

# COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

156 University Hall

July 7, 2010

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

## MINUTES

### ATTENDANCE

#### Faculty:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ✓ Dr. Leslie Alexander (History)                                | ✓ Dr. Jay S. Hobgood (Geography)                    |
| ✓ Dr. Lawrence A. Baum (Political Science)                      | ✓ Dr. Daniel A. Mendelsohn (Mechanical Engineering) |
| Dr. Neelima M. Bendapudi (Marketing and Logistics)              | Dr. Robert J. Ward (Music)                          |
| ✓ Dr. Marilyn J. Blackwell (Germanic Languages and Literatures) | ✓ Dr. John W. Wilkins (Physics)                     |
| ✓ Dr. James W. Cogdell (Mathematics)                            | Dr. Kay N. Wolf (Allied Medical Professions)        |

#### Students:

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Ms. Sarah K. Douglas (CGS, History)   | Ms. Meghan Offenberger (IPC, Pharmacy)         |
| Ms. Olga A. Isenberg (CGS, Business)  | ✓ Mr. John D. Tannous (UGS, Political Science) |
| Mr. Benjamin T. Reinke (USG, Physics) |  |

#### Administrators:

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

#### Guests:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Dr. Ann Christy (Faculty Fellow, Academic Affairs)                                  | Ms. Sarah Lang (Academic Planning Specialist, Education and Human Ecology)                          |
| Dr. Alexis C. Collier (Associate Provost)   | Ms. Jessica Mercerhill (Curriculum Reform Program Director, College of Education and Human Ecology) |
| Dr. Terry L. Gustafson (Associate Executive Dean, Arts and Sciences)                | Dr. Bernadette Vankeerbergen (Curriculum Coordinator, Arts and Sciences)                            |
| Ms. Andrea Bour (Office of the University Registrar)                                | Mr. David L. Roy (Assistant Director, Enrollment Services)  |
| Dr. Kate Hallihan (Director, Student Services, John Glenn School of Public Affairs) |   |

The Council came to order at 10:00 AM

## **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JUNE 2, 2010**

Hobgood moved approval of the Minutes of the June 2, 2010 meeting; it was seconded by Mendelsohn; and the motion carried with all in favor.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR—PROFESSOR JAY S. HOBGOOD**

- Hobgood expressed thanks to Council members for their willingness to participate at Summer meetings that are now being scheduled.

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

- On June 18, 2010, the Board of Trustees approved the establishment of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Effective Autumn 2010, in alignment with expectations from the Ohio Board of Regents, all new majors will be sent to that Office for staff review/approval immediately following approval by the Council. All academic units will be informed of this step.
- Appointment of new Council members for Autumn 2010 is still underway.

## **PROPOSAL FROM SUBCOMMITTEE D—PROFESSORS JAY S. HOBGOOD AND W. RANDY SMITH**

- **New Interdisciplinary Minor in Nonprofit Studies, College of Arts and Sciences (Guests: Associate Executive Dean for Arts and Sciences Terry Gustafson and Assistant Provost, Mindy Wright)**

Hobgood provided an overview of the proposal. This new minor, administered by the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, will provide students who wish to work in the philanthropic sector with a set of knowledge and skills covering a range of disciplines. The undergraduate minor in Nonprofit Studies requires completion of a minimum 23 credit hours. Students are required to take 15 hours from the list of required courses and 8 elective hours which may be taken from the remaining core courses or the elective list provided. The minor is expected to attract students majoring in a variety of subjects, especially in the Arts and Sciences, the Fisher College of Business and Social Work. Program assessment will initially focus on analyzing student enrollment data. Subsequently, exit surveys of students graduating with the minor will be used. It is expected that the minor will initially attract a total of 20 students and grow to attract 50 students within five years.

During the discussion, the following issues were raised and clarifications provided.

- The students may petition to use courses that are relevant. They should check with advising as to appropriateness of the courses. Advising will be done by School advisors as well as faculty. They will monitor growth of student participation in the minor and make recommendations about possible increases in seat availability, if needed.
- Local non-profit practitioner provided strong input in crafting this proposal.
- It is expected that new courses may be developed as there will be a body of students to populate them and the number of faculty could increase too.

