if we redlined the whole section mentioning that the regional campuses be designated as one academic unit. She asked whether the retrenchment statement would then apply to everyone at Kent State.

Senator Deborah Smith said that it would not apply to everyone at Kent State because they could do retrenchment at the level of an academic unit or individual program.

Senator Landingham said that Senator Smith had not understood her question, and she asked whether redlining the passage she had mentioned would mean retrenchment policy would apply equally to all campuses at Kent State.

Senator Deborah Smith replied that the administration gets to invoke retrenchment based on the university's needs. They could retrench the Philosophy Department without retrenching the entire College of Arts and Sciences. She said the language in the proposed policy protects regional campus faculty.

Senator Rose said she did not read the policy as having that protection. She did not want this to lead to the dissolution of campuses and their replacement with some kind of learning centers.

Senator Boyd-Swan replied that the administration could do that even if the line was not in the policy. The language puts up a barrier unless all regional campuses were retrenched.

Senator Deborah Smith said there is a distinction between closing a campus and retrenchment. Administration could invoke retrenchment and get rid of all the faculty on the campuses without closing the campuses. They could also close a campus without invoking retrenchment by moving the TT faculty elsewhere. She stressed that these are separate issues, but they could happen together. She said that the policy being proposed was just addressing the laying off of TT faculty.

Senator Bhargava said that SB 1 asks for retrenchment for the university (not for TT faculty), and that the proposed policy is not reflective of the wording of the bill.

Senator Deborah Smith said that traditionally at Kent State University, retrenchment was defined as the release of TT faculty; she added that in the law, they link it in some ways to tenure, but she agreed that the law's language does not actually specify NTT faculty. She suggested that this could undercut NTT faculty in a way she had not previously considered.

Senator Mangrum said that under B2 in the proposed policy, if the university determines that a reduction in the TT faculty is necessary it shall first attempt to achieve the desire by attrition and early retirement and then a release of NTT faculty. He asked whether, given that the language was from the CBA and retrenchment no longer has CBA implications, section B2 should remain in the proposed policy, and he offered a friendly amendment that paragraph B2 be redlined.

Senator Deborah Smith said the purpose was to acknowledge that there are academic areas without tenure-eligible faculty because it is not a common culture in their setting (e.g., the College of Podiatric Medicine), but in academic units with tenure, the question could be whether or not all full-time faculty should be eligible for tenure; she said that the answer is likely to be that the university needs to be able to grow and shrink without laying off tenure-track faculty. She suggested that this is part of the reason that FTNTT faculty exist in those units. She said that the language in the proposed policy is something they could rethink, but that would mean the decision would be left to the administration with no recommendation from Faculty Senate.

Senator Mangrum said there are units with plenty of NTTs, and their role has evolved significantly over the last 30 years. Given that NTTs have substantial numbers in strong and growing departments, he suggested that losing a tenure-track faculty member in some areas may not be as detrimental as it would have been when the CBA language was written. He once again offered his friendly amendment.

Chair Kaplan asked whether the authors of the policy accepted the friendly amendment from Senator Mangrum.

Senator Deborah Smith said that they did not because the change was too substantive to be covered with a friendly amendment.

Senator Walton-Fisette asked whether the law applied differently to NTTs with regard to any “reduction in force” language in their contract.

It was confirmed that the language in the law applies equally to everyone.

Senator Tippey said that the draft only addresses the tenure-track, and we cannot vote on it if it only represents that group. He suggested it go back to the PSC.

Senator Mangrum added that since the law does not make the distinction between TT and NTT faculty, the provisions in the contracts do not apply.

Senator Deborah Smith said that if it passed, the proposed policy would supersede the CBAs, but the language in the CBAs would apply until we have an approved policy.

Senator Bhargava said that the draft does not consider what SB 1 requires and suggested the motion be tabled.

Senator Torres said he was conflicted about equity and equality aspects of the proposed policy, and even though he is tenured, he asked what tenure entailed philosophically. He explained he thought tenure gave TTs the ability to push without too much fear of being fired; he also wants us to understand that if retrenchment is left in broad terms, it would be in the best choice of the university to release tenured faculty because they make the most money. If money was the issue, this could be an incentive. He said he did not have a solution, but he wants people to consider it.

