

Faculty Senate Agenda – September 13, 2021

Item No.	Item	PDF Pg. No.
1	Call to Order	
2	Roll Call	
3	Approval of the Agenda	
4	Approval of the July 19, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes	2-11
5	Chair's Remarks	
6	Provost's Remarks	
7	Old Business: Action Item: Faculty Ethics Committee Purpose & Procedures Proposed Changes (Susan Roxburgh, Professor for the Department of Sociology and the Faculty Ethics Committee Chair)	13-17
8	New Business	
9	Announcements / Statements for the Record: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPC Subcommittee – Transfer Credit Committee (Ed Dauterich, Professor of English and the Transfer Credit Committee Chair) • The Faculty Senate Fall Retreat will be held on Friday, October 29, 2021 at 12:00–2:00 p.m. 	
10	Adjourn	
	Additional Items:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of June 30, 2021 	18-21
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of July 29, 2021 	22-23
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of August 5, 2021 	24-28



FACULTY SENATE

Meeting Minutes

July 19, 2021

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Omid Bagheri, Tina Bhargava, Jeffrey Child, Tammy Clewell, Timothy Culver, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Omar De La Cruz Cabrera, Kimberly DePaul, Tracy Dodson, Yanhai Du, Julie Evey, Pamela Grimm, Angela Guercio, Mariann Harding, Edgar Kooijman, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Velvet Landingham, Tracy Laux, Karen Mascolo, Mahli Mechenbier, Oana Mocioalca, Deepraj Mukherjee, Abe Osbourne, Vic Perera, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Helen Piontkivska, Susan Roxburgh, Athena Salaba, Murali Shanker, Denice Sheehan, Deborah Smith, Eric Taylor, Robin Vande Zande, Laurie Wagner, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Haiyan Zhu

Senators Not Present: Todd Hawley, David Kaplan, Janice Kroeger, Cathy Marshall, Diane Stroup, Melissa Zullo

Ex-Officio Members Present: President Todd Diacon; Senior Vice President Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Sean Broghammer*, Amoaba Gooden, Lamar Hylton, Rebecca Murphy*, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Peggy Shaddock, Jack Witt; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, Christina Bloebaum, Allan Boike, James Hannon, Mark Mistur, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk*, Diane Petrella, Eboni Pringle, Amy Reynolds, Alison Smith, Manfred van Dulmen *Interim

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Senior Vice President and Provost Melody Tankersley; Vice Presidents: Doug Delahanty*, Valoree Vargo*, Willis Walker; Deans: Ken Burhanna, Deborah Spake *Interim

Observers Present: Paul Farrell (Emeritus Professor), Claire Jackman (GSS)

Observers Not Present: Brandon Allen (USS)

Guests Present: Sue Averill, J.R. Campbell, Sue Clement, Emmanuel Dechenaux, Chris Dorsten, Jo Dowell, Tameka Ellington, Christopher Fenk, Nick Gattozzi, Jennifer Hebebrand, Thomas Janson, Lynette Johnson, Mike Johnson, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Valerie Kelly, Dana Lawless-Andric, Michael Lehman, Babacar M'Baye, Lawrence Marks, Shelley Marshall, Jennifer McDonough, Susan Perry, Amy Petrinec, Amy Quillin, Jim Raber, Dirk Remley, Kara Robinson, Therese Tillett, Julie Volcheck, Annie Zwisler

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Roll Call

Secretary Dauterich called the roll.

3. Approval of the Agenda

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve the agenda. A motion was made and seconded (Kracht/Kristof). The motion passed unanimously.

4. Approval of the May 10, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting (Bagheri/Mukherjee). The minutes were passed unanimously as written.

5. Chair's Remarks

Chair Grimm delivered her remarks. [Attachment]

Chair Grimm then invited President Diacon to speak.

6. President's Remarks

President Diacon began by describing a recent visit he had taken to the Porthouse Theatre. There, he met with former Faculty Senator Kathy Kerns who asked him what it was like to be the president during the pandemic. He told her that he had thought of three real notable dynamics during the pandemic. One was the speed with which big decisions had to be made. The second was the amount of effort it took to reach those decisions and then implement them. The third was the dedication of faculty, staff, and employees to the students of Kent State. He said that it occurred to him then that the Porthouse Theatre was a microcosm of the Kent State situation. He said that it was a real testimony to the producing artistic director, Terri Kent, and the executive producer, Eric van Baars, that they produced "Quilters" and "BKLYN the Musical," respectively, as well as they did. They had to make early decisions about whether to have an in-person season. They had to decide where the season could be performed in person if it was to be so and whether it would be preferable to have no one in the audience and broadcast it virtually. They even considered building mobile plexiglass boxes for each actor to protect the actors from one another. After vaccinations became widely available, they decided to have in-person productions with no limits on attendance.

They had to limit their shows to casts of seven or less because of the timing of the auditions, and they could not provide housing for actors and actresses, so they had to work with local talent, particularly current and recently graduated Kent State students.

He said that the excellence and dedication of everyone involved in the productions was clear. He mentioned that reviewers unanimously praised the Kent State actors and actresses under Eric van Baar's direction, and he reiterated that this is why it is a microcosm of Kent State in the pandemic; there were big decisions to make, great effort to implement the decisions, and a total commitment to excellence.

He finished by encouraging the Kent State community to celebrate their work and successes and to attend upcoming productions at the Porthouse Theatre. He then turned the meeting over to Chair Grimm.

Chair Grimm thanked the president and invited Associate Provost van Dulmen to speak.

7. State of the Pandemic and Prevention Strategies for the Fall (Manfred van Dulmen, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs & Dean for the Division of Graduate Studies and Julie Volcheck, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs & Director of University Health Services)

Associate Provost van Dulmen spoke on the state of the pandemic and prevention strategies for the upcoming semester. He first addressed what changes had occurred since May 2021. Fully vaccinated individuals can now be together without restrictions. CDC and state guidelines changed so that athletic venues and restaurants are all open without restrictions in our area. There is no longer a health emergency in the state of Ohio, and there are no longer health requirements in place. Domestic and international travel has reopened, and Kent State has resumed study away and abroad programs. There are concerns about the Delta variant and increases of cases domestically and internationally, but so far, the vaccine is showing effectiveness for this and other variants.

