



## FACULTY SENATE

---

**TO:** Members of the Faculty Senate and Guests      **DATE:** October 28, 2019  
**FROM:** Pamela E. Grimm, Chair of the Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Agenda and Materials for the November 4, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

---

Attached you will find the agenda and the materials for the November 4<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting. As always, we will meet in the Governance Chambers at 3:20 p.m. Refreshments will be provided.

Senators, please note that a substantial amount of time has been allocated for the discussion of the EPC item regarding the Kent Core Assessment (Item 7). Please read the report and support material in preparation for this discussion.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Approval of the October 14, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
5. Chair's Remarks
6. President's Remarks
7. EPC Items:

A. From the September 16, 2019 EPC Meeting:

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COUNCIL

1. Support Material - Proposal from the URCC

The EPC had voted to endorse the URCC Report: Analysis of the Kent Core Assessment Method With a Plan for Reform. The drive from the HLC was to assess the core at the program level, not individual course level. After extensive discussion at Senate, with the Executive Committee and with the Chair of URCC, Dean Smith, the following language is being

presented for discussion and vote. For more information on how and why the language was changes, please see Support Material Proposal from the URCC that accompanied the Faculty Senate packet for the November 4th meeting.

- a. URCC proposes the adoption of paired assessment for core learning outcomes. Core learning outcomes would be assessed at two different periods of time (e.g. first semester and last semester).
- b. URCC proposes that Kent State University adopt language provided by AAC&U describing four learning outcomes, referred to as LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, and that the eleven Kent State University learning outcomes be mapped onto the LEAP essential learning outcomes. The LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes provide standards that can be compared across institutions.
- c. URCC proposes that Kent State University assess learning outcomes using VALUE rubrics available from the AAC&U designed to assess LEAP essential outcomes.
- d. URCC proposes the establishment of a faculty-led Kent Core assessment council to review assessment data and provide feedback to appropriate parties regarding students' learning in the core.

B. From the October 21, 2019 EPC Meeting:

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COUNCIL

1. College of Arts and Sciences: Inactivation of the Integrated Life Sciences [ILS] major within the Bachelor of Science [BS] degree. Admission to the program was suspended fall 2019 (19 November 2018 agenda), although the last cohort was admitted in 2016. There are nine active students enrolled in the program, with expected graduation dates of fall 2019, spring or summer 2020. All ILS courses (seven) are being inactivated with the program. Effective Fall 2020 | [Attachment 3](#)
2. College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Geography: Establishment of an Environmental Studies [ENVS] minor to be offered at the Kent Campus and Stark Campus. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 18. Effective Fall 2020 | [Attachment 4](#)

## GRADUATE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COUNCIL

1. College of Architecture and Environmental Design: Establishment of a Construction Management [COMA] major within the Master of Science [MS] degree, to be offered at the Kent Campus. Two courses (CMGT 62080, CMGT 65099) are established for the program. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 35. Effective Fall 2020 pending final approvals | [Attachment 5](#)
2. College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Geography: Revision of degree name for the Geography [GEOG] major within the Master of Arts [MA] degree. Revised degree is Master of Science [MS]. Admission, course and graduation requirements are unchanged. Effective Fall 2020 pending final approvals | [Attachment 6](#)
8. Old Business
9. New Business
10. Announcements / Statements for the Record: Faculty Senate Fall Retreat, November 22, 2019 at Laziza, Special Guest: President Todd Diacon
11. Adjourn



## FACULTY SENATE

### Meeting Minutes

October 14, 2019

**Senators Present:** Ann Abraham, Kathy Bergh, Sheryl Chatfield, Jeffrey Child, Michael Chunn, Jeffrey Ciesla, Sue Clement, Tammy Clewell, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Jean Engohang-Ndong, Christopher Fenk, Pamela Grimm, Angela Guercio, Mariann Harding, Todd Hawley, David Kaplan, Edgar Kooijman, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Janice Kroeger, Tracy Laux, Richard Mangrum, Mahli Mechenbier, Oana Mocioalca, Deepraj Mukherjee, Lisa Onesko, Vic Perera, Rocco Petrozzi, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Helen Piontkivska, Denice Sheehan, Brett Tippey, Robert Twieg, Robin Vande Zande, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Molly Wang, Donald White, Jay White, Kathryn Wilson, Haiyan Zhu, Melissa Zullo

