

# **COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

## **200 BRICKER HALL**

**January 9, 2008**

**3:00-5:00**

### **MINUTES**

#### **Present:**

Professors: Daniel E. Collins, Lora G. Dobos, Marcia E. Farr, E. Kay Halasek (Chair), Daniel A. Mendelsohn, John M. Robinson, W. Randy Smith (Vice-Chair), Brian L. Winer.

Student Members: Rose M. Babington, Adrienne Belt (Undergraduate Student Government); Robert Calhoun (Council of Graduate Students)

Guests: Jed Dickhaut, Associate Registrar, Office of the University Registrar; David Roy, Senior Assistant Director, Enrollment Services; Dr. John Wanzer, Senior Vice Provost, Enrollment Management; Professor Edward H. Adelson, Associate Executive Dean, College of the Arts and Sciences; Professor Robert Kaufman, Associate Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; and Professors Richard T. Hart, Chair, Department of Biomedical Engineering, and Robert Gustafson, Associate Dean, College of Engineering.

#### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

- The draft minutes from the November 28 and December 5, 2007 meetings will be reviewed at the next Council meeting on January 23, 2008.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR – PROFESSOR E. KAY HALASEK**

- There were no comments from the Chair.

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

- The University Senate meeting scheduled for January 10, 2008 was cancelled. Approval of the proposal from the College of Nursing to establish a Doctorate in Nursing Practice therefore will be delayed until the February 2008 Senate meeting. The proposal to eliminate 15 hours of free electives is still being reviewed by other Senate groups. At the February Senate meeting, Executive Vice President and Provost Alutto will be giving his first annual address.

- The review of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC) has continued. The Review Committee has met with approximately 125 people: the Executive Dean, each individual ASC dean, the college executive committees, development officers, the information technology group, college fiscal officers, associate deans and federation staff, directors of the interdisciplinary programs - International Studies, Middle Childhood Education and Film Studies, the ASC Faculty Senate, and the University Senate Faculty Council. There were two open faculty forums. An external team will be invited to advise the Committee on its work.
- He has begun individual meetings with the associate deans for curriculum of the 18 colleges to discuss the current status and future plans related to: course enrollments; trends in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs; learning outcomes assessment; distance/distributed learning; and international programs.
- On January 18, 2008, he is convening the group of colleges that has programs in the interdisciplinary area of “environment”. Seven colleges will be represented and the current proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Engineering will be discussed.

**PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY, DEPARTMENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY AND SPEECH AND HEARING SCIENCE, COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES - PROFESSOR LORA G. DOBOS, CHAIR, SUBCOMMITTEE C**

Dobos gave a summary of the proposal. At present, only two units (Psychology and Speech and Hearing Science) have courses in place that would be designated as “clinical” and could be taught by clinical faculty. These areas would like to offer faculty appointments to clinical practitioners in order to “attract the most highly-qualified individuals to teach clinical and practicum courses.” Subcommittee C reviewed two different versions of the proposal. The response from the College to the last set of questions was received in August 2007. Based on the responses, the proposal is brought to the full Council with reservations for the following reasons.

In section VBi the proposal identifies, through a list from each Department, courses that are “likely to” or “might be” taught by clinical faculty. It also notes that in “unusual” circumstances clinical faculty might be assigned to courses beyond those listed in the proposal. As presented, the proposal does not meet the terms of the University Rule governing the establishment of a regular clinical track faculty. A complete list of current and proposed courses taught only by the clinical faculty is not included in the proposal as required by the University guidelines. Dobos also noted that Rules state that at least a majority of all faculty must approve, but the vote did not include a major of all faculty.

Smith noted that this must be interpreted within the context of the College pattern of administration.

Winer wanted to know whether the revised proposal is in response to the first or second set of questions. Responses were not given item by item.

