



Meeting Minutes
Monday, 20 April 2026
[VIEW THE MEETING](#)

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

Administrators present: Deans Peggy Shadduck, Deborah F. Spake; Associate Provost Scott C. Sheridan

Faculty present: Professors Luke Armour, Jen Cunningham, Robert D. Jewell, Hyunjoo (Gerrey) Noh, Helen Piontkivska, Steven N. Rugare, J K. Vick; Associate Professors Brian R. Barber, Bethany G. Lanese, Abe G. Osbourne, JD Ponder, Sue Wamsley; Assistant Professors Abdelhakim Al Turk, Tianyuan Guan, Janet M. Reed; Senior Lecturer Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturer Olivia B. Krise

Faculty not present: Professor Karen L. Mascolo; Associate Professor Vanessa J. Earp; Assistant Professor Jason Lorenzon; Senior Lecturer Kingsly T. Berlin

Guests: Mandy Anderson, Kelly Cichy, Kim Hahn, Shannon Helfinstine, Kristen Kolenz, Miriam Matteson, Diane Petrella, Amy Reynolds, Kathy Spicer, Jennifer Walton-Fisette, Deirdre Warren, Sharon Wohl, Kathy Zarges, Cathy Zingrone, Melissa Zullo, Haithem Zourrig

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 20 April 2026, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 23 March 2026

Professor Piontkivska made a motion to approve, and Professor Cunningham seconded.

Professor Piontkivska asked for a correction made to her title under the "Approval of Minutes" from "Associate Professor" to "Professor."

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

II. Academic Units Proposals Review

A. Action Item

College of Communication and Information

College of the Arts

1. College of Design, Media and the Arts—Merge the College of the Arts and the College of Communication and Information (*fall 2027*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Provost Sheridan explained that the proposal builds on the previously approved T28 proposal from February 10, 2025, which introduced the Gold Plus model combining CCI and the arts. The primary focus of the current proposal is to finalize the name of the new academic unit following extensive consultation with the chosen name being the College of Design, Media and the Arts. He noted that all other aspects remain consistent with the original T28 approval including the planned launch in fall 2027 while budget structures and related administrative details will be addressed through standard processes moving forward. Associate Provost Sheridan added that bringing the proposal forward at this stage will support admissions and curricular processes by allowing early recoding of units before applications open helping to avoid the complications experienced during the previous implementation cycle.

Professor Piontkivska made a motion to approve, and Professor Armour seconded.

With no comments or questions, the item passed unanimously.

III. Policy Proposals Review

A. Action Item

Office of Admissions

1. Admission of Undergraduate Students—Revise policy

[View the Discussion](#)

Director Kolenz explained that the proposal seeks to revise language in the conduct and criminal history disclosure policy to better align with the questions asked on undergraduate and graduate applications. Specifically, the revision removes the word “felony” from the disclosure so that applicants are required to report pending charges, convictions and dismissals or suspensions without distinguishing between felony and misdemeanor offenses, reflecting the actual application questions. Additionally, the proposal updates terminology by renaming the “personal explanation statement” to “conduct and criminal history disclosure” to ensure consistency between the catalog and the application process, particularly regarding the form students complete after submitting their application.

Dean Shadduck expressed appreciation for efforts to ensure consistency in the policy but raised concerns about the broader implications of collecting criminal history information. She noted that requiring disclosure of all charges, beyond minor traffic violations, is a nationally debated issue, referencing movements like the Ban the Box campaign, which argue that individuals who have served their sentences should not face ongoing barriers in higher education. While acknowledging the intent to clarify and align policy language, she emphasized that some within the university community believe such disclosures should not be required at all.

Assistant Director Nuesch shared a personal perspective based on experience as a student conduct hearing officer, describing a case in which a student failed to disclose past conduct on an application and was later held accountable under the disclosure policy. She suggested the student may have been more forthcoming if there had been a clearer opportunity to explain their history without fear of negatively impacting admission. She raised the question of whether the application will include a clear statement informing applicants that they will have the opportunity to provide a disclosure.

Director Kolenz responded that the application already includes a statement clarifying that answering "yes" to conduct or criminal history questions does not automatically preclude admission to Kent State but does require the applicant to complete a conduct and criminal history disclosure and provide supporting documentation.

Associate Professor Ponder asked a clarifying question related to the earlier discussion, inquiring whether removing the distinction of "felony" from the policy and expanding disclosure to include all non-traffic charges might lead to an increase in the volume of submitted documentation or paperwork.

Director Kolenz explained that she does not anticipate an influx of additional paperwork as a result of the policy change. She described the current process in which students sometimes answer disclosure questions inconsistently and are asked to provide explanations when they answer "yes." She noted that minor traffic violations including cases such as DUIs are common but are not referred to the student conduct review process. She further explained that a pre-admission committee composed of Student Conduct, Student Affairs, KSU Police, Title IX and Admissions reviews cases, when necessary, though minor traffic violations are excluded. Kolenz added that most cases are resolved within a week by the Student Conduct Office. She also noted that Student Conduct conducts basic verification checks to identify any undisclosed information and that there are frequent instances of inaccurate or corrected disclosures during the process. She explained that students submit the application and then receive an additional questionnaire which must be completed before the application is reviewed for admission alongside materials such as transcripts and that Student Conduct then reviews the information. She added that if further review is needed it may take additional time but emphasized that the process is managed in the interest of maintaining commitment to campus safety.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked if the form asks about academic dismissal.