Chair Kaplan said that there was still an opportunity to send the policy back and have another meeting before the deadline and suggested that some NTTs could be added to the PSC.

Senator Smith replied that there are already NTTs on the PSC.

A motion was made and seconded to table the motion (Bhargava/Rose).

Senator Mangrum said that his friendly amendment needed to be accepted or rejected but was fine with tabling.

Senator Smith said that a motion to table supersedes the motion to amend.

Senator Roxburgh asked whether there were further concerns.

Senator Landingham said she was concerned we would end up with the same language next time and wanted a more open forum to discuss the policy revisions.

Senator Dees replied that there is going to be a Faculty Senate Retreat on October 31st, and he proposed that it could be discussed further there.

Senator Rose said that the president began the meeting by talking about shields and protections and that we need to ground policies in our visions, missions, and value statements. She added that she would like to see some element of what is important to us

added to the policy. She felt the statement in parentheses was an attack on the regional campuses.

Senator Fisch said he wanted to know whether the November 10th deadline gave the administration enough time to get the policy through the Board of Trustees.

President Diacon agreed it could make it to the Board of Trustees in time.

Associate Provost West verified that there was enough time.

Senator Dalman asked whether the College of Podiatric Medicine could send a representative to the PSC.

Senator Deborah Smith replied that for the Faculty Senate, the categories are TT and NTE, so there is currently no university policy for retrenchment for the College of Podiatric Medicine. She said the PSC would like to see their handbook to see how their retrenchment policy is worded.

Senator Bhargava invited Senator Dalman to join the online NTT conversation that has been taking place about the policies proposed by the PSC.

There were no further comments or questions.

Chair Kaplan called the vote.

The motion to table passed unanimously.

d. Workload Policy ([View Redlined](#))

Senator Boyd-Swan explained the policy.

A motion was made to approve the policy (Dees).

Chair Kaplan then invited comments or questions.

Senator Mechenbier said she wanted to discuss sections B2 and E. In B2, the language states that in those few cases, when such service is very heavy, the college Dean and Provost may allow the service to receive appropriate teaching and load equivalency. She added that in E, it points out that credit can also be given for special service and advising activities “above the level expected of all tenured and tenure-track faculty.” She asked how the NTTs fit into either section if they are not acknowledged in the policy. She recognized that there are no service expectations for NTT faculty, but she suggested that many NTTs do perform service and if they are not given credit for it, the whole system could crash.

Senator Dauterich suggested two friendly amendments: (1) that the policy be changed to state specifically that there are no service requirements for NTT faculty (since the service requirements for TT faculty are clearly stated in the proposed policy) and (2) that the line “above the level expected of all tenured and tenure-track faculty” be redlined.

Senator Deborah Smith agreed that NTTs are not required to have workload devoted to service.

Senator Bhargava agreed with Senator Dauterich that taking out the tenured and tenure-track reference would fix the problem.

Senator Dauterich restated his friendly amendments.

Senator Deborah Smith explained why the second friendly amendment would not work; she said that TTs currently do not get workload credit for service, and changing it as proposed by the second friendly amendment would mean that NTTs would have to get workload credit for service that TTs do not get credit for. She said that if this were the case, NTTs would not be assigned workload credit or even allowed by the administration to do it.

Senator Tippet reminded the audience of the first friendly amendment.

Senator Dauterich’s first friendly amendment was acceptable to the PSC.

Senator Wagner explained that it was not that there was a desire to remove service expectations; rather, it was about workload. She said that in the paragraph where TT expectations are mentioned, the lines are aimed at TT faculty who would not show up for service unless it was on their workload. She added that workload credit inspires NTTs to do service, but the TTs already have it as an expectation that some struggle to meet. She said that this helps explain the “above and beyond language” in the proposed policy. The process of receiving acknowledgment for service works differently for TTs than it does for NTTs because of the different requirements.

Senator Bhargava recognized that there could be issues with putting in the first friendly amendment because of contractual conflicts, but she saw less problem with the second one.

