



FACULTY SENATE

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests **DATE:** March 6, 2018
FROM: Deborah C. Smith, Chair of the Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Agenda and Materials for the March 12, 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the March 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 February 12, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
5. Chair's Remarks
6. Update from the Great Place Committee (Mandy Munro-Stasiuk and Dana Lawless-Andric)
7. Election of At-Large Member of the Faculty Ethics Committee
8. EPC Items:
 - a. Action Items:
 1. Office of the Provost: Establishment of a Global Distinction Program to be administered by the University College. Effective fall 2018.
 2. University College: Revision of admission criteria for the Cooperative Education Program. Revision includes decreasing GPA, from 2.750 to 2.000; eliminating requirement that students must be in a degree program (although they must be degree seeking); and revising minimum enrollment status prior to first co-op experience, from full time to part time (6 credit hours or more). Effective fall 2018.

8. EPC Items: *(continued)*
 - b. Information Items:
 1. College of Arts and Sciences: Revision of name for the Applied Conflict Management major within the Bachelor of Arts degree in the School of Peace and Conflict Studies. Revised name is Peace and Conflict Studies. Effective fall 2018.
 2. Formation of an EPC task force to undertake a review of responsibility, authority and structure of the Educational Policies Council, as per administrative policy 3342-2-07.
9. Old Business:
 - a. Action Item: Proposed Revisions to the University Policy and Procedure Governing Modification of the Faculty Probationary Period
 - b. Discussion Item: Options for Changing the University Calendar to Accommodate the Fall Break
10. New Business
11. Announcements/Statements for the Record
12. Faculty Senate Meeting Adjournment



FACULTY SENATE

Meeting Minutes

February 12, 2018

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Patti Baller, Rachael Blasiman, Jeffrey Child, Michael Chunn, Jeffrey Ciesla, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Vanessa Earp, Christopher Fenk, Mary Lou Ferranto, Farid Fouad, Lee Fox, George Garrison, Todd Hawley, Albert Ingram, Robert Kairis, David Kaplan, Kathy Kerns, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Tracy Laux, Mahli Mechenbier, Stephen Minnick, Mary Mooney, Rocco Petrozzi, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Carol Robinson, Mary Beth Rollick, Susan Roxburgh, James Seelye, Denice Sheehan, Deborah Smith, John Stoker, Blake Stringer, Robert Twieg, Robin Vande Zande, Jennifer Walton-Fisette, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Molly Wang, Linda Williams, Kathryn Wilson

Senators Not Present: Vinay Cheruvu, Pamela Grimm, Bruce Gunning, Edgar Kooijman, Richard Mangrum, Terrence Uber

Ex-Officio Members Present: President Beverly Warren; Executive Vice President and Provost Todd Diacon; Senior Vice Presidents: Rebecca Murphy for Karen Clarke, Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Dana Lawless-Andric for Alfreda Brown, Paul DiCorleto, Shay Little, Charlene Reed, Nathan Ritchey, Coleen Santee, Jack Witt; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Blank, Allan Boike, Barbara Broome, Ken Burhanna, John Crawford-Spinelli, Alicia Crowe for James Hannon, Mark Mistur, Eboni Pringle, Robert Sines, Alison Smith, Bob Hisrich for Deborah Spake, Melody Tankersley

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Vice Presidents: Stephen Sokany, Willis Walker; Dean Amy Reynolds

Observers Present: Thomas Janson (Emeritus Professor)

Observers Not Present: Haley Foster (USS), Mark Rhodes (GSS)

Guests Present: Sue Averill, Lorraine Bears, Amanda Bevington, Larry Froehlich, Julie Gabella, Nick Gattozzi, Lynette Johnson, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Karen Keenan, Jennifer Kellogg, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Eric Mintz, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Susan Perry, Jennifer Piatt, Amy Quillin, Swathi Ravichandran, Gail Rebeta, Valerie Royzman, Therese Tillett, Roberto Uribe, Laina Yost

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:20PM in the Governance Chambers, Kent Student Center.

2. Roll Call

Senator Kerns called the roll.

3. Approval of the Agenda

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the agenda. A motion was made and seconded (Dauterich/Ciesla). No additional changes to the agenda were offered. The agenda was approved.

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

Chair Smith asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 11 Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Sheehan/Rollick). A minor correction to the minutes was offered. The minutes were approved.

5. Chair's Remarks

Chair Smith discussed concerns about a lack of shared governance in making final decisions about instituting a new Fall Break (see attached).

Senator Kerns suggested that requiring administrators to include a statement of impact on faculty in proposals for changes would be one way to ensure that faculty interests are given adequate consideration. Senator Twieg stated that the process followed by the administration that Chair Smith described reflects contempt for faculty.

6. Provost's Remarks

Provost Diacon reported that KSU has renewed their contract to participate in the COACHE survey. Participating institutions follow a plan in a 3-year cycle of administering a survey in year 1, reviewing their results in comparison to other institutions in Year 2, and developing programs to address results in year 3. All faculty were just sent a link for completing the survey. The 2015 survey identified many positive results. Areas of concern included lower satisfaction ratings from faculty of color, women, and Associate Professors. In response, the Provost's office has implemented a number of new programs: training for faculty search committees and a retreat for chairs on the topic of diversity in hiring; a series of workshops for Associate Professors; a coaching program in which over 40 faculty have participated; information to Chairs on best mentoring practices; and focus sessions for women faculty. He encouraged faculty to complete the 2018 survey.

Senator Laux noted that data were collected for NTT faculty but all the new programs targeted TT faculty. He encouraged the university to consider creating programs to address the concerns of NTT faculty. Provost Diacon agreed although he also noted that NTT faculty were the most satisfied group of faculty. Senator Williams stated faculty should receive greater recognition for their service (e.g., 25 years), more on par with how the service of staff is recognized. Provost Diacon said that has been discussed. More recognition is given to the staff because of their lower salaries and fewer opportunities for promotion. The university has done more to acknowledge faculty when they receive tenure or are promoted. Senator Roxburgh noted that the new programming targets individuals, but there may be systemic factors that need to be addressed such as expectations for women to do service. Associate Provost Munro-Stasiuk concurred and indicated that academic affairs has been working to address these issues with Chairs and Deans.

7. EPC Items

- a. Action Items:

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

Professor Froehlich explained that due to curricular changes the program no longer meets requirements for a concentration, so they are proposing to establish Computer Engineering Technology as a major. A motion was made to approve the proposal (Kracht). There was no discussion. The motion was approved.

- (2) College of Arts and Sciences: Establishment of a Neuroscience major within the Bachelor of Science degree, to be offered on the Kent Campus and administered by the Department of Biological Sciences and Department of Psychological Sciences. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 120. Effective fall 2019 pending final approval.

Associate Dean Mintz indicated that this will be an interdisciplinary major, and it is being proposed in response to student interest for the major at other universities. A motion was made to approve the proposal (Laux). There was no discussion. The motion was approved.

- (3) Regional College: Establishment of a Modeling, Animation and Game Creation major within the Bachelor of Science degree, to be offered on the Kent, Stark and Tuscarawas campuses. The program replaces the Computer Design, Animation and Game Design concentration in the Engineering Technology major. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 120. Effective fall 2018 pending final approval.

Professor Froehlich presented the proposal. This proposal involves elevating a concentration in the Engineering Technology major to create a new major titled Modeling, Animation and Game Creation. A motion was made to approve the proposal (Fouad). Senator Twieg stated a concern that the math requirement for the program (Algebra and Trigonometry) might be insufficient. Ms. Bears responded that this program focuses on game design and modeling rather than programming, and graduates work with programmers, so the math requirement is sufficient. The motion was approved.

b. Information Items:

Chair Smith noted that several information items had been previously approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and she asked whether there were comments. Senator Williams asked for clarification on the name changes, and Professor Crowe indicated the changes were made so that titles better aligned with program content. Senator Twieg asked why the Manufacturing and Engineering Technology degree is being deactivated as there seem to be jobs in this field. Professor Froehlich stated the equipment for the program has become outdated, and there is little student interest in the program.

8. Old Business:

a. Action Item: Proposed Revision to Student Survey of Instruction

Director Marcinkiewicz from the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) discussed the proposal for new items on the Student Survey of Instruction (SSI). She began by reviewing the four core items that all students will complete. The committee is recommending that: distributions of responses from these questions, as well as narrative comments, be provided to course instructors; the surveys be administered electronically during class time when possible; and additional items be limited to up to 8 from the department and up to 3 from instructors. The committee has a list of items that have already been used and validated at other institutions. The committee will not be involved in choosing the vendor who will provide the technology for administering the survey.

