KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Educational Policies Council
Meeting Minutes
Monday, 21 April 2025
VIEW THE MEETING

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

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

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

Faculty not present: Professor Richard L. Mangrum; Associate Professor Pamela L. Stephenson; Assistant Professor Yuening Zhang

Guests: J.R. Campbell, Alicia Crowe, Chris Dorsten, James Hannon, Viveka Jenks, Ebone Jones, Todd Kamenash, Kristen Kolenz, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Liz Piatt, Christa Porter, Dirk Remley, Hollie Simpson, Alison Smith, Misty Sommers, Kathy Spicer, Deirdre Warren, Sharon Wohl, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 21 April 2025, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes
A. Meeting on 24 March 2025
Professor Salaba made a motion to approve, and Associate Professor Fisch seconded.

With no corrections or comments, the minutes passed unanimously.

II. Subcommittee Reports
A. Transfer Credit Committee
VIEW THE REPORT
Assistant University Registrar, Misty Sommers, stated that the committee had continued training options for faculty transfer champions and now have created a new advisor

training for transfer champions. The plan is to have five supplemental trainings that can be offered in conjunction with those. There are two trainings that are completed. One is military credit training, and the other is career tech credit training. Career tech credit training has not been offered yet, but it will be brought up to the current group training for the military credit. Additionally, there have been committee discussions on various policies that are pertinent to recent events including national and state policies and accreditation requirements.

III. Policy Proposals Review
A. Action Items

Graduate Policies Council
1. Dismissal and Appeal – Graduate
Revise policy to update general language, administrative titles and College of Podiatric Medicine processes
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Associate Professor Barber stated that the Dismissal and Appeal policy explains when a student is removed from a graduate program due to poor academic performance, lack of progress or not meeting professional standards. Dismissal Decisions are made by the program's administrator and shared with the student in writing. They are dismissed from the university and that is noted on their transcript. There is a formal appeals process where students can explain their case, submit evidence and have the decision reviewed by a college committee. If the appeal is successful, students can be reinstated. Special rules apply to students in dual degree and Podiatric Medicine. Reviewing this policy was part of the normal review cycle process. The committee noticed there were about four areas that could improve the policy. An improvement to the policy that were added are the administrative title flexibility now built in. It replaced specific titles like the chair, director or coordinator. The broader term of "administrator" will accommodate the varying college structures. Another improvement was to propose appeal deadline clarification. It will be changed from 10 weekdays from the receipt of the email to 10 weekdays from when the dismissal e-mail was sent. It helps to provide a uniform, time-stamped basis for the deadline. The third improvement is to specify that expectations for academic performance, progress and professional standards must be communicated in writing. Based on the 15-day review that went out for feedback, the committee noted that there are some new FAQs that were added. The committee has created five FAQs related to enrolling in another program after dismissal or dismissal from only one program in a dual degree.

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

Professor Salaba asked where the dismissal and appeals committee at the college level is defined.
Associate Professor Barber said that would be designated by the college.

Professor Salaba asked for faculty advisors to be informed of the dismissal within the process as they are not always notified.

With no further questions, the item passed unanimously.

Undergraduate Policies Council
2. Graduation
Revise policy to eliminate the late application fee and distinguish the difference between graduation and commencement (*fall 2025*)
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Director Liedel explained that this is an undergraduate and graduate policy. This policy went through both committees for review and discussion. Changes were minimal. The committee's focus is to update it to the new format to make sure that the readability for students, particularly deadlines, are clearer. The main change was to eliminate the late fee for applying for graduation. In 2009, the Board of Trustees approved a $200.00 fee for late graduation applications. In 2018, both UDC and GDAC voted to eliminate the fee. It was decided that it would be discretionary by each of the units, and that would not be systematically assessed. In review of the data, it showed that units stopped assessing the fee entirely in 2021. Before that, only a handful were assessed. Committee members agreed that this fee seemed punitive. The committee wanted to make sure students were getting the deadline. Communication of the deadline will be improved in the process.
The committee also discussed changing some of the deadlines for graduation applications. Specifically, bachelor degrees. They are currently about a semester ahead of masters and associates. The committee discussed that it might be less confusing for students to have the same application deadline for everything in every way. However, the graduate degrees are a little bit longer with application review and allowing time for corrections. The committee felt units are not prepared to change the deadlines and processes right now. The committee will revisit the conversation in the future.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

