

# **COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**200 BRICKER HALL**

**JULY 20, 2006**

**2:00-4:00 PM**

**MINUTES**

Present:

Professors: Lora Gingerich Dobos, Kay Halasek, Raymond Noe (Chair), Electra Paskett, Nancy Reynolds, W. Randy Smith (Vice-Chair), Harald Vaessin, Brian Winer, George Valco

Student Members: Jane Evans and Scott Pearson (Council of Graduate Students).

Guests: Professor Paul Beck, Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; Professors Stephen Gavazzi, Department of Human Development and Family Sciences and Scott Scheer, Department of Human and Community Resource Development; Professor Elliot Slotnick, Associate Dean, Graduate School; and Jed Dickhaut, Office of the University Registrar

## **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JULY 6, 2006**

- Reynolds moved approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of July 6, 2006. Evans seconded the motion and it carried with three abstentions.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR - PROFESSOR RAYMOND NOE**

- There were no comments from the Chair

## **COMMENTS FROM THE VICE-CHAIR – PROFESSOR W. RANDY SMITH**

- There will be a meeting on July 24, 2006, when the Executive Vice President and Provost, and all the Vice Provosts, will meet with the University Senate leadership to discuss activities/issues for the forthcoming academic year. Included will be a discussion of the recent issues that have emerged relating to this Council and the proposal approval process.

Professor Brian Winer, Department of Physics will serve as Chair of the Council and Smith will serve as the Vice Chair of the Council in academic year 2006 – 2007. Four new faculty and three new students will join the

Council in October. There will be an orientation session for the new members sometime during the first three weeks of September to help with the transition to the Council.

- Smith attended a meeting on “service learning” courses. Professor Golden Jackson, Department of Consumer Sciences, has been coordinating this initiative at the University level. Jackson has developed a template for such courses that will need action by Council this Autumn. Discussions are also underway for a designated course number for such courses.
- Smith presented three proposals relating to the use of the term center/institute.

The College of Medicine is requesting the use of “center” for the **Center for IT Innovations in Healthcare (CITIH)**, an effort to organize all the clinical information technologies and programs that support the clinical mission.

The Fisher College of Business has submitted a proposal to change the name of the Center for Information Technologies to the **Center for Business Performance Management**. It has the support of the faculty and the College office.

Professor Jacqueline Royster, Executive Dean, Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, has requested to use the title “institute” as an organizing mechanism for the development of a proposal for the **Institute on Women, Gender, and Public Policy**.

Smith asked the Council if there were any objections. There was none. The Council unanimously approved all three proposals.

Smith will send these proposals to the Board of Trustees for approval at its next meeting: September 22, 2006.

**PROPOSAL TO ABOLISH THE CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH –  
PROFESSORS RAYMOND A. NOE, AND W. RANDY SMITH,  
SUBCOMMITTEE D**

Smith commented that Professor Paul Beck, Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, had met with the Council on January 18, 2006 to indicate that this Center had been dismantled in recent years and he wanted that action to become official. At the Council meeting on July 6, 2006 there was further discussion, and although the rule/guidelines are about to be changed, it was suggested that Beck could give the Council a formal two-page request for abolition of this Center at the next meeting. If approved, the proposal will go to the Senate for action during Autumn 2006.

## **DISCUSSION WITH PROFESSOR PAUL BECK, DEAN, COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**

Beck summarized the proposal to abolish the Center for Survey Research. Survey Research had first been housed in the Department of Political Science where Beck had served as Chair. Several things contributed to the decline of the Center. The creation of the Center was justified initially to raise funds and help faculty by providing survey research. It failed on both counts. It stopped generating income. There has been a major change in the way surveys were being taken. Telephone surveys were being replaced by e-mail and regular mail surveys. Competition was intense. Faculty started losing interest and took their business elsewhere at lower cost. The Center was created with the “academic enrichment” funds from the Office of Academic Affairs. Beck discussed this issue with the Executive Vice President and Provost and decided to return the funds except for \$15,000 for the Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Survey Research (GISSR). The amount was matched by the College.

GISSR is flourishing and doing very well. It is a very valuable program and could grow over time. This program has been coordinated by Professor Jerry Kosicki, School of Communication, and is overseen by an inter-college faculty oversight committee. Students are involved in activities in various departments and colleges. Various courses are offered in individual departments such as Statistics and Political Science.

