



Meeting Minutes
Monday, 20 October 2025
[VIEW THE MEETING](#)

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

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

Faculty present: Professors Luke Armour, Jen Cunningham, Michael J. Ensley, Robert D. Jewell, Karen L. Mascolo, Helen Piontkivska, JD Ponder, Steve Rugare, J K. Vick; Associate Professors Brian R. Barber, Vanessa J. Earp, Bethany G. Lanese, Abe G. Osbourne, Joanthan F. Swoboda, Sue Wamsley; Assistant Professors Tianyuan Guan, Jason Lorenzon, Janet M. Reed; Senior Lecturers Kingsly T. Berlin, Shelley K. Marshall

Faculty not present: Assistant Professor Abdelhakim Al Turk

Students present: Iyanuoluwa Ogunmiluyi

Guests: Mandy Anderson, Maureen Blankemeyer, Christina Bloebaum, Frank Congin, Alicia Crowe, Chris Dorsten, Keiran Dunne, Susan Emens, Aviad Israeli, Miriam Matteson, Jennifer McCullough, Aaron Mulrooney, Stina Olafsdottir, Liz Piatt, Matthew Rollyson, Hollie Simpson, Alison Smith, Kathy Spicer, Cassie Storlie, Laurie Wagner, Deirdre Warren, Sharon Wohl, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 20 October 2025, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 15 September 2025

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

With no comments or corrections, the minutes passed unanimously.

II. Presentation

A. SB1 Updates

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Associate Provost Sheridan provided updates from the five SB 1 working groups. He reported that Kent State selected Simple Higher Ed (Simple Syllabus) to develop a publicly accessible syllabus system, which must be in place by Fall 2026. The College of Aeronautics and

Engineering will pilot the system internally in Spring 2026, with a state compliance report due June 30, 2026. Associate Provost Sheridan stated that the state has not yet responded to Kent State's August waiver requests for low degree conferral programs. The working group is identifying programs that may fall below the five-degree threshold and developing a timeline to notify units earlier, with full consultation planned by May 2026. Waiver requests are due July 15, and any inactivations must occur by August 15. He noted that the Board of Trustees approved the Civic Literacy plan in September and that two courses are moving through the approval process. Associate Provost Sheridan confirmed that three new state-required questions have been added to Student Survey of Instruction forms. The SSI Working Group, led by Jenny Marcinkiewicz, will develop a peer evaluation system for faculty teaching development, with a draft expected in January 2026. He added that the CIM system will soon include a checkbox statement on intellectual diversity for new and revised courses and programs.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked for clarification on the difference between a peer observation and a peer evaluation.

Associate Provost Sheridan responded that, as written in SB1, the requirement refers to a peer evaluation focused on a faculty member's professional development related to teaching rather than classroom observation. He explained that it may address activities such as improving pedagogy or engaging in professional development, not necessarily what occurs during class sessions. He added that there is currently no additional state guidance beyond that description and that discussions with other Ohio institutions are ongoing to clarify the distinction. Associate Provost Sheridan noted that this charge was only recently added to Jenny Marcinkiewicz's group last week, and they have not yet met to define the scope of the work. He anticipates providing more information at the next meeting as the group begins developing the framework. He also shared that other institutions are considering similar approaches, using existing rubrics that define effective teaching and reflective practices, such as participation in Center for Teaching and Learning workshops, as starting points for determining what constitutes professional development in this context.

III. Academic Unit Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship

1. Department of Sport, Hospitality and Event Management—Establish department (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Dean Spake explained that the proposal seeks to establish a Department of Sport, Hospitality and Event Management within the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship. The new department would house the Sport Administration and Hospitality and Event Management programs, which have requested to move to the college as part of the T28 changes. She noted that additional curriculum-related actions will follow, but this proposal specifically addresses creating the new department.

Associate Professor Earp made a motion to approve, and Associate Professor Barber seconded.

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

IV. Policy Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Graduate Dean's Advisory Council

1. Language Requirement for Graduate Students—Inactivate policy (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Provost Sheridan explained that the policy under review is outdated and redundant with current university practices. He stated that while the policy once addressed broader foreign language requirements, there are now no university-wide standards, and current admissions requirements already cover the same information. Individual units may still set their own language requirements, but this does not need to be specified in policy. He noted that both the GPC and GDAC committees reviewed the proposal and unanimously supported inactivating the policy.

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

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

2. University Policy Regarding Graduate Assistantships—Revise policy (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Provost Sheridan explained that the Graduate College re-evaluated the tuition remission policy to clarify minimum requirements for graduate assistantships. The revision specifies that full-time graduate assistants must receive at least four credit hours of tuition remission, rather than the previous expectation of eight, allowing greater flexibility for programs offering partial waivers alongside stipends. He added that appointment letters must now clearly outline the scope of tuition waivers for the entire program to ensure transparency for students. The policy revision was unanimously approved by GDAC.

Dean Shadduck motioned to approve, and Senior Lecturer Marshall seconded.

University Requirements Curriculum Committee

3. Diversity Course Requirement—Either inactivate policy or inactivate policy (*fall 2026*)

View the Discussion

Dean Smith explained that the proposals stem from Senate Bill 1 mandates and are moving forward quickly. She reviewed the history of Kent State's diversity requirement, which has been in place since the late 1990s and requires all undergraduate students to complete two diversity-designated courses, one focused on domestic issues and one on global issues. Following a review by the University Requirements Curriculum Committee (URCC) and in light of SB 1, Dean Smith stated that the current diversity requirement is no longer compliant with state law. The URCC is therefore recommending two options: to eliminate the requirement entirely or to replace it with a new *Perspectives Requirement*. If eliminated, the rationale would be to simplify degree requirements and support timely degree completion for students, given the number of existing requirements such as Kent Core, experiential learning, and writing-intensive courses. If replaced, the *Perspectives Requirement* would consist of one course, likely drawn from the Kent Core, designed to help students understand different cultures, viewpoints, and ways of living and working. This approach would align with both Kent State's mission and Ohio's emphasis on workforce readiness. Dean Smith noted that, unlike the current diversity requirement, the new *Perspectives Requirement* would include defined learning outcomes developed in collaboration

with faculty during spring 2026. Proposed courses would need to be submitted and approved by December 2026 for inclusion in the Fall 2027 catalog. Continuing students would remain under their existing catalog year, while the new requirement would apply to incoming students beginning Fall 2027. If the replacement option is selected, a moratorium would be placed on new diversity-designated courses, and all existing diversity courses would need to be resubmitted under the new framework.

Senior Lecturer Marshall motioned to approve, and Associate Barber seconded the motion.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked for clarification on the distinction between the Perspectives Requirement and the diversity requirement, noting that it was unclear whether specific perspectives had been defined or if the details were still being developed.

Dean Smith explained that the most recent review by URCC has been in progress for nearly two years and began before the implementation of Senate Bill 1. She noted that while SB1 and House Bill 96 reflect some resistance to diversity-related language, they also emphasize preparing students to work effectively with others in diverse environments. In response, the committee aimed to design a requirement that encourages collaboration, exposure to different perspectives and problem-solving in group settings. She added that existing Kent Core and upper-division courses—around 70 in total—may align with this approach if revised to emphasize these elements.

Associate Professor McCullough noted that under the old diversity requirement, many courses focused on meeting superficial criteria—such as including U.S. or international content—rather than emphasizing what students were actually learning. She explained that the new approach focuses more on clear learning outcomes, particularly on collaboration, communication across different experiences and worldviews and workplace readiness. She added that while some existing diversity courses may still align with the new framework, the emphasis will now be on meaningful engagement and measurable outcomes.

Associate Professor Wamsley sought clarification, noting that the main difference between the diversity and Perspectives Requirements seemed to be the focus on group work and collaboration, and asked if there were other distinctions.

Dean Smith agreed that collaboration is a key element but added that the new requirement also emphasizes discussing and understanding different perspectives on shared issues. She explained that previous diversity learning objectives—both domestic and global—largely overlapped, leading to the idea of combining them into a single course focused on multiple viewpoints and teamwork. Smith also noted that the current diversity requirement would not meet Senate Bill 1's expectations and must be revised to remain viable.

Associate Professor McCullough added that the learning outcomes are still being developed and that broader faculty input would be sought to refine and define them more clearly.

Dean Smith explained that the process moved more quickly than anticipated, preventing the planned faculty feedback and forum from occurring, but that developing formal learning outcomes is now scheduled for the spring semester.

Associate Professor Ponder asked whether the proposals needed to be separated and discussed individually, noting it as a procedural question.

Chair Dauterich responded that both options could be presented together in a single motion, allowing members to vote for either option removing the requirement or replacing it with the Perspectives Requirement or to abstain. He explained that while this approach is not typical, there is nothing in the procedures that would prevent it.

Secretary Kellogg confirmed this, noting that discussion was expected, but the vote would ultimately be to choose between option one or option two.

Associate Professor Ponder asked whether the proposal was a result of Senate Bill 1 or derived from other factors such as student feedback, advising input, or curriculum complexity, noting that SB1 was not explicitly mentioned in the materials provided.

Dean Smith clarified that the discussion and proposals were a direct result of Senate Bill 1. She explained that two main options were being considered: eliminating the requirement entirely or revising it to align with SB1 expectations.

Associate Professor Ponder added that research strongly supports the value of perspectives-type courses, citing studies involving over 116,000 students showing positive impacts on critical thinking, moral reasoning, personal growth, civic engagement and degree completion. He noted that although Generation Z is highly diverse, they often experience greater social segregation, making such courses particularly relevant. He suggested that the university could adopt SB1's own terminology by framing the requirement around "diversity and open inquiry" to align with state language.

Dean Smith responded that the name "diversity and open inquiry" had been among the options considered. She also referenced a survey from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) showing that employers prioritize many of the same qualities developed through these courses when determining promotability, underscoring their long-term value.

Associate Professor Ensley expressed concern that the process felt rushed, acknowledging the tight timeline but emphasizing his hesitation in supporting option two. He noted the lack of faculty input, explaining that as a member of the committee that began revising the Kent Core two years ago, the group had already been discussing what should be included before adjustments were made due to budget changes, T28 and Senate Bill 1.

Professor Armour asked for clarification on whether the proposal would replace the current diversity requirement with a single course for all students.

Dean Smith explained that students would still take two courses, but one would fall under a new perspectives category, primarily drawn from Kent Core courses. She noted that most existing diversity courses are already in the Kent Core, and this approach would simplify fulfillment, particularly for upper-division and lockstep program students, while still accommodating study abroad options.

Professor Armour asked whether revising the Kent Core could cause problems in the future.

Dean Smith responded that the proposal aligns with ongoing Kent Core revisions and faculty feedback and would fit into planned updates to be presented at the next EPC meeting.

Professor Rugare raised concerns that adding new learning outcomes might complicate faculty workload, especially for courses tied to accreditation, and questioned whether university education as a whole should achieve these goals.

Dean Smith clarified that faculty would select a single learning outcome for a course from a compiled list in the spring to avoid overload.

Senior Lecturer Marshall asked whether courses outside the Kent Core, including lockstep program courses, could also fulfill the requirement.

Dean Smith explained that the initial implementation by December 2026 would focus on Kent Core courses, with potential future expansion to other courses. She noted that most upper-division courses already include diversity components, so students would continue to meet those requirements.

Associate Professor McCullough added that students starting with the Fall 2027 catalog would likely take Kent Core courses first, supporting early engagement with the new learning outcomes.

Professor Piontkivska cautioned that moving forward too quickly with the proposal could lead to unintended consequences. She suggested it may be premature to require the change at this time and recommended taking more time to consider the options echoing earlier comments from other members about proceeding thoughtfully rather than rushing implementation.

Professor Mascolo expressed concern about adding new requirements to lockstep programs that already meet multiple accreditation standards requiring diversity content in every course. She asked whether existing courses such as community health could meet the new Perspectives Requirement to avoid increasing student workload.

Dean Smith explained that the perspectives designation would function similarly to the current diversity indicator in the Kent Core appearing alongside applicable courses. She clarified that it would not add additional requirements for students as courses meeting both Kent Core and perspectives designations would fulfill existing degree requirements.

Dean Bloebaum emphasized that programs with extensive accreditation requirements such as engineering and aeronautics face challenges when additional mandates are introduced. She noted that best practice is to minimize new requirements where possible. She added that there will now be other requirements per House Bill 96 which will add to the existing mandates and that her college is already overburdened by a Kent Core that eliminates flexibility.

Dean Smith explained that House Bill 96, also known as the budget bill passed in June, introduces additional requirements beyond the civics course tied to Senate Bill 1. He noted that two other required courses are included in House Bill 96 and emphasized that institutions will need to determine how to accommodate these new mandates as they are required by law.

Associate Professor Ponder confirmed that under Option Two the change would reduce rather than increase total course requirements by replacing two existing courses with one while introducing a new framework through which units could apply for perspectives course designations.

Chair Dauterich and Dean Smith confirmed this understanding.

Professor Ensley added that students will also have a new civics requirement under state legislation which will accompany these proposed changes.

With no further questions or comments, the council voted 17-6-1 to inactivate the Diversity Course Requirement policy.