Senator Boyd-Swan said it would be discouraging to allow NTTs to perform service if the second amendment was included.

Senator Bhargava suggested that the interpretation of the policy and how it is practiced is too vague.

Senator Deborah Smith said that the Faculty Senate cannot approve a policy that contravenes the NTT contract, so placing the language into the policy would be moot if the NTT contract is in effect.

Senator Vachon expressed frustration about NTTs and TTs having different workload expectations and added that SB 1 should have allowed us to revisit these policies, but we are not doing it well.

Senator Fisch said his dean reminds everyone that just because TTs are not scheduled 15 credit hours per semester does not mean they only have to work for 12. There is an expectation of three hours of service, but it is not as cut and dried as it sounds.

Chair Kaplan said that we need to pass this by the November deadline at the latest and said that although he would prefer a friendly amendment, the motion could also be tabled.

Senator Boyd-Swan said that she worried that adding the first friendly amendment could be made moot if the CBA for NTTs changed.

Senator Deborah Smith said the policy would not have to change, but CBA language would prevail. She added that she thought it would be best for all involved if the policy stayed silent on the matter.

Senator Tippey said that we have a history of units denying workload for service to NTTs and suggested that he would not want the friendly amendment.

Senator Deborah Smith suggested that instead of saying that there is no expectation for NTTs to do service, the policy could be changed to clearly state that where there is workload equivalency connected to service (i.e., both TT and NTT faculty get it). This could be built into the policy with a friendly amendment.

Senator Bhargava wanted to know whether that further complicates things and asked Senator Dauterich about his thoughts on it.

Senator Dauterich dropped the friendly amendments.

Chair Kaplan suggested that the amendment be tabled and asked for a motion and a second to do so.

Senator Walton-Fisette recommended cleaning up the language since we are changing the policy to workload. She said we could fix all the places where it says, "teaching workload equivalency" and/or "teaching load equivalency" and replace them with "workload" and then have the language make it clear that teaching workload is teaching.

Chair Kaplan added that once we pass this policy, it is difficult to make changes. He then asked again whether there was a motion to table the policy.

There was a motion and a second to table the policy until the next meeting (Dauterich/Fisch).

Senator Tippey wondered whether we need to acknowledge that NTTs' workloads are related to the track on which they are assigned.

Senator Deborah Smith said that this could be built into the policy, but she pointed out that some NTTs are appointed on the research track.

Senator Wagner asked for clarification of the meaning of the phrase “traditional classes” in the policy.

Senator Deborah Smith replied that the phrase meant a lecture or lab as opposed to a dissertation or individual investigation.

Senator Dees said that we need to avoid hurried, bad decisions. He said the PSC could resolve some of this through email, so we have a policy by the end of the next Faculty Senate meeting.

There were no further comments or questions.

The motion to table passed unanimously.

8. Action Item from the SSI Review Committee (presented by Senator Tina Bhargava)

Senator Bhargava explained the recommendation of the committee to not exclusively remove senior guests from the SSI ([View](#)).

A motion was made to include senior guests in SSIs (Dauterich).

Chair Kaplan then invited comments or questions.

Senator Deborah Smith mentioned that senior guests are not taking classes for credit unlike other registered students. She added that professors can turn down senior guests, which is another significant difference. She said that the possibility of weaponization of SSIs may encourage people not to admit senior guests.

Senator Tippey agreed with Senator Smith, and he said that although most senior guests were excellent participants, there could be some courses that are politically targeted. He said he would vote against the senior guests being given course evaluations.

Senator Seelye said he agreed with Senators Smith and Tippey. He said he has turned down possibly combative students in the past.

Senator Bhargava said the committee discussed those concerns. She added that the committee tried to determine what the characteristics are that should keep people from getting SSIs; excluding one group without those criteria does not work.

Senator Tippey said it should be based on whether the student earned credit.

Senator Boyd-Swan asked whether senior guests are getting the survey and whether other auditing students received it.

Lead Applications Support Analyst Paul Creed clarified that all students who are registered in Banner currently receive a survey.

