

**Report of the CAA Ad-hoc Subcommittee on the
Proposal to Realign Academic Units of the College of Education and
Human Ecology**

September 5, 2012

Members: Ashok Krishnamurthy (Chair), Leslie Alexander, John Wilkins, Sarah Lang, Mary Ellen Wewers, and Tom Wells

I. Background

The College of Education and the College of Human Ecology were merged in 2006 to form the College of Education and Human Ecology (EHE). A motivation for the merger was “to achieve synergy of mission and purpose.” The academic units in the original College of Education were the School of Teaching and Learning, the School of Educational Policy and Leadership, and the School of Physical Activities and Education Services. The original College of Human Ecology consisted of the Department of Consumer Science, the Department of Human Development and Family Science, and the Department of Human Nutrition.

The academic units within the college have remained largely unchanged since the merger. The proposal to merge the two colleges envisioned a necessary second phase in which the internal structure of the academic units of the merged colleges would require to be changed pursuant to Faculty Rules 3335-3-37 to take full advantage of the opportunities presented by the merger. The current proposal under consideration is the realignment proposal that addresses Phase 2 of the merger.

II. Summary of Proposal

At the request of the Provost, the Dean of the College of Education and Human Ecology initiated a process for realigning the academic units of the college in January 2011. The steps in the process leading up to the current proposal can be best summarized in a time line as follows:

1. *November 2010:* Provost Alutto and Dean Achterberg convene a meeting of the faculty of the college during which the need for the realignment of the college is discussed.
2. *November 2010:* Dean Achterberg defines a set of Guiding Principles and provides a time line for the realignment process.
3. *January 2011:*

- a. Associate Dean Blount is made the point person for the realignment process.
 - b. Dean Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount convene a realignment kick-off meeting of the faculty of the college. College faculty are provided with data sheets on the current units of the college.
 - c. Faculty are encouraged to work in sub-groups to develop proposals for realigned units that meet the Guiding Principles and submit such proposals to the Realignment Task Force by 2/25/11. A suitable template is provided to assist in developing proposals for realigned units.
 - d. Dean Achterberg appoints a 5 person Realignment Task Force to consider proposals submitted by groups of faculty. The Task Force members were selected by the Dean to represent the college collectively.
4. *February 2011 – March 2011:* The Realignment Task Force meets several times to consider the eight submitted proposals and settles on two possible proposals: a 4-unit model and a 3-unit model. The Task Force meets with the college administrative team and is encouraged to present the unit realignment proposals and the question of schools vs departments as the resulting units to the College Council.
5. *April 2011:* The Realignment Task Force presents its recommendations to the College Council.
6. *May 2011:*
- a. A college-wide forum is held to discuss the proposals for the 3-unit and 4-unit models developed by the Task Force.
 - b. A 4-day window is opened for faculty to vote on the two questions: (i) 3-unit vs. 4-unit structure for the realigned college; and (ii) departments or schools for the realigned units.
 - c. 72% (110/153) of the votes cast favor the 3-unit model; 27% (41/153) of the votes favor the 4-unit model and there were 2 abstentions. The votes cast represent 84% of the eligible faculty.
 - d. 54% (82/152) of the votes cast favor departments; 46% (70/152) votes were for schools. The votes cast represent 83% of the eligible faculty.
 - e. Since Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 requires a simple majority vote of the faculty of the college which contains the realigned units, the 3-unit model with each unit being named a department is chosen as the proposal to go forward. Unit A has 54 faculty members, all from the existing School of Teaching and Learning; Unit B has 53

faculty members and includes all faculty members from the existing School of Educational Policy and Leadership, 23 faculty members from the School of Physical Activities and Educational services, and one faculty member from the existing Department of Human Development and Family Science; and Unit C consists of 54 faculty members that includes 14 from the Department of Consumer Science, 11 from the Department of Human Development and Family Science, 13 from the Department of Human Nutrition, and 16 from the School of Physical Activities and Educational Services.

