



**COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES
EHHS CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
October 23, 2009**

MEMBERS ATTENDING: Sloane Burgess, HS; Natalie Caine-Bish, HS; Angela Ridgel, HS; Tracy Lara, FLA; Averil McClelland, FLA; Cindy Kovalik, LDES; Todd Hawley, TLC; Jennifer James, TLC; Andrew Gilbert, TLC; Lori Wilfong, RC; Joanne Arhar, EHHS.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Betsy Page, LDES; Frank Sansosti, LDES; Nancy Barbour, EHHS; Vilma Seeberg, FLA; Charity Snyder, EHHS

GUESTS: Anne Morrison, LDES; Julie Mirabell, Ashtabula Campus, Harriett Bynum, East Liverpool Campus

AGENDA ITEM		ACTION TAKEN
INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS		
Welcome and Introductions	Joanne Arhar called the meeting to order, welcomed members and guests and introductions were made.	No action necessary.
Minutes	September minutes were reviewed and approved.	Motion to approve by Natalie Caine-Bish; seconded by Cindy Kovalik. Motion passed by unanimous vote
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM PROPOSALS		
Regional Campuses, Occupational Therapy Assistant Technology Program. (Harriett Bynum and Julie Mirabell)	<p>Program revision: Increase admission GPA requirement for the Kent State University at East Liverpool and Kent State University at Ashtabula campuses Occupational Therapy Assistant Technology Program from 2.5 to 2.7. Effective Fall 2010.</p> <p>Discussion included statistics that indicated students admitted into the program with less than 2.7 GPA were less likely to complete the program, making retention an issue for this group of students. No adverse financial impact is anticipated because there are an abundance of applicants with higher GPAs.</p>	Motion to approve by Averil McClelland; seconded by Lori Wilfong. Motion passed by unanimous vote
LDES, ITEC 47401, Design and Production of Educational Media. (Cindy Kovalik for Drew Tiene)	<p>Course Inactivation: Inactivate ITEC 47401, Design and Production of Educational Media. Effective Fall 2010.</p> <p>Discussion revealed that this course has not been taught in over five years, the technology in it is outdated, and there are no plans to offer the course in the future. No other programs are impacted by the inactivation of the course.</p>	Motion to approve by Natalie Caine-Bish; seconded by Sloane Burgess. Motion passed by unanimous vote.
ITEC 37400, Introduction to Educational Media; ITEC 47401, Design and Production of Educational Media; ITEC 47402, Organization and Administration of Educational Media and Centers; ITEC 47403, Instructional Design; ITEC 47427, Technology and	<p>Large Scale Change: All prerequisites were removed from ITEC courses: 37400, 47401, 47402, 47403, 47427, 47430, 47496. Effective Fall 2010.</p> <p>Discussion revealed that the prerequisites not needed in the program. Prerequisites have not been shown to be critical to student success in the program. No programs outside the ITEC program will be impacted; students in the ITEC program may have changes in the sequence courses are taken but enrollment will not be impacted.</p>	Motion to approve by Andy Gilbert; seconded by Tracy Lara. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

