

COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

200 BRICKER HALL

AUGUST 23, 2006

10:00-1:00P

MINUTES

Present:

Professors: Lora Gingerich Dobos, Richard Gunther, Margaret McMahon, Raymond Noe (Chair), Electra Paskett, Nancy Reynolds, W. Randy Smith (Vice-Chair), Harald Vaessin, Brian Winer, and George Vaclo

Student Members: Jane Evans (Council of Graduate Students), Elaine Yeh (Undergraduate Student Government)

Guests: Professors Stephen Gavazzi, Department of Human Development and Family Sciences and Scott Scheer, Department of Human and Community Resource Development; Professor Larry Schlesinger, Department of Internal Medicine; Professor Edward Adelson, Executive Associate Dean and Katherine Morgan, College of the Arts and Sciences; Professor Alexis Collier, Department of Psychology; Jed Dickhaut, Associate Registrar, Office of the University Registrars;

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JULY 20, 2006

- Winer moved approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of July 20, 2006. Dobos seconded the motion and the motion carried with one abstention.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR – PROFESSOR RAYMOND NOE

- There were no comments from the Chair

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

- On July 24, 2006, the Executive Vice President and Provost and all the Vice Provosts met with the University Senate leadership to discuss activities/issues for the forthcoming academic year. Included topics were discussion of the recent issues that have emerged relating to this Council and the proposal approval process. Follow up meeting will be held at the end of September at a mini retreat.

- Professor Winer, Chair of the Council on Academic Affairs next academic year met with the Dean of Humanities to discuss a proposal to establish Religious Studies Center. A formal proposal will be submitted in the fall.
- Formal steps along with a template are being developed for Service Learning courses. A formal proposal will be submitted for approval in the fall.
- A proposal to change the graduate program and graduate degree name from Electrical Engineering to Electrical and Computer Engineering has been submitted. Two years ago, the Department of Electrical Engineering changed its name and also the major to Electrical and Computer Engineering. However, they did not submit the paper work to change the name of the graduate program.

Subcommittee D moved approval of the proposal. Gunther seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- A proposal to create the Battelle Center for Mathematics and Science Education Policy at Ohio State, housed at the John Glenn School of Public Affairs and a request to use the term ‘center’ was received. An advisory committee comprised of the Deans of the Colleges of Education, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, and Engineering will guide the operations of the center. This center is part of the OHIOSTEM program. STEM stands for Science, Technology, Engineering and Math.

Smith asked the Council if there is any objection to using the term ‘center’. There was none. The Council unanimously approved to use the term ‘center.’

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

Smith summarized that at the last meeting CFR proposal was tabled. Smith and Dutta met with Professors Gavazzi and Scheer and discussed their revised proposal. In their revised proposal they addressed the level of membership, Lead Dean issue, the organization chart and provided a new letter from Dean David Andrews in his role as the Dean of the College of Education and Human Ecology. They also broadened their research focus from At – Risk youth to include aging and family/work issues. They embedded in the revised proposal their response to the University Research Committee.

Following concerns were raised by the Council:

- There was a concern about co-director roles. Paskett still felt that it should be a small ‘c’ center.
- Valco wanted criteria for membership defined clearly.

- Gunther felt that co-director model might fail when two individuals are equally in charge of the center.
- Smith indicated that the co-director model if does not work, it will be addressed when the center will be reviewed in five years

Guests:

- What are the specific criteria for membership in the center? Membership is open to individuals with interest in the research areas of the Center.
- What qualification should an individual have to become part of the center? Does he have a specific area of research interest which will generate funding? If an individual is interested in the Center's areas of research, then they should contact the co-directors and the co-directors will make the decision to allow membership.
- There is a concern about the co-directorship. What happens when the vision differs which can cause gridlock? Structural problems may arise due to disagreement on policies. Chair and Associate Chair may be a better model. Scheer indicated that they are open to looking at different models. Gavazzi indicated that the Co-directors will report to the department chair and the chair reports to the Dean. A Council member felt that with two equal votes, there are possibilities for paralysis.

