



**KENT STATE**  
UNIVERSITY  
Educational Policies Council  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, 16 December 2024  
[VIEW THE MEETING](#)

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

**Administrators present:** Deans Peggy Shaddock, Deborah F. Spake

**Administrators not present:** Interim Associate Provost Scott C. Sheridan

**Faculty present:** Professors Alan A. Brandyberry, Karen Gracy, Robert D. Jewell, Athena Salaba; Associate Professors Brian R. Barber, Vanessa J. Earp, Michael J. Ensley, Michael R. Fisch, Samuel Kim, Bethany G. Lanese, Abe G. Osbourne, JD Ponder, Pamela L. Stephenson, Jonathan F. Swoboda; Assistant Professors Tinyuan Guan, Christopher W. Totten, Yuening Zhang; Senior Lecturer Tracy Laux; Associate Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturers Lisa M. Davis, Olivia B. Krise

**Faculty not present:** Professors Steven Rugare, J Vick; Assistant Professor Stephanie Fussell

**Students present:** Lisa Onyao

**Guests:** Kevin Adams, Sonia Alemagno, Mandy Anderson, Maureen Blankemeyer, Thomas Brewer, Scott Bunge, Frank Congin, Alicia Crowe, Chris Dorsten, Susan Emens, James Hannon, Amirhossein Jabbari, Eric Jefferis, Ebone Jones, Chia-Ling Kuo, Kelsen LaBerge, Emily Metzgar, Stephen Mitchell, Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Helen Piontkivska, Christa Porter, Linda Ruse, Hollie Simpson, Alison Smith, Misty Sommers, Kathy Spicer, Sue Wamsley, Dee Warren, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 16 December 2024, via Microsoft Teams.

---

## **I. Approval of Minutes**

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

Senior Lecturer Laux made a motion to approve the minutes, and Associate Lecturer Marshall seconded.

With no comments or corrections, the minutes passed unanimously.

## **II. Subcommittee Report Out A. Credit Transfer Committee**

### **A. Credit Transfer Committee**

#### [WATCH THE REPORT](#)

Assistant University Registrar, Misty Sommers, stated that the items that were discussed this fall were the Transfer of Undergraduate Credit policy. It was discussed in late spring and revisited in the fall. Feedback was given by the committee. The updated format and edits were overseen by Joanna Liedel and then reviewed again with the committee in early October. Notes were finalized at the end of October so it could be posted for the academic policy review. Information on the fall review cycle was presented to give faculty a chance to ask for clarification on areas where there were common questions. The committee took a more in depth look at the Ohio Seals on high school transcripts and what they might mean for Ohio students coming into Kent State as well as how those deals might be connected to alternative credits on a Kent State student's record. Topics that the committee will be discussing are an informational update on statewide certificate credits and marketing handouts that are available for the programs that benefit from ITAG credits, graduate transfer credit and the policies that guide the process so the group can share feedback and how to help educate the faculty who are approving that. In September, Misty sent out an invitation to faculty who are involved with the syllabus to review to see if any of them were interested in joining the EPC subcommittee, but did not hear back. Another recent email regarding faculty transfer training received some interested parties who completed the recorded training and the after-video quiz. Misty is hoping to get the committee's feedback on a paired advisor training session being created for the spring after winter break and then review which additional areas to offer training for next.

Secretary Tillett asked where the committee is on the best practices guidelines for review and approval of transfer coursework.

Misty explained that faculty training was developed. It was basically a webinar to go ahead and update faculty on how to review if they were involved with evaluating transfer credits coming in from a student or looking at syllabi. The training was completed in fall 2022 and started training faculty in fall 2023. The first session had great turn out and the video of the session was dispersed to faculty. There is a questionnaire at the end that they can take and when they will get an emailed badge saying they have completed the training. For the first session, an invitation was sent to the faculty on the transfer credit list. There was 50% compliance with that. More than that came, but 50% filled out the questionnaire at the end. She said she gets good feedback on the training.

Secretary Tillett asked if the training information is also available in a written document.

Misty said yes, the slides from the training are in a PDF form.