<p>Learning; ITEC 47430, Computer Applications in Education; ITEC 47496, Individual Investigations in Educational Media; (Cindy Kovalik for Drew Tiene)</p>		
UNDERGRADUATE/GRADUATE CURRICULUM PROPOSALS		
<p>EPSY 49525, EPSY 59525 and EPSY 79525; Relational Learning from a Global Perspective (Anne Morrison)</p>	<p>Establish Course: Proposal was presented by Anne Morrison who explained that this course is currently being offered as a special topics course. Students enrolled in the course may mentor students as part of their experience. This slash course offers multiple levels of credit (undergraduate, masters, and doctoral) as well as multiple options for class participation. The course was described as a “hybrid” with the sections of the course offered on campus, online, and as part of a study abroad course, and combinations of all. Related questions/ comments that arose included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encroachment issues were discussed. Anne discussed the departments that were contacted and explained there were no issues that she was aware of. She noted that she had sent a request for support to the Psychology Dept. and was waiting for a response. 2. It was noted that several items on the CCP needed to be checked off since this was a new course. This will be corrected. 3. Differences between bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral levels were discussed. Briefly, all students would share the basic content and would have the option to participate in study abroad programs as part of this some sections of the course but study abroad would not be mandatory. Bachelor’s students may serve as student mentors, master’s students may serve as student mentors and possibly in a professional capacity, and doctoral level students would primarily focus on research in an ongoing faculty led qualitative research project. For master’s students, dependent upon when the course was taken, mentoring could be focused toward students on campus or in an international location. Doctoral level students would be involved in research projects. It was asked if the students would be expected to develop their own IRB. Anne explained they would be participating in ongoing qualitative projects. Doctoral students would not produce their own study. It was suggested it would be helpful if it were more clearly defined on the BDS that the student would be involved in “faculty” led projects at the doctoral level offering. 4. Questions were raised regarding contact hours since the international component would not be mandatory. Anne explained that all students enrolled would have a minimum of 45 contact hours and the international experience would be an additional opportunity offered. It was suggested that perhaps the students participating in the international component should 	<p>Motion to table this proposal until the next meeting by Averil McClelland; seconded by Natalie Caine-Bish. Motion passed.</p> <p>Questions raised will be researched and resolved prior to resubmitting.</p>

	<p>receive additional credit hours. This raised the question of whether additional charge would be incurred by the student in addition to the international cost incurred.</p> <p>6. Additionally, the choice of seminar as the schedule type was questioned as appropriate. Some felt that the course should be lecture.</p> <p>Joanne Arhar suggested that this proposal should be tabled until next meeting in order for it to be reviewed by the Dean and Therese Tillett, Director Curriculum Services. There is a desire for more and more international offerings. With this being the first proposal of this type, she felt there should be additional investigation into the appropriate method of submitting this type of course offering, i.e. are two separate sections needed – one domestic and one with international component; should two data sheets be done – one for domestic section and one for international; should additional credit hours be included in international offering; etc.</p>	
GRADUATE PROPOSALS		
<p>ITEC 77442 Designing Online Courses</p> <p>ITEC 77444 Teaching Online Courses</p> <p>ITEC 77449 Research in Online Learning</p>	<p>Establish course: proposals presented by Cindy Kovalik on behalf of Drew Tiene and Albert Ingram. These courses were initially setup at the 60000 level. Doctoral students have been requesting these courses be offered at the 70000 level. The doctoral levels will include additional research. It was an oversight by the department not to have setup both levels with the original proposal. It was shared that many teachers and administrators in the surrounding area have been taking these courses. Related questions/comments that arose included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was asked if these courses were a required part of the IT program or if they were electives. Cindy explained that they were electives. 2. It was felt that the addition of these courses constituted a program change and a program summary, transmittal and CCP were also needed. 3. Questions were raised if these should be offered as part of a certificate program with the interest from area educators. 4. Proposal should be discussed with the Graduate Associate Dean along with her review of the transmittal and CCP. 	<p>Motion to table until November meeting by Averil McClelland and seconded by Angela Ridgel. Motion passed by unanimous vote</p>
<p>ITEC 6/77420 Current Issues in Instructional Technology</p>	<p>Course Revision: Change of course name to <i>Researching Current Issues in Instructional Technology</i>. Proposals presented by Cindy Kovalik on behalf of Drew Tiene. Courses are being revised to incorporate an additional research component. The name is being changed to reflect that addition. Courses will now include reading research literature and reviewing various research topics. Cindy explained that the research component would be as a reader/interpreter, not doing actual research. Related questions/comments that arose included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction of 77420 CCP to reflect course content revision and not credit by exam. 2. It was felt that there needed to be a statement added to the proposal summary regarding where the research comes in and writing expectations. 	<p>Motion to table until November meeting by Todd Hawley and seconded by Jennifer James. Motion passed by unanimous vote.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Committee would like to see the rigor in the courses. It was felt that this was not reflected in the textbooks listed. 4. The doctoral proposal needs to be more explicit regarding how the research component is accomplished. 5. Proposal needs to include research topics in the summary. Both levels need to include how the research is incorporated. 	
<p>Instructional Tech. Masters Degree Program</p> <p>Instructional Tech. Masters Degree Program with a Library/Media Licensure</p> <p>Instructional Tech. Masters Degree Program with a Computing/Technology Endorsement</p>	<p>Program Revision: The course <i>EDPF 65511 Research in Educational Services</i> will be removed as a required course from all three Instructional Technology programs. Proposals presented by Cindy Kovalik on behalf of Drew Tiene. It was explained that, because research methods are currently taught within a number of the program courses, the faculty involved in these program felt this course could be removed as a requirement. This drop in total program credit hours would also help bring these programs more in line with other program offerings by Library Science and make them more competitive. Related questions/comments that arose included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal is missing a transmittal memo describing proposal action and explaining the impact, if any, on other bodies. 2. The question was raised as to how dropping this course would affect the Evaluation & Measurement program. Cindy pointed out that, as outlined on the CCP, Sean Fitzgerald was consulted and he finds this acceptable. 3. Committee requested that a revised program requirement sheet be included with the proposal. 4. A typo was discovered in the body of the proposal under Alternatives and Consequences. This will be corrected prior to sending on to EPC. 	<p>Motion to approve with the outlined additions and corrections being addressed was made by Jennifer James and seconded by Lori Wilfong. Motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>ITEC 57401 Design and Production of Educational Media</p> <p>ITEC 6/77409 Teacher Education and Media</p> <p>ITEC 6/77431 Programming for Educators</p> <p>ITEC 6/77433 Interactive Video</p>	<p>Inactivation of graduate courses: Proposals presented by Cindy Kovalik on behalf of Drew Tiene. Cindy explained that these courses were identified by the faculty of the ITEC program as being outdated with irrelevant content. She pointed out that these courses have not been offered in a very long time. Related questions/comments that arose included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was asked why the courses were not revised as opposed to inactivated. It was explained that they are so outdated and the content antiquated. Courses are no longer needed for current programs. 2. Cindy was asked if the courses were being used by any other program. She was sure they were not. Joanne Arhar stated that she had done a search of the catalog and indeed they are not being offered by any other programs. 	<p>Motion to approve was made by Averil McClelland and seconded by Andrew Gilbert. Motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>ITEC 57430 Computer Applications in Education</p> <p>ITEC 67412 Instructional Technology in Secondary Schools</p> <p>ITEC 6/77417 Advanced</p>	<p>Program revision to remove prerequisites: Proposals presented by Cindy Kovalik on behalf of Drew Tiene. It was determined by the program that the prerequisites have not been significantly critical in terms of the students being prepared, and in fact, with the move to Banner these courses are now hampering students in the registration process by causing a need for overrides. Faculty voted unanimously to remove these prerequisites.</p>	<p>Motion to approve was made by Lori Wilfong and seconded by Angela Ridgel. Motion passed unanimously.</p>