Senator Kaplan asked whether electronic devices would be used for administration in face-to-face classes given that instructors often have policies prohibiting the use of devices. Director Marcinkiewicz indicated that electronic administration is planned for those classes. Senator Kaplan also stated that evaluations tended to be related to instructor's grade distributions, and Director Marcinkiewicz noted that the current vendor can access that information using Banner and subdivide the results by student grade. Senator Kairis asked why response rates were lower for the electronic pilot, and Director Marcinkiewicz commented that that was primarily in classes where students had to rate multiple instructors using both the paper and electronic forms. Senator Vande Zande asked whether assistance could be offered to faculty to help them interpret the SSIs and to improve their teaching, and Director Marcinkiewicz indicated she already does individual consulting but the addition of group workshops could also be helpful. Senator Stoker asked whether the ID questions on the form are staying the same, and Director Marcinkiewicz indicated yes except that GPA information might be taken directly from Banner. Senator Stoker also expressed concern that overall rating questions can still be used by instructors or departments, and Director Marcinkiewicz agreed those work best if they follow more specific questions. Senator Mooney expressed concern that student ratings are influenced by the student's overall liking of an instructor and that students are often not in a position to judge whether the information they are learning will be valuable for their careers. Director Marcinkiewicz agreed that students are limited in what they can judge and the surveys only reflect student perceptions which may be influenced by contextual factors. Senator Child stated that it would be helpful to know whether multiple negative comments were coming from the same person or different students, and Director Marcinkiewicz was not sure whether vendors will be able to provide that information. Senator Minnick suggested that there be consideration of whether electronic surveys would be stored centrally by the institution or by individual units. Senator Williams stated that she was not too concerned about student evaluations being affected by grades given that most students believe they are going to get an A or a B. Senator Piccirillo-Smith asked about the process for departments to add questions and how it can be assured departments will choose good questions. Director Marcinkiewicz suggested that FACs could choose questions, and they could draw from the list of previously validated and recommended questions. Senator Laux expressed concern about how SSIs are used to evaluate faculty, and he asked whether administrators will be educated about how to interpret them. Director Marcinkiewicz indicated that a presentation has been made to Chairs and Directors. Senator Laux suggested training also be given to faculty, and Director Marcinkiewicz suggested that could be done when faculty are given instructions about the new SSI. Senator Dauterich asked whether departments will receive guidance on avoiding

using overall rating questions to evaluate faculty, and Director Marcinkiewicz indicated that could be added to the recommendations.

A motion was made to approve the committee recommendations (Stoker/Mooney). The motion was approved. Chair Smith stated that the next step will be for the university to identify a vendor.

b. Discussion Item: Proposed New University Policy Regarding Consensual Relationships and Other Relationship-based Conflicts of Interest

Chair Smith indicated that the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) had revised the policy in response to feedback from Faculty Senate. It will be considered for adoption at the March or April Senate meeting. Senator Roxburgh presented a summary of the changes which included adding language to the purpose to clarify that the central concern is unequal power in relationships, and adding language that makes clear that the policy is there to protect both parties. The current draft policy applies just to faculty and not all employees. Senator Roxburgh indicated that she was asked about the policy covering ex-partners and specifying a “cooling off” period, but she was not in favor of that change as the policy is intended to cover new relationships and not ones that have already been identified to exist (and thus taken into account).

Senator Kerns asked whether the language in C3 of the draft policy would prohibit a faculty member from hiring a spouse on a grant or would prohibit spousal hires. Senator Roxburgh indicated that it would prohibit the former but not the latter, and Senator Kerns suggested adding clarification about spousal hires. Senator Jansen asked about including third parties (not current students or faculty, e.g. applying students) in the policy. He also questioned the need for faculty to notify an administrator if they had a date as it seemed invasive. Senator Roxburgh responded that the policy only applies if there is a direct supervisory relationship and if there is a relationship (i.e., more than 1 or 2 dates). Senator Dauterich asked whether a faculty member could report the relationship to another administrator if they did not have a good relationship with their local administrator, and Senator Roxburgh said the committee could consider that question. Senator Fenk asked what section of the policy register this would go in, and why it would apply only to faculty. Chair Smith indicated chapter 6 (Personnel), and Senator Roxburgh stated that her committee oversees faculty standards. President Warren indicated that there is not opposition to a broader policy. Senator Kairis noted that the policy does not specify consequences for a failure to report, and Senator Roxburgh stated that the point is to make clear what is not acceptable. Senator Wilson stated that the CBA for TT and NTT faculty specify different procedures to follow when faculty violate rules, and Senator Kristoff pointed out that we have other policies that specify acceptable behavior without detailing consequences for violating the policy. Senator Garrison spoke in favor of having a policy that applies to all employees and not just faculty and suggested administrators be involved in drafting a more general policy. Senator Theresa Walton-Fisette suggested that the policy could be placed into section 6-23.

9. New Business:

a. Action Item: Proposed Revisions to the University Policy and Procedure Governing Modification of the Faculty Probationary Period

Senator Roxburgh presented the proposed changes to the policy that governs modification of the faculty probation period (tolling policy). Some of the content was reorganized to improve the flow. The policy now clarifies that a faculty member does not submit reappointment materials during his/her tolling year and that expectations for productivity are the same and not increased for those who have tolled. A motion was made to approve the changes (Kaplan/Kristof).

Senator Fenk noted that the language has changed from specifying some events that automatically qualify a person for tolling and stating that for other events a faculty member needs to make his/her case, and Senator Roxburgh agreed that is a change. Senator Vande Zande noted that the policy does not require outside reviewers to be informed that a candidate has tolled, and Senator Roxburgh agreed that doing so was a good idea. Chair Smith initially suggested that adding that could be a friendly amendment to the motion and those who moved and seconded the motion agreed to the change, but after questions about it were raised, it was decided to treat the suggested change as an amendment to the motion. Senator Garrison spoke in favor of the amendment, noting that it was important for external reviewers to know the KSU policy. He also suggested sending the policy to external reviewers so that the year of tolling would not be viewed as a time of unsustained productivity. Chair Smith suggested that the policy could be returned to the committee, so they could work on wording for the suggested changes. A motion was made to refer the item back to the committee (Fenk/Williams). The motion was passed. Dean Mistur suggested that language on how to communicate this information to letter writers could be added to the procedure guidelines sent to chairs and directors rather than the policy, and Senator Roxburgh added that that would allow the candidate to voice an opinion about how it would be handled. Senator Kerns suggested that the information about the tolling policy be in the Chair's letter rather than expecting letter writers to read the policy. Senator Garrison advocated for ensuring fairness in the RTP process by informing reviewers of the policy, and Senator Kaplan suggested the Chair could reference the policy in their letter.

b. Action Item: Options for Changing Either Summer Session or Spring Semester to Accommodate the Fall Break

Chair Smith explained that with the implementation of the Fall break, there was now a need to alter further the academic calendar. Associate Provost Tankersley presented two options that are under consideration, and she requested that Senators send her feedback on them. Chair Smith indicated the Senate would be voting, so there would be a clear recommendation from Senate. Associate Provost Tankersley stated that, with the new Fall break, classes will begin two days earlier on a Thursday. This change will make it difficult for staff to process all of the paperwork that is done between Summer session III and the Fall semester, so there will be a need to adjust the calendar in spring or summer of next year to allow more time for this. One proposal is to shorten Spring semester by 3 days, starting final exams on a Thursday, and then starting summer classes earlier. The semester length would be closer to the Fall semester. Graduation would still occur on the weekend, so students would need to stay around after the semester to participate. The second option is to shorten the summer III term by 2 days. Some courses would have to be reconfigured to fit the summer schedule.

Senator Stoker suggested the spring break could be shortened two days instead. Senator Baller suggested a need to see whether shortening the semester would impact requirements for nursing students, and Associate Provost Tankersley indicated that she had consulted with nursing. Senator Williams asked whether mandates for required contact hours would be met with these proposals, and she suggested that, if there were a reading day in Spring, then students might request that for Fall semester as well. Senator Rollick indicated that several of her colleagues were unhappy about lost class time in the Fall, and they suggested that the university eliminate intersession as a way to adjust the calendar. Senator Abraham noted that faculty at her campus were also unhappy about reduced instructional time, and she voiced concern over reducing course time in the summer session. Senator Laux recommended additional consultation with faculty who teach nursing clinicals, ESL, or work in the math emporium to check how calendar changes will affect them. Senator Kerns asked what kinds of consultation Chairs were asked to have with faculty about the academic calendar, and Associate Provost Tankersley indicated that she had discussions with Chairs and Deans, and she hoped they had discussed this with faculty.

Chair Smith asked for a motion on one of the options. A motion was made to endorse the option of reducing the summer term (Stoker/Earp). Senator Kracht spoke for eliminating the intersession, and she asked whether that was part of the motion. Senator Stoker responded that that was not one of the formal options, so his motion was for the option that reduces the summer session. Chair Smith noted that Senators who want to reduce the intersession instead could vote against the motion and propose that alternative. Senator Vande Zande expressed a preference for shortening the Spring semester. Senator Baller stated that she thought the purpose today was to gather information and she preferred not to vote on options today. Chair Smith said that was an option, but she endorsed having the Senate take a vote today as she was concerned this would be the only opportunity to weigh in on the matter and therefore it was important to make the will of the senate clear. Associate Provost Tankersley indicated that, if Senate desired more time to consider other options and seek feedback from constituents, it would be possible to bring this item back to Senate at a future meeting for a vote. Senator Mooney questioned the need to add a reading day, and Associate Provost Tankersley noted that it was to allow a break between classes and exams (Fall semester has a weekend in between). Senator Kerns endorsed shortening intersession and starting the summer sessions a week earlier. She also moved to table the item so that Associate Provost Tankersley could bring back the proposal after considering the suggestions. The motion to table was seconded (Kracht). Senator Wilson spoke in favor of allowing more time for consulting on the options. Senator Stoker asked whether altering intersession was considered, and Associate Provost Tankersley stated other options were considered less disruptive. The motion to table to the item was approved.

