

Faculty Senate Agenda July 19, 2021

Item No.	Item	PDF Pg. No.
1	Call to Order	
2	Roll Call	
3	Approval of Agenda	
4	Approval of the May 10, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes	2 - 11
5	Chair's Remarks	
6	President's Remarks	
7	State of the Pandemic and Prevention Strategies for the Fall (Manfred van Dulmen, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs & Dean for the Division of Graduate Studies and Julie Volcheck, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs & Director of University Health Services)	
8	Enrollment Management Update (Sean Broghammer, Associate V.P. for Enrollment Management)	
9	Budget Update (Mark Polatajko, Senior V.P. for Finance and Administration)	
10	Presentation and Discussion about IT Governance and University Council on Technology (John Rathje, V.P. for Information Technology and Shelley Marshall, Associate Lecturer for Computer Technology and the University Council on Technology Chair)	
11	VPN Update (Jim Raber, Executive Director of Support, Infrastructure and Research Technology and Robert Eckman, Chief Info Security Officer)	
12	Old Business	
13	New Business: Discussion Item: Faculty Ethics Committee Purpose & Procedures Proposed Changes (Susan Roxburgh, Professor for the Department of Sociology and the Faculty Ethics Committee Chair) (see attached documents)	12 13 - 15
14	Announcements / Statements for the Record	
15	Adjourn	
	Additional Items:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 17, 2021 	16 - 18
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 26, 2021 	19 - 20
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of June 16, 2021 	21 - 22
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of June 17, 2021 	23 - 24
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of June 23, 2021 	25 - 28



FACULTY SENATE

Meeting Minutes

May 10, 2021

Senators Present: Ann Abraham, Omid Bagheri, Kathy Bergh, Jeffrey Child, Jeffrey Ciesla, Sue Clement, Tammy Clewell, Alice Colwell, Scott Courtney, Timothy Culver, Ed Dauterich, Tracy Dodson, Yanhai Du, Julie Evey, Pamela Grimm, Angela Guercio, Mariann Harding, Todd Hawley, Darci Kracht, Cynthia Kristof, Velvet Landingham, Tracy Laux, Cathy Marshall, Mahli Mechenbier, Oana Mocioalca, Deepraj Mukherjee, Abe Osbourne, Vic Perera, Amy Petrinec, Linda Piccirillo-Smith, Helen Piontkivska, Terri Polanski, Susan Roxburgh, Murali Shanker, Deborah Smith, Diane Stroup, Robin Vande Zande, Theresa Walton-Fisette, Donald White, Haiyan Zhu

Senators-Elect Present: Tina Bhargava, Omar De La Cruz Cabrera, Kimberly DePaul, Karen Mascolo, Denise McEnroe-Petitte, Eric Taylor, Laurie Wagner

Senators Not Present: Jean Engohang-Ndong, David Kaplan, Edgar Kooijman, Janice Kroeger, Kimberly Peer, Athena Salaba, Melissa Zullo

Ex-Officio Members Present: President Todd Diacon; Senior Vice President and Provost Melody Tankersley; Senior Vice President Mark Polatajko; Vice Presidents: Paul DiCorleto, Amoaba Gooden*, Lamar Hylton, Sean Broghammer for Mary Parker, John Rathje, Charlene Reed, Peggy Shadduck, Valoree Vargo*, Jack Witt; Deans: Christina Bloebaum, Allan Boike, Ken Burhanna, John Crawford-Spinelli, James Hannon, Mark Mistur, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk*, Eboni Pringle, Amy Reynolds, Denice Sheehan*, Alison Smith, Deborah Spake, Manfred van Dulmen *Interim

Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Vice Presidents: Rebecca Murphy*, Willis Walker; Dean Sonia Alemagno *Interim

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

Observers Not Present: Thomas Niepsuj (USS)

Guests Present: Emma Andrus, Sue Averill, J.R. Campbell, Michael Daniels, Ken Ditlevson, Tameka Ellington, Chris Fenk, Jeffrey Hallam, Jennifer Hebebrand, Lynette Johnson, Tess Kail, Michael Kavulic, Valerie Kelly, Kelly Krabill, Dana Lawless-Andric, Michael Lehman, AJ Leu, Babacar M'Baye, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Jennifer McDonough, Susan Perry, Jim Raber, Hollie Simpson, Clare Stacey, Therese Tillett, Deirdre Warren

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 (Piccirillo-Smith/Kracht). The motion passed unanimously.

4. Approval of the April 12, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

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

5. Chair's Remarks

Chair Grimm delivered her remarks. [Attachment]

Chair Grimm invited comments or questions.

There were no comments or questions.