7. *Summer 2011*: Dean Achterberg communicates her approval of the 3-unit, department structure for the new college to Provost Alutto via a memo. Provost Alutto asks for a proposal reflecting the approved structure for review by CAA, University Senate, and the Board of Trustees as per Faculty Rule 3335-3-37.
8. *Autumn 2011*: Faculty from the proposed Unit B choose the name “Educational Studies” for their unit. Faculty from Unit A choose to retain the existing name “Teaching and Learning”.
9. *January 2012*: Faculty in Unit C choose the name “Human Sciences” for their unit.
10. *February 2012*: The proposal under review is submitted to CAA.

III. Ad-hoc Subcommittee Activities

The activities of Ad-hoc subcommittee are also best summarized using a timeline.

1. *March 2012*: Subcommittee A of CAA (Krishnamurthy, Alexander, Lang and Wilkins) received the “Proposal to re-align academic units of the College of Education and Human Ecology”.
2. *March/April 2012*: The subcommittee met twice to consider the proposal. Prof. Wells is added to the Subcommittee in late April.
3. *May 2012*:
 - a. In early May Professors Mary Ellen Wewers is added to the subcommittee to bring it to full strength.
 - b. The subcommittee formulated a set of questions about the proposal that were emailed to Dean Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount on May 8, 2012.

- c. On May 10, 2012, Krishnamurthy requested Dean Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount to inform the faculty of the college that they can (a) email the subcommittee with any comments about the EHE realignment; and (b) attend a meeting of the subcommittee on May 16, 2012 to address any comments or concerns to the subcommittee directly. All communication would be kept in complete confidence.
 - d. On May 13, Associate Dean Blount emailed the subcommittee a memo responding to the questions posed by the subcommittee, and confirming that college faculty would be informed on May 14 about the two methods of communicating with the subcommittee. The memo from Dean Achterberg is attached to this report.
 - e. On May 16, the Subcommittee met with several faculty members from the College of EHE. All the EHE faculty were from the proposed Unit C, and several expressed significant concern about the 3-unit structure, and the process that was followed in choosing the proposals to be brought forward, as well as the voting. Notes from the meeting with the faculty are attached to this report.
 - f. Several faculty members from EHE emailed the chair of the Subcommittee with comments about the EHE realignment proposal.
4. *June 1, 2012:* The subcommittee met with Dean Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount to hear their views of the realignment process and the resulting proposal. Notes from this meeting are also attached to this report.
 5. *July 11, 2012:* The subcommittee met with members of the EHE Realignment Task Force to get their view on the realignment process and resulting proposal. The notes from this meeting are also attached to the report.
 6. *August 2, 2012:* The subcommittee met with Profs. Randy Smith, Susan Williams from OAA and Prof. Kay Wolf, Chair of CAA, to discuss the status of the evaluation of the realignment proposal. A large portion of the discussion focused on stipulations that could be added to the subcommittee's recommendations to ensure that the faculty concerns heard during the proposal evaluation process are suitably addressed. The notes from this meeting are attached to this report.
 7. *August 27, 2012:* The subcommittee met to finalize this report and recommendations to CAA.

IV. Evaluation of the Ad-hoc Subcommittee

The subcommittee evaluated the proposal on two dimensions: process and outcome. The evaluation of the process was primarily concerned with ensuring that all steps as per Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 were correctly followed. The evaluation of the outcome was primarily concerned with determining if the proposed realignment of the college will lead to synergistic academic units that can grow and enhance the academic reputation of the college, and attract high caliber faculty and students.

Evaluation of process: Faculty Rules 3335-3-37 require that a number of steps be carried out in the alteration and abolition of academic units, including the reconfiguration of units.

1. Initiation of alteration or abolition

The proposal is initiated by the Dean of the College of Education and Human Ecology under Faculty Rules 3335-3-37.

2. Proposal for alteration or abolition

(a) *A rationale for alteration or abolition of the unit which includes a history of the formation, activities and evaluation of the performance of the unit.*

The stated rationale in the proposal is that the realignment of the units is essential to fully achieve the intended synergies and collaborations among faculty that was anticipated by the merger of the Colleges of Education and Human Ecology. The subcommittee is of the opinion that the rationale is appropriate since the academic units within the College of Education and Human Ecology have been unchanged since the merger.

(b) *An enumeration of all faculty affected by the alteration or abolition of the unit.*

The proposal provides such an enumeration.