10. Adjournment

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 6:02PM.

attachment

Chair's Remarks for February 12, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting:

In my Chair's remarks over the last year and a half, I have often praised President Warren, Provost Diacon, Senior Vice President Polatajko, and others for their commitment to shared governance and increased transparency. I trust that I will have opportunity to do so again in the future. However, today I want to express my deep disappointment over how a recent decision affecting all faculty at Kent State was made.

Many of you will recall that at our April 10, 2017 Senate Meeting, a proposal to create a Fall Break was placed on the agenda for Senate action. The concern motivating the proposal was that student use of mental and physical health facilities on campus was spiking in mid to late October. The proposal would create a four day weekend by eliminating class meetings on the Thursday and Friday of the eighth week of classes. The hope was that students would take this time to go home, recharge, and if necessary get caught up on their studies.

At the April meeting, many concerns about the proposal were raised by Senators and are reflected in the minutes. Some expressed concern about the elimination of contact hours. Some opined that taking a full week break at Thanksgiving would be preferable, given that more than a few students already take the full week off. Some asserted that the data cited as rationale for the proposal were ambiguous. Others questioned whether there was empirical evidence from other Universities that creating a Fall Break would actually help mitigate the stress and other mental health issues students seemed to be experiencing. A motion was passed to send the proposal back to committee. At that time, my expectation—and I'm sure the expectation of other Senators—was that a revised proposal would ultimately be brought back to Senate for a vote.

But that is not what happened. At a meeting on December 5, 2017, Associate Provost Melody Tankersley announced that President Warren had made the decision to implement a Fall Break in 2018 and to make up for the lost class time by beginning the semester two days earlier. This came as a shock to me, not because I opposed the idea of a Fall Break, but because Senate had not been given an opportunity to consider and vote on a revised proposal. Moreover, it was revealed that the decision would have unintended consequences for either Spring Semester or the Summer Sessions—consequences that very likely would have had an impact on Senate's thinking about whether or not to endorse a Fall Break.

We'll be considering two options for how to address the unintended consequences later in the agenda. What I want to highlight now is how little faculty input went into the development of the Fall Break proposal and the ultimate decision to implement it.

On November 14, 2016, I was invited to a meeting of an ad hoc committee chaired by Associate Provost Tankersley consisting of the standing University Calendar Committee (which seems to have no full-time faculty as members) and myself. The text of the Outlook invite read: "The meeting is not so much to discuss the merits of a fall recess, but to determine how a fall recess would (or should) affect the academic calendar if one was approved." This ad hoc committee met one more time on December 7, 2016 to discuss the number of classes that would be impacted by a Thursday/Friday option, a Monday/Tuesday option, and a Friday/Monday option for a Fall Break. The available internal data seemed to suggest that fewer classes university-wide would be impacted by the Thursday/Friday option.

On January 20, 2017, a wider group of “stakeholders” was convened to discuss the draft proposal being developed. If my memory serves, the only additional faculty member involved in this wider group was Jennifer Larson who had been invited in her capacity as President of AAUP-KSU. Since there were no obvious contractual implications in the proposal being developed, she had little to say at this meeting.

On March 20, 2017, a formal proposal to create a Fall Break was presented as an action item at EPC. This was the first time that the proposal had been shared with any committee that had a significant number of faculty members on it. It is also worth noting that, prior to this point, there had been no committee (or at least none involving faculty) that had discussed the actual merits of instituting a Fall Break. Unsurprisingly, the faculty members of EPC expressed the same sorts of concerns as those later expressed at Senate. My recollection is that the administrative members were largely silent. The voice vote was too close to call and a request was made to have EPC members vote by holding up their name tags. Although the motion to approve the item passed, it was apparent to me that it did so without a majority of faculty support.

After formally being transmitted from EPC to Senate, the item was originally placed as an action item on the agenda for the April 10, 2017 meeting. However, just hours before the meeting, I received a call from Associate Provost Tankersley informing me that the Provost’s Office had come to realize that there had been insufficient consultation with faculty, chairs, directors, and deans and that Provost Diacon wanted to pull the proposal as an action item and instead proceed with it as discussion item. The minutes for the meeting reflect that Associate Provost Tankersley made several comments about needing to seek additional faculty input during the Senate discussion.

So, what happened after Senate voted to send the proposal back to committee? Answer: very little that involved any faculty input. The ad hoc committee, now enlarged with one additional member from Nursing, didn’t meet again until October 31, 2017. At that meeting, we discussed various options for altering the academic calendar to accommodate the possibility of starting courses two days early in Fall Semester. However, no decisions were reached and no discussion of how to amend the proposal occurred. My belief at the time was that this was just the beginning of what would be an extended discussion involving a greater number of faculty voices and leading to a revised Fall Break proposal that would be presented for a vote at Senate. As it would turn out, this was the only meeting involving any faculty input that occurred between the Senate meeting in April and the final decision to implement a Fall Break.

On December 5, 2017, I was invited to a meeting which had been labeled on the Outlook invite as “Academic Calendar Discussion: Faculty.” I was therefore quite surprised when I arrived to find that, although there were perhaps two dozen chairs, directors, and deans present, I was the only full-time faculty member in attendance. It was at this meeting that Associate Provost Tankersley made clear that there was no plan to take a revised Fall Break proposal back for a vote at Senate and that the decision to implement a Fall Break in 2018 and to start classes on the Thursday and Friday of what is now Welcome Week had already been made by President Warren.

Attendees at this meeting were informed that, to accommodate starting classes earlier in the Fall, the summer session would have to be pushed back to allow for a sufficient number of processing days between the end of the Summer III session and the start of Fall semester. Since our terms are basically back to back, Associate Provost Tankersley asserted that there were only two viable options: shorten the summer term by two days or shorten Spring semester by two days. Those in

attendance were tasked with figuring out which option would be better. Associate Provost Tankersley made clear that the hope was to give a recommendation to President Warren quickly so that she could announce a final decision sometime in January. Even though both options had implications for the way faculty design and deliver their courses, there was at that time no plan to bring a proposal to EPC or to Senate. I made it very clear that I was displeased by the disenfranchisement of Senate on this and that Senators would justifiably see this as an erosion of faculty governance.

The small bit of good news in all this is that, as a result of the concern I expressed at the December 5th meeting, President Warren agreed to extend the timeframe for making a final decision between the two options so that the matter could be taken up today at Senate. However, it remains the case that, after asking Senate not to vote on the proposal for a Fall Break last April, almost no additional input from the full-time faculty was sought and Senate was not allowed the opportunity to vote on a revised proposal before the final decision to implement a Fall Break was made.

Had more input been sought, faculty in the College of Nursing would have been able to express concerns about how the proposal affects the scheduling of clinical sections, each of which must meet the required number of hours reported to the Ohio Board of Nursing while ensuring continuity in instruction. Had more input been sought, the Honors College and other organizations would have been able to weigh in on how the proposal affects their beginning of the year activities for students and parents. Had more input been sought, faculty in the College of Podiatric Medicine would have had an opportunity to weigh in on whether the proposal affects their unusual terms. Had more input been sought, Senators would have learned before any decision was made to implement a Fall Break that the proposal would affect the entire university calendar and require changes to the timing of Summer terms and perhaps also the Spring semester before any decision was made to implement a Fall Break.

The reason we have shared governance—the very reason Faculty Senate exists—is so that we can collaborate for positive change at the university. Instead, in forgetting that, the result is hard feelings, missed opportunities, and a decision that ultimately creates more problems than it solves. I don't know how to convey how deeply disappointed I am by what I consider to be a fairly egregious affront to the principle of shared governance on a matter that directly impacts the way faculty design and deliver their courses. I urge those who have the power to make these decisions not to make the same mistakes next time. The faculty of Kent State University deserve better.

Thank you. I'll now entertain any questions, comments, or criticisms.

Chair Smith

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date **29-Jan-18** Curriculum Bulletin _____
 Effective Date **Fall 2018** Approved by EPC _____

Department _____
 College **PR - Provost**
 Degree _____
 Program Name **Global Distinction** Program Banner Code _____
 Concentration(s) _____ Concentration(s) Banner Code(s) _____
 Proposal **Establish program**

Description of proposal:

The Office of the Provost proposes establishment of a Global Distinction Program that will allow undergraduate students to enhance their degree through the study and practice of global and intercultural learning.

Does proposed revision change program's total credit hours? Yes No

Current total credit hours: _____ Proposed total credit hours _____

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and staffing considerations; need; audience; prerequisites; teacher education licensure):

Starting in Fall 2018, University College will administer the program, including the training of advisors, tracking of student requirements, and program assessment. Students successfully completing the program shall graduate with the additional transcript designation of "Global Distinction." The program will not impact other programs, other than to potentially add incentives for more student participation. The program will require additional staffing for University College.

