



Meeting Minutes

Monday, 26 January 2026

[VIEW THE MEETING](#)

Leadership present: Chair Edward Dauterich; Secretaries Therese E. Tillett, 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, Robert D. Jewell, Karen L. Mascolo, Hyunjoo (Gerrey) Noh, Helen Piontkivska, JD Ponder, Steven N. Rugare, J K. Vick; Associate Professors Brian R. Barber, Vanessa J. Earp, Bethany G. Lanese, Abe G. Osbourne, Sue Wamsley; Assistant Professors Abdelhakim Al Turk, Tianyuan Guan, Jason Lorenzon, Janet M. Reed; Senior Lecturers Kingsly T. Berlin, Shelley K. Marshall; Lecturer Olivia B. Krise

Students present: Iyanoluwa Ogunmiluyi

Guests: Asli Arikan, Christina Bloebaum, Scott Bunge, Christina Burnworth, Carolyn Carvalho, Alicia Crowe, Emmanuel Dechenaux, David Dees, Chris Dorsten, Susan Emens, Beate Gersch, Shawn Golden, Eric Johnson, Doug Kubinski, Timothy Long, Jennifer McCullough, Sarah Motts, Jennifer Newberger, Jennifer Ray-Tomasek, Dirk Remley, Nate Ritchey, Jenya Sopranova, Kimberly Steele-Marks, Francisco Torres, Christopher Totten, Jonathan VanFossen, Jennifer Walton-Fisette, Deirdre Warren, Shelly Weekley, Sharon Wohl, Kathy Zarges, Cathy Zingrone

Chair Dauterich called the meeting to order at 3:20p.m., on Monday, 26 January 2026, via Microsoft Teams.

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Meeting on 20 January 2026

Dean Shadduck made a motion to approve, and Associate Professor Barber seconded the motion.

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

II. Policy Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Office of the Provost

1. University Policy Regarding the Curricular Approval Process—Establish policy to comply with Ohio Revised Code 3345.457 (spring 2026)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

VP Kubinski explained that the proposed university policy is required under House Bill 96 (HB 96), the state budget bill, and aligns with Ohio Revised Code 3345.457. The law requires the university to submit a Board of Trustees-approved curricular approval process to the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) by the end of March. He outlined the three statutory requirements the policy must address: (1) granting Faculty Senate the ability to provide advice, feedback and recommendations on all curricular approvals, (2) clarifying that Faculty Senate input is advisory in nature and (3) retaining the Board of Trustees' overriding authority to approve, modify, reject or defer any curricular changes. The policy presented is a high-level university policy intended to capture the institution's existing curricular approval process rather than change it. It is designed to satisfy the statutory requirements and clearly document current practice in a form acceptable to ODHE. The policy includes definitions, a purpose and scope section referencing the statute, a statement of statutory requirements and a four-step overview of the curricular approval process, with explicit reaffirmation of the Board of Trustees' ultimate authority. VP Kubinski noted that the policy must be resubmitted to ODHE every five years and includes a standard provision stating that the statute supersedes other policies and procedures. He emphasized that the policy is broad and does not preclude the future development of an administrative policy to further codify detailed curricular processes.

Associate Professor Wamsley made a motion to approve, and Professor Armour seconded. With no questions, comments or concerns, the item passed unanimously.

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

Revisioning the Kent Core Committee

2. Kent Core Requirement—Revise the Kent Core Requirement, including revise name to Pathways of Inquiry (fall 2027)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Dees presented revisions to the proposed general education program based on additional faculty feedback gathered through a post-December Senate survey. He reiterated the original recommendations including clearer learning outcomes to address Higher Learning Commission concerns, a faculty-governed body focused on general education, a student advisory group and a revised course distribution and program name. He emphasized that revisions are constrained by Ohio Transfer 36 requirements and are designed to avoid increasing time to graduation. Survey feedback was largely positive regarding the learning outcomes framework, pathways of inquiry model and governance structure while concerns focused on removal of the second writing requirement, the credit weight of the Pressing Issues category and overall model clarity. In response the proposal reduces the Pressing Issues requirement to three credit hours, designates American civics as a standalone state-mandated requirement and

reallocates remaining credits to pathway electives to provide flexibility for majors and students. Associate Professor Dees concluded that the revised model better balances faculty feedback, institutional mission and student needs while simplifying requirements from the student perspective.