(c) *A person-by-person analysis of the proposed reassignment or other accommodation of the faculty identified in paragraph (B)(2)(b) of this rule, including a statement of the impact on promotion and tenure. No tenured faculty member shall be involuntarily terminated as a result of this process. However, faculty may be transferred to another unit in accordance*

with paragraph (C)(2) of rule 3335-6-06 of the Administrative Code and with regard to the teaching, research, and service expertise of the individual.

The proposal does not require the termination of any faculty member as a result of the realignment. While there are changes in the TIU of a number of faculty members, such changes are made within the scope of appropriate Faculty Rules. A reasonable procedure for the consideration of promotion and tenure cases is provided. A suitable length of time for faculty to choose to be evaluated under the P&T criteria of their existing unit, where possible, is provided.

(d) An analysis of the academic courses now taught by the unit and provisions for their reassignment to other units, if relevant.

The proposal describes how academic programs, and presumably the academic courses within these programs, will be transferred to academic units within the realigned college.

(e) An analysis of the students affected by the proposal, including majors, non-majors, professional and graduate students.

The proposal states that students will not be impacted in any substantial way since all programs and courses will continue to be offered after realignment; the only change may be a change in the academic unit offering the program. The proposal further states that students will have the same access to faculty and staff as before realignment. The subcommittee is of the opinion that while this is substantially true for most of the college, graduate students in the current Department of Human Development and Family Science may be affected because of a loss of several faculty members, and as a result, their areas of expertise.

(f) Specific proposals regarding support for currently enrolled students until degree completion.

Since academic programs are unaffected by the realignment, specific proposals for currently enrolled students are not provided.

(g) An analysis of the budgetary consequences to all relevant units as a consequence of the proposal.

The proposal states that the fiscal health of the realigned units and the college as a whole will continue to be strong after realignment. The proposal also

states that an ongoing fiscal advisory committee will be created to review and suggest updates to fiscal policies.

(h) An analysis of the services lost to the rest of the university as a consequence of the proposal.

The proposal does not identify any loss of services to the university as a result of the realignment.

(i) An analysis of impact on constituencies external to the university, including alumni.

The proposal states that external constituencies will be minimally affected by the realignment, with the benefit that the new academic units and structure will be more “intuitive and sense making.” It does not appear that the proposed structure has been communicated to alumni or other external groups and their feedback solicited.

(j) An analysis of the impact on governance at all relevant levels as a consequence of the proposal.

The proposal describes governance changes at the university, college and department level that will occur as a result of the realignment. The subcommittee did not see any cause for concern in the proposed changes or procedures to be followed to affect the changes.

(k) An analysis of the impact upon diversity.

The proposal states that the realignment will result in a greater balance across the resulting units in terms of gender and race/ethnicity.

(l) An analysis of the impact on the academic freedom and responsibility of all affected faculty.

The proposal states that there will be no substantial change in academic freedom and responsibility of the faculty in the college; however new Patterns of Administration at the department and college level will need to be developed.

3. Discussion of proposal with affected faculty, students and staff

The proposal describes a process that was followed to discuss the submitted proposal with the affected faculty, students and staff. The subcommittee is concerned that because of miscommunication and a lack of oversight, the presented proposal lacks broad support among many of the faculty in the

proposed Unit C. This, we believe, stems from the fact the proposal for Unit C (Human Sciences) was not substantially discussed with the affected faculty before it was submitted to the Realignment Task Force. There was, however, discussion of the proposal with the college as one of the two proposals that emerged from the Realignment Task Force before the vote of the faculty of the college.

There is no evidence of discussion of the proposal with students and staff.