4. American Civic Literacy Requirement—Establish policy (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Dean Smith explained that a new university-level American Civic Literacy requirement will be implemented for all bachelor's degree students to comply with the Advance Ohio Education Act approved March 28. Students graduating in May 2030 and beyond must complete and pass a comprehensive exam in an approved American Civic Literacy course to graduate.

She noted that the timeline is tight as students entering in fall 2026 will fall within the first affected cohort. The requirement mandates that students demonstrate proficiency in a list of state-assigned readings and passing the comprehensive exam is a condition for graduation.

Dean Smith stated that an ad hoc American Civic Literacy Working Group chaired by Dean Mandy Monroe-Stasik has already developed two approved courses—one from History and one from Political Science—to be available in fall 2026. These courses will serve as the first options for meeting the new requirement. The working group will likely continue under a formalized structure within EPC. The courses fulfilling this requirement will be housed in the Kent Core though the civic literacy mandate functions as a separate university requirement. Curriculum Services will need to review all 127 bachelor's degree programs to determine the impact of adding the new requirement and coordinate necessary program adjustments. Dean Smith emphasized that this is a significant undertaking due to the legal timeline. The learning outcomes for these courses align with those outlined in Senate Bill 1 requiring students to pass a comprehensive final exam based on a state-defined reading list. The list includes the U.S. Constitution, Declaration of Independence, at least five essays from *The Federalist Papers*, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Gettysburg Address, *Letter from Birmingham Jail* and excerpts from Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*. She added that the working group plans to create a question bank for the comprehensive exam to support multiple departments that may offer qualifying courses. The first two courses must be ready by fall 2026 to meet the legislative mandate ensuring that the May 2030 graduating class will have fulfilled the requirement.

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

Associate Professor Ponder asked which five of the 85 Federalist Papers would be chosen for the required readings. Dean Smith explained that different courses may select different papers, and corresponding questions will be developed for the exam question bank.

Professor Ponder then asked how the university would ensure that the exam questions align with the specific Federalist Papers students actually read, rather than unrelated ones.

Associate Dean Warren responded that consistency would be maintained within each course. For example, departments offering the civics course, such as History or Political Science, would select a consistent set of readings for their students. She added that the comprehensive exam would include both a shared set of general questions applicable to all courses and a portion specific to each department's chosen readings. Departments would contribute to the question bank based on their disciplinary focus.

Professor Ponder also raised concerns about the breadth of Adam Smith's writings, noting that *The Wealth of Nations* alone is extensive.

Associate Dean Warren clarified that for Adam Smith and the Federalist Papers, departments have flexibility to determine specific portions of the readings while the rest of the list—such as the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence—is fixed.

Professor McCullough added that each department proposing a qualifying civics course would decide which readings to include and would contribute corresponding questions to the test bank.

Associate Dean Warren confirmed this approach, stating that while courses within a department will remain consistent, variation across disciplines is acceptable and contributes to a richer educational experience.

Associate Professor Wamsley explained that the history department has been developing the course since last spring and noted that publishing companies have already created readers with materials and questions that meet state requirements. She added that the department has not yet decided whether all sections will use the same readings, such as selections from the *Federalist Papers* or Adam Smith, but emphasized that other states have implemented similar approaches.

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

Office of the Bursar

5. Undergraduate Tuition Guarantee Program—Establish policy (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Vice President Olafsdottir explained that the tuition guarantee program, established in fall 2018, must be published in multiple locations as required by the Ohio Revised Code. She noted that the code specifies the information must appear in the university handbook, course catalog and on the website. While it is currently listed on the website, it is missing from the course catalog, so the request is to add the tuition guarantee policy there to meet compliance requirements.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

V. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items – ORC 3345.454 Policies on Tenure and Retrenchment and Elimination of Undergraduate Degree Programs (aka Senate Bill 1)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Chair Dauterich noted that 19-degree programs are being inactivated in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code. He explained that while some faculty supported and others opposed their program inactivation, the action is required by state law. Chair Dauterich suggested voting on all 19 programs as a single slate rather than reviewing each.

Professor Piontkivska made a motion to approve, and Professor Rugare seconded the motion.

Associate Professor Ponder stated that after reviewing all the proposals and related documents, about 15 were either not supported or opposed by their respective department faculty. Many also lacked support from their CCCs and most from their CACS.

Chair Dauterich noted that the committee could vote against the proposals and that they would still proceed to the Faculty Senate for a vote. While this would not alter state law, the committee could use the vote to formally express opposition if members wished to do so.

Associate Professor Wamsley observed that enrollment numbers varied across the programs, with some courses having only a few students and others over twenty. Associate Professor Wamsley sought clarification on whether the decisions were based solely on the number of degrees conferred, noting that those figures were fewer than five.

