

CHARGE OF THE EPC TASK FORCE

In 2018, the EPC and the Faculty Senate approved the convening of a task force to undertake a review of the EPC, including its mission and purpose, composition and membership and logistics in how meetings are scheduled and conducted.

This charge aligns with 3342-2-07 Administrative Policy and Procedures Regarding the Educational Policies Council:

- C. Periodic review of the educational policies council. The responsibility, authority and structure of the educational policies council shall be reviewed each two years or at any time review may be considered appropriate by majority vote of the whole membership of the educational policies council.

The following agreed to serve on the EPC Task Force:

Name	Title	EPC Membership
Sonia A. Alemagno	Dean and Professor, College of Public Health	Ex-Officio (AY2010–AY2018)
Jennifer Cunningham	Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences	Faculty Senate (AY2017–AY18)
Edward Dauterich	Professor, College of Arts and Sciences	Faculty Senate (AY2017–AY18)
Richard Mangrum	Professor, College of Aeronautics and Engineering	CCC (AY2010–AY2012, AY2016–AY2018)
Denise M. McEnroe-Petitte	Associate Professor, Regional College	CCC (AY2017–AY2018)
I. Richmond Nettey	Professor, College of Aeronautics and Engineering	Ex-Officio (AY2009–AY2018)
Melissa Zullo	Associate Professor, College of Public Health	CCC (AY2016–AY2018)

The Office of Curriculum Services assisted as consultants to the Task Force and organized the meetings and materials.

Members have met three times, on 25-Sep-18, 22-Oct-18 and 19-Nov-18. Meeting minutes are attached at the end of this document.

The following pages represents what the task force has identified as issues with the current EPC structure, possibly reasons for those issues and outcomes resulting from the issues.

In addition, the EPC Task Force presents recommendations for the future, including a restructured EPC membership.

Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Value of EPC is questioned ▪ EPC is not fulfilling its responsibility for long-range academic planning ▪ Culture of EPC is consensus, rather than deliberative ▪ EPC members sometimes seem uninformed of their role and expectations
Why are these issues important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Other than EPC (and to some extent, Faculty Senate), there is no committee addressing and communicating curricular and academic policy planning at the university level
Possible reasons for the issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EPC committee membership is large ▪ Sense that EPC members do not know why they are there and what their vote represents ▪ Top-level discussions on university strategic goals and state priorities are not being communicated to EPC members ▪ Belief among members that since the item may go to Faculty Senate, deliberation can be left to that body ▪ Since the EPC membership includes deans – faculty in those colleges may feel they cannot question an item coming from their college (or any item that their dean approves) ▪ As the provost approves items for agenda and runs meetings, EPC members may feel they cannot question an item if they believe the provost has already approved it ▪ Too many items on the agenda to review and/or are listed as information and lesser action items (i.e., not up for a vote; therefore, not up for discussion)
Outcomes of the issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Image that EPC “rubber stamps” proposals ▪ Decreased EPC attendance and increased proxy/designee voting ▪ Little discussion on items ▪ EPC members continue to exist in silos and review proposals against how the proposed may affect them/their unit only ▪ There are times when it appears that EPC members do not <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ read the documents provided ○ seem prepared to discuss or ask questions ○ feel accountable ▪ Sense that EPC is inefficient and time consuming ▪ Appearance that EPC members vote the way everyone else votes ▪ Some seem to set a goal of seeing how fast the agenda can be completed and meeting adjourned ▪ EPC members wait until after the meeting (or at Faculty Senate or in private) to discuss ▪ EPC members do not seem aware of university priorities/issues when reviewing proposals ▪ Dependence on Curriculum Services for proposal review and issue resolution