He said that for the upcoming school year, positive cases on campus are expected. Unlike Fall 2020, however, we will not have certain health measures in place such as deep cleaning, required face coverings, or required physical distancing. Like Fall 2020, we will have bipolar ionization units that are now installed across campus. He added that unlike the previous fall, an effective vaccine is widely available. The university's focus is on promoting the vaccine, and they are currently working on another educational campaign and a vaccine incentive strategy, which will roll out in the next few weeks.

He continued by saying that we control what we can control, and we currently require screening for non-vaccinated students in the residence halls, but we also have to be mindful of state regulations including the recently introduced House Bill 244, which would no longer allow universities to treat vaccinated and unvaccinated students differently. The bill goes into effect on October 12th, but it will only apply to vaccines not fully approved by the FDA.

In addition, health requirements may change based on other triggers like the disease rate, quarantine space on campus, absenteeism, and supply availability within the parameters of what the university can do given changes in state law.

With regard to available actions for instructors, Associate Provost van Dulmen said that they cannot impose other health requirements, including taking temperatures, asking for vaccination cards, and requiring students to wear face coverings. Instructors may ask students to wear face coverings, but they cannot be required. Instructors can also ask individuals to stay home when they are symptomatic, or someone is a close contact of someone who tested positive.

He added that instructors will be asked to fill out floor plans with assigned seating in classrooms to assist with contact tracing. Contact tracing information will be shared in early August through a communication and will also be available on SharePoint. He added that the university's COVID-19 response team works directly with the Health Commissioner and Julie Volcheck, and they will make a flow chart available, so everyone knows the pathway to follow when somebody in the classroom tests positive or when there are concerns about close contact in the classroom. He then invited comments or questions.

Senator Kracht asked whether faculty can ask students to wear face coverings.

Associate Provost van Dulmen replied that they can ask students to wear one, but they cannot require it.

There were no further comments or questions.

8. Enrollment Management Update (Sean Broghammer, Interim V.P. for Enrollment Management)

Interim Vice President Broghammer addressed the senate on the state of enrollment at the university. He said that for first-year students over the last 7-8 years, we have had an average enrollment of 4,200. For Fall 2020, that number dropped to 3,870, a loss of about 400 students. He said that the challenge around the pandemic is that it is not contained to one year. Because those 400 students were not here last year, from a retention perspective, the university is already behind by about 320 students. This means that the university is already down 3% in our first-year retention. They would have expected 81 to 82% retention on that class, but they currently stand at 78.6%. There is some growth in the size of the freshman class from last year. They are anticipating a class of 3,950. They hope to get closer to the 4,000 mark and there still may be opportunity there.

He continued by saying that as of mid-July last year, we had a persistence rate of about 77.6%. Just under 16,000 students registered for Fall 2020. This year, school starts with 19,620. Officially registered as of last week were about 14,457, and the persistence rate is 73.7%, for a drop of about 4%. First-year students are having a little bit higher of a drop in the persistence rate. Overall, while the university is down from the 2019 registration numbers, Interim Vice President Broghammer says that we expect to arrive at numbers similar to Fall 2020 in the upcoming days.

He continued by saying that from 2019 to current enrollment, the university is down 7% on undergraduate enrollment with similar numbers on the graduate side. Regional campus registration looks to be down around 8% for the coming year. He said that in order to stabilize enrollment, they have created a strategic enrollment management plan that is meant to bring various areas of the campus together to address their concerns. More information on this will be forthcoming in Fall 2021.

He then invited comments or questions.

Senator Smith asked whether the decline was due to the pandemic, expected changes in demographics, or both.

Interim Vice President Broghammer said that the demographic shift in the number of students was not expected until 2027-2028, and that the pandemic likely moved that forward as more families are questioning the outcomes of college education.

President Diacon added that where we see an unusual weakness this year is in the registration of continuing students. He said it appeared that the university is going to set a record for the six-year graduation rate on the Kent campus (67.5%), which is higher than a dozen flagship universities in the rest of the United States for a university of our profile. He added that what we have noticed in the current continuing students are weaknesses that were not seen in the previous 9-10 years, so the drop in enrollment is mostly driven by the pandemic.

Interim Dean Munro-Stasiuk asked how we are faring compared to other schools in the region.

Interim Vice President Broghammer replied that he believed a majority of the public institutions will be behind from last year's numbers.

Chair Grimm asked about strategies that some schools were offering, such as free tuition, and wondered how that was working for them or whether it was impacting Kent.

Broghammer said that many schools are offering more scholarships to buy enrollment, which is probably not sustainable in the long term.

There were no further comments or questions.

9. Budget Update (Mark Polatajko, Senior V.P. for Finance and Administration)

Senior Vice President Polatajko began by discussing budget planning for the university. On June 30th Governor DeWine signed a budget bill for 2022-2023 biennium, which provided a 1% increase in the state share of instruction (SSI) for public schools and universities. The tuition and fee caps specifically for the tuition guarantee had a limit of about 3.8%, and Kent State's board of trustees at the June meeting approved about a 2.9% increase for incoming freshman cohort. This is good news from an access and affordability perspective. The Ohio College Opportunity Grant was increased by \$500 per student overall. He added that one of the guiding principles for the upcoming budget is to limit new hires, so the university can provide raises to the non-represented employees and offer other work/life enhancements. He said that the university will continue from an effectiveness and efficiency perspective and that looking at our cost structure will limit administrative and non-academic expenditures through a continued emphasis on reorganization and shared services. Balancing the budget continues to be a priority.

He said that we are projecting about a 5% decline in enrollment for the Kent campus compared to fiscal year 2021, and our regional campuses will be looking at about an 8% decline. We will increase tuition by 2.9% for incoming students, but we are not increasing any tuition or any fees for our current and continuing undergraduates and graduate students, nor are we increasing the non-resident surcharge. The 1% increase in SSI each of the years means about \$1.5 million in additional revenue for Kent State in fiscal year 2022 and then in the second year of the biennium, another \$1.5 million. The base budget will increase two years from now to about \$3 million for the upcoming year and about 1.5 million in terms of investment income. In the upcoming year, there will be a proposal to return to the budget target of about \$9 million of realized investment gains. Those are capital gains, interest income and dividends to support our operations. There is also good news about auxiliaries, which appear to be returning to normal as they relate to other revenue sources. For example, residence hall occupancy has increased to 5,000 at this point in time compared to only 2,800 last year. Athletic revenues are coming back to the levels they were pre-pandemic. Total revenues for our Kent and regional campuses will only decrease slightly.