6. Provost's Remarks

Provost Tankersley began by saying she had recently returned from the first university-wide event since the beginning of 2020—the advanced degree graduation ceremony. She mentioned that as a university, we continue to achieve well despite the pandemic. She added that while experiencing challenges, our university achieves important outcomes, and we are set up well to achieve in the future. The provost maintained that Kent State University will pursue change, forge new ideals, and reach for lofty goals, and that we are thriving rather than surviving during the pandemic. She said that much of this success was due to the faculty present at the meeting and their colleagues. One successful change mentioned by the provost was that Faculty Senate unanimously recommended making the SAT or the ACT optional, which furthers the goal of equitable access to higher education for incoming students. Faculty Senate also asked the university to review graduate testing requirements. 17 new faculty members were brought to Kent last fall, and the university is on track for adding at least 32 new faculty members this coming fall. There has been a noticeable increase in the number of black and Latinx faculty admitted. Two new research institutes (the Anti-Racism and Equity Institute and the Environmental Science and Design Research Institute) have been created. A third is being considered. She cited all of these as examples of thriving. In addition, 7 new majors, 7 certificates, and 14 minors were created. The Anti-Racism Task Force was established to examine how racism is a barrier to success for everyone in the Kent State University community. A Town Hall meeting in April was held to deliver the results. President Diacon pledged 1 million dollars in university funding to work toward the recommendations of the committee. She warned that there will be around a 1.9% decline to the student body for the upcoming year, yet overall enrollment is not expected to drop further. She added that about 72% of our pre-pandemic, in-person sections will be offered in the fall. Over 1,100 instructors participated in workshops to improve their online teaching. She said that she is optimistic about returning to normal, in-person, course offerings by Spring 2022. She thanked everyone for being a part of helping Kent State thrive.

Chair Grimm then invited comments or questions.

Senator Roxburgh asked whether an ombuds was still being considered.

Chair Grimm replied that the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate will put together a job description for an ombuds, but the description had been paused until other hires were completed. The committee will provide the description to the provost soon.

Senator Roxburgh asked whether anything is being done to remember that the pandemic has created further inequities. She mentioned the high level of stress for faculty with children. She pointed out that the College of Arts and Sciences recently received an approval for funds, and she asked whether those funds were meant to address the issue or whether there was additional discussion being had for offering assistance to mid-level faculty.

Interim Dean Munro-Stasiuk said that the purpose of the funding was open for anyone to use to restart their research if it had been halted due to the pandemic. Individuals will need to apply and make their cases.

Senator Roxburgh asked whether the funds could be used to buy out teaching.

Interim Dean Munro-Stasiuk said that it could not be used to pay faculty directly.

Senator Roxburgh worried that the approach would only benefit those who were already doing well as opposed to those in the humanities who might be less likely to apply for or receive aid.

Chair Grimm asked about the time issue for those faculty who had children and were affected. She said that the cost of an adjunct would be low for buying out teaching time and asked whether that was a possible approach.

Interim Dean Munro-Stasiuk said that the college could deal with the time releases through a general workload piece. She also said that they are cognizant that the program needed to elevate the social sciences and humanities for access to the funding.

Senator Smith mentioned that money would not be helpful at all for her research, but she said that having a class bought out and receiving extra time would be helpful. She suggested that, for some, not having money for buying out teaching time would be useless.

Interim Dean Munro-Stasiuk asked that concerned people put forward possible proposals for how to work with Senator Smith's and Senator Roxburgh's concerns.

There were no further comments or questions.

7. Budget Update (Mark Polatajko, Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration)

Senior Vice President Polatajko greeted and thanked faculty. He reported that for FY 2021 his office had assumed that there would be an 8.6% cut in the state's share of instruction (SSI) and a 6.5% drop in enrollment. This amounted to a loss of 65 million dollars (a 10% drop from the previous year). Instead there was a 3% rather than 6.5% decline in enrollment. SSI increased 13 million dollars instead of declining 8.6%. As a result, 12 million dollars will be allocated to the

colleges, the regional campuses, and podiatric medicine. Investment income is projected to be 12 million dollars. Total auxiliary revenues are down 9 million dollars (mostly in athletics, residence services, and dining). Salaries were restored to the June 2020 levels, and the voluntary separation programs have saved an additional 8 million dollars in salary and benefits. The university has committed 1 million dollars to the Anti-Racism Task Force. Key construction projects are planned to restart. A projected year-end surplus of around 4 million dollars will be dedicated to strategic priorities in a one-time spend. He also listed where COVID-19 Pandemic Relief Funds would be allocated. Despite the good news, there is still uncertainty for FY 2022. SSI may increase modestly. Tuition will raise 3.8% if the state legislature approves. Guiding principles and assumptions for next year were also addressed including a 1.9% decrease in enrollment for the new freshman class as compared to last year. The assumptions also include wage increases for faculty and staff. He concluded with a timeline for completing the goals.

Senior Vice President Polatajko then invited comments or questions.

Chair Grimm asked for clarification on the 9-million-dollar loss from auxiliaries. She wanted to know whether it was greater or less than expected.