## **III. Council Business**

### **A. Action Item: Dispute resolution process**

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

Chair Dauterich explained that the document itself was brought about because of a recent dispute and what is going on with T28. The executive committee agreed that it would be good to have a formal, internal process for EPC in case of a dispute between a curricular body and administration or two different curricular bodies. The document discusses how to initiate the process and who is able to do it. Once these disputes are reported to EPC then the item will

become an action item on the EPC agenda if they were not already designated as an action item. One representative from each disputing faculty curricular body would be invited and the administrator or the designated delegate for the administrator would come and present. Supporting information would be submitted. The document discusses the submission guidelines. The document also talks about what will happen during the discussion at EPC. The EPC will then take a vote if there is a disputed item and then the results will be communicated to Faculty Senate via the chair and the provost. If someone does not like EPC's decision, they can appeal to Faculty Senate for additional consideration. That Faculty Senate decision would be final if it is specified in the EPC approval process or would then go to the next appropriate body.

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

Senior Lecturer Laux asked for clarification that the final decision for the item would be at a curricular body (i.e., EPC, Faculty Senate) and is final decision on the advice from faculty.

Chair Dauterich said yes.

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

### **B. Discussion Item: Voting status for inactivation of minors and certificates**

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

Chair Dauterich stated that to establish a minor or certificate, it takes EPC to vote on the item. However, when they are up for inactivation, they do not need voted on. The Exec EPC saw there was a discrepancy.

Secretary Tillett added name changes. Maybe the inactivation or the name change of a major requirements a vote at EPC, because it also requires a vote at Faculty Senate, Board of Trustees and they must be submitted to ODHE. However, it is kind of unusual that EPC votes to approve a new certificate and minor, but not to approve a name change or inactivation of said certificate or minor. Secretary Tillett said she wanted to discuss this with EPC to see how members felt and if there should be a vote on these items for an inactivation or name change.

Chair Dauterich said, for consistency, it would be interesting to do the same things. However, it can be left as it is.

Senior Lecturer Laux said he likes the idea of balance. However, he is leaning towards keeping it the same unless someone has an issue with it or if it ever becomes problematic.

Secretary Tillett added that she does not know if anyone has ever had an issue. The only time there is an issue with a name change is when faculty may feel there is encroachment. It does not create any more paperwork to raise these to action items. It is just a matter of that EPC would have to vote on it rather than just find it on the agenda and review it.

Associate Lecturer Marshall asked if the inactivations and name changes usually get resolved before they are on the agenda if there is a conflict or do they come to the agenda even when there is remaining conflict.

Secretary Tillett explained that if there is a conflict, it tends to be another discipline, department or college. It does not happen very often, but it just depends on whether they see it and if they are to pay attention to the agenda. She said that her office always tries to ensure that if it looks similar to another program's name, that they ask the unit to reach out to the other unit to discuss. However, the office does not always know if there is encroachment based on terminology. That is also the same with conflict over a course. It depends on who and when they see it on the agenda or when they hear about it.

Chair Dauterich added that someone could always turn an information or lesser action item to an action item to be voted on at any time.

Associate Professor Ponder said talking about inactivations of minors does serve to bring awareness to the situation. Particularly, if other programs have those minors listed in informal ways as suggested education.

Associate Professor Ponder made a motion to change the voting status inactivations for minors and certificates, and Senior Lecturer Laux seconded.

Chair Dauterich said there is a motion on the floor to change the process so that inactivations of both minors and certificates will be action items.

Secretary Tillett asked for confirmation that it would not include name changes.

Chair Dauterich said no as it is not listed on the item.

With one nay, the item passed.

#### **IV. Policy Proposals Review**

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

##### **Graduate Policies Council**

##### **1. Academic Standing – Graduate Student—Revise policy**

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

Associate Professor Barber stated that the Academic Standing policy was part of the review cycle for the committee last year. The committee took some time on this one and made quite a few changes. Changes made by the committee are:

1. Removed variance by credit hour—eight credit hours of grades lower than a “B” or more than four credit hours of grades lower than a “C.”
2. Focused on a GPA of 3.0 whereas it was not consistent in the past policy version.
3. Referred to other policies rather than duplicating information.
4. Added in references to minors, certificates, endorsements, licensures and non-degree as not counting toward completion requirements, but are, in fact, counted in the GPA.
5. CPM specific outcomes were moved to a separate section.
6. Clarified probation and the amount of time allotted to be in good standing.
7. Suggested the students may not begin a new graduate assistantship while they are on probation. They may continue in a role, but not be hired into a role while on probation.

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

Secretary Tillett asked about students being put on academic probation at the end of the semester in which their overall GPA and graduate courses within the current program is below 3.0. She asked if it was the semester and overall GPA or semester GPA with only the courses in the program.

Associate Professor Barber stated that there is no program GPA at the graduate level right now. So, it is their semester GPA, overall GPA.

Secretary Tillett added that a student could be taking a graduate course that would not count towards their program or is a prerequisite.

Associate Professor Barber explained that is why they put in the language to specify that those minors, certificates and so on do not count toward the completion requirements, but they do count toward the GPA. There was some confusion at one point with the prior version as to whether or not they counted toward the GPA as well. The committee responded that they do count.

Secretary Tillett asked if this would display in banner or how department chairs or program coordinators be aware if a graduate student is on probation.

Associate Professor Barber said he is not exactly sure how that is going to be handled as that is part of the procedural side.

Secretary Tillett stated that the policy proposal says that enrollment is permitted only on a term-by-term basis until probation is removed. She asked if that meant that a student cannot register on their own until they are off probation.

Associate Professor Barber said he believes that is what it means.

Secretary Tillett asked a follow-up question if the expectation is that the registration restriction will be added to the student that they cannot register until they do something like see an advisor.

Associate Professor Barber said he thinks that is the intention, but it could be clearer. The committee can make the adjustment to be clear in the language on that sentence.

Secretary Tillett asked about the section that says students must obtain a minimum 3.0 semester GPA the first semester after probation. Failure to do so will result in academic dismissal. She asked if that meant they have one semester on probation and if in the second semester back, they are still below the 3.0 if they would be automatically dismissed.

Associate Professor Barber said he thinks that is the idea. Essentially, it means that they have not improved their GPA for a year. Therefore, if they have not improved it to a 3.0 in a year, they would move into the dismissal category and follow the procedures there.

Secretary Tillett stated that departments need to know about this, because she believes this is new.

Associate Professor Barber explained that these were passed through GDAC and went for a 30-day review and several other feedback. When policy revision goes into effect, there is probably some notification that needs to occur. That is probably something EPC needs to be aware of. When policies are revised through subcommittees, they do go into effect at some point, and someone needs to let people know.

Secretary Tillett said she recommends discussing with the registrar that it is something that is expected of that office. Otherwise, it is not going to show up in banner.

Associate Barber assured the registrar had a lot of input into the policy through the committee.

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

## **V. Program Proposals Review**

### **A. Action Items**

#### **College of Applied and Technical Studies**

1. Insurance Studies – B.S.—Revise degree name to Bachelor of Applied and Technical Studies (new degree to Kent State); seek approval for a 90-credit hour bachelor's degree; revise delivery to online only; revise description, course requirements, roadmap (*fall 2025 pending final approvals*)

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

Dean Shaddock stated that Kent State currently offers a Bachelor of Science degree with a major in insurance studies. That degree, like most, has several parts to it. One part is the full Kent core and then also has the major requirements and an electives list. The insurance studies degree has enough with the required courses and general electives to reach 120 credit hours. The reason for the proposal is that there is an emerging national trend toward looking at applied degrees, such as insurance studies, to determine whether appropriate learning outcomes could be met with fewer than 120 credit hours. This fall, the Higher Learning Commission, Kent State's accrediting body, launched a new, substantive change application specifically for what are called "reduced credit bachelor degrees." The proposal is to change from a Bachelor of Science to a Bachelor of Applied Studies. It is Kent State's first use of this new process through Higher Learning Commission. The reasons to consider a different bachelor's degree for a subset of students served by Kent State can be summarized in several points. Some applied areas, such as the insurance industry, where there is a high demand for workers. A shorter path to completion of an applied bachelor's degree may meet some industry needs. A second reason to look at this is that for adult learners who are already working in an applied field, such as in the insurance field, career advancement by earning a bachelor's degrees can be very important. Finding a way to accelerate that process can increase the number of citizens who are getting higher education rather than selecting not to attend college at all. This is an opportunity to open doors for people who would not have considered higher education. The third reason to look at this approach is to keep Kent State competitive in a changing world. Kent State really needs to expand the kinds of higher education we can provide, thereby attracting students who would not engage, or have engaged otherwise. Reduced credit bachelor's degrees are being proposed by several nearby competitor institutions. Having the College of Applied and Technical Studies (CATS) offer a different bachelor's degree is one way for Kent State to set a tone for a high-quality degree, but one that is different from other bachelor degrees that the university offers. The college proposes to offer a different bachelor's degree with continued high quality is to keep essential components of the bachelor's degrees at Kent State which are full Kent Core and full 39-hour upper division

course requirements. The way to reduce credit is a little bit of a reduction in the required courses within the major. In this case, it would be two introductory business management technology courses. The larger change is to reduce the credit hours in the courses that students are choosing, including the major electives list and the general electives list. The target audience for this are students who are adults already working at jobs in the insurance industry.

Associate Lecturer Marshall made a motion to approve, and Dean Spake seconded the motion.

Associate Professor Ponder asked for more understanding of the “less than 120 credit hour” options mean.

Dean Shadduck explained that there has been a lot of discussion in higher education about whether bachelor degrees that are not fully 120 hours, but have fewer required hours are an option that should be seriously considered. There are other universities across the country as well as other accrediting bodies that are really entering into this area. What is being proposed is a different degree. It is purposefully named different to differentiate it. This is a different approach to a traditional bachelor's degree. The Higher Learning Commission stepped into this realm, because there is a whole national working group made up of several different universities that are piloting this kind of thing and different accrediting bodies that are piloting this. The Higher Learning Commission was taking a hard look and setting up a process to follow. There is a 10–15-page application that goes to Higher Learning Commission. This is a growing pressure to consider the option of whether students are getting a valuable bachelor's degree. With significant learning, there are different approaches that people are taking. For example, Brigham Young University is doing something where they are doing more stacking of lower level. That is why it was pointed out that the college thinks upper-level requirement of 39 credit hours was important to have. There are some others that are choosing to reduce the core. The college, again, said that it is not the direction Kent State should try, but that we should see those pieces as the essence of what we do in a bachelor's degree. This proposal is an attempt to show that a 90-credit hour degree can be done. It does not necessarily fit everywhere, but for selected degrees and selected audiences of learners it may be a very good option.

Professor Jewell asked about the criteria for determining whether a program were to qualify for this technical educed credit hour degree. He asked, for Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship, if accounting or finance be considered for a 90-credit-hour degree.

Dean Shadduck said faculty from the university should probably have a deep discussion and debate about the broader issue. The insurance studies major seemed like a good starting point and very obvious for this 90-credit hour degree option. Exactly where those lines are and what should or should not be considered is something that would need to be debated by faculty in different disciplines if they chose to consider this. The College of Applied and Technical Studies has programs that are direct career pathways. They are not, in most cases, programs that are heading people toward graduate education. Therefore, those seem very clear through the college but may not be as clear through other colleges.

Professor Jewell replied he is not sure how the council can approve it without any specific criteria. The council does not have a way to judge whether the program would qualify properly or not if there is not some sort of standard for which to compare it. Another concern is if

accounting decided to go this way and other departments did not want to, would there be an interdepartmental competition for students? Programs competing for students based on credit hours; 90 versus 120. It is a really serious precedent that would be set if the university adopts this lower credit hour degree.

Professor Salaba added that she agrees that a broader conversation needs to be done before we can start looking at individual proposals. This proposal is a new type of bachelor's degree that is different from what Kent State is offering or, at least, what the requirement is so far it says that a bachelor degree requires 120 credit hours minimum. What is needed first is allowing 90 credit bachelor degrees and then criteria of what those 90 credit degrees would be. She said she can see many units wanting to change their program from 120 to 90. What would qualify needs to be discussed.

