

1 UNIVERSITY COMMISSION

Report of the One University Commission Spring 2015

Overview

Kent State University's wealth of intellectual, physical and cultural resources makes it a whole that has a far greater impact than the sum of its parts. As one university with multiple campuses, Kent State serves as an economic driver and regional cornerstone in communities throughout Northeast Ohio. To best serve constituents across the region and beyond, it is imperative that there is clarity in the articulation of Kent State's distinctive role as a public research university. A part of that distinctive role is the unique opportunity to form a cohesive eight-campus system spanning over a 500-mile radius of the Northeast quadrant of Ohio. As a large system with more than 41,000 students and offering more than 280 degrees from the associate to doctoral levels, Kent State University is distinctively poised to serve as an exemplar of the new American research university – one that produces cutting-edge knowledge and new ideas while offering access to a high-quality education for a large number of students.

Kent State University has been comprised of unique regional campuses since 1946 and has functioned historically as a main campus in Kent with seven regional campuses throughout Northeast Ohio. While there have been a number of efforts to more clearly define the relationships among the campuses, there continues to be a need to define the university as one university where each campus contributes its own unique mission to fulfill a unified shared vision of One University.

It was from this conceptual model that the One University Commission (1UC) was created and convened in the Fall of 2014. The Commission was chaired by Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Todd Diacon, and was composed of 31 faculty, staff, and students from across all eight of Kent State's campuses (See Appendix A for full membership list). The general charge from President Warren (see Appendix B) focused on a review of internal policies and procedures to bring the campuses into greater alignment with a one university conceptual model. There was also an expectation of an endorsement of a culture where all members of the university community feel valued and respected for the unique contributions that each brings to the realization of a strong and vibrant eight-campus system.

The One University Commission was divided into four critical working groups: the eight-campus student experience; faculty roles, responsibilities and culture in an eight-campus system; academics and curriculum within and across the eight campuses; and structure and leadership within and across the regional campuses.

While the report reflects the general views of the four working groups and the 31 commission members, there was not unanimity of endorsement of the report. Two alternative opinions are included in the Appendices (C and D) of the document to reflect the differing points of view.

This report is viewed as the first of a number of studies that will be convened to continue to advance a one university model for Kent State University.

Introduction

The One University Commission (1UC) report addresses issues both broad and narrow. Initially, the idea for such a commission emerged when the Provost began responding to a growing number of unresolved questions surrounding distance learning (DL), particularly in terms of the locus of authority for assigning DL courses, and whether our current Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) approach to budgeting distributed accurately the revenues generated by DL courses. With the arrival of President Warren and the start of her Listening Tour broader issues of the culture, connections, disconnects, and opportunities afforded by interactions among the regional campuses themselves, and between them and the Kent campus, emerged. Truly Kent State University is greater than the sum of its parts. But identifying what exactly each part does, and understanding better how each part relates to other parts, fueled this attempt to address issues both large and small.

The concept of One University is grounded in the belief that every student, professor, staff member, administrator and community supporter plays a vital role in the life of our university. One University proudly and aggressively states that we value and honor all contributions. The daily contributions of our talented and dedicated staff who ensure that our students have the information and support they need, that the roads are passable, and our spaces are welcoming and connected; of our prize-winning scientists, authors, and performers; of the trustees and advisory boards who guide our paths; and of the innovative and successful instructors and mentors who help our students exceed their imagined potential. And we find these people and their contributions on all of our campuses.

One University, however, does not mean that every part of our system is equal in the sense that each part is the exact replica of the other. Instead, One University honors the unique roles and contributions of our parts, namely each of the regional campuses and the Kent campus. It recognizes that policies, procedures, activities and evaluations are and should be different for these parts, and also that each of these endeavors must be driven, first and foremost, by *mission*. One University, then, is a forceful declaration of respect for all and a rededication to organizing ourselves around our different missions. We celebrate equally all contributions and, even more importantly, pay homage to the respective *missions* of the different components of Kent State University.

What follows is a report fashioned by the tireless work of the talented members of the One University Commission. These students, professors, administrators and staff members met frequently and grappled with matters large and small. To advance our work we collected survey results when we took 1UC to each campus and hosted an electronic listening post, the Civic Commons. In total, 770 participants provided 2,818 contributions, with 2,599 contributions via anonymous surveys, 127 made at the Listening Post meetings, and 92 contributions on the Civic Commons online platform. Taken together, this input, this work and our report embody what is best about Kent State: *its people*.

Section I: Students First

Our students are Kent State students whether they study in Ashtabula or Tuscarawas, Trumbull or Stark, East Liverpool or Geauga, or Kent or Salem. Looking for ways to best integrate our 41,000 plus students, the Student Experiences Subcommittee produced a useful roadmap for improving student experiences on each of our campuses, and for interactions across all our campuses.

Our study recommends a series of what should be relatively easy-to-implement improvements. For example, students lead and benefit from more than 300 registered student organizations on our campuses. These activities enrich lives, and creating a centralized listing of these organizations and their events will encourage students from other campuses to interact with these clubs and meet other students. A limited number of students on the regional campuses opined that they *did not* support increasing student fees to allow for increased programming on their campuses. However, other students did express support for additional fees, provided they fund specific programs. Our hope is that even in the absence of more financial resources, better coordination and advertising of existing activities may suffice to boost interactions. Certainly our students want to learn about major events being held on all our campuses.

A transformational aspect of higher education is the creation of *leaders*. In this spirit we recommend the creation of a Student Leadership Academy for student government officers from all campuses. At least once each semester our student leaders should gather on one of our campuses to study leadership, and to interact meaningfully with each other. However, for this to happen we first must charter a formal student governance structure on each campus. Currently some campuses have no student government, and others operate under different terminologies. Creating a standard, university-wide student government charter will facilitate the learning and interaction of student leaders. And when these leaders meet we will seek their input on how to add value to their educational experience by, for example, examining how we can enhance and improve career counseling and internship opportunities.

Even though we are a multi-campus system, there is only one diploma at Kent State University. We are one university even though our eight campuses cover an area the size of Connecticut. Most of our students are proud to begin and complete their education on just one of our campuses. However, some students begin on a regional campus and then transition to the Kent campus. Speaking to IUC committee members, these students highlighted the absence of a transitional program just for them. Incoming freshmen benefit from our Destination Kent State (DKS) orientation, as do students transferring to the Kent campus from other colleges and universities. Yet *our own* students transitioning from a regional campus to the Kent campus benefit from neither effort. As such, we should strive to create an orientation program tailored specifically for these students, either through the existing DKS infrastructure, or through the Center for Student Involvement.

Students are proud to study on, and graduate from, a regional campus. A student leader at Tuscarawas was emphatic about this: “we are where we want to be,” she said. “We are not second class citizens simply because we *chose* not to study on the Kent campus.” IUC members could not agree more. And yet, some of our students who do not initially gain acceptance to the

Kent campus eventually do wish to study in Kent. These students should receive a welcoming, upbeat admissions packet from a regional campus, or from all or some regional campuses, explaining clearly and forcefully that they are welcomed on the regional campus, and that by beginning on a regional campus the path to a Kent campus experience is still open to them. As one student member of the committee noted, “Deferment to a regional campus is not a rejection, but an opportunity to explore academic endeavors in a different environment—smaller class sizes, cheaper tuition, and [an] equal opportunity to have a college experience.”

As of today the Star Trek “transporter” still does not exist. And yet, one technological and pedagogical development has allowed students to conquer time and space: distance learning. Asynchronous distance learning allows students to attend lectures and learn material at the time of day that is most appropriate for their schedules. Synchronous distance learning allows us to replicate fully the live classroom experience for students on different campuses. Students on our regional campuses desire more online degree programs that will allow them to finish a degree program where they are, even if that regional campus’s size and resources do not allow it to offer the program on its own. Currently the Salem campus’ Insurance Studies bachelor’s degree program is the only one that allows students to complete an undergraduate degree entirely online.

An exciting middle ground between fully face-to-face and fully online degree programs awaits exploration. This middle ground, mentioned by students in our surveys, would allow regional campus students to complete the first two years of a program in face-to-face courses, to then finish the final two years online. Our student success data and professors’ experiences demonstrate that first and second year students often lack the independence and maturity to complete self-directed online courses successfully. Enrolling instead in face-to-face courses at the start of a degree program to then transition to online upper-division courses addresses this challenge.

Furthermore, we can envision a scenario in which our regional students regularly would take synchronous DL upper-division courses on a campus, instead of at home, thus avoiding technological costs were they to use their own hardware (and they would benefit from the presence of a technology specialist in the building). In March 2015 the Kent State Board of Trustees approved the first such hybrid program, the Kent campus’s AACSB-accredited bachelor’s degree program in General Business. Students on a regional campus can complete the associate degree in Business Technology in face-to-face courses on regional campuses. Then they can complete the final two years of the program, which is too expensive to offer on most regional campuses, entirely online. The Division of Academic Affairs and college deans are encouraged to develop other majors that would lend themselves to this approach so that students will have the option of majoring in programs that do not currently exist on most regional campuses. The Division of Academic Affairs is also encouraged to enhance and expand career services and internship/co-op opportunities.

Section II: Faculty Matter(s)

Students are indeed first at Kent State University. However, these students would finish last were it not for the outstanding work of our dedicated and talented faculty. While students and alumni regularly recognize this work, not all at Kent State honor equally the contributions of all

professors. The failure to fully appreciate the contributions of regional faculty by *some* individuals on the Kent campus has led to distinct feelings of second-class citizenship. Two IUC subcommittees found that this long-asserted culture of second-class citizenship for regional employees is not simply a myth, but instead is supported by extended anecdotal and structural evidence.

“We were stunned by the lack of collegiality and misunderstandings about the Regional Campus faculty and students as second-class citizens,” wrote the members of the Academics and Curriculum Subcommittee. Quoting a professor from a regional campus, “Until you change the culture [environment] of Regional Campus faculty, you won’t have ‘1 University.’” To change this culture will require specific policy and procedural improvements, as well as embracing fully the equal importance and value of our different missions. Fortunately the members of the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Subcommittee have generated a useful roadmap to begin this work.

To start, the IUC recommends making it clear that regional faculty are *welcomed* to participate meaningfully in Kent academic departmental governance (two IUC committee members who began their careers on regional campuses, but who now work on the Kent campus, both experienced hostility when they attended Kent departmental meetings as junior faculty—one was told she wasn’t to be there, and the other was told he could not speak at Kent departmental meetings). Another recommendation of the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Subcommittee is that departments periodically rotate regional campus professors through the Kent campus for part of their teaching assignments. This would make the regional professor more of a known quantity on the Kent campus, and would facilitate her or his integration into the academic department. How we refer to ourselves also matters. President Warren noticed this on her initial visits to our campuses, when often the Kent campus was referred to as the “main” campus. Instead, President Warren prefers “Kent campus” without any suggestion of “main,” which carries with it the unspoken suggestion that other campuses are less important. Part of this confusion rests in a long history of calling ourselves different things at different times. It also results in the failure by some on the Kent campus to accompany and understand the changing activities and pursuits on the regional campuses over several decades. As reported by the Academics and Curriculum Subcommittee, “we were told that the Regional Campuses are like community colleges or should become community colleges, that they have no business offering Baccalaureate degrees (nor do they have the resources or talent to offer upper-division courses).” That 27 baccalaureate degree programs are now awarded on one or more regional campuses appears to have escaped notice by some.

What must be repeated emphatically is this: *we value our different missions equally*. There is no hierarchy of importance, but merely the reality of difference. Our regional campuses excel in offering small enrollment classroom learning experiences appropriate to their teaching mission. To be sure, Kent campus professors excel as teachers as well. But their mission is different and calls on the tenure-stream faculty to excel also in research. That these research successes often bring them national and even international notice does not make them more important than professors on the regional campuses. These successes should be honored, and they are. But so too should we honor and recognize the commitment of regional campus faculty to fulfilling their campus missions. *One University means that we value all our people and missions equally even while we recognize and benefit from our differences.*

Recognizing and honoring our different missions generates in turn a guide for addressing the issues that shape the lives of our professors. 1UC members grappled with the issues of teaching loads and research expectations across all campuses. Currently only 20 professors teaching on the regional campuses have attained the rank of full professor, which is a curiously low number for what is, for all intents and purposes, a “university” that enrolls some 15,000 students. On the regional campuses, 10.5% of faculty are full professors, while 26.3% of faculty are full professors at the Kent campus. One solution suggested to the Commission is to lower the standard four courses a semester teaching load on regional campuses to a three-course load, at least for all tenure-track assistant professors and for research active associate and full professors. In addition, others who contacted Commission members called for increasing research support on the regional campuses (seed grants, travel funds, administrative support).

A daunting challenge to this approach is the resource base of regional campuses. Kent State regional campus tuition is 40% lower than tuition on the Kent campus, which demonstrates in and of itself the different missions of the Kent and regional campuses. It simply is not possible to replicate on the regional campuses all or even much of the research support found on the Kent campus. Trying to do so would bankrupt the regional campuses. Furthermore, grafting Kent campus research expectations onto the regional campuses would further confuse the different missions of the Kent and regional campuses.

The reappointment, tenure and promotion (RTP) policies of Kent academic departments (which serve as the academic home of many regional tenure-stream professors) further complicate the matter, for they fail to fully reflect mission differences. Some departments apply the same research standards and expectations whether the professor works on the Kent campus, or on a regional campus. Other departments excel at recognizing mission differences between Kent and regional faculty in their research standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Academic units have not, however, recognized these mission differences when they evaluate regional campus faculty members for promotion to full professor—and they are strongly encouraged to do so. Conversely, all regional campuses should make sure to articulate the weighing of academic unit research and teaching expectations in their campus handbooks.

What to do, then? The different missions of the regional campuses versus the Kent campus mean a much higher teaching load for regional campus faculty, which inhibits greatly their ability to achieve the rank of full professor using existing criteria. Furthermore, a 40% tuition differential means that regional campus leaders cannot replicate Kent campus research conditions even if they wanted to. Happily, the work of the 1UC suggests a flexible approach to the vexing issue of research expectations and faculty promotion for regional campus professors.

Regional deans already can and do temporarily reduce the teaching loads of a small number of research active faculty so that they might complete a project. In addition, Kent campus academic departments’ handbooks could better reflect mission differences in their research expectations for tenure and promotion. As mentioned above, some departments already have such differential language for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Given that tenure is the single largest commitment the university makes to a faculty member, it seems logical to extend this differential language to cover requirements for the promotion to Full Professor as well. If departments

decide not to add differential research expectations for regional professors to earn tenure, promotion to Associate, and promotion to Full, then these departments (and their respective colleges) should be expected to assume the costs of helping regional faculty conduct research of the kind required for promotion. In essence, if Kent academic departments have the same research promotion standards for Kent and regional professors, then these Kent departments logically should provide the financial resources needed to replicate the same research conditions on each campus (enhanced laboratory facilities, reduced teaching loads, and the provision of research seed grants).

One University Commission surveys identify increasing interactions between professors on different campuses as a key to building a more appropriate, more just and healthier culture at Kent State. One way to increase such interactions would be to encourage and facilitate shared teaching assignments across two or more campuses. The members of the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Subcommittee noted that students would benefit from such an approach given that it likely would increase the range of courses they could take on their campuses. Of course, several logistical issues would need to be resolved, such as the need to provide office space on each campus, the time and expense of driving to a different campus, not feeling fully a part of either campus, and additional evaluations needed for tenure and promotion. And yet, it is not far-fetched to envision the same professor teaching courses, say, at both Stark and Tuscarawas, or at Trumbull and Geauga, or in Kent and Salem.

Related to cross-campus teaching assignments is the idea of joint hires of tenure-stream faculty to teach at more than one campus. In survey responses, in their comments on the Civic Commons, and in meetings with Provost Diacon, faculty on regional campuses press for more tenure-stream faculty hires, as opposed to the growing use of full-time, non-tenure track professors and adjunct faculty. This is understandable. Tenure is the coin of the academic realm, and the presence of a healthy number of tenured professors on a campus helps ensure effective and independent faculty governance, which also is a hallmark of higher education in America. On the other hand, as of late our regional campuses are experiencing a decline in enrollment that would lead one to question the need for more tenure-stream faculty. What can be done?

Making joint appointments of faculty across two or more campuses would be one way to facilitate financially an expanding number of tenure-stream professors on our regional campuses. Hiring a tenure-track professor to split her or his time at Geauga and Trumbull, or Stark and Tuscarawas would provide the financial room for regional deans to make additional hires. Distance learning's power to break the grip of geography makes joint hires even more possible. Realistically, given the lower tuition on regional campuses and higher education's increasing reliance on tuition revenue, this might be the only way to increase the percentage of tenure-stream faculty on the regional campuses.

Section III: Faculty Matter(s) and Distance Learning

Distance learning frees us from the bonds of time and space. Given our system of eight campuses spread across northeast Ohio it is tailor-made for Kent State University. And yet, just as a fine handcrafted garment must occasionally be altered and refitted, so too must Kent State's administration of distance learning be re-examined.

In a Thomas Friedman sense (The World is Flat) two developments “flattened” the Kent State system: the rapid increase in the number of Kent State students enrolled in our DL courses (at the undergraduate level most of our DL students are Kent State students), and the implementation of a responsibility centered approach to budgeting on the Kent campus. Before the creation of distance learning courses few students left their “home” campus to take courses on another campus. But students, with the rise of DL, increasingly began taking courses taught by a professor from a different campus than their own. Furthermore, with the implementation of RCM on the Kent campus (the regionals always operated under this approach) it now made a significant financial difference if Kent campus students took a course or more from another campus, both because of the issue of which campus would receive the revenue, and because as the number of such enrollments grew it began impacting the scheduling of Kent courses, particularly in summer sessions. On top of this, Kent and regional tuitions are different for face-to-face classes, and a small tuition difference still remains for online classes.

The DL and RCM “flattening” at Kent State generated understandable, but sometimes lamentable, reactions. For example, some Kent departments began to pay more attention to who was teaching a course on a regional campus, and at times these departments demanded, even after the start of a semester, that a course be shut down over issues of appropriate training needed to teach the course. In an effort to eliminate competition with Kent course offerings other Kent departments proposed new handbook language that would restrict the ability of regional faculty to offer online courses. Kent academic deans grew increasingly worried about losing students and revenue when “their” students enrolled in a regional online section of a course being offered the same semester face-to-face on the Kent campus.

To quell growing concerns and increasing bad blood between the Kent and regional campuses the Provost issued a policy memo in February 2014. The memo clarified that a) colleges/schools/departments on the Kent campus have the authority to determine who is qualified to teach courses in the discipline on the regional campuses; b) regional deans and the Associate Provost for Kent State Systems Integration maintain the authority to schedule courses on their campuses (both face-to-face and DL); c) if a course is taught online by a Kent professor it can be taught online by a regional professor; and d) all faculty teaching online are now expected to experience training in online pedagogy of the kind offered by the Kent State Office of Continuing and Distance Education.

To resolve these issues more systematically the Provost called for the creation of a committee to study the matter further. He charged what eventually became the IUC Academics and Curriculum Subcommittee with researching distance education and course scheduling issues, and asked them to provide alternatives and policy advice. The subcommittee’s recommendations largely support the solutions implemented by the Provost in the February 2014 memo.

The issue at hand revolves around the locus of authority. The members of the Academics and Curriculum Subcommittee believe that campus leaders (deans and assistant deans on the regionals) should continue to schedule face-to-face courses on their campuses. Increasingly, the subcommittee members believe, distance learning courses offered by regional campus faculty should be coordinated by regional system leaders to avoid the duplication of effort and create

efficiencies (a pilot of this approach is underway). Kent academic departments determine which courses in their discipline may be taught in an online format, but once a professor has been trained in online pedagogy by the staff of the Office of Continuing and Distance Education the professor is authorized to offer that course in an online format, provided this is desired by campus leadership. “Fundamentally,” the subcommittee members noted, “if an instructor is qualified to teach a given course in a traditional format, that instructor is also qualified to teach the course in an online format given proper training. Departments determine the instructor’s academic qualifications to teach content, not how delivery is made.”

Revenue concerns drive most of the above issues and tensions. In an RCM world it matters who gets “credit” for the revenue generated by tuition and the state subsidy of instruction. Kent State’s eight campus system and the new frontiers opened by distance learning make the answer to the deceptively simple question “who earns the revenue from DL courses?” agonizingly complex. For example, how should we determine which campus a student “belongs” to for revenue distribution purposes? If the student lives near our Stark campus, and in the past has taken only Stark courses, should Stark get the revenue if this student during any given semester enrolls in a DL course taught by a Geauga professor, and one taught by a Kent professor? Furthermore, is the revenue being generated and shared the regional rate, or the Kent rate?

The IUC recommendation is that Kent students be limited to enrolling in DL courses taught by Kent faculty, and that regional campus students be limited to enrolling in DL courses taught by faculty across the regional campuses [this being a variation of the method employed on the Penn State University campuses].¹ Doing so will simplify revenue issues, and presumably if this approach is implemented we would eliminate the recent move to largely equalize online tuition for regional and Kent offered DL courses (thereby returning to the 40% tuition differential in place for face-to-face courses). Of course in the spirit of “students first” we do not wish to exclude students from a DL course if, for example, it is offered by a regional faculty member, but not that semester by a Kent professor, particularly if not allowing this would hinder the student’s progress to degree. To address this situation the IUC recommendation is to work with the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration to create a revenue sharing model.

Section IV: Establishing an Appropriate Administrative Structure for Regional Campuses

Higher education can and does exist in an almost infinite variety of forms in the United States and in other countries. No matter the size, organizational form, and nature and level of public and private financial support NO institution can exist without two things: students and teachers. To put it differently, higher educational institutions are built around students and professors.

Administrators are another matter. They aren’t necessary, exactly, but in an organization with 41,000 students, eight campuses and a budget approaching \$700 million there must be individuals charged with overseeing broad aspects of the university. Indeed, the recommendations made in the preceding pages call for *more* coordination of effort, whether it is coordinating DL offerings across campuses, coordinated hires, and/or the possibility of joint

¹ When a course is not available online on the Kent campus, Kent campus students may enroll in that course offered online by a regional campus (and vice versa). A revenue sharing agreement will govern these enrollments.

hires of tenure-stream faculty across campuses. Students, we have learned, want to interact more with their colleagues on other campuses, and wish to engage in coordinated leadership training.

What, then, is the appropriate administrative structure of our regional campuses? Less than a decade ago over twenty employees housed on the Kent campus in the Lincoln Building centrally managed regional campuses. Then, a pendulum swing reduced this regional administrative staff to just five positions: the Associate Provost for Kent State Systems Integration, the Dean of the Regional College (currently held by the same individual), a budget officer for regional campuses, a business manager, and a special assistant. While not desiring a return to the old “Lincoln Building” model, the IUC recommendation is to create a “Lincoln Lite” administrative structure.

The unanimous recommendation of the Structure and Leadership Subcommittee is to create a Cabinet-level position to enhance the voice of the regional campuses. Serving as a Vice President, this individual would attend Cabinet meetings to ensure that that the perspectives of the regional campuses inform discussions and decisions. This officer would either report to the President with a dotted line report to the Provost, or vice-versa. The new VP would be acknowledged as the leader of our regional campuses, with campus deans reporting to this individual.

Participants on the IUC and respondents to questionnaires/Civic Commons think it vital to support the new Vice President’s work by hiring a separate individual to serve as Dean of the Regional College. Then, in addition to the existing budget officer position for the regional campuses (Executive Director for Academic Budget and Resource Management), an associate or assistant vice president would assist the VP, especially given the state’s newly renewed interest in boosting pre-college dual enrollment programs. With this staff of seven individuals (up from five currently) regional campuses could engage in the kinds of coordinated course scheduling, teaching assignments and even coordinated hires suggested in this report.

Employees on our regional campuses lament the lack of a place of their own on the Kent campus, a role the Lincoln Building once filled. As noted in the Structure and Leadership Subcommittee report, “an overwhelming majority of respondents suggest that having a centralized location would benefit the Regional Campuses in many ways.” These benefits would include providing a place for regional campus faculty, staff and administrators to meet when on the Kent campus, one that also would serve as a communication center for all regional campuses. A suite of offices in the Library on the Kent campus would meet this need.

Not only is the structure of administrative support an important consideration, but how we communicate the leadership roles is significant. Opinion is divided on whether a change in title is needed for what we currently call Dean and Chief Administrative Officer. Those favoring a change to “Chancellor” or to “Campus President” noted that the dean title fails to capture the full range duties of this officer, particularly when interacting with groups external to the university. For example, the Dean of the Stark campus is part of an organization of higher education leaders in Stark County, yet every other participant in that meeting holds the title of president. Those favoring a title change further noted that the dean title does not make sense outside of Ohio, where in most places this individual would be a chancellor or president. Finally, IUC participants noted that our deans interact regularly with community leaders, politicians,

governmental leaders, safety officers, and the like, and these responsibilities are more reflective of a leader with the title of chancellor or campus president.

Others feel the dean title should be maintained given its strong association with the academic side of the ledger, which, after all, is most important at a university. They assert that the leader of a regional campus “should have an academic background and hold appropriate faculty rank in order to make ‘substantive academic judgments’ concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, as well as curricular changes.” However, holding to this requirement would likely place hiring decisions in the hands of Kent academic departments (who grant tenure and rank when an individual is in their academic area). Furthermore, currently two of our regional deans serve quite successfully and yet do not have tenure in a Kent academic department or in the Regional College. Regardless of where people stand on titles, all agreed that there should be clearly defined reporting lines and job responsibilities vis-à-vis the new Cabinet-level VP.

Conclusion

The bookstore on our Salem campus sells a decal that features a solid blue image of the state of Ohio with KENT STATE written across the image in bold, block letters. Perhaps no other image better captures the power of our great university, as well as the spirit of our 1 University Commission. We are powerful because our campuses create an impressive footprint on the state. We transform lives and anchor the communities we serve, as President Warren heard repeatedly during her Listening Tour. Kent State University enriches the lives of the citizens of the State of Ohio, and it educates those same citizens so that they can, will and do become the leaders of NE Ohio, the State of Ohio, and indeed the nation and world.

In higher education today, particularly with the end of the post-World War II model of highly subsidized higher education, a standard criticism is to tag a university with trying to be all things to all people. Such an attitude is understandable and even wise, for declining resources mean that we must embrace what we do exceptionally well, while deciding on what activities, areas of focus, and investments are best avoided in the current environment. And yet, Kent State “being all things to all people” actually comes close to describing the heart of our university. We train students for professional careers while bolstering a larger Ashtabula community battered by economic forces. We educate the students in Geauga, the state’s third wealthiest county, who are not the children of Cleveland executives but rather who struggle to earn degrees so that they may move beyond entry-level jobs. In East Liverpool and Salem our campuses likewise generate hope in difficult circumstances. In short, our Stark, Tuscarawas and Trumbull campuses, indeed all of our campuses, serve as engines of opportunity and social mobility at a time in America when the fuel for these engines is in short supply.

Such a broad footprint and mission generates complexity, which in turn has generated most of the issues addressed in this report. That these complexities exist is not anyone’s fault, but they are our responsibility to resolve. And most importantly, we will not resolve these complicated issues by treating Kent State as two entities (Kent regionals) locked in a struggle for superiority and appropriate relevance.

We can and will improve our university by embracing all our constituent parts equally. If we do not do this we are turning our backs on the very thing that makes us who we are. We can embrace equally and celebrate broadly who we are even while we recognize that individual components of our complex institution pursue different missions. *Not more important or less important missions, but different missions.* And when we embrace and build our one university identity on this commitment to different missions within one university, we will generate the roadmap to structure the appropriate policies and procedures to run this complicated and great university.

One University of this size and scope creates challenges, but we are up to meeting these challenges. One University is who we are. One University is the source of our strength. Our One University thrives by combining different missions and by celebrating these missions equally. Ohio's One University is Kent State University.

Appendix A: Membership of the One University Commission

Dr. Todd Diacon, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, *Chair*

Structure and Leadership Sub-Committee

Dr. Willie Harrell, Provost's Fellow, Kent; *Coordinator*

Dr. Steve Nameth, Dean/Chief Administrative Officer, East Liverpool and Salem

Dr. Ken Bindas, Department Chair, History, Kent

Dr. Thomas Norton-Smith, Professor, Philosophy, RCFAC; Stark

Margie Iagulli, Senior Lecturer, Radiology Technology (NTT), Salem

Academics and Curriculum Sub-Committee

Dr. Denise Seachrist, Interim Dean and Chief Administrative Officer, Stark; *Coordinator*

Dr. James Blank, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Kent

Dr. Susan Emens, Interim Assistant Dean, Geauga

Dr. Maria Zaragoza, Department Chair, Psychology, Kent

Dr. Joseph Muscatello, Associate Professor, Program Coordinator, Business Technology, Geauga

Dr. Gary Hanson, Professor, Journalism and Mass Communications, Kent

Dr. Eric Johnson, Associate Professor, Economics, Kent

Dr. Brian Castellani, Professor, Sociology (RCFAC), Ashtabula

Dr. Renate Prescott, Associate Professor, English (RCFAC), Geauga

Dr. Ernest Freeman, Associate Professor, Biological Sciences (RCFAC), Salem

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Sub-Committee

Dr. Barbara Broome, Dean, College of Nursing, Kent; *Coordinator*

Dr. Lee Fox, Associate Professor, Psychology, Stark; Chair of Faculty Senate

Dr. Jonathan Secaur, Assistant Professor, Physics, Kent (NTT)

Dr. Roxanne Burns, Associate Professor, Biological Sciences (RCFAC), East Liverpool

Dr. Gary Ciuba, Professor, English (RCFAC), Trumbull

Dr. Nicole Willey, Associate Professor, English (RCFAC), Tuscarawas

Student Experiences Sub-Committee

Iris Harvey, Vice President, University Relations, Kent; *Co-Coordinator*

Dr. Shay Little, Associate Vice President and Dean of Students; *Co-Coordinator*

Laurie Donley, Director II, Enrollment Management and Student Services, Tuscarawas

Dr. James Ritter, Director II, Enrollment Management and Student Services, Trumbull

Blake Springhetti, Student - Junior, Political Science Major, Kent

PJ Kimmel, Student - Junior, Finance Major, Kent

Dorvan Byler, Student - Senior, History Major, Stark

Sarah Spies, Student - Senior, English Major, Tuscarawas

Mathew Duck, Student - Senior, Nursing Major, Salem

Appendix B: Charge to the One University Commission

On September 23, 2014, President Beverly Warren charged the One University Commission as follows:

The **1 University Commission (IUC)** will include representatives from the following university constituencies: administration, faculty, staff, and students from across the University's eight campuses. The Commission will (i) receive its charge; (ii) consult with appropriate University stakeholders to collect and review data during the Fall 2014 semester; and (iii) provide a summary report of findings and recommendations to President Warren prior to Spring Recess in March 2015. With a primary focus of reviewing the relationship between the Kent and regional campuses, the commission is charged to consider and make recommendations on four main topic areas, as follows:

Structure and Leadership

- The appropriate title for the head of each regional campus (currently, Dean and Chief Administrative Officer).
- The appropriate title for the highest-level administrator of the regional campus system (currently, Associate Provost for KSU Systems Integration).
- The placement of the highest-level administrator of the regional campuses in the overall administrative structure of the University (currently, Provost's Office).
- The need for a centralized regional campuses office and the appropriate duties and/or staffing, if such is recommended.

Academics and Curriculum

- The need for coordinated policies on scheduling, which could address but not be limited to the following:
 - the locus of authority to schedule courses (e.g., regional campus deans or Kent campus academic unit administrators).
 - The need for and/or feasibility of system-wide course scheduling.
 - When students take face-to-face courses on multiple campuses, the appropriate distribution of enrollment revenues in the context of the University's RCM budgetary model.
- The need for coordinated policies on distance learning (DL), which could address but not be limited to the following:
 - The locus of authority to determine whether a campus and/or campuses will offer a DL course.
 - The need for centrally provided, mandatory training to prepare faculty members to offer DL courses.

- The appropriate distribution of DL revenues in the context of the University's RCM budgetary model.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

- The locus of authority for the review of faculty and/or approval to teach various courses (e.g., content, level) and/or in various formats (e.g., face-to-face, DL).
- The need for and/or feasibility of faculty mobility throughout the University system for more efficient course scheduling.
- The need for and/or feasibility of more programs to increase collegial interactions between faculty members at all campuses.
- The need for consistent policies on faculty hiring throughout the system (e.g., are regional campuses expected to hire Kent Ph.D.s when running searches?)

Student Experiences

- The need for and/or feasibility of creating leadership development opportunities for students across all campuses.
- The need for and/or feasibility of promoting student interactions across campuses.
- The appropriateness of automatic admission to a regional campus for those students who are not accepted for admission on the Kent campus (e.g., branding, scholarship opportunity).

Appendix C: Gary Ciuba, Professor of English, Member of the 1UC

Thank you for the opportunity to provide alternative perspectives on your draft report related to the work of the One University Commission dated “3/11/15” and distributed to Commission members on March 19. I understand that all such reports will be submitted to President Warren along with your report and all of the subcommittee reports. I hope that these multiple documents will convey to the President that although the Commission focused on “One University,” it also often contained multiple, divergent, and mutually challenging voices.

Although the draft report dated “3/11/15” is titled the “Report of the One University Commission,” I believe that it should **never** be called by that particular title. Your report contains various suggestions made by 1UC subcommittees, but it adopted a highly selective approach to those recommendations, accepting some and rejecting others. Moreover, although the “3/3/15” draft report was discussed for two hours by 1UC, the latest version of your report was never discussed by members as a group. On the one hand, your second report changed very little despite the numerous reservations that were sometimes expressed about the first draft at our meeting in early March. On the other hand, neither the “3/3/15” draft nor the “3/11/15” draft was ever endorsed or even voted upon by the members of 1UC. Therefore, it cannot properly be called the “Report of the One University Commission.” It is **not** a report approved by 2/3 or even a simple majority of 1UC members but your individual distillation of 1UC work.

The rest of this report will focus on areas where a subcommittee’s recommendations differed from what made its way into your final report and on areas that need further elaboration and clarification to capture their full complexity. However, I do want to emphasize that I agree with your report’s clear affirmation of respect for all faculty members and for the work of all campuses. As I stated at the last 1UC meeting, if the Commission succeeds in fostering a culture of respect at Kent State, it will be a major achievement of this taskforce. I also agree strongly with many of the suggestions in Section I, provided by the subcommittee on student experiences. A centralized listing of student organizations, a student leadership academy, a renewed commitment to student government on the regional campuses, and an orientation program for regional campus students who transition to the Kent Campus would do much to help all students become fully integrated into the life of the University.

Yet respect for faculty members and concern for students mean, I believe, that we must question and go beyond the recommendations in your report. Having worked on the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities subcommittee, I was especially disappointed to read that your report did not consider more seriously and extensively many of our recommendations.

As your report noted, the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities subcommittee tried to address the frequent concern of regional campuses faculty members who want to pursue research and who are expected to pursue research as part of their mission and the RTP process. Your report mentioned that Kent Campus faculty members often achieve “national and even international notice” (9) for their research. However, it ignored the fact that regional campuses faculty members have likewise excelled in research and achieved “national and even international notice” for their work, even as they pursued such research while typically teaching four classes a semester. When the regional campuses began, faculty members were not well integrated into

their departments and were not expected to pursue research. However, over the past three decades, as the regional campuses sought to bring university education to their communities, the faculty at regional campuses became increasingly Ph.D.-trained and research-accomplished.

Although the regional campuses have a strong teaching mission, the connection between teaching and research should be clearly understood. The student quoted on pg. 5 who valued the regional campuses as an “equal opportunity to have a college experience” should not be deprived of the “equal opportunity” to be taught by research-inspired faculty members. Such engaged professors bring their research into their classrooms and bring their students into their research. Our regional campuses students deserve the same opportunity to be taught by professors fully engaged in and contributing to their disciplines as is given to Kent Campus students.

To support such research, the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities subcommittee recommended that regional pre-tenure faculty members and post-tenure faculty members with a productive research agenda should teach three courses a semester. This teaching load still recognizes the greater commitment to teaching expected of regional campuses faculty members, for the 3-3 load is significantly different from the 1-1, 1-2, or 2-2 loads that are common on the Kent Campus. However, it provides time for research so that regional campuses faculty members do not have to subsidize such endeavors on evenings, over the weekends, and during breaks, as they do now.

Your report dismissed such a proposal as a financial impossibility. Such a rejection demonstrates the way budget drives vision rather than vision driving the budget. Yet even if one expresses legitimate concerns about implementing such a proposal based on carefully working out its cost, I wish that ways of implementing even a modified version of such a proposal might be explored. Perhaps it might be phased in, beginning with pre-tenure faculty. Perhaps a reduced teaching load might be made available on a somewhat extensive but still competitive basis. Perhaps campuses could be required to include in their budgets regular lines for a program of workload equivalencies that would give selected faculty members a reduced teaching load every other year or on some other rotating basis. Your revised report indicates that “regional deans already can and do temporarily reduce the teaching loads of a small number of research active faculty so that they might complete a project” (11). However, this support (rightly described with numerous qualifications in your sentence) is occasional, often not well institutionalized, highly dependent on campus resources, and subject to whether a dean regards research as important or not. Our regional campuses faculty deserve more sustained support for their research, and our regional campuses students deserve the opportunity to benefit from that research.

Your report seeks to address the lack of University-supported research time available to regional campuses faculty members by proposing reduced amounts of research for regional RTP. This issue needs to be explored in all of its complexity. If the University provided more time for regional campuses faculty members to pursue research, the issue of differential criteria would probably be far less significant. However, given the current lack of support and the expectation that regional professors subsidize research out of their private lives, there may be valid reasons for making distinctions in the amount of research that might be expected of regional faculty members because of their high teaching responsibilities and limited access to the resources necessary in some fields. Many units have written these differential criteria into their

handbooks, and regional campuses have sought to develop their own weighting standards for unit criteria.

Although differential criteria seem to have made a difference in helping regional campuses professors reach the associate level, the low number of full professors at the regional campuses suggests that these criteria are not in place for the highest level of promotion. Any discussion of supporting such differential criteria should also acknowledge the possible disadvantages of making such distinctions. It is possible that differential criteria at the full professor level might create a two-tiered full professoriate, with Kent Campus professors having achieved the highest level because of high research accomplishments but regional campuses professors having achieved the supposedly same rank because of more modest research accomplishments. Since all full professors vote on every RTP in the unit, such differential criteria may throw into doubt whether regional campuses full professors who have achieved a lesser level of research are really qualified to vote on the research-driven agenda of Kent Campus colleagues applying for full professor. Moreover, even if such differential criteria help to increase the number of full professors on the regional campuses, such a change will do nothing to help those professors continue to be active in their fields once they have achieved promotion. This new class of full professors will still lack the time to devote to their research interests.

The intent to create a culture of respect must go beyond affirming its need and insisting that the Kent Campus not be called the “main Campus.” It must be translated into specific forms of measurable action. For example, the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities subcommittee suggested that units be required on some regular basis to document what particular steps they have taken to implement a culture of respect. It also suggested that respect be signified by re-examining the whole issue of salary equity. Salary is a complex signifier, but one of its meanings is a statement of value and affirmation. The long-standing discrepancies between the salaries of those at the Kent Campus and those on the regional campuses record in dollars one more way of not respecting the work at the regional campuses. Regional campus faculty members typically start at the lowest end of the salary scale, and they rarely receive any kind of start-up funding as their counterparts often do at the Kent Campus. These salary differences get magnified with every raise based on a percentage of salary. Perpetuated over many years, the result is systemic salary inequity that your draft report does not address. We are not “One University” when salaries differ so radically based on campus.

Your report suggested that greater unity might be achieved if faculty members shared teaching assignments across two or more campuses. However, although it is true that the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities subcommittee considered such split loads, the suggestion that we have itinerant regional campus professors was given much greater weight in your report than our subcommittee ever gave to it. Our sub-committee report indicated numerous problems with such a scenario and began its recommendation with a caveat: “If such assignments occur, they should respond to a clearly demonstrated need” On page 5, our report stipulated “Travel issues will be a barrier for the majority of faculty.” Since regional campuses faculty members already devote extensive amounts of time to teaching and service and must subsidize research with their own time, it is indeed quite “far-fetched to envision the same professor teaching courses, say, at both Stark and Tuscarawas,” or at any of the other locations that your report proposes, except for a very few cases.

A different version of your split-teaching load proposal was the suggestion of joint TT hires—faculty who would always split their teaching between two campuses. I am not sure how this recommendation made its way into the report from the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities subcommittee because our subcommittee report never made such a recommendation. The problems with such joint hires are as obvious as the problems with occasionally split teaching loads. Faculty members would lose valuable amounts of time as roving, highway academics, driving to campus X on one day and to campus Y on another. Moreover, they would never establish meaningful relationships with the faculty or students at either campus. About a year ago, such a split appointment was tried at the Trumbull and Ashtabula Campuses, and the results were not pleasing to the campuses or to the faculty member, who eventually left Kent State with disappointment and frustration.

The impractical suggestion of joint TT hirings was made even more problematic because your report linked the proposal to two very important issues on the regional campuses: the need for increased TT hiring and the recent decline in enrollments. Your report suggested that such joint hires “might be the only way to increase the percentage of tenure-stream faculty on the regional campuses,” whose enrollment declines might not warrant single-campus appointments (13). Now completing my twenty-ninth year of service to Kent State, I am disturbed that the recent enrollment declines are being used as the latest reason not to hire TT faculty at the regional campuses. For more than a decade and a half, I have heard every reason imaginable for such an institutional refusal to live out the One University ideal by making equal commitments to TT faculty at the Kent and the regional campuses. Everyone who has served Kent State for more than a decade understands that the recent enrollment declines are relative to the enrollment spikes of the recession era. When the regional campuses were enjoying such a boom, it was commonly recognized that the increase would be temporary and that enrollments would level out. Although campuses are rightly working diligently to build enrollments now, enrollments will always be stronger during a weak economy. Ironically, while the regional campuses were enjoying the years of peak enrollments, many suffered a decline in the number of TT faculty. The Trumbull Campus, for example, did not hire one TT faculty member for five years during the enrollment spike. Many regional campuses now have more students but fewer TT faculty than they did a decade ago. So, the perceived enrollment decline, when seen against the background of long-term enrollment trends, should not be used as another of the many arguments against TT hiring on the regional campuses. Instead, Kent State should recognize that if it wants to provide a similar education on all campuses, if it values academic freedom, if it esteems the research provided by TT faculty, the University must immediately reverse the historic decline in TT hiring on the regional campuses.

Finally, I note that one of the issues that you specifically charged the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities subcommittee to investigate—the hiring of Kent Ph.D.’s on the regional campuses—was never even addressed in your report.

Since I served on the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities subcommittee, whose work was reported in Section II of your report, I will comment on Sections III and IV of your report more briefly.

The report recognizes in Section III (page 16) the “agonizingly complex” issue of assigning the revenue from DL courses. Its recommendation that Kent Campus students primarily enroll in Kent Campus DL courses and that regional students enroll in regional courses is designed to “simplify revenue issues” (page 16). However, if Kent Campus students take DL courses, in limited cases, from the regional campuses, or if students at one regional campus takes a DL course at another regional campus, the issue of assigning revenues immediately returns. It seems that despite all of the desires to put fences around courses, “a revenue sharing model” (page 17) will still have to be developed that recognizes students are in One University.

Section IV recommends the creation of a Vice Presidential position for the regional campuses. Although I believe that there may be many advantages to such a position, I am not comfortable with recommending it without a discussion of specific responsibilities and of budgetary implications. What will such a new administrative structure cost? How will it be financed? The regional campuses have been increasingly concerned about the ever-growing service fee that they pay to Kent State. How will such new positions affect campus budgets?

The report also seems a little confusing about the number of administrators for the regional campuses. It mentions five under the old system and seven under the new (page 19), but it lists only six for the proposed reorganization: 1. Vice President, 2. Regional College Dean, 3. “the existing budget officer position for the regional campuses (Executive Director for Academic Budget and Resource Management), 4. an associate or assistant vice president, and 5. a business manager as well as 6. a special assistant—both of whom are currently in place.

In summary, I believe that 1UC has raised many important issues, gathered much useful data, and made many promising suggestions. However, I wish that a number of the recommendations, especially in the subcommittee report on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities, were given more serious consideration.

I appreciate the chance to offer an alternative perspective on the work of 1UC, and I hope that Kent State will benefit from your report as well as from the reports of all of the subcommittees.

Appendix D: Nicole Willey, Associate Professor of English, KSU-Tuscarawas, Member of the IUC

I would like to start by saying there is much in Provost Diacon's IUC summary document that I admire. Specifically, I'm pleased with the recommendation of having a cabinet-level person in charge of the Regional Campuses, and separating that position from the Dean of the Regional College. (I do hope this person is a direct report to the President.) I am also pleased to see recommendations that Regional Campuses have a space on the second floor of the library, along with many other small and larger items, in particular, the drive to have a culture of respect permeate the Kent State system. In general, it has been most refreshing to find that a group of Kent and Regional Kent State faculty, administrators, staff and students can come together and find common ground through sharing information and evaluating the surveys, and I commend the Provost for his work in keeping the large meetings open to varying ideas and voices.

I do feel it necessary, though, to make a few comments in response to this document. I know it would be impossible to create a draft that every member of the IUC would be able to unanimously support in every area, but it does seem that it would have been possible to more closely use the reports of the subcommittees to create the document, as well as initiate some type of motion for support of the document. As the document stands, and as many as its merits may be, this is not really a IUC Recommending Document, but rather a synopsis of the convener of the IUC's thoughts in response to the work of the subcommittees. And since this document does not specifically carry the official endorsement of the IUC, I feel it necessary to state my own personal objections to certain recommendations that made their way into this document. I appreciate that Provost Diacon is willing to append notes like mine to the document.

I will speak only to the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities section of the document, as that is the subcommittee to which I was assigned. In particular, these are my concerns about the document moving forward:

- While I have been convinced that differential criteria for Full Professor between Kent and Regional faculty in each department is a good solution that will help increase the percentage of Full Professors on Regional Campuses, I am concerned that if we move forward with that recommendation, we will need to have clear incentives for departments to take up differential language and consequences for those who do not. I wonder about the possibility of creating benchmarks for departments to try to move toward parity in full professor percentages between Kent and regional faculty, for instance. The idea that campuses and departments should support their senior faculty in the final promotion is a good idea, but we need to make sure that they follow through with this support.
- This leads to my second concern, which is that the idea of reduced teaching loads and some financial commitment to research for regional faculty was dismissed as an impossibility. While the specific recommendations of my subcommittee *might* prove too costly for the regional system, it would still be beneficial for all involved to consider ways to make the probationary period for junior tenure track faculty less teaching intensive, as well as to encourage senior faculty's research productivity. After all, research is a requirement of tenure in every department, and it is not only Kent campus

faculty who are nationally and internationally acclaimed as scholars.

- Finally, I am very concerned with the notion of joint campus appointments. While I am appreciative of the protection that being tenured in the regional campus system affords me, I am also mindful that the vast majority of regional faculty are assigned at hire to one home campus. My subcommittee listed countless concerns with multiple campus assignments, and we never listed joint appointments as a recommendation. It seems that this recommendation is being implicitly offered as an either/or option for hiring more TT faculty on regional campuses. This does not reflect our report and presents a further deterioration of TT/NTT ratios on the regional campus, a ratio that is already problematic on many campuses. If the 1UC is serious about a culture of respect for all stakeholders on all campuses, then protecting tenure on the regional campuses, as well as supporting the research of our tenure stream faculty, is absolutely necessary.

I am pleased that I was asked to be a part of the 1UC, and I do believe the work has been fruitful. Again, I am thankful for the opportunity to include my diverse voice to the document.