Senior Vice President Polatajko said it was greater than what was budgeted, and that the biggest loss was from the loss of on-campus residency. We had about 50% residency and had budgeted for 60-65%.

President Diacon said that the auxiliary revenues went below budget because many students canceled residence hall contracts when we went to mostly remote courses in the fall semester.

Senator Laux asked whether the 9-million-dollar decrease was a net loss.

Senior Vice President Polatajko said the 9 million was lost revenue and that expenses could not have been reduced further.

There were no further comments or questions.

8. EPC ITEMS

a. Action Item: Division of Research and Sponsored Programs – Healthy Communities Research Institute (HCRI)– Establish Institute (Fall 2021)

The item was presented by Paul DiCorleto, Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs. The HCRI had been an initiative for the last two years. He thanked the co-directors of the initiative and pointed out that 60 faculty members from 20 different units engaged in the initiative. They published scholarly work and received grant funding while there. The research also applies to graduate and undergraduate students across the university. He also mentioned the connections to the community, their public health offerings in many venues, and their website and talked about how they assisted with public health efforts. It has undergone rigorous review on an annual basis, and that would continue in the future.

He then invited comments or questions.

There were no comments or questions.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the creation of the institute (Roxburgh/Walton-Fisette). The motion passed unanimously.

b. Action Item: College of Arts and Sciences – Center for Comparative and Integrative Programs – Revising the Center to a School and Renaming It the School for Multidisciplinary Social Sciences and Humanities (Fall 2021)

The item was presented by Interim Dean Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. All programs and courses in the center and the Center for the Study of Gender and Sexuality (a center within the center) will be in the new school, except the Pre-Law minor and advising programs (which move to the Department of Political Science). The B.A. in International Relations will move from the Department of Political Science to this new school. The school will have around nine faculty at the full-time level, and they will have a director like other schools/departments. There should be about 250 majors attending classes. Faculty and students in the effected areas are supportive of the changes.

She then invited comments or questions.

Senator Smith asked how many faculty were tenure-track.

Interim Dean Munro-Stasiuk said there would be four non-tenure-track and five tenure-track faculty.

Senator Vande Zande asked whether this would be a model for multidisciplinary study in the future.

Associate Provost van Dulmen said that this was definitely the direction in which the university was moving.

Senator Kracht asked whether the physical space was available.

Interim Dean Munro-Stasiuk said the space in Bowman that they currently use could work with minor adjustments. Those members in Cartwright would be moved to Bowman.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the change (Dauterich/Mukherjee). The motion passed unanimously.

c. Information Item: EPC – University Requirements Curriculum Committee – Experiential Learning Requirement (March 2021)

There will be a one-year moratorium on new Experiential Learning Requirement (ELR) courses; this does not include new section-only ELR status, revisions of existing ELR courses, or new courses that automatically receive ELR designation based on the course type and number.

Senator Laux asked whether the moratorium was for only one year.

Dean Smith said that the moratorium will be for only one year until the Kent Core is revised.

There were no further comments or questions.

9. Old Business

Action Item: RTP Policy Revisions (Co-chairs of the Professional Standards Committee, Jeff Ciesla, Associate Professor of Psychology and Dave Kaplan, Professor of Geography)

The revisions were summarized by Senator Smith. The revisions were parallel across all three policies and were set to be voted on as a single slate. The three changes were summarized in the document sent out by the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) to senate. There is language clarification in all three policies. One change guarantees four voting members at the college level committee. Another addition was language that regional campus members could not vote at both campus and college levels. The final change involved allowing those standing for full professor to reach back to the previous five years to use a handbook from the time the person was hired.

She then invited comments or questions.

Dean Mistur asked whether a member could abstain from voting due to conflicts of interest.

Senator Smith clarified that the member could. The member could talk to the administrator ahead of time so that a replacement could be found to make up for the abstention.

There were no further comments or questions.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the slate of changes (Mocioalca/Smith). The motion passed unanimously.

10. New Business

a. Discussion Item: Policy Regarding Faculty Pursuing the Doctorate at Kent State (Co-chairs of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC), Jeff Ciesla, Associate Professor of Psychology and Dave Kaplan, Professor of Geography)

Senator Ciesla said the policy had been reviewed recently and that if faculty are currently in a department and wish to pursue a doctorate at Kent State, language in the existing policy was out of touch with current terminology and CBAs. The old policy used old terms to differentiate faculty from one another. The proposal is to drop the tiering of faculty with regard to eligibility; irrespective of rank or campus, the policy would be the same for everyone. The second concern was whether or not a faculty member could pursue a doctorate within their own department and what could be done to deal with problems that might arise. He asked whether there was a need for different policies for different types of faculty or faculty from different campuses.

There were no questions or comments.

He then asked for discussion about whether a current member should be able to pursue a doctorate within their own department.

Senator Kracht mentioned that she had done this in mathematics, but she said that there had been no conflicts in her case. She said she did not believe it should be discouraged.