- Are there any other functions or services provided by CSR that will be affected? No. One possibility is to provide survey research through GISSR. It will provide a series of courses bringing in people from the outside. That will continue. This is very important for the GISSR.
- What will happen to the coordinator? He will remain in that role and use his faculty office to coordinate the program. There may be a dozen graduate students doing interdisciplinary research. It will become harder for students to get a practicum. That was one of the weaknesses of the operation because survey research is routine and not creative. Students were used to do routine research and not more creative work. Kosicki has arranged for local research firms to provide the practicum. Many students got hired permanently after a practicum. However, a practicum is not required to do this graduate interdisciplinary specialization.
- Graduate students work on research at the local research firms: when is that work considered "research" for purposes of University compliance with IRB regulations? Since they are doing research for the firm and not doing research for themselves, they are not bound by IRB regulations.
- Academics used CSR. What should be told to them? Academics have been taking their business to private research firms for sometime. They now do not receive many inquiries about CSR. However they do receive inquiries about the poly

metrics laboratory that is mostly used for surveys. The Center simply did not serve academics as hoped. Faculty took their business elsewhere at lower cost.

There were no further questions.

Subcommittee D moved to abolish Center for Survey Research. It was seconded by Halasek. The motion carried unanimously.

Smith will send the proposal to the Senate for action, probably at the November meeting, and then to the Board of Trustees. In the mean time, Council must begin its work on revising the guidelines related to centers/institutes.

**PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A CENTER FOR FAMILY RESEARCH –  
PROFESSOR E. KAY HALASEK, CHAIR, SUBCOMMITTEE B**

The proposal to establish a Center for Family Research was reviewed by Subcommittee B during Spring 2005. Several questions raised by the subcommittee were answered. The Subcommittee had additional questions when it met with Professor Stephen Gavaazi. The proposal was forwarded to the University Research Committee during the 2005-06 academic year. The current Subcommittee B did not review the proposal again this past academic year. Although Subcommittee B concluded that this is a reasonable center proposal, the University Research Committee had questions about sustainability and funding, and about affiliated faculty. Those issues do need to be addressed today.

**Discussion:**

Paskett had several concerns. There are three levels of membership listed on page 17. What are the criteria to belong to a certain level? Paskett also expressed concerns about the use of a “rotating” lead Dean, and now-dated (2004) support letters. Winer had concern about the organizational chart and its alignment with the text.

Smith indicated that the University Research Committee talked about sustainability. However, the center will be reviewed every five years.

Dobos suggested that a two-page CV for each of the participating faculty be attached to the proposal. Smith indicated that since there are about hundred people involved, he did not require that so many vitae be included.

Since the College of Human Ecology has now merged with the College of Education, a new letter from the Dean of the new College of Education and Human Ecology should be requested.

**DISCUSSION WITH PROFESSORS STEPHEN GAVAAZI, DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SCIENCES, AND SCOTT SCHEER, DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN AND COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT.**

Gavaazi gave a summary of the rationale for the creation of a Center for Family Research (CFR). He and Scheer are both family scientists with an extensive track record of scholarship efforts in this area of inquiry. Many American universities have established family-based centers. However, OSU currently has no center with a core focus on family-related matters. There is an informal collection of individuals interested in family-based research. Gavaazi and Scheer have been working for the past two years to formalize a Center for Family Research and it has been operating informally.

Gavaazi has maintained a research program that has focused primarily on assessment and intervention efforts involving at-risk adolescents and their families, as well as having been involved in the evaluation of family-based programs. Scheer's research program has focused on the study and promotion of positive child and adolescent development that includes both outreach programming for children/youth, and prevention of adolescent substance abuse.

- What are the vision, mission, and function of the Center? CFR has both a research and graduate education component. There are two large data sets. Projects are primarily derived from juvenile court in Ohio, South Dakota and Connecticut through collecting data on at-risk youth and families. Second is coordination of efforts of every agency that touches the lives of Ohio youth and family. This includes the Department of Mental Health, Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services, the Ohio Department of Education, the Ohio Department of Youth Services, the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug and Addition Services, the Ohio Association of County Behavioral Health Authority, and the Public Children's Services Association of Ohio. All of them have a vested interest in statewide projects that have to do with looking at how the state could have a better impact on services that are provided. They have been using a longitudinal data base to track 3000 families over the past two years. This represents the public partnership that they have, where data are generated with regard to the evaluation of a project. The Center will provide coordinated efforts to use data partnering with people and making it available to individuals in order to create scholarly contributions as well as to acquire federal funding to better their understanding of families, in particular families of at-risk youth.
- There are three different levels of faculty membership listed. What are the criteria for each level? There are no specific criteria to belong to a particular level. This enables individuals to belong to which ever level they choose instead of mandating the levels.
- It was suggested that they have a formalize criteria for each level. Gavaazi indicated that he has heard that suggestion before, but they want to be inclusive

and not exclusive by allowing participants options to choose the level to which they wish to belong. A Council member warned that with such a loose definition, it is possible to run into problems. Smith noted that among the most recent centers approved, there is variability in such criteria and in some cases a very rigid set of guidelines for inclusion has deterred membership.

