



Meeting Minutes
Monday, 23 March 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

Administrators not present: Associate Provost Scott C. Sheridan

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

Faculty not present: Professor J K. Vick; Assistant Professor Jason Lorenzon

Guests: Asli Arikan, Maureen Blankemeyer, Thomas Brewer, Natalie Cain-Bish, Carolyn Carvalho, Kelly Cichy, Chris Dorsten, Susan Emens, Shannon Helfinstine, Amir Jabbari, Lynette Johnson, Timothy Long, Miriam Matteson, Dirk Remley, Misty Sommers, Kathy Spicer, Jennifer Walton-Fisette, Deirdre Warren, Sharon Wohl, Kathy Zarges, Cathy Zingrone, Melissa Zullo

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 23 March 2026, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 16 February 2026

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

Chair Dauterich requested corrections on page 2 – confusing sentence, page 7 – Associate VP Burke repeated twice, page 7 – last paragraph, summary of paragraph needs removed.

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

II. Presentations

A. Academic Calendar Advisory Committee

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Secretary Tillett announced that the Academic Calendar Committee has been reconvened as a standing EPC committee, activated as needed, to develop the next five years of the academic calendar since the current calendar extends only through spring 2028. Committee membership was included on the agenda, and members were invited to share any questions, concerns or feedback. The committee will meet weekly until the new calendar is completed.

B. Transfer Credit Committee

[VIEW THE PRESENTATION](#)

Assistant University Registrar Sommers reported that the Transfer Credit Subcommittee met twice during the spring semester. In February, the group established International Baccalaureate (IB) credit standards for the Theory of Knowledge and Extended Essay components, which were approved by the Provost and will support submission of the IB credit chart to ODHE by the April 10 deadline, with at least one student already benefiting from the updates. The committee also began developing formal credit standards for credentials, an ongoing effort aimed at improving prior learning assessment and creating a clearer process. In March, the subcommittee reviewed recent state and national legislation impacting transfer credits, leading to informative discussion and feedback. Due to time constraints, discussion of transfer credit appeals and improving policy clarity was postponed and will be addressed at the next meeting.

III. Academic Units Proposals Review

A. Action Items

College of Education, Health and Human Services

School of Health Sciences

1. Nutrition Outreach Center—Relocate center to the College of Public Health (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Caine-Bish reported that the School of Health Sciences is transitioning from the College of Education, Health and Human Services to the new College of Public Health and Health Sciences, and that the associated center will be moved accordingly to align with the new college structure.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

School of Lifespan Development and Educational Sciences

2. Human Development Center—Inactivate center

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Blakemeyer reported that the Human Development Center, originally established to support faculty research and grant activity, is no longer active following the retirement of the faculty member associated with it. The center currently has no personnel or remaining funds, and the building in which it is housed is slated for demolition.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

IV. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Graduate Policies Council

1. Course Privilege for Doctoral Students—Inactivate policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel reported that the course privilege policy, which has been in place for 62 years, is being considered for inactivation. Originally created before modern course controls such as prerequisites were in place, the policy is now outdated, as graduate students already have access through existing systems. As a result, the policy is no longer necessary.

Professor Cunningham made a motion to approve, and Associate Professor Ponder seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

2. Leave of Absence for Graduate Students—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel explained that the leave of absence policy, previously approved by EPC and Faculty Senate, was never added to the catalog due to concerns raised by legal counsel, particularly regarding the short-term leave of absence section. Over the past year, revisions were made in collaboration with legal and other stakeholders. Updates include clarifying language by focusing on ineligible students rather than eligibility, removing health services from the inactive student section due to broader access changes, and establishing a 10-working-day response timeframe for leave requests. The policy also maintains that time away does not count toward time-to-degree limits, with added clarification for accreditation-based exceptions. Overall, the revisions aim to improve clarity and alignment with legal and institutional standards.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

