



Educational Policies Council

Meeting Minutes

Monday, 18 November 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: Interim Associate Provost Scott C. Sheridan; Deans Peggy Shaddock, Deborah F. Spake

Faculty present: Professors Alan A. Brandyberry, Karen Gracy, Robert D. Jewell, Steven N. Rugare, 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 Stephanie G. Fussell, Tinyuan Guan, Christopher W. Totten; Senior Lecturer Tracy Laux; Associate Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturers Lisa M. Davis, Olivia B. Krise

Faculty not present: Professor J Vick

Guests: Sonia Alemagno, Mandy Anderson, Maureen Blankemeyer, Sean Broghammer, Scott Bunge, Frank Congin, Scott Courtney, Alicia Crowe, Chris Dorsten, Susan Emens, James Hannon, Amirhossein Jabbari, Jay Jonas, Ebone Jones, John McDaniel, Stephen Mitchell, Christa Porter, Dirk Remley, Matthew Rollyson, Hollie Simpson, Alison Smith, Kathy Spicer, Dee Warren, Jennifer Wiggins-Lyndall, Cathy Zingrone, Haithem Zourrig

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

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 21 October 2024

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

With no comments or corrections, the minutes passed unanimously.

II. T28 Action Items

A. Temporary moratorium on new units, programs and courses

[View the Item Discussion](#)

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan stated that the T28 framework is currently being discussed. The goal is to have a final model for academic reorganization through or by February 2025. The Provost's Office would like to put a temporary moratorium on the establishment of new courses, majors, concentrations, minors and certificates through February 2025. Even though the agenda

does not have a specific end date on it, this is not intended to be something that is long lasting. This is largely aimed at all the discussions about reorganization and potential movements. The Provost's Office felt it was in the best interest to put a pause on a lot of these proposals until the conversation is done. There are going to be exceptions to the moratorium including:

1. Courses that are considered "new" because of significant revisions to an existing course, which results in "new" course paired with the inactivation of the current course.
2. Courses that are created to slash with an existing course at a different level (e.g., new 4-level course to slash with an existing 5-level course), or courses that are moving levels, so that "new" course is paired with the inactivation of the current course at a different level.
3. Courses that are created as a new requirement in a program.

Dean Spake asked if concentrations being elevated to majors, like Public Health to gain STEM designation, if those could be considered in the exceptions to the moratorium since they are not creating something new.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan said he would talk to the provost about it.

Dean Shadduck asked, since College of Applied and Technical Studies is not part of T28, what language should be used to communicate to the faculty and staff about the moratorium.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan said the Provost's Office is looking at this from the perspective of the overall university system with regard to new curricular proposals. A lot of that was couched in between T28. Another thing the office kept in mind is the financial aspects of where the university is right now. There are a lot of components, such as reducing curricular complexity. Interim Associate Provost Sheridan said he is reviewing courses and programs with low enrollment and review things from a holistic approach. For right now, the office wanted to put a hold on things for a couple months while they are sorting out T28.

Professor Ensley stated that there does not seem to be a vision behind this. It is not saving money to not put these classes on the books. In general, from discussion with faculty, there seems to be no vision behind this and why it is happening. They have not had a chance to discuss it in either CCC or CAC. At this time, the sense is that faculty do not really support this.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan stated he understood the points made. He reminded that this would be only for the next three months.

Chair Dauterich asked if these items get put on the March agenda, would that be enough time for them to be effective for fall 2025.

Secretary Tillett stated that the curriculum process and deadlines are not changing. For example, a new major, like MPH, which would be a new major those concentrations if that appeared on the March agenda there is a possibility it could be approved for fall 2025.

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

Associate Professor Ponder asked if the moratorium was effective immediately.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan stated that it would affect future EPC meetings going through the meeting in February. The ones that are on the agenda today fit the exception criteria.

Associate Professor Ponder asked about courses approved at a CCC, even though they did not show up here, would be put on hold until post February 2025.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan said, correct.

Chair Dauterich asked for clarification that the list of proposed new units, programs and courses are being postponed.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan said, yes. Those are the ones that Therese pulled from the agenda.