Chair Dauterich explained that the determinations were based on state legislation requiring programs to average at least five degrees conferred per year over a rolling three-year period. Programs falling below that threshold were placed on the state's review list.

Associate Professor Wamsley noted that despite some programs having good enrollment this semester, she asked if they could potentially be reinstated or reconsidered in the future.

Chair Dauterich confirmed that programs could be proposed for reinstatement in the future through the standard curricular approval process. However, for now, they would be inactivated due to insufficient numbers of graduates. He clarified the difference between the one-year and two-year waivers, explaining that a one-year waiver commits the program to closure after a year, while a two-year waiver allows additional time for review. Some programs had requested the two-year waiver, but no response had yet been received from the state. Chair Dauterich then moved the discussion to a vote on the slate of 19 program inactivations. The results were 12 in favor, 8 against, and 2 abstentions.

B. Action Items

College of Education, Health and Human Services

School of Foundations, Leadership and Administration

1. Cultural Foundations – M.A.—Inactivate degree program; admission was suspended spring 2026 (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Interim Dean Crowe explained that the Cultural Foundations faculty reviewed their degree programs and decided to close the M.A. program due to low enrollment. Admissions had already been suspended, and the remaining three students will be taught out. One student is expected to graduate in May 2026 and the other two by May 2027. The remaining students can complete required courses through the M.Ed. or doctoral programs which share the same coursework. The faculty plan to focus their efforts on their other two degrees and the Ed.D. concentration.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

School of Lifespan Development and Educational Sciences

2. Pre-Counseling – Minor—Establish minor (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Blankemeyer explained that the Human Development and Family Science curriculum was overhauled last year, eliminating concentrations and one minor to streamline the undergraduate degree. They are now requesting to offer a pre-counseling minor jointly with Counselor Education and Supervision, as many students pursue careers in counseling and related fields. The minor is intended to be career-focused and attract students following the recent curriculum changes.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed with 18 yeas and two abstentions.

C. Discussion Items

College of Aeronautics and Engineering

School of Aeronautics

1. Aviation Science – M.S.—Initial inquiry to establish a new degree program; full proposal to come to EPC for a vote at a later date

2. Aviation Science – Ph.D.—Initial inquiry to establish a new degree program; full proposal to come to EPC for a vote at a later date

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Dean Bloebaum provided an overview of the College of Aeronautics and Engineering, emphasizing its unique integration of aeronautics and engineering programs and its strong undergraduate and graduate offerings. She explained that the college previously suspended the M.S. in Aviation Management and Logistics to redevelop M.S. and Ph.D. programs in Aviation Science for greater flexibility. Undergraduate enrollment is increasing with more high-achieving students, and she added that the college is now seeing more students wanting to stay for a graduate degree.

She described the college's research strengths, 2+2 partnerships and international collaborations including with Rwanda and Rwanda Air, supporting both student and faculty graduate education. Labor market data indicate strong growth and demand for aviation-related fields with limited graduate programs nationally and only one in Ohio, emphasizing the opportunity for new

graduate programs at the college. Dean Bloebaum highlighted the college's extensive faculty expertise, state-of-the-art labs, an on-campus airport and interdisciplinary research capabilities, particularly in areas such as Advanced Air Mobility (AAM) and unmanned aerial systems. The college leads the state in AAM research and is establishing an AAM innovation hub and maintenance operations hangar supported by \$10 million in funding. This initiative aligns with a presidential priority and opens opportunities to collaborate with the FAA and other agencies. She concluded by saying that this was a high-level overview.

VI. Course Proposals Review

A. Action Items (*fall 2026*)

American Civic Literacy Requirement

1. HIST 12061 American Foundations: From Pre-Colonization to Civil War and Reconstruction (*Domestic*)
2. POL 10101 American Government

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Chair Dauterich asked for a motion and a second to present the items together.

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

Associate Dean Warren explained that in response to the SB1 requirement for a civic literacy course, two three-credit courses have been created for bachelor's degree programs. These courses must be in place by fall 2026 to ensure all students graduating in 2029 and 2030 complete the requirement. The chosen courses, History 12061: American Foundations and Political Science 10101: American Government, were selected because they already closely aligned with the required content and readings, making it easier to adapt them to meet the SB1 learning outcomes.

With no questions or comments, the items passed unanimously.

With no further questions or comments, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 5:19pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Christa N. Ord

Christa N. Ord

Operations and Special Projects Coordinator, Curriculum Services
Office of the Provost