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

Professor Cunningham stated that survey feedback consistently showed strong concern about the removal of the second writing course, yet the proposal did not address that feedback. She explained that for many students, particularly those completing College Credit Plus, Research Writing (ENG 21011) is their first sustained university-level writing experience and is essential for developing research skills, information literacy, citation practices, AI literacy and preparation for writing-intensive courses in the major. She cautioned that removing this requirement would weaken student preparedness and shift the burden to upper-division instructors. Professor Cunningham also raised concerns about adding AI as a stand-alone option within the Pressing Issues category, noting that the state expects AI literacy to be embedded within existing courses rather than added as a new requirement and arguing that this trade-off for removing research writing is pedagogically unsound. She further questioned the feasibility of the Pressing Issues category due to its anticipated need for frequent revision as state priorities change. Professor Cunningham proposed an alternative model that would preserve the second writing course, move civics into essential foundations and convert Pressing Issues into a fully elective category while still allowing oversight and optional inclusion of AI or entrepreneurship courses. She concluded that because survey feedback was not adequately incorporated, particularly regarding the second writing requirement.

Associate Professor Dees clarified that the Pressing Issues category is not intended to create a stand-alone AI requirement but to reflect Kent State's tradition of examining emerging technologies and articulating institutional values within general education. He emphasized that Pressing Issues is meant to distinguish the program and reinforce personal and social responsibility rather than function as a generic elective. He explained that themes would rotate every three to five years to limit disruption and that a new faculty governance body would allow for more timely and sustainable program updates. Associate Professor Dees also noted that if preserving the second writing requirement is preferred, one pathway elective could be converted back into a second composition course with minimal changes to the overall model.

Professor Cunningham clarified that the proposed compromise would restore the second writing requirement to a total of six composition credit hours rather than nine and stated that she would support this approach, noting it aligns with earlier general education models.

Associate Professor Dees agreed that this represents a reasonable and straightforward compromise and reiterated the importance of retaining the Pressing Issues category to promote interdisciplinary engagement and faculty participation in general education. He emphasized that Pressing Issues themes would be driven by institutional priorities and student interest rather

than House Bill 96 and would evolve over time. Associate Professor Dees asked whether reallocating a pathway elective to restore the second writing course would be acceptable.

Professor Cunningham confirmed her full support for this approach.

Professor Piontkivska expressed concern about the proposal to make the second writing course an elective. She noted that students entering with College Credit Plus (CCP) or AP credit may bypass foundational English courses, and while Kent State allows students with an AP score of 3 to advance, they may miss essential writing instruction. She argued that making the second writing course an elective could result in students lacking critical writing skills needed for other university courses, particularly in sciences and hard sciences where literacy is essential. She emphasized that while some students are highly capable writers, many are not, creating an opt-in versus opt-out problem. Professor Piontkivska noted that even students who barely pass CCP will need guidance, and instructors will still attempt to teach them foundational skills. She concluded that the second writing course should remain part of the foundational requirements and that foundational writing credit hours should total six to ensure students are literate and able to communicate effectively.

Associate Professor Dees responded to Professor Piontkivska's concerns by agreeing that restoring the second writing course as a requirement would address the issue. He noted that it ensures students receive necessary foundational writing instruction, while acknowledging that questions remain about how prior credits are counted or bypassed. He indicated that reinstating the course appears to be a straightforward and effective solution.

Professor Cunningham agreed with Professor Piontkivska, confirming that students who have taken college writing courses are accounted for in this context.

Associate Professor Wamsley expressed strong support for maintaining the second writing course, stating that students clearly need it and agreeing that reinstating it is a good compromise. She indicated she had additional questions regarding the Pressing Issues category but suggested addressing those separately after the discussion on writing.

Director Zingrone asked whether the six-hour pathway elective would have a specific list of courses for students to choose from, or whether students could select courses from other Pathways of Inquiry categories or other courses such as ENG 21101.

Associate Professor Dees clarified that the courses in question are general education electives, not program-specific options. Students may choose from within the state-required general education categories and while these function-like free electives, they must remain within the designated general education buckets.

Director Zingrone explained that her question stemmed from English 21011 not appearing in a category and how a student would take it as a pathway elective. She referenced existing options

such as Principles of Thinking or COM 15000 and sought clarification on whether students would choose from a limited list or from other categories.

Associate Professor Dees stated that students would choose from the other required categories and noted that moving the elective to composition would help clarify the structure.

Associate Professor Wamsley expressed concern that while the idea sounded appealing in theory, its practical implementation was unclear. She questioned who would determine when a new pressing issue is added and which issue would be removed, noting that the decision-making process could become political.