<p>Task force list of potential recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make EPC membership smaller, or separate into small UG/GR committees ▪ Restructure committee membership to be less administration and more faculty ▪ Add a reviewing committee (e.g., Executive EPC) to set agenda, approve items and bring presenters to meetings ▪ Change EPC leadership ▪ Have regular presentations on university strategic planning, state priorities, new federal regulations, etc. ▪ Have presentations where colleges/divisions discuss their priorities and future initiatives ▪ Require that the proposal's developer present and explain the proposal at the EPC meeting ▪ Restructure EPC to provide more input to top administrators ▪ Better define EPC's role in "long-range academic planning" ▪ Hold training workshops each August for EPC members ▪ Create a "possible issues" (thinking points) list for EPC members to review when reading proposal ▪ Create a diagnostic questions list for each member to answer while reading the documents ▪ Create an executive summary or bullet points of information so EPC members don't have to read the full documents ▪ Require EPC members to include rationale with their vote ▪ Send Faculty Senate minutes to EPC members ▪ Have EPC members cast votes as a college vote ▪ Have provost share his concerns about an item ▪ Call on EPC members for their opinion ▪ Change student membership from observing to voting ▪ Clarify the no-proxy policy ▪ Designate member alternates to attend ▪ Stipulate that regular nonattendance leads to removal ▪ On agenda, change information items to be discussion items ▪ On agenda, separate action items from the information and lesser items ▪ Create a consent calendar (one vote for several items) ▪ Allow EPC members to vote electronically
--	--

EPC STRUCTURE

Current Structure	Recommended Structure
Two councils (UG/GR) that meet together, but with separate agendas	One council with one agenda
Co-chairs are the provost and chair of the Faculty Senate	Chair is a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Large membership (55 voting)	Small membership (28 voting)
Voting members are nearly half (45/55%) administrators and faculty (25 deans/assoc deans, 20 college faculty, 10 faculty senators)	Voting members are primarily (88%) faculty (20 college faculty, 2 faculty senators, 1 library faculty, 3 deans/assoc deans/provost)
Campus deans, A/A deans, department chairs and school directors are not members, but are notified of the agenda before the council meets	Campus deans, college deans*, A/A deans, department chairs and school directors are not members, but are notified of the agenda before the council meets (* 2 of 15 college/division deans are members)
Dean from University Libraries is a voting member	Faculty member from University Libraries is a voting member
Students from the UG/GR government bodies are non-voting members	Students from the UG/GR government bodies are voting members
Based on UG/GR designation, members vote only on items on their agenda	Members vote on all items on the agenda
College deans present agenda items	Proposal developers present agenda items
	Exec committee is added with small membership (5) from the EPC
	Exec members are 60/40% administrators and faculty (3 deans/assoc deans/provost, 2 faculty senators)
	Exec chair is also EPC chair (member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee)
	Secretary to both EPC and EPC Exec is Office of Curriculum Services

