

COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

200 Bricker Hall

November 2, 2016

3-5 p.m.

MINUTES

Attendance

Faculty:

- ✓ Dr. Eric Bielefeld (Speech and Hearing Sciences)
- ✓ Dr. John Buford (School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences)
- ✓ Dr. Jill Bystydzienski (Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies)
- ✓ Dr. Debbie Guatelli-Steinberg (Anthropology)
- ✓ Dr. Curtis Haugtvædt (Marketing and Logistics)
- ✓ Dr. Karen Irving (Teaching and Learning)
- ✓ Dr. Laurice Joseph (Educational Studies)
- ✓ Dr. Maria Miriti (Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology)
- ✓ Dr. Susie Whittington (Agricultural Communication, Education and Leadership)
- ✓ Dr. Celia Wills (Nursing)

Students:

- ✓ Mr. Mario Belfiglio (USG, Biology)
- ✓ Ms. Emily Clark (USG, Public Affairs)
- ✓ Mr. Daniel Puthawala (CGS, Linguistics)
- ✓ Mr. Jordan Vajda (IPC, Medicine)
- Mr. Alex Wesaw (CGS, City and Regional Planning)

Administrator:

- ✓ Dr. W. Randy Smith (Academic Affairs), Vice Chair

Guests:

- Dr. Kevin Evans (School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences)
- Dr. Steve Fink (College of Arts and Sciences)
- Dr. Rob Griffiths (Office of Distance Education and eLearning)
- Dr. Kate Hallihan (John Glenn College of Public Affairs)
- Ms. Jill Hampshire (Office of Enrollment Services)
- Dr. Russell Hassan (John Glenn College of Public Affairs)
- Dr. Scott Herness (Graduate School)
- Dr. Alan Kalish (University Center for the Advancement of Teaching)

Mr. Rand McGlaughlin (Office of University Registrar)
Dr. Maria Mone (John Glenn College of Public Affairs)
Ms. Sarah Odum (College of Education and Human Ecology)
Dr. Bryan Warnick (College of Education and Human Ecology)

The meeting came to order at 3:00 pm

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR – PROFESSOR JOHN BUFORD

Undergraduate Student Government (USG) approached Faculty Council with a resolution to add a mental health statement on course syllabi. The goal of the resolution is to increase awareness of contact information for campus resources that offer treatment for mental health issues.

The University has tried to limit syllabi requirements to course-specific concerns (i.e. academic misconduct). Advisory statements such as this proposed resolution have been available on a website. Discussion of this resolution will be tabled in this Council until Buford has a chance to connect with Senate leadership.

Subcommittee A is currently reviewing an undergraduate minor proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Buford reminded members that the Council's annual dinner with the Provost is this evening at the Faculty Club.

COMMENTS FROM THE VICE CHAIR—PROFESSOR W. RANDY SMITH

Smith encouraged Council members to be candid with the Provost at this evening's dinner. This is an opportunity to have an open discussion with the Provost.

Two graduate proposals were approved at the Board of Trustees meeting on November 4, 2016: a Master of Respiratory Therapy degree and an Interdisciplinary Master of Arts degree program in Medical Humanities and Social Sciences.

Vice Provost Mike Boehm has accepted a Vice Chancellor position at the University of Nebraska effective January 1, 2017. There are other vice provost vacancies in the Office of Academic Affairs. Smith expects the Provost to view these openings as an opportunity to reconfigure the office.

The University is searching for a new director of Ohio State ATI. Smith met with the first two candidates. He is meeting with the third in a few weeks.

Dr. David Laude from the University of Texas-Austin visited campus on October 28, 2016 as part of the STEM Redesign Colloquium Series.

The Department of Management Sciences in the Fisher College of Business recently went through an academic program review. A team of external evaluators came to campus October 23-25, 2016. All vice provosts were invited to the exit session on October 25, 2016.

Smith is leading a review of the Nutrition programs on campus. Based on changing specialized accreditation requirements – a move to the Master’s level for licensure - our current two undergraduate programs in two different colleges – Education and Human Ecology and Medicine - are working on the development of a combined master’s program. Smith met with representatives from both colleges on October 28, 2016. He will next meet with them on December 1, 2016 with Interim Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, Scott Herness in attendance.

The State’s Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways program—also referred to as Two Plus Two—is starting to develop the first two pathway clusters. As a reminder, this program will align programs at two-year institutions with programs at four-year institutions. The goal of the program is to simplify the transfer process for students at two-year institutions. The first two clusters are in Business and the Social Sciences. Eventually, there will be six other clusters.

Buford and Smith are attending the Steering Committee meeting on November 3, 2016. Smith will discuss Ohio State’s upcoming institutional re-accreditation in March 2017.

Smith is scheduled to attend the annual Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) Conference in Austin, TX on November 13-15, 2016.

A call is out for an Associate Vice Provost position, which will report directly to Smith. The position is a 50% FTE and is available as of January 1, 2017.