On the expenditures side, the university will continue to support the collective bargaining agreements and align resources as contractually negotiated. A 2% increase will continue to be modeled for non-represented personnel in terms of health care benefits. In addition, as a result of some very successful voluntary separation incentive programs, there should not be an increase in the amount budgeted in fiscal year 2022 compared to where we were at in terms of fiscal year 2021. As far as scholarships, the university will continue to strive for financial aid optimization. He

said that the focus will be on aligning our resources to those core activities of access, completion, and research. The next steps are to finalize the budgets, and then communicate the information to stakeholders for feedback.

He then invited comments or questions.

Senator Vande Zande asked about new hires being limited and wanted to know whether that was across the board or only for non-represented employees.

Senior Vice President Polatajko said the hiring limits were mostly on the non-academic and administrative side.

There were no further comments or questions.

10. Presentation and Discussion about IT Governance and University Council on Technology (John Rathje, V.P. for Information Technology and Shelley Marshall, Associate Lecturer for Computer Technology and the University Council on Technology Chair)

Chair Grimm invited Vice President Rathje and Shelley Marshall, chair of the University Council on Technology (UCT) to speak.

Vice President Rathje began by discussing IT governance at the university. He said that a good IT governance framework really helps organizations better manage risk and align the efforts of IT to support the overall mission objectives of the organization itself. He said that the current objectives are to ensure that we have a broad representation of input, but at the same time, to have focused input and representation as it relates to different domains of need. Across the university, it is intended to provide transparency into projects and spending. It will also help improve leverage of university investments to ensure that the dollars that are available are being used well. IT governance should also focus on helping improve the experience users have with technology and technology services. He added that the planned governance structure will involve a coordinated approach across the university, so we can protect its mission, needs, and goals and do not have disjointed efforts that compete for attention or priority. Another goal is to help IT continually improve through feedback and to ensure that the technology, resources, and the team that supports technology are doing all the right things.

Vice President Rathje added that part of the change would be a proposal related to the UCT. He said that the UCT was established in the 1990s, and it had not had much change in its approach to operations or aligning with other efforts on campus. He said that the proposed adjustment was meant to focus the membership and the leadership of the group around the educational and academic mission. This will help the UCT to assess needs, look at recommended changes, and improve in its use of technologies.

He then turned the discussion over to Chair Marshall.

Chair Marshall gave a brief overview of the UCT and said the council wanted to change its mission and bylaws to allow for a change in membership. The original membership reflected a council that was working more at the administrative level rather than acting as the interface between the administration and faculty, which is what it is at present. The goal of the proposed changes is to increase the membership numbers for faculty leaders who are interested in technology,

technology in the classroom, technology and research, and enterprise technology. They would also like to continue working closely with the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the Office of Continuing and Distance Education (OCDE).

The presenters then invited comments or questions.

Senator Kristof asked how the libraries would be involved in the changes.

Chair Marshall said that they hope to have multiple library members on the committees and subcommittees.

Emeritus Professor Farrell asked whether they were returning to the original UCT mission and structure, and he expressed the hope that the UCT would be consulted on email, remote logins, security, and other things that might impact the research mission in addition to being focused on learning management systems and teaching systems.

Chair Marshall thanked him for his comments.

Vice President Rathje added that the inclusion of voice is a principal objective of IT governance, and he said that we need to understand that IT does not just deal with applications any longer or just a network any longer. It is a system of systems that they work with, and the approach to organizing and structuring this governance is to improve overall understanding and the ability to input, so the experience for students, faculty, staff, and researchers can be the best it possibly can be given all of those moving parts.

Chair Marshall added that the UCT wants to remain broad in its focus to help meet those goals.

Vice Chair Laux said that the UCT cannot make policy and that some technology in the classroom might not be under UCT's governance. He also applauded the idea of recruiting additional faculty to the council to help it gain a more diverse voice.

Chair Marshall agreed that they do not make policy and are a recommending body.

Senator Kracht asked what we are doing to prevent ransomware attacks.

Vice President Rathje said that the increasing threats of such attacks are very real, but the IT team is working on it. There is no such thing as absolute coverage, but he maintained that the area of concern is one in which the university will continue to invest resources.

There were no further comments or questions.

11. VPN Update Chief Information Security Officer Robert Eckman and Executive Director, Support, Infrastructure and Research Technology, Jim Raber

Chief Information Security Officer Eckman was unable to attend the meeting. Executive Director Raber began by saying that his group is working on some improvements on the VPN in order to make sure the VPN software allows good off-campus access to the university network. The current VPN solution does not support multifactor authentication based off some behavior that they have

observed. Over the next few weeks, a new VPN will be rolled out, and it will support such authentication.

He added that the new VPN works in a similar way to the old one where a username and password are entered for access. The big difference is that once those are entered, it will then prompt for multifactor authentication. This will be in the form of a code that you would get through SMS text. It will require some new software to be installed, which they are looking at automating for Windows users. Software for Mac users and others will be available at software.kent.edu.

He then invited comments or questions.

Emeritus Professor Farrell asked whether retired faculty would continue to have access to the VPN.

Executive Director Raber said they would.

Senator Bagheri asked where to download the new software from.

Executive Director Raber told him that it can be downloaded from software.kent.edu.

There were no further comments or questions.

12. Old Business

There was no old business.