Dean Shadduck reiterated that the college, with this proposal, is not going to claim that they have the magic answer to exactly what guidelines the university might like to put forward on some of this. The college is certainly trying to trigger some of these questions by bringing forth a proposal like this and trying to bring on that seems quite clear as a good candidate. Some additional discussion is needed. The process for bringing that was to bring one forward. The college thinks it is a really good opportunity and would love to have Kent State be a leader rather than a follower. A concern she has is that the university debates things for three or four years before making a decision on it. She said Kent State, in her opinion, will get left in the dust because others are moving fast and hard in this field. Dean Shadduck's recommendation is to possibly limit to two or three proposals in the College of Applied and Technical Studies that the university puts forth to pilot and try them while also establishing guidelines, limits, directions and strategy for anything broader for the university.

Professor Jewell stated that if insurance studies is an obvious candidate, then there must be some set of criteria that made this one be brought forth.

Dean Shadduck said it is very much related to target audience. The target audience is primarily adult learners who are already engaged in this applied field and are aiming for a more accelerated pathway to earning a bachelor's degree. That target audience are people where the bachelor's degree is the end result. Not just trying bypass something else and choose some easy path. They are trying to achieve a very clear, important goal. She does not think it would work for every degree.

Professor Jewell replied that there would be no way to preclude anybody from signing up for this. It could ultimately end up where 25% are the expected target market, but the other 75% are other students. He said he is concerned that this places Kent State between a community college degree and bachelor's degree. Getting ahead of something is not a good enough reason. That is at the risk of belaboring it without having some real clear criteria.

Assistant Professor Ruse added that there is a tremendous need for employees and insurance now. Several years ago, when the insurance studies program first started, Ohio Governor Kasich started ensuring Ohio futures and all these initiatives to get government agencies to work with insurance companies to get the workforce ready for this enormous need in the industry. It is projected that 108,000 jobs are going to be available in the next 8 to 10 years in Ohio alone, because insurance employees, such as the baby boomers, are all getting ready to leave around the



same time. So, there is going to be all sorts of jobs. A program like this would enable these students to be ready for all these great opportunities. Ohio Insurance Institute estimated that the average salary in the insurance industry was around \$90,000. By having an accelerated program, you get these individuals out there a year earlier to take advantage of the employment opportunities. Although there is a target audience, it gives other students who might be on the fence about going to college an opportunity in the insurance world that might be persuasive. Also, the parents would be interested in saving that year of tuition and having their child enter into a somewhat lucrative position right off the bat. She said she has a lot of students working in the insurance industry that are stuck, and this program would help them move along and do so faster.

Dean Spake asked for confirmation that, in designing this degree, the amount of business course credit was kept below 25% threshold to not trigger accreditation, which again, is one of the rationales for using a lot of Kent Core in addition to wanting a liberal arts education, it helps to balance out the insurance studies courses with what might otherwise be perceived as business courses so that it is not a business degree.

Dean Shadduck said that is correct. It is not a business degree. It includes 21 hours of direct insurance courses. That is one of the reasons, if it goes down to a 90-hour degree, then it needed fewer hours that could be interpreted as business, or it would have triggered a different kind of accreditation than is to handle this degree. That is why the two BMRT courses were eliminated from the required major courses. Linda has taken a hard look and is working also directly with the BMRT faculty to make sure that those major concepts are incorporated in the insurance courses without going over the hours.

Assistant Professor Ruse added that there are several elements of what is covered in the business classes that are being eliminated in the program already. It is a regulated industry. So, arguably, there is more compliance coverage in the insurance studies classes than a lot of other programs.

Dean Spake reiterated that the business content needs to be less than 25% of the curriculum or it becomes a business degree. Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship is not quite ready for a 90-credit hour business degree.

Dean Shadduck said it is 21 of the 90 hours and is less than 25%.

Senior Lecturer Laux suggested either tabling the proposal or voting to either move it to Faculty Senate or not.