PROPOSAL FROM SUBCOMMITTEE D – PROFESSORS JOHN BUFORD AND W. RANDY SMITH

- **Proposal for a New Certificate in Public Leadership – John Glenn College of Public Affairs**

Guests: Kate Hallihan, Director of Student Services, John Glenn College of Public Affairs; Russell Hassan, Associate Professor, John Glenn College of Public Affairs; Maria Mone, Director of Management Development Programs, John Glenn College of Public Affairs

The John Glenn College of Public Affairs proposes a new Certificate in Public Leadership. This certificate falls into the category “Workforce Development Certificate of Completion Program.”

The certificate is a four-course, six-credit program specifically designed for mid-career professionals in public and nonprofit organizations who aspire to further develop their management and leadership skills. The targeted population is mid-career professionals who occupy a supervisory position in their organizations.

The 5000-level courses in the certificate are designed to encourage leaders to pursue a graduate degree by offering graduate credit to those who already have a Bachelor's degree, some of which may be counted toward the Master of Arts or Master of Public Administration degree requirements should a student apply and be accepted to a degree program. For those professionals who have not attained a Bachelor's degree, this certificate program is designed to aid them in beginning or finishing the degree by giving them undergraduate credit.

The college expects to enroll 60 students (two 30-member cohorts) annually in each of the four courses that make up the certificate program. The certificate will be administered by the Management Development Programs units of the college whose focus is providing continuing education to Ohio's public and nonprofit professionals. Students will apply for the certificate through the college and must be a part of cohort to obtain it.

The program has four components or modules relevant to anyone working in modern public and nonprofit organizations, namely self-development (PA 5059), managing people in public and nonprofit organizations (PA 5060), leading people in public and nonprofit organizations (PA 5061), and leadership development application (PA 5062). The program includes a blend of theoretical knowledge and practical skills with approximately 30% lecture and 70% group problem solving exercises and activities, including scenario and case discussion. The total number of contact hours is 78.

An advising sheet, a framework of the program, letters of concurrence, and syllabi for each course were provided. Concurrence was obtained from the College of Social Work, Fisher College of Business, and the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CFAES). An assessment plan and curriculum map were also provided.

Whittington noted that there was no hesitation from CFAES when asked for concurrence. The faculty reviewing the proposal felt that it was strong.

Herness noted that this is a certificate of completion—not a graduate certificate. Participants do not have to be admitted to the Graduate School. Students taking the courses at the graduate-level would be enrolled as graduate non-degree students.

The Council discussed the purpose and background of certificates at the University.

Belfiglio noted that there was a typo on the advising sheet.

Buford moved approval of the proposal; it was seconded by Vajda and it carried with all in favor.

STATE PROCEDURES FOR CERTIFICATES APPROVAL – PROFESSOR W. RANDY SMITH

The Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) does not need to see a graduate-level certificate unless it is over 21 credit hours. This Council would be the last step in getting a graduate certificate approved.

ODHE has a template to complete for undergraduate certificates. Smith's office will work with the college on getting the proposal in the proper format and will submit it to ODHE.

Smith will send all new certificates to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) for informational purposes.

Smith noted that certificates already exist on campus. A survey will be sent from the Office of Academic Affairs to all academic units to gather a master list of current certificates. Smith will discuss the survey results with the curricular deans and report back to this Council. Until the list is gathered, we cannot determine how to handle current certificates. The list will also help the University determine what can and cannot be called a 'certificate.'

Since the approval of certificates is a new process, Smith would like to do an annual review of the process to see how it is going.

OVERVIEW OF CENTERS/INSTITUTES REVIEW PROCESS – PROFESSOR CELIA WILLS

Wills read the definition of a University-level academic center (institute): University center typically will have a substantial research/scholarship component to their mission, but also may be involved in instruction, and/or related service. Their internal funding (initial and continuing) is drawn fully, or in large part, from center university funds (i.e. Office of the President, Office of Academic Affairs, Office of Research, College of Arts and Sciences). The leadership of the center will report to one or more of those offices.

According to Senate rules, centers are supposed to be reviewed every four years. The Senate's main concern is that centers take resources. Centers need to be reviewed and held accountable.

Currently there are approximately 80 University centers. This Council will review three-four in 2016-17. Priority was given to centers who have seen significant growth and those that have not been reviewed by an accreditation body.

An email will be sent to stakeholders (deans and center directors) outlining the review process. Each center will need to submit a 30-page report. The report should be a data-driven self-evaluation that states what the center is doing well and lists areas for enhancement/approval.

If the review process goes well this year, the Council will likely increase the number of centers it reviews next year.

Two of the four centers under review in 2016-17 have been determined: Newark Earthworks and the Center for Urban and Regional Analysis.

Smith noted that this Council, based on its review of a center, has the ability to specify that it is in good standing, or to ask for improvements, or to deactivate the center.

Smith remarked that “center/institute” is a distinguished title at the University. A center should be active and responsible.

To clarify misperceptions on campus, Smith said that there is currently no discussion in the Office of Academic Affairs to limit the number of centers/institutes at the University.