Associate Professor Dees explained that the intent is to rely on a newly charged faculty committee to determine the themes and manage the timing of when they are introduced and phased out. He added that this is a large, well-represented committee across all colleges and is intended to be the forum where this type of dialogue and discussion would take place.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked how often the issues would be reviewed, whether on an annual, multi-year or longer cycle and whether the specific timeframe would be determined later.

Associate Professor Dees explained that thematic approaches typically rotate one theme every few years, allowing students to choose a new theme during their four-year enrollment. Some themes may be retained permanently, with oversight provided by the governing body in consultation with the faculty committee and Faculty Senate.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked for an example of a university who does this and how they have done it.

Associate Professor Dees noted that the thematic program cited was established within a single college, not university-wide, and was credited with benefiting the College of Arts and Sciences at Purdue.

Dean Bloebaum asked for confirmation that previous surveys and discussions had addressed the second composition course and that votes had taken place.

Associate Professor Dees replied that there was a vote in URCC.

Dean Bloebaum explained that the college supports changing the requirement to allow more electives and flexibility, especially given strict accreditation requirements in programs like aeronautics, engineering, and nursing. She noted that the lack of flexibility makes it difficult for students to graduate in 120 hours and emphasized the importance of allowing programs to decide which courses best fit their needs.

Associate Professor Dees said he understands concerns about prescribed courses and emphasized efforts to build in as much flexibility as possible to address these pressure points.

Senior Lecturer Marshall suggested combining Pressing Issues and pathway electives into a single grouping called Pathway Electives.

Associate Professor Dees explained that Pressing Issues are tied to a specific learning outcome focused on personal and social responsibility. He emphasized that making it an elective would constrain the purpose of the electives and go against the original vision of the program.

Professor Rugare suggested that Pressing Issues could be integrated across disciplines like fine arts, humanities, basic science, and social science, with courses receiving a "Pressing Issues" designation or badge. This approach could address goals like interactivity and collaboration without requiring a separate credit category.

Associate Professor Dees explained that integrating pressing issues into existing courses was considered but rejected because it was confusing for students and advisors, as seen previously with the diversity requirement. He emphasized the design team's goal of creating a distinct program element that clearly reflects the institution's values and avoids dilution or additional tracking challenges.

Assistant Professor Lorenzon expressed concern that giving programs too much structure, especially in aeronautics with heavy, non-elective majors, could limit student flexibility. He noted that while he appreciated the work done, the approach might strongly constrain students in already rigid programs.

Associate Professor Dees discussed credit hour concerns, noting that summer courses and other adjustments could help address pressures without compromising the program. He emphasized the program's goal of functioning as a distinct academic program while supporting majors and suggested working with individual units to explore minor curriculum adjustments to benefit students.

Assistant Professor Al Turk noted that in the College of Aeronautics and Engineering, credit reductions with departments like physics and math are limited because program requirements, such as the 30-credit hour math requirement for industrial engineering, are fixed.

With no further comments, questions or concerns, Chair Dauterich explained that if the vote does not pass, the committee would likely revise the plan rather than create an entirely new one. He clarified that friendly amendments usually don't require a vote, but if preferred, members could vote on them first. With no objections, the friendly amendment was accepted, and the group proceeded to vote on the amended proposal.

The item passed with 13 yeas, eight nays and four abstentions.

III. Program Proposals Review

A. Action Items

Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship

Department of Management

1. Healthcare Systems Management for Business Majors – Minor—Inactivate program (*fall 2026*)

2. Military Leadership Studies – Minor—Suspend admission (*spring 2026*) and inactivate program (*fall 2026*)

Department of Marketing and Entrepreneurship

1. Entrepreneurship for Non-Business Majors – Minor—Inactivate program (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Dean Spake explained that all three minors appeared on the Provost's low-enrollment list, each graduating fewer than 10 students per year. She noted that there were two versions of the minor, one designed for business students and one for non-business students. As a result, three minors are being closed and consolidated into the corresponding versions with higher enrollment.

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

With no questions or comments, the items passed unanimously.