### **DISCUSSION WITH THE PROFESSOR ROBERT A. KAUFMAN, ASSOCIATE DEAN, COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**

Kaufman gave an overview of the proposal. The basic reason for the proposal is that there are couple of departments such as Psychology and Speech and Hearing Science, that have courses in place that would be designated “clinical” and could be taught by clinical faculty members. This proposal describes how the clinical track faculty would operate within these two units. Other units in the College may have clinical courses that could be taught by Clinical Faculty. Each subsequently would have to submit a proposal for approval.

Dobos indicated that there is general support for the proposal from the Subcommittee C. However, the following issues have to be clarified prior to final approval by the Council.

The University Guidelines require that a complete list of current and proposed courses that have the potential to be taught by clinical faculty be included in the proposal along with syllabi.

Subcommittee C is concerned about the language in the last paragraph in section VB.i. The proposal identifies, through a list from each Department, courses that are “likely to” or “might be” taught by clinical faculty. It also notes that in “unusual” circumstances clinical faculty might be assigned to courses beyond those listed in the proposal. As presented, the proposal does not meet the terms of the University Rule governing the establishment of a regular clinical track faculty.

Subcommittee C will be more comfortable with the following recommended changes. Strike the paragraph that includes language indicating that clinical track faculty may, under certain circumstances, teach additional courses which would then limit the assignment of clinical faculty only to those courses presently listed in the proposal or include in the proposal, in addition to the rationale and list of course already included, a list of all courses to which clinical faculty might be assigned, a syllabus for each, and separate detailed rationales for assigning clinical faculty each of those courses.

The spirit of the Rule is that the University does not want clinical faculty to teach courses that could/should be taught by regular tenure track faculty. Otherwise, this could shrink the tenure track faculty pool.

Winer indicated that an annual report of courses taught by clinical faculty should be requested by Council. Smith agreed and noted that he had contacted the relevant deans

(Law, Engineering, Business) and learned that there had been very few appointments thus far. Nonetheless, the Council should ask for an update from each college this year.

Smith added that in order for Council not to have a decision-making role related to specific courses, the University Rule would have to be changed. Since that has not occurred, this proposal must follow the current Rule. He noted that this proposal, as the earlier ones (Law, Engineering and Business) had done, suggested the need to revisit the Guidelines for the establishment or amendment of Clinical Faculty Tracks.

It was noted that any seminar course taught by the clinical faculty will have to provide a rationale for doing so. It was requested that a list of practice courses and their syllabi be provided.

Given these considerations, Mendelsohn moved to table the proposal. It was seconded by Collins. The motion passed unanimously. Halasek and Smith will contact the College to provide details for follow-up action.

**PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR IN BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING - PROFESSOR SHERYL BARRINGER, CHAIR, SUBCOMMITTEE B**

In Barringer's absence, Winer gave a summary of the proposal. The Biomedical Engineering Center has been offering graduate degrees in Biomedical Engineering through the Graduate School for several decades. In November 2005, the Biomedical Engineering Center became the Department of Biomedical Engineering. By investing in the potential and existing strength of its health sciences and engineering, the University is now in a position to join other top-ranked Colleges of Engineering by offering a high quality undergraduate program in biomedical engineering.

There are 42 undergraduate Bioengineering/Biomedical Engineering programs that are ABET accredited around the country. A US Department of Labor Statistics Report projects a growth of biomedical engineering jobs from 2002-2012. The proposal includes the new major curriculum and new undergraduate courses. The major will require 193 hours to be completed with 35 hours of new general education hours. The proposal includes three concurrences received from other departments, a list of courses overlapping with other departments and a list of current faculty members. They are negotiating to hire two faculty immediately and plan to hire four more in the near future. The program will not expand rapidly if four more faculty are not hired.

A Council member wanted to know if the demand in the field is overstated. The statistics are from the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics Report published in February, 2004, and the number of graduates has increased.

Based on this information, Subcommittee B recommends approval of the proposal.