CURRENT STRUCTURE	RECOMMENDED STRUCTURE																																																				
<p>College/Division/Committee (recommendation) ↓</p> <p>Provost / Graduate Studies Dean (approval) ↓</p> <p>Campus Deans, A/A Deans, Chairs, Directors (notification) ↓</p> <p>UG and GR EPC (approval) ↓</p> <p>Faculty Senate (approval)</p>	<p>College/Division/Committee (recommendation) ↓</p> <p>Provost / Graduate Studies Dean (approval) ↓</p> <p>Executive EPC (approval) ↓</p> <p>College Deans, Campus Deans, A/A Deans, Chairs, Directors (notification) ↓</p> <p>EPC (approval) ↓</p> <p>Faculty Senate (approval)</p>																																																				
CURRENT LEADERSHIP	RECOMMENDED LEADERSHIP																																																				
<p>Co-chairs: Provost, Faculty Senate chair</p>	<p>Chair: Faculty Senate Exec Committee rep Secretary: Curriculum Services</p>																																																				
CURRENT MEMBERSHIP	RECOMMENDED MEMBERSHIP																																																				
<p>VOTING MEMBERS</p> <p>UG and GR EPC</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Deans - UG degree colleges</td><td style="text-align: right;">10</td></tr> <tr><td>Assoc deans - GR degree colleges</td><td style="text-align: right;">10</td></tr> <tr><td>Dean - Graduate Studies</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Dean - Honors College</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Dean - University College</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Dean - University Libraries</td><td style="text-align: right;">2</td></tr> <tr><td>UG faculty reps (CCC) - degree colleges</td><td style="text-align: right;">10</td></tr> <tr><td>GR faculty reps - degree colleges</td><td style="text-align: right;">10</td></tr> <tr><td>Faculty Senate reps</td><td style="text-align: right;">10</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: right;">Total</td><td style="text-align: right;">55</td></tr> </table> <p>NON-VOTING MEMBERS</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>UG student rep (USG)</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>GR student rep (GSS)</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: right;">Total</td><td style="text-align: right;">2</td></tr> </table>	Deans - UG degree colleges	10	Assoc deans - GR degree colleges	10	Dean - Graduate Studies	1	Dean - Honors College	1	Dean - University College	1	Dean - University Libraries	2	UG faculty reps (CCC) - degree colleges	10	GR faculty reps - degree colleges	10	Faculty Senate reps	10	Total	55	UG student rep (USG)	1	GR student rep (GSS)	1	Total	2	<p>VOTING MEMBERS</p> <p>Executive EPC</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Provost Office rep</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>College Deans Office reps</td><td style="text-align: right;">2</td></tr> <tr><td>Faculty Senate reps</td><td style="text-align: right;">2</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: right;">Total</td><td style="text-align: right;">5</td></tr> </table> <p>EPC</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Provost Office rep (from Exec EPC)</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>College Deans Office reps (from Exec EPC)</td><td style="text-align: right;">2</td></tr> <tr><td>Faculty Senate reps (from Exec EPC)</td><td style="text-align: right;">2</td></tr> <tr><td>UG faculty reps (CCC) - degree colleges</td><td style="text-align: right;">10</td></tr> <tr><td>GR faculty reps - degree colleges</td><td style="text-align: right;">10</td></tr> <tr><td>Faculty rep - University Libraries</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>UG student rep (USG)</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>GR student rep (GSS)</td><td style="text-align: right;">1</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: right;">Total</td><td style="text-align: right;">28</td></tr> </table>	Provost Office rep	1	College Deans Office reps	2	Faculty Senate reps	2	Total	5	Provost Office rep (from Exec EPC)	1	College Deans Office reps (from Exec EPC)	2	Faculty Senate reps (from Exec EPC)	2	UG faculty reps (CCC) - degree colleges	10	GR faculty reps - degree colleges	10	Faculty rep - University Libraries	1	UG student rep (USG)	1	GR student rep (GSS)	1	Total	28
Deans - UG degree colleges	10																																																				
Assoc deans - GR degree colleges	10																																																				
Dean - Graduate Studies	1																																																				
Dean - Honors College	1																																																				
Dean - University College	1																																																				
Dean - University Libraries	2																																																				
UG faculty reps (CCC) - degree colleges	10																																																				
GR faculty reps - degree colleges	10																																																				
Faculty Senate reps	10																																																				
Total	55																																																				
UG student rep (USG)	1																																																				
GR student rep (GSS)	1																																																				
Total	2																																																				
Provost Office rep	1																																																				
College Deans Office reps	2																																																				
Faculty Senate reps	2																																																				
Total	5																																																				
Provost Office rep (from Exec EPC)	1																																																				
College Deans Office reps (from Exec EPC)	2																																																				
Faculty Senate reps (from Exec EPC)	2																																																				
UG faculty reps (CCC) - degree colleges	10																																																				
GR faculty reps - degree colleges	10																																																				
Faculty rep - University Libraries	1																																																				
UG student rep (USG)	1																																																				
GR student rep (GSS)	1																																																				
Total	28																																																				

