

**COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**200 Bricker Hall**

**SEPTEMBER 5, 2012**

**3:00 - 5:00 PM**

**MINUTES**

**Attendance**

**Faculty:**

- ✓ Dr. Heather Allen Heather (Chemistry)
- ✓ Dr. Mollie Blackburn (School of Teaching and Learning)
- Dr. Ken Goings (African American and African Studies)
- ✓ Dr. Ashok Krishnamurthy (Engineering)
- ✓ Dr. Eric MacGilvary (Political Science)
- ✓ Dr. Jim Rathman (Engineering)
- ✓ Dr. Fernando Unzueta (Spanish and Portuguese)
- ✓ Dr. Kay N. Wolf (Health and Rehabilitation Sciences)
- ✓ Dr. Henry Zerby (Animal Sciences)

**Students:**

- Antani Niraj (USG, Political Science)
- ✓ Lang Sarah (CGS, Education and Human Ecology)
- Morrison Ann (Optometry)
- ✓ Paropkari Akshay(Engineering)

**Administrator:**

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

**Guests:**

- Dr. Jackie Blount (College of Education and Human Ecology)
- Dr. Cheryl Achterberg (College of Education and Human Ecology)
- Dr. Leslie Alexander(African American and African Studies)
- Dr. Scott Herness (Graduate School)
- Dr. Alan Kalish (University Center for the Advancement of Teaching)
- Ms. Melissa Soave (Office of Academic Affairs)
- Dr. John Wanzer (Undergraduate Education)
- Dr. Susan Williams (Office of Academic Affairs)

**The meeting came to order at 3:00 PM.**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JULY 18, 2012.**

The Minutes of the Meeting of July 18, 2012 were approved by online voting during August 2012, so that Council members who had attended that meeting but were rotating off the Council before its next meeting, could vote.

### **REPORT FROM THE CO-CHAIR – KAY N. WOLF**

All Council members introduced themselves and Wolf welcomed the new members. She indicated that an orientation for new members had occurred on August 29, 2012.

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

There was a Board of Trustees' meeting August 31, 2012. No Council items were on the agenda for action. At the Academic Affairs and Student Life Committee meeting, the focus was on enrollment planning.

Autumn Semester began on August 22, 2012. There have been no major transition issues to date. The Office of Academic Affairs is grateful to all academic units and academic support offices involved in the transition, and to faculty, staff and students who have been heavily involved.

The Semester Conversion Coordinating Committee will continue to meet and advise the Office of Academic Affairs on selected semester implementation issues. The first meeting of the group is scheduled for October 2, 2012.

The monthly newsletter: Quarter to Semester Update (QSU) will continue to be distributed periodically beginning this month and will provide updates on the semester conversion process.

Smith thanked the returning Council members for their outstanding work during the past two years.

### **CAA AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE – Professors Leslie Alexander, Ashok Krishnamurthy, Sarah Lang, Tom Wells, Mary Ellen Wewers and John Wilkins**

- **Realignment of the College of Education and Human Ecology – Guests: Dr. Cheryl Achterberg, Dean, and Dr. Jackie Blount, Associate Dean, College of Education and Human Ecology**

Krishnamurthy provided an overview of the proposal. In 2006 the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology merged into the College of Education and Human Ecology (EHE). At that time the College of Education consisted of three schools: Teaching and Learning, Educational Policy and Leadership, and Physical Activity and Educational Services. The College

of Human Ecology consisted of three departments: Consumer Sciences, Human Development and Family Science, and Human Nutrition. The merger was planned to have two phases:

- The first phase was bringing the two colleges together under one common administrative structure
- The second phase was the realignment of the academic schools and departments within the merged colleges.

The current proposal addresses phase two of the merger and began in January 2011. At that time, Dean Achterberg appointed a Realignment Task Force to oversee the academic alignment of the schools and departments. Prior to the election of the Task Force, individual faculty were encouraged to get together and propose potential units for the realignment without thinking necessarily of how these units would overlap, or connect at the College level. Parameters were given on how these units should be developed. The Task Force would then determine how the overall structure of the suggested units would interconnect to form one entity as a college. The Task Force received eight proposals, that were then summarized into the two main proposals: a three unit structure or a four unit structure. The majority of the College faculty vote supported the three unit structure and naming the units “Departments” (not Schools). Ultimately the names chosen were: Educational Studies, Human Sciences, and Teaching and Learning.