**Senators Not Present:** Simon Adamtey, Omid Bagheri, Kimberly Peer, Susan Roxburgh, Deborah Smith, Blake Stringer

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Manfred van Dulmen for Interim Senior Vice President and Provost Melody Tankersley; Senior Vice Presidents: Mark Polatajko, Rebeca Murphy for Karen Clarke; Vice Presidents: Alfreda Brown, Paul DiCorleto, Mary Parker, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Nathan Ritchey, Jack Witt, Amy Quillin for Lamar Hylton, David Ochmann for Willis Walker; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, Christina Bloebaum, Barbara Broome, Ken Burhanna, James Hannon, Mark Mistur, Alison Smith, Interim Dean Cynthia Stillings, Mary Ann Haley for James Blank, Matt Rollyson for Amy Reynolds

**Ex-Officio Members Not Present:** President Todd Diacon; Vice President Stephen Sokany, Deans: Allan Boike, John Crawford-Spinelli, Eboni Pringle, Deborah Spake

**Observers Present:** Thomas Janson (Emeritus Professor), Anna Solberg (GSS), Drake Wartman (USS)

**Guests Present:** Sue Averill, Paul Fehrmann, Michael Fisch, Larry Froehlich, Gary Goldberg, Jennifer (Butto) Hebebrand, Tess Kail, Karen Keenan, Dana Lawless-Andric, Collin Meyer, Tracey Motter, Katie Null, Michael O’Karma, Susan Perry, Jennifer Piatt, Hollie Simpson, Therese Tillett, Cathy Zingrone

#### 1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Governance Chambers, Kent Student Center.

#### 2. Roll Call

Secretary Dauterich called the roll.

#### 3. Approval of the Agenda

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve today's agenda. A motion was made and seconded (Laux/Mangrum). The agenda was approved unanimously.

#### **4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of September 9, 2019**

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the September 9, 2019, Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Child/Wang). The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

#### **5. Chair's Remarks**

Chair Grimm delivered her remarks. [Attachment]

There were no questions or comments.

#### **6. Interim Provost Tankersley's Remarks**

Interim Provost Tankersley delivered her remarks through a recorded video. Interim Associate Provost van Dulmen was present to answer questions about her video. She began her remarks by saying that she was excited to begin her 27th year at Kent, and she talked about her journey to becoming the Interim Provost. She said she never originally planned to be provost any more than she planned to go to college (her mother made her do it). She was the first in her family to graduate from college, and she believes Kent serves a high percentage of first-generation students well, and she knows that this can interrupt a cycle of low income and poverty. But, many come to Kent being not college-ready. There is nothing wrong with them; they simply have not been exposed to higher education yet. They do not need lowered standards—just guidance. They need help that provides access without knowing some secret language. So how can we improve our environment and become a student-ready college? She described the academic administrators' retreat and how they read *Becoming a Student-Ready College*, which helped them address barriers to students. They identified five major areas to work on: 1) financial support; (2) helping students understand the purpose and value of the Kent Core; (3) establishing a guide for graduate education (letting students know what to do, but also what to expect); (4) building community to create a greater sense of belonging (the main reason students give for thinking about leaving KSU); and (5) increasing the engagement of everyone on campus in students' success. The conclusion was we had to be all-in and work strategically in these five areas together. She then invited senators to send her their thoughts, thanked everyone for letting her talk, and noted that Interim Associate Provost van Dulmen was there for comments or questions.

Senator Piontkivska asked about surveys and data that were made available and wondered whether there was a central repository where reports could be accessed.

Interim Associate Provost van Dulmen did not know and turned the question over to Senator Wilson.

Senator Wilson said that the Great Place Initiative (GPI) website had some of the climate survey information available.

Senator Piontkivska suggested that a central repository of climate study data, COACHE data, and other relevant data would help people move forward with Interim Provost Tankersley's ideas.

Senator Wilson replied that most of that information is on the GPI website.

There were no further comments or questions.