13. New Business: Discussion Item: Faculty Ethics Committee Purpose & Procedures Proposed Changes (Susan Roxburgh, Professor for the Department of Sociology and the Faculty Ethics Committee Chair)

Chair Grimm invited Senator Roxburgh to discuss proposed changes to the purpose and procedures of the Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC). Senator Roxburgh said that the FEC had difficult meetings and hearings over the past year, and she added that issues arose that begged a change in policies and procedures. One concerned how to handle the requests for additional materials from both parties at hearings. The committee would like to prevent additional materials beyond what they asked for from being submitted in order to avoid a potential deluge of materials and responses. A second concern was about providing materials in a timely manner. The FEC would like to replace the phrase “timely manner” with “seven calendar days” in the committee description. A third item addressed the number of witnesses called by respondents and complainants. The FEC recommends that no more than five witnesses be called by either the complainant or the respondent. A fourth concern was the role of the chair in regard to witnesses. The FEC recommends that it is the role of the chair of the committee to explain and discuss the role of witnesses with the complainant and respondent. A fifth concern is that members of the FEC do not always know when the decisions are made about what they recommend. She added that the FEC previously had not specified in the policy that the results of the complaint be conveyed to the complainant, the respondent, the Chair of Faculty Senate, and the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. This has been made clearer in the proposed changes. The Vice Provost

for Faculty Affairs would then communicate with the Chair of Faculty Senate regarding the decision on the FEC's recommendation.

She then invited comments or questions.

Senator Smith suggested that it would be helpful if there was a mechanism for the complainant or respondent to request additional witnesses and then have it considered by the committee. She also suggested that a timely response in reporting the decision may not always be possible because of contractual processes.

Senator Roxburgh thanked her for her comments and agreed to consider the suggestions.

Senator Salaba asked a question about how complaints and responses were distributed and who should have access to those.

Senator Roxburgh said that one of the issues that they struggled with was that some materials from one side of a complaint could potentially be confidential. The complainant, however, had the right to receive all the materials that have been provided by the respondent and vice versa. In turn, both have the right to share that information with their witnesses

Senator Salaba added that she was also concerned that the portion of the explanation about how results are communicated only discusses the procedure of what happen in the case of an affirmative answer. She wondered whether or not it would be possible to inform only the complainant and respondent in the event of a negative response rather than the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Senator Roxburgh said they could consider the idea and thanked her for her response.

Senator Mocioalca asked whether the restricted number of documents had to be submitted by a particular deadline or period.

Senator Roxburgh responded that the committee could request what they needed, but the purpose on the restriction of documents was to prevent an endless exchange of supporting materials as new materials are received.

Senator Mocioalca expressed the concern that the FEC might not know what documents to ask for.

Senator Roxburgh responded that they probably would because the chair of the committee would be having confidential conversations with the respondent and the complainant and could relay the information to the rest of the committee.

Senator Mocioalca thanked her for the explanation.

Senator Shanker suggested that the core of the problem was not the number of documents, but whether or not the complaint and response were themselves factual.

Senator Roxburgh agreed that this was an important problem, but she added that the process was not a trial or legal procedure, and policy should not be written that would make it one.

Senator Sheehan asked whether three witnesses would be enough.

Senator Roxburgh responded that the hearings only last thirty minutes, so it was up to the complainant and the respondent to use their time wisely when considering how many witnesses they want to include.

Chair Grimm expressed her appreciation for Senator Roxburgh, Senator Salaba, and their work on the FEC.

There were no further comments or questions.

14. Announcements/Statements for the Record

President Diacon mentioned that this was Associate Provost Averill's last meeting and said that he wanted to call attention to her years of service for both the union and in her role as the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Chair Grimm echoed the president's sentiments and added that we would all miss Associate Provost Averill.

15. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate

Attachment

Chair's Remarks for July 19, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

My summer memories are pretty much a blur. A few key moments stick out, but not much. I liked school and summer wasn't as big a deal for me as for my siblings. However, some summer stories have passed into lore within our family. So, I'm going to tell you about a summer adventure that wasn't mine but belongs to me, none the less.

My mother is the oldest of seven. She had a sister who was the second oldest, my aunt Annie. Annie had moved early in her marriage to California. But about 5 years later, her husband got a job in Corning, NY and they had to move across country. Uncle Leo went ahead, got a place to live and started working. Annie was left to close up the house and drive her two kids across country. My mother decided this was an ideal opportunity for her and my three brothers to go to California, have some fun at Disneyland and Knox Berry Farm, and then drive back to New York in a stationwagon, with my Aunt Annie and her two children. That's five children, ages 7 and under, across the country. You couldn't even do this today. Kids were stowed in the far back of the wagon...no seat belts...and yet, they survived.

On some long stretch of road somewhere in the middle of the country, they stopped for a typical break, no doubt taking a little longer because there were seven of them. The break ended, they all hustled back into the car and got on their way. After about 10 or 15 minutes my brother Danny started crying and said "are we ever going back for Bobby?" Shrieks...u-turns and 10 minutes later they pulled into the gas station and saw Bobby, maybe 7 years old, patiently sitting on a box waiting for them to return.

For years, we blamed Danny for the fact that we had an oldest brother who was frequently the bane of our existence. If you are an only child you won't get this. If you are one of four or more, you probably do.

There are some things you can leave behind and some things you can't. We are transitioning from Blackboard to Canvas this year. There is probably no other learning software so universally used as our LMS. And now we have two. This transition is inevitably going to induce anxiety among students, faculty and perhaps staff. Personally, I'm looking forward to leaving Blackboard behind, but we are not there yet. It's important that as we move towards the full transition to Canvas, we don't leave behind those currently using Blackboard. The "hard stop" on Blackboard is the end of next spring. This transition was complicated by Barnes and Noble Bookstore, that initially told us they couldn't support delivery of Flashbooks to both Blackboard and Canvas at the same time. Faculty were facing the possibility of either denying students access to highly reduced book prices or being forced onto the Canvas platform, whether they were ready to switch or not. I'm grateful to Barb Bolts and all of our employees who worked with Barnes and Noble to ensure that users of either Blackboard or Canvas will have access to Flashbooks from this Fall as we make this transition. I'm also glad that we will continue to support students and faculty on both Blackboard and Canvas throughout this transition.

I used Canvas for my Summer 1 course and, with a few blips, found it to be infinitely easier to use than Blackboard, as did my students. I'll be using the summer to finish work on a master course for the fall, really getting the hang of Canvas. While I will grudgingly admit that it was best that my mother didn't leave Bobby behind, I'm looking forward to leaving Blackboard behind and looking forward to becoming best friends with Canvas this fall.