College of Applied and Technical Studies

4. Applied Organizational Leadership – A.B.A.S.—Establish 90-credit bachelor's degree and new degree (*fall 2026*)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Dean Shadduck outlined the background and rationale for reduced credit bachelor's degrees, noting that the Higher Learning Commission approved a process in 2024 and that state law now requires each public university to offer an accelerated 90 credit hour degree by the 2027 academic year. She described the national trend toward 90 to 96 credit hour bachelor's degrees and emphasized Kent State's efforts to comply with state expectations. She reviewed Kent State's prior approval of the accelerated Bachelor of Applied Studies in Insurance Studies which is still under review by the Ohio Department of Higher Education and noted the recent requirement to include the word "accelerated" in degree titles to clearly distinguish these programs from traditional BA and BS degrees. Dean Shadduck then summarized the proposed accelerated Bachelor of Applied Studies in Applied Organizational Leadership housed in the College of Applied and Technical Studies. She explained that the program targets adult non-traditional learners served through the regional campuses and retains the full Kent Core and 39 upper division credit hours. She concluded by describing the degree as a three year approximately 90 credit hour program focused on leadership across diverse organizational

settings drawing on existing and new courses from multiple disciplines while intentionally avoiding classification as a business degree.

Assistant Professor Long reviewed the course structure for the proposed accelerated degree, noting the inclusion of core major courses such as BMRT Human Resource Management, Communications and Information Technology. He explained that several existing Applied and Technical Studies courses were transitioned to a LEAD prefix to align with common practice in organizational and strategic leadership programs and that two new upper-level LEAD courses were developed to complete the sequence. He described the major electives which provide flexibility through options in organizational communication, professional selling, human development and family studies, English, psychology, information technology and related areas. He emphasized that these choices allow students to tailor the degree to their professional backgrounds and career goals. Professor Long noted the challenge of designing a 90-credit hour degree while still meeting Kent Core requirements the 39 upper division credit hour requirement and the American civic literacy requirement. He emphasized that the streamlined structure makes the degree less cumbersome than a traditional 120 credit hour program. He concluded by explaining that the degree is sector neutral and well suited for adult learners and working professionals such as first responders, law enforcement, healthcare workers, public safety employees and those in manufacturing and logistics, making it an effective accelerated completer pathway.

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

Dean Spake asked whether the proposed degree program uses the same state level CIP code as the business program.

Dean Shadduck stated that she did not know the answer and would need to review the CIP code to confirm whether it matches the business program.

Dean Spake acknowledged the interdisciplinary intent of the proposed degree but noted that several courses may be viewed as business-like. She emphasized the need to avoid unintentionally triggering Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accreditation, which occurs when one quarter or more of required credit hours are business or business related. She cautioned that at the 90-credit hour level required business-related coursework should remain at 24 credit hours or fewer. Dean Spake suggested moving some business-oriented courses to electives to stay below the threshold and noted that accreditors may focus on course titles in addition to content.

Dean Shadduck stated that the college will look at the CIP code, but the approach is across all different kinds of organizations. It is not limited to for-profit organizations. She said if they need to do some adjustment with the CIP code, they can.

Dean Shadduck noted that the program under discussion is not a business degree, emphasizing that this had been discussed with the Provost nearly three years ago before any program work began.

Dean Spake expressed support for the three-year degree while cautioning that care should be taken to avoid any confusion regarding business accreditation and to ensure it is clear the program is not a business degree.

Dean Shadduck confirmed that the current program design is well below the threshold for business coursework and agreed that language should be clarified to make this distinction explicit.

Dean Spake suggested reviewing courses that might appear business-related and potentially swapping one or two required courses with electives to further reduce any perception of a business focus.

Dean Shadduck noted that only the BMRT courses fall into this category and that they represent a small portion of the curriculum.

Dean Spake recommended that once the degree requirements are clearly defined the program be submitted to the accreditor for guidance.

With no further questions or comments, the item passed with 16 yeas, three nays and four abstentions.

5. Human Services – A.A.S.—revise name to Social Work Assistant and Addictions; revise delivery from mostly online to online only; revise description, outcomes (fall 2026)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Academic Program Director Steele-Marks explained that the program is proposing a name change from the Associate Applied Science Degree in Human Services to the Associate Applied Science Degree in Social Work Assistant and Addictions. This change is intended to reduce ambiguity around the Human Services field and align the program with endorsed credentials recognized by the Ohio Social Work Board and the Chemical Dependency Board. She noted that Human Services has been endorsed since 2017, making the program one of the first in the state to receive recognition for meeting or exceeding education requirements for the Social Work Assistant and Chemical Dependency Counseling Assistant designations. The program continues to be taught from a generalist perspective, and it is not a social work degree. The endorsement process allows students to meet education requirements that make them eligible for credentials and licensure, enabling them to enter the workforce earlier with internships providing practical experience toward required field hours. Academic Program Director Steele-Marks emphasized that the name change clarifies the program's focus while maintaining the same curriculum and generalist approach and it helps students understand the marketable credentials and pathways available upon graduation.

