



Meeting Minutes
Monday, 23 January 2023
[View the Meeting](#)

Leadership present: Chair Edward Dauterich; Secretaries Therese E. Tillett, Jennifer S. Kellogg, Kristi M. Kamis, Joanna Liedel, Ashley N. Maher, Christa N. Ord

Administrators present: Senior Associate Provost Manfred H. van Dulmen; Deans Sonia A. Alemagno, Versie Mallard-Johnson

Faculty present: Professors Karen Gracy, Tiffany Taylor; Associate Professors Vanessa J. Earp, Doug Ellison, Michael J. Ensley, Michael R. Fisch, Eric S. Kildow, Dandan Liu, Denise M. McEnroe-Petitte, Mitchell J. McKenney, Abe G. Osbourne, Blake D. Stringer, Jonathan F. Swoboda, Brett D. Tippey; Assistant Professors Bethany G. Lanese, Tina Patel, Maggie Stedman-Smith; Senior Lecturers Tracy A. Laux, Jennifer R. Metheney; Associate Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturer Kristy Jacobson

Faculty not present: Associate Professors Brian R. Barber, Christopher Rowan, Helen Piontkivska, Geoffrey Steinberg

Students present: Jeremy Foust

Guests: Susan Augustine, Michael Beam, Neil Cooper, Alicia Crowe, Jennifer Cunningham, Jo Dowell, Radd Ehrman, Susan Emens, Stephanie Fussell, James Hannon, Brian Harvey, Sarah Harvey, Ryan Hediger, Julie Mazzei, Babacar M'Baye, Noël Palomo-Lovinski, Liz Piatt, Eboni Pringle, Matthew Rollyson, Hollie Simpson, Alison Smith, Kathleen Spicer, Linnea Stafford, Deirdre Warren, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 23 January 2022, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 5 December 2022

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

With no questions or comments, the item was approved.

II. Structure Proposals Review

A. Action Items

College of Arts and Sciences

1. Center for Democracy, Social Justice and Peaceful Change—Establish Center

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Neil stated that the proposal is to establish a center for democracy, social justice and peaceful change. The proposed center builds on and substantially extends the impressive interdisciplinary work already undertaken under the umbrella of what is known the Growing Democracy Project. This existing body of work includes community workshops, a podcast series that, while only launched in the summer of 2020, includes 75 episodes with thousands of listeners, a growing democracy blog, secured funding of around \$35,000 and production of scholarly papers. The mission of the news center is to be an inclusive community that strengthens democracy, fosters equity-centered civic engagement and facilitates peaceful change through transformative research, learning and community-engaged practice. The existing Growing Democracy Project already represents an impressive example of interdisciplinary collaboration in and of itself, involving as it does faculty from SBCS, Africana studies and economics, as well as colleagues from geography, political science, and the Women's Center. But the new center will substantially expand on this level of cross disciplinary collaboration to include a wide range of additional colleagues with expertise in a range of areas, including in elections and voting, regional identity, human rights, political violence and youth civics. Over and above this, as well as continuing with the existing workshops, podcasts, et cetera that have been inaugurated under the auspices of the Growing Democracy Project, the new center will launch a range of new projects, including a democracy roundtable, community organizing workshops and a civics academy. It is also envisaged that it will offer a further fee for service applied research service. The proposed head of the center, Ashley Nickels, has an impressive record of producing original, high quality, high impact publications. Some of which have also received prestigious external awards. Dr. Nickels status as a leading scholar in the field, means she will be an excellent figurehead for the new center. Likewise, a central role in the Growing Democracy Project, I think means she is well suited to understand the demands of having the new sensor and growing its portfolio of research, extramural funding, and applied work in the community. The proposed center also fills a gap in the university's current portfolio as centers and institutes. There are some existing centers whose work connects into cognitive concerns and themes that the center will be addressing. The Antiracism and Equity Institute, for instance, or the Institute for African American Affairs come to mind. But I don't think there is any current center or institute that is specifically designed to address questions of democracy, civic engagement, community rights and community empowerment writ large. Given both the salience and polarized nature of current discussions in the US about the state of democracy, this represents quite a notable gap in the university's architecture of centers and institutes, which the center will amply fill. Moreover, the center proposal demonstrates there is a good deal of research, teaching and applied work going on in KSU that would benefit from being harnessed under the umbrella of the new center. The framework of activities envisaged for the center offer a real potential for university researchers in this field to discover new synergies and areas of collaboration, whether it be in research teaching, funding applications or applied work. It is also worth noting that the proposal is consistent with the vision and mission set out in the university strategic roadmap, most notably the emphasis placed on meaningful voice as well as priority four of the roadmap community impact. Finally, the work of the center, in general, but particularly the proposal to create a civics academy to