Subcommittee B moved approval of the proposal to establish a Center for Family Research contingent upon clarification of membership criteria and co-directorship issues. The motion was seconded by Reynolds. The motion passed unanimously.

Smith will work with Gavazzi and Scheer on revised version of the proposal that should address: the need for a statement on membership status and the process to achieve it; and manner in which co-directorship concerns will be addressed. The proposal will be sent to the University Senate for action at an Autumn Quarter 2006 meeting. Following Senate action, the proposal will be sent to the Board of Trustees for final approval. In the interim, the Council believes that the term center can be used noting, when appropriate, that it is pending final action by the Board.

PROPOSAL TO CREATE A CENTER FOR MICROBIAL INTERFACE BIOLOGY – PROFESSOR HARALD VAESSIN, CHAIR, SUBCOMMITTEE A

Microbial Interface Biology (CMIB) proposal is a multidisciplinary research center related to infectious disease and microbial pathogenesis. There are four faculty members directly appointed to the Center and 20 other faculty has association with the Center. Professor Schlesinger responded satisfactorily to various questions of Subcommittee A. Subcommittee A also reviewed responses to questions raised in the University Research Committee review of the proposed center and satisfied with their responses.

Subcommittee A recommends approval of the proposal to establish a Center for Microbial Interface Biology.

Discussion:

Council members raised following questions:

- Are the faculty members listed on page 29 appointed directly to the Center?
- Can a non-faculty member be appointed to the center?
- There was a concern about item 4 on page 4 on future appointments and future membership. What is the current status of membership list? Are they from Tenure Initiating Units or are they non-faculty members?
- Serious concerns were expressed about the budget. So far they have accounted for \$80,000 plus \$12,000 plus \$25,000 although the total budget is \$220,000. There is anticipation of revenue based upon something may materialize in future. If the external funding does not materialize how will the center be funded?

Guest:

- Is recruitment to the center from current faculty from existing TIU (Tenure Initiating Units) or individuals with no faculty status? What is the status of current membership?

Schlesinger informed that the vision of the center is to start a membership list that included letter of offer with the word 'Center' in them. Schlesinger met with hundreds of faculty for participation in the center, but no letters were generated. For newer recruits, the letter of offer from Microbiology included also participation in CMIB as part of coming to OSU. There are already six formal members. These are from within the campus and will become members. CMIB will not be functioning as TIU. Membership in the center will be reviewed to make sure people are actually participating. CMIB has funding for two more recruits. It will be a joint appointment with Microbiology with primary appointment in Internal Medicine. All members come from TIUs.

- On page 6, question 11. The CMIB budget is expected to be \$220,000. Only \$80,000, \$12,000, and \$25,000 are accounted for. Where is the rest of the money coming from?
- In September CMIB submitted a Business Plan to the College of Medicine. They have been awarded significant amount of the proposal which will cover rest of the funding.

Subcommittee A moved approval of the proposal to establish a Center for Microbial Interface Biology contingent upon clarification of membership and budget related issues. The motion was seconded by Yeh. The motion passed unanimously.

Smith will work with Schlesinger to submit a revised proposal that addresses the issues discussed: an updated list of faculty participation in the Center; clarification of the use of the term “appointment”; and an updated budget statement. The proposal will be sent to the University Senate for action at its Autumn Quarter 2006 meeting. Following Senate action, the proposal will be sent to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The term center can be used noting, when appropriate, that it is pending final action by the Board.

There was a strong consensus that the Council should revisit Center issues.

DISCUSSION ON GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES (GECs) OVERSIGHT – Professor W. Randy Smith

Who will oversee General Education courses? McHale recommended that there should be a University Wide Oversight Committee to monitor General Education Curriculum. This Oversight Committee will report to Council on Academic Affairs. Currently, Arts and Science is responsible for approval of GEC courses. The University Wide Oversight Committee will comprise of members of subcommittee within Arts and Sciences’ College Committee on Instruction embellished with members from other parts of the university without adding another layer of bureaucracy.