Note: Kent State has 11 degree-granting colleges, of which 10 offer undergraduate degrees, and 10 offer graduate degrees: (1) Aeronautics and Engineering; (2) Architecture and Environmental Design; (3) Arts; (4) Arts and Sciences; (5) Business Administration; (6) Communication and Information; (7) Education, Health and Human Services; (8) Nursing (9) Podiatric Medicine (*graduate only*); (10) Public Health; (11) Regional (*undergraduate only*)



**EPC Task Force
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 25, 2018**

Members present: Sonia Alemagno, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Denise McEnroe-Petite, Richmond Nettey, Liz Sinclair, Melissa Zullo, Therese Tillett

Members not present: Rick Mangrum

Ex-Officio Members present: Aimee Bell, Christa Ord

Therese began the meeting by asking the members to introduce themselves and say one thing they would like to see accomplished with the EPC:

- Greater efficiency
- EPC is a time consuming process – could be automated
- Smaller counsel in a smaller setting
- Members who are devoted to this process
- All online
- More thoughtful discussion that ties it back to the mission and values of the university.
- More streamlined, hitting the points and, possibly, voted on electronically
- Real curriculum issues brought to the council
- Better communication
- Smaller council to help generate the discussions
- Efficiency, better communication and streamlined

Therese thanked everyone for volunteering. She said a review of EPC is something that has been on EPC's mind due to the decline in attendance, and it has been brought to Faculty Senate's attention as well. She explained that she briefly would go over the history of EPC, the issues that Curriculum Services has seen and the issues that the task force members have witnessed.

Therese stated that EPC was created in the 1960's to move a lot of the responsibility to the colleges to review the smaller curriculum changes. EPC took more of an overarching role in the long-range academic planning and other major issues. She explained that EPC was used as a vehicle for communication for colleges to come together and notify each other about any changes.

Over the years, colleges were getting bigger and the graduate studies dean, at the time, wanted to implement an undergraduate and graduate council (in 2008). She said that the graduate studies dean wanted more time devoted to the graduate level and then, possibly, GDAC could cease to exist.

Therese stated that after more graduate information was brought to her, a lot of things were more about operations rather than academics. It was clear that GDAC should stay active.

Therese explained that there are a lot of committees, such as UDC, Advising Deans Council and AAAC, due to so many independent issues and areas. Therese said there are overlaps in these councils, but there is so much on their agendas to go over already. Additionally, the undergraduate and graduate councils within EPC could not meet separately, because there are issues that affect both and scheduling conflicts. She explained that when the two groups were combined and assigned to meet together in the Governance Chambers, attendance and conversation decreased. Therese read some of the attendance percentages compared to the months, years and possible agenda items. The decline in EPC attendance has caused concern about meeting quorum for voting.

Member questions and discussion:

- What is the mission of EPC?
- What are the roles of URCC, GDAC and EPC, and how do they relate?
- It seems like there is always a disconnect between what goes on in URCC and GDAC and then what happens in EPC.
- In August and May, departments and colleges have many things going on.
- Is a reason for low attendance be that members have to travel to the Kent Campus?

Therese stated that, historically, EPC has always been on Mondays at 3:20 p.m., and meets a minimum three times per academic year. She said that the task force can review the months that the council meets. Faculty Senate sets the meeting date to correspondence to its meetings. Therese explained that main concerns are low attendance, apathy and the idea that EPC is not vetting things.

Therese asked what issues the members have seen:

- A lot of items could be handled outside of the meeting.
- EPC members don't debate on anything.
- EPC members ask questions that could be answered in the materials they received.
- People do not feel as if EPC is doing much.
- Not apathy, rather consensus – if people have a problem, they will speak up
- EPC is doing its job and that no one would be on EPC who did not have well-meaning for everything.
- Half of the work for EPC could be done at the college level if there is no encroachment.
- Items could stop at the college level, bypass EPC and become an information item for Faculty Senate. (EPC does not need to vet it again if the college already has.)
- Is there a way to bring the more controversial issues to EPC first and have a larger conversation?
- This is really about culture, and that EPC has a consensus culture. Faculty Senate is not of consensus. It is one where senators can represent their group and say their thoughts. Because Faculty Senate has more conversation, it is more of a deliberative model.