**DISCUSSION WITH PROFESSORS RICHARD HART, CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING, AND ROBERT GUSTUFSON, ASSOCIATE DEAN, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

Hart gave an overview of the proposal. With funding from National Science Foundation, the Biomedical Engineering Center was formed in 1971 and was part of the Electrical Engineering graduate program. The Biomedical Engineering center, a college center, is located on the west campus. The graduate program has a strong curriculum integrating engineering and medicine. In 2005, the Biomedical Engineering center became the Department of Biomedical Engineering. By investing in the potential and existing strength of its health sciences and engineering, the College of Engineering is poised to offer a high quality undergraduate program in biomedical engineering.

Gustafson added that there is great deal of support from the college and accreditation criteria are being developed for this program.

What is the time line to hire four faculty to teach all the courses? There are 15 core faculty - approximately 9.5 FTE. They are planning to hire two faculty right away so that the program can handle 50 students. Four more faculty will be needed in order to expand the program.

It is critical to have two faculty positions they are trying to fill to run the program. The four other faculty positions are important, but not required to run the program. Two staff positions will be advertised as soon as the proposal is approved.

Hart commented on the US Department of Labor Statistics Report and noted that some students are pre-medicine, others go to graduate school pursuing a doctoral program, and others seek employment after completing the undergraduate program. There is a strong market for technical sales for medical devices, for those completing an undergraduate program. Most students in the undergraduate program will do an internship.

Is the job market saturated to absorb all the new graduates? There has not been much change in the job opportunities for students graduating from this program. Most students are successful in finding a job.

There were no further questions. Smith added that this proposal, if approved by the Council, will need University Senate and Board of Trustees action, and will need to be sent to the Ohio Board of Regents. It should still be possible to start the program effective Autumn 2008.

Subcommittee C moved approval of the proposal and the motion was seconded by Collins. The motion passed unanimously.

## **PROPOSALS FROM SUBCOMMITTEE D - PROFESSORS E. KAY HALASEK AND W. RANDY SMITH**

- **Proposal to Establish a Minor in Air Science.**

Halasek gave an overview of the proposal. It is similar to the recent proposal from Military Science requesting a minor. The Air Science department feels that students deserve the academic recognition they have earned for the 24 credit hours of Air Science courses they are required to take. This does not include the rigorous four weeks Field Training Exercise, twice weekly Physical Training, and various other activities required to become an officer in the United States Air Force. These courses do not apply towards their college major. As a result, students do not receive any recognition for completion of this rigorous program. This minor is open only to those in ROTC's Air Science program, because these courses are restricted to commissioned officers.

The Air Science minor consists of a minimum of 20 credit hours. A student is required to maintain a minimum GPA of 2.0 and declare the minor prior to accumulating 90 total credit hours. The proposal did not clearly state that a student must achieve at least a minimum of C- in each course. Halasek contacted the proposer about this and a revised proposal was submitted.

Subcommittee D moved approval of this proposal and it was seconded by Mendelsohn. The motion passed unanimously.

Smith noted that in the past, minors were developed only by the units in the Arts and Sciences. Over the past decade or so, other colleges developed their own minors. Although they often follow the ASC template, they are using differential criteria to suit their profession. Smith has been advised by many colleges to establish one set of guidelines for all minors to remove the confusion. He will convene a small work group later this academic year to address this issue and asked Council members to consider service on it.

- **Revisions to the Rule/Guidelines on Institutes and Centers; Continued Discussion**

Smith asked if Council members had any further thoughts on the proposal to revise center/institute guidelines.

For college centers, how will we know that the Dean is reviewing college based centers? Should this Council be embedded in that review in some way?

How will current "area studies" centers, and all other centers created before 1996 guidelines, be reviewed?

Halasek and Winer raised issues about center funding and the need to ensure that there is not a proliferation of centers, without appropriate funding attached to them, thus degrading the concept of a center.

Depending on the scope of the agenda, there will be further discussion of this topic at the next Council meeting.

**The meeting adjourned at 4:35pm**

Respectfully Submitted by

W. Randy Smith  
Lakshmi Dutta