Summary of Proposed Changes to Faculty Ethics Purpose and Procedures

1. No additional materials may be added: see 4-B and 4-G
2. Specify 'timely manner:' see 4-E
3. When the complainant submits list of witnesses (not previously specified) and when the respondent receives this information. See 4-F
4. Limit on number of witnesses: See 4-F and 4-G
5. What information the witnesses receive – from the Chair, they receive a copy of the Faculty Code of Ethics and the Committee's Purpose and Procedures. Complainant and Respondent will provide their witnesses with a copy of the complaint and any other materials previously submitted to the Committee that they deem relevant. See 4G
6. Finding of violation and recommendations will be distributed to the Chair of Faculty Senate, the Complainant(s), the Respondents, the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, and the Provost. If the Provost does not concur with the committee's finding that a violation has occurred, the Provost shall notify the Chair of Faculty Senate of this decision in a timely fashion. If the Provost does concur with the committee's finding that a violation occurred, any restorative measures or disciplinary actions will be communicated to the Chair of Faculty Senate after due process provided by any applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement or University Policy. See 5C

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY ETHICS COMMITTEE
PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

1. PURPOSE

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

2. MEMBERSHIP

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

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

3. RECUSAL AND REMOVAL OF MEMBERS

- A. Any members of the Committee who are directly involved in a case before the Committee or who judge that they cannot render impartial judgment in a case shall recuse themselves from all Committee activities pertaining to the case. Members may recuse themselves at any time during the proceedings.
- B. The Committee may by a vote of three-fourths (3/4) of the members remove a member who, in the judgment of the other members, has or may have a conflict of interest or other consideration that likely impairs the member’s impartiality. The member in question is excluded from this vote. A member may be removed at any time during the proceedings.
- C. In the event of a member’s recusal or removal, the Chair of the Committee, with the approval of a majority of Committee members, shall select a unit alternate to serve on the Committee for the duration of that case. If the recused or removed member is Committee Chair, then the remaining members of the Committee shall elect an interim chair to serve for the duration of that case, including the selection of an alternate member. Should the elected member and all alternates from any unit recuse themselves from a given case, alternates from other units will be called upon to hear the case.

4. SCREENING PROCEDURE

- A. A faculty member(s) (“Complainant(s)”) who is (are) lodging a charge of unethical professional conduct against another faculty member (“Respondent”) shall prepare a file consisting of all documents the Complainant(s) would like considered and a list of witnesses the Complainant(s) wish to give testimony at a hearing and shall submit the file to the Chair of the Committee. Note that one or more complainants can bring a complaint against a single respondent.
- B. The written complaint submitted by the Complainant(s) should include the nature of the complaint, the facts and circumstances leading to the complaint, and reasons or evidence in support of the complaint. The written complaint shall present the charge in terms of violating stated provisions of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-6-17 of the University Policy Register). The file submitted by the Complainant(s) becomes the basis for all further consideration

of the matter. Unless additional material is requested by the Committee, no additional materials may be submitted by the Complainant once the written complaint is submitted.

- C. The complaint shall include a statement indicating how the Complainant has used the consultative procedures at the departmental, college, or regional campus levels such as FAC, CAC, or FC, as appropriate for the case. The Committee shall normally decline to hear ethical disputes without documented evidence of a bona fide attempt at resolution at the unit, college, or regional campus level. If, however, a dispute involves parties in different colleges or at different campuses, the dispute is of a highly sensitive nature, or for other good cause, a majority of Committee members may vote to hear the complaint without a prior attempt at resolution.
- D. No more than thirty (30) calendar days may elapse from the time of final unsatisfactory resolution of a charge through consultative procedures for the matter to be formally initiated in writing with the Committee. If the final unsatisfactory resolution occurs during Finals Week or after the end of a regular semester or during a summer session, the Complainant(s) shall have up to fifteen (15) calendar days at the start of the next semester to submit a complaint. Upon receipt of the initial written complaint, the Committee may deem it necessary to request additional information, which must be submitted within ten (10) calendar days from the day of the Committee's request.
- E. The Committee, upon receiving the file, shall meet within seven (7) calendar days to in a timely manner and review the documents to determine whether the charge is within the purview of the Committee. If a majority of the Committee membership agrees that a case is within the purview of the Committee, a hearing shall take place following the procedures below. If a majority of the Committee judges that a charge is not within the purview of the Committee, the Complainant(s) and, when appropriate, the Respondent, shall be notified, in writing, within ten (10) calendar days.
- F. If the Committee rules that a complaint is within the purview of the Committee, the Complainant(s) and Respondent shall be notified in writing within ten (10) calendar days. If they have not already received them, the parties shall be sent copies of the Faculty Code of Ethics along with a copy of this Committee's Purposes and Procedures. The Respondent shall also receive copies of all documents included in the complaint. Upon notification that a hearing will be held, the Complainant has five (5) days to provide the Committee with a list of witnesses. No more than five witnesses are permitted. The list of witnesses should be conveyed to the Respondent within two (2) calendar days by the Chair.
- G. Upon receipt of notification that the Committee will hear the complaint, the Respondent shall have twenty (20) calendar days to submit to the Committee a written response with supporting documentation and a list of no more than five (5) witnesses the Respondent(s) wish to give testimony at a hearing. Additional material may be requested by the Committee, but no additional materials may be submitted by the Respondent once the response has been received by the Committee. If the notification that the Committee will hear the complaint occurs during Finals Week or after the end of a regular semester, the Respondent(s) shall have up to fifteen (15) calendar days at the start of the next semester to submit a written response. The Chair of the Committee shall provide written notification of the date, time, and place of the hearings to the parties and to the Committee members no less than five (5) calendar days prior to the hearing. The Chair shall also provide, in a timely manner, copies of all documents related to the complaint to both parties and to all members of the Committee. The Chair shall provide all witnesses with copies of the Faculty Code of Ethics and the Committee's Purposes and Procedures. It is the responsibility of the Complainant and the Respondent to provide their witnesses with a copy of the complaint and any other materials previously submitted to the Committee that they deem relevant. No more than five (5) witnesses representing the Respondent and the Complainant are permitted.
- H. The hearings shall be held at a mutually agreed upon date no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the notification of the Complainant(s) and Respondent.