Director Kolenz clarified that the disclosure in question refers to non-academic dismissal and not academic dismissal, noting that academic dismissal has not been routinely inquired about in some time. She acknowledged that both applicants and staff sometimes confuse the distinction. She explained that there is no application question about academic dismissal though it may still appear on transcripts depending on the sending institution. She added that students who are academically dismissed are generally not admissible to the Kent Campus based on GPA and admission standards though outcomes depend on individual circumstances and some applicants may come from multiple institutions or academic backgrounds.

She further explained that students may have attended multiple campuses or institutions and performed differently at each, resulting in varied academic outcomes such as meeting the minimum 2.0 GPA required for transfer admission. She noted that such students may be admissible to the Kent Campus depending on overall academic record. However, if a dismissal is identified within a year, her team flags the case and she may personally reach out, emphasizing that these situations require human intervention. She also reiterated that students who are academically dismissed are not eligible for admission to the Kent Campus for a period consistent with the originating institution's requirements and university policy but may be admitted to regional campuses within a year of dismissal, which operate as open access entry points consistent with university guidelines.

Associate Professor Wamsley noted that the application includes a question asking applicants to list all former institutions they have attended. She explained that this question is important because applicants might otherwise fail to include prior institutions or transcripts in their application materials.

Director Kolenz confirmed that applicants are required to disclose all prior institutions they have attended. She explained that Financial Aid assists in identifying cases where students have failed to report prior enrollment, and these cases are referred back for follow-up review. She noted that in recent years there have been instances where students did not disclose prior dismissals from other institutions and were only discovered after admission. In some cases, action must be taken after enrollment, though timing may limit available options. She emphasized that decisions are made on a case-by-case basis and that a blanket policy cannot be applied retroactively to all enrolled students. Instead, each situation is reviewed individually through a reverse review process.

Associate Dean Wohl raised concerns about the implications of both dishonesty and full disclosure in the criminal history and conduct disclosure process. She asked whether applicants who are found to have lied on their application, particularly regarding criminal charges or parole supervision, could face dismissal after admission and whether the form clearly communicates those potential consequences. She also raised the converse concern, questioning what impact truthful disclosure might have on admitted students, especially in cases involving prior criminal justice involvement or mental health considerations. She emphasized the importance of balancing accountability with fairness and expressed concern that disclosure of sensitive history could complicate later decisions regarding student conduct or dismissal.

Director Kolenz clarified that the proposal does not add or remove any disclosure requirements but maintains the existing policy language. In response to concerns about consequences related to honesty or disclosure, she stated that she could not definitively answer how such situations would be handled in student conduct hearings as she has not encountered that scenario directly. She explained that her role on the pre-admission committee is administrative and facilitative, supporting the process by presenting materials and documenting decisions rather than serving as a decision maker. She described the committee as including representatives

from Student Conduct, the Dean of Students Office, Admissions, Title IX and KSU Police who collectively review cases and make determinations.

Associate Dean Wohl expressed concern about how disclosure information may affect later student conduct decisions and outcomes. She noted that in typical student conduct processes, action is often guided by whether there is a pattern of behavior rather than a first-time infraction. She reflected on a prior case in which a student's dishonesty on the application ultimately influenced the decision to remove the student from a program, and she suggested that the outcome might have been more complicated if the student had been fully truthful and admitted. She emphasized the tension between encouraging honesty in disclosures and managing subsequent student success and safety concerns once students are enrolled, and she suggested that this issue may warrant further broader discussion beyond the specific policy document under review.

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

IV. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items

College of Applied and Technical Studies

1. Insurance Studies – B.S.—Inactivate degree program

College of Arts and Sciences

Department of Biological Sciences

2. Plant Biology – B.S.—Inactivate degree program

Department of Philosophy

3. Philosophy – B.A.—Inactivate degree program

College of the Arts

School of Music

4. Music – B.A.—Inactivate degree program

[View the Discussion](#)

Chair Dauterich stated that the remaining policy proposals under review were lesser action items and noted that EPC members could raise questions if needed, otherwise they would be considered approved and moved forward. He confirmed that no questions were raised and the committee proceeded to program proposals review. He explained that the items included program inactivations, including one degree program inactivated due to its replacement with the accelerated Bachelor of Applied Studies degree, along with additional inactivations resulting from Senate Bill 1. He indicated that the committee could consider the items as a slate or review them individually and called for a motion and a second to proceed.

Professor Cunningham made a motion to approve the items as a slate, and Professor Piontkivska seconded the motion.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked about accelerated and reduced-credit-hour programs, inquiring whether completion of such programs is specifically noted on student diplomas or

whether graduates receive a standard degree designation without any indication of the program format.

Chair Dauterich explained that accelerated programs are designated as Accelerated Bachelor of Applied Studies (ABAS) degrees rather than traditional BA or BS degrees, meaning they are conferred as a distinct degree type rather than being noted only as an accelerated format on a standard degree.

With no further questions, the items passed unanimously.

With no further questions or comments on the agenda, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 3:48pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Christa N. Ord

Christa N. Ord

Operations and Special Projects Coordinator, Curriculum Services

Office of the Provost