overlap with the annual May 4th commemoration, cause real potential, not just to honor the legacy of May 4th, but to link that legacy with contemporary concerns about the issues of democracy, voice participation and civic rights that were at the very heart of the student protests on May 4th. The center builds on an impressive body of work already undertaken under the umbrella of the Growing Democracy Project. It promises to develop several promising new strands of work. It fills in a gap in the current portfolio centers and institutes and it has the potential to provide a collaborative forum for existing KSU researchers in this field to explore new research, teaching and funding synergies. Above all, I think the center will be addressing questions of democracy, participation, and peaceful change that are central to local and national debates today about politics, community and society and those processes of peaceful change associated with those factors.

Associate Professor Kildow motioned to approve, and Associate Professor Ensley seconded. Secretary Tillett asked if the new center would absorb all funding and all activities from the Growing Democracy Project and if it will cease to exist.

Neil replied, yes, it will subsume the Growing Democracy Project within the auspices of the new center.

Secretary Tillett asked why to create a center and not just continue with the activities of the project.

Neil said, the Growing Democracy Project has grown to the point where it is almost a center already, but we have just not given it that label. So, this is a kind of proposal, in part, to recognize where it is or where it is going and to make that direction of travel more concrete.

Secretary Tillett asked if the budget would be funded, for the first three years, by grants that have already come in for the project or is it university money that is funding.

Neil explained that there is a mix. There is funding from money that has been provided to Ashley herself that she is putting forward towards the new center. The funding that the school is providing as part of the support. That is part and parcel of the kind of funding mechanism. The aim is really to utilize the framework and the umbrella of the new center to optimize the funding applications. The aim is to gradually move towards funding model where the funding is coming in from extramural sources, whether it is through grant activities or fee for service work.

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

III. Policy Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Graduate Dean's Advisory Council

1. Combined Bachelor's/Master's Degree Program—Revise policy to align with ODHE directive (fall 2023)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen stated that this is coming down from the ODHE and is something all public universities in the state that offer combined degree programs need to be

compliant. Currently, Kent State allows combined degree programs to double count anywhere from 9 to 12 credits. Under the change policy, the number is decreased to 9. Conversations have been had at Graduate Deans Advisory Council, various offices on campus and coordinators or associate deans and colleges where their programs currently allow for more than 9 credits to be double counted to ensure that we have a teach out program for students in those programs. Going forward only 9 credits can be double counted in combined bachelor's and master's programs. What has been allowed in combined programs has not been clear for some time. The state wants to make sure they are compliant with the HLC. They have had some concerns from HLC about practices. This new directive also is basically an effect of that.

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

An EPC member asked if this is at the state level as it runs contrary to the ideas of making these academic endeavors possible. This seems like a tiny step in the opposite direction of wanting to reduce the number of credit hours for students to make education more affordable.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen said he agrees. The Council for Graduate Deans was not to have a cap on the number of credits that could be double counted, but leave it up to each institution to decide what that cap should be and how should how it should work. We also have master's programs that have a large number of credits. However, ODHE said that is not the direction KSU can move.

An EPC member asked for clarification on double counting credit hours.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen explained that for undergraduate degree at minimum 120 credits and for a master's with at least 30 credits now 9 credits can count both towards the bachelor's degree and the master's degree.

With no further questions or comments, the item passed.

2. Transfer of Graduate Credit—Revise Policy allow Kent State students pursuing subsequent degrees to double count courses (*fall 2023*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen said the second proposal is in proposal for transfer of graduate credit. The proposal is for students who are entering or wanting to seek a dual degree program, but have not entered at the same time in both degrees. They currently cannot count the credits from the first degree earned towards the second degree. If a student wants to do a dual degree in the MSN and an MBA, they need to be enrolled simultaneously. However, if the student earned MSN before the MBA, they cannot earn a dual degree because they were not enrolled at the same time and transferred those credits. The policy is to make modifications to the current transfer policy to allow the credits earned from a previous graduate degree from Kent State to be also count to a future degree at Kent.

Associate Professor Tippey made a motion to approve, and Associate Professor Liu seconded.

An EPC guest asked if students go into one degree in the fall, can they start another degree without finishing the first degree.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen said, yes, as long as the program approves it.

An EPC member asked if someone has a professional degree, that in the future, they could try to use some courses towards another degree at Kent State.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen said yes, as long as it is approved by the faculty in the program.

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

University College

3. Destination Kent State: First Year Experience to: Flashes 101 (New Student Orientation)—Revision policy to align with courses changes (*fall 2023*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Dean Piatt stated that the policy language will bring the already approved revisions into alignment.

Associate Professor Kildow made a motion to approve, and Associate Professor Ensley seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed.

IV. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items

College of Aeronautics and Engineering

1. Aeronautical Studies – B.S.—Establish program (*fall 2023*)

2. Aeronautics – B.S.—Inactivate program (*fall 2023*)

3. Air Traffic and Airspace Management – B.S.—Establish program (*fall 2023*)

4. Aviation Management – B.S.—Establish program (*fall 2023*)

5. Professional Pilot – B.S.—Establish program (*fall 2023*)

6. Unmanned Aircraft Systems Flight Operations – B.S.—Establish program (*fall 2023*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Assistant Professor Fussell said after looking at recruitment and retention and the marketing abilities of the program, the college realized and was advised to split the concentrations into their own bachelor's degree programs which also lets certain things happen for accreditation purposes. Currently, the college can only market the professional pilot program in certain ways because it is a concentration. By moving the aeronautical studies air traffic and airspace management, aviation management and professional pilot and unmanned aircraft systems flight operations from concentrations into their own bachelor science degree programs, that left the college with the inactivation of the Aeronautics – B.S.

Associate Professor Kildow motioned to approve, and Associate Lecturer Marshall seconded.

With no questions or comments, items 1-6 were approved unanimously.

College of Arts and Sciences: Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies

7. Classics – Graduate Minor—Establish program (*fall 2023*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Professor Larson stated that the classics faculty have proposed a graduate minor, because many students from other graduate programs, were taking MCLS courses. The department thought it would be beneficial for them to have that coursework memorialized on their transcript if they have enough coursework. This can be done either completely online, hybrid, partly online, partly in person or all in person. Supporting data on student enrollment and documents are included with the proposal.

Associate Lecturer Marshall motioned to approve the item, and Associate Professor Ensley seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

College of Communication and Information: School of Emerging Media and Technology

8. Broadcast Engineering Technology—Establish program (*fall 2023*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

School Director Beam said that the proposal is an interdisciplinary collaboration between faculty in the School of Emerging Media and Technology and the School of Media and Journalism in the College of Communication and Information and faculty from the College of Aeronautics and Engineering. The college consulted with Kent State's working broadcast engineers in tele productions and members of the Society of Broadcast Engineers when developing the program. As noted in the proposal, the minor provides coursework where students learn technical applications, skills and networking, multimedia production and coding and problem solving. Students will have the opportunity to use technology to facilitate media recording and coding, distribution, streaming and interaction. This is a 19-credit hour minor with 13 core credit hours and six minor elective hours between EMAT, MDJ and CAE. The program is relying on existing coursework.

Associate Professor McKenney made a motion to approve, and Professor McEnroe-Petite seconded the motion.

Secretary Tillett asked if there were any other majors that would benefit from this minor.

Associate Professor McKenney said that there are number of parts of the program that students may be interested in. For example, if they were involved with TV2 and loved that, they could get into this minor. It is not a big hill to climb if the students are already in some of those courses, but could be picked up from outside.

Secretary Tillett asked what kind of jobs are out there for broadcast engineers.

Associate Professor McKenney explained that the jobs are for people making sure everything is working. These days, with all the streaming options and all the different ways that stuff is connecting, the information they have to know in order to make that work is rapidly changing. With no further questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

Secretary Tillett asked if broadcast engineers are at streaming companies along with local and national TV stations.

School Director Beam said, yes. Currently, there is a lot of move from regional sports networks to streaming services. Broadcast engineers are working at those companies to help with the encoding and distribution from the truck outside the sports stadium to the streaming platform company, then distribution out to viewers.

Secretary Tillett asked what kind of background do broadcast engineers have. Is it the engineering part or the media or the integration of both?

School Director Beam exemplified that it is an integration. There are a lot of these types of roles across different companies and I think some roles are more on the production side. Some are maybe more on the technical application side and then some are more on the engineering side. All those different backgrounds play a distinct role in these types of jobs. A range of jobs that are going to require more or less hard engineering versus understanding the production elements from inside a studio and camera operation or being able to code or script.

With no further questions or comments the item passed.

School of Media and Journalism

9. Journalism – Minor—Establish program (fall 2023)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor McKenney said there has not been a journalism minor available going back several years. Students were encouraged to take the major if they wanted to be in journalism. There were other minors that were kind of adjacent but not journalism itself. A couple things have changed. One is the accreditation body allows our students to consume more of our program. Before there was a ceiling on that. Electives were fine, but they were not graduating any sooner. If a student had a minor within the program, it was almost counterproductive in their graduation timeline. That is no longer true. The school is seeing students interested in public relations major, journalism minor, digital media production major and communication studies from across CCI and elsewhere. The school designed an 18-hour minor. The first five classes are the same ones that students take for journalism or for PR. Then, three-hour elective out of several of the class that come next. It allows the school to offer that to students to be able to do storytelling. Another change is to offer one writing course for everyone instead of a writing course for majors and one for non-majors.

Associate Professor Tippey motioned to approve, and Associate Professor seconded.

Secretary Tillett stated that the program will need more upper-division credit hours to meet the minimum for minors. Curriculum Services will work with Associate Professor McKenney to make that correction.

Associate Lecturer Marshall recommended that the motion is modified to say that the proposal is supported with the modifications made by Curriculum Services.

Chair Dauterich said, yes and requested a motion to approve and a second for the friendly amendments.

Associate Lecturer Marshall motioned to approve, and Associate Professor Earp seconded.

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

B. Discussion Items

College of the Arts—School of Fashion Design and Merchandising

1. Fashion Industry Studies – M.F.I.S.—Revise delivery mode, description, program requirements, graduation requirements (*fall 2023*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Professor Palomo-Lovinski stated that what the school is trying to do is shift the M.F.I.S. to be more industry facing for people that are needing to upscale. The delivery mode is online and in person. There are a lot of international students, so the school wants to be able to have the international students on campus should they choose and also industry people, that are predominantly in New York, to be able to engage online. There are some redundancies in courses. The school now has a research methods in fashion industry course and fashion systems thinking which is more critical thinking and revisioning of the fashion industry. The school took an elective that was global consumer in the fashion industry and moved that to a required course. They will be keeping the thesis requirement for those would like to propose their own research ideas and a non-thesis option which bounces off of the required fashion practicum. This is where students are immersed for a semester in an industry with a very particular problem that they are trying to solve while engaged in industry practice. Students are taking what they have done in the practicum and writing about it, exploring it and pushing it a little bit more robustly.

Secretary Tillett asked how the program moved away from its original intention.

Professor Palomo-Lovinski explained that its original intention was to be something that was really hybridized between design and merchandising, and it became, given that fact that two merchandise faculty were the directors, it kept moving more and more towards something that was much more heavily focused. In merchandising, it really did not address a lot of the creative practice that is incredibly important to design and how that design practice can be pragmatically implemented and usable to industry. In the associate director role, the program could be shifted back to what was originally planned.

Secretary Tillett asked what graduates of the program tend to go on to.

Professor Palomo-Lovinski said that it is a little bit of the problem. Merchandising faculty generally go into a Ph.D. program. The courses were being treated like Ph.D. prep. Design is going to be much more focused on design and reflective practice and the on-the-ground solutions. Students come in with a smattering of outcomes. Most of them go right back into industry and are doing exactly what they were doing. The school is trying to figure out a more pointed way in which students can do something very pointedly and pragmatically in the fashion industry.

School of Theatre and Dance

2. Theatre and Social Change – Minor—Establish program at Trumbull Campus; revise learning outcomes (fall 2023)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Kildow this is an attempt to rectify an oversight. The theatre major was established at the Trumbull campus back in 2018. There was the theatre and society concentration. The minor had not been created at Trumbull due to error in not selecting that option. The school is now looking to establish the minor at Trumbull to rectify this.

College of Communication and Information: School of Media and Journalism

3. Digital Media Production – Minor—Establish minor at Trumbull Campus; revise program graduation requirements (fall 2023)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor McKenney explained that Trumbull approached about offering the digital media production minor. It was previously approved for Stark. It was not a difficult task to arrange, so they are ready to move forward.

An EPC member asked if the only change was to offer on an additional site.

Associate Professor McKenney said yes, with minor administrative changes.

Secretary Tillett asked how the minor is doing at Stark and why Trumbull and not any other campus.

Associate Professor McKenney said that students from Trumbull Career and Technical Center (TCTC) could easily flow right into the program at the Trumbull Campus. In particular, there is student interest in this issue at all campuses wanting the idea of film and video recording. The Trumbull Campus believes they could really take advantage of the connection there. Additionally, they are looking into building some CCP courses, so students could get some of the coursework done before they graduate high school. Stark just adopted this about two or three years ago. They are not pursuing it aggressively right now. The numbers have not supported that. They thought with the music technology major there would be some overlap, but there has not been. Stark is not seeing big numbers in this, but it is known that the regionals have had some challenges. It cannot be attributed, necessarily, to lack of interest.

V. Course Proposals Review

A. Discussion Items – University Requirements Curriculum Committee (*fall 2023*)

Diversity Requirement

Kent Core Requirement

1. ENG 11002 College Writing I-Stretch to: College Writing-Stretch
2. ENG 11011 College Writing I to: College Writing
3. ENG 21011 College Writing II to: Research Writing

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Cunningham explained that Executive EPC had a question about removing roman numerals. It is obvious, by the course numbers and GPS, that students cannot take ENG 21011-College Writing II until they complete ENG 11011-College Writing I. The roman numerals does not suggest to students that they need to take both courses or that the focus of each is different. While 21011 is a continuation of the first writing course, it is an extension and more involved. The language of it being a continuation indicates that students will continue using the processes they learned in 11011, which is peer review, workshops drafts and revisions. The proposed name changes articulate both to students and instructors how these classes are related, but different. Students who have had any writing exposure in high school tend to assume that they do not need the basic information that they presume is included in the first writing course. The college writing courses shift focus from purely academic writing and the writing process to academic writing requiring research and analysis. For example, that is not the same kind of transition as elementary French one to French two. The new titles make the distinction very clear. Roman numerals are not necessary to indicate that students need to take both. The course numbers indicate that one is 10,000 level and the next is 20,000 level. Further, in the GPS system, students see all of the classes that they need to take, which will only continue to improve and become more obvious with the Kent Core initiatives. Anecdotally, the students that have been spoken to, a lot of whom are already in these classes or some of whom have moved on, liked the new titles and thought that they made more sense. One member of the Writing Program Committee said that she could not tell you how many times students waited until later in their academic career to take College Writing II. The students mentioned how they wished they would have taken it sooner as it would have helped with the research foundation and all of their other courses. It is not obvious to students that is what the class is, so it is being renamed Research Writing. The name change will help make the content more obvious. Other Ohio institutions are interested in the name change and would like to do similar. This would make Kent State's writing program at the forefronts of these changes in how composition courses are perceived by students and others outside of the discipline. The Executive EPC also asked about more information about the confusion students were experiencing. Students were misinterpreting the roman numerals to mean that they only need to take one of the two courses and that they can skip the first one entirely. What they do not understand, because the names are vague, is that the first course provides a foundation for writing and teaches students how to write drafts and receive feedback. Before coming to college, most students do not understand that writing is a dialogic process and undervalue or do not understand the importance of receiving feedback in order to revise. They also tend to write in a five-paragraph essay format largely due to standardized testing, which we totally understand. This class helps them understand that and move beyond it. The second writing course applies all of what they learned in the first writing course, but it focuses more on finding, evaluating and integrating secondary sources. Including the word research is in line with the field of writing studies, and the less about what is considered research

in terms of empirical research and other disciplines. Finding, evaluating and integrating secondary sources applies to all disciplines, and the name research writing is not meant to be a class for all majors, but a class for all students. It is a foundational class that is relevant to all other core classes and to basic academic research concepts that can be applied to all fields. The second course has had a research component since the state learning outcomes were updated about 15 years ago and is meant to give students the opportunity to understand the basic concepts of researching, writing, and using secondary sources that can be applied to any discipline. Changing that name will help instructors who have been teaching before these updates occurred when that class was a literature class and some are trying to hold on to that, even though that meets none of the learning outcomes, it is a research writing course. The other issue that arose with Executive EPC was confusion with transfer students. The Writing Program Committee does not believe that these name changes would confuse any transfer students who already work with advisors and the writing program when they are figuring out which courses to transfer. The state maintains course equivalency management system that would be updated with these name changes. The Flash Credit Estimator would also be updated with the name changes.