GENERAL EDUCATION: A REVIEW – PROFESSORS KEVIN EVAN AND W. RANDY SMITH

The University-Level Advisory Committee (ULAC) on the General Education (GE) Program recommends that this Council initiate a University-wide review of the GE beginning this (2016-17) academic year.

The recommendation is based on ULAC’s own insights through its continuous monitoring of the GE over the past decade, but also on its recent discussions about several contemporary issues that have aligned to prompt such a review. Moreover, in March 2016, Provost Bruce McPheron (then Interim Provost) suggested that a review may be warranted.

ULAC recommends a formal campus-wide review based on the following considerations:

- The current GE has been in place for nearly 30 years without substantial review and revision. That situation is not appropriate for any curricular program.
- Within the University a revision to the GE needs to align with the new mission/vision statement and growing attention overall to its teaching and learning mission. Indeed, a new University-level Teaching and Learning Institute has just been established.
- The GE was developed by a generation of faculty many of whom are no longer with the University. Most of our current faculty were not involved in its development and implementation and need to be given the opportunity to help determine what the GE should be going forward.
- The GE was developed when the University had an open admissions policy and there were questions about the level of student preparedness that the GEC was designed to help address. Today, with the selective admissions process well established, students are better prepared for university-level work and the GE component of their undergraduate program needs to be aligned accordingly. The University needs to understand more clearly current state-wide K-12 content standards and assessments – that affect the academic expectations placed on our students at the pre-collegiate level. How do these educational changes affect the sequencing of GE courses (first year, second year, beyond) within our undergraduate programs?

- Statewide initiatives administered through the Ohio Department of Higher Education, such as College Credit Plus (dual enrollment), and an increasing number of students taking Advanced Placement and other related types of credit while in high school, have resulted in many students entering the University with a large amount of credit—much of it GE credit—completed. Transfer students entering with similar credit represent a large part of our enrollment profile. These students, though the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) bring credit with them that must be transferred and applied, primarily to our GE requirement. These initiatives will continue.
- Computing technology is now ubiquitous throughout the University’s learning environment. Instructors and students are immersed in a digital world, operating within a rapid and instant information age. Our connectedness allows new forms of engagement and instruction via varied implementations of blended, flipper, or online learning. The University has expanded undergraduate and graduate level online course and program offerings in the past five years and continues to explore new opportunities. How does that affect the content and the method of GE instruction going forward?
- Our institutional accrediting body—the Higher Learning Commission—has expectations about general education, notably student learning outcomes assessment, and this dimension of the GE needs strengthening.

The review process needs to be inclusive, faculty driven, with substantial input from students and staff, notably advisers, all campuses, and include alumni and our major transfer partner, Columbus State Community College (CSCC).

The University Senate leadership will be consulted on process issues at each stage of the review.

The following timeline is proposed:

- The Council on Academic Affairs recommends a GE review (11/16).
- A GE Review Committee is established with membership (12-15) from ULAC, CAA, and faculty and students from across the University. Members should include at least one adviser, one representative from a regional campus, and one representative from CSCC. Committee to be led by two (funded) faculty fellows (11/16).
- Review Committee (11/16-3/17):
 - Establishes and runs a set of listening sessions with the following constituencies: undergraduate students, faculty, college curriculum committees, graduate teaching associates, Deans, University Senate committees and other groups as determined. Such sessions provide background on the rationale for the review and potential options for moving forward, as points of departure.
 - Develops a website for monitoring of, and input to, the process.
 - Develops online surveys of faculty, students, staff, alumni, for input.
 - May form subcommittees as needed.

- Review Committee develops a broad structure for the GE and distributes a draft to constituencies that provided input for reactions (4/17).
- Review Committee makes recommendation to CAA (5/17).
- CAA determines components of approval process (AY 17-18) and implementation (date to be determined).

Evans and Smith asked the Council if it was time to review the GE.

The Council endorsed ULAC's document. Comments/questions included:

- Students could be taking the same GE as their parents. While the course content may have changed, the structure is the same.
- Need to determine how best to make the GE work between colleges and for students interested in double-majors.
- Should build on the success of students rather than re-teaching what they know.
- Need more interdisciplinary opportunities.
- Need to determine what we want students to get out of the GE. What does the University want its GE to be with its current faculty and students? Why do we have the GE?
- Implementation issues—such as students circumventing GE requirements by petitioning—need to be resolved. How do we implement a new GE well?
- Should we move to one University-wide GE?
- If students are coming in with “first-tier” courses, should the GE focus more on upper-level courses? Would this affect time to degree?
- The Review Committee should look at different GE models at peer institutions.
- What is an educated person in 2016?

Smith emphasized that we need to remove the budget model from the discussion. We need to determine the best GE for our University and then determine the budget. Ownership and dollars should not be part of the discussion.

Smith also noted that we need to be sensitive to the State's transfer module. While it will not drive the discussion, it must be part of it.

The Meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Randy Smith
Katie Reed