3. Undergraduate Students Enrolling in Graduate Courses—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel reported that the policy was updated to align with the new format and address key advising concerns. The revision removes the restriction preventing courses from later being applied toward a master's degree, allowing students to use graduate coursework toward future programs and encouraging exploration of graduate study. Eligibility requirements were adjusted by lowering the GPA from 3.3 to 3.0 while maintaining the 90-credit hour threshold, and the maximum allowable graduate credits was reduced from 12 to 9 to align with state limits and

combined bachelor's/master's programs. The policy also clarifies that enrollment in graduate courses remains by student request and departmental approval.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

Undergraduate Policies Council

4. Academic Dismissal – Undergraduate—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel reported that the policy underwent a year-and-a-half review process involving data collection and campus feedback, resulting in several key revisions. The policy retains the provision dismissing first-semester students who earn a 0.5 GPA or below, while clarifying that dismissal is only assessed in fall and spring terms, not summer. It removes certain first-semester dismissal criteria related to failing credit hours, though these standards still apply to continuing students. Additionally, the policy maintains provisions aimed at preventing financial aid misuse. Finally, the policy is being restructured to separate dismissal, appeal and reinstatement into distinct but related policies to improve clarity and flexibility for future updates.

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

With no comments or questions, the item passed unanimously.

5. Academic Dismissal Appeal – Undergraduate—Establish policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel explained that the appeals policy, while technically a new standalone policy, consolidates language previously included within the dismissal, appeal and reinstatement policy. Appeals are initiated immediately after dismissal, with students given 10 working days to submit a request if they believe the decision was made in error or due to extenuating circumstances. The proposed changes centralize the appeals process under the Provost's Office to improve consistency, replacing the current decentralized, unit-based approach that has resulted in variation across colleges and campuses. A standardized rubric will be used to evaluate appeals, supported by a committee including representation from campuses and faculty. The committee will review written appeals and meet twice annually, with members serving three-year terms. Additional changes include developing an online submission form to replace the current paper-based process. The revisions aim to ensure a more consistent, equitable, and transparent appeals process while still maintaining meaningful academic input from colleges and faculty.

Associate Professor Earp made motion to approve, and Assistant Professor Reed seconded the motion.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

6. Critical Reading Strategies Placement—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel reported that the University Readiness Standards and Placement policy has been restructured from a single, lengthy document into multiple discrete but related policies to improve clarity and usability. As part of this reorganization, the policy was renamed and updated to reflect program changes, including the inactivation of one developmental course (READ 00003) so that only READ 00006 remains. The placement standards themselves were not changed; updates primarily focused on aligning the policy with current course offerings and adopting the new standardized policy format.

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

Secretary Tillett asked whether the committee discussed why the program is offered exclusively at the regional campuses and limited to those students.

Director Liedel responded that the courses are offered at the regional campuses due to their Open Access mission, which serves students who are returning to education or entering without traditional college-level readiness. These courses are designed to support student success by building foundational skills such as reading and study strategies. She noted that regional campus leadership oversees the program and that students often choose to enroll voluntarily when they feel they need additional academic support.

Secretary Tillett asked if the course was only offered at Stark or on all regionals.

Director Liedel said that she believes that they do offer it on other campuses. It is just the Stark campus that manages it.

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

7. English Placement—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel reported that the policy update primarily involved formatting changes. Earlier in the year, Jen Cunningham had already updated some of the scores, and this revision incorporated those changes while transitioning the document into the new standardized format, including the addition of FAQs and definitions.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

8. Foreign Language Placement—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel reported that the updates to the English policy primarily involved transitioning it to the new standardized format, with minimal substantive changes. The main revision was updating the list of acceptable tests and scores used to demonstrate English proficiency for international students, reflecting additions to the list as it continues to expand.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

9. Mathematics Placement—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel explained that this policy revision is the same as the last—updated format.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

10. Placement Assessments—Establish policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel stated that the language was brought from another policy and put in the new format.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

11. Posthumous Degrees—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Professor Liedel reported that the policy, last revised in 2015, has been updated to reflect current practices developed over the past 11 years. Key changes include transferring oversight of the process from the Office of the Provost to the Office of the President, updating procedures for initial contact when a family member or loved one requests a degree, and revising language to be more inclusive of all potential requestors, such as spouses, domestic partners and children, rather than limiting it to parents.