Senator Smith said that with tenure-track faculty, the department might offer a different doctoral degree than the faculty member currently has. She saw no reason for there to be barriers to earning this. She also said she did not see why we want to ban access to any

degree. We should be aware of the possibility of conflicts of interest, but there should be no restrictions on the access to benefits.

Senator Ciesla said the PSC as a whole agreed.

Senator Laux reiterated that the policy was written prior to the creation of NTTs and that practices have changed due to that and due to how regional campuses often used to hire without a terminal degree in the field. The policies were antiquated.

Senator Walton-Fisette said that her school was full of disparate programs that could allow faculty in one to take a doctorate in another without a conflict of interest.

Senator Ciesla said this might impact nursing.

Senator Petrinec said that she had helped a faculty member pursue a doctorate in nursing. She agreed with the overall idea and saw no reason to object in nursing.

Senator Mocioalca said that PSC (which she is a member of) had probably overanalyzed the possible problems and agreed with the positive reaction from other senators.

Senator-Elect Mascolo shared that the way nursing courses were distributed, few NTTs had doctorates, so if someone (NTT) wanted to pursue one, they probably would never have worked with TT faculty. She believed that the conflict would probably not happen.

Dean Mistur agreed that this was a good way to proceed as long as there is a conflict of interest management plan with a neutral overseer.

Senator Ciesla agreed.

Senator-Elect McEnroe-Petitte said that she is from a regional campus, and she was unable to get her doctorate from Kent at the time she wished to pursue it and had to go outside the university. She supported the change that would allow the doctorate to happen for people in her previous situation.

There were no further comments or questions.

b. Information Item: Understanding the Importance of Chosen Names and Pronouns (Ken Ditlevson (he/him), Director of the LGBTQ+ Center and AJ Leu (they/them), President of Spectrum: LGBTQ+ and Ally Employee Resource Group)

Director Leu began with an explanation of the chosen name system. Many members of trans and non-binary communities refer to names they do not like as “dead names,” and their chosen name is how they identify in the world. Both preferred names and gender pronouns are important in a “students first” environment. Students do not want to be “dead-named.” Director Ditlevson added that chosen pronouns are also important and that students are advocating for them. Director Leu supported Director Ditlevson’s suggestion about sharing pronouns at the head of a conversation, and they both wish that there will be a systemic solution to add pronouns to chosen names as a preference for students. They/them/their can be a safety net for faculty/staff addressing large classes. Director

Ditlevson added that it would help if training and integration could work with the different student information systems. Director Leu said that the default recommendation for mass communication is to be generic in the greeting and not work with any gender related terms (e.g., "Hi students, faculty, or staff" rather than a name, gender, etc.) Both also offered many options for future training for faculty/staff. Director Ditlevson said that we need to make sure students feel valued and supported; he talked about resilience with student and about making sure they are connected with faith groups, mental health, and other support groups if they feel disrespected. In Fall 2021, the plan is that the "preferred name" category for student information will be replaced with "chosen name." Pronouns will also be added to student demographics in the Fall 2021 semester.

They then invited comments or questions.

Chair Grimm commented that in a larger context, this helps people feel accepted for who they are, as they are.

Senator Kracht thanked the presenters and said that this would be helpful for many people for many reasons (e.g., those who go by middle names).

The presenters agreed.

There were no further comments or questions.

11. Announcements/Statements for the Record

Chair Grimm announced that the Committee on Administrative Officers (CAO) is undergoing an election that ends at 11:59 p.m. on May 10.

Senator Dauterich alerted the senate to the passing of Dr. Elizabeth Howard. He said that Dr. Howard had long been an accomplished scholar and instructor in the English Department and a personal friend of his. He added that she was an inspiration to her students and an invaluable colleague to her peers. He concluded by saying that like those other members of the department who passed away this year, including Professors Kimberley Winebrenner, Claire Culleton, and Bill Gray, she will be sorely missed.

12. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate

Attachment

Chair's Remarks for May 10, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

I want to start by acknowledging and thanking those members of the Faculty Senate who will be finishing up their terms with this meeting. As I call your name, if you are willing, please turn on your video and leave it on until I've concluded thanking all of our outgoing senators.

- Kathy Bergh (Lifespan Dev & Educ Sciences) NTE
- Jeff Ciesla (Psychology) A&S
- Sue Clement (Geology, Geauga) NTE
- Alice Colwell (Nursing, Trumbull) NTE
- Scott Courtney (Teaching, Learning & Curr Studies) At-Large
- Jean Engohang-Ndong (Biological Sciences, Tusc) Tusc
- Kimberly Peer (Health Sciences) EHHS
- Terri Polanski (Mathematical Science) NTE
- Donald White (Mathematical Science) At-Large

Many thanks to each of you. Your service has been invaluable.