<p>Instructional Design</p> <p>ITEC 6/77432 Designing Multimedia for Instruction</p> <p>ITEC 6/77433 Interactive Video</p> <p>ITEC 6/77438 Instructional Applications of the Internet</p> <p>ITEC 67442 Designing Online Courses</p> <p>ITEC 6/7444 Teaching Online Courses</p> <p>ITEC 67449 Research in Online Learning</p>		
OTHER		
Update on Regional College proposal (Joanne Arhar)	<p>Joanne shared that a proposal to institute a Regional College for the purpose of reviewing curriculum on the Kent State University Regional Campuses was brought to EPC in Oct. and passed. The Regional College's function is solely to review curriculum and will be divided into three sections: Applied Business, Health Occupations, and Professional Studies. This College will review only programs that are owned by regional campuses. Curriculum decisions for some programs with connections to Kent campus programs will remain the same. It was noted that the current curriculum process is difficult for regional campuses and this plan will allow them to be more responsive to regional campus' needs. Proposals will continue to be reviewed by EPC. Note: Faculty tenure and promotion overview is not a responsibility of the proposed Regional College. The proposal will now move forward to Faculty Senate.</p>	No action necessary.
Update on Kent Core proposal	The Kent Core proposal was recently discussed by Faculty Senate and will be brought to a vote in Nov.	No action necessary.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.

Next meeting: **Friday, November 13, 2009, 1:30 – 4:30 PM**

Respectfully submitted

Luci Wymer, Graduate Recorder

Hilda Pettit, Undergraduate Recorder