- If goal is to make EPC more deliberative and strategic in an academic sense, then the culture has to change to foster discussion.
- Curriculum Services de-conflicted a lot of issues before they get to EPC, and that could be why the culture is more of a consensus one.
- There are so many EPC members, there should be a review to see if they are all needed.
- Senate looks at EPC as an administrator's committee that agrees with the Provost.
- EPC members may think they do not need to attend, because things will just get done.
- It is helpful when colleges explain their proposal during EPC, as they have the expertise in their discipline. But if the proposal conflicts with another college, there should be discussion at EPC. In addition, if there is a noticeable program organizational issue, such as not enough faculty, then EPC needs to ask questions, which is not going to happen when there is a culture of consensus.
- Faculty Senate second-guesses EPC. If Faculty Senate is going to have committees, it should listen to them. It is like starting over again.
- Nothing is decided or changed at EPC – there is no action. Only when people get upset is when something is changed.
- Deans do not need to be on EPC since faculty own curriculum.
- There does not need to be so many administrators on EPC – that may make it less of a conflict between EPC and Faculty Senate.
- Administrators have always voted at EPC, and that it is a very important vote.
- Members do not speak at EPC, and they vote without knowing if they should be voting.
- Could members of the same college vote opposite and cancel each other's vote out? Should they harmonize things in their college before coming to EPC?
- Many EPC members have not reviewed the material prior to the meeting and ask questions about things that have already been answered.

Therese said that members brought up a lot of good points, and that EPC is more of an approving body. However, when you look at its responsibility, it is long-range academic planning, which may not be happening. At one time in the past, there was a provost telling college deans that they must always approve at EPC what he approved. Which makes it difficult to have a meeting. Therese explained that Curriculum Services tries to ward off issues and review things prior to moving them forward. She expressed concern that there were times when she wished members would speak up about items. Additionally, she said the Provost will state that he is unsure about some proposals, but he wants EPC to make that decision. The college needs to defend their proposal at EPC.

Task force members discussed a member's recommendation to eliminate EPC and hand things off to Faculty Senate. The member responded that they did mean all of it, but a lot of it. They said that if there is no university issue, there is no reason for it to go to EPC. Therese asked who determines there is a university issue. The member replied that the answer would be policy – management and policy gets confused. There is derailment when management messes with policy.

Therese asked the members what they thought would be their ideal committee to be approving major changes, as well as long-range academic planning.

- Call on EPC members for their opinions
- Let EPC members know that these are the things that will be discussed
- Inform EPC members the council's expectations
- Present a summary of the information from the documents – members may be confused by the paperwork, and that's why they don't read it
- Present bullet points of information, possible issues that could arise and what EPC should be focused on
- Ask curriculum committees to talk to EPC about the issues and questions they received during their process
- Present diagnostic questions about the proposal that EPC members should review

Therese asked if there should be two councils; one dedicated to undergrad and one to grad:

- Rational makes sense
- If two councils, they should all meet together and discuss all proposals
- May be better to have split meetings, but the same person could not serve on both
- Could people be on both?
- Makes sense to have an agenda that separates everything
- Make the committee smaller by having one person per college representing both undergrad and graduate

Therese asked what the taskforce should discuss at the next meeting:

- EPC membership
- EPC agenda
- Role of the chair
- Possible issue of one person representing both UG/GR bodies
- Changing the culture

**EPC Task Force
Meeting Minutes
Monday, 22 October 2018**

Members present: Sonia Alemagno, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Rick Mangrum, Richmond Nettey, Liz Sinclair, Melissa Zullo

Members not present: Denise McEnroe-Petitte, Therese Tillett

Ex-Officio Members present: Aimee Bell, Jennifer Kellogg, Christa Ord

Discussion Topic I: What is the EPC?