## **7. Educational Policies Council (EPC) Item from the September 16, 2019 EPC Meeting**

At the meeting, EPC voted to endorse the University Requirements Curriculum Committee (URCC) report (Analysis of the Kent Core Assessment Method) with a recommendation and plan for reform. The report includes recommendations to adopt language and tools developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). These recommendations address directives from both the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and the State of Ohio. Specifically, the following recommendations are made:

- a. Use paired assessment of core learning objectives with the students' first course and senior-level course in their majors to assess learning outcomes. This shifts decision-making authority regarding core courses majors take to the department housing a major. Departments are in the best position to know which learning objectives and set of core courses serve the interests of their majors (beyond those required by the State of Ohio – see page 6 and Appendix C (p.69) of Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Review ([https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/program-approval/Academic-Program-Review-Guidelines\\_07\\_05\\_16.pdf](https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/program-approval/Academic-Program-Review-Guidelines_07_05_16.pdf)). This change is aligned with directives coming from both the State of Ohio, that core courses be more closely aligned with majors, and the HLC, that paired assessments be part of the Core assessment process;
- b. Adopt language provided by AAC&U describing learning outcomes, referred to as Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) Essential Learning Outcomes. These outcomes are largely consistent with current KSU learning outcomes and provide standards that can be compared across institutions;
- c. Assess learning outcomes using Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics available from the AAC&U designed to assess LEAP essential outcomes;
- d. Establish a faculty-led Kent Core assessment council to review assessment data and provide feedback to departments regarding their students' learning in the Kent Core. Departments housing majors would share feedback with the departments providing the core courses their majors are taking.

Dean Alison Smith presented the report for discussion. She gave the history of how the URCC was charged to recommend changes to assessment of the Kent Core and of the Kent Core itself. The report was submitted to the HLC in Spring 2019 and approved by them as a first step toward changes that may occur in the core. She also asked for senators to provide any feedback they wished. She mentioned that the core had 124 courses—she presented them as a being sandwiched by the HLC and ODHE. Previously, courses were assessed in each individual course, and the assessment drew on 11 different learning objectives. The state mandates that 24 hours be defined by discipline and number of hours—evident in the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM). General Education is also strongly structured by the HLC—the accreditation body for many universities in the northern Midwest. She then focused on five topics: (1) paired assessment; (2) assessment of

general education within the majors; (3) linking general education to Kent State's mission; (4) closing the loop—making sense of assessment data and showing evidence it is improving curriculum, retention, and student success; and (5) an ability to link assessment outcomes to nationally recognized learning outcomes (LEAP and AAC&Us VALUE rubrics. URCC proposed reducing our learning objectives from 11 to four broad “bins” for learning outcomes: (1) Community & Inclusion, Liberal Education; (2) Independent Thinking, Responsibility, Lifelong Learning; (3) Written/Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning; and (4) Critical Thinking. URCC also proposed a model for the Kent Core assessment plan based on state and HLC structure requirements. The four bins should be taken, and courses should be mapped onto them and aligned with the LEAP outcomes—all of which have national rubrics associated with them. The learning outcomes would then cover our broad learning objectives. URCC also recommends paired assessment, in which assessment would be moved to the majors. The first would take place in an early course in the major that was not a core course. The piece itself would be drawn from the VALUE rubrics; faculty would work with them and make the decisions and do the assessment. URCC also recommended that we need a central repository for assessment data, but also that it be returned to departments. To do this, they recommend a faculty committee that sits above the college, comprised of faculty with expertise in assessment, which would look at the outcomes and then send summaries of them to the assessment and accreditation office at the university and then back to the departments to be considered. The second part of the paired assessment would take place in a capstone course or senior experience course and would be done according to the same VALUE rubrics.

Dean Smith then invited questions or comments.

Senator Kroeger thanked Dean Smith and asked about the pre- and post-assessments; she asked whether the post-assessment examined students' ideas from the whole of their experience or just from the point of the Kent Core. She also asked who would be on the committee.

Dean Smith said ideally, they would be drawing on general education experiences, but there were variables. She also said that the committee overseeing it would be comprised of faculty interested in pedagogy who are assessment experts.

Senator Fenk asked whether only courses within the major would be core courses.

Dean Smith said that the core courses we have right now are what we move forward with. There is no change to what the core courses themselves are. Students would take whatever core courses they take, but the first assessment would occur in a core course in the major.

Senator Vande Zande asked about the LEAP and VALUE assessment tools; what would happen if we find that a class is very weak in one of the learning outcomes or more than one?

Dean Smith said we may find that students should be performing better, and then the committee would notice it, send the information back to the departments, and then allow the departments to have a conversation about how to make the courses achieve the results. Over time, this would raise the quality of instruction.

Senator Vande Zande asked whether we would need to add new courses.

Dean Smith said that no program can stay perfectly still; whether courses should be changed or augmented is a matter for the faculty to discuss. 24 hours are disciplinarily defined by the state, but 12 are not. There needs to be a discussion for how to use those 12.