Now I want to tell you about Eulis Cathey's Birthday

I was performing in *Sexual Perversity* in Chicago at Ujima Theater Company at some point in the 80's. There were only four of us in the cast. I was playing opposite Eulis Cathey. I met Eulis through our work together on this play. Eulis was a Jazz radio host on WEBR radio in Buffalo and had the sexiest voice on the planet. No kidding. He was a quiet, shy, somewhat introverted person but very committed to his part.

Lorna Hill, who you may have heard me mention before, was producing directing and co-starring in the show. Lorna decided one night that we would play a prank on Eulis. I'm not sure what her motivation was and I'm not sure she ever told him it was a prank. I didn't. She wrote up a short message to audience members, made multiple copies and stuck them on the audience chairs before the show started. The message said something to the effect that:

Today is Eulis Cathey's birthday! Please join us in making this a memorable day for Eulis by showing him some love at the curtain call.

Of course, it wasn't really Eulis' birthday. We did the show. The performance went well. The curtain call came and Eulis got a three minute standing ovation! He was so tickled! Walking off stage he said to me "they really loved me tonight!" I smiled. Honestly, I don't know now whether he ever really found out he had been pranked. But what a great prank!

Sometimes happy just isn't happening all by itself. And hasn't that been the story of this past academic year. Getting by has been real work. Finding fun and enjoyment has been an effort, but I hope you've had some success.

I also hope you will be able to take some time over the summer to make some happiness, for yourself or others, enjoy some rest and relaxation and come back to a Fall semester that will still be a bit different, but will get us closer to our own “happy places” as members of our academic community.

Thank you.
Pamela E. Grimm
Chair, Faculty Senate

MEMO

List of Proposed Changes to Faculty Ethics Committee Policy: Spring 2021

June 25, 2021

Prepared by: Susan Roxburgh, Professor & Chair, FEC

1. No additional materials may be added: see 4-B and 4-G
2. Specify 'timely manner:' see 4-E
3. When the complainant submits list of witnesses (not previously specified) and when the respondent receives this information.

See 4-F

4. Limit on number of witnesses: See 4-F and 4-G
5. What information the witnesses receive – from the Chair, they receive a copy of the FEC policy and procedures, the Code of Ethics, the complaint, and all other materials provided to FEC by the Complainant/Respondent.

See 4G

Item for Discussion

1. Should we require that the VP of Academic Affairs inform the Committee Chair as to their decision in the case of a finding by the Committee that a violation of the Code has occurred?

Approved by FEC 11/2/17; 4/21/20; Approved by FS 9/14/20

**KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY ETHICS COMMITTEE
PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES**

1. PURPOSE

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

2. MEMBERSHIP

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

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

3. RECUSAL AND REMOVAL OF MEMBERS

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

4. SCREENING PROCEDURE

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

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

Deleted: in a timely manner and

- H. The hearings shall be held at a mutually agreed upon date no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the notification of the Complainant(s) and Respondent.
- I. In extraordinary circumstances and with proper written substantiation requesting an extension of a deadline by one of the parties, the Committee members may determine that an extension is warranted.

5. HEARING PROCEDURE

- A. The conduct of matters brought before the Faculty Ethics Committee shall be non-adversarial in nature. The hearings shall be closed to all but those necessary for a full and complete hearing. The Complainant(s) and the Respondent shall be invited to appear before the committee. Each party may bring one (1) faculty advocate and no more than five (5) witnesses. 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, and to the Associate Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs.
- 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 17, 2021**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Tracy Laux (Vice Chair), Ann Abraham (Appointed), Melissa Zullo (Appointed)

Not Present: Darci Kracht (At-Large)

Guests Present: President Todd Diacon, Associate Provost Manfred van Dulmen, Professor John Dunlosky, Assistant Dean John Jewell

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Discuss Topics for President Diacon and Associate Provost van Dulmen

Topics to be discussed included the Barnes and Noble Bookstore (their inability to integrate Flashbooks with two different Learning Management Systems (LMS)) and the membership in the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) that Senator Kracht had asked Provost Tankersley about at a previous meeting. There was also a question about what else could be done to continue to emphasize the importance of academic integrity on campus.

3. Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee (FaSBAC) Replacement

Members were nominated by the Executive Committee to replace a previous selection who was not a senator.