Council members noted that this is one of the best proposals received from the College of Arts and Sciences. There were no concerns expressed.

Hobgood moved approval; it was seconded by Wilkins; and the motion carried with all in favor.

- **Revision to the Communication Technology Focus Area within the Communication Major, School of Communication, College of Arts and Sciences**

Hobgood provided an overview of the proposal. The revision of the focus area is accompanied by the creation of one new course Communication 450 and three course changes: Communication 611, 650 and 657. Titles and content were changed for these last three courses. The School of Communication is not changing the goals and objectives of the program. They are only highlighting more the technological aspects of the program.

During the discussion, the following issues were raised and clarifications provided.

- The revision will give students a more coherent course of study and a clear understanding of the career choices they will have available. The faculty and the departmental advising committee supported these changes.
- The focus area will have two new tracks for students to pursue: Human–Computer Interaction and Communication Technology Management.

There were no other concerns with this proposal.

Hobgood moved approval; it was seconded by Blackwell; and the motion carried with all in favor.

- **Proposal to Change the Name of the Department of Women’s Studies to the Department of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies: (Guests: Professor Joseph Steinmetz, Executive Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, and Professor Rebecca Wanzo)**

Wanzo presented the proposal and the need to change the name of this department. The Department of Women's Studies focuses not only on the feminist methodology foundational to the discipline, but also the broader application of this lens applied to different genders and sexuality in order to understand the social relationships within our society today. The Department of Women's Studies will change its name to, Department of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies.

During the discussion, the following issues were raised and clarifications provided.

- The change to the name of this department and its programs emerged from discussions among faculty and also from the review of the curriculum due to the semester conversion process.
- Including the word "sexuality" in the department's title also points towards the national norm of housing sexuality studies in women's and gender studies programs and departments.

There were no other concerns with this proposal.

Hobgood moved approval; it was seconded by Wilkins; and the motion carried with all in favor.

Smith noted that the graduate program name changes need approval from the Graduate School before the entire proposal is sent to the University Senate for action.

- **Revision to the Undergraduate Admission Criteria for the Fisher College of Business (Guests: Professor Stephen Mangum, Senior Associate Dean, Executive Director of Undergraduate Programs and Advising, Jacqueline Elcik, and Professor Rao Unnava, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs)**

This proposal initially was discussed in a previous Council meeting. Guests from the Fisher College of Business presented an overview of this revision. Unnava explained that the College would like to move to a more holistic process for admission to business programs. Students who do not meet the minimum qualification for these programs will be reviewed based on work experience, academic background, essays and extra-curricular experiences, if space is available. This revision will give more chances for advancement to a variety of students. It is meant to reach deeper in our community and provide college experience in business programs to minority groups, including older students and those from regional campuses. The Fisher College also has a close connection with other colleges inside the university to provide placement to those students who do not qualify for programs inside the College.

There were no other concerns with this proposal.

Hobgood moved approval; it was seconded by Tannous; and the motion carried with all in favor.

**UNIVERSITY CENTER REVIEWS: (Guest: Professor Dale Vandre, Chair, University Research Committee)**

Council members reviewed University Rule 3335-3-36. Attention was given to paragraphs containing information about establishment, reporting, and oversight of centers: 3335-3-36 (B) (6) and 3335-3-36 (B) (7). These paragraphs are included in the Appendix to these notes.

- **Review of the Campus Microscopy and Imaging Facility (Guest: Professor Richard Burry, Director)**

Vandre presented the results from review of the Campus Microscopy and Instrumentation Facility (CMIF). The Review Subcommittee was composed of: Dale Vandre, James Cogdell, Kari Green-Church and Sarah Douglas who asked the Center for information about: its mission; and how it changed over time; statements describing staff, associated faculty and student involvement and their contributions to the facility; a list of grants and publications derived from the facility; the administrative structure and oversight of the facility; budget reports; and criteria used to evaluate the facility mission. Besides the self-study, the CMIF review subcommittee also requested information about: a) imaging services provided by other units inside the campus; b) equipment available; c) education opportunities; d) comparison of CMIF with other units at benchmark institutions.

During the discussion, the following issues were raised and clarifications provided.

