



Meeting Minutes
Monday, 18 March 2024
[VIEW THE MEETING](#)

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

Administrators present: Associate Provost Manfred H. van Dulmen; Dean Sonia A. Alemagno

Administrators not present: Dean Versie Johnson-Mallard

Faculty present: Professors Greta Polites, Athena Salaba, Tiffany Taylor; Associate Professors Ali Abdul-Aziz, Brian R. Barber, Michael J. Ensley, Michael R. Fisch, Abe G. Osbourne, JD Ponder, Catherine Smith; Assistant Professor Bethany G. Lanese; Senior Lecturer Jennifer R. Metheney; Associate Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturers Kristy Jacobson, Olivia Krise

Faculty not present: Professors Saiying Deng; Associate Professors Simon Adamtey, Jillian S. Coorey, Vanessa J. Earp, Dandan Liu, Jonathan F. Swoboda, Christopher W. Totten; Senior Lecturer Tracy A. Laux

Students present: Chukwudi Nwoko

Guests: Susan Augustine, Michael Bell, Christina Bloebaum, Chris Dorsten, David Dees, Susan Emens, James Hannon, Ladaja Kennedy, Matthew Minichillo, Hossein Mirinejad, Collin Palmer, Christa Porter, Renée Roll, Matthew Rollyson, Scott Sheridan, Hollie Simpson, Alison Smith, Misty Sommers, Linnea Stafford, Deirdre Warren, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 18 March 2024, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 29 January 2024

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

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

II. Presentations

A. Kent Core Assessment Pilot 2.0 Preliminary Results

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Dean Smith said that URCC is presenting an overview of the second pilot on the Kent Core value rubrics. This was the result of an assessment pilot workshop, which ran in the summer and

into the fall with participating faculty. URCC had the goal for this assessment of Kent core courses. The AACU value rubrics were being used. The committee wanted to know about the faculty experience. In the pilot, approximately a dozen faculty were taking part. The questions are about what their experience was, what they liked and disliked and how it went. This report is focused on user experience. Pre-pandemic (2019-2020), Faculty Senate approved nationally recognized assessments rubric collection to assess the Kent Core moving away from 11 learning outcome design of the separate home-built approach and more towards the recognized national assessment tools. They also approved the formation of a faculty committee that would sit above the level of the individual colleges that would oversee the assessment of the Kent Core. The AACU value rubrics are used by thousands of colleges and universities. There are 16 different rubrics. They are based on four broad learning outcomes known as the LEAP outcomes that are part of AACU assessment of liberal education. The key part of this is that these rubrics can be adapted to courses. The courses do not need to be adapted to the rubrics. This is why they are so popular. In 2021, URCC completed the first pilot where 14 faculty members from eight different colleges submitted student assignments directly to AACU for them to score. The two rubrics they chose were critical thinking and written communication. The purpose of the pilot was to examine the general applicability of those rubrics to our courses. It was a successful pilot, and the assessment was satisfactory. This year, URCC looked at what would happen if the Kent State Faculty were doing the scoring. This was the second pilot completed this fall in which 12 faculty members from seven colleges took a summer workshop on how to score assignments with the rubrics. The three rubrics chosen were critical thinking, written communication and quantitative literacy. For the faculty that had a large class size, no more than 20 assignments were selected from random students. For the most part, Kent Core courses were reviewed, a couple of capstones and some other courses within the major. For each course for smaller classes, no more than a minimum of eight students were scored in critical thinking, no more than 10 for written communication and no more than 13 for quantitative literacy. On average, critical thinking took one to five minutes to score per student, three to seven minutes for written communication and three to four minutes for quantitative literacy. The overall assessment of critical thinking took three to 20 hours, written communication took five to 40 hours and quantitative literacy took 12 to 15 hours. The data was entered into a Qualtrics form. Overall, positive feedback was received regarding the use of the rubric. Of the three rubrics, written communication will need the most adjusting. It was found to be vague. The Kent Core assessment recommendations for Fall 2024 are the select and charge the new Kent Core Assessment faculty committee, provide AACU value rubric training to the committee, share assessment rubrics with faculty and curriculum committees and continue building capacity with the value rubrics. Kent Core assessment recommendations for Spring 2025 are to customize assessment rubrics developed collectively with faculty and curriculum committees, develop plan for cyclical Kent Core/Gen Ed program assessment and collection of data and continue building capacity with the value rubrics.