Senator Mocioalca asked whether the assessment part would affect students, and if so, how?

Dean Smith said that it should affect students by having faculty in departments have conversations and take action on how to improve the Kent Core courses they are taking. The individual student will be anonymous, and we cannot know the effects on each one, but future students can be affected.

Senator Wilson thanked Dean Smith for all her work. She asked three questions: (1) Variation in assessment across the system is a problem; how will over 300 different majors doing assessments improve this?; (2) It seems that this would work well for students who know their majors when they come in and stay with them, but maybe not for those who change majors; if they have completed the pre-assessment and change majors, how does this fit in?; and (3) Are we evaluating the core or the core and the major? For evaluating the core alone, what can we do from a core perspective if they fail an assessment in one or more areas? We have 28,000 undergraduates—will we be evaluating everyone? Is there a way to do it from a sample instead of all of this?

Dean Smith responded that the four bins are huge, and the rubrics are broad, so there would not be hundreds of majors being examined—certain questions would be associated with the broad bins. Most universities do not assess every student; they use statistical sampling which URCC would also recommend at the major level; not every student is assessed on everything. As far as those who switch majors, there is a possibility of doing paired assessment by running it in FYE (a separate approach which would involve changing how rubrics are applied), which would give a snapshot of the first year—this would miss transfer students, but statistically, the number would be small. As far as what we are testing goes, we do not know what they came in with or where what they learned comes from. It is up to us to make the pathway work the way we want it to, and we need a far greater discussion for how to implement it.

Senator Kracht said that after clicking through roadmaps, she saw that some majors have courses not in the core in their first semester, but others might wait until the second semester or third or even fourth, by which time they have completed most of the core. There is the potential for this to require revisions of majors across campus, which faculty would resist.

Chair Grimm said that under no circumstances should core assessment drive curriculum change, and Dean Smith agreed.

Dean Smith said that the possibility mentioned by Senator Kracht is an argument for putting the first assessment in the FYE course, but otherwise, departments that do not have one the first semester could decide on their own how to do assessments. A lot of models to look at are out there.

Senator Kracht commented that it would be nice if the process were more holistic, and she found problems with the “Closing the Loop” idea. How do people know who the students were, when they took the assessment, etc.? How could any of this say anything about the core itself? It does say something about education, which is good, but what does it say about the core?



Dean Smith replied that what is needed is to provide examples of how “Closing the Loop” works at other universities and recommended looking at the link she provided to the University of Cincinnati’s website that shows how they did it successfully. Other universities show these as well.

Senator Child asked how we can build a plan to improve curriculum if some of the classes are not in the control of the major. If we are going to close the loop in quantitative reasoning, and we do not control the curriculum, is there an interdepartmental dialogue or specialized sections that would be created?

Dean Smith agreed that it would become an inter-departmental dialogue.

Senator Tippey asked whether the faculty would be examining how much students learned from the core.

Dean Smith said any change would require a large collaborative effort from the university. The CTL may roll out workshops and sessions addressing how to deal with it.

Senator Tippey suggested a slow rollout would be helpful.

Dean Smith agreed that this would be wise and recommended that a pilot program run alongside current assessment would be the best way to go.

Senator Tippey asked whether we are compromising the value of liberal education.

Dean Smith responded that she did not think so, but it does reinforce the importance of a clear link between general education and the students’ majors while still allowing for some exploration.

Senator Harding asked whether this applied to students receiving associate degrees only, and if so, how would it work?

Dean Smith said it was discussed and said that the state requires assessments even for associate degrees. It would still be possible to run assessments, but it also raises the question of how they would handle the remaining twelve hours. They could be distributed into the upper-division classes as interdisciplinary courses. Associate degree students should be part of it, but they will have to definitely be a part of the discussion.

Chair Grimm invited further comments or questions.

There were no further comments or questions.

## **8. Old Business**

There was no old business.

## **9. New Business**

There was no new business.

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

The Faculty Senate Fall Retreat will take place on November 22, 2019.

