



Meeting Minutes
Monday, 15 May 2023
[View the Meeting](#)

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

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

Administrators not present: Dean Versie Mallard-Johnson

Faculty present: Professors Karen Gracy, Tiffany Taylor; Associate Professors Brian R. Barber, Doug Ellison, Michael J. Ensley, Dandan Liu, Mitchell J. McKenney, Abe G. Osbourne, Blake Stringer, Jonathan F. Swoboda; Assistant Professors Bethany G. Lanese, Maggie Stedman-Smith; Senior Lecturers Tracy A. Laux, Jennifer R. Metheny; Associate Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturer Kristy Jacobson

Faculty not present: Professor Helen Piontkivska; Associate Professors Vanessa J. Earp, Michael R. Fisch, Eric S. Kildow, Denise McEnroe-Petitte, Geoffrey Steinberg, Brett D. Tippey; Assistant Professor Tina Patel

Guests: Donna Alexander, Susan Augustine, Chris Dorsten, Susan Emens, James Hannon, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Tracey Motter, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Jennifer Newberger, Stina Olafsdottir, Eboni Pringle, Andrew Shipka, Hollie Simpson, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 15 May 2023, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 17 April 2023

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

With no questions, comments or corrections, the minutes passed unanimously.

II. Presentations

A. Update on Re-Envisioning the Kent Core

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen stated that subcommittees have been working on questions about the Kent Core. Phase one began this past year. The phase included involvement of 100

individuals and three subcommittees focusing on budget questions, focusing on distinction and design and organization. In the fall semester, members of leadership and subcommittees went to all academic departments to get a sense of what worked and did not work in the Kent Core and what they would like to see going forward. The consensus from other universities on trying to re-envision the general education program failed, because people were trying to do it too quickly and others were not on board. Doing something different requires having multiple conversations, having everyone at the table, making it student-focused and meaningful experiences for instructors in the education program. This project will last approximately five years. The design subcommittee focused on six areas of student outcomes and are currently working on the use Q-Sort to inform prioritization of strategies (educational experiences) supporting student outcomes. The subcommittee did not want to focus on which courses are on the Kent Core, but wanted to focus on student experience and meaningful for instructors. The distinctiveness subcommittee focused on how to make the experience unique to Kent State. The subcommittee identified four broad themes and carefully gathered and reviewed data. The budget subcommittee's main focus is to answer how current RCM is impeding the Kent Core and options to improve it.

Dean Smith explained that the next steps are to develop an advising listening tour this summer and solicit feedback from advisors. URCC will be starting conversation about infrastructure and starting a strategy on student listening tours. Data analysis of the faculty listening tour will be completed and combined with the NSSE data. In August, URCC will launch the alumni phone campaign to hear feedback from employees and employers in the workforce. A summit will be held in the fall along with finalizing the initial phase of subcommittee work including developing initial piloting projects.

Chair Dauterich asked how faculty can get more information on how RCM impacts the Kent Core.

Dean Munro Stasiuk explained that the subcommittee asked this question to a number of people on the campus. A lot of it was on decision making on offering classes and how RCM was implementing the offering of those classes. The feedback showed that the RCM was affecting how the classes were being offered. The subcommittee will focus recommendations for student experience and how the classes are offered.

Secretary Tillett asked if there were any universities reviewed that they believe could be considered an aspirant gen ed structure.

Associate Professor Marcinkiewicz said that there were pieces of many that are great, but not one that stood out.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen added that Paul Gaston was one of the consultants that was adamant about not locking into a certain model or university. The consideration should be what is best for Kent State and consider bits and pieces from other universities that work well instead of one as a prototype.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked if there was a noticeable difference between units that were offering Kent Core courses that are must-haves and those that are options.