Jennifer Kellogg began the discussion by directing members to the attachments that have the role definitions that are included in the policy register and member guidelines of EPC.

- 1 Can the definitions be edited?
 - a This committee can recommend that definitions be revised
- 2 Will changes go to the provost?
 - a Any recommended changes will need to be approved by the provost, EPC and Faculty Senate

Jennifer Kellogg asked members what they thought about the purpose and if it is being met.

- 1 Purpose still holds
- 2 Lacking is the long-range academic planning
- 3 Lack of discussion at EPC creates an assumption of approval by the provost's office
- 4 If EPC members are unsure about the information in a proposal, they tend to want to move on

Other discussion:

- 1 Questions need to be posed to EPC members to facilitate discussion – EPC members could be asked to be aware and bring up any issues they see with a proposal
 - a May be better to constrict questions to anything that may affect another area
 - b Questioning the particulars of a college's proposal may be insulting
 - c Some questions are not appropriate for the setting, and that people may not be preparing themselves prior
 - d Unless there is a glaring issue that would affect the university, members should not question the proposing college
- 2 Communicate to members that they should be reviewing the materials before attending the meeting
 - a Ask EPC chair to communicate that it is appropriate to cut someone off when there is an indication that the person has not read the materials
 - b Colleges should be trusted in what they are proposing, and EPC members' questions should be halted if the information was already stated in the materials

- c Concern with the provost cutting off faculty members and the impression that gives
 - d Recommend that the chair cut off any non-pertinent discussion
 - e Someone could direct those questions to the pertinent sections of the material
- 3 The provost could discuss his concerns on proposals.
- 4 Have a smaller council so that members feel more responsible in reviewing the materials and coming prepared
- a Size of the committee is not the issue, but the culture created by the person managing the proceedings – culture is just to approve rather than to discuss and approve
 - b Members may defer from questions thinking they are going against the provost who has already approved the proposal
- 5 Concern that the conceptual and structural long-range academic and curricular planning cannot be handled with so many campuses and locations
- a EPC is the only body that can cover that
 - b Administrator and faculty are there representing each college
 - c Is there an undergraduate CCC of all of the colleges to fulfill the curricular planning?
 - i That is the EPC
- 6 EPC should consider the overall curricular matters and the impact on the university
- a May be helpful to advise EPC members what curricular studies are heavily covered and to possibly consider other areas when creating new curriculum
 - b EPC is is much more reactionary rather than planning for the long-term
 - i Having information provided ahead of time of what is coming would help the council plan ahead
 - ii A Faculty Senate member could present a strategic plan for the year or review of what happened the year before
 - iii Send expectations and guidelines to new members
 - iv August meeting, which is regularly canceled, could be used for training
 - (1) Experienced members could give their perception of the council and what they would like to do with it
 - v More information needs to be filtered down from administration
 - (1) Have provost and chair outline state priorities and their expectations
 - (a) Example: discuss admissions to the university
 - (b) Example: review programs that need students and find ways to attract students to those programs
 - c Faculty Senate should communicate more with EPC
 - i Send Faculty Senate meeting minutes to EPC members for review
 - d EPC should do more assessment of the university alignment of proposals
 - e EPC chair should provide concerns to EPC members to gauge more discussion

- f If the EPC restructuring is done right, what comes from EPC will percolate up to the VP of Enrollment
- g Long-range planning of the university is more about the curriculum impact
 - i A program proposal goes to many committees and councils to be reviewed and approved – that is long-term academic planning
 - ii Some administrators may not have known they needed to do research on the need or desire for a program prior to proposing it
 - iii Administrators are taking interest in what faculty thinks, and this is the opportunity for EPC to have an impact on long-range academic planning