**11. Adjournment**

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich  
Secretary, Faculty Senate

Attachment

## Chair's Remarks for October 14, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

I dropped out of College at the age of 18 after my first year at the University at Buffalo. My mother said "...you'll never go back, you'll never go back." Ten years later when I was starting my PhD program, she said "...you'll never leave school, you'll never leave school." And I haven't. Anyway. I dropped out because it was not what I had in mind. My advisor put me into what seemed a very weird line-up of classes for an English major. I was coming from some highly interactive AP classes at my high school and what I got were mostly really big lectures. It wasn't really what I had in mind when I thought of College. Not terribly hard, but not exciting either. Except one class. I still remember my Introduction to Sociology class. I can't remember my teacher's name, though I can see him before me. I remember we were discussing the 1968 Democratic Convention riots as police riots, but also extended that discussion when my teacher asserted that the very presence of police can provoke response. The idea of non-confrontation really intrigued me and, in many ways, my sociology teacher and that particular discussion changed my world view in ways that still resonate, especially here at Kent State. That was about 45 years ago.

About a month ago I was sitting in Rays with a group of five of my students having lunch. I had recently met with Dean Smith regarding the Kent core, so I asked them about it with a general question: "how do you feel about the core courses you take?" The first student to speak said he really liked exploring different topics and having the ability to check out different subjects. Another student said he had taken a lot of his core courses as College Credit Plus while in high school and he thought he'd be able to graduate a year early. A third student said she thought the core was a waste of time. She didn't understand what the point was and she felt it was something of a rip-off to have to pay for courses you didn't want to take and whose point or purpose wasn't clear. I know I can't generalize from the responses of a handful of students, but additional sources of information seem to confirm that many of our students don't know what the core is supposed to be doing for them. Some see value, some don't. Sometimes I wonder if we are clear ourselves about what the core is supposed to be doing for our students.

Most of our time today has been allocated to discuss the method used to assess the Kent Core. We will be considering recommendations drawn from a report from the University Requirements Curriculum Committee (aka, the URCC). That report was required by and created specifically for the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The URCC has extracted three (or four, depending on how you break them up) recommendations from that report and forwarded them to EPC. EPC voted to approve those recommendations. These recommendations are NOT about changing core courses, they are about putting in place a system to assess the impact of the Kent Core on our students. But one of the ramifications of this proposal is that, within the constraints set forth by the State of Ohio, departments will be able to specify or be more directive in the core courses they feel will most benefit their majors. It is a change in the way we think about core courses.

The gory details of exactly how this change would be operationalized would be the work of the URCC with help from additional faculty recruited to ensure a strong faculty voice in the process. I expect the entire process of changing the way we assess the core would be the work of several years, with the first year devoted to a general understanding of how we want to proceed. In a second year, work would shift to FACs, CACs and undergraduate curriculum committees in departments and schools across Kent State. In that phase, academic units would consider how they want the Kent core to augment, support, expand or enhance the learning that takes place in their majors. That will be a pretty big change and a pretty big challenge.

The truth is that the URCC could have moved forward with the specific recommendations we are considering today without having had them endorsed by EPC or the Faculty Senate. If you've been around awhile you've been to that rodeo. A committee produces recommendations for some massive change and presents that recommendation as fait accompli. A committee may well have done a lot of work, but it may also have been working in a vacuum, without significant input from faculty. How many times have you sat in this body and had a proposal put forth that seems to have had little or no faculty input? And then there's the flip side: How many times have you sat on a committee, worked hard and had your work ignored by those on whose behalf you feel you are working?

I think the URCC has done a good job of soliciting feedback from faculty and students over the past year. However, some of the heaviest lifting is yet to come. That lifting will involve administrators and a bunch of faculty and it will require a lot of work from everyone. My take on the recommendations we are being asked to endorse is that the URCC wants to make sure, before investing more of everyone's time, effort and energy, that this body views this general approach as generally viable. There is no question that the Higher Learning Commission is going to require change on our part. What we are doing now to assess the core doesn't work. And it is likely that the State of Ohio will also be requiring that we make changes to how our students experience the core. The real question seems to be how do we want to meet these challenges?

The URCC has put two years into examining the core and exploring other institutions and their approach to their core. They are recommending that we change the general approach we take to the core, putting more control of the core in the hands of faculty through the academic units and, ultimately, through creation of a faculty led Kent Core assessment council. URCC is also recommending taking advantage of some existing and established standardized tools in assessment. Wow. We aren't reinventing the wheel (for a change). Those tools would be used in what is called paired assessments – that would be testing at time t and at time t+4 (more or less). Paired assessment is being required by the HLC. That is the sum total of what URCC is recommending at this time.

Today's discussion is limited in scope to assessment of the core, but like a stone thrown into a pool of water, changing anything about the core will have effects that ripple throughout our university. I look forward to Dean Smith's presentation and our discussion of the assessment of the Kent core. I'm eager to hear your thoughts on the recommendations and the changes inherent in this approach. We will limit ourselves today to discussion with the expectation that we vote on this issue at our November 4th meeting.

Thank you.  
Pamela E. Grimm  
Chair, Faculty Senate

## Support Material - Proposal from the URCC

The EPC had voted to endorse the URCC Report: Analysis of the Kent Core Assessment Method With a Plan for Reform. The charge from the HLC was to assess the core at the program level, not individual course level.

After multiple presentations and much discussion among the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Dean Alison Smith, Chair of the URCC, it is apparent that some key pieces of information are not being communicated clearly to you. These key pieces of information are provided below and followed by revisions to the recommendations received from EPC.

### Key Pieces of Information

- HLC is requiring changes in assessing the Kent Core. This is a multi-year project and the URCC is asking the Senate to endorse interim steps to achieve the HLC's requirements. The URCC has forwarded a general approach to move forward with assessing the core with the understanding that enacting specific changes will require additional review and approval by EPC and the Faculty Senate.
- All of the efforts of the URCC have been focused on assessment of the Kent core. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) is clear in its requirement for assessment of the Kent core *as a program*. Kent has been attempting to assess the Kent core at the course level. However, participation in core assessment has been extremely low and the position of the HLC (our accrediting body) is that, since the core is a program, it should be assessed at the core program level (see <http://catalog.kent.edu/undergraduate-university-requirements/kent-core/> )
- In addition to the requirements of the HLC, the URCC attempted to respond pro-actively to what appeared to be a trend in Columbus to require universities to align core courses with majors. The recommendation regarding paired assessments (required by HLC) being conducted in the first course in the major grew out of this effort.
  - However, there is little agreement on whether this approach is either desirable or practical. Some feel that the core is something that should be viewed at an institution level, not a department level. Others feel designating the core at the department level would be desirable.
  - In other words, there are three basic choices for how the courses that constitute the core for a given student are designated (university level, major level or some combination of the two). The original report from URCC recommended designation at the major level, but there is not sufficient consensus on this point to move it forward.
- When/where the core should be assessed is a question that is independent of the need for paired assessments. Paired assessment can happen regardless of how we choose to designate the core (university level, major level or some combination of the two).

The initial report contained four key recommendations. Based on our discussions last week, and extensive discussion among members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the URCC has extracted specific items and formulated specific proposals that are subsets of the initial recommendations. The original recommendations with revised language, along with the rationale for change, are provided below. Voting is on specific revised language.

#### Original Language

- a. Use paired assessment of core learning objectives with the students' first course and senior-level course in their majors to assess learning outcomes. This shifts decision-making authority regarding core courses majors take to the department housing a major. Departments are in the best position to know which learning objectives and set of core courses serve the interests of their majors (beyond those required by the State of Ohio – see page 6 and Appendix C (p.69) of Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Review [https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/program-approval/Academic-Program-Review-Guidelines\\_070516.pdf](https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/program-approval/Academic-Program-Review-Guidelines_070516.pdf)) This change is aligned with directives coming from both the State of Ohio, that core courses be more closely aligned with majors, and the HLC that paired assessments be part of the Core assessment process;

#### Revised Language

- a. URCC proposes the adoption of paired assessment for core learning outcomes. Core learning outcomes would be assessed at two different periods of time (e.g. first semester and last semester).

Rationale for change: Alignment of the core with majors is not currently required by the state and may run counter to our currently defined goals for the Kent core which include “It broadens intellectual perspectives, fosters ethical and humanitarian values and prepares students for responsible citizenship and productive careers.” Decisions on how the core should be designated (university level, major level or some combination of the two) will need to be made, but the work of the URCC specific to assessment can proceed before that decision is made.

#### Original Language

- b. Adopt language provided by AAC&U describing learning outcomes, referred to as LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. These outcomes are largely consistent with current KSU learning outcomes and provide standards that can be compared across institutions;

Revised Language

- b. URCC proposes that Kent State University adopt language provided by AAC&U describing four learning outcomes, referred to as LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, and that the eleven Kent State University learning outcomes be mapped onto the LEAP essential learning outcomes. The LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes provide standards that can be compared across institutions;

Rationale for change: To provide more clarity in the action that will be taken by the URCC.

Original Language

- c. Assess learning outcomes using VALUE rubrics available from the AAC&U designed to assess LEAP essential outcomes;

Revised Language

- c. URCC proposes that Kent State University assess learning outcomes using VALUE rubrics available from the AAC&U designed to assess LEAP essential outcomes

Rationale for change: Restate recommendation as proposal.

Original Language

- d. Establish a faculty-led Kent Core assessment council to review assessment data, provide feedback to departments regarding their students' learning in the core. Departments housing majors would share feedback with the departments providing the core courses their majors are taking.

Revised Language

- d. URCC proposes the establishment of a faculty-led Kent Core assessment council to review assessment data and provide feedback to appropriate parties regarding students' learning in the core.

Rationale for change: The council provides a mechanism for evaluating and delivering feedback on the extent to which the core learning objectives are or aren't being met at the institutional level. Given that the decision on where core should be designated (university level, major level or some combination of the two) has not yet been made, the revision provides a more general statement of where feedback would be delivered.



## Faculty Senate Executive Committee

### Minutes of the Meeting

September 13, 2019

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Molly Wang (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Not Present: Denice Sheehan (Appointed),

Guests: President Todd Diacon, Interim Provost Melody Tankersley, Interim Associate Provost, Manfred van Dulmen

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m. in the Urban Conference Room on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Kent State University Library.

2. Review of Topics for the President and Interim Provost

Topics were reviewed including future enrollment and “right-sizing” the university, micro-credentialing, and the cancellation of a field hockey game earlier in the semester.

3. Approval of Minutes: Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of August 26, 2019

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes (Laux/Wang). The minutes were approved.

4. (11:00) Meet with President Diacon, Interim Provost Tankersley, and Interim Associate Provost Manfred van Dulmen

Interim Associate Provost van Dulmen began by explaining that there is a process going forward to examine the possibility of micro-credentialing at Kent State. We currently have no process for credit-bearing digital badges, although we do have ones without credit. Many programs are interested in developing ones with credit. Around 30 members of KSU investigated it and contacted other universities (the University of Buffalo and Wichita State) to see how this process could work. In addition, the state is pushing for the idea through a House Bill that is currently in development and may provide some funding for companies to pay for this credentialing for their employees. Local companies have



also expressed interest. The working group that was created identified two separate actions that need to be addressed: (1) convening a committee charged with constructing the academic process of credit-bearing micro-credentials at Kent State University; and (2) convening a committee charged with crafting a vision for micro-credentials at Kent State University. Both committees should have a significant faculty presence. He also discussed terminology for these credentials and how we could best define the terms we use with the Executive Committee. This all would eventually come back to EPC and Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee supported the Interim Associate Provost's proposal to convene the committees. Interim Associate Provost van Dulmen also suggested that he is open to suggestions for faculty members to serve on the committees.

The Executive Committee also discussed the situation with the canceled field hockey game with the president. President Diacon said that the incident is still under investigation.

There was also a brief discussion about "right-sizing" the university. Interim Associate Provost Tankersley said that they will create a group to work on solutions to finding the right number of students, programs, faculty, and staff and invited Chair Grimm to be part of the group.

5. Set up Commission for Charter & Bylaws Provision

The Executive Committee decided that an ad hoc committee needs to be created to change the Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws with regard to upcoming changes to the EPC and other procedural terms in the charter and bylaws that could be better housed and more easily changed on the Faculty Senate website. Secretary Dauterich was asked to chair the committee, and Chair Grimm said that she would investigate the policy for how to establish the committee. Each member of the Executive Committee was asked to look into other places in the charter and bylaws where things can be taken out and moved to the website and to communicate those to the rest of the committee through e-mail. We can also discuss who should be in the committee through e-mail.

6. Fall Retreat

We are waiting to hear from President Diacon about a possible date when he could attend the event with Faculty Senate. We will request November 22 from 12-2 as the date/time. The location is still to be determined.

7. Executive Committee Retreat for Strategic Planning

The date and time for the retreat are September 27th, 12:30-5. The location is still to be determined.

8. Salary Redistribution

Chair Grimm will put in the paperwork in the next 36 hours.

9. Agenda for the October 14, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

Portions of the agenda were finalized.

10. Additional Items

The Executive Committee will invite Dean Alison Smith to present URCC findings on possible changes to the Kent Core at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

There is a possible issue with some of the introductory material on the new SSIs as far as language concerning student grievance procedures. Suggestions were made for changes to the language. Another concern was that the first and last names of each instructor are included. The concern here is that maybe only the first initial should be included to avoid race and gender-based biases. The committee found this to have a relatively small impact. There is also a concern that the personalized questions are clearly presented as coming from faculty—this could imply items are less important since they come from faculty rather than from administration. From a legal standpoint this is probably necessary—students should know the faculty questions were not approved officially by the university. It was suggested that language could be changed.

For future discussion, it was suggested that tenure expectations are still confusing across the board. There needs to be more consistency. There is also a concern that adjuncts do not get access to Blackboard until their contract is activated. It was added that we should hear more updates from other university initiatives (e.g., Environmental Science and Design).

11. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich  
Secretary, Faculty Senate



## **Faculty Senate Executive Committee**

### **Minutes of the Meeting**

**September 19, 2019**

**Present:** Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

**Not Present:** Molly Wang (Appointed)

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m. in 227 Schwartz Center.

**2. Approval of Minutes:**

**a. Faculty Senate meeting minutes of September 9, 2019**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes (Laux/Sheehan). The minutes were approved unanimously.

**b. Executive Committee meeting minutes of September 13, 2019**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes (Laux.Vande Zande). The minutes were approved unanimously.

**3. EPC Item from the September 16 EPC Meeting**

University Requirements Curriculum Committee: Report: Analysis of the Kent Core Assessment Method, which includes recommendations to (a) assess using LEAP essential outcomes and VALUE rubrics available from the Association of American Colleges and University; (b) use paired assessment with the students' first course and senior-level course in their majors and not within the Kent core courses themselves; and (c) establish a faculty-led Kent Core assessment council to review assessment data, make recommendations on changes and provide feedback to departments and their faculty.

There was a discussion over whether the report should be forwarded to senate for discussion. EPC approved sending the discussion forward. Recommendations were made by the Executive Committee to forward to Dean Smith including adding explanations of

the LEAP and VALUE rubrics and making alterations to other language in the documents to assist with the clarity of the overall presentation.

#### 4. SSI Update

- a. Suggestion for a commission to review the list each early spring for addition of custom questions

The Executive Committee recommended that a commission be formed to do so.

- b. Request from OGE for reports on faculty to be made available to OGE personnel for sharing with our Brazilian partner Brazil's Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná

The Executive Committee recommended that this not be done until OGE has a meeting with members of the SSI committee

- c. Last email regarding SSI formatting

There was a concern from faculty about why the instructor's name is repeated for every question on the SSI. This could encourage bias. The Executive Committee understands the concern, but due to limitations in how survey data is both collected and assessed, and the difficulty doing so in courses that have multiple instructors, the formatting will have to continue.

- d. Problem with courses and SSI in Music

Three faculty are assigned to one 1-credit hour course. One is assigned to the first five, one to the next five, and one to the last five weeks. The SSI evaluation only goes out at the end for all three instructors, but the first two faculty have already given grades by the time the survey has come out. The concern is that the long wait to take the SSI could bias the students against the earlier instructors in the course. The Executive Committee will inform the faculty member that this is not within the capacity of the system to change.

- e. SSI transition assessment ... and C&D update tomorrow

Response rates will be examined moving forward to compare results to the previous version of SSI's.

#### 5. Commission for Charter & Bylaws Provision

Secretary Dauterich agreed to chair the commission. Chair Grimm will locate another person who is willing to serve. Therese Tillett will be asked to work with the EPC portions of the changes to the bylaws.

6. Substitute Speakers for Provost or President at Faculty Senate Meetings

The Executive Committee discussed recommendations for how to respond to requests for substitutes to present to the Faculty Senate in lieu of the President or Provost. Recommendations include the following: 1) a printed report could be handed out instead of a replacement speaker; 2) a prepared statement from the President and/or Provost could be read by a substitute; 3) a replacement speaker could meet beforehand with the Executive Committee to see how to move forward; or, 4) The Provost and President could trade places for their remarks. Interim Provost Tankersley will be informed of the recommendations.

7. Fall Retreat Update – November 22, 2019

The committee is still resolving the details for the retreat.

8. Executive Committee Retreat for Strategic Planning Friday, September 27 12:30-5:00 at Twin Lakes Association, 1509 Merrill Avenue, Kent, OH 44240

The agenda for the retreat was discussed.

9. Finalize Agenda for the October 14, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

The agenda was finalized.

10. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

11. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich  
Secretary, Faculty Senate