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

Chair Dauterich asked why the policy moved to the President's Office.

Director Liedel clarified that Lashonda Taylor oversees the process, including its connection to commencement and related recognitions, while continuing to coordinate with the Registrar's Office. The Registrar's Office is responsible for attesting to completion percentages and working with faculty, and this responsibility was transferred several years ago.

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

12. Registration—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel reported that the late registration portion of a broader policy is being minimally revised by removing the non-payment fee requirement. This change was requested by the Bursar's Office and the Registrar's Office, as the fee has not been assessed since 2020 and is not intended to be reinstated. The update will remove the fee from the policy, and a subsequent request will be made to remove it from the fee register.

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

With no comments or questions, the item passed unanimously.

13. University Readiness Standards—Revise policy

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Director Liedel reported that this policy represents the final component of the University Readiness Standards and Placement series, which has been divided into six separate policies. This particular section is required by the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) and contains a state-mandated metric and chart. The content is directly adopted from the state's website and is presented as a standalone policy to comply with catalog requirements.

Associate Professor Wamsley made a motion to approve, and Professor Cunningham seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

Graduate Dean's Advisory Council

14. Transfer of Graduate Council

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Dean Cichy reported that the proposed revision to the transfer policy originated from the Graduate Dean's Advisory Council and would allow credits from a previously earned degree to be applied toward certificate and non-degree programs. Currently, the policy does not permit this, which can require students to repeat coursework or take unrelated courses, adding unnecessary time and cost and potentially discouraging enrollment. The revision would enable programs, at their discretion, to accept such credits for applicable credentials while maintaining program-level control over transfer decisions.

Professor Cunningham made a motion to approve, and Assistant Professor Reed seconded the motion.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

V. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items

College of Applied and Technical Studies

1. Applied Organizational Leadership – A.B.A.S.—Establish 90-credit bachelor’s degree (fall 2026)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Dean Emens provided an overview of the College of Applied and Technical Studies (CATS), noting that the college serves a broad range of programs from certificates through bachelor’s degrees with a focus on technical education, workforce development and non-traditional, regional campus students such as adult learners, career changers and working professionals. She highlighted that CATS programs are designed to provide accessible, affordable pathways aligned with regional workforce needs across disciplines such as nursing, engineering technology, IT, radiology and social work. She then discussed the proposed Accelerated Bachelor of Applied Studies (reduced-credit bachelor’s degree), which is intended to serve adult and non-traditional learners and aligns with state expectations for accelerated degree pathways. The proposal includes revisions made in response to prior discussions, including replacing certain courses to ensure accreditation alignment and offering several modifications to address concerns from other departments, though consensus was not reached with some units. The program retains the full Kent Core, includes 39 upper-division credit hours and incorporates leadership-focused coursework across multiple disciplines, with a total degree requirement of approximately 91–94 credit hours. She emphasized that the curriculum draws on faculty expertise within CATS and across the university, includes consultation with multiple departments and is comparable to similar organizational leadership programs at peer institutions that are not housed within business colleges. She also underscored the program’s goal of expanding access to underserved adult learners in Ohio supported by labor market and educational attainment data.

Dean Spake reported that she worked collaboratively with Peggy Shadduck over several months to revise the proposed Accelerated Bachelor of Applied Studies degree, with a primary focus on ensuring the program would not be subject to AACSB accreditation. She explained that multiple revisions were made in response to accreditation considerations, including modifying course content to reduce the proportion of business or business-like coursework below the accreditation threshold, such as replacing certain courses with communications and technical and applied studies options and adjusting the capstone course. She also noted that several proposed changes originated from regional campus feedback, including renaming the major to Applied Leadership Studies, revising course prefixes from LEAD to ATS and modifying terminology to reduce association with a traditional business degree. Additional adjustments included changing the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code to further distinguish the program from business disciplines. Dean Spake emphasized that these changes reflect an

effort to address accreditation concerns while refining the program structure and positioning it as distinct from a business degree.