The proposal was distributed to Subcommittee A which was supplemented with Professors Tom Wells (Music) and Mary Ellen Wewers (Public Health). The goal was to ensure that there had been adherence to the guidelines for the abolition/alteration of units. The Subcommittee met several times and presented a list of questions to Dean Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount for discussion. Faculty from the College were invited to participate in a meeting with the Subcommittee to express their views, and faculty had the opportunity to present their concerns by e-mail to members of the Subcommittee A. The predominant representation in that input came from faculty from the proposed Human Sciences department.

The Subcommittee found that while there are no substantial errors in process, it was clear that a group of faculty, mainly from the proposed Human Sciences department, were concerned about the outcome of reconfiguration as it related to their visibility and future academic activities. The Subcommittee sought advice from the leaders of the Council, Dr. Wolf and Dr. Smith, and included Dr. Susan Williams (Vice-Provost for Academic Policy and Faculty Resources) before finalizing its recommendation.

The Subcommittee did not believe that the process would have a significantly different outcome if the College were now asked to start over, or return to some stage within the process; rather, the proposal should move forward with stipulations tied to implementation. They will ensure that the concerns of those particular faculty from Unit C are being heard and addressed.

During the Council discussion, the following comments and concerns were raised:

- Should an academic program review with external consultants be conducted now, before the reconfiguration, to help shape the new structure, or occur in a few years and focus on progress, as recommended by the Subcommittee?

- Some of the larger units, particularly, Teaching and Learning, did not put forward any reconfiguration proposals, meaning that they wanted the status quo for their unit. To some extent, the Educational Policy and Leadership unit would also stay mostly the same. Committee members looked if the realignment of the Colleges fulfills the intent of the original merger. The proposed Department of Human Sciences is a consolidation of the former College of Human Ecology with a handful of faculty from the current School of Physical Activity and Education Services. Other than that, it seems that the pattern of administration of the former EDU and HEC have not been crossed. It is difficult to see within the proposed structure a true integration of the two colleges. As a result, the constraints on how to reconfigure the academic units were very tight for the Task Force. Given that the faculty generated proposals, and given that there was no proposals to reconfigure units that did not submit any proposals, the Task Force could not find many options to reconfigure these six units. The Dean sees and recognizes the value of each department and has and will continue to support every unit. The Subcommittee believes that the stipulations specified will be sufficient to ensure that the faculty will be heard and their needs addressed. Smith noted that the Dean had already approached the Office of Academic Affairs about starting program reviews for the 3 units beginning this academic year with Teaching and Learning. Some members of the committee believe that the same set of constraints was not held constant from proposal construction to evaluation, to selection. This was a key factor which ultimately leads to the lack of an adequate voice for faculty from certain units within the College.

- There seemed to be lack of student involvement in this proposal. This leads to believe that parts of section 3 of rule 3353-3-37 for the Alteration or Abolition of units were not fully addressed. The proposed realignment of the college will lead to units that grow and link with each other, to enhance the academic reputation of the college and to attract high caliber faculty and students. There are no changes in programs of study. All programs are being offered by one of the units in the college even if the academic unit offering the program might change. The Subcommittee believes that some graduate students will be affected as several faculty members move among the units. While this might be a concern, it does not represent a sufficient problem at this time to delay the reorganization process.

Dean Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount were invited to provide clarification to some of the questions raised by the Council. Achterberg said that the College has been engaged in a complete transformation to respond to internal and external pressures. Many of these issues revolve around education at large (i.e. K-12 arena has been under tremendous pressure to adjust

how teachers are being trained and what the education majors should look like). The School of Teaching and Learning has been one of the units most affected by that environment. In preparation for semester conversion, all academic programs were reviewed and starting this Autumn, licensure preparation is available at the undergraduate level in addition to the graduate-level. Some of the changes in the proposal are attributed to realignment of the college, some are based on the transformation of the college within the university, and a few are driven by interests in efficiency and effectiveness. These last activities would occur regardless of the realignment of the whole college. Staff have been deeply engaged in discussions, especially for the first phase of the merger. Besides all ongoing activities, the College at large was informed about the realignment of the academic units once the decision for the merger of the two colleges was announced. Faculty members were encouraged to submit curriculum collaboration proposals for semester change process. The new human nutrition major, developed prior to the college realignment, is a result of intercollege collaborations.

The Dean said that her main priority is to make sure that the College is prepared for the educational needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The former two colleges were constructed to deliver services on an old model. Both of them have been struggling for national recognition and trying to maintain their individual identities. To better manage the students' expectations, and their career plans, and also to make sure that the College will survive for a long period of time, the merger of the two colleges was inevitable. The realignment of the academic units is an inevitable part of the merger process. Each academic unit has an entirely different portfolio, from undergraduate teaching, to graduate teaching, and funding opportunities. One of the realignment goals is for the academic units to be able to sustain themselves.

An anonymous vote of all faculty from all units (Teaching and Learning, Educational Policy and Leadership, Physical Activity and Educational Services, Consumer Sciences, Human Development and Family Science, and Human Nutrition) was conducted for the adoption of the three versus four unit model. It is unknown how many faculty from the proposed Human Sciences department voted for a four unit model. However, the overall responses are representative enough to state that the three unit model was preferred by the majority of the faculty who voted. There are going to be shifts of faculty among the units; some faculty left their original units already; some have left the University; and new faculty have been hired for this semester. Before voting, faculty were presented with statistical data (number of faculty, credit hours, enrolments, staffing, funding, research projects, space...) regarding each unit to be created. The Dean considers that faculty who voted, showed wisdom in their selections, based on the statistical data (Appendix C) with which they were provided.

Students were invited to faculty gatherings and to the town meetings to express their views. A student survey was not conducted. The new reconfiguration will provide students with

opportunities they did not have before, from sharing resources, to access to faculty expertise, to undergraduate and graduate collaborations.

Given all that has happened to date, it is not possible at this point to go back and revisit/redo the process. Some programs have already changed and some faculty have already shifted units.

The new Interim Chair for the proposed Human Sciences department is widely known, highly energetic, and is working to maintain stability in the unit until a new chair is appointed. A national search for the position of Department Chair of this unit has been initiated.

The Dean noted that in the adopting the three unit proposal versus the four unit one, the Realignment Task Force took into consideration a multitude of facts: size of the unit (FTE Faculty), Salary and benefits, FTE GTA's, credit hours, undergraduate and graduate majors, costs generated by the unit, grant expenditures. Efficiency, effectiveness, fiscal responsibility, collective responsibility, contributions to shared governance and the impact on constituencies external to the university were also taken into consideration in the selection process.

Krishnamurthy moved the approval of the proposal as written, with the recommendations mentioned in the report of the Ad-hoc Subcommittee:

- “1. It is essential to clearly measure and report progress towards the academic and administrative goals of the realigned college. To that end, it is suggested that a template to measure and document the progress be created by the Dean with the collaboration and the endorsement of the full faculty of the college by March 2013. The template should be presented to CAA in Spring 2013.*
- 2. Suitable metrics to measure progress on the goals of the realignment should include the following:*
  - a. Documentable synergies such as new collaborations, new programs, new external partnerships etc. that are facilitated by the realigned structure of the college.*
  - b. Student enrollment at the undergraduate and graduate levels.*
  - c. Research expenditures.*
  - d. Faculty recruitment and retention.*
  - e. Survey of faculty to measure their sentiment on progress towards the academic goals of the realignment.*
- 3. It is strongly suggested that the Dean have an increased level of involvement in the success of Unit C.*
- 4. It is urged that the Dean undertake a Program Review of the college in the next 1-2 years.*
- 5. It is required that the Dean make an annual report to the CAA and the Provost reporting on the progress towards the goals of the realignment, starting Spring 2014. The report should separate out administrative and fiscal progress from academic progress.*
- 6. CAA should evaluate realignment of the college in 5 years to ensure that the goals have been successfully met.”*

The motion was seconded by Allen. The Subcommittee concluded that the faculty rules and the procedures in place for submitting new proposals were followed correctly. At this point, there is no need for the proposal to be rejected completely and to ask the College faculty to think of a totally new reconfiguration. Council should vote on the current proposal with the specified stipulations. It will be left to the College to demonstrate in the years ahead that the new configuration is working well and is attaining the goals stated in the proposal.

Wolf amended the previous motion, with the stipulation that the second recommendation:” *Suitable metrics to measure progress on the goals of the realignment should include the following:*” be changed to “*Suitable metrics to measure progress on the goals of the realignment should be reported by departments and by whole college, and will include the following:*” Krishnamurthy seconded this motion.

MacGilvary amended the previous motion and proposed inclusion of the following wording in the proposal:

- “*Suitable metrics, to be reported by unit, to measure progress on the goals...*”
- *A new subsection F will be added to section 2 to read:”Survey of students, undergraduate and graduate, to measure their sentiment on progress towards the academic goals of the realignment.”*

Krishnamurthy seconded this motion; and carried with eight in favor, one opposed and one abstention.

## **Discussion Topics for Council in 2012-2013**

Among the topics for consideration by the Council this academic years are:

- New graduate proposals from Graduate School including professional master’s programs;
- Detailed reviews of university-level centers and institutes.
- Discussion of next steps for distance education at the University.
- A review of the undergraduate minors.

### **The Meeting Adjourned at 4:45 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

W. Randy Smith

Liana Crisan-Vandeborne