- I. In extraordinary circumstances and with proper written substantiation requesting an extension of a deadline by one of the parties, the Committee members may determine that an extension is warranted.

5. HEARING PROCEDURE

- A. The conduct of matters brought before the Faculty Ethics Committee shall be non-adversarial in nature. The hearings shall be closed to all but those necessary for a full and complete hearing. The Complainant(s) and the Respondent shall be invited to appear before the committee. Each party may bring one (1) faculty advocate and no more than five (5) witnesses. Under exceptional circumstances to be determined by the Chair of FEC, additional witnesses may be permitted. Faculty advocates shall be full-time faculty as determined by the Faculty Senate census. The committee may also invite testimony from any other persons who, in the judgment of the committee, may assist in its examination and evaluation of the complaint. Legal counsel is excluded.
- B. The Faculty ethics Committee shall hold two separate hearings: one for the Complainant(s) and one for the Respondent. The Complainant(s) and Respondent shall each have up to forty-five (45) minutes for their respective presentations. For a period after the presentations not exceeding thirty (30) minutes, the members of the Committee may question any person who has presented information at the hearing. The Complainant(s) or Respondent shall then have the opportunity to give a final summation of at most ten (10) minutes. The Committee may choose to adjust the periods depending on the nature of each case.
- C. Following the hearings, the Committee shall have five (5) calendar days to produce a written recommendation concerning the charge. The question before the committee is whether a preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusion that the Respondent committed a violation of the Faculty Code of Professional Ethics (3342-6-17 of the University Policy Register). An affirmative answer to this question and any subsequent recommendation shall require a two-thirds majority of the vote of the Committee. The Committee may recommend that the Provost pursue restorative measures or disciplinary actions consistent with the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreements or University Policy. In the case of a null finding, the Committee's report of the vote and any recommendation shall be sent to the Chair of Faculty Senate and to both the Complainant(s) and the Respondent. In the case of a finding of a violation, the Committee's report and any recommendation shall be sent to the Chair of Faculty Senate, the Complainant(s), the Respondents, the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, and the Provost. If the Provost does not concur with the committee's finding that a violation has occurred, the Provost shall notify the Chair of Faculty Senate of this decision in a timely fashion. If the Provost does concur with the committee's finding that a violation has occurred, the decision concerning any restorative measures or disciplinary actions will be communicated to the Chair of Faculty Senate at the conclusion of the due process provided by any applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement or University Policy.
- D. In Committee deliberations pertaining to a Complaint, the Chair of the Committee will have a vote.
- E. As the Committee's hearings yield only recommendations and not sanctions or censure, no formal appeal process attaches to this procedure.
- F. If any members of the Committee, including the Chair, are involved in hearing a case when their terms of office end, they shall continue hearing that case until it is terminated. No newly elected member of the Committee shall join a case in progress.
- G. The proceedings of this Committee are confidential and absolute integrity is expected of all parties involved in each Complaint.

6. REPOSITORY OF THE DOCUMENTS

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

7. REPORT OF THE FACULTY ETHICS COMMITTEE TO THE FACULTY SENATE

By May 1 of each year, the Committee shall report to the Chair and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate a summary report of the Committee's activities during the academic year.



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
June 30, 2021**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Tracy Laux (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Darci Kracht (At-Large), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: Angela Guercio (Appointed)

Guests Present: Susan Roxburgh (Faculty Ethics Committee Chair)

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Meet with Susan Roxburgh (Faculty Ethics Committee Chair)

The Executive Committee met with Senator Roxburgh to discuss proposed changes to the purpose and procedures of the Faculty Ethics Committee. Senator Roxburgh said the Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC) had difficult meetings and hearings over the past year, and she added that issues arose that begged a change in policies and procedures. One concern was how to handle the requests for additional materials from both parties at hearings, and one was about providing materials in a timely manner. The FEC would like to replace the phrase “timely manner” with “seven calendar days” in the committee description. A third item addressed the number of witnesses called by respondents and complainants. A fourth concerned the role of the chair in regard to witnesses. Another concern is the statute of limitations insofar as how far back a person can go to raise a complaint. A final concern is that members of the FEC do not always know when the decisions are made about what they recommend. Senator Roxburgh was concerned that the committee has no “teeth” and wonders if the committee would be necessary if we had an ombuds.

Vice Chair Laux said that the language in the description is internal language to the FEC only, not in the senate bylaws or university policy, so the FEC is fully allowed to propose changes and have them approved by senate. He added that there is strong university policy (including the faculty code of ethics) that makes the FEC responsible for responding to some interactions, and he expressed a concern that administration

sometimes disregards the FEC's work. He said that the administration needs to be called out at senate meetings for ignoring the work of the FEC.

Chair Grimm said that the way things are running imply that the FEC is responsible for any faculty interactions that lead to dispute.

Senator Roxburgh said this all goes back to the faculty code of ethics and that the past year's disputes also connected to violations of that code of ethics.

Chair Grimm said that interpretations of the code of ethics are often subjective and added that the FEC rarely gets support for their decisions unless the dispute is connected to something like Title IX.

Vice Chair Laux brought up examples of NTT vs. TT interactions that violated the code and were ignored. He said the Faculty Senate Executive Committee could put an end to this.

Senator Roxburgh said the decisions were hard to make and, when made, were often not acknowledged.

Chair Grimm brought up concerns about confidentiality when complaints are brought to FEC.

Vice Chair Laux agreed that those concerns could be avoided, and a resolution could still be made.

Senator Sheehan brought up an issue with a past administration and said that some of these issues might be handled during Executive Committee meetings with the president and provost and with the new ombuds position if that position is created. She said that there needs to be accountability from administrators when issues arise.

Senator Roxburgh agreed and said that disputes had been ignored and bad behavior had been reinforced in the past. She suggested their needs to be more accountability.

Chair Grimm asked why there have not been better responses to FEC recommendations.

Vice Chair Laux said we should start with using recent cases brought before the FEC to see why we have heard nothing from administration after recommendations from the FEC.

