

COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1039 Derby Hall

July 22, 2010

12:00 PM – 2:00 PM

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Faculty:

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

Students:

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

Administrators:

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

Guests:

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

The Council came to order at 12:10 PM

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR—PROFESSOR JAY S. HOBGOOD

- Hobgood expressed thanks to Council members for their willingness to participate in these Summer meetings.
- Cogdell, Hobgood, and Smith are working with the University Senate leadership to identify faculty and students to join the Council over the next year to help with the semester conversion process.

COMMENTS FROM THE VICE CHAIR — PROFESSOR W. RANDY SMITH

- Smith has just returned from a trip to Washington DC where he participated in a meeting organized by the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU). The topic was urban serving universities. The University is a formal member of this group that is focusing on urban education, urban economic development, and urban health.

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

This proposal was presented at the Council meeting on July 7, 2010. Hobgood contacted Professor Miller (Director, Division of Plastic Surgery) with the following questions: how will the new department be organized; will there be any changes to the tenure and promotion procedures for the faculty; what are the budgetary implications for the new department and the existing Department of Surgery; and will there be any impacts on students? All questions were answered and details regarding the proposed organizational chart, procedures for appointments, promotion and tenure, and the pattern of administration (POA) were provided to Council.

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

- A few editorial changes will need to be made before this proposal will go forward to Faculty Council and University Senate.
 - the sentence in answer to question 2: “*We will comply with established rules followed in the College of Medicine.*” Should include: “*We will comply with established rules followed in the University and in the College of Medicine.*”
 - the POA needs to be reviewed for typographical errors.
 - the Grievance Procedures included in chapter XVII should be reviewed and updated.
 - the first paragraph in the “Department Mission” “*The mission of the Department of Plastic Surgery at the Ohio State University is to restore wholeness to people suffering from physical deformities through integrated programs in patient care, education and research in the field of plastic surgery.*” should include the word “aesthetic”.

There were no other concerns with this proposal.

Hobgood moved approval; it was seconded by Mendelsohn; and the motion carried with eleven in favor and one abstention.

Smith noted that this proposal will need approval by both the University Senate and the Board of Trustees.

UNIVERSITY CENTER REVIEWS: CONTINUED DISCUSSION

- **Review of the Campus Microscopy and Imaging Facility (CMIF)**

This review was presented at the Council meeting on July 7, 2010. During that discussion, the following issues were raised and clarifications provided.

- The CMIF meets its mission and should be supported in the future. The director, Dr. Richard Burry spent tremendous time, effort and dedicated his service to this facility. Efforts should be taken to increase the administrative support staff responsible for record keeping and billing. The CMIF must have a functional faculty governance oversight body that meets on a regular basis because functional oversight body is a requirement of Centers at the University. A single reporting structure inside CMIF needs to be defined. A clarification of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between CMIF and Comprehensive Cancer Center is required.
- Within one year, the Council will review how the recommendations will be implemented. The MOU should be the first priority that needed rapid implementation.

There were no other concerns with this review.

Hobgood proposed the endorsement of this report; it was seconded by Wolf and carried with all in favor.

- **Review of the Center for Cognitive Research (CCR)**

This review was presented at the Council meeting on July 7, 2010. During that discussion, the following issues were raised and clarifications provided.

- 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 financially self sufficient. The cooperation with other departments inside and outside of Arts and Sciences (Department of Computer Sciences, and the College of Engineering) is crucial to this Center's future.

- There was only one Council member involved in this review. Due to the lack of representation and the multitude of questions raised by Council members, Professors Carol Whitacre, Vice President for Research, Office of Research, Joseph Steinmentz, Executive Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, and Richard Herrmann, Chair, Center Review Committee will be invited to next meeting for further discussion. Council members are especially interested in the budgetary future of this Center.

There were no other concerns with this review at this time.

The Council members agreed that the process of reviewing centers should be revisited. Specific details at every step in this process could eliminate some of the issues that members encountered during these two reviews.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING: SEMESTER CONVERSION PROPOSAL (curriculum issues affecting all engineering programs) **Guest: Professor David Tomasko, Associate Dean, College of Engineering**

Tomasko presented the proposal - those curriculum issues that have an impact on all engineering programs. This proposal should accompany all semester conversion proposals originating in the College of Engineering. The proposal was reviewed by: the college's Quarter to Semester Task Force, college's Core Curriculum, UG Services Committee, and College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs. All of the programs in the college were encouraged to view the conversion to semesters as an opportunity to completely reassess their curriculum rather than just make a straight conversion. As a result many programs have changed their curriculum based on their ongoing outcomes assessment programs as well as accreditation expectations and criteria. This proposal assesses the curriculum common to all engineering programs to include the engineering core and general education requirements.

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

- The core required courses under semester based system will be: Fundamentals of Engineering (I and II, 4 credit hours), Engineering Calculus (I and II, 10 credit hours), Physics (I, 5 credit hours), Engineering 1100 (1 credit hours). Overall the total credit hours will be slightly less. Calculus I will remain the same. Calculus II will be slightly different for engineer programs, with a more advanced mathematics component. Two quarters of Physics were combined into one semester. Chemistry will be absent from this model.
- Regarding general education courses, the College of Engineering is committed to maintain them under the semester system. Few updates they would like to make are related to:
 - Writing Level 2 will contain technical writing and technical communication;
 - Biological Science will be able to be substituted for Chemistry, Biology, and Physics;
 - Ethics courses will be required;
 - Every engineering program will require some courses with content in Statistics and Data Analysis; and

- A foreign language course could be substituted for: a) one GEC requirement in the Literature or Arts category; or b) completion of a foreign language minor may be substituted for two GEC requirements, one in Social Science and one in Culture and Ideas or Historic Studies category.
 - Note 7 from chapter 5.2 Curriculum, should be changed from: *“One 0-count” course in “Social Diversity in US” in any general education category may be required.”* to *“One 0-count course in “Social Diversity in US” in any general education category **will** be required.”*
- Engineering Survey 1100 helps students decide where they would like to fit. It also helps students decide which major they would like to pursue. The Departments of Mathematics, Physics, and Chemistry, could make their changes to the previous general education studies and will submit their proposals this Autumn. A few required core course will be substituted by more specialized mathematics courses specific to their programs.
 - The number of students who are switching out of engineering programs is far less than in other colleges, in part because on the Engineering Survey course 1100. The College of Engineering compared its general education with other benchmark institutions. The introductory classes here have more in class work and require students to be directly and deeply engaged in engineering science through in-class activities.
 - The graduate teacher assistants (GTA) will not be highly impacted by the conversion. GTAs are much more involved in laboratory activities as assistants and not as much as lecturers, in teaching.
 - Before and during the transition process, advising will be provided by faculty members to those students enrolled in engineering programs. Time to graduation was also taken into consideration, especially for those students already enrolled during the transition from quarters to semester. The transition could be different for every department. Co-op courses could appear during the first stages of the transition and implementations of online courses are being considered. Transition plans might need to be adjusted, and the College of Engineering is already considering different ways to speed up the process; especially the processes regarding student advising.
 - Tomasko acknowledged that the College of Engineering will need additional help during the transition from quarters to semesters. Especially, he requested on-line advertising and public relations help, considering the competitiveness of benchmark and local institutions.

There were no other concerns with this proposal at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Randy Smith

Liana Crisan-Vandeborne