Senator Mocioalca said that although faculty children go to the university for free, it is part of the faculty benefits. They are paying in a different way.

Senator Fisch said non-traditional students bring a lot to courses. He said it is a good way for instructors to get extra insight in class. He does not believe there would be a huge problem if those students received evaluations.

Senator Piccirillo-Smith said that taking away the evaluations does not preclude people from admitting guests. She stressed that the SSIs are important to faculty evaluations. SB 1 is now requiring that 25% of the annual faculty evaluation be based in SSIs, and she said that someone auditing a course is not responsible for the work. She suggested that if they are not getting credit for the work, then their SSIs should not be counted in faculty evaluations. She believed there are enough bad actors for it to be a problem.

Senator Bhargava said the previous proposal brought forward was to remove senior guests from those who receive SSIs. She said that she could look at whether students who audit courses should receive SSIs. She gave the prison program as an example; they have no technology in the prisons to complete SSIs. She asked what the university would be willing to invest to have those voices heard. She said the committee can take a bigger look, but we should not remove senior guests.

Senator Piontkivska said that she is concerned that senior guests are both non-paying and not getting credit for the course. She said faculty could ask for their feedback personally, but they should not receive SSIs.

Senator Boyd-Swan said another point for consideration was whether or not faculty can prevent a student from auditing or not, in the same way that they can select senior guests. If a faculty member is making the choice, this could water down or overamplify a voice selected by the faculty member.

Chair Kaplan said he will be bringing in senior guest ringers to make himself look better.

Senator Wagner said faculty can consent for audits and senior guest students but not College Credit Plus students. She said that Pass/Fail students are ones we do not know about.

Chair Kaplan summarized the concerns of the audience. He then asked Lead Applications Support Analyst Creed how long it would take to make changes.

He replied that Executive Vice President and Provost Tankersley has already sent the request to remove senior guests from the group of those receiving SSIs, but he added that the request is at the bottom of the priority list, so it probably could not take place until next fall.

Chair Kaplan suggested that based on having plenty of time, he would like a straw poll.

Senator Dees asked how many senior guests were taking classes.

Associate Provost Sheridan replied that there were about 80 per semester.

Senator Dees asked how difficult it would actually be to make the changes.

Lead Applications Support Analyst Creed said that the whole current process would have to be rewritten; the changes need to meet industry standards.

Senator Dees asked whether any changes to Banner would be problematic.

Lead Applications Support Analyst Creed responded that code would have to be rewritten to handle the changes; this particular change would take time.

Chair Kaplan asked for a straw poll.

The straw poll suggested a split vote would happen.

Chair Kaplan suggested charging the committee to find criteria for which types of students should not receive SSIs.

Senator Piccirillo-Smith said it may be discipline specific; those who teach sensitive subjects could feel the negative effects of evaluations more strongly.

There was a motion and a second to table the motion (Tippey/Fisch).

Associate Professor Karen Mascolo said that she had a concern, but she is not currently a senator. She asked whether we are overreacting to senior guests being allowed. She suggested that one person would not have much impact.

Senator Boyd-Swan said she once had three senior guests in a class of twelve.

There were no further comments or questions.

The motion to table passed unanimously.

9. Old Business

Senator Piccirillo-Smith asked about the Scheduling Committee and wanted clarification of its charge.

Chair Kaplan said he is on the committee, and they are doing surveys of students, looking at space issues, and trying to deal with it in a very thorough way. He added that there is a presumption that the university needs to expand to a schedule with more Monday, Wednesday, and Friday courses, and the committee is looking at the best ways to do that. He asked Senator Was, who is also on the committee, whether this summarized the situation well.

Senator Was said that Chair Kaplan summed it up well and that the committee is looking at all aspects of making scheduling work.

10. New Business

There was no new business.

11. Additional Items

Senator Dees reminded senators to register for and attend the Fall Retreat.

12. Announcements/ Statements for the Record

Chair Kaplan invited announcements or statements for the record from the floor.

There were no further announcements.

15. Adjournment

Chair Kaplan adjourned the meeting at 5:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate