



Meeting Minutes
Monday, 21 August 2023
[View the Meeting](#)

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

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

Faculty present: Professor Tiffany Taylor; Associate Professors Brian R. Barber, Michael J. Ensley, Michael R. Fisch, Dandan Liu, Abe Osbourne; Assistant Professors Bethany G. Lanese, Christopher W. Totten; Senior Lecturers Tracy A. Laux, Jennifer R. Metheney; Lecturer Olivia B. Krise; Associate Lecturers Kristy Jacobson, Shelley K. Marshall

Faculty not present: Associate Professor Vanessa J. Earp, Jonathan F. Swoboda

Guests: Susan Augustine, Sean Broghammer, Chris Dorsten, Susan Emens, Karen Gracy, Kim Hahn, Karen Mascolo, Miriam Matteson, Wendy Matthews, Emily Metzgar, Charity Miller, Stephen Mitchell, Renée Roll, Matthew Rollyson, Hollie Simpson, Alison Smith, Kathleen Spicer, Linnea Stafford, Manfred van Dulmen, Deirdre Warren, Sharon Wohl, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 21 August 2023, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 15 May 2023

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

Chair Dauterich stated that there is a change for page 5 under section II, “. . .only Kent State and Akron had spring break during the ninth week.” “Ninth” should be “eleventh.”

Secretary Ord will make the correction to the minutes.

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

II. Presentation

A. Role of Policy in Student Success and Equity Work

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Associate Provost Bartell shared that when looking at policy in equitable student success, the most important thing is the extent to which the policy is supporting the learning and growth of students. The policies are written for the majority of students trying to do the right thing. Policies are the scaffolds that are put into place to help them to be successful. Even when viewing policies referring to cheating and plagiarism there is a way to approach that kind of behavior from a growth-oriented and learning-centered perspective. Other policies that are helpful to take a learning-centered approach to are more college-specific policies, such as entrance criteria. For example, GPA requirements for entrance into high-impact practices. A student may need to have a 3.5 to access undergraduate research opportunities, to be an undergraduate learning assistant or to participate in an internship. From a learning-centered perspective, that makes sense if it is certain that a student with a lower GPA will not be successful. If it is not the reason for the requirement, then taking a look at whether that is fair and equitable makes sense. Keeping a learning-centered approach at the top of the mind is really helpful in thinking about how policy can be used in ways to support student success. It is also important to access fairness in policies. Does policy create barriers for some students and not others? A third focal point when reviewing policies is transparency. This refers to how easily accessible and understandable the policy is for students, faculty and staff. Also making sure that processes and materials for policy are accessible. Another question to review with policy is if it is reasonable. This relates to uncomplicating the policy for all involved. These focal points are encouraged to be used when reviewing policy.

Secretary Tillett explained that there are also policies that are outdated that do not really work with today's world. For example, a policy process may include submitting physical paperwork rather than an electronic document. More efficient processes should be considered when reviewing the policies to make it easier for students and faculty.

Associate Provost Bartell added that policy reviewers should think intentionally about easing the process for everyone.

Senior Lecturer Laux said since the required signature for withdrawing from a course went away, students have withdrawn that did not need to withdraw. The efficiency removed the consultation between the faculty and students.

Associate Provost Bartell asked members to consider ways to create efficiency, remove barriers, but also allow for things like faculty and student consultation.

Chair Dauterich asked if there was any other process for withdrawing from a course other than just withdrawing.

Secretary Tillett said students can go into the system and withdraw on their own.

Undergraduate student representative, Olivia Eader, stated that having something that explains why a student withdraws from a course could be optional, but not required. Students should be able to make informed decisions on their own without having to share the reason.

Assistant Professor Totten added that a requirement to explain withdraw is a privacy issue.

Associate Provost Bartell said that faculty could put a statement in the syllabus or have a conversation encouraging students to discuss withdrawing for academic reasons if they are considering it. Students should not feel obligated to disclose personal information. Withdrawing is not always about not doing well in the course. The decision to withdraw should be respected.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Graduate Policy Council

[VIEW THE REPORT](#)

VP Broghammer stated that the policies that were reviewed were Leave of Absence, Graduate Standing and Dismissal policy and Student Grievances. This year, the committee will be reviewing stackable certificates and the issue of students being dismissed from a program, their GPA and entering another program. Faculty, staff and student volunteers are encouraged to join. The meetings are twice a month.

B. Micro-Credential Approval Committee

[VIEW THE REPORT](#)

Associate Professor Mascolo explained that the Micro-Credential Approval Committee has 17 members from across the university. Dean Shadduck is the administrative liaison. Membership includes 12 representatives from Kent, 1 from Stark, 2 from Trumbull, 2 from Ashtabula and 3 from Tuscarawas. There are some standing meetings, but the committee is trying to create a process where things are done quickly. The committee is called together whenever there are applications that need to be reviewed. There is an online application process. The committee is still working on making the process more effective. The committee is looking at the budget to allow for the process to be completely online. A few micro-credentials have been approved so far. They are 3D Printing, Electrical Technician I and II, Semiconductors for STEM Majors, Microdrafting and Design, Nursing Administration and Healthcare Systems Leadership.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked if the approval process includes EPC.

Associate Professor Mascolo said yes, EPC will always be asked for approval.

C. Transfer Credit Committee

[VIEW THE REPORT](#)

Academic Partnerships Director, Joanna Liedel, explained that the committee discusses how to review unique credit that comes in and being equitable to students in acknowledging their learning. The committee has robust discussions where members learn more about transferring. The committee wants to create a framework from faculty on what credit means and how it should be approached. The framework is then brought to EPC and the transfer office. Volunteer members do not have to know about transferring to join the committee. Faculty are encouraged to join the committee. They meet once a month.

IV. Program Proposals Review

A. Information Items

Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship
Department of Management

1. Business Administration – Executive – M.B.A.—Suspend admission temporarily (*fall 2023*)

No questions, comments or concerns.

College of Communication and Information

School of Media and Journalism

2. Media and Journalism – M.A.—Suspend admission temporarily to the in-person delivery (*spring 2024*); revise program requirements (*fall 2024*)

No questions, comments or concerns.

Honors College

3. Mission Statement—Revise mission statement (*fall 2024*)

No questions, comments or concerns.

B. Lesser Action Items

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship

Department of Management

1. Dual Degree M.B.A./M.E.T.—Establish program (*fall 2024*)

Chair Dauterich stated that in the note of the proposal, the initiator was emailed that the online portion could not be included. However, it still states the online portion in the proposal summary. He asked if the online portion would be removed from there before it moves to senate.

Secretary Tillett said that it can be changed, but Curriculum Services does not like to edit the proposal summary, so an explanation is done in the comments section. The reason the dual degree cannot be in person is because the M.E.T. is only offered in-person. This item will not go to senate since it is a lesser action item. Curriculum Services can edit the proposal summary if requested by Chair Dauterich. The initiator would not be able to edit the proposal since it is already through the approval process. Christa, the curriculum liaison for the college, did notify the college of the proposal change.

V. Course Proposals Review

A. Lesser Action Items—University Requirements Curriculum Committee (*fall 2024*)

Diversity Requirements

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

1. HIST 41056 History of Colonial America: 1492-1714 *to*: HIST 31084 The Invention of America: 1492-1714 (*Domestic*)

2. HIST 41057 Eighteenth-Century America: 1714-1789 *to*: HIST 31085 Alexander Hamilton's World: 18th-Century America (*Domestic*)

B. Lesser Action Items—Course Changes (*fall 2024*)

Department of History

25. HIST 31106 Progressive America: The United States, 1896-1919 *to*: Progressive America – Reformers, Crusaders and Radicals: America, 1893-1929

Chair Dauterich asked about the programs that were reached out to for support of the history course changes, but have not responded.

Assistant Director Augustine stated, via chat, that EHHS supports the changes and has added documentation to the proposal.

IV. Orientation for New and Returning Members

About EPC—[VIEW](#)

Reading CIM proposals—[VIEW](#)

Questions—[VIEW](#)

Senior Lecturer Laux asked how academic units may browse any proposals going through the workflow before they reach EPC and how they may express concern.

Secretary Kellogg stated that all faculty has access to the CIM system. They can search the proposals going through the workflow and click the green “Add Comment” button on the proposal to ask a question or present a concern. When going to the course or program site, users should click the “Workflow” column title twice and it will populate all proposals in the workflow and display the step where the proposal currently resides. All of the steps in the workflow can be clicked to open the e-mail of the person responsible for the step in the workflow.

Senior Lecturer Laux asked how many items are currently in the workflow.

Secretary Kellogg said that the management list shows all courses in the management site. The top of the list shows the items currently being worked on. She can run a report to get an exact number.

Senior Lecturer Laux said curriculum committees should be proactive in making sure if there is anyone who needs contacted about a proposal for support that they are contacted. Also, they should go into CIM to see what proposals are going through that they need to know about.

Secretary Kellogg added that Curriculum Services also tries to make sure that the proposal initiators contact all of whom they should contact for support. Colleges are becoming better, with the help of the CIM system, in reviewing proposals. The hope is there will be more early intervention.

Secretary Kellogg asked colleges and all academic units to review the workflow e-mail sent out. She reiterated that workflows can be revised, and more steps can be added for notification and approval.

Secretary Tillett added that more faculty and administration are seeing the value in using CIM during their meetings. Even being able to make changes and approve proposals in their meetings. The workflow can be set up so that either the curriculum committee chair reviews or all curriculum committee members can review the proposals with one person to approve. CourseLeaf makes the workflow flexible.

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

With no other comments or questions, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 4:58p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christa N. Ord

Christa N. Ord

Operations and Special Projects Coordinator, Curriculum Services

Office of the Provost