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):

The committee consulted with deans; chairs and directors; advisors; the Registrar; Global Education, Honors College; Curriculum Services; the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Learning; and Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

Department Chair / School Director	____/____/____
Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)	____/____/____
College Dean (or designee)	____/____/____
Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)	____/____/____
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (or designee)	____/____/____

Global Distinction Program Proposal

Subject Specification

The Office of the Provost proposes establishment of a **Global Distinction Program** that will allow undergraduate students to enhance their degree through the study and practice of global and intercultural learning.

Starting in Fall 2018, University College will administer the program, including the training of advisors, tracking of student requirements, and program assessment. Students successfully completing the program shall graduate with the additional transcript designation of “*Global Distinction.*”

Program Overview

The Association of American Colleges and Universities¹ recommends that institutions of higher education assist students with seeing themselves as a part of a world community by integrating intercultural knowledge and competence within the educational experience. Furthermore, in 2014 survey of 606 employers, the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE)² identified “Global/Intercultural Fluency” as one of the seven essential competencies college graduates must possess to be considered “career ready”. NACE defines this competency as valuing, respecting, and learning from diverse cultures, races, ages, genders, sexual orientations, and religions. This competency is demonstrated through an individual’s ability to be open, inclusive, sensitive, and respectful of all people.

The Global Distinction Program (GDP) will enable students to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to become global citizens. In addition to studying their discipline, students will also develop key global and intercultural skills that will enable them to work more effectively across cultures and to approach complex global problems. Available to all degree-seeking undergraduates, this transcript credential will serve as recognition of student’s commitment to global and intercultural learning.

The program consists of three components:

1. Coursework

Each student must complete 12 credit hours of coursework focused on intercultural and global learning outcomes to complete this component of the program. Eligible courses include global diversity-focused courses from the Diversity Course Requirement, foreign or second language proficiency, and International Baccalaureate program courses. See the section on **Global Distinction Course Requirements** for more details.

2. Immersive Experience

¹ Rhodes, T. (2009). Assessing outcomes and improving achievement: Tips and tools for using the rubrics. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledge>

² National Association of Colleges and Employers (2014). Career Readiness Defined, NACE Center for Career Development and Talent Acquisition. <http://www.nacweb.org/career-readiness/competencies/career-readiness-defined/>

Global Distinction Program Proposal

To complete this component of the program, each student must participate in one long-term or two short-term immersive international experiences involving extensive interactions with people of different cultures.

3. Culminating Presentation

Students will give a presentation that answers the question: How has my commitment to global distinction prepared me for the future? The presentation will articulate how they have explored the program learning outcomes. See the section on the **Culminating Presentation Assignment** for more details.

Background Information

In January 2017, the Office of the Provost formed a committee to develop a programmatic approach to enhance global and intercultural learning for undergraduate students. This work aligned with the University's Strategic Priority 3: Global Competitiveness. Specifically, it addressed strategic initiative 3.2: Enhance the internationalization of the university through programmatic and partnership engagement.

The committee³ was thoughtfully put together. Individuals with strengths in global and intercultural learning were recruited. Functional experts were also sought out, including representation from global education, curriculum services and the honors college. Additional committee members, especially faculty, were added throughout the process, as new expertise was identified.

The committee reviewed numerous similar programs at universities throughout the United States⁴. In some cases, emailing and/or talking with program administrators. The committee consulted with deans; chairs and directors; advisors; the registrar; Global Education, the Honors College; curriculum services; the office of accreditation, assessment and learning; and Faculty Senate.

Program Administration

It is recommended that University College administer the Global Distinction program because it aligns with the mission and scope of programs offered in University College. University College

³ Global Distinction Committee Membership: Ken Burhanna (chair), Francoise Massardier-Kenney, Eboni Pringle, Amanda Bevington, J.R. Campbell, Kevin Heller (student), Frank Congin, Katie Goldring, Ashley Williams, Eron Memaj, Ediz Kaykayoglu, Stephanie Smith, Edgar Kooijman, Amanda Woodyard, Steven Antalvari, Mary Kuchin, Pamela Stephenson, and Linda Robertson

⁴ Examples include:

- Stephen F. Austin State University's Certificate of International Competency - <http://www.sfasu.edu/oip/234.asp>.
- University of Houston's (Peer) Certificate in Global Studies and Research – <http://www.uh.edu/honors/Programs-Minors/honors-minors-programs/global-studies/>.
- University of North Texas's (Peer) Global Perspectives Certificate - http://catalog.unt.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=3&poid=845&returnto=87.
- University of South Florida's (Aspirational) Global Citizen Project - <http://www.usf.edu/gep/documents/gepexecutivesummary.pdf>.
- University Wisconsin Whitewater's Global Engagement Certificate – <https://www.uww.edu/clis/global-engagement>.

Global Distinction Program Proposal

serves students from all colleges and in some cases all campuses with the mission of providing non-major specific academic opportunities regardless of declared degree program. While not connected to a specific degree program, advisors will need to work directly with students to help them understand how the Global Distinction program requirements will align with their degree program. This program will require on-going academic advisor training and support. University College is well positioned to provide advisor training and support in addition to aligning the Global Distinction program with the National Student Exchange and Alternative Spring Break program which are both housed in University College.

Students will formally apply to demonstrate their proficiency through the culminating presentation assignment. This application (see appendix C) will trigger a review of the student's coursework and immersive experience record to ensure that student is on track with program requirements.

Components and Guidelines

Eligibility

All degree-seeking undergraduate students are eligible to pursue the Global Distinction Program. This includes international students as well, as noted by program pathways designed specifically for them.

Learning Outcomes

The Global Distinction learning outcomes have been adapted from the AAC&U's Value Rubrics on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence and Global Learning. The committee has strived for these outcomes to guide all components of the Global Distinction Program.

1. Cultural Self-Awareness

Describe visible and hidden factors that shape your culture (and sub-cultures), beliefs and values and those of others.

2. Cultural Perspective Taking

Evaluate cultural factors likely to lead to cross-cultural misunderstandings or conflicts at the macro and micro level and formulate appropriate strategies to avoid or mitigate cultural misunderstandings or conflicts.

3. Global Self-Awareness

Evaluate and apply diverse perspectives to complex problems within natural and human systems (e.g., epidemiology).

4. Understanding Global Systems

Describe multiple world views, experiences and power structures.

5. Cultural Diversity

Recognize interconnections of human organizations and processes, and innovative solutions to global problems.

Coursework Requirements

Global Distinction Program Proposal

Students wishing to fulfill the curricular requirements for Global Distinction need to successfully complete 12 credit hours from courses that address the learning outcomes of the program.

Students can complete their 12 credit hours through a combination of the following:

- A. Up to twelve (12) credit hours of Global Diversity-focused courses, as designated for the Diversity Course Requirement (<http://catalog.kent.edu/undergraduate-university-requirements/diversity-course-requirement/>). See **Appendix A** for a list of Global Diversity-focused courses.
- B. Up to six (6) credit hours of Foreign or second language proficiency may count (see note on foreign language proficiency).
- C. International Baccalaureate program completion qualifies for up to six (6) credit hours (see note on IB programs).

Note: Foreign Language Proficiency

Foreign language proficiency can serve as a catalyst for global and intercultural learning. However, attaining this proficiency often depends on the socio-economic and cultural background of students and on the university-wide requirements of individual majors. In addition, language proficiency is not sufficient in and of itself. It needs to be accompanied by cultural competency to meet the goals of a global distinction program. Thus, foreign language proficiency cannot be a mandatory requirement for the global distinction program, but it is strongly encouraged and may count for 6 credit hours towards meeting the curricular requirements of the program.

Students can demonstrate proficiency in the following ways:

- A. Successfully complete foreign language coursework at the intermediate-mid proficiency level with a grade of "B" or higher in an upper division course.
- B. Demonstrate intermediate-mid proficiency by taking an official language proficiency test (ACTFL) and scoring at the intermediate-mid level or higher.
- C. Provide proof of English language proficiency per the admission requirements of the Office of Global Education (for non-native English speaking international students).

Note: International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs

Students will receive six (6) hours of credit towards their global distinction coursework requirement upon completion of the IB programme. The College of Education, Health and Human Services' Early Childhood Education (ECED) and Middle Childhood Education (MCED) programs are recognized by the International Baccalaureate Organization and allow students to earn Baccalaureate Primary Year and Middle Year Programme Certificates respectively.

Immersive Experience

To complete this component of the program, each student must participate in one long-term or two short-term immersive international experiences involving extensive interactions with people of different cultures. Short-term is defined as any experience that is shorter than an academic term. Long-term experiences are those that are at least one full academic term. If a course has an immersive period within it (e.g., students study Cuban history for a semester and have a four-day immersive experience in Cuba), the four-day trip would count as a short-term immersive experience. Immersive experiences include:

Global Distinction Program Proposal

- National Student Exchange locations abroad
- Alternative Break trips with international destinations or with an emphasis on international populations
- Residence in the International Living Learning Community for an academic year
- Education Abroad
- International students earn this component by studying at one of Kent State's campuses in the United States

The immersive experiences listed above have been identified as ideal opportunities for students to engage with international cultures as they offer structured opportunities for the learning outcomes of the Global Distinction program to be met. However, the committee understands that opportunities may exist outside of those listed and students will be offered an exception form to seek approval for other experiences they feel satisfy this component of the program.