Chairperson Arian reported that the department reviewed the proposed degree program and subsequent revisions through its curriculum committee meetings on February 18 and March 6, focusing on course listings, program alignment and application details. The department raised concerns about potential overlap with existing programs, including the management major, general business program and transfer pathways from BMRT, particularly given similarities in leadership content and the use of related course material. They also expressed concern about mixed messaging for prospective students and employers, as well as the possibility that a three-year degree could compete with or divert students from existing four-year pathways. The department acknowledged the value of the proposed program but suggested that its content and student population align closely with existing offerings, especially within regional campus pathways and two-plus-one models. They indicated that while they would not object to the coursework itself, concerns would be mitigated if the term "organizational" were removed, as they view organizational leadership as closely aligned with the management discipline. Overall, the department emphasized concerns about program overlap, potential cannibalization of existing programs and clarity in program positioning within the broader academic landscape.

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

Professor Cunningham asked for clarification regarding whether the state requirement for 90-credit hour degree programs means that institutions are required to have at least one such program, noting that Kent State already has one in place. He inquired whether the program under consideration is necessary to meet compliance or if its approval is not essential at this time and would not negatively impact the university if not passed.

Dean Shadduck confirmed that while each institution is required to have at least one 90-credit hour degree program, Kent State has already submitted one that has not yet been approved. She explained that peer institutions are pursuing multiple such programs, and in order for Kent State to remain competitive, it will likely need to offer several programs tailored to different target audiences. She emphasized that the College of Applied and Technical Studies is focused on serving adult learners, particularly working professionals without prior college credit, and noted that pursuing multiple programs aligns with these goals.

Associate Professor Earp asked if the program is designed for working adults, why Flashes 101 is required.

Dean Shadduck explained that the program would follow the same approach used for other adult learners, applying standard requirements while maintaining flexibility where appropriate. She noted that if exemptions or alternative options to Flashes 101 exist for incoming adult students, those alternatives would be considered in the same manner as they are for other degree programs.

Professor Jewell asked for clarification on how the program will specifically target its intended audience and whether targeting a particular group would exclude other individuals from enrolling. He also asked for confirmation on whether the program would remain open to any eligible student despite its focus on a specific population.

Dean Shadduck confirmed that the program is designed with a target audience in mind, similar to other university degrees, but remains open to all eligible students. She emphasized that recruitment and advising would play a key role in guiding students toward the pathway that best fits their goals, and that this program would be no exception. If alternative degree options better suit a student's needs, advisors would encourage those pathways instead. She also explained that recruitment efforts would differ from traditional undergraduate models and would focus on direct outreach to local companies, particularly those near regional campuses, to support working adults and employees seeking advancement rather than relying primarily on high school recruitment.

Professor Jewell asked if Dean Shadduck has a list of companies, targeted organizations or specific employees.

Dean Shadduck explained that recruitment and outreach for the program would be conducted in close collaboration with the regional campuses. The College of Applied and Technical Studies works closely with regional campus deans, who maintain strong relationships with employers across Northeast Ohio. These established connections would be used to engage potential students through direct outreach coordinated by the regional campus deans.

Professor Jewell noted that recruiting adult learners would require a different approach, including distinct promotional materials tailored to this audience, and asked if that is part of the program plan.

Dean Shadduck confirmed that the program would involve a different promotional and outreach approach as part of its implementation, with targeted efforts to build awareness of Kent State's offerings in a market where peer institutions are already active. She noted that institutions such as Penn State, the University of Cincinnati and Wright State are competing in this space, while Kent State currently has a gap in serving this population. The proposed strategy aims to better reach these prospective students, reduce the number of students going to competitor institutions and align outreach efforts with the needs of this specific audience.

Professor Jewell expressed concern about the characterization that prospective students are being sent to competitor institutions, noting that this may be overstated. He also asked whether any feasibility study has been conducted to support the assumption that students who do not enroll at Kent State would choose other institutions instead.

Dean Shadduck responded that while no formal feasibility study has been conducted, her perspective is based on anecdotal evidence gathered through individual conversations with

employers and during events at regional campuses. In these discussions, employers have expressed interest in Kent State offering programs of this type closer to their locations.