- Will Professor David Andrews, Dean, College of Education and Human Ecology, be the lead Dean? Yes.
- Who will be the non-leading Dean? Andrews has given both fiscal and human resource support in the creation of this Center. Vice President Bobby Moser has always deferred to Andrews on such matters and will be the other Dean heavily involved.
- What is the impact of the recent merger of the two colleges on this proposal? They are planning to add a significant number of faculty to the Center as a result of the merger.
- The vision for the Center seems to focus on families of at-risk youths. What about aging and family/work issues? Gavazzi said that they are open to including work on those issues. Indeed current data sets being used can be used for a variety of other issues as well.
- A question was raised about a formal Memorandum of Understanding. Gavaazi indicated that a formal MOU is deferred until formal approval of the Center. He also added that Andrews already has gone above and beyond the information for an MOU.

### **Discussion:**

Council members debated how to proceed; whether to approve or wait for the revised proposal. Smith indicated that he will work with Gavaazi and Scheer to address various issues raised by Council members. It was agreed that a new letter of support from Andrews should be requested in view of his new role as a Dean of the merged College.

Questions were raised about the level of membership. What does it entail? How are they evaluated? Do we “require” different levels of membership for centers? No. Even without levels of membership, there have to be criteria for membership in the Center and they also need to incorporate in the proposal their response to the University Research Committee.

Halasek moved to table the proposal. Winer seconded the motion. It carried unanimously.

## **PROPOSALS FROM SUBCOMMITTEE D – PROFESSORS RAYMOND A. NOE AND W. RANDY SMITH**

- Smith presented proposals for two graduate minors and two graduate interdisciplinary specializations, all approved by the Council on Research and Graduate Studies (CRGS). Professor Elliot Slotnick, Associate Dean, Graduate School, commented on each proposal.
  - i) Slotnick indicated that the proposal for Graduate Minor in Women’s Studies is straight forward and there were no major issues. The CRGSR raised some specific questions on the Graduate Minor in Environment and Natural Resources proposal. The proposal was approved after the questions were addressed satisfactorily.

Subcommittee D moved approval to establish a Graduate Minor in Women’s Studies and a Graduate Minor in Environment and Natural Resources. The motion was seconded by Reynolds and passed unanimously.

- ii) Proposals for Graduate Interdisciplinary Specializations in Singing Health and in Fine Arts were presented by Slotnick. The proposal for Singing Health is a targeted program. The CRGS had concerns about its sustainability, tied to funding, and received satisfactory responses including a formal commitment from Professor Bradley Welling (Speech and Hearing Sciences). A Council member indicated that the title “Singing Health” was a concern. There was a short discussion on the title, with Slotnick stressing the common usage of this term, and thus there was no proposal to recommend a title change.

Dobos had a concern about the course prerequisites in the Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Fine Arts. On page 8 and 12 of the proposal, Music 646 requires a ‘background in music but not expertise or sophistication’. On page 12 it states that “...some background will be sufficient (for example, the ability to read music)”. The concern was that students without proper background might enroll in the upper level courses. Slotnick explained that students without proper background will have to get the instructor’s permission. Proper background will be evaluated prior to giving permission.

Subcommittee D moved approval of a Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Singing Health, and Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Fine Arts. Dobos seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

## **DISCUSSION OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE UNIVERSITY-WIDE REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

Smith indicated that he had convened another meeting of all the Colleges on July 18, 2006 to discuss their current reactions to the Final Report of the Committee on the University-wide Review of Undergraduate Education. Except for Arts and Sciences, colleges support the proposal for 180 hours as the minimum hours to graduation. Arts and Sciences did not provide any rationale for staying with the current 191 hours to graduate for the B.A. degree. All the colleges support the freshman cluster concept, increased flexibility; and a new University-wide oversight committee (a committee that will be a combination of individuals from the current Arts and Sciences General Education Curriculum (GEC) subcommittee, supplemented by individuals from other colleges). The Council will return to this topic at its next meeting, and at several meetings this Autumn.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Halasek informed the Council that she has received materials from the Oversight Committee for the new undergraduate major in Biomedical Sciences, on which she serves, and will send them to Smith for wider distribution.

Smith thanked Pearson, who will be leaving the University for his first academic appointment, for his service to the Council over the past year. All Council members expressed their appreciation.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Randy Smith  
Lakshmi Dutta