Evaluation of outcome: The Realignment Task Force put forward two proposals for the realigned college for faculty vote: A 3-unit model and a 4-unit model. The college-wide faculty vote resulted in the selection of the three unit model. However, many members of the faculty in the proposed Unit C (Human Sciences) believe that this model fails to meet the criteria for the realignment in terms of providing the required synergies and collaboration opportunities as compared to the 4-unit model. The notes from the various meetings held by the subcommittee are attached to this report, and provide the data on which we base the following observations:

- i. Proposals for realigned units were allowed to be faculty driven, based on guidelines provided by the Dean. However, the proposal approved by faculty vote does not meet the suggested criteria for optimal size of realigned units.
- ii. Because of the lack of a formal written charge, there appears to have been a miscommunication on the authority of the Realignment Task Force to formulate realignment structures for the college. As a result, while the Dean believed that the Realignment Task Force was given the authority to create substantially new proposals outside the scope of those submitted by the faculty-driven process, the Realignment Task Force was under the impression that the final product could not deviate significantly from submitted proposals.
- iii. Large units under the existing college structure (Teaching and Learning, size 54) chose not to submit any proposals to realign themselves despite the fact the unit as a whole was substantially larger than the optimal unit size (30 ± 5) outlined by the Dean. This significantly constrained the possible choices available to the Realignment Task Force, given their understanding of their task (see ii. above).

In spite of the reservations expressed above, the subcommittee is of the opinion that restarting the realignment process will not lead to an outcome that is significantly better. Instead we believe that the proposed structure should be

allowed to go forward with stipulations that will enable CAA and the Provost to monitor the progress in the college towards the desirable goals of the realignment.

V. Ad-hoc Subcommittee Recommendations

After reviewing all the documents provided to the subcommittee and after taking into consideration the discussions with faculty of the college, Dean Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount, the members of the EHE Realignment Task Force, and Associate Provosts Smith and Williams, and CAA Chair Wolf, the subcommittee recommends that the proposal to realign the academic units of the College of Education and Human Ecology be accepted with the following stipulations:

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.



Office of Academic Affairs
172 Arps Hall, 1945 N. High Street
614 688-4571

Date: May 13, 2012

To: Ashok Krishnamurthy, Chair, Subcommittee A of CAA

From: Cheryl Achterberg, Dean
Jackie Blount, Associate Dean and EHE Re-alignment Point Person

RE: Responses to your questions regarding EHE Re-alignment proposal

This past week, we received your list of questions posed by *CAA Subcommittee A* regarding the EHE Re-alignment Proposal. In what follows, we will address each question.

1. Please provide a list of the membership of the Re-alignment Task Force, including current affiliation. We suggest that this information be also included in the proposal so that it is entered in the records.

The members of the EHE Re-alignment Task Force (2011) were:

- Jerry D'Agostino, Chair (so chosen because D'Agostino was President of the EHE College Council at the time), School of Educational Policy and Leadership
- Antoinette Miranda, School of Physical Activity and Educational Services
- Ann O'Connell, School of Educational Policy and Leadership
- Steve Petrill, Department of Human Development and Family Sciences
- Kathy Trundle, School of Teaching and Learning
- Jackie Blount, ex officio, Associate Dean and Re-alignment Point Person

2. Please provide a unit-by-unit (by existing units) distribution of the votes for the 3-unit re-aligned college.

The college-wide vote on whether to choose a 4- or a 3-unit model was taken and presented as a vote of the whole. University Rule 3335-3-37 on the Alteration or Abolition of Units simply states that, "Following a thorough consultative process with affected faculty, students, staff, and others as appropriate, the college faculty shall vote on the proposal. The proposal, along with the numerical vote of the college faculty, shall then be forwarded to the council on academic affairs." To this end, the numerical votes of the college faculty regarding whether to adopt the 4- vs. 3-unit model, whether to call our units "departments" or "schools," and on the acceptability of the current full EHE Re-alignment Proposal in meeting the terms of University Rule 3335-3-37 all have been included as a part of the Re-alignment Proposal package.

Essentially, then, there is no requirement in University Rule 3335-3-37 that the faculty vote should be broken down by academic unit. Furthermore, we intended this to be an anonymous vote, in part to protect faculty in smaller units. More importantly, though, this re-alignment of our academic units has been conceived throughout as a process of finding new ways to bring our faculty together, ways not necessarily defined or bound by our current academic unit lines. The Dean's charge to the Re-alignment Task Force was to present viable options for structuring academic units in the college. Because the Task Force was open to considering a wide variety of possible configurations that cut across all existing units, and because the models that the Task Force presented for a vote included all existing units, it was necessary for a vote to be taken among faculty across the entire college.

3. Please provide a unit-by-unit distribution of the votes favoring departments over schools.

Please see the response to item #2 above.