Jennifer Kellogg asked if there was anything on the EPC responsibilities or member expectations that are not being fulfilled currently:

- 1 Curriculum Services handles curriculum disputes very well
- 2 On the expectations [in EPC new members guidelines], it says to consult your colleagues – some do and some do not
 - a Something to bring up at the first meeting
 - b Expectation of reviewing materials should also be communicated
- 3 EPC members should be called on for their thoughts, which may help facilitate more discussion
- 4 Program development plans and suspended programs should be discussion items, rather than information, when they affect long-range academic planning
 - a All information items should be discussion items
 - i Would provide an avenue of discussion for people to talk about those items
 - ii Not beneficial for a college to go through the steps of developing a program and for it to not be supported
 - iii Discussion of information items is important, because they could affect other colleges
 - iv Discussion of information items will help with changing the culture of EPC from just approving items to discussing and approving
 - v These actions would fit with the long-range planning.

Discussion Topic II: Membership

- 1 Only problem with membership is the decrease in attendance
 - a Find a way to increase attendance by possibly changing the membership size and setting
 - b Attendance decreased because of proxy voting
 - i There have been times when a person is voting for three people
 - ii Policy states proxy voting is not allowed
 - iii If proxy voting is allowed, members will not show up at all
 - c Apply Faculty Senate's tactic of if a member does not attend a number of meetings in a row, the member will be replaced
- 2 Decrease the size of the council or redefine the expectation of the council so that members understand its importance

- 3 From the information provided, it appears that Kent State's EPC is in line with other universities
- 4 Other universities have student members
 - a EPC has two non-voting student members from the undergraduate and graduate levels, but that they do not always come.
 - i Allow the students to have an alternate
- 5 Have an alternate for all the EPC members
- 6 Have one EPC member with dual role to vote for both undergraduate and graduate
 - a Some colleges may not like that if the member does not have graduate faculty status
 - b There could be an option for that if their college allowed it
- 7 One EPC, rather than two (UG/GR) would keep it simple
- 8 Some institutions have an EPC where votes are cast by college
 - a A whole different level of engagement, but it does work
 - b There could be a size problem, because there are so many academic units within the colleges
 - c Have the college CAC or CCC review the agenda items a month ahead and have their college vote
 - i It could be decided after the review if members need to meet
 - ii Dean's vote would be representative of the CAC or CCC vote
- 9 Have only faculty on EPC, because the dean already signs off before proposal leaves the college
 - a This truly would give faculty recommendation
 - b Add a level of approval, such as UDC so that the information passes through the deans
 - c EPC is not just a faculty group – that is why Faculty Senate was created
 - i Concerned that deans would not get to vote on agenda items that they have not seen prior
- 10 Other institutions reviewed do not seem to have as many deans on their EPC as Kent State
 - a Could limit the amount of deans by electing a dean representative to EPC
 - b Membership is the way it is, because deans are representative of their college
 - i Dean's perspective is different from faculty
 - c Use the UDC and GDAC for pre-EPC approval and have EPC be majority faculty
 - i Have a representative from UDC and GDAC attend EPC
 - ii Members of UDC may not have the opinion of the faculty to get the input
- 11 Needs to be more efficiency in the approval process
 - a Vote on some issues electronically
 - b Bigger items addressed at a meeting once a month
 - c Faculty make suggestions about what should be on the agenda



**EPC Task Force Meeting
Meeting Minutes
Monday, November 19, 2018**

Members present: Sonia Alemagno, Jennifer Cunningham, Ed Dauterich, Rick Mangrum, Liz Sinclair, Therese Tillett

Members not present: Denise McEnroe-Petitte, Richmond Nettey, Melissa Zullo

Ex-Officio Members present: Aimee Bell, Jennifer Kellogg, Christa Ord

Discussion Topic I: Identification of EPC Issues, Outcomes, Recommendations

Issues of concern

- Consensus culture
- Value questioned

Outcomes of those issues

- Items
- Decreased attendance
- Inefficient
- Time consuming
- Rubber-stamping appearance
- Members waiting for faculty senate to discuss issues