3. Transfer of Undergraduate Credit
Revise policy to update language and format and improve readability for students (*fall 2025*)
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Director Liedel stated that this policy was up for review. It had been a number of years since it was last reviewed. The policy helps to ensure consistency from one public institution to the next. A lot of the language is provided to Kent State. The policy is very paragraph and language heavy. The committee felt it would be beneficial to increase space by using bullet points and separate sections by headers, so it is a little less dense. Language was updated with current transfer words. This policy also benefits from a lot of FAQs. Those are being maintained by Misty Sommers' office. Those will remain on their site and will be linked on the policy page.

Associate Professor Ponder motioned to approve, and Associate Professor Barber seconded.

With no questions or comments, the policy revisions passed unanimously.

Division of Academic Affairs/Division of Student Life
4. Administrative Policy Regarding Student Cheating and Plagiarism (3-01.8)
Revise policy to add a timeline for violation submissions; adjust definitions; update sanctioning options; streamline submission, hearing and appeals process; and change policy name to Administrative Policy Regarding Academic Integrity (*fall 2025*)
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Associate Dean Kamenash explained that this policy was substantively overviewed around 2011. There were some changes made last year, specifically regarding generative AI, but the rest of the policy was not adjusted. This is an attempt to make some significant adjustments not only into the standards, but the why of what the office is doing. This includes changing it from a cheating and plagiarism policy into an academic integrity policy. It is really not focusing specifically on or only what happens if a student were to get into trouble. It is framing what is important and valued for Kent State. The office is taking this opportunity to update a number of items including clearing up some of the timeline issues. The policy is set to have a number of steps to get through in order to be approved. This reduces a lot of those barriers for timing. The office has adjusted definitions to be current and promising practices. Updates to the process have also been made. There are no longer different versions of days (i.e., business, calendar). They have removed the need for several levels of approval. The office listened to the faculty who are supplying these over the years. One request was to not limit the outcome actions on the sanctions for when a students has broken the rules. They used to have only three. The updated version provides a tiered system. The office also updated the appeal process to make it more consistent with how the Office of Student Conduct operates for behavioral cases.

Associate Professor Marcinkiewicz added that the office added a small adjustment to the definition section. Previously under c.1.e. it said, "using generative AI to generate content in satisfaction of assigned coursework except as expressly permitted by the instructor" has been changed to "using AI to generate content in satisfaction of assigned coursework when the instructor has forbidden it." The default is different under these circumstances because there was a lot of feedback during the public comment period related to students using AI on assignments that were faculty who routinely ask their students to use AI on assignments. Recognizing that it is a tool and not inherently evil seems like a good way to go.

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

Professor Rugare stated that from the perspective of architecture and the design world, this policy sounds good. The College of Architecture and Environmental Design is trying to

get students to integrate AI into their work for creative ways rather than evil ways. It is becoming a huge part of design for idea generation.

Senior Lecturer Laux stated that it does not seem like a minor change in regard to the default. In the math department, AI is a forbidden tool.

Associate Professor Marcinkiewicz asked if Senior Lecturer Laux would prefer to say that the instructor expressly forbid it or for students to know inherently that it is forbidden as it could be allowed in their other courses.

Senior Lecturer Laux replied that students should know it is expressly forbidden. He said he believes that the default should be forbidden. Faculty members are given a lot of thought when AI is an appropriate tool in a class or for an assignment.

Professor Salaba stated that the default for using other materials, such as notes, is that it is forbidden. There needs to be consistency. It is easier for the default to be "not allowed" unless the instructor permits it. She asked about sections 1.d.b. and 1.d.e. as both talk about assignments, notes, quizzes, tests and AI and why both are needed.

Associate Professor Marcinkiewicz explained that using AI on an exam, test or quiz would be inherently wrong but would be different for an assignment.

Professor Salaba stated that both cover tests and quizzes.

Associate Dean Kamenash agreed that it sounds redundant.

Professor Salaba suggested condensing the two to provide clarification.

Associate Professor Earp clarified about the removal of language about plagiarism school. They are not doing away with the remediation that the library offers. It was purposefully taken out mention of a specific program to allow them to be more adaptable as new things come up. When it talks about educational sanctions, there is a line that talks about being run by either the Office of Student Conduct or University Libraries. The change is just allowing more flexibility.

Associate Professor Ensley agreed that the default should be that AI is not allowed unless allowed by the instructor.

Associate Professor Marcinkiewicz is in agreement with the revision if every instructor would explain to their students, either in writing or verbally, that it is not permitted.

Professor Salaba made a motion to a friendly amendment to reverse the revision of allowing AI unless otherwise stated by the instructor to not allowing AI unless otherwise stated by the instructor. Also to revise and combine 1.d.b. and 1.d.e.

Associate Professor Fisch seconded the friendly amendment motion.

Secretary Tillett added that if these changes are for fall 2025, the proposal needs to go to Faculty Senate in May unless there is a July meeting.

Senior Lecturer Laux said that his last day as chair is May 31st. He is not sure what the new chair will want to do or if there could be something from SB1 that will warrant a July meeting.

Secretary Tillett clarified that the proposal would go to the May Faculty Senate meeting and June Board of Trustees because this is in the policy register and not in the catalog. She asked if, with friendly amendments, could this be approved today to go to Faculty Senate for next month.

Associate Professor Earp made a motion to submit the friendly amendment as these issues can also be discussed at Faculty Senate. The friendly amendment includes reverting to the language that is in the current policy about generative artificial intelligence is prohibited unless expressly permitted by the instructor and revisions to 1.d.b. and 1.d.e.

Chair Dauterich asked if members would want to continue to vote on tabling the motion or withdraw that and vote on the amendment instead.

Senior Lecturer Laux said there is no withdrawing. The members have to vote on it.

Professor Ensley seconded the friendly amendment motion.

Associate Dean Kamenash and Associate Professor Marcinkiewicz agreed to the proposed amendments.

Secretary Tillett asked for an additional friendly amendment to 2.b.1. sanctions there is missing "grade." It should say "reduction in course grade."

Professor Jewell asked how the friendly amendments are different than the original version of the policy that the proposal was changing.

Chair Dauterich said that the amendment is whether the onus is on the instructor or not. It is reverting back to the original policy and the other ones are just language changes that are removing a redundancy or adding extra clarity.

Assistant Professor Totten suggested to add large language model (LLM) as an "or" to AI. It should be covered by the policy in case someone uses it.

Professor Salaba said that she thinks that it is in the definition of generative artificial intelligence. AI means any artificial intelligence programs that make use of large language model algorithms. She asked if that would cover it.

Assistant Professor Totten said yes.

First poll went out to members asking to approve, deny or abstain from tabling the admin policy regarding student cheating and plagiarism. Eight members voted "yea," 13 voted "nay" and one abstained.

The second poll went out to members asking for approval of the admin policy regarding students cheating and plagiarism with the friendly amendments. 19 members voted "yea," three voted "nay" and one abstained.

Office of Admissions
5. Admission of Guest Students
Revise policy on admission ineligibility to be applicable only to those denied admission due to criminal or student-conduct history; remove information on undergraduate guest students, which is being added to Admission of Undergraduate Students; policy title is changed to Admission of Graduate Guest Students (*fall 2025*)
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Director Kolenz explained that the Office of Admissions is making a change to clarify the policy as admission of graduate guest students. They are taking out undergraduate because the undergraduate admission of undergraduate students' policy is being changed to be more inclusive of the very different types of admission. It will now be read specifically to graduate students. Additionally, the policy will no longer state that someone who is denied from Kent State can be denied as a guest student as previously stated. That meant someone denied college credit plus, someone denied as a freshman or as a transfer student could also be denied guest status, previously, undergraduate or graduate. Now, they can only be denied for conduct denial. That means they went through the pre-admission process and on their application stated that they have been convicted of a crime or non-academically dismissed. In the past and then as a committee, the pre-admission committee has said students cannot attend if they have been denied by the pre-admission conduct committee then they cannot be admitted as guest student.

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

The poll went out to members. Members voted unanimously to approve the proposal.