Senator Roxburgh asked Senator Sheehan if a recent case provoked a response.

Senator Sheehan said that in the case in question, the FEC decision was put forward to the provost, but no one knew how the decision was communicated to the respondent or the complainant.

Senator Roxburgh responded that with the revision of the committee procedures, the decision will now need to be communicated to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Senator Sheehan reiterated that all parties need to be aware of the outcome.

Senator Roxburgh agreed but added that the FEC also needed to be added to those who are informed of the outcome.

Senator Kracht asked for clarification about who decisions were submitted to and who should act on them.

Senator Roxburgh said that she submitted recommendations to faculty senate, the complainant, and the respondent per policy, and then, that decisions should also be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Senator Kracht asked what the Executive Committee could do to request the information about results.

Senator Roxburgh replied that a decision about handling this has not been made yet.

Senator Kracht asked if Chair Grimm ever got feedback about current FEC cases from administration.

Chair Grimm said she had not.

Chair Grimm asked about timelines that were set in the new committee language. She felt the amount of time allocated may be unreasonable. She wanted to know how strict the seven-day response time was.

Senator Roxburgh said that it is in the best interests of all involved that complaints were determined to be legitimate as quickly as possible, but she added that the time could be extended to ten working or fourteen calendar days.

Chair Grimm agreed that that number of days would be a more comfortable range.

Vice Chair Laux asked why witnesses were limited to five in the new wording.

Senator Roxburgh said that some participants had made requests for twelve or more, and there was not enough time to hear that many witnesses.

Chair Grimm invited Senator Roxburgh to the July senate meeting to present with the expectation for a vote at the September meeting.

Senator Roxburgh agreed to the chair's suggestions.

3. **Approval of Minutes: Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of June 23, 2021**
A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes (Laux/Kracht). The minutes were approved as written.

4. **Review Draft of Email Regarding SSIs**

The committee agreed that the email should be shortened and that the value of SSIs needed not to be overestimated particularly with regard to NTTs. Chair Grimm will revise the email and send it out in 24 hours.

5. **Set Agenda for the July 19, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting**

The agenda for the meeting was set. Vice President Amoaba Gooden will be invited to the September meeting to talk about the Anti-Racism Task Force. In addition, the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) needs to be asked to clean up language about faculty pursuing advanced degrees, so senate can vote on it.

6. **Additional Items**

There were no additional items.

7. **Adjournment**

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
July 29, 2021**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Tracy Laux (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Darci Kracht (At-Large), Angela Guercio (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: Denice Sheehan (Appointed)

Guests Present: President Todd Diacon, Provost Melody Tankersley

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Discuss Topics for President Diacon and Provost Tankersley

Topics discussed included: (1) regional campus faculty and NTT faculty members at the Kent campus and how they are treated in what appears to be an academic caste system, (2) whether all students can be given access to computers if we go remote at some point next semester, and (3) whether the provost will be able to make opening remarks at the next senate meeting. The committee decided that these could be discussed after any issues brought by the president and provost, if time remained to do so.

3. University Accreditation and Accountability Committee (UAAC)

The Executive Committee decided to forward recommendations to Assistant Provost Susan Perry in the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Learning. Recommendations included that each college have faculty representation on the committee and that some of the language in the committee charge be reworded. Chair Grimm will summarize the proposed recommendations and send them to Assistant Provost Perry for her consideration.

4. (4:00) Meet with President Diacon and Provost Tankersley

The committee invited the president and provost to share issues of concern. Provost Tankersley shared two items. The first was that if faculty need to move to remote this fall, a plan needs to be put together. Faculty choice will be honored if they need to shift,

but students will still have to have the course delivered in person if faculty choose to change the mode of delivery. This means that if the faculty member switches modality, the students may have an adjunct working with the faculty member to finish the course, or the faculty member would broadcast remotely into the space while someone else monitored the computer in the classroom. President Diacon said that the adjunct option would be preferred and that emergency funding could be used to cover it. These points will be relayed to faculty. The provost also brought up the idea that faculty will have a floor plan and seating chart to be used to help with contact tracing if necessary in the fall. This is not a mandatory requirement, but it is a request from the administration. Taking attendance at every class would also be helpful. There was also a request for a change of title for a current administrative position. The Associate Provost for Global Education will be renamed the Vice President for Global Education. No other changes will be made to the job descriptions, duties, reporting structure, or benefits. The change is simply being made to assist with working in foreign countries where the title provost carries less influence. There will also be no administrative staff hired to complement the name change.

President Diacon shared information on House Bill 244. It was passed by the state legislature and said that if the emergency COVID vaccines are not fully approved, then higher education institutions will not be able to require the vaccines or treat unvaccinated students differently from those who are vaccinated. This goes into effect October 14. The governor has made it clear that he favors encouraging vaccinations. None of the fourteen state universities are currently requiring vaccines. If FDA approval of the vaccines happens, the law will be moot. Kent State University will be offering incentives for students to provide vaccination records.

President Diacon also updated the committee on the state of the university budget.

The committee mentioned the NTT and regional campus issue listed above and said that we would like to hear more in the future from the president and the provost about this.

Provost Tankersley agreed that she could make opening remarks at the next senate meeting.

The president and provost left the meeting at 4:37.

5. Additional Items
There were no additional items.

6. Adjournment
Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
August 5, 2021**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Tracy Laux (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Angela Guercio (Appointed), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: Darci Kracht (At-Large)

Guests Present: Vice President Lamar Hylton

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Discuss Topics for Vice President Lamar Hylton

Topics discussed included: (1) the bookstore contract update, (2) an update on the dining program and food services, (3) an update on the Ice Arena, and (4) the role of faculty information/input on student life decisions.

3. Approval of the Minutes

- a. Executive Committee Minutes of June 30, 2021
- b. Executive Committee Minutes of July 29, 2021

A motion was made and seconded to pass the minutes as a single slate (Laux/Guercio). The minutes passed as written.

