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

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

Faculty present: Professor Karen Gracy; Associate Professors Brian R. Barber, Vanessa J. Earp, Doug Ellison, Michael J. Ensley, Michael R. Fisch, Eric S. Kildow, Dandan Liu, Denise M. McEnroe-Petitte, Abe G. Osbourne, Helen Piontkivska, Christopher Rowan, Jonathan F. Swoboda; Assistant Professors Bethany G. Lanese, Maggie Stedman-Smith; Senior Lecturer Tracy A. Laux, Jennifer R. Metheney; Associate Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturer Kristy Jacobsen

Faculty not present: Associate Professors Mitchell J. McKenney, Geoffrey Steinberg, Blake Stringer

Students present: Seth T. Young

Guests: Donna Alexander, Susan Augustine, Denise Bartell, Frank Congin, Alicia Crowe, Chris Dorsten, Stephanie FusSELL, James Hannon, Tony Hardin

Chair Edward Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 19 September 2022, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes
A. Meeting on 22 August 2022
Associate Lecturer Marshall made a motion to approve the item, and Professor Earp seconded the motion.

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

II. Presentation
A. Flash Credit Estimator for Transfer Students
Ted Mckown, senior associate director for transfer enrollment
Misty Sommers, transfer operations analyst
View the presentation
Ted stated that the Flash Credit Estimator is located on the transfer website. It is a recruitment tool that students can use to plug in their own credits. It is specific to Kent State and will allow them to see how credits apply directly to a Kent State program. The information is pinging off DegreeWorks. Students can request to speak with an advisor and have the information they put in reviewed. The program also allows students to schedule a visit, apply, send transcripts, view scholarships and learn more about financial aid and file a FAFSA. The tool allows students to review how their credits will transfer without contacting anyone. Since the tool captures the student’s information, the transfer team will follow up with the student afterwards.

Misty explained that sometimes students input courses that are not yet in the transfer table. Students can manually add courses to their Flash Credit Estimator list. This triggers the system to e-mail the transfer team to review the course and, if acceptable, add it to the transfer table. While the course(s) are being reviewed, they will stay in the “pending courses tab” for the student. When the course is added to the table, the student will get an e-mail saying that the course has been added and they can go back into the estimator to see how it will transfer.

Therese asked if students could put in their credits and the system tell them what majors their credits would apply.

Ted said that it does. The system will recommend programs in addition to the ones they have chosen and show how far along the student is within each program.

Therese asked if the system would let the student know a certain grade would need to be met for a course.

Ted explained that they are not able to plug in grades into the system. There is, however, program information and links so students can determine if there are certain grades needed.

Misty added that there are defaults that will alert students that there may be additional requirements and to refer to the university catalog for more information. There are also times when the title in GPS states the minimum grade requirement. This will show on the estimator.

Chair Dauterich asked if there was any feedback from students on the estimator.

Ted said that students have been excited to use the estimator. If the students fill out the profile, they will get an e-mail 24 hours after requesting to have a meeting. The next step is a virtual appointment with a transfer enrollment specialist. The specialists can then explain about minimum requirements, course sequencing and more. They also help the student determine the best time to transfer based on their chosen major.

**A. Academic Calendar Advisory Committee**

*Deborah Knapp and Therese Tillett, co-chairs*

[View the report](#)

Therese stated that the committee has reconvened for the fall semester. The recommendations to the calendar from the committee were approved. The next step is to review the summer term.
Summer has always been setup as 13 weeks with part of terms (i.e., 3-week intercession, 5-week summer I, 5-week summer III). The new changes decreased the summer term by one week. Parts of term will need to be reconsidered. The committee is very robust and ready to commence work this week. There are many faculty on the committee that utilize the summer term. The committee will be reviewing data including student data, what other universities do and best practices. The goal is to make a recommendation by the end of the semester.

An EPC member asked if spring break would be coming to the committee as an issue.

Therese said that it has not been given to the committee as a charge, but the committee will review and make recommendations if requested by Faculty Senate.

Senior Associate Provost van Dulmen added that the spring break issue would be going back to Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate can send it back to the calendar committee.

**B. Transfer Credit Committee**

*Edward Dauterich and Joanna Liedel, co-chairs*

[View the report](#)

Joanna stated that the committee had their first meeting, and they have a lot of new faculty members joining. Faculty are a very important voice on the committee, and they wanted to make sure they were well represented. The committee met to set the tone for the semester and decide on projects. One project will be a one-page document of best practices and tips for faculty that are reviewing courses. Another project will be to create a document of state initiatives to keep faculty and advisors informed. These documents will be made easily accessible. The committee is open to any transfer issues and concerns that need reviewed and encourages to bring those forth.

**IV. Program Proposals Review**

**A. Action Item**

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

*(Presented by Associate Professor Jennifer Roche)*

1. Speech Language Pathology – Ph.D.: Revise major name to Communication Sciences and Disorders; revise course progression requirements

[View the discussion](#)

Associate Professor Roche said that the program is looking to change the name of the Ph.D. program, because R1 and R2 programs typically their doctorates are going to be in communication sciences and disorders. Not in speech language pathology. The revision also included changes to the curriculum. The language in the graduate handbook was also changed to reflect some of the changes.

Therese asked if it is the norm in this field to have a specialized pathway for each student at the Ph.D. level.
Associate Professor Roche replied, yes. Across the board, the faculty are very mentor focused. Each student that comes in is working with a faculty member. Each faculty member has a different focus. Some focus on swallowing, cognition, autism and other areas.

Therese asked if it is the trajectory for the students to go into teaching and/or research.

Associate Professor Roche said that is correct. The Ph.D. is not practice or clinical. It is research-based only.

An EPC guest said that the School of Communication and Information would be sending some trends and other information to be attached to the proposal as Associate Professor Roche had reached out for consultation.

Senior Lecturer Laux motioned to approve the item, and Associate Lecturer Marshall seconded.

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

**B. Lesser Action Item**

**College of Arts and Sciences**

**School of Multidisciplinary Social Sciences and Humanities**

1. Liberal Studies – L.S.M.: Revise program requirements by replacing AS courses with new LSTU courses *(fall 2022)*

*(View the discussion)*

An EPC member asked about an approval from the chair of the faculty advisory body.

The school director, Julie Mazzei, stated that it was approved, and a letter could be attached.

An EPC member asked for evidence of consultation with the school advisory committee (i.e., meeting minutes).

Julie said that a letter will be written and attached to the proposal.

An EPC member asked for documentation of advisory committee consultation part of the curriculum process.

Jennifer Kellogg, Assistant Director of Curriculum Services, explained that when CIM was implemented, colleges, schools and departments were able to customize their approval pathway. Units, eventually, have wanted to represent more people in their approval pathway and have, thus, added approvers to the approval flow. Some of the colleges have put in a comment and/or meeting minutes saying that it has been approved by the faculty approving body on a certain date. More units may be recommended to document approvals, in the future, for those not represented on the approval flow. Jennifer gave examples of how to leave a comment on a proposal saying that the advisory body approved the proposal on a certain date (i.e., “Approved by [advisory committee name] on month/day/year.”) Minutes from the advisory body can also be attached.
With no further comments, questions or concerns, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 4:16pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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