6. Admission of Undergraduate Students
Revise policy to fully cover the applicant types and requirements to apply and be admitted to Kent State as undergraduate student; separate undergraduate admission policies are eliminated (*fall 2025*)
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Director Kolenz explained that office looked at other policies and pulled them into this larger policy for a few reasons. They did not want them to be redundant. With redundancy, there is an opportunity to make things incorrect. It is also better to have it in a single place so that whoever is searching for this information will find it in a single entry. The things that they are removing from the policy are admission of post undergraduate students. That

is currently its own policy. It is moving into the undergrad admission policy. Admission of undergraduate adult students is becoming part of the admission overall policy. Admission of undergraduate former students and admission of undergraduate home school students are moving into the undergraduate entry. Some of the highlights would be that the office is calling out the types of admission that one can receive as an undergraduate. This is important for many reasons, including financial aid. It is important to make it very clear to applicants when they are applying that they have to apply as a certain type of student and they have to align with the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations are informed by the federal government and the federal aid disbursement system. This is to make the policy easier to understand. Students will see that the Kent campus is selective and what that is based on. Whereas the regionals are open enrollment. They can also see how to apply and what type of student they are upfront instead of guessing which creates issues down the road for the student and office. Who is admitted and how they are admitted is not changing. That remains the same.

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

Associate Professor Fisch asked where the college credit plus fits within this policy.

Director Kolenz said college credit plus is not part of the policy of undergraduate admissions. However, there is mention in the policy that if they have college credit plus hours, they are still considered freshmen. CCP has its own entry and is not owned by the Office of Admissions.

Dean Shadduck asked about guest student status in Lifelong Learning where there is both credit and non-credit learning. She asked if that would still be available for short term learners even if they are in the non-credit world.

Director Kolenz said that there was not anything in the policy that would exclude them. It just says they enroll in a limited number of Kent State courses without being formally admitted to a degree or certificate program. They can take a maximum of 18 credit hours of coursework. They do not pay an application fee, and they can be anyone as long as they have a high school diploma or alternative diploma.

The poll went out to members. Members voted unanimously to approve the proposal.

Office of the University Registrar
7. Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy
Revise policy to rename the "One-Year Option" to "Associate of Technical Studies Pathway" per a state directive (*fall 2025*)
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Assistant Registrar Sommers stated that the state of Ohio decided to rebrand the "One-Year Option" to make it more understandable. Many students did not understand it. They are rebranding it to include some other things to turn it into a more degree pathway that

expands outside of the ATS program. The revision is just to update the name. There are no other policy changes.

Senior Lecturer Laux made a motion to approver, and Associate Professor Ponder seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

IV. Program Proposals Review
A. Action Items

College of the Arts
School of Theatre and Dance
1. Costume Design Technology – Minor—Inactivate program (*fall 2025*)
2. Lighting Design and Technology – Minor—Inactivate program (*fall 2025*)
3. Scene Design – Minor—Inactivate program (*fall 2025*)
4. Scenic Technology – Minor—Inactivate program (*fall 2025*)
Theatre and Social Change – Minor—Inactivate program (*fall 2025*)
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Chair Dauterich and Associate Professor Swoboda agreed to review and vote on these items as a slate.

Associate Professor Swoboda explained that these five minors are part of what was a collection of eight minors. The school is inactivating them and consolidating them into three minors. The new minors will be reduced in credit hours to 14-15 from 20-21. This is to streamline curriculum by removing minors that have been under enrolled or had no enrollment. No courses are being inactivated. All those who are currently enrolled will finish their minors.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

V. Other EPC Discussion
1. Moratorium Course List Update
VIEW THE DISCUSSION
Associate Professor Ponder asked for an update on the moratorium course list.

Secretary Tillett replied that the provost put out a request to the dean's office to ask if they still wanted to bring the courses forward as they are new, elective courses. If yes, they needed to provide a rationale since they are electives. Colleges submitted to bring forward 38 of the 44 courses. Melody has a request for confirmation of moving these courses forward to the deans and is waiting for responses.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan added that Melody is meeting with all deans, one on one, about the number of related curricular issues and this is one of them. He encouraged members to talk to their deans to see what information they have for Melody.

Associate Professor Ponder stated that the council was told that the moratorium would end in February. Instructors would need an update on this to know how to move forward with the curriculum.

Interim Associate Provost Sheridan explained that when the moratorium began, it was to put a hold on all new curricular developments. Now, the provost is asking that deans be thoughtful in terms of what they are putting forward and supporting. The provost wants to make sure deans are doing their due diligence and supporting what they are moving forward. He reiterated to members to speak to their deans.

With no further questions or comments on the agenda items, the meeting adjourned at 4:33pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Christa N. Ord

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