Secretary Tillett asked if the faculty assessment committee exists?

Dean Smith said she does not think so. URCC had a meeting about it a year ago, but not sure if it actually was going to be a subcommittee of EPC or if faculty got it off the ground.

Chair Dauterich said he does not believe the committee was convened. There was a list of people who were willing to serve on it.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen added that the role and function of URCC is being reviewed, so the assessment committee was put on hold.

Secretary Tillett asked if the assessment committee will respond to the questions that have come up from the pilots.

Dean Smith said yes.

Secretary Tillett asked if the assessment committee will be convened and start the assessment before whatever comes from the reinvisioning or the two going hand in hand.

Dean Smith explained that once the questions are answered, the rubrics can be used. So, they should go hand in hand with the reinvisioning.

Associate Professor Dees added that the reinvisioning committee has been working with Dean Smith and Associate Professor Roll. There are several ways the assessment and reinvisioning work together.

Associate Professor Ponder asked about a process to address the issue of the workload that will fall on faculty members completing the assessments.

Dean Smith explained that the process will come from the assessment committee. The rubrics are in use in several colleges as part of the accreditation process. Some colleges have designated people who do the scoring. There are many different solutions, and the committee will address this in detail.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen added that the assessment is part of the accreditation for the university and is a requirement.

Dean Smith said HLC pointed out Kent State's weak approach some years ago, and when they return, they are expecting to see progress.

B. Course Program of Study (CPoS)

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Secretary Tillett stated that Course Program of Study (CPoS) is a federal regulation coming from the U.S. Department of Education that says that federal financial aid is to only be given to courses that apply toward a student program of study. If Kent State awards federal financial aid to courses that do not apply to students' program of study, Kent will be liable for having to return the aid or lose federal financial aid eligibility overall. It may adversely affect accreditation. This regulation has been in place since 2017, but it is now gearing up now that there is more technology to implement it. The vast majority of students receive some federal financial aid. In 2021-2022, between 61% and 77% of our students on the different campuses received federal grants. These are only for new students who are coming to college for the first time. Factoring in continuing students, transfer students and graduate students, that percentage of the student body who receives federal financial aid is large and is affected by this regulation. This affects students and their federal financial aid. This affects faculty by needing to figure out what courses apply to a student's program of study. This comes through what is listed in the catalog as program requirements, the prerequisites, the equivalencies, attributes and what

programmed in GPS degree audit. If it is not in the catalog, it is not going to be in the degree audit. Therefore, all programs, graduate and undergraduate majors, minors and certificates all need to be in the degree audit. The student's program of study is the Kent Core and any university requirement that is required for a degree such as ELR, EIC, diversity for all bachelor's degrees, all majors including the concentrations that lead to a degree. Certificates approved for federal financial aid eligibility, minors and certificates for students who are in a degree program. There are some non-degree programs eligible for federal financial aid. Mostly teacher licensure programs. General electives may be eligible for federal financial aid, but only if they need to complete the minimum credit hours.

Registrar Dorsten reminded members and guests of the tuition plateau. Anything from 12 to 18 credits is considered full time. If students want to go outside of their program, they should ensure that 12 credits count towards their program. If a student has 9 credits where only 6 count toward their program, they would be considered part time for federal financial aid. Faculty should ensure that program requirements and prerequisites listed in the catalog are correct. Faculty should review their program requirements and that they account for all courses that are accepted or required including that prerequisites should be listed in the program. Review of courses for transfer, equivalencies, substitutions and exceptions should be reviewed and approved or denied as quickly as possible. It may have an impact on what a student can register for. Exceptions were not processed until after the student registered. For CPoS to work, exceptions will have to be approved at the point that the student registers for courses. Otherwise, the system will come back and say they cannot take the class. It is not in the program. Advising will need to work with students to ensure that their program is up to date and current. If a student is going to change their program, it should be done as soon as possible so that when the process is run, it is looking at the correct degree program and matching the courses accordingly. Therese's department is also working on advising program areas on curricular updates. Chris and Therese have been meeting with College Curriculum Committees and other groups to talk about curriculum changes. The Registrar's office is currently working on getting all graduate programs into GPS. There are 73% in GPS currently. Any curricular changes that faculty approve will need to be entered into GPS as soon as possible for the CPoS job to run. There is a CPoS steering committee that consists of faculty, deans, university staff and administration from different colleges. Strata Information Group (SIG) has been contracted to consult with helping implement CPoS. Originally, it was to be implemented in fall 2025. Since more things need reviewed and additional time needed, the hope is to implement for fall registration which starts March 2026. They will be called soft launches before the full implementation for fall 2026. This will be at the institutional level looking internally at how the process works and then tying that into the communication plan to inform the Kent State community about this change. The committee will be working on good communication with everyone across the institution about this change and creating a website. Some timelines and deadlines may change.

Secretary Tillett added that curriculum being reviewed now will not be effective until fall 2025. Chris and Therese can speak to curriculum committees and Curriculum Services can help with different avenues on how changes can be made. The biggest goal is to make sure curriculum is as accurate as possible.

Dean Smith asked about special topics courses that are typically offered by departments as new courses and, in the case of Honors, what about Honors Thesis (6 hours spread over 2-3 semesters).

Secretary Tillett explained that many programs include special topics courses in an elective list. So, there may be several instances where a special topics course will count in their program. There are also programs with general electives that students may use a special topics course for that requirement. As Chris said, the student needs 12 credit hours to count towards their program for federal financial aid.

An EPC guest asked how this might affect summer enrollment.

Secretary Tillett explained that it would work the same way. Students should meet the credit hours for financial aid with courses counting toward their program.

C. Kent State as Teach-Out Partner with Notre Dame College

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen stated that Kent State is one of the 17 teachout partners for Notre Dame College. Based on estimates, there is expected to be approximately 30 students transferring. The scope of work will be rather small, but it is really complex. The anticipation is that this will not be the last small liberal arts college in the region to close. There will be other partners in the coming years. Kent has taken this opportunity in the past weeks to develop a university strategy to be a teach-out partner. Another complicated factor was when the announcement from Notre Dame came out that they were going to close and Kent is a teach-out partner, there was not a formal MU signed. Calls came from students with questions and assumptions of what would be honored that was not agreed to. It is important for Kent to keep in mind how to support students from these colleges that want to continue their education and how to do that in an equitable way.

Associate VP Palmer gave an update that there have been 52 undergraduate and graduate applicants which are representative of several Kent State campuses.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Transfer Credit Subcommittee

[VIEW THE REPORT](#)

Co-chair Sommers stated that last fall, the committee had spent a lot of time prior to developing a faculty training session. It is a 20-minute training session that covers policies and practices surrounding transfer credits at Kent State. The training was created and reviewed by the Transfer Credit subcommittee prior to sending out faculty invites. Training is for faculty who review syllabi, transfer credit pathways and who are involved in any kind of articulation agreements or those who advise transfer students. Staff in colleges who assist with syllabi were also welcomed to attend. The reason why training was established was to meet them halfway. Also, HLC recommends a periodic review of policies and procedures around transfer credit. Their statement included clarity to those who administer them, which includes all staff and faculty who are a part of this process. There were two live training sessions held. Invitations were sent to approximately 100 faculty members after the live sessions. There was also a link posted for a virtual session so that anyone who could not attend the two live sessions, were able to attend a recorded version. Content in the presentation included terminology, best practices, Ohio-wide guarantees, evaluation standards and examples, equivalencies vs. GPS exceptions and some reference links. After the end of the session, all attendees were invited to complete a five-question quiz to ensure everything was understood. They also had the option, in the quiz, to copy their supervisor or a dean on the email confirmation of their training completion. There was also

a training survey to provide feedback. Of the 100 people invited, 51 of those people attended and 34 completed the quiz. A follow up email for the quiz was sent. Those who completed the quiz did receive a small insignia that they could use for their email signature or to share on LinkedIn if they wanted. There was good participation and feedback provided. The committee will be working towards creating an advisor training session for next year and seeing what additional areas could be setup as a general training or both faculty and advisors going forward.

VIEW THE REPORT

Co-chair Liedel stated that the Undergraduate Policies Council (UPC) have been aggressively reviewing policies this year. The review process includes 10 different policies and those will be coming forward soon. The policies are being put through a 30-day comment period. Once the committee gets done reviewing those and they are put into CIM, Therese sends something out to a broad audience. The UPC tries to reach as many people in the Kent State community as possible to review the policy and give feedback before coming to EPC or Faculty Senate. The committee is working on revising policies from the feedback received. The UPC has subcommittees that are meeting and those should be ready for presentation in April. UPC has determined that Flexibly Scheduled Course Sections policy is actually just a definition in the catalog. There is nothing else in the policy about a part of term course. This policy will be demoted from a policy to glossary of terms. The Not Permitted to Continue policy is taking quite a bit of time. It will be put out for 30-day comment after the next meeting. The Graduation Academic Standing will be going out for 30-day comment soon. UPC is finalizing FAQs for grade point average. In the Midterm Evaluations policy, in the business practices, the committee might include 30000, 40000-level courses. This would allow faculty teaching 30000, 40000-level courses to include midterm GPA's if they want. Midterm evaluations are really valuable for students. More students are entering into 30000, 40000-level courses earlier due to CCP and other factors. There were faculty who thought it would be great and others who felt strongly that it was not necessary and would be an additional burden. That is why it is stalled.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen asked for clarification that the midterm evaluation grade would not be required.

Co-chair Liedel said many feel it should be, and that was evident in the feedback.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen said that if it is made available, people could be open to it. He asked if the advising deans and undergraduate deans were consulted.

Co-chair Liedel said yes. The advising community feels it is a useful tool. It gives students a mark of where they are since we know that some classes, particularly upper division courses, may not have many assessments at that point.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen added that there could be an opportunity to see if doing a midterm evaluation could be some professional development. If it is going to be changed, it should be made inclusive across course levels for training for faculty. It may be better received if it is professional development related.

Co-chair Liedel continued that the Dual Degrees and Double Majors is out for comment. The committee is waiting for data for the Incomplete Mark policy and are still in talks with this policy. Pass-Fail Grade policy was just introduced to UPC. One thing that will be discussed is that students do not actually fail. Is this a misnomer of the policy? Should it be credit/no credit?

Those policies will go out for 30-day comment. The 30-day comment process is working really well. The feedback comes from a variety of sources so that the committee knows when it is brought forward that it is a very sound policy and has been reviewed by many eyes.

IV. Policy Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Graduate Policies Council

1. Leave of Absence for Graduate Students—Revise policy (*fall 2024*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Co-chair Barber stated that proposal sought to revise the leave of absence policy that currently exists for graduate students to include some specific language and clarify definitions and actions related to short- and long-term leaves of absence. The revisions include new language related to eligibility and procedures for seeking and accessing services during and returning from a leave of absence (LOA). The revisions clarify the formal LOA process so that students and academic units can adhere to those conditions and support the students. During the draft process, the Graduate Policies Council (GPC) committee empathized that students on a leave of absence should maintain access to some university students. Including student health services. The rationale for that is that these services are often related to the source of student duress and their ability to return. The revisions include a short-term, meaning six weeks or less, and long-term leave of absence which is considered to be longer than a semester. Requirements have been eliminated for students to have completed a full-term of enrollment prior to beginning an LOA as well as being in good academic standing and making reasonable progress toward the degree. There was a lot of feedback on that good academic standing should be language should be kept, but the council decided that students who are not in good academic standing could be either related to or a source of their duress. The council wanted to make sure that this is in protection of the students as much as possible. It was specified that the time taken on a leave of absence is not included in time requirements for programs, except in the case where accreditation specifies. The LOA form is to be submitted prior to the term requested for a long-term LOA, but not necessarily a short-term that can be filed after the short-term leave. Assistantships held prior to an LOA will be reoffered to the student pending available funds at the unit level. Students on a leave of absence, regardless of the length, whether it is short or long, should maintain access to those health services. Short-term LOA continues to receive student rights and privileges including stipends or subsidized health insurance where applicable.

Professor Salaba asked for an example of a short-term LOA and how that works with the beginning, middle or end of the semester. Also, how that works for the completion of requirements for a course for faculty and the student.

Co-chair Barber explained that some of the language is actually related to the short-term and how that affects course progress. The policy says that students should consult the instructor to make arrangements for that. Short-term LOA's can happen at any point in time throughout the semester and can be filed. LOA's can also be submitted retroactively for medical and family emergencies. Students can also submit an LOA to attend a conference or workshop where they will miss more than five consecutive days and need to be protected during their absence without consequences or repercussions.

Professor Salaba asked how the short-term LOA arrangements are made with students to not have expectations that might not be possible.

Co-chair Baber said that there is language in the revised policy that indicates that students may have to review course withdrawal or the IP grade. The LOA does not preclude their course obligations in any way. It is just protecting them from consequences during that time. Students may need an additional short-term leave and should consider course withdrawal. That language is in the policy.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen expressed that in the policy it states that short-term leaves would be managed through the Graduate College. That is not feasible. There should be a different strategy that includes the academic colleges with how that should be managed.

Co-chair Barber explained that including the Graduate College in the policy procedures is for documentation, but they do not need to use the Graduate College for that. The language in the policy can be adjusted to clear the Graduate College of keeping track of all short-term leaves.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen asked about intermediate leave and what happens when they become apparent. How students take a leave.

Co-chair Barber said, right now, the LOA covers up to six weeks of leave. Assuming that a student would apply for leave of absence due to pregnancy and parenting. The student would look at the possibility of returning and if they see they cannot, they will forego a short-term leave and immediately apply for long-term LOA. Those situations are protected under this policy and there is intentional language around pregnancy and parenting embedded in the language.

Chair Dauterich said the proposal could move forward with the amendment of excluding housing the LOA requests with the Graduate College.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen clarified it would just be excluding short-term LOA's being filed with the Graduate College. The college will still manage long-term LOA's. The short-term LOA's can be managed at the program level.

Secretary Tillett asked if the policy would be revised or if it would be decided later. The policy revisions currently says that all LOA requests are to be submitted through the Graduate College for final approval.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen said to add long-term leaves are submitted through the Graduate College.

Secretary Tillett said she would add a sentence saying that LOA requests should be submitted through the Graduate College. Students should contact their college for short-term leave of absence requests.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen added that this should be discussed at GDAC with the graduate associate deans.

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

With no further comments or questions, the item passed with one abstaining vote by co-chair Barber.

2. Transfer of Graduate Credit—Revise policy (*fall 2024*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Co-chair Barber stated that the policy is now clearly defined as Graduate credit earned at another university. The council clarified the language. Additionally, the council focused on maintaining a maximum of 12 credits that may be applied toward a degree. The transfer credit could not be used for a previous degree. The exception is that the certificates are not considered degrees, so those credits can be used toward certificates. The council stipulated that it must follow time limits of six years for master's and nine years for doctoral programs. The form is still required to be completed. There is a necessary edit to procedures that will be made on the form. The credit has to be earned at another institution for it to count as transfer credit. The language in the form needs to be adjusted to specify that and talk about when students can and cannot petition for transfer credit. Courses taken at Kent State cannot be considered transfer, but they can be applied to another Kent State program with the approval of the program's coordinator.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

V. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items

College of Applied and Technical Studies

1. Agribusiness – B.S.—Inactivate major offered at Tuscarawas Campus (*fall 2024*)

2. Environmental Health and Safety – A.A.S.—Inactivate major offered at East Liverpool and Trumbull Campuses

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Dean Emens stated that the Bachelor of Science in Agribusiness had been suspended in February 2023 due to low enrollment. A faculty member was lost due to transfer, and they were not replaced. The Associate of Applied Science in Environmental Health and Safety was offered at Trumbull and East Liverpool Campuses with very low enrollment. There were no students and faculty to run the program. The college also investigated altering the program thinking maybe it could be before water technicians to meet the needs of groups coming in like Intel. However, the consulting body that was hired came back with recommendations that there is not a high need in the area.

Associate Lecturer Marshall made a motion to approve, and Associate Professor Abe Osbourne seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

Professor Salaba asked if the Graduate College courses on the agenda are to be used when faculties home unit does not have research and individual investigations.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen said yes and that the courses were previously active and are being reactivated. Also, Graduate College is not an RCM generating unit. So, the revenue from the course would follow the faculty member teaching the course.

**VII. Next Meeting:
Monday, 15 April 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