Dean Munro Stasiuk said there was a trend of split between courses that must be taken and courses that are options.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Transfer Credit Committee

[VIEW THE REPORT](#)

Director Liedel stated that the transfer committee aims to provide education about transfer credit. The committee has also worked on documenting business practices. Another topic that the committee has discussed is how to evaluate alternative credit. Discussions are centered around what is fair, consistent among students, transparent to students and faculty and keeping within Kent State ethos. This semester, the committee continued discussion on awarding upper division general credit for lower division courses. The discussion will continue with looking at what other universities do. Other work included creating documents and a presentation for faculty on how to award credit and other transfer credit information. The committee will be offering to come to other committees to present and provide more information on transfer credit. There is a program for the state of Ohio called One Year Option (OYO). This is for students pursuing the ATS degree and adult students participating in the Ohio technical centers. Technical center students who have gone back to get certain certificates and want to roll that into an associate's degree can roll it into the ATS. The committee also discussed if this could be awarded to students from proprietary schools or students pursuing other degrees and has a program from an Ohio technical center. The committee agreed to stick with the state's standards. Otherwise, an articulation agreement could be created so there is a one-to-one legal document for what is accepted. The committee had a lot more faculty participation this year and encourages more faculty to participate.

IV. Policy Proposals Review

A. Action Items

EPC Academic Calendar Advisory Committee

1. Summer Term—Revise parts of term in the summer to accommodate term length decreasing from 13 to 12 weeks (*summer 2024*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Secretary Tillett stated that the Academic Calendar Advisory Committee is an EPC subcommittee. There were approved changes to the fall and spring semesters that will go into effect this coming fall 2023. Those changes will allow fall to start on a Monday as well as ensure both fall and spring semesters have enough instructional days for our contact to credit hour ratio. Alternatively, the changes caused a loss of one week in the summer term. This affects the last week of the summer term and reduces summer to 12 weeks instead of 13 weeks. The charge of the committee was to determine options that would provide minimum disruption as well as options with accelerated seven-week offerings, preserve as much as possible, activities that occur during intersession and review offerings in open learning. Recent federal regulations have brought forth more rules that said non-standard terms and open learning courses would be considered non-standard. They must comply with more complex rules for federal financial aid. Those rules may delay aid disbursement to students who are taking courses in open learning. The committee wanted to look at how many courses are in open learning and how to alleviate that. Another open learning issues is a lack of transparency of deadlines, because it is not part of an established part of term. The deadlines are not in a public place, because the start and end date of the particular course may be unique to that section. Additionally, final grades for open learning

sections do not roll to history or the student transcript until the end of the term. The committee did a deep data dive reviewing five years' worth of summer terms. This does not include the pandemic summer. The data showed that summer one is the most enrolled followed by summer three and open learning. The committee reviewed other Ohio universities. Fifty percent of Ohio public universities have a 12-week summer term. They are all inconsistent and do it slightly differently. They all have two six-week sessions. Additionally, a survey for feedback of options was sent to full-time faculty, department chairs, school directors and campus and college administrative leadership. The data showed that students and faculty need a break. The first recommendation is to leave intersession as it is, summer one starts two weeks after spring semester, summer two starts the same time as intersession and there will be a two-week break between summer three and fall semester. The benefits of this will be to keep all parts of term at current length and this does not negatively affect students' financial aid if they take both summer one and summer three courses. The challenges include 18% of survey respondents said overlapping intersession with summer one and two was not acceptable. Recommendations for the first and second seven weeks would be to either overlap or to create a first and second six-weeks. The overlapping seven weeks would keep the length and remain aligned with seven weeks schedule in fall and spring. The first and second six weeks allow seven-week courses to shorten by a week if the program area does not want to overlap, allows summer two courses to increase if program area does not want to teach in five weeks and 61% survey respondents selected it as their first option. The full-term recommendation is for 13 weeks to be reserved for practical experience only. The final recommendation is for a full term or 12 weeks that includes a break before and after. If approved, the recommendations would go into effect in summer 2024.

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

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen asked what it would mean for the recommendations to be implemented.

Registrar, Chris Dorsten, stated that the new parts of term fall on the schedulers and the college/departments to build. Any parts of term that already exist do not need built. The lift of scheduling the parts of term falls on chairs and directors and deans to review the schedule. Faculty will also need to submit grades more often with more parts of term. Financial aid will need to see how SAF will roll in the summer. It will make things more complex, but will be doable. There was a lot of conversation about added lift.

An EPC member asked if there would be any impact on faculty load.

Senior Lecturer Laux stated that there are some restrictions. Everything for full-time, non-tenure track and contract would be covered regardless of the change because of language that puts an overall restriction on 15 credit hours for the summer, not including intersession. Regardless of how many session there are, there is always that fall back language in the CBA. No impact is expected in regards to the CBA.

Chair Dauterich asked if only the 13-week session is limited to what departments are doing or can they mix and match whatever works best for their pedagogy or desires.

Secretary Tillett said yes, that is what the committee is recommending. The 13 week will only be for practical experiences.

The Registrar, Chris Dorsten, added that a report could be created to monitor the parameters of the terms as needed.

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

2. Spring Break—Revise placement of spring break to the ninth week (*spring 2024*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Secretary Tillett stated that the committee worked on reviewing spring break for two years. The current structure of spring break is in the 11th week of the semester. It falls between the second and third five week and falls near the beginning of the second seven-week classes. The committee's recommendation is to move up spring break to the ninth week. It will almost be in the middle. The recommendation is for the ninth week and would become effective in spring 2025. Data showed that 62% of Ohio public and private universities schedule spring break in the ninth week. Only Kent State and The University of Akron have spring break during the 11th week. Most courses are scheduled for the full term. If moving spring break to the ninth week, it would be in the second, five weeks. The majority of students are scheduled for full-term courses and the fewest are scheduled for the second five-week courses. When surveying students, faculty and staff, 42% chose the ninth week for spring break. Respondents liked the ninth week, because it was in the middle of the semester. Additionally, it would allow everyone to recharge after midterms. Many respondents noticed that with the 11th week spring break, students do not want to return or are less engaged. Additionally, concern about local school district's spring breaks came up. They tend to follow what the universities do. Any school districts around Kent will align with the changes.

An EPC member asked about Nursing's perspective on the ninth week.

Dean Motter stated that the ninth week is perfect as it will give students a break before they start again.

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

With no further comments or questions, the item passed.

EPC NF Mark Committee

3. NF Mark—Revise the process of assigning the NF mark at the end of term (*fall 2023*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Therese explained that EPC approved the temporary NF mark (never attended) subcommittee last year. It has not had a comprehensive review since it was created. Two recommendations are being brought forward for the council to approve one of the options. In 2003, the university established the NF (never attended) and SF (stopped attending) marks. It was a federal mandate to all universities that for students receiving federal financial aid, they should not get aid if they did not attend the course, or they get partial aid if they stopped attending. The university approved two marks to replace the NA. They now count as an "F" grade in the student's GPA.

Associate VP for Business and Administration Services, Stina Olafsdottir, explained that faculty assign the NF mark using the academic engagement verification roster. It is calculated as an “F” grade in the student’s GPA. It is displayed on the student’s transcript and appears on the degree audit as not counting towards the program course. This triggers a system email to the student that they have been assigned an F marker for the course. Some faculty submit an earlier alert notification of a pending “F.” Advisors also reach out. Students are liable, if applicable, for tuition and or fees for courses reported as “never attended.” Students must petition if they want the NF mark removed from their academic record. There are two different petitions. Current term courses, if approved, the course is removed from the academic record. For prior term courses, if approved, the course is not removed from the academic record and the student receives a “W” grade. With both, if applicable, a tuition and/or fee credit is applied to the student’s account. Kent State is required to send outstanding student account balances to the OAG’s office for collections. Kent State is unable to recover balances of courses with NF markers. The court system views these as unjust enrichment with no benefit conferred. Students at the OAG office must file a tuition refund appeal to have tuition and/or fees reversed for courses they never attended.

University Registrar, Chris Dorsten, stated that one of the things that the data showed is that the NF marker is a great motivator for students to take action. They either start attending the class or withdraw. The data showed that students who start attending those courses do really well. If they missed a few classes at the beginning, an instructor indicates that they have not been attending. Notification goes to the student which, most of the time, alerts them to either withdraw or start attending the class. Most students (80%) who initially received an NF mark either started attending the class or withdrew. The academic record of the students who started attending the class was not negatively impacted. Almost 74% passed the class with 62% of those students earning either an A to a B-. The majority of students (88%) had one to two NF marks. Only a few students earned an NF mark in all of their classes did not return to Kent State. If a student received all NF marks, they did not return. Most students who earned an NF mark in two or three courses also did not return. Overall, 80% of students who receive an NF mark are successful while 20% are unsuccessful. This attests to what the NF mark and alert is doing for students.