What would be the charge of this Committee? Smith distributed a draft of the proposed charge and asked for Council’s feedback.

Smith indicated that there is no one GEC model through out the university. Arts and Sciences’ model has eight categories and other colleges have their own model. Not all courses within those categories are used. There are 800 GEC courses. The reality is that most students complete only a small subset of these courses. One of the charges of the Oversight Committee is to do a pattern analysis of these courses annually. Ninety percent of all GECs are offered by the College of Arts and Sciences. The issue is, who should assess the efficacy of GEC’s learning outcomes in respect to category goals and objectives? There has never been any assessment to make sure the goals and objectives of these categories are met. Ethics course issue was raised by Engineering. The Oversight Committee should recommend ways in which category goals and objectives are aligned with outcomes. There will not be a need for a McHale type of report every few years, if the assessment of GECs is done properly and continually.

The Oversight Committee should have student focus groups and also focus group for faculty teaching GEC courses to get information from students and faculty teaching GEC courses.

A question was raised whether the subcommittee that approves GECs courses also is responsible for assessment. Adelson explained that originally the subcommittee with the

College curriculum committee that was responsible for approving GEC was also responsible for assessment. But it did not work well. So, a separate sub committee E was formed for assessing GEC courses.

What will be the connection between the Arts and Science Subcommittee and the Oversight Committee? Smith explained that the subcommittee doing the assessment will be embellished with faculty from rest of the campus to form the Oversight Committee. This is because the subcommittee E members can provide a valuable service in assessing GECS.

A Council member raised the issue of graduating seniors having to take a 100-level course to satisfy GEC requirements. He indicated that there is very little probability of taking a 100-level course from a faculty member. There are 60 courses in each category. A graduating senior should have the flexibility to take 500-level courses that meet the goals and objectives of a category to satisfy GEC requirement. They don't have to be the prescribed 100 and 200 level courses.

How do you assess the social diversity component of a course in Sociology, Political Science, etc.? Assessment is done through exams, embedded test questions, raising questions in an exam about social diversity, etc.

How frequently assessment will be done? Courses will be assessed every few years on a rotating basis. It has to be continuous quality improvement.

Smith summed up the charge of the oversight Committee:

- Provide an annual pattern analysis that includes a summary of major course enrollment as well as trends in GEC courses.
- Assess the efficacy of GEC learning outcomes in respect to category goals and objectives
- Recommend ways in which category goals and objectives need to be realigned and reassessed.
- Study the use of exceptions and substitutions in the GEC
- Work in conjunction with other University committees such Curricular Quality Control of CAA to consider information about staffing patterns and GPAs of GEC courses in its assessments; work in conjunction with college representatives at Associate and Assistant Deans from across the university to receive feedback on the impact of the GEC on specific majors; work with chairs of CAA subcommittees to respond to issues that arise within CAE's process of deliberations.

- Utilize exit surveys from colleges, focus groups, and tracking of representative samples of students in its work
- Provide an annual report to CAA on the status of the GEC, including recommendations for change.

Smith added that assessment is a big issue at CIC. The Oversight Committee will be charged with fiscal monitoring, advising concerns, GEC course assessment, etc. He added that there should be an advisor on the oversight committee.

Smith informed the Council that there are four faculty members, Ray Noe, Electra Paskett, Margaret McMahon, and Harald Vaessin and three student members Kevin Freeman, Scott Pearson, and Amanda Ransburgh will be leaving. Harald Vaessin will assume responsibility of Chair of the University Senate Steering Committee. He thanked all of them for their diligent and hard work over the past few years.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25p

Respectfully submitted,

W. Randy Smith
Lakshmi Dutta