



**Educational Policies Council
Minutes of the Meeting
Monday, 21 September 2020**

Leadership present: Chair Pamela E. Grimm; Secretaries Therese E. Tillett, Jennifer S. Kellogg, Aimee J. Bell, Christa N. Ord

Administrators present (or represented): Interim Associate Provost Manfred H. van Dulmen; Deans Christina L. Bloebaum, Mark S. Mistur

Faculty present (or represented): Professors Edward Dauterich, Christine A. Hudak, Eric S. Jefferis, Donald L. White; Associate Professors Derek Kingsley, Brian R. Barber, Darwin L. Boyd, Vanessa J. Earp, Duane J. Ehredt, Dandan Liu, Denise M. McEnroe-Petitte, Gabriella Paar-Jakli, Mary M. Step, Blake Stringer, Jonathan F. Swoboda; Assistant Professors Patrick J. Dillon, Eric S. Kildow, Christopher Rowan, Yvonne M. Smith; Associate Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall

Faculty not present (or represented): Professor Lawrence J. Marks

Guests: Ann Abraham, Susan Augustine, Michael Beam, Cathy Dubois, Lynette Johnson, Jennifer McDonough, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Lameck Onsarigo, Amy Reynolds, Matthew Rollyson, Hollie Simpson, Alison Smith, Linnea Stafford, Melody Tankersley, Deidre Warren, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Pamela E. Grimm called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 21 September 2020, via Microsoft Teams.

Item I: Approval of Minutes of 12 May 2020

Chair Pamela E. Grimm agreed to wait until next meeting for members to review and approve the minutes.

Item II: Presentations

a. EPC Restructure

Chair Pamela E. Grimm summarized the restructure of EPC. She said the composition decreased the number of voting members from 55 to 30. The majority are voting members are now faculty. EPC has added an executive committee that is made up of the provost's office, faculty members from faculty senate and two faculty members with Pam chairing the committee. Chair Grimm explained that the charge has not changed for the council. She encouraged everyone to review the EPC member guidelines. The restructure was approved by the faculty senate with the charter and bylaws approved by faculty senate and board of trustees. Specific language defining the changes will go back to the faculty senate for final approval. Chair Grimm stated that the hope

for the restructure is to get a more vigorous engagement in the process. She said that key expectations are preparing ahead of time for meetings by looking at meeting materials, having questions ready and feeling empowered to ask those questions.

With no questions or comments, the council moved to the next topic.

b. Overview of the Curriculum Information Management (CIM) system

Jennifer Kellogg explained that she would be providing an overview of helpful pages and how to review and search proposals. She stated that the Curriculum Management page (<https://www.kent.edu/provost/curriculum/curriculum-management>) could be found through the Curriculum Services site. This site includes a user manual in html format, FAQ's, terms and definitions, curriculum deadlines, training and action pages. She said that courses, programs and policies all go through the CIM system. The action pages provide dropdowns for courses and programs with step-by-step instructions on how to initiate different requests. Jennifer moved onto the management buttons and explained that members could enter the management sites from those buttons. The management sites include course management, program management, policy management and miscellaneous management. Miscellaneous management is used for small changes on a large scale. She gave an example that if a prerequisite needs to be changed on 20 courses, the initiator could use the miscellaneous form rather than going through each course. Jennifer proceeded to the course management site. This site allows members to research, review a proposal, begin a proposal or revise. She showed members how to search, read the course status and workflow and an overview of the revise page. This included the ecosystem showing where courses live in the catalog, where it is required in a program and it is a prerequisite for another course. She also highlighted the course learning outcomes which is new to the form. On the agenda, Jennifer showed members how they may click on the link next to each course that takes them to the CIM proposal where they can review the workflow and changes accentuated in red (removed) and green (added). Proceeding the course management site, Jennifer signed onto the program management site and showed members how to search, read the program status and workflow, the eco system and how to track changes. Additionally, she encouraged members to sign up for training through the curriculum management page.

Item III: Committee Reports

a. University Requirements Curriculum Committee

Dean Alison J. Smith explained that the University Requirements Curriculum Committee (URCC) is a subcommittee of EPC. She said they are currently working on revision of the Kent Core. Last November, faculty senate approved the URCC proposed path towards revising the assessment of the general education program. That approval included using the American Association of College and University (AACU) value rubrics. This reduced the amount of learning outcomes from 11 to 4 utilizing the AACU leap model. Using best practices to develop the assessment tools. The faculty senate approved establishing a faculty lead committee on general education assessment. Dean Smith said that there will be an AACU pilot study of two of the general education rubrics. Those are value rubrics. URCC have contracted with AACU to run the critical thinking and written communication rubrics this year. The rubrics will be completed in the spring semester. She said that in the fall, they will be working with faculty to get that setup. Dean Smith stated that at the end of the spring semester, the data will go to AACU for analysis and will return a full report. She concluded her statements that based on the results of

the pilot study URCC will be able to move forward in a big way to implement AACU value rubrics.

An EPC member asked if there is a separate group that is looking at the Kent Core and the modifications.