Chair Dauterich agreed and said that the council can decide to table the proposal or vote. If no one wants to table it, then it can go for a vote.

No members chose to table the item. Chair Dauterich called for a vote.

The item passed with one nay vote and one abstention.

**College of Arts and Sciences****Department of Biological Sciences**

2. Botany – B.S.—Revise major name Plant Biology; revise course requirements, roadmap (*fall 2025*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Professor Piontkivska stated that this proposal is essentially housekeeping to change the name to fit the offering of courses a bit better. Botany is Greek derived word and plant biology is a little bit more user friendly. The department is not changing anything in the program. There is a minor exception, because Department of Chemistry now offers general chemistry for life sciences courses. So, the department edited the roadmap to facilitate students taking either gen chem or gen chem for life sciences. Otherwise, it is essentially the same program. The reason is that the faculty who wanted to do that is to make it somewhat user friendly for students to find course offerings. The program usually has 25-30 majors. These folks go on to have careers in environmental sciences or other interdisciplinary things. That is why plant biology is a better name.

Senior Lecturer Laux made a motion to approve, and Associate Lecturer seconded the motion.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

**Department of History**

3. History – Ph.D.—Suspend admission temporarily (*spring 2025*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Dean Munro-Stasiuk stated that one of the things they do in the college is monitor all the programs systematically. That is done through collected metrics in the college office and then through program review. After looking at a lot of metrics and discussions within the college, dean's office and the history department, Dean Munro-Stasiuk initiated this and asked the department to consider pausing admissions to their Ph.D. program effective this year. The reason for this is financial, data related to student outcomes and related to diminishing interest in the program for potential students. To put this into context for the entire department, because the department itself has for a little over 100 undergraduate majors. So, it is pretty healthy in that respect. The Ph.D. program has 15 students. So, it is pretty small. What is clear is that faculty in history are particularly passionate about their research and preserving the doctoral program and the current students also have a great sense of pride in their program. That is not being diminished through the proposal. In terms of the financials, one of the real big issues is the program itself receives no SSI from the state and never has. A snapshot from last year, master's and doctoral programs combined in history received a total revenue, before we removed the administrative fees, a little over \$238,000 from the tuition and fees from students. Only \$13,619 comes from the doctoral tuition. So, it is a tiny fraction. Looking at the revenue available to the college and department from the doctoral program, once you remove the administrative fees, it literally produces only \$7,000. This is nowhere near enough to support 9 doctoral students. Looking at the cost side of the programs, it is a little bit more difficult to separate the absolute cost between the masters and the doctoral education. Between the two programs just last year, the college spent about \$139,000 in stipends, \$85,000 in tuition, \$9,000 in insurance and \$336,000 in faculty workload entirely dedicated to the graduate programs. So, both the master's and Ph.D. program. Looking at the graduate level, that is a net loss of \$450,000. Graduate education is expensive. It is never really going to necessarily pay for itself unless you are lucky enough to have a program that is attractive to self-paying students and those kinds of things.

Quite often, with the doctoral program, that is not the case. The hope would be that those costs would be offset by undergraduate education within that same department or even within another area of the college if it is deemed that the department or program is important enough to keep. The issue is that the entire department was in deficit by about \$700,000 last year. Total revenues generated in the department were not enough to offset any of the graduate education. So, for the college, it was a decision if the program is important enough to keep subsidizing it from all other monies that the college is making. Another thing that was reviewed was student success measures as well as the second set of criteria. Looking at the documentation, there is a lot of information on this. Currently, there are nine students in the program. Almost half of them are year seven or beyond. This is a program trend. Students take quite some time to finish. At the end of their sixth year, only 25% of those graduate students had graduated. Looking at an 8-year graduation rate, 33% of their students actually completed after eight years. This is a low number. It does take longer in history, but it is still really low. To offset this, when thinking about how much of the faculty time has actually been used to work with these students, it is very high. This program has been reviewed externally three times and internally reviewed once in the last two decades. All four of the program reviews were critical. They used language like “low quality,” “not viable” and “3<sup>rd</sup> tier.” In 2004, the external review committee considered this a third-tier program that should rethink its purpose and structure. The committee also recommended that if the university wanted to make it more competitive then it needed invested in, but there was no investment. The internal university review showed that the program is clearly at the minimum size. They recommended suspending admissions for fall 2006. That did not happen. In the 2012 external review, the committee stated that even when relatively prestigious institutions are cutting their Ph.D. programs, there is not a convincing rationale for continuing the doctoral program in history. Graduate recruitment and placement is poor. The overall quality of the graduate program is inadequate to justify a Ph.D. program and the recommended abolishing the program. Nothing happened after that review. The most recent review in 2020 states that if the college wishes to continue supporting the program, it needs to invest heavily in faculty resources, because graduate students do not have the depth of faculty, they need for a strong doctoral education. They praised the current faculty for being dedicated. However, it also said if the college is not willing to make that investment, then the department should seriously consider discontinuing the doctoral program and investing everything in the M.A. program which would allow the faculty to participate in the M.A. program and the undergraduate program. Distributing the workload over the two programs instead. She said she recommends taking the \$336,000 in faculty time and reinvesting that into the master’s program and also in teaching more undergraduate courses since there is a demand there. She said she believes this will have no impact on the faculty other than the fact that they will not be mentoring Ph.D. students eventually but will still be teaching and mentoring master’s and undergraduate students.

Associate Professor Adams said he is attending to represent the consensus of the FAC against suspending admissions to the Ph.D. program. One thing to emphasize is the lack of state subsidy which ended in the early 1990’s when the state of Ohio began to condense programs across a variety of fields. This is why the action plan that was approved by the dean’s office and the provost in 2020 and 2022 had a culminating step, an application to the state of Ohio for subsidy, because that was seen as the only way to move forward to make this a viable program. In relation to the program review, the end result was to create a reimagined focus program with thematic concentrations that connect with faculty expertise, KSU’s unique institutional history and analytical trends in the discipline. That has been done over the last four years. Students have been admitted to the program including two first year students who have come from Texas and

New Jersey to take advantage of the reimagined program. The preference to the faculty would be to ask that the action plan be allowed to serve its natural lifespan and apply for state subsidy. The department asked that it be allowed to seek external funding within a defined timeframe via foundations in partnership with the Western Reserve Historical Society and their connections in Columbus. Along with federal monies for certain fields like African history, which have been done quite well. In the meantime, students would still be admitted but not funded. New lines would not be offered. This would not be a burden on existing resources in terms of workload. There are no distinct doctoral level classes. The students are coming in and taking classes with master's students, so there will not be any savings in terms of faculty workload. It would be a strategic misstep given the reanimation of SB-83 which has within its provisions the creation of a mandatory civics course that resembles the American institution's requirements found in many states across the union. If that is to come to pass, the department along with political science will be tasked to serve another 4000 students per year approximately capacity which cannot be met at the present time. If this is a scenario that comes to pass, there will be a need for Ph.D. lines in history to help expand those sections and serve as adjuncts once they pass their doctoral exams to help meet demand. He encouraged to hold off on this until that all plays out.

Senior Lecturer Laux made a motion to approve the item, and Dean Shadduck seconded the motion.

Senior Lecturer Laux said when he read the item, it says suspend admission temporarily. He asked what temporarily means.

Secretary Tillett explained that from a university policy standpoint, temporarily is a maximum of five years. At which point, if it is not reopened or revised and reopened, then the provost has the authority to inactivate it. It can be reopened at any time within the five years.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked if there was anything that would be done within the five-year suspension period by either party.

Dean Munro-Stasiuk said she does not foresee reopening the program.

Associate Professor Adams said he would anticipate that the history Chairperson, Ann Heiss, might create a panel of colleagues who are committed to finding funding and pursuing those options to see if they are viable.

Senior Lecturer Laux said looking down the lines at applying for funding or a miracle from the possible passage of a version of SB-83 leading to a need for more Ph.D. programs or fund Ph.D. programs in the state of Ohio.

Dean Munro-Stasiuk said it would be more appropriate to hire a non-tenure track faculty member if needing extra teaching at the undergraduate level and that it is more cost effective.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked about the other local history Ph.D. programs in Northeast Ohio.