4. What is happening with staff? How did staff provide input into the process?

For the phase of the re-alignment in which we were to choose a 3- vs. a 4-unit model and departments vs. schools, this decision needed to be decided by regular, tenure-line faculty because it concerned the structure of tenure initiating units (TIUs). However, staff were free to provide input throughout the process. Some participated on College Council when these imminent decisions were discussed. Many staff also attended the EHE Town Hall meeting about these decisions, providing ample feedback.

For the phase in which we were to decide if the formal Re-alignment Proposal adequately addressed the requirements of University Rule 3335-3-37, about half of the initial proposal reviewers were staff. Then during each of four subsequent iterations of the proposal draft, staff were invited to contribute input just as much as faculty – and many took the opportunity.

In the current proposal under your review, most staff in the college will be unaffected by the re-alignment in the sense that their positions will remain the same. However, others will be affected. The proposal calls for the School of PAES to be split with one part going to Unit B and the other to Unit C. Most of the staff in PAES are assigned to sections that will move to one unit or the other. Consequently, their academic unit will change, but responsibilities largely will remain the same. Some administrative staff will see their responsibilities, direct reports, and units change, though. We are currently working through a process to determine the most equitable, fair, and effective way of accomplishing this.

5. For re-aligned Unit B, i.e., “Educational Studies” – has thought been given as to how the loss of the word leadership in the unit title may affect visibility both within and outside the university? How might this affect student recruitment (or do you believe it will)?

During a meeting this past October 4th, 2011 of all faculty in proposed Unit B, this faculty engaged in quite a bit of discussion about what the new name of the unit should be. A number of individuals raised concern about loss of identity, no matter what the new name of the unit might be. In the end, though, prevailing arguments centered on two ideas:

- 1) Unit B would continue to be structured into sections, each named in such a manner as to retain the scholarly identity of that group of faculty. Because this

has been the case in the past for virtually all of the sections that will constitute Unit B, the notion of a “loss of identity” seems relatively unlikely. A number of faculty expressed the view that students and others already were well able to “find” these program areas, that recruitment was unhampered, and that national rankings (U.S. News & World Report) seem able to single out performance of sections as they currently exist, rather than confusing them with the name of the larger school or losing section identity altogether.

- 2) Many faculty felt that it was more important to have a short departmental name than a longer one that was more comprehensive.

6. Was the choice of the name “Educational Studies” put to a faculty vote?

The name “Educational Studies” was put to a vote of all the faculty in the proposed Unit B during the October 4, 2011 meeting. This name won the vote.

7. Was concurrence for the new unit titles sought from other Colleges as appropriate (e.g., the College of Medicine for “Human Sciences”)?

The re-alignment proposal as submitted, describes the structure of so-called Units A, B, and C. We are currently pursuing concurrence with colleges around campus about names for these three departments. So far, we have consulted with Public Health, Arts & Sciences, and FAES. We have not yet completed this process.

8. In terms of graduate students – will the “grad handbooks” remain per program? (e.g., HDFS and Consumer Science separate) and not per unit? Or will it eventually be moving to per unit? What thought has been given to providing consistency across the newly formed units?

During the 2012-13 academic year, existing graduate student handbooks will apply for all of our graduate students. Each new academic unit will have one year from the point that the re-alignment plan is implemented to make any changes they desire for their graduate student handbooks. Whether or not any changes are made – and certainly whether such changes might be at the programmatic level or departmental level – are decisions that are best made by faculty within each department.

9. Do you foresee any impact on GA assignments and how these will be determined? As of now, at least in unit C, four separate individuals (chairs/directors) were helping to make those decisions.

In terms of numbers of GA assignments, each such position will follow its respective academic program. As for choosing who serves as a GA, this is a matter best handled by each academic unit in accordance with the governance structure/processes determined by each. As a final note, GA assignments for 2012-13 have now been made and will be honored.

10. The distribution of research, service, and teaching units being brought together under the proposal appear to be different. How will the disparity in these elements within departments (e.g., encouragement and expectation to “buy out” teaching to focus more on funded research) – be addressed in the new units? These decisions and policies also have implications for students.