4. (3:45) Meet with Guests: Associate Provost Manfred van Dulmen, Professor John Dunlosky, and Assistant Dean John Jewell to discuss CircleIn (<https://www.circleinapp.com/>)

The guests discussed CircleIn with the Executive Committee. CircleIn is an external vendor that may meet the needs of Kent State students according to Associate Provost van Dulmen. It is an app that helps students prepare for specific classes. A student could have a Canvas link that would show classes and connect to others who wished to share

notes about their classes, ask questions, set up meeting schedules with other students, and accrue points on the app which could earn them gift cards. Participation would come at no cost to the university. The app would encourage interaction of students within the class. For faculty, they could be aware of what was happening when students interact in their courses, and they could make sure the interaction was more inclusive. Faculty do not have to be involved, but they could if they want to see notes and questions being posed. Associate Provost van Dulmen said it has already been adopted by many public universities. CircleIn has a National Science Foundation grant for a pilot to get new clients, so Kent had interested parties look into it, and they intend to start a pilot in Fall 2021. Kent State may continue to use CircleIn after the pilot if students are interested. The option to leave the pilot at any point is available to the university. It would be rolled out to early adopters of Canvas first. Vice Chair Laux said he encouraged the pilot, but he maintained that it should be offered free of cost, and he added that it could put more pressure on online proctoring. He asked whether students would be able to collaborate during an exam while they were online. Associate Provost van Dulmen said there is a small financial investment per student, which is why we need evidence of efficacy after the pilot period. Professor Jewell said it is available to all students rather than text groups such as GroupMe that are not inclusive. Secretary Dauterich asked whether it came with an on/off switch for faculty participation, so that students would not feel intimidated. Professor Dunlosky said he will ask CircleIn about that. Senator Zullo asked whether this was for student interaction or instructor feedback. Professor Dunlosky said it was more for student-student interaction, but it would take place with the whole class rather than being available to a self-selected group of students within a class. Senator Zullo asked about the app's user friendliness vs. the Blackboard discussion function. Associate Provost van Dulmen said that it is a nimble app that can be accessed quickly and easily. Senator Abraham was willing to adopt, but she wanted to know whether the gift cards awarded would be restricted by location; her concern was over how this could affect regional campus students. She also brought up cheating concerns. Associate Provost van Dulmen said he will ask whether the app can be turned off at critical times when cheating might be an issue. Chair Grimm said that inclusiveness is important, but she wanted to know how we will see improvement in students' grades or the overall student experience, and whether students are still using competing products.

5. (4:00) Meet with President Diacon and Associate Provost van Dulmen

President Diacon reported that commencement in person went well. He then asked about Executive Committee concerns. The committee brought up the issue of the LMS integration problem with Flashbooks. They also discussed the status of the university relationship with the bookstore. President Diacon said that Vice President Hylton would look into it. The committee also asked about ICAI membership. Associate Provost van Dulmen will take the issue back to Provost Tankersley for confirmation. The Executive Committee also asked whether there would be more communications about academic integrity to students and to faculty. Associate Provost van Dulmen will take this question to the provost as well.

President Diacon said he has evidence that students are still seeing too many remote courses on their schedules, and he added that this is discouraging to them. There was also a discussion about the percentage of remote courses that will be offered in the fall and whether that could change if the CDC revises its guidelines.

6. Future Senate Meetings

The Executive Committee decided that there will be a decision as to whether to have a Summer 2021 meeting. The decision will be made by June 19th. For Fall 2021, senate will tentatively plan to continue with remote meetings, and for Spring 2021, the full senate will discuss whether there will be remote, in-person, or a combination of the two meeting types.

7. Reasonable, Flexible, and Equitable Considerations for Faculty Regarding Student Absences (<https://www.kent.edu/policyreg/administrative-policy-regarding-class-attendance-and-class-absence>)

This item was forwarded to the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) for consultation.

8. Discussion: Committee Preference Survey

The committee discussed whether it was preferable to have faculty fill out new interest forms every year or to have information pre-generated. It was decided to continue having faculty fill out yearly forms, but the committee also agreed that a more sustainable way to tabulate the results needs to be created in the future.

9. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

10. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
May 26, 2021**

Present: Pamela Grimm (Chair), Tracy Laux (Vice Chair), Ed Dauterich (Secretary), Angela Guercio (Appointed)

Not Present: Darci Kracht (At-Large), Melissa Zullo (Appointed), Ann Abraham (Appointed), Denice Sheehan (Appointed)

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of Minutes: Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 17, 2021

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

3. Faculty Senate Meetings: Review/Approve Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule for AY21-22

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed schedule (Laux/Dauterich). The motion passed unanimously.

4. Old Business or Final Issues for AY20-21

a. Request 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Status Report from Karen Keenan (Project Manager, Office of the Provost)

The report has been requested.

b. Update on Committee Thank You Letters

The letters will be sent next week.

c. Review of AY21-22 Committee on Committees (CoC) Recommendations

Vice Chair Laux explained the membership recommendations that were made by the committee. The discussion will be carried on in further depth at the next meeting, so all committee members can be present and provide input to help advise the chair.

5. Future Planning: Potential Issues and Goals for AY21-22

This item was postponed until the next meeting.

6. AY21-22 Load Release Hours = 36 hours for the Executive Committee Members

Chair Grimm distributed the load release hours among the members of the Executive Committee.

7. Review of Topics for Discussion with the President and Provost

The switch of the learning management system (LMS) from Blackboard to Canvas was mentioned as a possible topic. The possible reconstruction of the University Council on Technology (UCT) as a faculty-oriented committee was another option brought up for discussion. Jon Rathje (Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer), Jim Raber (Executive Director, Information Services Educational Technology & Service Management), and Shelley Marshall (UCT Chair) will be invited to attend an upcoming Executive Committee meeting (June 23rd). Other topics will be considered more fully over email and at the next Executive Committee meeting.

8. Additional Items

There were no additional items.

9. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
June 16, 2021**

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

Not Present: Denice Sheehan (Appointed)

Guests Present: President Todd Diacon, Provost Melody Tankersley

1. Call to Order

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

2. Faculty Senate Summer Meeting – July 19, 2021

The Executive Committee decided to postpone the decision on whether to hold the meeting for one more week. Faculty will be invited to an informal meeting on June 22nd to see whether they want the July 19th meeting to be held or not.

3. Discuss Topics for President Diacon and Provost Tankersley

Topics suggested for discussion were as follows: (1) earnings of TT and NTT faculty with relation to minority status; (2) perceived status of regional campus faculty; (3) concerns with the campus bookstore, food service, and other auxiliaries; (4) the status of the remote work policy; and (5) whether the president or the provost will make opening remarks if there is a summer senate meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes

- a. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of May 10, 2021
- b. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 26, 2021

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as a slate rather than individually (Laux/Guercio). The minutes were approved.

5. (4:00) Meet with President Diacon and Provost Tankersley

The Executive Committee invited the president and provost to speak about their concerns.

Provost Tankersley brought up topics that she would like to discuss at future meetings, including (1) a lifelong learning proposal which would involve credentialing and certificates and (2) plans in graduate studies that would make continuing education more in control than distance education. She also mentioned interdisciplinary program development that could lead to interdisciplinary degrees. Finally, she suggested that a strategic plan update on both graduate and global education should be included in a future meeting.

President Diacon updated the committee on current enrollment numbers.

The Executive committee also discussed the current state of the bookstore, the ice rink, and some food service venues with the president and provost. The committee also mentioned the need to discuss the remote work policy and resolve problems with communication about it.

6. Additional Items

The Executive Committee agreed to meet the following day to consider additional items from the agenda that were not completed at this meeting.

7. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
June 17, 2021**

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

Not Present: Denice Sheehan (Appointed)

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Committee Appointments

The Executive Committee made suggestions for appointments to the Committee on Committees, the Educational Policies Council, the Faculty Marshals Committee, and the Survey of Student Instruction Review Committee.

3. Summer and Fall Meeting Schedule

The committee organized their schedules to make sure that they will be available for meetings.

4. Discussion Regarding Ombuds

A list of people was created. The people on the list will be invited to discuss the ombuds position with the Executive Committee.

5. Recruiting Faculty for the Transfer/Alternate Credit Committee

The Executive Committee were asked to help recruit faculty for this committee, which is a subcommittee of the Educational Policies Council. Vice Chair Laux expressed a concern over the wording of the charge of the committee. Secretary Dauterich (who is a co-chair of the Transfer/Alternate Credit Committee) agreed to work on rewording the committee's charge with the other members of the committee.

6. Future Planning Goals for the Upcoming Academic Year

The Executive Committee postponed this item until the next meeting.

7. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate



**Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the Meeting
June 23, 2021**

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

Not Present: Tracy Laux (Vice Chair)

Guests Present: John Rathje (Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer), James Raber (Executive Director of Support, Infrastructure and Research Technology – Kent Campus), Shelley Marshall (Chair, University Council on Technology (UCT))

1. Call to Order

Chair Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m. on Microsoft Teams.

2. Approval of Minutes

- a. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of June 16, 2021
- b. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of June 17, 2021

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as a slate (Kracht/Guercio).
The minutes were approved.

3. (3:30) Meet with John Rathje, James Raber, and Shelley Marshall to discuss IT Governance and the University Council on Technology (UCT)

The guests joined at 3:30 p.m. Vice President Rathje spoke about the importance of governance in IT. He shared some slides that laid out the context of IT governance for the Executive Committee. He said that governance is critical because it requires coordination for the university to be successful. He added that he saw governance as an overarching, decision-making framework that helps align IT's efforts with policies aligned with the university's mission and goals. He suggested that governance should have a broad-based representation that maintains trust through communication and added that we need this because IT initiatives happen with limited coordination. In the past, there was often a lack of visibility into spending and projects. Some priorities were misaligned, and some

projects failed. All these things showed the need for stronger governance. He then showed a slide with a graph showing the different domains in addition to the UCT that he was proposing as parts of a new governance structure. Groups included the following: (1) the Board of Trustees/President/Senior Vice President; (2) the IT Executive Committee; (3) the IT Investment and Portfolio Committee; and (4) other mission-focused domains and processes centered on teaching and learning. He then turned the discussion over to Chair Marshall.

Chair Marshall said that part of the goal is to modernize the UCT and help it fit into the broader governance structure. The UCT bylaws have not been updated since 2004, and membership guidelines have not always been clear. Chair Marshall said that the UCT is trying to shift toward a stronger focus on teaching and learning rather than having administrative IT work go to the council. She wants to change UCT bylaws to add more faculty representation, retain the Office of Continuing and Distance Education (OCDE) and Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) members, and keep the council from having an imbalance of administrators. The UCT wants to be more focused on instructional technology in both the virtual and face-to-face classrooms. They also want to work more closely with Faculty Senate and the University Teaching Council (UTC). She then invited questions.

Chair Grimm asked whether non-teaching-specific software like Banner would still be under the purview of the UCT. She wanted to know where decisions about such things would be made.

Chair Marshall replied that it should first be asked how these things impact instruction and the student experience. She suggested that UCT should work with such systems in those cases where student instruction and experience could be affected.

Vice President Rathje added that we should look at outcomes we want to achieve rather than particular items of software and technology. He maintained that faculty should always be invited to the table in all facets to determine whether we are achieving a desired outcome and whether we have the resources to achieve that outcome. If an IT decision has an impact on an individual, he said we should have a framework that allows input for all stakeholders. Educational outcomes should be the first consideration made. He invited Executive Director Raber to add his comments.

Executive Director Raber pointed out that technology is the means to an end, and he agreed that focusing on outcomes that the university needs is important.

Chair Marshall added that the UCT wants to deal with a forward-looking approach to emerging technology when we think about assessments, the Learning Management System (LMS), and plagiarism, and they want to keep their concerns broad enough even if it looks like the UCT need not be concerned.

Vice President Rathje added that IT will continue to contextualize services for students and faculty so that the right people can be consulted and give feedback on how

technology is functioning. He said IT is looking to improve communication around these issues.

Chair Grimm summarized that it sounded like the UCT was being reconstructed to focus on faculty representation and membership in conjunction with the OCDE, the CTL, and IT representatives as necessary. She also suggested that communication channels seemed to be much more open with the proposed changes.

Vice President Rathje agreed with her interpretation and added that they wanted faculty to help define the trajectory that the UCT should take as they move forward.

Chair Marshall said that the model is informally in place already, but she wanted to know whether cross-council membership could be involved (e.g., having the CTL, the UTC, the Faculty Senate and other groups send a member to the UCT).

Executive Director Raber supported her idea.

Senator Sheehan brought up simulation labs and suggested that those running them should have a seat at the table.

Executive Director Raber agreed that they and others working on emerging technology should always be available to the UCT and other governance groups.

Vice President Rathje added that groups of thought leaders from all areas should have representation when new technology is considered, even at the level of vendor presentations.

Chair Grimm asked how we get to the formal establishment of the new ideas.

Chair Marshall said she and Executive Director Raber would try to create a skeleton of the new structure and put together a commission, including faculty, that would participate in establishing the new ideas during the fall.

Senator Guercio said that she was pleased with the direction IT governance and the UCT were taking. She asked whether faculty would see the bylaws and changes in advance rather than finding out at the last minute.

Chair Marshall and Vice President Rathje agreed that they would.

Senator Kracht reinforced Chair Grimm's idea that faculty need to have input on technology decisions that have effects on teaching. Technology cannot be a reason for faculty to be unable to do their educational work.

Vice President Rathje said that if anyone says the technology cannot serve to help the success of the educational mission, we should call him directly, and he will help get to a solution. He added that technology cannot be an unsurmountable problem.

Chair Grimm asked whether the TEAMS transcription function can be used for senate meetings in person in the fall. She also asked whether IT could assist with remote attendance at the in-person meetings.

Executive Director Raber said there is a committee currently looking into questions about remote meetings and a series of hardware recommendations that will allow for transcription. He said this may be ready by the end of the month.

There were no further comments or questions, and the guests left at 4:20.

4. Discussion of the Informal Senate Meeting of June 22nd and the Possibility of a July 19th Senate Meeting.

It was decided at the informal meeting on June 22nd that there will be a July 19th Faculty Senate meeting. A town hall meeting for all faculty will also be tentatively scheduled for July 20th at 4:00 p.m. Vice President Mark Polatajko, Provost Melody Tankersley, Associate Provost Manfred van Dulmen, Senator Deborah Smith, Vice Chair Tracy Laux, and Professor Melissa Zullo will be invited to the town hall meeting to discuss administrative, union, and public health concerns respectively.

5. Set Executive Committee Retreat to Review Potential Issues and Goals for AY21-22

Senator Sheehan offered to hold the retreat to discuss future goals in her home. The retreat will be tentatively scheduled for Monday, August 16th from 10:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m.

6. Additional Items: Topic or Ideas for the Faculty Senate Fall Retreat

This item was postponed pending information we gather from the July senate meeting and town hall.

7. Adjournment

Chair Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Edward Dauterich
Secretary, Faculty Senate