Culminating Presentation Assignment

To complete the culminating presentation assignment for global distinction, students need to design and deliver a presentation that addresses the five program learning outcomes in relation to the question: *How has my commitment to global distinction prepared me for the future?* In addressing this question, identify the impact and influence of the five learning outcomes on you and your approach to the world. Use examples from your own experiences to support your presentation. A rubric will be used to both guide students and structure the evaluation of their presentation. A draft rubric is provided in **Appendix B**.

Students need to design and deliver their presentation at a designated Kent State University student conference opportunity. University College will designate which student conferences are made available for Global Distinction presentations. Conference judges comprised of faculty members will apply the rubric to the presentations. We anticipate that in certain exceptional cases students will need an alternate pathway. In these cases, University College will work with students to identify a suitable alternative pathway.

Program Assessment

University College will oversee program assessment. In general, assessment activities will flow from the three main program components. Assessment data on coursework will come from URCC for the global diversity-focused courses, from global education and MCLS for foreign language, and from EHHS for the IB programme. Immersive experience assessment data will flow from the administrative or sponsoring unit for experiences. The culminating presentation will be assessed directly using its assignment rubric.

It is recommended that the program be assessed at the institutional level through the systematic administration of the *Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)*, an internationally recognized assessment designed to measure cross-cultural competence. Ideally, freshmen would be pre-tested and then post-tested near graduation.

University College will compile and analyze this data regularly, with the goal of providing an assessment report every five years.

Global Distinction Program Proposal

Fiscal Impact

Need	Cost
Staffing – leverage current part-time and adoption of full-time coordinator (Salary and first-year benefits)	\$86,950
Marketing materials	\$2,000
Supplies (Culminating Presentation)	\$3,000
Advisor training and professional development	\$30,000
National Student Exchange costs	\$7,000
Annual Cost	\$128,950
Developer Time (Information Services)	\$10,000
One-time Cost	\$10,000
TOTAL First Year Cost	\$138,950

Alternatives and Consequences

The alternative would be to maintain current practices and assist students with demonstrating their global competence through their resume/CV and in interviews.

Specific Recommendation and Justification

The specific recommendation is to establish the Global Distinction Program in University College for Fall 2018 to create an opportunity for undergraduate students to enhance their degree and career opportunities through the study and practice of global and intercultural learning.

Timetable and Actions Required

1. Approval from Office of the Provost: January 2018
2. Approval from Education Policies Council: 19 February 2018
3. Approval from Faculty Senate: 12 March 2018
4. Implementation: Fall 2018

Global Distinction Program Proposal

Appendix A: Global Diversity-Focused Courses

- Course ListCode Title Credit Hours
- ANTH 18210 INTRODUCTION TO CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY (DIVG) (KSS) 3
- ANTH 18420 INTRODUCTION TO ARCHAEOLOGY (DIVG) (KSS) 3
- ANTH 38240 CULTURE AND PERSONALITY (DIVG) 3
- ANTH 48212 KINSHIP AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION (DIVG) 3
- ANTH 48250 MEDICAL ANTHROPOLOGY (DIVG) 3
- ANTH 48630 PACIFIC ISLAND CULTURES (DIVG) 3
- ANTH 48262 PEOPLES AND CULTURES OF AMAZONIA (DIVG) 3
- ANTH 48360 ANTHROPOLOGY OF GENDER AND SEXUALITY (DIVG) 3
- ANTH 48830 HUMAN BEHAVIORAL ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTION (DIVG) (ELR) (WIC) 3
- ARTH 22020 ART OF AFRICA, OCEANIA AND THE AMERICAS (DIVG) (KFA) 3
- ARTH 42025 ART OF WEST AFRICA (DIVG) 3
- ARTH 42026 ART OF NIGERIA (DIVG) 3
- ARTH 42027 ART OF CENTRAL AFRICA (DIVG) 3
- CACM 32030 INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION (DIVG) 3
- CACM 32040 CROSS-CULTURAL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT (DIVG) 3
- CACM 41010 RECONCILIATION VERSUS REVENGE: TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE (DIVG) (WIC) 3
- CLAS 21404 THE GREEK ACHIEVEMENT (DIVG) (KHUM) 3
- CLAS 21405 THE ROMAN ACHIEVEMENT (DIVG) (KHUM) 3
- COMM 35852 INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION (DIVG) 3
- DAN 27076 DANCE AS AN ART FORM (DIVG) (KFA) 3
- ENG 31006 WORLD ENGLISHES (DIVG) (WIC) 3
- ENG 33013 PAN-AFRICAN WOMEN'S LITERATURE (DIVG) 3
- ENG 33015 AFRICAN LITERATURES (DIVG) 3
- ENG 34011 WORLD LITERATURE IN ENGLISH (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 17063 WORLD GEOGRAPHY (DIVG) (KSS) 3
- GEOG 22040 INTRODUCTION TO GLOBAL TOURISM (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 22061 HUMAN GEOGRAPHY (DIVG) (KSS) 3
- GEOG 32080 POLITICS AND PLACE (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 36065 CITIES AND URBANIZATION (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 37040 GEOGRAPHY OF AFRICA (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 37050 GEOGRAPHY OF RUSSIA AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 37066 GEOGRAPHY OF EUROPE (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 37070 GEOGRAPHY OF EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIA (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 37084 GEOGRAPHY OF SOUTH AMERICA (DIVG) 3
- GEOG 37085 GEOGRAPHY OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (DIVG) 3
- HIST 11050 WORLD HISTORY: ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL (DIVG) (KHUM) 3
- HIST 11051 WORLD HISTORY: MODERN (DIVG) (KHUM) 3

Global Distinction Program Proposal

- HIST 31140 MODERN LATIN AMERICA (DIVG) 3
- MCLS 21417 MULTICULTURALISM IN TODAY'S GERMANY (DIVG) 3
- MUS 22121 MUSIC AS A WORLD PHENOMENON (DIVG) (KFA) 3
- MUS 42181 POPULAR WORLD MUSIC (DIVG) 3
- PAS 23001 BLACK EXPERIENCE I: BEGINNINGS TO 1865 (DIVG) (KHUM) 3
- PAS 24407 CARIBBEAN STUDIES (DIVG) 3
- PAS 32050 AFRICAN LITERATURES (DIVG) 3
- PAS 34000 INTRODUCTION TO AFRICAN WORLD VIEW (DIVG) 3
- PAS 37100 PAN-AFRICAN WOMEN'S LITERATURE (DIVG) 3
- PH 10002 INTRODUCTION TO GLOBAL HEALTH (DIVG) 3
- PHIL 11001 INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY (DIVG) (KHUM) 3
- PHIL 21001 INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS (DIVG) (KHUM) 3
- PHIL 31075 PHILOSOPHY AND MULTICULTURALISM (DIVG) 3
- POL 10004 COMPARATIVE POLITICS (DIVG) (KSS) 3
- POL 10500 WORLD POLITICS (DIVG) (KSS) 3
- POL 30520 EUROPEAN POLITICS (DIVG) 3
- POL 30530 ASIAN POLITICS (DIVG) 3
- POL 30540 AFRICAN POLITICS (DIVG) 3
- POL 30550 LATIN AMERICAN POLITICS (DIVG) 3
- POL 30560 MIDDLE EAST POLITICS (DIVG) 3
- POL 40540 POLITICS OF DEVELOPMENT (DIVG) 3
- POL 40560 HUMAN RIGHTS AND SOCIAL JUSTICE (DIVG) 3
- REL 11020 INTRODUCTION TO WORLD RELIGIONS (DIVG) (ELR) (KHUM) 3
- REL 21021 MOSES, JESUS AND MOHAMMAD (DIVG) (ELR) (KHUM) 3
- RPTM 26060 INTRODUCTION TO GLOBAL TOURISM (DIVG) 3
- SOC 22778 SOCIAL PROBLEMS (DIVG) (KSS) 3
- SOC 42575 FAMILIES IN A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE (DIVG) 3
- THEA 11000 THE ART OF THE THEATRE (DIVG) (KFA) 3

Global Distinction Program Proposal

Appendix B: Draft Rubric for the Culminating Presentation Assignment

A rubric will be used to both guide students and structure the evaluation of their presentation. The rubric below is draft.

Scores of twelve (12) and higher rate as “proficient” or “highly proficient.” Scores lower than twelve (12) rate as “inadequate” and require the candidate to revise and give their presentation again to achieve proficiency.

Global Distinction Culminating Presentation Draft Rubric				
	Highly Proficient (3)	Proficient (2)	Inadequate (1)	Score
Organization / Design / Accuracy / Appearance	<p>Organization: All the items included in the poster support the main point. The narrative flows logically and naturally from the introduction with no missing steps.</p> <p>Design: There is a balance of text and graphics. They are evenly distributed around the poster. The arrangement is simple and uncrowded</p> <p>Accuracy: Sentences properly punctuated and all words spelled correctly.</p> <p>Appearance: The introduction and the other paragraphs can be read from at least three feet away.</p>	<p>Organization: Most items included in the poster support the main point. The narrative mostly flows logically and naturally from the introduction with no missing steps.</p> <p>Design: There is some balance of text and graphics. They are somewhat evenly distributed around the poster. The arrangement could be simpler and less crowded, but it makes sense.</p> <p>Accuracy: Most sentences are properly punctuated, and most words spelled correctly.</p> <p>Appearance: The introduction and the other paragraphs can mostly be read from at least three feet away.</p>	<p>Organization: Some items included in the poster support the main point. The narrative does not always flow logically. Some steps are missing.</p> <p>Design: There is a lack of overall balance of text and graphics. They are not evenly distributed around the poster. The arrangement is confusing at times and could be less crowded.</p> <p>Accuracy: Some sentences are properly punctuated, and more than a few words are misspelled.</p> <p>Appearance: The introduction and the other paragraphs cannot be clearly read from three feet away.</p>	
Learning Outcome Reflections: Participants are asked to reflect on their commitment and exploration of the program learning outcomes, as outlined in the culminating				

Global Distinction Program Proposal

presentation assignment instructions. The learning outcomes are listed below this rubric.				
	Highly Proficient (3)	Proficient (2)	Inadequate (1)	Score
1.Cultural Self-Awareness: Describe visible and hidden factors that shape your culture (and sub-cultures), beliefs and values and those of others.	Demonstrates excellent understanding of visible and hidden factors that shape culture (and sub-cultures), beliefs and values and those of others.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of visible and hidden factors that shape culture (and sub-cultures), beliefs and values and those of others.	Fails to demonstrate understanding of visible and hidden factors that shape culture (and sub-cultures), beliefs and values and those of others.	
2.Cultural Perspective Taking: Evaluate cultural factors likely to lead to cross-cultural misunderstandings or conflicts at the macro and micro level and formulate appropriate strategies to avoid or mitigate cultural misunderstandings or conflicts.	Demonstrates excellent understanding of the factors likely to lead to cross-cultural misunderstandings and of appropriate strategies likely to prevent or decrease such misunderstandings.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the factors likely to lead to cross-cultural misunderstandings and of appropriate strategies likely to prevent or decrease such misunderstandings.	Fails to demonstrate understanding of the factors likely to lead to cross-cultural misunderstandings and of appropriate strategies likely to prevent or decrease such misunderstandings.	
3.Global Self-Awareness: Evaluate and apply diverse perspectives to complex problems within natural and human systems.	Demonstrates competence; evaluates and applies diverse perspectives to complex problems, providing examples within natural and/or human systems.	Indicates competence; some evidence of application of diverse perspectives to complex problems and using examples within natural and/or human systems.	Indicates lack of competence; narrative lacks evidence of application of diverse perspectives to complex problems; choice of examples does not clearly support perspectives invoked.	
4.Understanding Global Systems: Describe multiple world views, experiences and power structures.	The poster describes thoroughly and accurately multiple world views, experiences, or power structures	The poster describes multiple world views, experiences, or power structures with minor lapses in completeness and accuracy. More	The poster does not fully describe multiple world views and examples are not effective.	

Global Distinction Program Proposal

	with relevant examples.	examples may be needed.		
<p>5.Cultural Diversity: Recognize interconnections of human organizations and processes, and of innovative solutions to global problems.</p>	<p>Demonstrates awareness of substantial connections between the worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts and of innovative solutions to global problems.</p>	<p>Demonstrates awareness of some connections between the worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts and of solutions to global problems.</p>	<p>Fails to demonstrate awareness of some connections between the worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts and of solutions to global problems.</p>	
Total Score				

Global Distinction Program Proposal

Appendix C: Draft Application for Global Distinction

Students will complete this application when they are ready to do their culminating presentation assignment.

Application for Global Distinction

(To be adapted electronically and offered to students online)

Name

Banner ID

KSU Email

Class standing

Major(s)

Minor(s) if applicable

Students wishing to earn Global Distinction should complete the following curricular and immersive requirements and submit this application to deliver their culminating presentation.

Coursework

Please list coursework that counts towards this portion of the GDP requirement

Immersive Experience

Please indicate which immersive experience(s) you completed, when, and where:

- Short-term study abroad
- Long-term study abroad
- National Student Exchange experience abroad
- Alternative Break with global components
- Living in the International Living Learning Community for an academic year
- International Student option*
- Other**

*International students can earn this component by studying at one of Kent State's campuses in the United States.

** The immersive experiences listed above have been identified as ideal opportunities for students to engage with international cultures as they offer structured opportunities for the learning outcomes of the Global Distinction program to be met. However, there may be other experiences equally as rich that allow the student to obtain the same learning outcomes as the GDP. In these cases, students should contact the Program Coordinator to obtain an exception form.

Culminating Presentation

Opportunities to present your culminating Global Distinction presentation will be offered throughout the academic year. A rubric will be used to both guide students and structure the evaluation of their presentation. If proficiency is not met, the student will receive their rubric and be provided the opportunity to meet with the coordinator. After making any necessary edits or obtaining proficiency in all areas, the student should resubmit their presentation via the online method for the coordinator to re-evaluate.

Please select which event you'd like to present at:

- Career, Internship & Co-Op Fair (Fall and Spring)
- Undergraduate Research Symposium (Spring only)
- Online method (Fall and Spring)

Once proficiency is met, the coordinator will sign and send paperwork to the registrar's office to notate on applicant's transcript.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY CERTIFICATION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Preparation Date **22-Dec-17** Curriculum Bulletin _____
Effective Date **Fall 2018** Approved by EPC _____

Department **Career Exploration and Development**
College **UC - University College**
Proposal **Revise Policy**
Proposal Name **COOP 20092 Criteria Change**

Description of proposal:

Proposed changes are to encourage inclusion and promote Cooperative Education (co-op) experiences to all students. The co-op experience has numerous benefits including assisting students in major and career identification or confirmation, gain professional experience, improve time management, identify workplace preferences, etc. The changes proposed reduce the obstacles for student enrollment.

Describe impact on other programs, policies or procedures (e.g., duplication issues; enrollment and staffing considerations; need, audience)

COOP 20092 is not used in place of other classes, it is primarily used as a placeholder while the student is engaged in a full-time, professional experience.

Units consulted (other departments, programs or campuses affected by this proposal):

Career Services Office, College of Business Administration; College of Aeronautics and Engineering

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

Department Chair / School Director

____/____/____

Campus Dean (for Regional Campuses proposals)

____/____/____

Eboni J. Trugle

College Dean (or designee)

1/25/18

Dean of Graduate Studies (for graduate proposals)

____/____/____

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (or designee)

____/____/____

Proposal Summary for a Policy COOP 20092 Criteria for Enrollment

Subject Specification: *Change the Criteria for Enrollment for COOP 20092*

Background Information:

Current: Criteria for Enrollment for COOP 20092:

- Enrollment as a fulltime student in the semester prior (fall/spring)
- Admitted into a degree program
- Minimum cumulative 2.75 GPA at time of co-op application
- No holds on the student's record from any source (financial, academic, conduct)
- Co-op position must directly relate to student's major or concentration
- Completion of two semesters (one semester for transfer students) at Kent State prior to the first co-op rotation

EPC members passed a friendly resolution at its 19-Feb-18 meeting to revise the proposed 2.250 GPA (currently 2.750) to 2.000 GPA for admission to the program.

Proposed Criteria for Enrollment

- Students must have one semester as a degree seeking student at Kent State University prior to the first co-op rotation.
- Students must be enrolled as a half- or full-time student (minimum 6 credit hours) in the semester prior to enrollment in the cooperative education program.
- Students must have earned a minimum 2.250 overall GPA at the time of their co-op application.
- Students must have no holds on their student record from any source (financial, academic, conduct).
- Cooperative position must be approved and relevant to students' career direction.
- Students must have received a completed grade and have resolved any outstanding non-completed grades for previous co-op rotations.
- International students must receive work authorization prior to enrolling in each co-op rotation.
- University College will work with student's college to assess all applicants holistically, considering their academic progress, related experience, academic and extracurricular activities, among others, to evaluate students' likelihood of success in the program.

The following items were removed entirely from the Proposed Criteria

- Enrollment as a fulltime student in the semester prior (fall/spring)
- Admitted into a degree program

Rationale for the proposed changes is to encourage inclusion and promote Cooperative Education (co-op) experiences to all students. The co-op experience has numerous benefits including assisting students in major and career identification or confirmation, gain professional experience, improve time management, identify workplace preferences, etc. The changes proposed reduce obstacles for student enrollment.

Alternatives and Consequences: *Current criteria for enrollment will remain in place.*

Specific Recommendation and Justification:

1. **Current:** Minimum cumulative 2.75 GPA at time of co-op application
Amended: Students must have earned a minimum 2.250 overall GPA at the time of their co-op application.
 - The GPA criteria is restricting students who are successfully completing requirements for a degree. GPA criteria should be in accordance with standards for graduation.
 - Co-op can be used as a way to develop a resume for students who may not have a distinguishing GPA.
 - Research has shown that students perform better when returning to coursework, especially in areas requiring “soft skills”. Ultimately, the co-op may provide practical knowledge that can aid the student in the classroom and in the end reflect positively in their grades.
 - GPA criteria is restrictive towards students who are in academic recovery but are currently performing adequately.
 - Nationally, it is common for universities to use good standing as a criteria for enrollment.
2. **Current:** Admitted into a degree program
Eliminated: The co-op can be used by the student to determine likes and dislikes, which can be used in major identification.
3. **Current:** Enrollment as a fulltime student in the semester prior (fall/spring)
Amended: Students must be enrolled as a half- or full-time student (minimum 6 credit hours) in the semester prior to enrollment in the cooperative education program.
 - The co-op is an experience that should not preclude students who were enrolled the previous semester less than full-time.
4. Additional criteria recommended to be added:
 - Students must have received a completed grade in all previous co-ops.**
Students should not be allowed to register for a COOP 20092 if there are previous co-ops that are in incomplete status.
 - International students must receive work authorization prior to enrolling in each co-op.**
Criteria should be added to ensure international students have received the proper authorization before applying for the co-op class.

Timetable and Actions Required:

1. *Approve the changes to the Criteria for Enrollment for COOP 20092*
2. *Update the 2018-2019 University Catalog*
3. *Update www.kent.edu/career/co-op webpage*
4. *Inform campus partners of the changes to the Criteria for Enrollment*
5. *Develop marketing materials to promote the changes to students, faculty, staff, employer partners*

UNIVERSITY CATALOG COPY

Cooperative Education Program

Students in Kent State University's Cooperative Education Program (co-op) enhance their degree program by relating theory to practice and applying what they have learned in the classroom to real-life workplace scenarios. This process of “learning by doing” increases student motivation and employability after graduation and maximizes student growth and development. Through a co-op experience, students explore career and academic options, test career choices, increase professional skills and earn money to contribute to educational expenses. Cooperative education experiences are highly desired, selective and in the student’s chosen field.

All students participating in a co-op experience must register for COOP 20092 (non-credit, offered through University College) and pay the co-op fee. Enrollment in the course is restricted by special approval, and students may only register after submission and approval of all application forms. Enrollment in the course will ensure the student is designated and reported as a full-time student and permit the student to have access to all student services and resources during the co-op semester.

CRITERIA FOR ENROLLMENT

- ~~Completion of two~~ Students must have one semesters as a degree-seeking student at Kent State ~~(one semester for transfer students)~~ prior to the first co-op rotation.
- Students must be enrolled Enrollment as a half- or full-time student (minimum 6 credit hours) in the semester prior ~~(fall/spring)~~ to enrollment in the cooperative education program.
- ~~Admitted into a degree program (students in a fully online program must receive their dean’s permission to enroll in a co-op)~~
- Students must have earned a m~~Minimum 2.750~~ 2.250 overall GPA at the time of their co-op application.
- Students must have n~~No~~ holds on their student’s record from any source (financial, academic, conduct).
- Cooperative position must ~~directly relate~~ be approved and relevant to students’ ~~s-major-or concentration~~ career direction.
- Students must have received a completed grade and have resolved any outstanding non-completed grades for previous co-op rotations.
- International students must receive work authorization prior to enrolling in each co-op rotation.

The University College will work with the student’s college to assess all applicants holistically, considering their academic progress, related experience, academic and extracurricular activities, among others, to evaluate the student’s likelihood of success in the program.

For more information on the Cooperative Education Program, contact the Office of Career Exploration and Development.

3342-6-13 University policy and procedure governing modification of the faculty probationary period

(A) Policy statement: The probationary period for faculty members who hold a full-time tenure-track appointment at Kent State University is governed by policies on reappointment and tenure developed by the faculty senate professional standards committee and approved by the faculty senate and board of trustees. From time to time, personal and/or family circumstances arise such that a probationary faculty member may need to request that their probationary period be extended. Granting such an extension of the probationary period has traditionally been called "tolling" or "stopping the tenure clock."

(B) Eligibility (i.e., When tolling is permitted).

1. Faculty members shall be eligible to extend the probationary period leading to a mandatory tenure review, upon request, if:
 - a. The faculty (whether male or female) is a caregiver of a newborn, newly adopted or foster child, including a newborn, newly adopted or foster child of a domestic partner.
 - b. The faculty member develops a serious illness or disability or a member of his or her immediate family (as defined in the university's sick leave policy) becomes seriously ill or disabled.
2. Faculty members may be eligible to extend the probationary period leading to a mandatory tenure review, upon request, if the faculty member has other personal and/or family circumstances of a compelling nature that arise or that occupy a substantial period of time during the pre-tenure years.

(C) Implementation. The same professional standards and expectations shall apply to tenure candidates who have had an extension of their probationary period, as would apply to candidates who have not. Professional accomplishments realized during the extended probationary period shall be considered part of a candidate's record when he or she stands for tenure and/or promotion. However, a candidate who has had his or her probationary period extended by one or two years under this 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.

- a. Faculty Leave: Decisions about the extension of the probationary period shall occur independent of a faculty member's leave status. Faculty members may or may not have a full or partial leave during this period. Separate university policies and procedures exist for securing a leave (e.g. sick leave, leave of absence without pay, etc.) if one is appropriate.
- b. Length of Tolling: An extension of the probationary period shall be limited to one year for each qualifying event (or child), up to a total of two years. An extension, if approved, shall be only for increments of one year. The maximum extension of the probationary period will be no more than two full years.

- c. Requesting Tolling: Any request to extend the mandatory probationary period must be reviewed and approved on or before March first of the spring semester prior to the time that the candidate for tenure submits his or her tenure review file.
 - d. Dissemination of the Policy: A copy of this policy shall be provided to all those standing for reappointment and all new faculty by the unit administrator during the first week of the academic year.
 - e. Reappointment: A faculty member who has taken a tolling year shall not submit a reappointment file during the tolling year. The following year, the candidate will submit a reappointment letter detailing their accomplishments during the prior two years. Reviewers are reminded that irrespective of the two-year time-frame (or in the case of two years of tolling, the three-year time frame), the productivity of a faculty member who has tolled is not expected to exceed what is expected of a probationary faculty member in a single year.
- (D) Procedures. A probationary faculty member may initiate a request for an extension of his/her probationary period by the following procedures:
- a. On the Kent campus, the faculty member shall write a letter to the department chair or school director requesting permission to extend the probationary period and citing the reasons consistent with section (B) above why such action is warranted. On the regional campuses, the faculty member shall write a letter to the regional campus dean requesting permission to extend the probationary period and citing the reasons consistent with section (B) above why such action is warranted.
 - b. On the Kent campus, the department chair or school director shall consult with the faculty advisory committee (FAC) or school advisory committee (SAC). The FAC or SAC will make an advisory recommendation to the unit administrator. The unit administrator will then make a recommendation to the college dean. If the request is approved, he or she will forward it to the dean's office for further review.
On the regional campuses, the campus dean shall consult with the faculty council. The faculty council shall make an advisory recommendation to the campus dean. The campus dean will then make a recommendation to the chief academic officer of the regional campuses. If the request is approved, he or she will forward it to the chief academic officer of the regional campuses for further review.
 - c. The college dean shall consult with the college advisory committee (CAC). The chief academic officer of the regional campuses shall consult with the regional campus faculty advisory committee (RCFAC). The CAC or RCFAC will make an advisory recommendation to the appropriate administrator. The administrator shall then make a recommendation to the provost.
 - d. If the request is approved by the provost, the office of faculty affairs shall notify the faculty member in writing of the new date for the mandatory tenure review and that existing professional standards, as required by Section (C) above, will govern the future tenure decision. A copy of this letter shall be included in the candidate's tenure file.

During any year which is tolled, the faculty member does not submit a reappointment file. When the faculty member is next reviewed for reappointment, all of the faculty member's achievements, including those completed during the period subject to tolling, should be included in the faculty member's file.

- e. **External Reviewers for Tenure and Promotion Evaluation:** In the letter to the candidate's external reviewers, the unit administrator should explain that the candidate was granted an additional year or two years under the university tolling policy. The letter should include the following statement: *The tolling policy provides for additional years toward tenure for a variety of circumstances, but the policy stipulates that the presence of an extended probationary period shall not be interpreted to increase the expectations for productivity normally placed upon a probationary faculty member.*

E. Appeals

1. If the request is not approved by the unit administrator or regional campus dean, the reasons for the rejection will be set forth in writing and provided to the faculty member in question. If a Kent campus faculty member's request is not approved, he or she will have the right to appeal to the college dean in colleges with departments or schools or to the provost in colleges without departments and schools and university libraries, as applicable. If a regional campus faculty member's request is not approved, he or she will have the right to appeal to the chief academic officer of the regional campuses. Such an appeal must be initiated in writing within two weeks of the receipt of the negative decision by the unit administrator or campus dean. The appeal should state clearly why the faculty member disagrees with the decision. Appeals should be heard in a timely manner.
2. If the faculty member's request is not approved by either the college dean or the chief academic officer of the regional campuses, the reasons for the rejection will be set forth in writing and provided to the faculty member. The faculty member will have the right to appeal to the provost. Such an appeal must be initiated in writing within two weeks of the receipt of the negative decision by the college dean or chief academic officer of the regional campuses, whichever is appropriate. The appeal should state clearly why the faculty member disagrees with the decision. Appeals should be heard in a timely manner.

Policy Effective Date: Mar. 01, 2015

Policy Prior Effective Dates:

2009/02/04

ACADEMIC CALENDAR DISCUSSION

Shorter Summer Term with No Intersession

SUMMER 2019																																											
Monday to Sunday	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">May 13–May 19</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">End-of-Term Processing: Mon, May 13 – Sun, May 19</td> <td rowspan="3" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">1st 7 Weeks Mon, May 13 – Sat, Jun 29 (6 weeks 6 days*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">May 20–May 26</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">Full Term Mon, May 20 – Wed, Aug 14 (12 weeks, 3 days**)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Summer 1 Mon, May 27 – Sun, Jun 30 (5 weeks*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">May 27–Jun 2</td> <td rowspan="3" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">Summer 2 Mon, Jun 10 – Sun, Aug 4 (8 weeks*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jun 3–Jun 9</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jun 10–Jun 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jun 17–Jun 23</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Summer 3 Mon, Jul 8 – Sun, Aug 11 (5 weeks)</td> <td rowspan="2" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">2nd 7 Weeks Mon, Jul 1 – Wed, Aug 14 (6 weeks 3 days*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jun 24–Jun 30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jul 1–Jul 7</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jul 8–Jul 14</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jul 15–Jul 21</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jul 22–Jul 28</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Jul 29–Aug 4</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Aug 5–Aug 11</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Aug 12–Aug 18</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">End-of-Term Processing: Thu, Aug 15 – Wed, Aug 21</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Aug 19–Aug 25</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Fall Semester: starts Thu, Aug 22</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	May 13–May 19	End-of-Term Processing: Mon, May 13 – Sun, May 19		1st 7 Weeks Mon, May 13 – Sat, Jun 29 (6 weeks 6 days*)	May 20–May 26	Full Term Mon, May 20 – Wed, Aug 14 (12 weeks, 3 days**)	Summer 1 Mon, May 27 – Sun, Jun 30 (5 weeks*)	May 27–Jun 2	Summer 2 Mon, Jun 10 – Sun, Aug 4 (8 weeks*)	Jun 3–Jun 9	Jun 10–Jun 16	Jun 17–Jun 23	Summer 3 Mon, Jul 8 – Sun, Aug 11 (5 weeks)	2nd 7 Weeks Mon, Jul 1 – Wed, Aug 14 (6 weeks 3 days*)	Jun 24–Jun 30		Jul 1–Jul 7			Jul 8–Jul 14			Jul 15–Jul 21			Jul 22–Jul 28			Jul 29–Aug 4			Aug 5–Aug 11			Aug 12–Aug 18	End-of-Term Processing: Thu, Aug 15 – Wed, Aug 21			Aug 19–Aug 25	Fall Semester: starts Thu, Aug 22		
May 13–May 19	End-of-Term Processing: Mon, May 13 – Sun, May 19		1st 7 Weeks Mon, May 13 – Sat, Jun 29 (6 weeks 6 days*)																																								
May 20–May 26	Full Term Mon, May 20 – Wed, Aug 14 (12 weeks, 3 days**)	Summer 1 Mon, May 27 – Sun, Jun 30 (5 weeks*)																																									
May 27–Jun 2		Summer 2 Mon, Jun 10 – Sun, Aug 4 (8 weeks*)																																									
Jun 3–Jun 9																																											
Jun 10–Jun 16																																											
Jun 17–Jun 23		Summer 3 Mon, Jul 8 – Sun, Aug 11 (5 weeks)	2nd 7 Weeks Mon, Jul 1 – Wed, Aug 14 (6 weeks 3 days*)																																								
Jun 24–Jun 30																																											
Jul 1–Jul 7																																											
Jul 8–Jul 14																																											
Jul 15–Jul 21																																											
Jul 22–Jul 28																																											
Jul 29–Aug 4																																											
Aug 5–Aug 11																																											
Aug 12–Aug 18	End-of-Term Processing: Thu, Aug 15 – Wed, Aug 21																																										
Aug 19–Aug 25	Fall Semester: starts Thu, Aug 22																																										

* Duration includes 1 holiday

** Duration includes 2 holidays

Considerations

- Although not noted on the calendar above, flex scheduling options (open learning) may be used to preserve the current timing of courses that have been offered during intersession in the past. If used for a three-week course, the course would run May 20–June 9, which would overlap with Full Term and Summer I.
- Removal of summer intersession allows Summer 1 and Summer 3 to be moved earlier to keep instructional days intact.
- Removal of summer intersession allows for the week of July 4th (between Summer I and Summer III) to not meet.
- The 2nd 7-Week courses will lose 2 weekdays (3 calendar days) of instructional time.
- Full-Term courses will lose 2 weekdays (3 calendar days) of instructional time.

CAMPUS (All)

Column Labels

Part of Term	Spring 2017		Summer 2017		Fall 2017	
	Sum of INST	Sum of STUDENT	Sum of INST	Sum of STUDENT	Sum of INST	Sum of STUDENT
Full Term	3150	41790	170	699	3288	42947
First 5 Weeks	14	405			24	338
Second 5 Weeks	13	178			12	145
Third 5 Weeks	30	592			25	485
Flexibly Scheduled	210	2456	341	3134	198	2665
First Half Semester	114	2791			160	3978
Second Half Semester	145	2526			172	3736
Intersession			142	1736		
Summer 1-5 Weeks			454	5911		
Summer 2-8 Weeks			421	3921		
Summer 3-5 Weeks			404	4411		
First 7 Weeks	114	1880	70	863	92	1387
Second 7 Weeks	125	1821	64	697	103	1341
Campus						

Column Labels

Location	Spring 2017		Summer 2017		Fall 2017	
	Sum of INST	Sum of STUDENT	Sum of INST	Sum of STUDENT	Sum of INST	Sum of STUDENT
Study Abroad	48	359	49	371	29	226
All Other Courses	2671	34593	1447	14478	2727	35199



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
January 29, 2018**

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

1. Call to Order

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:07PM in the Faculty Senate office.

2. Approval of Minutes

Members of the executive committee reviewed the January 17, 2018 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes as revised (Vande Zande/Dauterich). The minutes were approved.

3. Review of Items from January 22, 2018 EPC Meeting

Chair Smith presented items from the January 22, 2018 EPC meeting. EPC had forwarded 11 items for approval by Faculty Senate. Chair Smith suggested that the Executive Committee could approve 6 of the items (#s 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10) on behalf of Senate as they involved either revisions to the names of majors or inactivation of majors that currently do not have students. She recommended that three items (#s 1, 4, and 11) be taken to Faculty Senate as they involve the establishment of new programs. There was discussion of whether the two items (#s 3 and 8) that involve changes in administrative structure needed to be presented to the full Senate or could be approved by the Executive Committee. It was decided the changes were not controversial and could be approved by the Executive Committee. A motion was made to approve EPC items 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 (Wilson/Dauterich). The motion was approved. These items will be listed as information items on the agenda for the February 12, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting, and the remaining 3 items not considered by the Executive Committee (#s 1, 4, and 11) will be listed as action items for that meeting.

4. Agenda for the February 12, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting

Chair Smith presented a draft agenda for the February 12, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting. One item listed under old business was moved to new business. A motion was made to approve the agenda (Fouad/Vande Zande). The motion was approved.

5. Election Updates

- a. Senate Elections. The slate for Faculty Senate elections is complete. Secretary Kerns distributed a copy of the final slate. Tess Kail will be distributing ballots soon, and they will be due on February 16, 2018.
- b. Faculty Ethics Committee: Unit Member Elections. Chair Smith announced that 4 units will be conducting elections this Spring to choose a representative to the Faculty Ethics Committee: Unit #2, A & S; Unit #4, CCI; unit #5, EHHS; and unit #6, Regional campuses. There will be two nominees for units 2, 4, and 5 and one from each regional campus for unit 6. Those elected will begin their service in the Fall 2018 semester. Chair Smith has contacted Deans and Faculty Councils to request nominees.
- c. Faculty Ethics Committee: Faculty Senator Elections. Chair Smith announced that we need two nominees from Faculty Senate to stand for election to the Ethics Committee. The election will take place in March. Potential nominees will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting.
- d. Faculty Senate Elections for the Executive Committee. Chair Smith noted that these elections will take place at the April Faculty Senate meeting. The current Executive Committee will need to appoint a Nominating Committee to prepare the slate. Potential nominees will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting.

6. Planning for Spring Faculty Senate Forum

There was brief discussion of the Spring Faculty Senate Forum. It will take place on campus, and all faculty (not just Senators) will be invited. The topic will be a follow-up from the Senate Fall Forum which focused on building resilience in students. Ed Dauterich, Farid Fouad, and Robin Vande Zande are in charge of planning for the forum.

7. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 4:32PM.

Respectfully submitted by Kathryn Kerns
Secretary, Faculty Senate