A very important part of the work of the Re-alignment Task Force was to propose new models of academic units that would allow faculty to better balance their responsibilities. The two models put forward by the Task Force, for example, each would allow faculty to provide service, but without the burden of having to provide a disproportionate amount of such service that so typically falls to faculty in small units. Also, each proposed model allows for a balance of faculty work where some who emphasize teaching responsibilities can be off-set by those who emphasize research – and vice versa.

Research-active faculty have bought out of some of their teaching responsibilities in the past when they have been awarded external funds. We expect that faculty will continue to be able to do this within the limits outlined in our College faculty workload policy and our College course buy-out policy.

11. If one of the goals was to improve graduate advising – how is this being met in the proposal?

The primary goals of re-alignment never addressed graduate advising. Having said that, though, advising of graduate students should be unaffected on account of re-alignment. Basically, students will continue to work with the same faculty as they would have prior to re-alignment. Students will be able to complete their studies with the expectation that the policies and procedures with which they must comply will be those in effect at the time of their admission and for the unit of their admission.

12. Are the per faculty research funding numbers in the Appendix on an annual basis?

The per faculty research funding numbers found on pp. 3-14 are on an annual basis.

13. Why are 5+ years not sufficient to see some of the improving ranks and other benefits of the college merger?

Actually, our graduate programs in education have gone up in their U.S. News & World Report rankings within this time frame. However, that may or may not be on account of the 2006 merger. The 2006 merger mainly changed college administrative functions, but largely left our academic units unaffected. Essentially, in the early years of the merger, no attempts were made to increase collaboration across academic unit lines. In addition, since then, both the university and college have engaged in culture change activities to increase collaboration. Finally, it is important to note that most national rankings of academic programs suffer to some degree by lag-time. Reputations can move slowly even when actual, measurable quality can change much more quickly. Many national rankings rely heavily on reputational scores and so are slow to move.

Notes from meeting with faculty from EHE

May 16, 2012

Attending: Ashok Krishnamurthy, John Wilkins, Sarah Lang, Mary Ellen Wewers, Tom Wells (CAA) and several faculty members from EHE (names not listed to preserve anonymity)

1. A number of faculty members from EHE (primarily in the current HDFFS department) had composed a letter to the subcommittee, which was read to us by one of the faculty members.
2. Several faculty members expressed concerns with the realignment process.
3. Most of the concerns were related to the proposed Human Sciences unit.
4. A summary of the concerns expressed is below:
 - a. The process was not faculty driven.
 - b. HDFFS did not have an opportunity to provide input on unit C.
 - c. The 3-unit proposal was a last minute/11th hour proposal.
 - d. The process was not transparent.
 - e. The vote distribution by unit was not reported.
 - f. The 3-unit proposal was not vetted.
 - g. The final proposal selected does not adhere to stated principles.
 - h. Human Science is simply the old College of Human Ecology.
 - i. The conceptual cohesion of Unit C is weak.
 - j. It is difficult to cross the disciplinary boundaries in Unit C.
 - k. There is concern about what will happen to the graduate program in HDFFS.
 - l. Four of the top faculty in HDFFS are leaving (the implication was that it is because of the realignment.)
 - m. Unit C will have such a diversity of disciplines that administrative overhead will be needed to function effectively.
 - n. The Chair named for Human Science is actually an animal scientist and not in Human Nutrition.
 - o. Consumer Science echoes the concerns of HDFFS.
 - p. Human Nutrition was not represented at the meeting.
 - q. PAES was not represented.
 - r. Most present preferred a 4-unit proposal; Consumer Science would be split in such a proposal. Also Hospitality Management and Textiles and Clothing would not be in unit D while EP&L would be (in the 4-unit proposal.)

- s. The final proposal that was submitted was an after the fact submission.
- t. Faculty could not abstain from voting for one of the choices.
- u. On line voting did not allow abstaining.
- v. Process laid out by the Dean was not followed.
- w. The current proposal does not result in any advantages in the merger of HE with E.
- x. Interim Chair (and presumed permanent Chair) Kinder was also the one who submitted the 3-unit proposal that was finally selected.
- y. Task force had to choose from the submitted proposals.
- z. T&L has 60 votes, but they did not submit a proposal.