4. (2:30) Meet with Vice President Hylton

Vice President Hylton had a discussion with the executive committee on the areas of concern listed above. Regarding the bookstore, Vice President Hylton informed the committee that the contract's initial terms had expired, and the university will now go year-to-year with the contract rather than having a full four-year extension, which was a

possibility. Vice President Hylton said this will allow for a more in-depth dialogue with the bookstore as circumstances and needs for students, faculty, and administration change. The upcoming year will be used to see how to best move forward.

Chair Grimm asked about the revenue-generating role of auxiliaries such as the bookstore. She suggested the university should not be making a profit from selling books to students.

Vice President Hylton agreed that this should be part of the discussion in the future, and he added that other auxiliaries needed to be included in that discussion as well. He said that the business model of higher education needs to change and that these things need to be addressed soon. He mentioned that profits are usually sent to places that cannot be used to pay off recurring debts. He added that this is all connected to a larger discussion of university finances that will have to be thought about differently moving forward.

Chair Grimm asked if a working group was being considered to begin this conversation.

Vice President Hylton said that general cost-structure parameters need to be looked at in relation to auxiliaries and other costs. He said that Vice President Polatajko would be the most likely leader of such a discussion.

Senator Sheehan said that the provost convened a subcommittee to restructure RCM, and she wondered if some of these parameters would be changing soon.

Chair Grimm said we will need to have a conversation about that in the future in connection with the RCM 2.0 committee and FaSBAC.

Senator Laux mentioned that the administration can create any committee they want without faculty involvement, but he was happy that Vice President Hylton was looking at a more structured way to handle auxiliaries.

Vice President Hylton agreed that it would be good to have more consistent approaches to these financial matters, so Kent will be ready for the changes that will come in the future. He added that in addition to auxiliaries, there ought to be other options for revenue generation. In Student Affairs, there will soon begin a five-year financial analysis of the entire division to provide a projection for where cuts, realignments, and reinvestments can be made in the future.

Chair Grimm then asked about the changes to dining services.

Vice President Hylton said Kent State Dining Services has only been self-operating since July 1, and the leadership team there is working hard to meet their goals. He hopes for more flexibility to meet the needs of the whole university community. Self-operation allows the removal of the middle agency that existed in the past. This allows for a more central, efficient relationship. He said that food and culinary services play a unique and creative role in retention, graduation, and student satisfaction—things which were not

corporate goals of the previous contract partner. Housing and dining will be merged into University Housing and Culinary Services. There are challenges (appropriate level of staffing, contractual renegotiations with existing food service brands on campus, liquor licenses), but he says they are working steadily and enthusiastically to overcome them. He believes the community will have a very positive reaction to the results of the transition.

Senator Laux posted in the chat that some of the auxiliaries are revenue positive and some are not. Those that are not are subsidized by others including the academic sector. Also, the academic sector finances much of the debt that is incurred for the auxiliaries via "transfers out." In fact, there are many parallel relationships between the various auxiliaries and between the academic colleges.

Vice President Hylton agreed with him and added that we need to think about auxiliaries in a more holistic fashion to help them align with the academic mission.

Senator Guercio asked if alternative ideas to extending the bookstore contract had been considered.

Vice President Hylton said that many options were considered, including eliminating the outside party, but that the possibilities would be considered more deeply during the upcoming year.

With regard to the Schwebel Room and the Rathskeller, Vice President Hylton said these are part of the mid-range plans under consideration, but other priorities will be worked with first. The Schwebel Room will still be available for special events and catering. The Rathskeller is also under consideration for redesign. Hospitality Management at Kent State are involved with the work on the Schwebel Room.

Senator Guercio asked if the regional campus dining systems were completely independent from the main campus.

Vice President Hylton said that the Kent Campus is still running regional operations and will continue to do so. Regional campuses will have flexibility for how to engage with community partners, and they will have much more leeway to do so than when they had to work with our previous strategic partner. He added that relationships with local community restaurants have greatly improved and that they will cooperate with Kent moving forward to help engage students with the community. In addition, the food truck (Fork in the Road) is back up and running, and it may also be deployed in the community.

Chair Grimm asked about the state of the Ice Arena.

Vice President Hylton said the public recreation rink of the arena will be re-engineered as an indoor marching band practice facility. Construction for this will start in December 2021. The competition rink will continue to be available for ice hockey activity for Kent

State's Ice Hockey Club and external partners. There will be public skating time built into the schedule for the rink until the outdoor ice rink is available in the city of Kent in November. There is less community outcry about the decision at this point. The ratio of Kent State vs. community usage is about 79:21. The outdoor rink will be located near the Kent State University Hotel.

Chair Grimm asked Vice President Hylton if he had further thoughts about the faculty role when it comes to student life.

Vice President Hylton said that the academic mission must be the first priority and that we need Student Affairs to work hand-in-hand with faculty in order for that mission to be successful. Open, two-way communication between Student Affairs and the Provost will be a necessity going forward, and faculty are integral to that communication. Students who have a sense of belonging at Kent are those who see that communication at work rather than seeing faculty and administration in their own silos.

Chair Grimm asked him if he had any questions for the Executive Committee.

He suggested that we could find ways of increasing students' sense of belonging in the classroom space in order to help them feel connected. He added that faculty could also be partnered with when mental health and well-being were concerned.

Chair Grimm asked Vice President Hylton what to do when faculty feel students have no sense of what the expectations of the faculty for them really are. She wanted to know how to convince students that they are the primary drivers of their own education, and how that message can be promoted without appearing as faculty are lecturing students.

Vice President Hylton said that this should start with the onboarding of new students in the residential programming curriculum, ideally with faculty mentors or faculty in residence in the halls to help reinforce the ideas. He added that in the ideal world, this could also be extended to commuter students so that all students could develop habits that would lead them to success in their academic environments.

Secretary Dauterich brought up mental health workshops for adjuncts that the English department held in the past. He suggested we could do something like that with adjuncts in the future to help students' sense of well-being.

Vice President Hylton said it was a good point.

Senator Sheehan agreed with holding workshops related to mental health concerns and suggested the distribution of resources both online and in-person for training faculty about addiction and mental health.

Vice President Hylton thanked her for her input.

There were no further comments or questions.

Vice President Hylton offered to return at any time and to be available if necessary to dispel rumors or clarify uncertainties.

5. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

6. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 3:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate