

Faculty Senate Agenda July 13, 2020

Item No.	Item	PDF Pg. No.
1	Call to Order	
2	Roll Call	
3	Approval of Agenda	
4	Approval of the May 11, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes	
5	Chair's Remarks	
6	Interim Provost's Remarks	
7	COVID-19 Update – Chris Woolverton	
8	Enrollment Update – Mary Parker	
9	Budget Update – Mark Polatajko	
10	Student and Faculty Technology Update – Jim Raber	
11	Educational Policies Council (EPC) Informational Items:	
a	College of Applied and Technical Studies: Establishment of a Cybersecurity major within the Associate of Applied Business degree to be offered fully online and hybrid (online/on-ground) at the Ashtabula, East Liverpool, Geauga, Salem, Stark, Trumbull and Tuscarawas campuses and the Twinsburg Center. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 60. Effective fall 2021 pending final approvals.	
b	College of Arts and Sciences: Establishment of an Artificial Intelligence major within the Master of Science degree, to be offered on the Kent Campus by the Department of Computer Science. Minimum total credit hours to program completion are 30. Effective fall 2021 pending final approvals.	
12	Old Business	
13	New Business: Discussion: Faculty Ethics Committee – Revised Purposes & Procedures (If the Senate discussion indicates consensus regarding the changes, Senate is open to an amendment to modify this to an action item.)	
14	Announcements / Statements for the Record	
15	Adjourn	
	Additional Items:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 5, 2020	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 18, 2020	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 27, 2020	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of June 4, 2020	



FACULTY SENATE

Meeting Minutes

May 11, 2020

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Omid Bagheri, Kathy Bergh, Sheryl Chatfield, Jeffrey Child, Michael Chunn, Jeffrey Ciesla, Sue Clement, Tammy Clewell, Alice Colwell, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Jean Engohang-Ndong, Christopher Fenk, Pamela Grimm, Angela Guercio, Mariann Harding, David Kaplan, Edgar Kooijman, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Janice Kroeger, Tracy Laux, Mahli Mechenbier, Oana Mocioalca, Deepraj Mukherjee; Kimberly Peer, Vic Perera, Rocco Petrozzi, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Helen Piontkivska, Terri Polanski, Susan Roxburgh, Denice Sheehan, Deborah Smith, Blake Stringer, Brett Tippey, Robert Twieg, Robin Vande Zande, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Molly Wang, Donald White, Kathryn Wilson, Haiyan Zhu, Melissa Zullo

Senators Not Present: Simon Adamtey, Todd Hawley, Richard Mangrum

Senators-Elect Present: Tracy Dodson, Yanhai Du, Julie Evey, Velvet Landingham, Cathy Marshall, Abe Osbourne, Athena Salaba, Murali Shanker, Diane Stroup

Ex-Officio Members Present: President Todd Diacon; Interim Senior Vice President and Provost Melody Tankersley; Senior Vice President Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: David Dees, Paul DiCorleto, Amoaba Gooden, Lamar Hylton, Rebecca Murphy, Mary Parker, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Stephen Sokany, Jack Witt; Deans: Sonia Alemagno, James Blank, Christina Bloebaum, Allan Boike, Barbara Broome, Ken Burhanna, John Crawford-Spinelli, James Hannon, Mark Mistur, Eboni Pringle, Amy Reynolds, Alison Smith, Deborah Spake, Cynthia Stillings

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Vice President Willis Walker; Dean Stocker

Observers Present: Thomas Janson (Emeritus Professor), Claire Jackman (GSS), Thomas Niepsuj (USS)

Guests Present: David Dees, J.R. Campbell, Susanna Fein, Mary Ann Haley, Jennifer Hebebrand, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Karen Keenan, Valerie Kelly, Dana Lawless-Andric, Michael Lehman, Alicia Marchand, Babacar M'Baye, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, David Odell-Scott, Christa Ord, Susan Perry, Jennifer Piatt, Jim Raber, Gail Rebata, Therese Tillett, Manfred van Dulmen

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 (Sheehan/Smith). The agenda was approved unanimously.

4. Approval of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of April 13, 2020

Chair Grimm asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 13, 2020, Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made and seconded (Vande Zande/Mukherjee).

The minutes were approved unanimously.

5. Chair's Remarks

Chair Grimm delivered her remarks. [Attachment]

She then invited comments or questions. There were no comments or questions.

6. President's Remarks

President Diacon thanked the faculty for leaning into the storm, acting in ways noticed and unnoticed, and bringing a successful conclusion to the semester. He said we will see reopening plans at the senate meeting in the summer. We plan to have a mix of remote learning and face-to-face classes. He added that we will see a presentation today on the upcoming budget in order to continue transparency with the university community. The administration will tell us what they know, when they know it, to the best of their ability and understanding. They assume revenues will be 20% lower. They are planning for the worst and hoping for the best. If we do not need a full 20% cut, that would be great, but there are too many uncertainties to say what will happen at this point. State support will decline 20% from last year. This means a 5% cut for the Kent budget. Enrollment numbers are about 20% down for regionals and about 6% for the Kent campus. This has a four-year impact on our revenues. International enrollment is up in the air, and enrollments in general have been in decline since 2016. There will also be many additional costs associated with providing a safe environment in the next academic year. We will operate in a new normal until and perhaps beyond the time a vaccine is developed and fully administered. What we experience now will last for a year and beyond. The good news is that this fiscal year's subsidy was reduced by 6.1 million dollars rather than the 8 million they expected. He thanked everyone again for helping current students and attracting new ones. He then invited comments or questions.

Senator Laux asked whether we will use the pandemic's effect on the state budget to look at all the expenses at the university to see how they affect the academic mission and to see how we can permanently reduce other costs, so academics remain at the forefront. He suggested examining the cost of our bureaucracy at the cabinet level as a starting point and making sure everything there was supporting the academic mission.

President Diacon said the goal is to make as many cuts on the administrative side as possible. All divisions including athletics are presenting budgets with 20% cuts and working on becoming more effective with their use of administrators.

Senator Engohang-Ndong asked whether the 20% budget reduction meant that departments would have to face budget cuts in programs that needed adjunct faculty.

President Diacon replied that he was not ready to talk about programmatic changes yet, but he said that we can address administrative cuts in some areas first and then move in other directions.

He could not address the adjunct faculty question at this time. It will depend on departments and units.

Senator Wilson asked about why we are not tapping into our reserves. The communication so far seems to be that we are doing a 20% cut; this has led to some departments letting faculty go for the upcoming academic year. She asked if the reserves could be used to work with that problem.

President Diacon said that if we truly have a 20% reduction in revenues, or more, or if we have sizable costs directed toward making the campus safe, there may be scenarios where we draw on reserves, but this is a problem for two reasons: (1) the impact of the virus is not going away, and (2) our reserves are everyone's fund balances (regional campuses, individual colleges, residence halls). He hopes we will not have to spend them.

Senator Wilson said that her department is making large cuts, and she does not know how we will serve students well if we do not have the projected declines. She worries we will not have enough personnel.

President Diacon said it is a jigsaw puzzle. He believes we should plan for a 20% budget cut, but it is too soon to say if we will implement one. He said he does not know how deans are handling this now, but at least on the administrative side, they can sustain a 20% cut.

Senator Chunn wanted to know about whether faculty could be rehired if they take an early separation.

President Diacon said he did not have an answer at this time. The goal is to reduce expenditures, but they had not looked directly at this possibility yet.

There were no further comments or questions.

7. Interim Provost's Remarks

Interim Provost Tankersley took the floor and thanked faculty, staff, and administration for successfully and efficiently completing the semester. She also thanked the Ad Hoc Continuity Planning committee for all the work they did to move the university forward. She also mentioned plans for face-to-face classes in the future. She said she will listen to our own public health experts, state directives, the CDC, and other universities in Ohio that are looking at the best scenarios. President Diacon has created reopening committees, including one on student and academic affairs, that will involve Faculty Senate. The shared governance of decision making will continue, and we are all in this together. We plan for residential living in the Fall 2020 semester and for face-to-face courses, while recognizing that remote instruction may be necessary. We will provide for faculty with underlying health concerns. We will maintain physical distancing even if we do return to campus. There are no specific dates set, but we are preplanning for opening in the fall. We will create the best and safest way forward.

Chair Grimm invited comments or questions.

Senator Tippey thanked the chair and the provost for mentioning studios and labs in their remarks and recognizing that all learning does not take place in a classroom setting.

Senator Vande Zande thanked the chair and the interim provost and suggested that we would have to know whether we have personal protective equipment before reopening and wanted to know whether we can secure it.

Interim Provost Tankersley said that we are working on acquiring the materials and following the protocols to keep spaces safe and clean.

Senator Kaplan thanked Interim Provost Tankersley and mentioned the importance of accommodating faculty, but he was curious about how much autonomy faculty would have as far as making the decision to teach in person.

Interim Provost Tankersley said we must work together and consult with departments to make those decisions.

President Diacon said they have a working goal to let every professor who wants to teach face-to-face do it, but we may not be able to.

Senator Engohang-Ndong said that some of the classes in biology must be face-to-face for the best experience possible. Many of these are introductory, but he suggested that course caps could be reduced to less than 24 to allow students to have the best experience and for faculty to serve them well. He also asked whether the cap cuts could be made now or whether large sections could meet with half of the students at one time and half of them at another.

Interim Provost Tankersley said she did not have an answer yet, but she is aware that faculty have these concerns, and they are working on balancing safety with quality instruction.

Senator Child asked about how graduation was being celebrated to allow students a sense of accomplishment in these times.

Interim Provost Tankersley said we had a great virtual ceremony over the weekend, and the administration received positive feedback from students. Students received a graduation box that included the paper commencement program, a mortar board and tassel, honors cords for those who earned them, and a letter from President Diacon, so that they could be in the spirit of celebrating virtually. Students have also been invited to come back to any face-to-face commencement that they would like to come back to. Each of the colleges worked hard to send out messages to their students. She said she had seen messages from chairs and faculty members and deans, all sharing the congratulations and admiration for graduating during an unusual time. Social media has been a good outlet for us to celebrate our students who were graduating. Kent State also held special virtual ceremonies for Karamu and Lavender Graduation as well. There was good attendance at the virtual commencements. The number in attendance exceeded our One University Commencement numbers.

Senator Mocioalca had three questions/comments: (1) is it possible to have hybrid courses; (2) will professors decide on remote or face-to-face learning in the classroom as individuals; and (3) will there be better proctoring services available to avoid non-proctored tests?

Interim Provost Tankersley said yes to the first, we are working on the second and have no answer yet, and the third is being investigated.

Chair Grimm interrupted the comments to assure senators that all questions in the virtual chatroom were being monitored, but that we needed to move forward with the agenda. She

mentioned Senator Du's question in the chatroom about whether Kent would pick up any Akron programs that are downsized.

President Diacon said they will pay attention to that, but they have not cut programs yet at Akron.

There were no further comments or questions.

8. Vice President for Enrollment Management Mary Parker with an Enrollment Update

Vice President Parker reported that nationally, there is great disruption and change. At Kent, we plan for the worst and hope for the best. Nationwide, 90% of enrollment leaders are concerned about meeting their goals. 45% of students are second-guessing their decision to attend; 53% of them say they want to be closer to home. 34% of current students are uncertain whether they will return in the fall. 77% said they need more financial aid. Kent is reaching out to continuing and new students, but families and students are concerned about affordability. Enrollment Management is working with them to make sure families know we can help them. They had used 2018 data from FAFSA to plan for financial aid, and now that circumstances have changed, they are doing their best to leverage scholarship dollars to make sure new families can come to Kent. In graduate enrollment, there is an increase in applications, but many of these are from international students, and we do not know how many will make it. We are waiving overseas charges for them if they have a degree from an Ohio institution, but there are still travel restrictions, extended visa interviews, and financial pressures on all the students. We need to increase domestic enrollment as well. We are a little less than 6% down at Kent and around 18% on the regional campuses.

Families are concerned about what happens if we continue online; however, not every student had a bad experience. We want to highlight instructors who stepped up and whose students had amazing experiences, and we want to highlight that to make sure families know we are ready for them no matter what venue we are providing, online or face to face.

Where we are significantly down right now is our entering freshmen. We are roughly about seven percent down in deposits compared to last year at this time. Nationally, we are hearing this across the country. In the state, we had a call last week with our in-state schools. Many of them are experiencing 20 and 30 % decreases. The only school right now that is up is The Ohio State University (+17%). We know from past years that when Ohio State is up, we tend to see some declines in enrollment. We are seeing that right now. We know Ohio State went almost down to the bottom of their wait list, and we are seeing some of the impacts of that in our enrollment.

We are working closely with our university marketing and communications area, and we are working closely with all the colleges. We have been doing aggressive campaigns in-state, particularly in certain areas to talk about affordability, to talk about what we have to offer, and to talk about the value proposition. We are doing that every day with personal calls to students, to families, and to parents. She said that she had personally been calling parents and talking with them. Since we started the calls to our entering freshmen, we have seen an increase in deposits. We pushed our deposit date back to June 1 to help with that, and we'll have a better indication of enrollment at that time. We have seen an increase in deposits and registration for Destination Kent State (DKS)—our orientation program. Over a week ago we were 900 down. We are now less than 500 down. We know these calls and these aggressive campaigns are working.

There has been an increase in housing. We are at about 88% occupancy in our housing, and they have seen increases in deposits with new students as well.

Akron has not yet announced they have eliminated any programs, but we do know there are institutions that have announced such cuts, and we are being aggressive with the ways we communicate with those students through social media. We are ready and available and want to support them in their education.

She also said that they will continue to keep this group updated on where they are. She suggested that she would welcome advice from faculty for any strategies to call students within their departments about them coming for the fall, and they would welcome our faculty to get engaged because they know that makes a big difference.

She then invited comments or questions.

Senator Kaplan pointed out that just like Ohio State can dip into its wait list, we also have many students who had been thinking about going out of state, and now they are not. They may be wanting to stay home because it might feel safer. He wondered what we are doing to recruit them.

Vice President Parker said that they have been able to look at the data to look at students who have been admitted, but who have not deposited, who we know have filled out financial aid forms or have done a housing assignment. In the past, that has been a good predictor of enrollment. We are still not seeing them commit, so we are reaching out to those students, and we have started a very heavy campaign to parents talking about the value proposition and talking about affordability.

We are doing personal outreach, and we are doing videos. We had many of our tour guides that put out impromptu videos about why they chose Kent State, about their experience through this semester, about moving to online, and about many of them having great experiences with their faculty. Parents and students are responding to that. They are also doing a higher-level brand strategy with our marketing area in addition to other parts of a multi-prong strategy.

Chair Grimm asked whether housing was at 88% capacity for the fall.

Vice President Parker replied that we get a housing update each week, and this week we are at an 88% occupancy. That reflects the number of applications that have come in from new students and continuing students. It is a way we continue to monitor and match our enrollment to see what the patterns of students are and what they are doing. We have seen an uptick in the number of freshmen applications coming in in housing, as well as a little bit of increase in the number of continuing students as well. It is just an occupancy based on the number of applications that have come in. There is no guarantee that those students are going to be with us.

Chair Grimm said that she assumed there was some adjustment for having rooms that do not hold as many students as they may have in the past.

Vice President Parker agreed and asked Vice President Hylton to add some comments.

Vice President Hylton said we have reduced our room density based on public health guidance, and we will continue to change this depending on how we will reopen in the fall.

Senator Mocioalca asked what Kent faculty can do to promote Kent State. She would like to advertise for Kent State but is uncertain about how to do it most effectively.

Vice President Parker said she would be happy to work with faculty to make sure messages are consistent.

There were no further comments or questions.

9. Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration Mark Polatajko with a Budget Update

Senior Vice President Polatajko greeted the senate and mentioned that his presentation had been shared over the past 10 days in small group budget meetings with the Board of Trustees, with the cabinet, with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, with FaSBAC, and with Moody's financial analysts.

Unlike some of our peer institutions who are dealing with a possible downgrade in their bond rating, currently in Moody's outlook, based on the results of the presentation, we have continued to maintain their confidence in what we are doing and how we are administering the university's finances.

He said that the goal of the presentation was to give an update on the budget, including the COVID-19 financial implications, the highlights of our planning assumptions for Fiscal Year 2021, and what our cash impacts and forecast are as well. He said that we want to preserve our sound financial position, which is reliant on reasonable debt, strong fund balances, and balanced operating activities.

The two key challenges for us are these: (1) the abruptness of the financial implications that we are dealing with as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, and (2) the uncertainty of what will happen next. As of today, we currently estimate that the net effect impact of COVID-19 is going to be approximately 10.4 million dollars. Furthermore, we just concluded our third quarter budgetary forecast, and given our reduced campus footprint and operations, we expect to be able to deliver even greater reduced expenses. It appears that we may end the year with a slight budget surplus of approximately 2 million dollars.

In the mid-year forecast on December 31st, 2019, which took into consideration the projected activity for the remaining six months, we were in great shape. Expenses were balanced and aligned to revenues, and we were on a good footing toward setting a good foundation for Fiscal Year 2021 in terms of reasonable increases in operating revenues, which included an anticipated one percent increase in State Share of Instruction (SSI).

In addition, as of January 31st, the investment portfolio was returning a positive 17.8 million dollars year-to-date. That changed, and in the presentation, he pointed to a tabulation of the revenue and expense impacts and Kent State's mitigating strategies.

He said that senators were aware of most of these items, including auxiliary refunds to our students for dining, parking, and prorated rooms, which resulted in a 13.3-million-dollar cost. We were anticipating a 20% reduction in State Share of Instruction for the remainder of this

fiscal year, April May and June. That was estimated at 8 million dollars. The good news was that we were recently informed that it will only be a 6-million-dollar reduction to Kent State University.

Kent made a commitment to provide the vital student wages and employment that our students needed by offering them opportunities to work remotely and earn those dollars for them to be able to meet their cost in attendance and their living expenses. This was a commitment for us that we wanted to be dedicated to deliver on through the remainder of this fiscal year. An estimate related to course fees and refunding those is about \$600,000.

Regarding athletics, no NCAA tournament means our MAC share of \$500,000 to fund university intercollegiate athletics was reduced. In addition, with no one using dining services and the bookstore, except for about 60 students that currently still live on campus, there was another loss of about 1.9 million dollars. In total, this adds up to about 25.5 million dollars.

There are factors that will offset that cost. Healthcare claims may be reduced by about a million dollars through June. There may also be savings as a result of postponing or delaying several construction projects. There will be fewer people on campus, so utilities will be used less. In addition, the 50th Commemoration of the May 4th shootings as well as a virtual commencement for students instead of the One University Commencement that we had planned for will cost much less than anticipated. With fewer people on campus and lower availability for staffing capacity, no overtime will be paid through the end of this time period. The CARE Act dedicates 9.7 million dollars to Kent State, one half of which is federally directed to students for their emergency use. The other half is available for Kent State University to cover its expenses related to this extraordinary event. Much of this might go towards offsetting current financial impact, but some of it could be used to prepare this campus for undertaking a different way to do its mission when we welcome our students back.

Kent State has the ability to submit an insurance claim for 5 million dollars for business interruption, and we have done that; however, the timing and likelihood of that insurance claim is unknown, so it is not included at this point in time as an offset to the Fiscal Year 2020 budget.

The bottom of the presentation shows 9.3 million dollars in investment income, which has been realized. What we are dealing with now is the unrealized market losses and the gains in the near term or in the unforeseen future. We had about 17.8 million dollars in investment income unrealized on January 31st. Within a 10-day period in March, that disappeared, and we went from 17.8 up to 22.25 million down. This is a 40-million-dollar swing in a 10-day period. The good news is those realized gains which are dividends, interest income and so forth, have been secured and will help us in terms of meeting our operating budget parameters.

He then went on to discuss capital construction projects, including those that are either in the planning phase or at a point where noncompletion would not hinder campus operations; those have been postponed or delayed at this point in time. This should provide for about 45.8 million dollars in cash. However, these funds will need to be available at a time when a decision is made to proceed forward with these various projects.

Kent State does have flexibility. He pointed to the major projects that we have postponed until further notice, which will provide significant dollars that will be retained to support our cash flow or working capital and until we feel comfortable in proceeding forward on a project-by-project basis.

Another factor is the likelihood and timing of capital appropriations. The Board of Trustees submitted 22.5 million dollars for the biannual state capital budget in December. There is uncertainty with respect to whether we will get that or not.

With regard to FY 2021, Senior Vice President Polatajko said we are planning for the worst and hoping for the best. We are facing a possible 110 million dollars in lost revenue. We must understand that the environment is going to help dictate or drive which direction we should be going in, in terms of tuition increases at a point in time where unemployment is at its highest level since the Great Depression. If this is truly a two to three year recovery, and unemployment continues to maintain at that level, affordability and access are going to be very critical and very challenging.

As far as investments, Kent dedicated 9.3 million dollars of investment income last year for operating purposes. Given the market volatility, that probably will not happen. Conservatively speaking, we may realize about 2 million of investment income. On the expense side, there are items related to staffing. We have a full hiring freeze in effect. The board last week approved a salary adjustment model for non-represented personnel. That will bring expense reductions of about 5.7 million dollars. There is also a voluntary separation plan approved by the board that was released earlier today with a three week window to opt in open until June 1st; this offers an estimated savings of about 23 million dollars based on preliminary estimates, and taking into account the one time cost associated with those savings in Fiscal Year 2021. The board also approved a memoranda of understanding with the AAUP tenure-track as well as the full-time non-tenure-track, which yielded budget savings for next year in terms of a cost avoidance for all of those salary increases, which equates to about 2.5 million dollars. This shows a possibility of 30 million dollars' worth of reduced expenses and cost avoidance in Fiscal Year 2021. In addition, there may be 20% budget cuts for the colleges, divisions, and auxiliaries. There will also be no university sponsored travel, which allows for 3.4 million in savings. Healthcare benefits expense is to be determined because we do not know how many individuals will be on the university's healthcare plan for the upcoming year, and that will be determined in partnership with our consultants and actuarial personnel.

As we look at forecasting cash needs over the next 15 months, we are applying the budget projections and COVID-19 financial implications for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2020, and the budget assumptions and expected one-time expenses. We are also reflecting on our tool set and what is available to us to enhance ongoing cash management functions with the continued focus on maximizing investment returns while still managing to have the cash available to meet operating and planned capital expenses. No one knows how long the difficulties will last. We know that market volatility will continue, and the investment portfolio may experience even further market losses. Therefore, if we do not do the hard work now to align budget expenses to projected revenues, and we rely on the investments to weather a storm, we run the real risk of a material erosion of investment balances, which will fundamentally jeopardize our viability as an institution.

Senior Vice President Polatajko then thanked senate for their leadership and support moving ahead.

He then invited comments or questions.

Senator Laux asked whether if we find out that in any particular academic unit they are not going to suffer a 20 percent enrollment drop, and that they can offer sections where the enrollment revenues exceed the cost, however they have already made personnel decisions based upon the 20 percent cut, but they do not have the adjunct faculty or full-time non-tenure-track to teach their courses, whether they are going to be allowed to hire to cover these courses.

Senior Vice President Polatajko deferred to Interim Provost Tankersley.

Interim Provost Tankersley said it is under consideration. They hope not to have a 20% decline, and we must meet the needs of students, so they are talking about it.

Senator Roxburgh said that cuts appear to be distributed evenly across units and wondered whether the strategy can be effective for really reducing the budget problems and how much it might hurt the pedagogy in units. She asked whether we should look at a major university restructuring.

President Diacon said we plan for the worst and hope for the best. We cannot respond to individual unit questions. Everything is a work in progress. He said he wants to limit most cuts to the central administrative side of things as much as possible.

Senator Mocioalca asked about the 20% expected reduction in tuition and fees. She wondered where, if we are around 9% now, the 20% came from.

President Diacon said he hopes not to have a 20% reduction. However, if there is a second wave of the pandemic, it could be worse.

Interim Provost Tankersley added that we are in too much of an unknown position to predict these things. Past analytics do not reflect what is currently happening. Things keep fluctuating with enrollment numbers, and we must implement something soon, so they are going with 20% based on nationwide trends and current Kent State statistics. She stressed that we cannot wait until August to decide.

Senator Laux said that he wished to deliver a financial resolution on behalf the senate. He moved to read the resolution. Senator Roxburgh seconded. Senator Laux asked Senator Dauterich to read the resolution, which stated the following:

“Whereas student safety and academic success are the primary concerns of faculty,

Whereas COVID-19 has had a profound impact on the world and that impact is being felt in higher education and at Kent State,

Whereas, a great deal of uncertainty regarding the 2021 fiscal budget currently exists,

Whereas the 20% planned budget cuts and projected enrollment decline resulted in early personnel decisions in academic units leading to many normally required adjuncts not being hired and the non-renewal of some full-time non-tenure eligible faculty,

Whereas, increased information later in the summer may indicate that student enrollments are not suffering in the way envisioned under the worst-case scenario that instigated the 20% budget cut,

Whereas the University has announced a hiring freeze that includes academic positions,

Whereas a reduction in the number of instructors without a corresponding reduction in student enrollment would endanger the ability of the academic units to fulfill their instructional duty to provide high quality education for our students,

Be it resolved that

Faculty Senate calls upon the administration to permit academic units to hire full or part-time instructors upon demonstrating need, if budget or enrollment predictions become more favorable than those used in the plan that led to the 20% cuts.”

Chair Grimm asked for questions or comments. There were none. The resolution passed unanimously.

There were no further comments or questions on the presentation from Senior Vice President Polatajko.

10. Educational Policies Council (EPC):

a. Action Items:

- i. Division of Graduate Studies: Revision of the policy on dissertation for the doctoral degree. Effective fall 2020. [Proposal](#)

Interim Dean Stillings presented the proposal.

Chair Grimm invited comments or questions.

Senator Ciesla moved to approve and offered an amendment to the proposal concerning the requirement for students to register during the summer. The amendment suggested that faculty helping students only do so if the students are registered in the summer and was worded as follows: “Graduate students requiring access to university resources during the Summer months, including but not limited to feedback or mentoring from their dissertation advisors, use of university buildings or other research resources, must enroll for summer

dissertation credit. If the student is an eligible graduate student in good standing, those hours will be approved by the academic unit administrator.”

Interim Dean Stillings expressed agreement with the amendment.

Senator Chunn said we also have a problem when a student finishes coursework and wants to study for qualifying exams in the fall, but that student cannot access the library in order to get material for qualifying exams.

Chair Grimm asked Dean Burhanna to address the question.

Dean Burhanna said that deans and advisors can request access in these situations.

Dean Bloebaum said that at her former institution there was no double counting of effort. So, for instance, if a student during the summer was on a grant and the faculty were on a grant and being paid that way, the student would not necessarily have to register for dissertation. It was a cost saving measure for them.

Senator Smith responded that in this case we have a CBA that requires that faculty be paid for the work they do advising the dissertation, which may be different at other institutions; at Kent State, no one should expect the faculty member to do any advising if the faculty member is not being paid in accordance with the contract.

Interim Dean Stillings said this was done for flexibility and no attempt was made to add workload to the faculty.

Senator Kaplan expressed support for the amendment but added that he would appreciate it if parts of it were amended and clarified.

Several senators offered rewording and clarification suggestions for portions of the amendment.

Senator Smith moved to approve the motion as amended and Senator Kaplan seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

ii. Division of Graduate Studies: Revision of the policy on thesis for the master’s degree. Effective fall 2020. [Proposal](#)

Interim Dean Stillings presented the proposal.

Chair Grimm invited comments or questions.

Vice President Tillett entered language parallel to the amendment in the previous proposal to be added to this policy; the language was altered to reflect that it concerned the master’s degree.

Chair Grimm asked whether the language was acceptable.

The motion was approved and seconded (Smith/Ciesla).

The motion passed unanimously.

b. Information Items

The items were listed at the end of the agenda. There were no comments or questions about the items.

11. Old Business: Revision to Charter and Bylaws

Chair Grimm invited Secretary Dauterich to present the revisions.

Secretary Dauterich mentioned that the revisions had been distributed prior to a previous senate meeting, and he noted that senate had had time to examine the documents and to see why language in the charter and bylaws had been changed. At that previous meeting, there were a few small amendments including the wording for the privilege of who got to speak on the floor and changing the title of student representatives to that currently used by Undergraduate Student Government. Secretary Dauterich added that the latest version also corrected a few typos. The revisions had been passed on to the Ad Hoc Commission on Charter and Bylaws, and they voted to support it and bring it back for a vote before the full senate.

Senator Vande Zande moved to approve.

Chair Grimm invited questions or comments.

There were none.

The revisions passed unanimously.

12. New Business

There was no new business.

13. Announcements/Statements for the Record

- a. Chair Grimm announced that we will hold the July 13 senate meeting.
- b. Chair Grimm announced that additional informal information meetings might occur.
- c. Chair Grimm reminded senate that the Committee on Administrative Officers (CAO) election closes at 11:59pm today (May 11).

14. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate

Attachment

Chair's Remarks for May 11, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting

First, we welcomed our new and re-elected senators at the April meeting. Today I want to take a moment to recognize and acknowledge the incredible contributions of faculty who will be completing their terms as Senators at the end of this academic year. Senators, as I call your name, if you are willing and able, please turn your video on and leave it on until we have completed recognizing you and your colleagues.

- Simon Adamtey
- Sheryl Chatfield
- Jeff Ciesla
- Chris Fenk
- Richard Mangrum
- Rocco Petrozzi
- Blake Stringer
- Brett Tippey
- Molly Wang
- Kathy Wilson

Please be aware that I have all your numbers and I will continue to reach out and tap the incredible knowledge and wisdom you have to offer.

When I was 7 or 8, my neighbor across the street, Mr. Baum was painting a portrait of my sister Gretchen. I would go over and hang out while he was painting. He and his house were fascinating and both Mr. and Mrs. Baum was really, really nice. Mr. Baum told me about going to see Annie Oakley shooting glass balls in the air when he was young. That really impressed me. Later that year, Mrs. Baum became ill. I would still go over and they both seemed to like having me visit. Sometimes Mr. Baum would ask me to sit by Mrs. Baum's bed while he was doing something in another part of the house. She was a tiny woman, at that point very fragile, like a bird. I still remember the touch, the sensation of holding her hand which was so soft, with skin that was almost transparent.

One day I went over and Mrs. Baum was downstairs asleep in the living room on the couch. Mr. Baum was sitting across from her on a chair. He was drawing his wife. She looked old, frail and sick to me. It was probably less than a week before she died. I couldn't understand why he would want to draw her in this way, but I could see it was a beautiful drawing. I've often thought about that drawing and the act of making that drawing. I think Mr. Baum was one of those people who made sense of his world by finding or creating beauty in the people and things that surrounded him. Even at a most difficult time, there he was, finding beauty.

Someday, the time of COVID-19 will be past. And I'm really looking forward to that time. But we all need to make space to see, to acknowledge, to enjoy and to celebrate the many beautiful things that have been happening during this most difficult time. You can find examples around the world, but I want to focus on the beautiful things that have and continue to happen at Kent State. As chair of the Faculty Senate, I want to start by thanking each and every one of you, and asking you to share those thanks with your colleagues, for undertaking the herculean task of transforming your face-to-face classes to remote teaching. I've heard so many wonderful stories of the varied and creative ways in which faculty undertook the challenge. From the tech savvy to the tech challenged, faculty did their best to help keep their students on track to

complete the semester successfully. You did it! And the students I've spoken with acknowledge and are grateful to faculty for the efforts they made.

And it has been beautiful to watch people from all over our university come together, roll up their sleeves and do what needs to be done to support our students and our faculty. I'm especially proud of the work of the Academic Continuity Committee and the collaborative spirit that has guided its work. I don't have time to recognize each member of that committee, but each and every one of them deserves our gratitude. The tenor and tone of much we did in Spring was based on the principle of "do no harm." We looked to find ways to mitigate the negative impact that the pandemic had on our students and faculty. This is the group that developed responses to COVID-19 such as an extended course withdrawal deadline and the modification to the tolling policy that allows any tenure track faculty member to request an additional year on the tenure clock. This group has also crafted language to ensure that money contractually designated for faculty professional development and research will be reserved explicitly for those purposes so both the teaching and research missions of the university can proceed with as little disruption as possible.

Another important principle that has guided us is that the academic units are the only ones who have the knowledge required to determine what does and doesn't work as appropriate responses to the limitations that COVID-19 places on us for a given course, major, minor, certificate or degree. This is why the decision on whether or not to allow courses in particular programs be taken pass-fail was left to the academic units themselves. I fully expect this principle to continue guiding our efforts as we plan for Fall of 2020.

More generally, the practice of shared governance has been critical to our accomplishments to date and will see us through the difficult times ahead. As I look forward to the summer and fall, I see a mountain of work that can't be done by any one individual, unit, office or leader. Shared governance and collaboration will be the only way to move forward effectively.

The foundation will be the guidance provided by our own experts on campus who have worked to develop a pandemic plan and have already been actively involved advising Student Affairs. It is a beautiful thing that we have some world-recognized experts in epidemiology and pandemic planning in Dr. Tara Smith and Dr. Chris Woolverton as part of our faculty and they will help us with contingency planning for varying degrees of constraints within which we will all be operating in the fall and beyond.

While the foundation is health and safety, our obligations to our current students and future success of Kent State University must be navigated, through shared governance process with the Office of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. We need to recognize first and foremost the needs of courses and programs that require a presence on campus in order to meet their learning objects. Many of our programs can shift to an online or remote format with little or no degradation of student experience. However, other courses and programs can't. We need to pay special attention to those courses and programs which are likely to include studios, labs and simulations requiring special equipment. The Provost's office will be reaching out to gather more detail on all our course and program needs.

We also need to figure out how we can address the health and safety considerations of each student and faculty member as we plan for opening. It's not going to be a one-size-fits-all. Who develops the rules? What will they be? How will they be enforced? More sticky issues that will be the work of shared governance process over the summer.

I feel a sense of urgency to complete planning for the fall and there are urgent matters to consider. But we are in a marathon not a sprint. I am not inherently a patient person. I'm too likely to focus on obstacles, problems, the challenges. As we work our way through the summer, I will try to be mindful of the beauty around me in the collective efforts of shared governance processes focused on helping KSU survive and ultimately thrive in the times to come.

Thank you.
Pamela E. Grimm
Chair, Faculty Senate

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”) 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 [wishes\(s\) 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 same complaint cannot be brought against the same respondent by multiple and separate written complaints. The file submitted by the Complainant(s) becomes the basis for all further consideration of the matter.

- 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 filed 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 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 seven (7) working 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 seven (7) working 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.
- G. Upon receipt of notification that the Committee will hear the complaint, the Respondent shall have fifteen (15) twenty (20) calendar days to submit to the Committee a written response with supporting documentation to the Committee and a list of witnesses the Respondent(s) wish to give testimony at a hearing. If the notification 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 hearing hearings to the parties and to the Committee members no less than fifteen (15) 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.
- H. The hearing hearings shall be held at a mutually agreed upon date no later than thirty (30) 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 hearing 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, ~~such as an AAUP KSU representative.~~ 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 Complainant~~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. Each party to the hearingThe Complainant(s) or Respondent shall then have the opportunity to give a final summation of at most ten (10) minutes, ~~concluding with~~. The Committee may choose to adjust the periods depending on the summary nature of the Respondent, each case.
- C. Following the ~~hearing~~hearings, the Committee shall have ~~fourteen (14) working~~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. The Committee's report of the vote and any recommendation shall be sent to the Chair of Faculty Senate and to both Complainant(s) and Respondent.
- 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 ~~as provided by the Faculty Code of Ethics, Faculty Senate By Laws, and other applicable policies and practices~~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.

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 same complaint cannot be brought against the same respondent by multiple and separate written complaints. The file submitted by the Complainant(s) becomes the basis for all further consideration of the matter.