Recommendations from EPC Taskforce

- Smaller EPC membership
- Faculty-led
- Reviewing committee
- No proxy—alternates
- Voting at the college level or electronically
- Having students be more active
- Efficiency
- More informative
- More discussion topics
- Making members accountable

Discussion Topic II: Review of EPC Structure and Membership Options

A Option 1: Revert to one EPC (rather than separate UG/GR), but make it a faculty body and add a notification step to administrators

1 Pros

- a EPC membership is smaller
- b Increases faculty participation

- c Notification to deans is enough
 - d Does not add extra steps
 - e No separate voting
- 2 Cons
- a Is notification enough to keep college admin in loop/participation?
- B Option 2: Keep 2-council structure (UG/GR), but make them completely separate (i.e., do not meet together, considers items separately)
- 1 Pros
- a Both admin and faculty participate in process together
 - b Separate EPC bodies are smaller membership
- 2 Cons
- a Too many meetings
 - b Multiple people have to be at both meetings
 - c No need for deans to attend (proposals already vetted by deans)
 - d Instances where the two EPC bodies will separately review and approve the same items (Faculty Senate may receive conflicting recommendations)
- C Option 3: Keep 2-council structure (UG/GR), but make them completely separate and make them faculty bodies and create a separate, administrative/faculty EPC to which the separate UG/GR bodies would report
- 1 Pros
- a Both admin and faculty participate in process together
- 2 Cons
- a Too many meetings
 - b Multiple people have to be at both meetings
 - c No need for deans to attend (proposals already vetted by deans)
 - d Adds another step that may affect approval timeline
- D Option 4: Revert to one EPC (rather than separate UG/GR) and make it a faculty body and use Undergraduate Deans Council (UDC) and Graduate Deans Advisory Council (GDAC) to approve items before EPC
- 1 Pros
- a EPC is faculty led, but both admin and faculty participate in process
 - b Use existing committees
 - b EPC membership is smaller

- 2 Cons
 - a GDAC and UDC may not be the right groups and/or will be unable to take on this responsibility
 - b Admin and faculty participate separately
 - c Adds another step that may affect approval timeline
- E Option 5: Keep current EPC structure and add an EPC Exec Committee to oversee EPC
 - 1 Pros
 - a Items can be approved at the Exec level
 - b Exec can implement many of the Task Force recommendations
 - 2 Cons
 - a EPC membership is large
 - b Adds another step that may affect approval timeline
- F Option 6—Created by Task Force members from the five options above
 - 1 Revert to one EPC that combines UG/GR
 - a Membership primary comprises UG/GR faculty from the colleges and Faculty Senate
 - b Small representation from Provost's Office and College Deans Offices (provost and college deans nominate reps to EPC)
 - c Students (UG/GR) become voting members
 - d Chair is determined by Faculty Senate Exec
 - e Everyone votes on the items (i.e., no separation of items/votes based on level)
 - 2 Create Executive EPC
 - a Very small membership (e.g., 5)
 - b Members appointed by provost, colleges, Faculty Senate Exec
 - c Chair is member of Faculty Senate Exec (or from Provost's Office)
 - d Graduate dean could serve on Exec
 - e One member must be NTT faculty
 - f Possible rotation of members each academic year or every two years
 - g Exec EPC decides if EPC needs to meet and sets agenda
 - 3 Deans and other administrators would be notified, but not serve on council (except for small representation).

Discussion III: Next Steps

Members confirmed they were ready for option 6 to go to the provost and Faculty Senate chair for review and approval.

Anticipated approval steps are:

provost/Faculty Senate chair > Faculty Senate Exec > EPC > Faculty Senate.