Chairperson Arian followed up on the discussion by referencing the market study included in the Applied Organizational Leadership application materials in the CIM system. She noted that the documented employer outreach primarily included large for-profit corporations and organizations such as the Cleveland Clinic and observed that there appeared to be limited documentation of engagement with smaller companies or organizations that had been mentioned in the discussion, suggesting that such information may be missing from the provided materials.

Associate Dean Emens explained that the letters of support included in the proposal were intended to demonstrate employer acceptance of the program across a broad range of organizations. She noted that examples such as University Hospitals, a nonprofit health system, were included to show that employers of that scale would find a reduced-credit, 90-hour bachelor's degree acceptable. The purpose of these letters was to illustrate employer support for the program concept and its viability as a relatively new degree structure.

Professor Rugare suggested that an associate's degree could address the needs of the target population, particularly for individuals seeking to obtain a qualification as quickly as possible. He asked whether, given the needs of potential employers, there was a specific reason why an associate's degree would not be considered an appropriate alternative for this program.

Dean Shadduck explained that associate degrees fall into two main categories: transfer-oriented degrees (such as the AA and AS) designed to prepare students for bachelor's programs, and technical associate degrees intended to lead directly into the workforce. While some technical associate degrees can serve as pathways into bachelor's programs, she emphasized that a bachelor's degree provides a fundamentally different educational experience. Specifically, bachelor's degrees include a full general education core that offers broader academic exposure and a greater number of upper-division courses that develop advanced critical thinking and problem-solving skills. In contrast, associate degrees typically include fewer core requirements and are composed primarily of lower-division coursework. As a result, she noted that a bachelor's degree and a technical associate degree serve different purposes and represent distinct academic pathways.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked for clarification on the reasons behind the dispute, requesting that someone present a clear and complete explanation of the underlying concerns.

Dean Spake explained that two issues were raised initially: one related to accreditation, which has been resolved, and a second ongoing concern centered on disciplinary overlap. Specifically, the department believes that organizational leadership falls within its academic domain and is concerned that introducing a separate bachelor's degree with that title could create confusion about departmental ownership or be perceived as a management-related program, raising concerns about potential overlap in scope and identity.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked a follow-up question seeking clarification on whether the business college believes it is already providing the same or similar education as the proposed program, indicating uncertainty about whether the program overlaps with existing offerings.

Dean Spake replied that they have a Business Management major which is delivered both on Kent campus and all regional campuses.

Chairperson Arikan stated that the business college does provide similar educational content through existing offerings, including certificates, a leadership minor, a management degree available on regional campuses, and a general business program. She noted that there are overlapping courses, including leadership-related content covered within the general business curriculum in both online and in-person formats.

Dean Shadduck acknowledged the differing perspectives and explained that the College of Applied and Technical Studies' position is informed by national trends, noting that many universities offer bachelor's degrees in organizational leadership outside of colleges of business. She emphasized that while the College of Business provides high-quality programs, the proposed organizational leadership pathway is intended to serve a different learner population with distinct goals. She also clarified that the proposal did not include a name change for the degree, as that option was considered but did not resolve the disagreement, which ultimately reflects a difference in opinion about the value of offering the program as proposed.

Chairperson Arikan clarified that the Department of Management is supportive of a three-year degree, or other degree lengths as deemed appropriate by the university, and that their concerns are not about the duration of the degree but rather the overlap with existing programs. She explained that after reviewing examples from other institutions, such as Wright State and University of Cincinnati, those programs appear to function as complete degrees with flexible or placeholder coursework, whereas the proposed Kent State degree is not designed in the same way. She also noted that organizational leadership courses at other universities are often context-specific to a particular college, while the Department of Management's courses are broadly applicable across organizational types without such qualifiers, which contributes to concerns about curricular overlap.

With no further comments or questions, the item passed with 11 yeas, seven nays and two abstentions.

With no further questions or comments, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 5:58pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Christa N. Ord

Christa N. Ord

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