Associate Dean Warren asked, if there are going to be program exceptions, would Interim Associate Provost Sheridan communicate that to the colleges. There is one Arts and Sciences program wanting to inactivate a major and replace it with a broad minor.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan asked Associate Dean Warren to send the details.

Associate Dean Crowe stated that EHHS faculty pulled out a concentration from a program that has a lot of students, streamlined the program, got rid of all the others that are not as popular and pulled those out into a minor. The program was requiring a minor but opening up choice to a lot which would include creating the minor so that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the students in the major would have the minor that they already are basically taking in the degree right now. If the proposal is passed, later they will be cutting off the courses that students are currently already taking because they will be moved into a minor for them to streamline the program and to get rid of other parts of the program. Associate Dean Crowe expressed concern about this proposal not being allowed on the agenda and another proposal streamlining. Longer term, it would be great for the college to know ahead of time so that they may not do this.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan asked Associate Dean Crowe to send details of this so he can understand better.

Associate Professor Lanese asked for clarification on the process of submitting information for an exception.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan replied that he discussed the concentration elevation with Sonia today. Dean Alemagno is already aware of the situation.

Assistant Professor Fussell asked when the moratorium would be voted on.

Chair Dauterich said that this is an action item for today. Things can be done to not vote on it, but right now, this would be something that the council will take a vote on.

Associate Lecturer asked about the items held from the November agenda that fall under the moratorium exceptions, if those would be added to the January agenda.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan said, yes.

Chairperson Zourrig asked if the moratorium would affect the special topic course topics.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan said the moratorium is for the establishment of new courses.

Chair Dauterich added that the moratorium would not affect courses that are already established like special topics courses.

Assistant Professor Fussell asked about special topics courses that have been offered and they want to make a regular course. Can this not move forward or is it part of the exceptions?

Secretary Tillett said if it is going to be a requirement in a program, it would be part of the exceptions. If it is going to be a prerequisite to a course in a program, then it most definitely should be a requirement in the program.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked if the council is voting on the moratorium or the moratorium with an appeals process to the provost.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan said that it could certainly be possible to add the appeals process to the moratorium item.

Professor Salaba added that the council needs to know if the exceptions criteria are the only items allowed or if there can be more exceptions.

Chair Dauterich asked if anyone would like to make a friendly amendment to the moratorium item.

Senior Lecturer Laux made a friendly amendment of the moratorium that includes an appeal process to the Provost Office.

Chair Dauterich asked for a motion to approve the friendly amendment.

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

The moratorium with the friendly amendment for an appeals process to the provost passed with 17 yeas and 5 nays.

B. Program suspension/inactivation process

[View the Discussion](#)

Secretary Tillett stated that the item being voted on is about removing suspended programs from applications. Curriculum Services would like to work with admissions to decide the term for suspension or pulling the program off applications once there is evidence showing faculty approved the program suspension and the is a CIM proposal is in the workflow. The proposal goes through the same workflow steps. Secretary Tillett said she is asking to be able to work with admissions to remove the program from applications before it comes to EPC and possibly to the CCC. The reason being is so that none can be applying to the program in the interim while

the proposal is still working its way through the CCC and coming to EPC which may be a month or two. Steps after the evidence of faculty vote to suspend and CIM proposal in the workflow:

1. Curriculum Services requests application data for the open admission terms.
2. Following individuals convene to review application data and decide suspension term:
 - a. Vice President for Enrollment Management
 - b. Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
 - c. Dean of Graduate College
 - d. Associate Vice President for Admissions
 - e. Associate Vice President of Curriculum Planning and Administration
3. The provost is notified of the suspension decision and term.
4. Admissions works with the college to craft the communication to be sent to applicants.

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

Secretary Tillett added that the provost, department chair and assistant/associate dean are notified of the suspension decision and term.

Assistant Professor asked for clarification on suspension and inactivation.

Secretary Tillett explained that a lot of people get confused between suspension and inactivation, because they are used differently. Suspension can be thought of as a pause in admissions with a goal to reopen admissions within five years. Suspension allows change to a program with not having to deal with new students coming in. Suspension can also be a step before inactivating. A program could pause admission and teach out students, but not allow new students to come in. The goal would then be to inactivate. Suspension can be used for different intentions, but suspension is not inactivation.

Professor Rugare said that this clarification is needed, because a lot of people may be confused.

Secretary Tillett agreed and that she has seen the possible confusion in meeting minutes. Faculty will decide not to suspend a program, because they want to make revisions. Which they can do during a suspension or pause. Current students can change their program to the suspended program, and it still displays in the catalog and search majors and degrees with a notation that the program is “not accepting applications as this time.” To reopen the program, a CIM proposal should be submitted to reopen admissions.

Professor Salaba suggested using “suspension of admissions to a program” rather than “program suspension” to help with confusion.

Secretary Tillett agreed and said, going forward, she would “admission suspended.” The caveat, if a program has been suspended for five years and nothing has been done with it, then the provost has the authority to inactivate the program. So, it would have a possible end date after five years of suspension.

With no other comments or questions, the item passed with one nay.

III. Academic Unit Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Office of the Provost

[View the Discussion](#)

1. Center for Educational Leadership Services, Center for Environmental Technology and Applied Research

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan stated that the Provost's Office asked all campus deans to look at all centers that were affiliated with each of the respective units. This was done initially as part of the plan to do center reviews more broadly. The first request was to see which centers are still active. Administration came up with 15 different academic centers and institutes that are not actually active. This proposal is to eliminate those centers and institutes that fall into that category. The list is attached to the agenda, and all show the approvals through the relevant deans in the process.

Dean Shaddock made a motion to approve, and Professor Salaba seconded the motion.

Senior Lecturer Laux stated that the reason there is a discussion to do more generally review institutes is because it is university policy that each and every center and institute at Kent State will undergo review every five years.

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

IV. Policy Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Graduate Policies Council

[View the Discussion](#)

1. Dissertation for the Doctoral Degree—Revise policy to add the Ed.D. degree in programs requiring a dissertation; decrease dissertation committee membership from four to three members; and require student's advisor to have full graduate faculty status in their college and be in the student's program area (*fall 2025*)

Associate Professor Barber stated that the committee wanted to provide clarity and alignment with the current university practice regarding the committee size and structure. The revised policy includes the education doctorate degree that is in the College of EHHS in the programs that do require a dissertation. It also decreases the dissertation committee membership from a minimum of four members to three. That is in light of some programs or units that may not have four members to allow them to fully staff dissertation committees. It requires that a student's advisor have full graduate faculty status in their college and be someone from the student's program area. Note that this committee structure proposed as a minimum and it is basically driven by program size, number of faculty, etcetera. To date, this has been done through some rounds of support and there was a university review period from August 30th to September 27th where members of the university were able to provide feedback on the draft. The committee has responded to that. The committee also has support from GDAC and the provost as of earlier this month.

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

Associate Professor Ponder asked for a definition of “program area” that is listed in the document.

Associate Professor Barber explained that it is an academic unit where the student is receiving their curriculum. He said he is not sure if there is a university definition.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked if these are all catalog policies and not university policies.

Associate Professor Barber said they all do go through the catalog, and some are in the policy register.

Secretary Tillett clarified that all of these policies are only in the catalog. Not the university policy register.

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

2. Residence Requirement—Revise policy to add a residence restriction for graduate certificates and minors, which was previously only in the graduate transfer policy (*fall 2025*)

Associate Professor Barber clarified that this is in regard to the “residence” requirement and not the “residency” requirement. The residency requirement means being on campus and having a certain number of hours that a student would take as an in-person student. The residence requirement essentially refers to taking courses at Kent and can be online. The rationale for this proposal is to limit the transfer credit for graduate certificates and minors to 50%, meaning that students have to take the majority of their courses through Kent State University. This was a restriction that was listed in the Transfer of Graduate Credit policy, but because it pertains solely to transfer from other institutions. The committee added language related to hours for graduate students around certificates and minors. The history of this is that it was due to the five-year review cycle, but the committee is proposing this on behalf of GDAC who brought this to our attention. The current residence requirement does not address certificates and minors. The previous amendment of this policy was done in August of 2010. So, it has been a while since it has been updated. This has received support from the university review period that was August 30th – September 27th. Also, the Dean of Graduate College, on behalf of GDAC, supported this as well as the provost earlier this month.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

3. Time Limits for Graduate Degrees—Revise policy to include all graduate programs, which necessitated policy name change to “Time Limits for Graduate Programs”; remove time limits for passing candidacy and oral exams; remove requirement that transfer coursework must be earned within six years; increase limit for post-master’s doctoral students, from nine to 10 years, to align with post-master’s doctoral students; among other changes (*fall 2025*)

Associate Professor Barber stated that setting time limits for graduate programs is fairly common. There are some examples in the proposal. Once the policy was implemented in GPS degree audit, it was apparent that the policy is not as clear as its intention and put in practice differently across colleges. In less than two years of having graduate programs active in GPS degree audit, there were 290 exceptions submitted to waive those time limits. In addition, there

are recent revisions to the Transfer of Graduate Credit policy which included removing Kent State courses as transfers that have prompted a need to examine this policy. That subcommittee conducted research on proposed changes to time limits for graduate degree policies and presented those proposed revisions to GDAC in August. The university review feedback was sent to GPC who made those updates and resubmitted the proposal on their behalf. So far, the support that we received in feedback through the university review period beginning August 30th. It was also approved by GDAC and the provost provided support earlier this month.

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

With no comments or questions, the item passed unanimously.

Undergraduate Policies Council

4. Flexibly Scheduled Course Sections—Inactivate policy; instead, the information will become a definition in the Glossary of Academic Terms (*fall 2025*)

Director Liedel stated that the first two policies are joint with UPC and GPC as they both affect undergraduate and graduate students. Flexibly Scheduled Courses policy is one that the committee reviewed and decided it was actually not a policy. It was just a definition of what flexibly scheduled courses were and felt that policies really needed to be things that affect students. We do not have all of the definitions under the catalog. The committee felt it should move to the glossary of academic terms. The definition is pulled straight from what the catalog policy read. The committee also put it in the glossary of academic terms which is available in the catalog. A link for open learning for students and/or faculty who may refer to some other courses as open learning that refers back to that as well as part of term courses so that they can see because those are all under the umbrella of flexibly scheduled courses. The information is also on the Curriculum Services website. The proposal is to remove it from the catalog and put it in the glossary of academic terms.

Senior Lecturer motioned to approve, and Associate Professor Barber seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

5. Graduation Planning System (GPS)—Revise policy language to reflect the connection of the audit to the catalog year in force and its use for graduation clearance (*fall 2025*)

Director Liedel explained that the committee felt that what was in the catalog actually read like a definition or advertisement of what GPS was rather than defining for the students why it matters to them and what GPS means to them in their program. The committee updated the format, updated the language to reflect the connection of the audit to the catalog year that is enforced as well as it's use for graduation clearance so that students understood it's importance. The graduate policy will be coming forward soon.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

6. Not Permitted to Continue—Revise policy to add appeal information; remove never-implemented business processes; and rename policy to “Program Progression Requirements – Undergraduate” (*fall 2025*)

The committee consulted with advising deans and others. One of the proposed changes is to change the name to “Progression Requirements.” The policy was last reviewed in 2015. At that time, the committee established a very detailed, step-by-step process for removal of students from programs who were not making progress toward a degree. The progression requirements are really about moving forward. Not just about graduation and the requirements that they have to do with. In the audit, the committee did a survey out to 68 programs that were identified in the catalog undergraduate programs as having program progression requirements. They are listed in that area of the catalog. The feedback showed that the process outlined in the policy was not systematically enacted or enacted by almost anyone. There were some business practices that needed established and other things were not. Programs had different interpretations of what they felt program progression requirements were. Some of them actually view them as graduation requirements and not points in their program where they might be held up. The committee found that programs rarely reference “Not Permitted to Continue.” Almost all of them refer to them as progression requirements both in their communication with the students. The proposal changes the name to “Progression” policy to reflect not only what it is called in the catalog, but what program areas routinely refer to it as. The committee removed the detailed business practices which was not implemented and not used by the areas. The committee wanted to make sure the program progression allowed for programs to remove students if they were not making progress, but not give them a detailed map of how they had to do it. The committee also included language for an appeal process. They felt, just like with dismissal from the university and other things, if students felt that there was an unfair reason for being removed from the program, that it was appealable. The committee also talked about what came through the survey and other groups to help strengthen the process and consistency of communication as these programs are communicated to students so that there is a more routine way that students are notified and what steps they need to take in order to remain in good academic standing in those programs.

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

7. Pass/Fail Grade— Revise policy to update name to “Credit/No Credit” and remove restriction of maximum one course per semester (*fall 2025*)

Director Liedel explained that the committee wanted to rename the policy. The proposal recommends changing the name from “Pass/Fail” to “Credit/No Credit.” The biggest reason is it is a designation that more accurately reflects what the students have earned. A “Z” grade is not actually going into their GPA as an “F” grade. It does not affect their GPA. So, calling it a fail is not correct and does not get calculated into the GPA. The committee also reviewed what other universities do. Very few called them “Pass/Fail.” Most of them call them “Credit/No credit” as well. They were very similar to Kent State’s in the fact that new students either receive credit or it just did not affect them if it was not a passing grade. The other suggestion that was given was to remove the restriction of one course per semester part of the policy that limits students to take 12-credit hour pass/fail limit during their college career. There was also a limit that they could only do one per semester. The committee felt the 12-credit hour limit boxed them in enough that it should not say one per semester since there was a limit overall. This is a very underused policy by many students partly because you cannot use it for Kent Core or for anything in the major or minor. So, it is really about exploration and allowing students to take something that they may have interest in but is not going towards their actual program requirements.

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

With no comments or questions, the item passed unanimously.

Office of Curriculum Services

[View the Discussion](#)

8. Ensemble Course Schedule Type—Establish new schedule type for music ensemble courses to be published in the Curriculum Guidelines for purposes of scheduling and determining credit-to-contact ratio (*fall 2025*)

Program Coordinator, Kristi Kamis, stated that the ensemble course schedule type is being proposed by the School of Music for their ensemble courses. Ensemble courses include their large music performance courses. The reason that they are establishing this is that they are currently using an array of different schedule types to classify their ensemble courses, and they want to standardize it so that it is standard across an array of ensemble courses that they offer. They are basing it a lot as well on the out-of-class practice that is required with these courses because as they are playing their instruments, it does require a lot of outside practice. They have incorporated that into the schedule type.

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

With no questions and comments, the item passed unanimously.

V. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship

Department of Marketing and Entrepreneurship

1. Managerial Marketing – B.B.A.—Inactivate program; admission was suspended spring 2024 (*fall 2025*)

[View the Discussion](#)

Chairperson Zourrig said that the program started in 2005. Students, at that time, had different needs. There has been a shift where the department is seeing students looking for more flexible programs and shifts in workforce skills. Over the years, the department has seen a decline in enrollment for Managerial Marketing. The FAC has decided to rework offerings for programs. There are different concentrations within the Marketing – B.B.A. With the decline in enrollment, the department has decided to eliminate the program.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

College of Applied and Technical Studies

2. Enology – A.A.S.—Suspend admission (*spring 2025*) and inactivate program (*fall 2025*)

3. Environment Management— Suspend admission (*spring 2025*) and inactivate program (*fall 2025*)

4. Viticulture – A.A.S.— Suspend admission (*spring 2025*) and inactivate program (*fall 2025*)

[View the Discussion](#)

Chair Dauterich asked if Associate Dean Emens would like to discuss the programs as a slate.

Associate Dean Emens said, yes. The Environment Management program is an associate of technical studies degree. Enrollment has dropped over the years. There are currently no full-time faculty members in the program. The college has another pathway for students to pursue the degree which is through the Individualized – A.T.S. Students would not be harmed if they wanted to pursue this pathway as the college could still bring in their green certificate and give them a block of credit. The second and third program are both A.A.S. in Enology and Viticulture. Both programs have had declining enrollment over the years. Currently, the Enology program has eight students and Viticulture has three. The advisory board felt like students did not need to have an associate degree to be successful in this discipline area. There are currently two certificate programs; one in Enology and one in Viticulture. The college is working with those industry experts to revise those two programs and then the pathway which will provide for students if they want to pursue an associate degree in the A.T.S. Individualized program where they could bring both certificates in and seamlessly allow the students to move forward with an associate degree. So, the college is not clocking any pathways by inactivating the two-degree programs.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

College of Education, Health and Human Services**School of Health Sciences**

5. Athletic Training – B.S.—Inactivate program; admission was suspended fall 2020 (*fall 2025*)

[View the Discussion](#)

The undergraduate athletic training program graduated the last cohort in spring 2023. The school migrated and moved accreditation to the master's degree level in accordance with the accrediting body. There are no longer allowed to be any undergraduate athletic training programs anywhere in the country. In accordance with that change over there being no more programs allowed, and no students enrolled, it has been a year and half since the last cohort graduated. The school needs to inactivate the program because the school can no longer house it from an accreditation standpoint and the graduate level accredited program is already up and running.

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

With no comments or questions, the item passed unanimously.

Associate Professor Blankemeyer asked to request to have the Human Development and Family Science – B.S. item removed from today's agenda.

Chair Dauterich asked if there was any kind of formal process to remove the item from the agenda.

Secretary Tillett said that if the college wants to remove it from the agenda, it will be marked as "withdrawn."

Associate Professor Blankemeyer asked if they will be able to present it once the moratorium is removed later at a different EPC meeting.

Secretary Tillett said yes. It can be brought back at any time.

Associate Professor Kim asked about the reactivation of a course if it will be returned or held until after February.

Secretary Tillett said it would be held back and put on for March with an effective term of spring 2026.

VI. Process Review

Discussion Item

1. Curriculum Disputes Process

[View the Discussion](#)

Senior Lecturer Laux asked to bring forward discussion on the process for handling curriculum disputes. Senior Lecturer Laux stated that last year, a school director and curricular body disagreed on an action item. Everyone was brought to EPC to make their case and EPC voted upon it. It is predicted that this may happen more often. He said he met with the provost recently and with Secretary Tillett and the provost to discuss how to handle EPC items that get either approved by the unit administrator but disapproved by the curricular committee or vice versa. Since this has not been discussed before, contractually, a lot of the role of the curricular committees is advisory. After discussion, the solution was that the disputed item would either go through Exec EPC that makes the decision whether it goes through to the EPC agenda or not or EPC makes the decision like any other curricular issue and votes upon it. Senior Lecturer Laux asked for input from EPC members on if it should be handled by Exec EPC or the EPC body.

Dean Shadduck said it makes sense for Exec EPC to handle this, because it is likely to be able to go into greater depth in understanding the reasons behind the issue than can be done in a larger group.

Associate Professor Ensley asked if EPC would hear from both sides if it came to EPC.

Senior Lecturer Laux said, yes. Both parties would make their case.

Associate Lecturer asked if it came to Exec EPC if both parties would come to a meeting and then Exec make a recommendation to EPC.

Senior Lecturer said that is what they would do. They would either vote to put it on the agenda and EPC would vote upon it or to stop it at that level.

Associate Professor Fisch asked about the advisory of the committees. If they are able to veto something, they are given too much power. Rather, they could advise on what to do.

Senior Lecturer Laux said then it will go into the hands of Senate, because they have the primary responsibility for curricular issues. Senate has that veto power. The faculty get to weigh in during the curricular approval process, but Senate is more than advisory.

Professor Rugare suggested it should come to the whole EPC since it is the body that would see it before Senate. It should be deliberated. Hearing from a CAC member along with the dean would make sense.

Chair Dauterich asked if anyone would like to make a motion to turn this into an action item and vote to send it to either Exec EPC or EPC when these situations arise.

Associate Professor Ensley made a motion to move the item to an action item, and Associate Professor Fisch seconded the motion.

Chair Dauterich said the motion has been made and seconded in moments of conflict between CAC's, FAC's and administration bringing an issue to the floor. The item would go onto EPC to make a decision.

Associate Professor Ponder suggested considering a limit on how long the conversations can be occurring. The concern is it would go the entire meeting.

Chair Dauterich said a limit could be handled at an Exec discussion about the process when this does happen.

Senior Lecturer Laux suggested doing what Senate does with the two meeting rule. Materials would be submitted and briefly discussed at one meeting and then EPC has until the other meeting to digest everything and vote upon it at the subsequent meeting.

Chair Dauterich stated that the motion is to send the disputed items between CAC's, CCC's, FAC's and administration to the full EPC for a vote.

With no further questions or comments, the item passed with one abstention.

Respectfully submitted,

Christa N. Ord

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