- 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 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.
- 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 witnesses the Respondent(s) wish to give testimony at a hearing. If the notification 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.
- 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. 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. The Committee's report of the vote and any recommendation shall be sent to the Chair of Faculty Senate and to both Complainant(s) and Respondent.
- 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
May 5, 2020**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Molly Wang (Appointed), Darci Kracht (At-Large Elect), Ann Abraham (Newly Appointed), Tess Kail (Office Secretary)

Guests Present: Interim Provost Melody Tankersley, Senior Vice President Mark Polatajko

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Meeting with Interim Provost Tankersley and Senior Vice President Polatajko

Senior Vice President Polatajko provided an update on the budgets for Fiscal Years 2020 and 2021, the status of building projects, and the cash forecast for the future. He suggested that the goal was to deliver an overall 20% budget cut (based on loss of State Share of Instruction (SSI) and tuition loss). Additionally, he said the university wants to change operations in order to achieve the cuts and keep reasonable debt levels and strong fund balances. He predicted a net budget impact of 14.4 million dollars for the 2020 fiscal year (FY).

He then addressed capital projects and said that many would be postponed or delayed, which will enhance the university's cash balances by 45.8 million dollars to support near-term working capital needs.

For FY 2021, he said we will plan for the worst and hope for the best. Based upon preliminary planning assumptions, we will propose an Expenditure Authorization at 80% of the FY 2020 Board of Trustees approved budget, allowing for the development of a more accurate FY 2021 budget during the summer months as the budgetary landscape post-COVID-19 becomes clearer.

Our reserves and fund balances are historically strong; however, based upon cash on hand as of 3/31/20 and current FY 2020 and 2021 assumptions, operating cash and liquidity will be a priority. Near term strategies include the following: (1) maintain a balanced operating

budget; (2) minimize non-operating expenses; (3) explore short-term financing sources; and (4) effectively manage cash and investments.

Future steps toward addressing financial issues will be considered at the next three upcoming Board of Trustees meetings.

Senior Vice President Polatajko then invited any comments or questions from the Executive Committee.

Chair Grimm asked whether all the adjustments mentioned address the 110-million-dollar shortfall. If not, will some of our reserves be used? For example, President Diacon mentioned that 70% of our reserves are tied up in longer term investments; what about the remaining 30%? This is specifically referring to the expendable net assets, not the reserves held within Academic Affairs units.

Senior Vice President Polatajko replied that the 110 million is not a one-time event; the decreases will continue to affect the university over a four-year period. The market volatility at this time also prevents some of these investments from being taken out at this time.

Senator Kracht asked for more information about an insurance claim against disasters that the university was filing.

Senior Vice President Polatajko said that the total insurance claim for the consortium of universities involved provides a 5-million-dollar cap to each institution for class interruption.

Senator Laux asked about the 45.8 million available as cash flow for postponed construction; would this have to be returned and how quickly?

Senior Vice President Polatajko said the projects will not go away, so when we use the money now for working capital, we will later replenish the funds slowly as tuition and fees come in. This helps the university keep away from the investment pool and from realizing losses from selling deflated assets or missing out on market gains. He said we have as long as the projects are not moving forward to pay back the money. This could be years or as soon as state money comes in.

Vice Chair Vande Zande asked about athletics. She wanted to know whether the university was cutting money from programs besides football.

Senior Vice President Polatajko said the athletic director is looking at every sport within guidelines set outside the university. The coaches are having salaries reduced. Athletics had a 30-million-dollar budget, 14 million of which was funded from general fee allocations.

Chair Grimm asked about the 2020 budget. Student wages were already budgeted, so why were they computed into the loss? How is it a loss?

Senior Vice President Polatajko said it was in the budget.

Chair Grimm said FY 2020 seems to show only a one million dollars remaining and wanted to know whether that is what is left for the fiscal year.

Senior Vice President Polatajko said yes, and that it is almost good news for this year. If we get reimbursed from the federal stimulus dollars, it will offset most of the losses.

Chair Grimm said that for FY 2021, the key assumption behind the 20% unit cuts is that we will be down 20% in SSI and enrollment.

Senior Vice President Polatajko replied that we are not assuming a 20% drop in enrollment, rather in tuition and fee revenue. Retention plays into this as well.

Chair Grimm asked where the 20% assumption is coming from.

Senior Vice President Polatajko said it came from conversations with other universities across the country and that we are planning for a worst-case scenario. His hope is that it will not have to come to that.

Interim Provost Tankersley added that in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and in *HigherEd*, 20% is the general number universities use. Kent currently is not projecting enrollment to be that bad.

Chair Grimm suggested that we are hurting academic affairs because of the required 20% proposal; NTT faculty have been non-renewed. Tapping into some of the reserves might have allowed better planning for academic units.

Senior Vice President Polatajko said he appreciated the feedback. He does not currently have numbers on layoffs and total reduction in staff because they have to wait and see who takes advantages of voluntary separation plans. Enrollment will also make a difference.

The committee asked what kind of contingency planning is currently underway to determine how, in the event of a worst-case scenario, programs (majors, minors, certificates, ROTC, etc.) would be reviewed for possible cuts?

Interim Provost Tankersley said everything will be done “as appropriate.” Deans will be asked to decrease staffing and increase shared services. Buyouts in addition to this could really hurt units who already do not have enough staff. One way around this could be to find units that are overly populated and move personnel to places with deficits. Shared services can also be increased (sharing budget personnel, administrative assistants, communications people, etc. rather than each department having one). The university is also looking at where fewer administrators might be needed. They are examining class enrollments and seeing whether classes could be combined rather than letting a section go. Faculty workloads also must remain appropriate. One college has a 4/4 load for NTTs and that probably cannot continue. They are looking at the trends based on the Delaware Cost Study data. They are

also looking at the five-year trends at Kent itself. Deans have been told they need to see how their programs fit. They may not be able to cut their way out of things, but they should be looking at trends for growth nationwide as well. All programs are being investigated. She said she will look into how many first- and second-year NTTs were not renewed after the proposed 20% budget exercise was announced. Melody has asked deans to propose 20%, 15%, 10%, and 7% budgets to see which schools need which cuts.

There were no further comments or questions, and Vice President Polatajko agreed to present his information at the next Faculty Senate meeting

3. Additional Items

It was decided that a representative from the Division of Student Affairs should be invited to be a part of the Academic Continuity Committee. The University College may also want to be represented.

4. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
May 18, 2020**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Molly Wang (Appointed), Darci Kracht (At-Large Elect), Ann Abraham (Newly Appointed)

Guests Present: President Todd Diacon, Interim Provost Melody Tankersley

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 2:19 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Review Topics for Discussion with President and Provost

Topics that were reviewed for discussion included the disconnect between what is possible and what is being suggested at each of the meetings of the Ad Hoc Continuity Committee and the various subcommittees and reopening committees. There is a concern that the committees are bogged down with overly optimistic projections when there is no clear guidance yet from state and public health officials. Institutional conversations and directions need to be anchored around the realities of the health situation.