Dean Smith explained that it is all part of the same committee. The assessment piece has to be completed first.

Item IV: Program Proposal Review

Chair Grimm explained that there were no action items for this meeting. There are lesser action items and they may be discussed at member request.

Item V: Course Proposal Review

Chair Grimm stated that there are no action items for this meeting. URCC items are modifications to courses and there are no new courses. There are lesser action items and they may be discussed at member request.

Therese stated that she received a request from chemical physics for material science to withdraw a revision to one of their courses. She said members could look online at the agenda to see one revision has been withdrawn under the college of arts and sciences. Additionally, she said Evaluation and Measurement changed their name to Research, Measurement and Statistics has contributed to so many courses on this list.

Item VI: Other—Discussion Items

a. Review of a new program review checklist

Therese stated that she created a helpful checklist to be used by members when they are reviewing a new program, minor, certificate or concentration to ensure it is aligned with the university's mission. Some questions the checklist asks are: Is it well designed? Does it have the faculty credentials and what's needed to be viable? Does it have academic quality, resources, needs and proposal quality? She explained that it would be for members personal use and would not be collected. She asked members to confirm if the checklist is useful, makes sense or if it is missing anything.

Chair Grimm asked if the criteria is clear to proposal initiators on what they need in their proposal.

Therese said that Curriculum Services will be preparing some resources for program development and go over a timeline. She added that they want to take a more active role in helping colleges and departments shape their proposals and get them out in a timely manner. The checklist would also be given to those creating a proposal to help them understand how their proposal will be reviewed at EPC to ensure it meets all of the items. Therese asked members to send her any recommendations on the checklist.

Chair Grimm requested to add whether the program is unique or is there an overlap with another program within KSU.

Interim Provost Manfred H. van Dulmen asked to include if the program will attract new students to Kent State.

b. Ideas for EPC subcommittees

Chair Grimm stated that the Undergraduate Policy Council (UPC) and Graduate Policy Council (GPC) will replace the EPC Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Policies. The proposed ideas for committees are Academic Calendar Advisory Committee (as needed, to develop 5-year calendar), Fiscal Impact Statement Review Subcommittee and Alternative Credit Subcommittee.

Therese added that the subcommittees listed are ideas for brand new subcommittees. She said Curriculum Services oversees the academic calendar. It is a 5-year lookout and is getting close to the time to create a new 5-year lookout. Groups to include are parking services, residence services and athletics since they depend on the academic calendar.

Manfred said that many universities have these committees and Kent has been using EPC Ad Hoc committee for both UG and GR. Most of the graduate policies have gone through the graduate dean's council which does not have faculty or student representation. He said they thought this would solve those issues. EPC Ad Hoc has representation from enrollment management and they envision going forward that these councils will have representation from financial aid, registrar's office and other functional areas on campus.

Therese explained the fiscal impact statements are required to be filled out for any new degree program. A Fiscal Impact Statement Review Subcommittee would assist with developing a better document. This would be a short-term subcommittee with members from EPC and financial areas to review the statement and make it more useful. The Alternative Credit Subcommittee is for test scores that come through that have not been reviewed and determined how to award credit. She said that awards may be very departmental, but there is no university-wide policy on alternative credit. For example, A-levels from England or GED. This committee could meet on an as-needed basis.

An EPC member asked what the current subcommittees are of EPC.

Therese replied, EPC Ad Hoc and asked for volunteers if members agreed subcommittees are beneficial.

Manfred added that there needs to be research on what other universities have done with composition and framework on subcommittees.

Chair Grimm asked members to reach out to herself or Therese if interested in subcommittees.

c. Presentations

Chair Grimm asked if there were any topic members were interested in hearing about during meetings.

Therese said she invited VP Mary Parker to discuss the new strategic enrollment plan for the next meeting.

An EPC member said they were interested in hearing about microcredentials.

d. Information items

Chair Grimm stated that the interim pass/fail policy for summer 2020, fall 2020 and spring 2021 passed through faculty senate. She added that there are new professional licensure disclosures required as well.

Therese added that typically the pass/fail policy would have gone to EPC, but it was an interim policy and needed to be approved quickly.

Jennifer explained the new federal regulations on professional licensure disclosures. She said universities need to disclose whether the requirements met at Kent State would meet the requirements to be licensed or certified in another state. Continuing distance education, registrar's office and admissions gathered and came up with a website. Students who are in a program, are applying to a program or anyone who changes their major to a program that leads to licensure will get notified by email about the professional licensure in other states. Jennifer said she requested faculty program coordinators to fill out a Qualtrics form for each of their licensure programs and all of the states. Feds said "not determined" programs are okay for now, but will need to be determined soon. The Qualtrics link will be sent out again to program coordinators during catalog proofs March-May.

Therese added that it is now up to universities to know if the licenses meet the requirements in other states.

With no further questions, comments or items, Chair Pamela E. Grimm adjourned the meeting at 4:26pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Christa N. Ord
Administrative Secretary, Curriculum Services
Office of the Provost