Associate Professor Adams replied that there are none in Northeast Ohio. Kent State is the only one left. The state subsidizes at University of Cincinnati, Ohio University and Ohio State University. So, the program has persisted without state subsidy.

The item passed with three nays.

**College of Education, Health and Human Services**  
**School of Lifespan Development and Educational Sciences**

4. Child and Youth Practice – Minor—Establish minor to be offered at Kent Campus (*fall 2025*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Blankemeyer stated that the human development and family science program is proposing to eliminate all concentrations. The school still wants to have some child and youth entity available to students since it is so popular. In short, it will be replacing one component of the major concentration with a minor, but a paired down version. The minor is 15 credits whereas the concentration was 26. The school is inactivating one of the minors as well. This was originally on last month's agenda, but because it was considered new, the school appealed since it is essentially no new courses and, basically, pairing down a concentration into a minor. It will be available to all students in other majors as well.

Senior Lecturer Laux motioned to approved, and Associate Professor Barber seconded.

Dean Shadduck asked if the school considered whether any courses that are in human services degree or social work might be good options within the minor that might also allow this minor to be open to students from regional campuses.

Associate Professor Blankemeyer said that they have looked at regional campuses because they do have an HDFS program. They have not looked at social work, but it is certainly something she is willing to bring up with faculty.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked EPC leadership if the establishments on the agenda have gone through the appeal process.

Secretary Tillett explained that the College of Education, Health and Human Services did request an exception for this minor. It was approved by the provost for the reasons Maureen stated. The two public health programs the provost has approved the initial inquiries. It is not the full proposal and is not voted on. The provost did approve initial inquiries to move forward during the moratorium. However, the full proposals for public health were approved by the provost to move forward. The course establishments on the agenda were approved under the exceptions to the moratorium. So, they are either required in a program, slashed with an existing course or it was a substantial revision that culminated in the inactivation of the current course and establishment of a new course.

Associate Professor Ponder pointed out that HDFS 24011 is a prerequisite to four courses in the minor. However, it is not listed in the minor. He asked who the intended audience would be for the minor and if they would already have HDFS 24011 completed. If the students may not have HDFS 24011 completed, he asked why it may not have been added to the minor.

Associate Professor Blankemeyer explained that the primary audience would be HDFS majors, because they will be required to have a minor. HDFS 24011 is required of the majors.

Secretary Kellogg added that a lot of the courses that are required in the program are actually going through for revision to revise those prerequisites. So, looking at the courses with a circle

next to them means that those courses are also going through their own revision and there is a proposal for them. If you click on the blue course link on the proposal, it will only show you the current description. It is not going to show you the revised description.

Associate Professor Ponder asked a follow-up question about whether the revisions would then include no prerequisites for the courses in the minor.

Associate Professor Blankemeyer stated that there are no hidden prerequisites.

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

Dean Shadduck expressed concern that in the Cybersecurity Engineering B.S. there are no potential options with Information Technology (IT), Cybersecurity A.A.S. or the Information Technology B.S.

Professor LaBerge said she would have to get with the faculty lead, Denise, on this, but if Dean Shadduck saw anything that could double count to please let them know and they can review them. The college has been trying to give CATS students pathways into bachelor's degrees within, at least, the engineering and engineering technology program.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked if units decide to discuss potential to collaborate on an item going through EPC and then one unit backs out of the collaboration that was discussed at EPC, if there is any recourse for the other unit.

Chair Dauterich said, as it stands with EPC, the item would pass unless someone disputed it during the meeting. Someone could elevate the item to an action item, and it could be voted on. That does not mean that if someone notices it has not been discussed after EPC that it could not be brought up again. So, that particular EPC meeting would not be the end-all be-all.

Associate Professor Fisch asked about the consultation for course CS 44004 Drone Programming. There is no consultation with the College of Aeronautics and Engineering.

Associate Dean Warren explained that it is a revision of the course description and not a new course. There is a new slashed version of the existing course also on the agenda.

With no further questions, comments or concerns about items on the agenda, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 5:08pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Christa N. Ord*

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