3. (3:30) Meet with President Diacon and Interim Provost Tankersley

The Executive Committee discussed reopening plans with the president and provost. President Diacon said that they hope to send out a communication on Friday, but their preference will continue to be for face-to-face instruction in the fall. They will adhere to core safety principles. Being face-to-face is a working goal. Faculty will be encouraged to choose whether they teach face-to-face as part of the working goal. We will need to learn to operate in person. If we go fully remote, it would only be until the creation and dissemination of a vaccine. There would also have to be a lot of cleaning protocols and social distancing changes to make it work. Required classes (those that cannot be offered remotely) are the current priority.

4. Executive Committee and Faculty Senate Meetings over the Next Six Weeks

Dates for upcoming meetings were discussed but not yet finalized.

5. June 8, 2020 Faculty Senate Informational Meeting

An informal informational meeting will be held on ZOOM.

6. Update from Tess Kail on Committee Appointment Letters

Tess Kail was not available for the update.

7. Additional Items

The Executive Committee chose a possible substitute for Denice Sheehan who has been promoted to Interim Dean of Nursing. We will hold a special election to replace her on senate, and after the election, we will proceed to appoint a new Executive Committee member.

8. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
May 27, 2020**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Robin Vande Zande (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Tracy Laux (At-Large), Denice Sheehan (Appointed), Molly Wang (Appointed), Darci Kracht (At-Large Elect), Ann Abraham (Newly Appointed)

Guests Present: Thomas Niepsuj (Director of Academic Affairs, Undergraduate Student Government)

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes were not available for approval at this meeting.

3. Other Final Business for Outgoing Executive Committee Members

a. Key Card Return

Outgoing members (Denice Sheehan, Molly Wang) need to return keys if they have physical keys to the Michael Schwartz Center.

b. 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Status Report, Karen Keenan

The report was not available at this time.

c. Faculty Senate Spring Digest

The committee discussed the digest and what will be placed in it including actions that impacted faculty over the past academic year.

4. Incoming Executive Committee

a. Select a Replacement for Denice Sheehan on Executive Committee

Chair Grimm will contact possible candidates about their willingness to serve.

b. Fall 2020 Executive Committee Meeting Schedule

The incoming senators on the 2020-2021 Executive Committee worked out their schedules for the upcoming academic year in order to find the best times for committee meetings.

c. Load Release for Executive Committee Members

Load hours for doing committee work were discussed and allocated.

d. Key Cards for Back Door

Executive Committee members needing key cards for entrance to the Michael Schwartz Center will have them assigned.

5. (3:30) Thomas Niepsuj, USG

Mr. Niepsuj is excited about the opportunity to work with the Faculty Senate and on the Academic Continuity Committee. He asked whether he would be able to discuss student opinions and initiatives with Faculty Senate. He wants to bring some mental health concerns to Academic Affairs and work with creating an incentive or resource to help bridge barriers between faculty and students. He is concerned with faculty understanding of students' mental health difficulties and how faculty can better connect with students both in class and during office hours.

The Executive Committee responded enthusiastically to Mr. Niepsuj's ideas and invited him to participate in further discussion with them about any matters he wished to bring before the full Faculty Senate.

6. Committee Appointments

a. Committee on Committees

Candidates were approved and will be asked whether they would be willing to serve on the committee.

b. Educational Policies Council – Discussion of Re-structure and Select Chair

This item was postponed until the next Executive Committee meeting.

c. Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee

Candidates were approved and will be asked whether they would be willing to serve on the committee.

7. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

8. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
June 4, 2020**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Tracy Laux (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary),
Darci Kracht (At-Large), Ann Abraham (Appointed), Melissa Zullo (Appointed)

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 12:22 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Approval of Minutes

a. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 5, 2020

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting (Laux/Kracht). The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

b. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of May 11, 2020

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting (Abraham/Laux). The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

c. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 18, 2020

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting (Laux/Kracht). The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

d. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 27, 2020

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the meeting (Kracht/Laux). The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

3. Welcome Melissa Zullo

Senator Zullo was welcomed by the Executive Committee as a newly appointed member for AY 2020-2021.

4. Discussion of the Faculty Response to Fall 2020 Survey

The results from the final version of the faculty survey about needs for the upcoming semester based on the COVID-19 pandemic have been received. There was a 64%

response rate. The information will be distributed to administration, the Ad Hoc Academic Continuity Committee (ACC), the Faculty Senate, and the various reopening committees, and it will be posted to the Faculty Senate website. The survey results confirmed that many faculty members are hesitant about returning to campus, and in addition, it shows resources faculty are interested in having in order to teach effectively in the fall. The document will be passed on to the ACC Faculty Subcommittee for discussion.

5. Senate Statement in Response to George Floyd Killing and Protests/Demonstrations

The committee discussed the joint statement about the murder that was sent out earlier by the university. There was discussion about whether the senate should make a statement of their own. The committee decided that a statement should be made and will be distributed. It was also suggested that a new climate study be administered during the upcoming academic year if there are not already plans to do so. Chair Grimm will draft a statement and send it to the committee for approval.

6. Educational Policies Council (EPC)

Chair Grimm expressed the desire to continue as the EPC Chair. The changes to the structure of the EPC were discussed and supported by the Executive Committee. Possible representatives from senate were discussed to fill the two positions that will be assigned to senate members. These changes will take place as soon as the Board of Trustees approves the charter and bylaws revisions.

7. Faculty Ethics Committee (FEC) – Revised FEC Purposes & Procedures

The committee moved and seconded to send the revision of the FEC purpose and procedures document to senate for a full vote (Laux/Dauterich). The motion to send it on passed. It will be added as a discussion item with the possibility of amending it to an action item.

8. Fall Retreat (Topics/Date)

Racial tensions and issues on campus were brought up as a possible topic. The committee agreed that the topic would serve for both the Fall Retreat and the Spring Forum. The Fall Retreat date will be decided later.

9. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

10. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 1:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate