



Meeting Minutes  
Monday, 15 April 2024  
[VIEW THE MEETING](#)

**Leadership present:** Chair Edward Dauterich; Secretaries Therese E. Tillett, Joanna Liedel, Jennifer S. Kellogg, Amy Nuesch, Kristi M. Kamis,

**Administrators not present:** Associate Provost Manfred H. van Dulmen; Deans Sonia A. Alemagno, Versie Johnson-Mallard

**Faculty present:** Professors Saiying Deng, Greta Polites, Athena Salaba, Tiffany Taylor; Associate Professors Ali Abdul-Aziz, Brian R. Barber, Vanessa J. Earp, Michael J. Ensley, Michael R. Fisch, Abe G. Osbourne, JD Ponder, Catherine Smith, Jonathan F. Swoboda, Christopher W. Totten; Assistant Professor Bethany G. Lanese; Senior Lecturers Tracy A. Laux, Jennifer R. Metheney; Associate Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturers Kristy Jacobson, Olivia Krise

**Faculty not present:** Associate Professors Simon Adamtey, Jillian S. Coorey, Dandan Liu

**Students present:** Chukwudi Nwoko

**Guests:** Sebastian Birch, J.R. Campbell, Frank Congin, Alicia Crowe, David Dees, Chris Dorsten, Susan Emens, Kim Hahn, Viveka Jenks, Jennifer Johnstone, Sarah Labovitz, Wendy Matthews, Stephen Mitchell, Hyunjoo Noh, Collin Palmer, Diane Petrella, Liz Piatt, Christa Porter, Shawn Powell, Robert Selvaggio, Jillian Sokso, Kathleen Spicer, Deirdre Warren, Sharon Wohl, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 15 April 2024, via Microsoft Teams.

---

## **I. Approval of Minutes**

### **A. Meeting on 18 March 2024**

Associate Lecturer Marshall motioned to approve, and Senior Lecturer Laux seconded the motion.

With no questions, comments or concerns, the item passed unanimously.

## **II. Presentations**

### **A. Reinvisioning the Kent Core: Possible Models**

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Associate Professor Dees stated that last year, they had three working teams: design team, distinctiveness team and budgetary team. The design team identified the “Big Six Outcomes.” As

the committee thought about Reinvisioning the Kent Core, they thought in terms of a program and not just a series of courses where students check a box. Rather, a program with measurable outcomes and a feedback strategy where students are constantly getting feedback. The distinctiveness team really worked hard on identifying who Kent State is and identifying themes that capture Kent State. The themes are culture of care, civic responsibility, local international partnerships and innovations to improve the world. Another thing that informed all of the design pieces was the OT36. Many people are getting more familiar with it and all Ohio universities are required to offer 36 hours of general education credit. The credits are split into 24 credits of disciplinary buckets and 12 credits with some freedom. There is some freedom within those 24 credits, but students have to make sure that they are aligning the disciplinary buckets with the expectations of the state of Ohio. The work done last year was ground setting. Listening tours were conducted for faculty and advisors. The committee also reached out to alumni for feedback. Members of each of the teams were gathered to form the spring model team. The team met each week throughout the fall semester from January-February. The work and feedback was reviewed, and the team designed three frameworks. The frameworks are currently being shown to the university community. The frameworks are Leading Life of Impact, Pyramid Plus and CLICK Pathways. Leading Life of Impact would be the easiest to transition to from the current framework. It has some high impact practices that it tries to utilize and thinks thematically of real-world problem solving at the end of the Kent Core experience. Pyramid Plus pulls from career and job-ready skills. It presents the core as a gamification process where students can mark their way through the different elements of the pyramid and document their success as they move through the program. CLICK Pathways which is a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary pathway where two or three courses are connected through thematic ideas and real-world problems. Each of the frameworks was designed through thinking of the work previously done and pulling out different elements of it. The Community Forum series started Wednesday, April 3<sup>rd</sup> and runs through April 23<sup>rd</sup>. Each session is 90-minutes and are conducted on Microsoft Teams. The committee will gather feedback on the elements that are liked, and the goal is to present it to Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate would review and recommend that specific pieces be put together to create the best version. This will allow everyone to feel a part of it and have ownership. A successful revamp takes three to five years. The committee is in year two and a half of the review and encourages everyone to attend a session and provide feedback.

### **III. Policy Proposals Review**

#### **A. Action Items**

#### **Undergraduate Policies Council**

##### **Overview**

##### [VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Co-chair Liedel said that the council was given a new charge this year. The council was asked to review anywhere between five to seven policies per semester to make sure all of the policies in the catalog are being touched. Most of the policies reviewed are on their way and some need a little more review before they are brought to EPC. As part of the new review process, the council is also putting the policies in a new format.

#### **1. Midterm Evaluation—Revise policy (*fall 2024*)**

##### [VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Co-chair Liedel said that the Midterm Evaluation policy was last reviewed in fall 2016 by the EPC Ad Hoc. The review was for freshman only, and that meant any students that were under 30 credit hours would show up on the roster in order to have a midterm evaluation submitted. The

committee did change that to be all classes that began with a zero, one or two (00000, 10000 or 20000 level). Even at that time, there was an increasing number of students coming in with CCP. Often times, they were beyond the 30 hours. During the last revision, the submission window was expanded from the 7<sup>th</sup> week to the 4<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> week for full-term courses. This allowed students to react faster if there was anything they needed to correct. There are students on the committee, but the council also asked students to go back to their student organizations for feedback. The students and faculty felt all students could benefit from early and frequent assessment. That is clear from student retention data. Students were unclear as to what midterms were, where to find them and how to interpret what they meant along with how to access resources to help them. The policy did not go under major revisions. Revisions included small semantic changes. There was a lot of discussion on expanding the evaluations to 30000-40000-level courses. A 30-day feedback survey was sent to many listservs. There were 28 responses with the majority wanting expansion to the 3/40000-level courses. Students and faculty want a more concrete, coordinated communication plan. Additionally, the feedback showed that there needs to be thoughtful and communication interventions to help students who are struggling. The Registrar's office will open the ability for midterm grades to be entered for 3/40000-level courses. It will be optional for faculty to enter midterm grades for 3/40000-level courses. A committee has been created with University Advising to create a robust communication campaign to students and faculty to explain what midterm evaluations are, why they are important and resources available to support students.

Associate Professor Fisch made a motion to approve, and Associate Lecturer Marshall seconded the motion.

Senior Lecturer Laux suggested using the word “grade” to align with Flashline where it is called “midterm grade.”

Co-chair Liedel explained that the committee discussed this, and the concern was using the word “grade” may make people assume it will be on the transcript. Flashline wording could be changed to say, “midterm evaluation grade.”

With no further questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

## **Undergraduate Policies Council and Graduate Policies Council**

### **2. Dual Degrees and Double Majors—Revise policy (*fall 2024*)**

#### [VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Co-chair Liedel explained that the policy revision is in collaboration with the Graduate Policies Council. Within the policy, there are sections for undergraduate and graduate. The policy revisions included condensing, clarifying and re-writing to make the policy easier to consume and understand. For the undergraduate section, two generalist degrees were added: Applied Media – B.A. and Technical and Applied Studies – B.T.A.S. For the graduate section, the list of graduate dual degree programs was removed and a link added to a list of programs. This allows for faster and easier updating. This policy went out for a 30-day feedback review. The survey feedback included positive feedback from 13 respondents.

Associate Professor Barber made a motion to approve, and Professor Salaba seconded.

No questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

### **3. Transcripts—Revise policy (*fall 2024*)**

#### [VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Co-chair Liedel said the Transcript policy was on the list to review. It affects both undergraduate and graduate students, so both committees reviewed. The revisions included aligning with the transcript policy in the policy register, removal of a paragraph about withholding transcript due to financial obligations and addition of the website to request transcripts. Federal guidelines changed, so transcripts can no longer be withheld due to financial obligations. The policy went out for a 30-day review and received positive feedback.

Associate Professor Barber made a motion to approve, and Associate Professor Osbourne seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

## **IV. Program Proposals Review**

### **A. Discussion Items**

#### **College of the Arts**

#### **School of Art**

### **1. Art Education – M.A.—Suspend admission (*fall 2024*)**

#### [VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Powell stated that during the March 8<sup>th</sup> FAC vote, the suspension did not pass. However, at the April 12<sup>th</sup> FAC meeting, the committee was able to discuss the issues and submitted a ballot revote in support of a one year pause on the admission to the program allowing curriculum revisions.

Senior Lecturer asked to clarify if the proposal is to suspend for one year and then faculty would have to decide on the program.

Secretary Tillett explained that when a program is suspended, Curriculum Services waits for the academic unit to say when they would like to re-open admission. In the past, when automatic re-opening was in practice, many of the programs were not ready. Therese asked if the FAC meant they would like the program to be re-opened for fall 2025 or later or time to make revisions and let Curriculum Services know when to re-open admissions.

Associate Professor Powell said that was not discussed specifically. The hope is that the revisions would be made and the program ready to be re-opened for fall 2025. Associate Professor Powell will seek clarification from the committee on that.

Secretary Tillett explained that the admissions window for fall 2025 opens in July. There is no expectation that Art Education would be on admission applications. The program will be back on applications when the program tells Curriculum Services to re-open the program.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked if it is an indefinite suspension.

Secretary Tillett clarified that it is indefinite with a limit. Programs can only be suspended for five years.

Associate VP Palmer stated that applications for the following fall open August 1<sup>st</sup>. So, the applications for fall 2024 opened on August 1, 2023.

Professor Salaba asked for clarification on the suspension effective date since the applications are already open, students are already admitted to the program.

Director Sokso explained that students have not been admitted into the program for fall 2024.

Dean Petrella added that the programs that have been put forward for suspension have not extended admittance.

### **School of Music**

#### **2. Music – B.A.—Suspend admission to the optional Jazz Studies concentration (*fall 2024*)**

##### **VIEW THE DISCUSSION**

Associate Professor Selvaggio explained that School of Music FAC unanimously voted to not suspend the Jazz Studies concentration. The Jazz Studies concentration is new and in its sixth year. After the pandemic, the last two years, Associate Professor Selvaggio has been working on building the program back up. From a number's standpoint, there are nine students in the major with 12 students in the minor. The importance of the Jazz Studies concentration is that it brings diversity to the School of Music along with creative activities and community engagement. The School of Music FAC voted to not suspend the concentration, because they see how important it is to what they are trying to do in the school.

Director Labovitz explained that at the time of the FAC discussion, there were four majors confirmed. One major change has gone through since that vote. There was expressed interest in the program and that is initially why the director was supportive of not suspending the degree. Upon further digging, the numbers of the minors and the majors does not fully encapsulate the academic progress. Keeping in mind the fiscal situation, the school cannot assure they will be running all of the major and minor coursework. Director Labovitz highly suggested taking the pause to re-do the curriculum to move forward sustainably.

Dean Petrella added that the decision is based on the number of students in the program and that none of the incoming students had committed to the program. They wanted to give time to make curriculum changes and then would provide support in recruitment. This is in no way to eliminate the Jazz Studies concentration. It is to help streamline it and make it more sustainable. Also, to make sure they are honoring the commitment to students in delivering the curriculum as it states in the catalog.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked how long it will take to revise the curriculum and will recruitment efforts move forward at the same time curriculum is being revised.

Dean Petrella said she is fine with that. The timeline is at the purview of the faculty. The college will support the faculty while making the changes to the timeline they can manage.

Director Labovitz added that so much of the curriculum is in the minor that the school can be recruiting towards the jazz coursework.

Associate Professor Selvaggio said that the school is rethinking all B.A. degrees. There is nothing out of compliance with the Jazz Studies concentration.

Director Labovitz agreed that there is nothing out of compliance with the concentration. However, there is a WIC course being taught outside of the school that is proving to be a hurdle to getting the degree. The revisions will make it an easier program for students to complete.

Dean Petrella said that one student confirmed admittance to the Jazz Studies concentration for fall. In this instance, because the first year of the B.A. in Music does not involve jazz, this student could come in as a B.A. in Music and easily transition to the Jazz Studies concentration without affecting their time to degree and allows the school time to make revisions.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked how long the revisions may take.

Director Labovitz said they have been discussing the revisions and are ready to make the changes as soon as possible. The school would like to be on the very first agenda in fall 2024.

Senior Lecturer asked what Associate Professor Selvaggio thinks about admissions if the program is revised and open again.

Associate Professor Selvaggio said that the numbers are better than what is shown, because there are students coming in and students switching to the major.

## **VI. Approval of EPC Meetings for Next Academic Year**

### **A. Meeting Schedule for Academic Year 24-25**

Chair Dauterich explained that one of the meeting dates had to be on a Tuesday as Monday is MLK day. He asked if members saw any issues with how the schedule is set up and if there were any concerns about holding the last meeting past contract.

With no comments or concerns with the schedule or meeting past contract for the last meeting.

## **VII. Miscellaneous Items**

Senior Lecturer Laux said the Leave of Absence policy was tabled at Faculty Senate for questions. He asked if the Leave of Absence policy revisions were for the catalog policy and not the university policy.

Associate Professor Barber said the intention is to revise them both.

Senior Lecturer Laux said Faculty Senate has the revisions for the catalog policy, but not the university policy.

Associate Professor Barber said if one is being revised the other one has to match. The revisions are submitted in CIM.

Secretary Tillett said there is a place in CIM to mark university policy register revisions and attach language. Once the revisions go through the workflow, Curriculum Services moves the policy register revisions to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked for confirmation that the catalog policies do not go to the board for approval.

Secretary Tillett confirmed the academic policies in the catalog do not go to the board for approval. It is the policies in the policy register that go to the board. She said sometimes the policies in the catalog versus the register are different because the policies in the register are in the Ohio administrative code that requires specific language and formatting. The language may be different between the two, but the intent should remain the same.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked Associate Professor Barber for the language for the policy register.

**VIII. Next Meeting:  
Monday, 20 May 2024**

With no other comments or questions, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 4:47pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Christa N. Ord*

Christa N. Ord  
Operations and Special Projects Coordinator, Curriculum Services  
Office of the Provost