An EPC member asked how students do not understand that they have to take College Writing I and II and how do they know students are confused. Additionally, the new name for the course may be more confused with this course name being like others within other majors.

Associate Professor Cunningham explained that the confusion comes from the roman numeral that makes students to believe that they are beyond that course and can skip it and they do not need College Writing I at all.

An EPC member asked if the Kent Core requirements say students must take both.

Associate Professor Cunningham said there are ways they do not have to take it. In the past, when Kent was using ACT, if students had a 26 or above, they could skip College Writing I. Now that it is test optional, students need to take College Writing I. The department wants students to understand that when they are looking at the core, there is a class called College Writing and a course called Research Writing. They are similar because they are both writing classes. However, they are different in the content and the research part of it is this idea of finding an integrating secondary sources, learning how to evaluate those courses, know what is credible, what is not credible, understand the basics of how a research essay is written and how to integrate valid sources.

An EPC member asked if students can test out of College Writing I in some manner.

Associate Professor Cunningham said they can still do that with the ACT score, but very few do.

An EPC member asked why they are still proposing College Writing and not something that is more specific to what happens in the course.

Associate Professor Cunningham explained that the Writing Program Committee has debated this for some time. It makes most sense to the committee to because college writing is learning

the writing process and that writing requires a dialogue and feedback. They thought of a lot of names, but College Writing fit best.

An EPC member asked what technical writing is compared to research writing. Also, should there be sections focused more on what STEM students are writing about as opposed to standard English.

Associate Professor Cunningham said that professional and technical writing is something completely different than research writing. The course does apply to STEM. They are teaching in a way that should apply to all fields and disciplines in terms of finding sources, integrating sources and knowing how to make sure that sources are credible. APA is used in the courses because it is used more widely. The way that research writing in College Writing II is taught already applies to STEM.

An EPC member asked how long College Writing II has been taught that way.

Associate Professor Cunningham explained that the change at the state level happened 15 years ago and the focus on APA began in 2018.

An EPC member expressed concern that students get to their senior year and are asked to do projects and they cannot write. There is obviously a disconnect senior and sophomore year.

Associate Professor Cunningham stated that the name change could also help with that. Some students do wait until senior year to take College Writing II. They wish they had taken it sooner as it would have helped with other courses. The hope is if they know that it is research writing, then they will be more likely not to wait and realizing it can help with other courses.

Chair Dauterich added that there are two seniors and three juniors in College Writing II. That is not typical of previous the college writing teaching experience.

Associate Dean Warren explained that these changes passed through Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee unanimously. There were no concerns brought up by any of the representation within our units, which include Psychology and Biology. If there were any concerns, they would have been raised and asked for these changes to be tabled.

An EPC member asked if the name change would help students take the course sooner.

Associate Professor Cunningham explained that if students get an idea of what the course is about from the name, they are more likely to take it sooner.

Secretary Tillett asked if students may feel daunted by taking a course called research writing so early in their academic career.

Associate Professor Cunningham said she would rather know students know what the course entails than a title that they do not know or understand. If it says, "research writing," at least they will know it involves research.

An EPC member asked about hyphenating with College Writing – English I and Research Writing – English II.

Associate Professor Cunningham explained that they did not see the need to make the title longer.

An EPC member asked if students would understand they have to take both.

Associate Professor Cunningham said, yes. There is no reason why students think they have to take College Writing I and II right now, except through GPS.

An EPC member suggested seeing if there is a way, university-wide, to get the writing courses in early in the college career to alleviate some of the deficits.

Associate Professor Cunningham said that students working with advisors are getting these courses in their freshman and sophomore years. She agreed that would be ideal to for all students to take the writing courses early in their college career.

With no further questions, comments or concerns, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 4:56pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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