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

Associate Professor Wamsley asked for clarification on the 2,000 required field hours, requesting an example of what typical work in the field entails.

Director Steele-Marks explained that students may earn a chemical dependency certification after completing the first three required courses. This certification can be renewed through additional Human Services coursework that covers the required content areas. Students are not required to pursue licensure; however, if they complete a Human Services degree, they become eligible to do so. She noted that the required 2,000 hours of field experience for licensure may begin during a student's internship or after earning the Chemical Dependency Counselor Assistant (CDCA) credential if the student is employed in a supervised setting. Supervised experience includes being taught, observed, and guided by qualified staff and may involve roles such as group facilitation, resident monitoring, or intake work, depending on the position. Students interested in pursuing licensure are encouraged to complete their internship in a chemical dependency treatment setting so those hours can count toward the 2,000-hour requirement, which is approximately equivalent to one year of employment.

Associate Professor Wamsley asked for confirmation that students can obtain the required experience through employment.

Director Steele-Marks replied "yes." She noted that the chemical dependency field offers multiple pathways to reduce barriers to entry, especially for individuals in recovery. While a preliminary CDCA can be earned without college coursework through approved CEUs, college education is preferred for more comprehensive preparation. She added that two semesters of internship allow students to complete many required work hours before graduation.

Associate Professor Barber asked if Counselor Education and Supervision (CES) and Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) were

Director Steele-Marks addressed concerns regarding overlap, student confusion and credentialing related to the proposed program name. She clarified that the degree differs from existing certificates in scope, level and target population and that Human Services credentialing pathways have been board-endorsed since 2017. The associate degree does not duplicate the upper-division Addictions Counseling Certificate and students are referred appropriately. She explained that CDCA credentials allow multiple pathways, consistent with the board's goal of reducing barriers and that the program remains formally endorsed. Regarding HDFS concerns, she noted that Human Services is no longer part of the HDFS pathway due to eliminated concentrations and that the name change would reduce confusion, align with scopes of practice and has BSW program support. She emphasized that the Social Work Assistant is an applied behavioral science role with a broad scope already reflected in existing coursework with no curricular changes proposed. The name change is intended to benefit students and workforce

clarity, and the associate degree's endorsement allows graduates to meet credentialing requirements without additional audits.

Associate Professor Barber asked if commented that it still does seem as though two programs continue to assert encroachment issues related to the current version of this proposal, and materials related to their concerns were not included for EPC review. He said he is concerned about transparency and integrity of the decision-making process.

Academic Program Director Steele-Marks stated that the letters and emails for collaboration had been sent to be attached to the proposal. She clarified that they were not part of her previous responses because she did not receive the HDFS materials until the previous Friday. She also noted that Social Work's statement of support was included.

With no further questions or comments, the item passed with 15 yeas, five nays and three abstentions.

Move programs to the School of Art, College of the Arts

6. Animation Game Design – B.S.—Revise department/college; inactivate at Stark Campus; revise description, course requirements, roadmap (fall 2026)

7. Game Design – Minor—Revise department/college, outcomes, course requirements (fall 2026)

8. Modeling and Animation – Minor—Revise department/college; inactivate at Stark Campus; revise outcomes, course requirements (fall 2026)

[**VIEW THE DISCUSSION**](#)

Associate Professor Totten provided background on the proposed move of the Animation Game Design (AGD) program noting that discussions began approximately two years ago in response to increased enrollment and guidance from the Dean and Provost. After evaluating several units, the program proposed moving to the School of Art based on alignment in curriculum content collaboration opportunities accreditation under NASAD and shared goals related to exhibition festivals and professional outcomes. He stated that AGD would become a program within the School of Art while maintaining its current NASAD-accredited curriculum with minor revisions. He explained that the Technical Modeling Design associate degree would remain in the College of Applied Technical Studies with relevant courses reclassified under a TMD designation.

Curriculum changes include adjustments to required and elective courses, the addition of two new major electives in Lighting and Compositing and Level Design and general course revisions reflecting industry trends. Totten noted that the program would be inactivated at the Stark campus due to low enrollment with students being taught out and offered options to transition to Kent or Tuscarawas. Enrollment data for fall 2025 showed 182 students at Kent 58 at Tuscarawas and 13 at Stark. AGD will be centered at the Kent campus within the School of Art with full upper and lower division offerings while Tuscarawas will offer lower division courses through synchronous online or V3 modalities and through articulation with the TMD degree. He also noted that minors associated with the program are moving to the School of Art.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

College of Aeronautics and Engineering**School of Aeronautics****9. Aviation Sciences – M.S.—Establish program (*fall 2026*)****10. Aviation Science – Ph.D.—Establish program (*fall 2026*)**[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)**School of Engineering****11. Aeronautical Systems Engineering Technology – B.S.—Revise name to Aerospace****Engineering Technology; revise accreditation, description, course requirements, graduation requirements, roadmap (*fall 2026*)**[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Dean Bloebaum outlined the college's strategic focus on paired engineering and engineering technology programs noting that the top four programs have been approved by Faculty Senate and are advancing to the Board of Trustees in March. She explained that these pairs align theoretical engineering programs with more hands-on engineering technology counterparts. While most pairs are well matched, she identified a mismatch between aerospace engineering and aeronautical systems engineering technology which prompted the proposed name change and minor curriculum revisions. She clarified that aeronautical refers to air applications while aerospace includes both air and space and noted that the current curriculum already includes space-related content. Following discussions with ABET approximately two to three years ago it was confirmed that a name change could occur under the existing curriculum though faculty chose to make modest updates. These include adding a spacecraft design course and removing another course. She emphasized that aerospace engineering technology is a rapidly growing field with projected growth of six to eight percent over the next decade driven by advances in air mobility and the expansion of commercial space. Dean Bloebaum expressed confidence that the name change and slight curricular adjustments will increase program appeal improving alignment and strengthen the college's position without creating competition elsewhere.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

College of Arts and Sciences**Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry****12. Biochemistry – Minor—Establish program (*fall 2026*)**[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Bunge reported that the department created a biochemistry major within the last three years, which has been well received by students. Building on this success, the

department is now working to establish a biochemistry minor. An analysis of the existing chemistry minor showed that approximately two-thirds of students pursuing it had a biological science affiliation, indicating strong interest in a biochemistry-focused option. Associate Professor Bunge noted that biochemistry minors are common at peer institutions nationwide, making this a logical next step. The proposed minor would include several unique upper-division biochemistry courses to clearly distinguish it from the more flexible chemistry minor. The minor is expected to benefit a broad range of students, particularly pre-professional students, by strengthening their academic preparation and enhancing their CVs or résumés.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

Department of Mathematical Sciences

13. CCP Credentialing in Mathematics – Graduate Certificate—Establish program (fall 2026)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Chairperson Ritchey discussed the Mathematics for Secondary Teachers (MST) program, which has been in place for over 20 years. The program originally aligned with the College Credit Plus (CCP) requirements, where instructors needed a master's degree plus 18 graduate credits in mathematics. Over the years, the program has supported many students in becoming certified, but there was previously no formal recognition or certificate for completing the MST coursework. To address this, the department proposed creating a certificate for the program. The proposal had gone through EPC, and Provost Tankersley raised questions about the novelty of the program and the lack of specified courses. After discussions, a list of specific courses was established. The certificate formalizes recognition for students completing the program without changing the program's core content.

Professor Piontkivska motioned to approve, and Senior Lecturer Marshall seconded.

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

School of Multidisciplinary Social Sciences and Humanities

Move program to the Department of Sociology and Criminology

14. Cybercriminology – B.S.—Revise department, course requirements, roadmap (fall 2026)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Dean Warren reported on the interdisciplinary program created two years ago and initially housed in the School for Multidisciplinary Social Sciences and Humanities. The program has grown significantly, now enrolling nearly 80 students. Based on this growth and after one full academic year, it is proposed to move the program to the Department of Sociology and Criminology, which provides half of the program's faculty and course requirements. This move is intended to improve structural alignment, logistical efficiency, and student access to relevant resources such as student organizations and internship coordination. Minor curriculum

adjustments were made to increase elective options. The proposed move has the support of the program co-coordinator, the school, the department, and the academic calendar.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

College of Education, Health and Human Services**School of Foundations, Leadership and Administration****15. Recreation Management – Minor—Inactivate program (fall 2026)****16. Recreation, Park and Tourism Management – B.S.—Inactivate program (fall 2026)****17. Tourism Management – Minor—Inactivate program (fall 2026)**[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Interim Associate Dean Walton-Fisette reported that the degree program and two minors are being inactivated due to low enrollment. The bachelor's program was previously suspended, and remaining students are being taught out. All three programs will now be formally inactivated.

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

With no questions or comments, the items passed unanimously.

Move programs to the School of Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies**18. Higher Education Administration and Student Affairs – Ed.S.—revise school, application deadlines, course requirements (fall 2026)**[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Interim Associate Dean Walton-Fisette noted that the Ed.S. program is being transferred to a different school as part of the T28 realignment. All other higher education programs have already been moved, and this step corrects the oversight of not having moved the Ed.S. program previously.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

19. Professional Studies – B.S.—Revise school, description, outcomes, admission requirements, course requirements (fall 2026)[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Professor Ray-Tomasek discussed the proposed move of the Professional Studies program. Originally created as Educational Studies in the 1980s for teacher education students who could not complete their primary degree, the program now serves a broader range of students including those returning after a hiatus. The program currently enrolls 70–80 students per semester and graduates 20–30 students. Professional Studies requires 7–12 credit hours to complete. Associate Professor Ray-Tomasek argued that moving the program to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship (ACCBE) rather than the proposed School of Teaching Learning and Curriculum Studies (TLC) would better serve the diverse student population and align with the program's role as a degree-completer program. She noted prior outreach efforts targeting non-completing students and emphasized that teacher education students could still be served within the ACCBE. She also referenced prior communication issues regarding the move and ongoing discussions with deans and stakeholders about the program's future.

Chair Dauterich asked for clarification that the upcoming motion under discussion is to move the Professional Studies program to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship.

Associate Professor Ray-Tomasek noted that the current application before the committee is to move the Professional Studies program to the School of Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies simply to provide it with a home. She stated that this situation provides an opportunity to make the case for, instead, moving the program to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship.

Secretary Tillett clarified that the current motion is to move the Professional Studies program within the College of Education. She noted that the committee could either vote on this motion first and, if it is not approved, then discuss moving the program to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship. She added that part of the dispute resolution process would include hearing Associate Professor Ray-Tomasek's argument followed by a counterargument from the college, presented either by Dean Crowe or Interim Associate Dean Walton-Fisette.

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

Professor Armour asked why the program is a Bachelor of Science degree.

Secretary Tillett explained that the program was originally established as Educational Studies and awarded a Bachelor of Science in Education (BSE). When the program was renamed Professional Studies, it became a Bachelor of Science (BS) degree to reflect that it serves students beyond the education field. She noted that it was not designated a Bachelor of Arts because it is not entirely rooted in the liberal arts and is more professionally oriented. She also mentioned that there had been discussion about creating a formal professional degree, such as

a Bachelor of Professional Studies, similar to the BTAS or BIS programs, but she did not recall why that option was not pursued.

Professor Cunningham asked to hear the counterargument before voting.

Dean Shadduck stated that if the discussion involves where the Professional Studies program should be housed, it would be important to consult with the other degree-completer programs. She noted that she does not recall such a consultation occurring within her college.

Associate Professor Barber expressed concern about changing a proposal during the meeting, suggesting that presenting the proposal in advance would allow for a more thoughtful and less reactive discussion by voting members.

Professor Armour asked if both college FAC's should vote before it moves to a new college.

Associate Professor Ray-Tomasek noted that the current proposal is to move the Professional Studies program to TLC, but this provides an opportunity to discuss moving it to a different college. She stated that discussions about moving the program to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship have taken place at multiple levels, including with Foundations, Leadership and Administration (FLA) faculty and college faculty, and that there is a record of support for that move. The process was temporarily delayed in the curriculum system to prioritize relocating the program due to the dissolution of FLA, but the move to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship had previously received approval within the college.

Chair Dauterich reminded the committee that the current proposal on the table is to move the Professional Studies program to TLC while remaining within EHHS, which was previously approved by FAC CAC and CCC.

Interim Dean Crowe affirmed that the Professional Studies program is a strong completer program and praised Jennifer Ray-Tomasek for her work with students. She noted the program has existed for over 30 years, originally serving teacher education majors who could not complete their primary degree. While the program has expanded to serve students in Health Sciences and other fields, she stated that she does not support moving it to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship, a position consistent with the previous Dean. Interim Dean Crowe emphasized that the program remains fundamentally focused on Education and Human Services, and that relocating it to business does not align with its current mission, despite serving students from across the university.

Chair Dauterich noted that the committee had heard from both Interim Dean Crowe and Associate Professor Ray-Tomasek. He addressed a prior question about the timing of the proposal, explaining that the current proposal was included in the materials. He clarified that the committee would first vote on the proposal as presented to ensure the program has a home. If

that vote passes, EPC members could then motion and second to open a discussion about moving the program to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship.

With no further comments or questions, the item passed with 21 yeas and one nay.

Chair Dauterich explained that to discuss a potential move of the Professional Studies program to the Ambassador Crawford College of Business and Entrepreneurship, an EPC member would need to make a motion and second to open the discussion. No motion was made, so the discussion will not occur at this meeting. He noted that the proposal could be brought forward later as a separate proposal, which would likely follow the same dispute resolution process, allowing Interim Dean Crowe or another representative to speak at that time.

Move program to Department of Geography, College of Arts and Sciences

20. Park Management – Minor—Revise department/college description, outcomes, admission requirements, course requirements (fall 2026)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Interim Associate Dean Walton-Fisette explained that this item involves a T28-adjacent move resulting from the inactivation of a degree program and two associated minors. Since the degree program will no longer exist, the Park Management minor cannot remain in its current home within EHHS. Many of the courses supporting the minor already come from Geography, and a significant number of Geography students complete the minor. To ensure continuity, the proposal moves the Park Management minor and all associated courses from Education, Health and Human Services to the College of Arts and Sciences, housed within Geography.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

School of Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies

21. Curriculum and Instruction – Ed.S.—Revise name to Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies; revise delivery from in person to fully online and mostly online; revise description, outcomes, application deadlines, course requirements (fall 2026)

22. Curriculum and Instruction – M.Ed.— Revise name to Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies; revise delivery from in person to fully online and mostly online; revise description, outcomes, admission requirements, application deadlines, course requirements, roadmap (fall 2026)

23. Curriculum and Instruction – Ph.D.— Revise name to Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies; revise delivery from in person to fully online and mostly online; revise description, outcomes, admission requirements, application deadlines, course requirements, roadmap (fall 2026)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Assistant Professor Torres explained that due to enrollment numbers, concentrations in Curriculum and Instruction were eliminated, prompting faculty to revise the program's structure,

courses and delivery. Based on research showing strong outcomes for online education programs, the program will transition to a mostly and fully online format. The program will also be renamed *Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies* to broaden reach beyond Ohio and improve access for full-time working professionals including teachers. These changes apply similarly across the PhD, MA and EdS programs, with differences primarily in coursework.

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

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

24. Physical Education and Sport Performance – B.S.—Revise

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Interim Associate Dean Walton-Fisette explained that this proposal began as a two-fold initiative to convert the physical education and health concentration from a five-year program to a four-year program as directed by the Provost. Following T28, Health Education moved from the School of Health Sciences to Teaching, Learning and Curriculum Studies and was subsequently inactivated due to Senate Bill 1. The proposal renames the bachelor's degree and concentration to more inclusively reflect the combination of health education with physical education and sport performance and updates the roadmap to a four-year program.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

Move programs to the College of Public Health

25. Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology – B.S.—Revise college, course requirements, roadmap (fall 2026)

26. Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology – Minor—Revise college (fall 2026)

[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Interim Associate Dean Walton-Fisette explained that this T28-adjacent item involves a relatively new fully online undergraduate program staffed by a single faculty member. Given the movement of sport and exercise-related programs to Public Health, the program is better aligned within Health Sciences. The proposal updates minor objectives and moves the program from the College of Education, Health and Human Services to the College of Public Health.

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

With no questions or comments, the item passed unanimously.

IV. Course Proposals

A. Action Items – University Requirements Curriculum Committee (fall 2026)

Kent Core Requirement

1. CHEM 10058 General Chemistry for Life Sciences I—added to Basic Sciences[VIEW THE DISCUSSION](#)

Associate Dean Warren explained that the proposal seeks Kent Core Basic Science status for Chemistry 10058. Chemistry 10058 and 10059 were developed as alternative general chemistry courses for life sciences students who do not require the traditional pre-med sequence and are intended to support student success in a more appropriate chemistry pathway. As required, the courses must be offered as permanent courses before Kent Core designation and Chemistry 10059 is currently being run. Granting Kent Core status to Chemistry 10058 aligns with the department's one-in one-out practice and helps offset the removal of four chemistry courses since 2016 while allowing students to meet Kent Core requirements.

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

With no comments or questions, the item passed unanimously.

With no further questions or comments, Chair Dauterich concluded the meeting at 6:40pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Christa N. Ord

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