Secretary Tillett added that Kent State does a lot of effective communication to students. Students receive notification from the Registrar’s Office, Student Financial Aid and Bursar’s. Additionally, some faculty also reach out immediately to students. The Student Success Program reaches out to students if faculty put in an early alert. Colleges and campuses all do their own outreach when they see students having an NF mark. There is no lack of communication with the students which helps them take action.

Stina explained that both recommendations include automating the removal of the course after the term has ended. Both options result in removing it from the GPA, not appearing on the audit or transcript and reversal of tuition which may or may not result in a refund. Option one removes the course after the term has ended for all students who receive one or more NF marks as a final grade. Option one is a way to address administrative barriers and equally apply the benefit of removal of the NF mark to all students. Consider with this option that if students know the grade will automatically be removed at the end, they may not start the course. Option two is the removal of the course after the term has ended, but only for students who received all NF marks

as a final grade. Option two addresses administrative barriers. It does not equally apply the benefit of the removal of the NF marker to all students.

An EPC member asked if the removal of the NF mark at the end of the semester has any impact on students who fall below full time because of an NF mark.

Stina said that, currently, as soon as the NF marker is assigned it is deducted from their time status. This means, even though they are unofficially withdrawn, the Bursar's office runs a report each week to watch for that. The Bursar's Office does not wait until the end of the semester for those. One reason the NF mark was created was to be able to watch for students not attending or stopped attending a course.

An EPC member asked if that would impact internal scholarships.

Stina said it could impact their federal financial aid.

An EPC member asked which option of the two the committee chairs recommend.

Chris stated that there are challenges with both. Option one applies the benefits to all and option two only applies to students with all NF's. The data shows that we have more students that will fall under option one.

Stina added that the process for adding an NF mark would not change. After the semester ends, a report is run and for those students who did not withdraw and did not attend the course, there would be an automated process to reverse tuition and remove the NF mark. The amount of students that this would impact is low compared to how important it is to allow the semester go as it should. Not every NF mark results in money owed. It depends on what it is for, the time and status.

An EPC guest asked for clarification as to how or why these options would remove the administrative barriers.

Stina explained that if students realize they during the semester as opposed to after the semester, the instances are treated differently. Navigating the petition is also very cumbersome. The committee wants to avoid the barrier to students. Treating both instances the same can help with that barrier.

Chris added that, currently, students have to petition and ask for the NF mark to be removed. Sometimes they do not know to ask, or they do not follow up. If the process was automated, then every student would get the same outcome. None of the students would be penalized by this, because it does currently impact their GPA which leads to potential probation or dismissal.

Therese added that the data shows that students that get all NF marks do not come to Kent State and had no intention to come. They probably registered for courses and then decided not to come, or they were going to another university and did not check their Kent State e-mail. The population of students with all NF's is small. If NF's are removed from all students, including continuing matriculating students, students may have no inclination to do anything because they know it will be removed at the end of the semester. That is something to consider.

An EPC guest asked if the NF will still impact financial aid.

Therese said the NF mark impacts financial aid no matter what. How financial aid handles the NF mark will not be changed. Also, the SF and NF marks do not shutdown Canvas as it did for Blackboard.

An EPC guest asked if it would also impact satisfactory academic progress.

Therese said yes. There are repercussions. Students who are on federal financial aid and the NF mark drops them below full-time, then they are on aid. This would motivate them to get in the class or register for another class.

An EPC member added that when an SF or NF grade is assigned, the student needs to talk to them to get back into the course. The student needs to agree to a contract about how they are going to get caught up and stay caught up. They are manually deactivated in Canvas until then.

Chair Dauterich asked for members to raise a virtual hand in favor of options one or two. Option one had the most votes. Chair Dauterich asked for a motion to approve option one.

Associate Lecturer Marshall made a motion to approve option one, Professor Taylor seconded the motion.

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

V. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items

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

1. German – M.A.—Inactivate program; last student enrolled in spring 2022 (*fall 2023*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Dean Warren stated that the department is waiting to inactivate the program due to no students being in the M.A. The department is trying to make some changes and reviewing their programs.

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

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

With no other comments or questions, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 5:11p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christa N. Ord

Christa N. Ord

Operations and Special Projects Coordinator, Curriculum Services

Office of the Provost