- The CMIF meets its mission and should be supported in the future.
- The Director has given tremendous time, effort and dedication in his service to this facility.
- Efforts should be taken to increase the administrative support staff responsible for record keeping and billing. The CMIF is making attempts to increase the staff, but funding is a major issue. If the addition of administrative support personnel cannot be funded through the CMIF budget, then the utilization of shared services support staff should be investigated.
- The CMIF must have a functional faculty governance oversight body that meets on a regular basis because a functional oversight body is a requirement of Centers at OSU.
- A single reporting structure inside CMIF needs to be defined. There are concerns as to how this structure will report to the current funding units including: College of Medicine, the Comprehensive Cancer Center, and the Office of Research.
- A clarification of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between CMIF and Comprehensive Cancer Center is required, but there are no specific guidelines inside the Office of Research on how this MOU should be structured.

There were no other concerns with this review.

- **Review of the Center for Cognitive Research (Guest: Professor Vladimir Sloutsky, Director)**

Vandre presented the results of the review of the Center for Cognitive Research (CCR). The review subcommittee, composed of: Richard Herrmann, Shari Speer, Brent Sohngen, and Ben Reinke, requested CCR to provide the same type of documents and reports as with the review team of CMIF: self study, services, equipments, educational opportunities and additional reports.

During the discussion, the following issues were raised and clarifications provided.

- Does the University need to support the CCR's mission? This Center can serve as a valuable meeting point for cross-disciplinary cooperation among students and faculty. It would be good to have such a center given the national prominence of cognitive science and cognitive neuro-science. The CCR have been organizing high quality events such as CogFest, and has been associated with high quality scholarship.
- The review subcommittee of CCR provided recommendations regarding the process of communication, decision making, leadership governance, the mission and the oversights of the Center. One of the recommendations was to locate the Center within the College of Arts and Sciences. The Center is not likely to become self sufficient. The cooperation with other departments inside and outside of Arts and Sciences (Department of Computer Science, and the College of Engineering) is crucial to this Center's future.

There were no other concerns with this review.

The Council will return to these two reviews at its next meeting.

**PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF PLASTIC SURGERY -  
SUBCOMMITTEE A - LESLIE ALEXANDER, LARRY BAUM, JOHN TANNOUS,  
JOHN WILKINS**

**Guest: Professor Michael Miller**

Baum presented an overview of the proposal. The creation of the Department of Plastic Surgery was accepted by the College of Medicine and it is seen as an alignment with a national trend. Plastic Surgery has the personnel, the resources and the determination to assume a leadership role nationally in Plastic Surgical clinical care, research, and education. An obstacle in achieving this goal is an antiquated structure with plastic surgery as a division. Over the past 10 years a few other disciplines that were previously divisions in the Department of Surgery achieved Departmental status: Orthopedic Surgery, Neurological Surgery and Urology.

During the discussion, the following issues were raised and clarifications provided.

- The discipline of plastic surgery represents an identifiable body of knowledge and academic concern that is not duplicated in other departments of the institution.
- Currently there are 11 full time faculty members in this division and 7 associate faculty members from the community who actively participate in the residency and training program.
- Plastic Surgery is uniquely multidisciplinary and a strong program in this field at the University. It adds value and is known for collaboration with many other disciplines including: Engineering (bone structures), Speech and Hearing, and Psychology.
- Plastic Surgery has demonstrated the capacity to generate adequate income from a variety of sources, including clinical care and research grants, to sustain an independent Department. It is fully prepared to assume primary fiscal responsibility for its existence.

Council members requested additional material and so action on this proposal was deferred until the next meeting.

**The meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

W. Randy Smith  
Liana Crisan-Vandeborne

**Appendix:**

University Rule 3335-3-36 Centers and institutes.

(A) Definition of an academic center (institute).

An academic center is a non-degree granting educational unit of the university engaged in research; instruction; or clinical, outreach, or related service. An academic center is defined by its mission and scope, not its title, and may be described as a center, institute, laboratory, or similar term. Use of "center" or "institute" in the names of proposed units of the university shall be limited to academic centers, unless otherwise approved by the council on academic affairs. See paragraph (C) of rule 3335-3-56 of the Administrative Code, for definition of non-academic centers. Academic centers are of two broad types: university centers and college centers.

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 central university funds (i.e. office of the president, office of academic affairs, office of research, colleges of the arts and sciences). The leadership of the center will report to one or more of those offices.

College centers typically will have some mix, with variable emphases, of research/scholarship, instruction, service, clinical or outreach missions. Internal funding (initial and continuing) is drawn fully, or in large part, from one college or a small set of colleges. The leadership of the center will report to one dean or a small set of deans.

(B) Establishment, reporting, and oversight.

(1) Establishment of university centers

Proposals for university centers will be developed following the “guidelines for the establishment and review of academic centers” and submitted to the office of academic affairs for action.

The chair of the council on academic affairs (CAA), the provost’s designee to that council, and the chair of the university research committee (URC) will review the proposal to ensure adherence to the guidelines and determine if it includes a substantial research component.

If so, a “centers subcommittee” of the council, supplemented with membership from URC, will review the proposal and bring a recommendation for action to CAA. If a substantial research component does not exist, the special subcommittee of the council (without URC involvement) will review the proposal and bring a recommendation for action to CAA.

If approved by CAA, the proposal will be sent to the university senate for final approval. That action will be communicated to the board of trustees.

(2) Establishment of college centers.

Each college will have a template for the establishment and review of centers that will be included in the college pattern of administration. Copies of college templates also will be maintained in the office of academic affairs (OAA). Proposals will be developed with adherence to the template, and submitted to the dean(s) of the college(s).

No review/action by CAA is required. The dean(s) will inform the OAA of the establishment of such a center. OAA will inform CAA, resulting in official institutional notification.

The office of academic affairs shall maintain a register of all academic centers and appropriate records concerning each one.

(3) Curricula and faculty affiliation.

Although neither university nor college centers may establish independent course offerings and degree programs, they may participate in cooperative programs involving course offerings and degree programs within existing academic units. With the approval of the council on academic affairs, the faculty of a school or college may delegate to an academic center the authority to offer courses or degree programs established under the auspices of that school or college. Proposals for any such courses or programs must be forwarded to the office of academic affairs with the signature approval of the appropriate school or college which must retain ultimate authority and responsibility for the courses or degree programs.



University faculty and staff may affiliate with the academic center under procedures approved by its oversight committee. Academic centers shall not serve as tenure initiating units.

(4) Administration.

An academic center shall be administered by a director who shall be appointed by and report to the dean, relevant vice president(s) or deans of the pertinent college(s).

(5) Oversight.

Each university and college center shall have an oversight committee, at least two-thirds of whose members are regular faculty from the academic units involved in the center. The director shall consult regularly with the oversight committee.

The director of each academic center shall develop in conjunction with the oversight committee a pattern of administration for the center.

(6) Review process.

All university centers will be reviewed two years after initial establishment and at four-year intervals thereafter. The centers subcommittee of CAA will conduct the review following the “guidelines for the establishment and review of centers” and bring a recommendation for action to CAA. The range of actions include: continuation, conditional continuation with a follow-up in less than four years, and termination.

All college centers will be monitored through annual reports to the college dean(s). Should significant change to a center occur, or a decision be made to abolish a center, notification of that decision will be made to the office of academic affairs and through it to CAA.

(7) Previously established centers.

All existing academic centers established outside of this rule shall be reviewed under the requirements of this rule. Those not in compliance with the rule shall be allowed one additional year to make appropriate adjustments to allow for their continuation.

Note: the request of any established center seeking to move from one type to another must be reviewed and approved by CAA.

(C) Conditional use of the term “center.”

Start-up centers are permitted. Following submission of a formal request by a vice president or dean and expedited review and approval by CAA, the term “center” may be used related to external or central funding possibilities. That action will be communicated directly to the board of trustees. Should funding not be secured within one year, the unit must request from CAA an extension of the use of the term. Once funding is secured, the appropriate process for establishment of a university or college center must be initiated within one year. (B/T 9/8/61, B/T/ 6/4/93, B/T 8/1/97, B/T 12/4/98, B/T 6/7/2005, B/T 6/6/2008)