Notes from meeting with Dean Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount

June 1, 2012

Attending: Ashok Krishnamurthy, John Wilkins, Sarah Lang, Mary Ellen Wewers, Tom Wells (CAA), Cheryl Achterberg and Jackie Blount

1. Achterberg and Blount explained the background behind the realignment of the college. Achterberg mentioned that it was made clear by the Provost that this was an expectation at the time she joined the college as Dean in July 2008. She negotiated additional time, until 2010 to complete the realignment, as she felt that more time was needed to make the changes “stick.”
2. Achterberg explained the process that she put in place for developing the realignment proposal:
 - a. A list of principles was created to guide the realignment.
 - b. She refused to specify a model, and did not direct participation in the process or to micromanage the process.
3. Blount explained that the process started with a meeting of the college faculty.
4. Since many of the faculty in the college did not know about the different units in the college, a set of data sheets were created to explain the units.
5. Several of the units were “lopsided”:
 - a. Only graduate students
 - b. Only undergraduate students
 - c. No extramural funding
6. As a result, one of the key principles was balance across all university missions for each unit in the realigned college.
7. Another key principle was fiscal sustainability. Rebased of a budget based on historic data was a step in addressing fiscal sustainability.
8. Achterberg explained the creation of the Realignment Task Force:
 - a. Have an odd number of members.
 - b. Not represent original units.
 - c. Elected leaders of college council.
 - d. Balance between different aspects: funding, undergraduate teaching, and ranks.
9. Task force solicited proposals, based on a template that was provided.
10. Proposals were put forth by ad hoc teams of faculty members, and there was a robust debate about the different proposals.

11. PAES, Consumer Science and HDFS faculty subsets produced proposals; T&L did not have any proposals.
12. The Task Force settled on a 3-unit and 4-unit models for the realigned college, which was put forward to the college for a vote.
13. The 3-unit model was similar to the one proposed by Dr. Kinder.
14. The Task Force had the authority to create their own proposals based on the input that they received in the different proposals put forward.
15. In answer to questions about when the proposals were submitted and when they were made available to faculty, Achterberg said that all proposals were made available to the unit leaders. However, she believes that not all unit leaders circulated it to the faculty in their units in a timely manner.
16. Human Science is a trend in the last 5 years in peer institutions. APLU has a board of human science that has significant overlap with Unit C.
17. Two of the task force members were QREM faculty.
18. As for synergy in Unit C, Kinesiology and Human Nutrition have already put forward a undergraduate degree program.
19. For the last 5-6 months, HDFS is not participating in the college activities:
 - a. Failed to put forward request fir faculty lines.
 - b. Developed their own, independent strategic vision.
 - c. Human Ecology appears to feel under siege across the country.

Notes from meeting with the College of EHE Realignment Task Force

July 11, 2012

Attending: Ashok Krishnamurthy, Leslie Alexander, John Wilkins, Sarah Lang, Mary Ellen Wewers, Tom Wells (CAA), Jerry D'Agostino, Stephen Petrill, Ann O'Connell and Jackie Blount

1. The voting process was handled by the College Council (D'Agostino is Chair of the Council.) The technology person for the college set up the electronic voting process.
2. The voting process did not allow "Abstention" as a choice; D'Agostino was asked about abstentions, and allowed abstentions to be recorded through direct contact. Three individuals did so. However, choosing Abstention this way meant that the choice was not anonymous.
3. The voting process allowed the possibility that you could choose not to vote on both issues on the ballot – The 2 vs. 3-unit proposal and The Schools vs Departments proposal.
4. Achterberg contacted D'Agostino and asked him to be the chair of the Task Force. All members of the Task Force were chosen by the Dean.
5. Blount, not the Task Force as a whole, mainly created the template for proposals.
6. The Task Force understood their function to be the following: (a) collect the proposals; (b) evaluate them on the 4 criteria laid out in the Star System on the template; and (c) come up with 1-3 college wide alternatives. *The Task Force further believed that they were to stay within the scope of the submitted proposals, and not come up with completely new ones.*
7. The existing Teaching and Learning unit did not submit any proposals, nor were they a part of any of the submitted proposals.
8. One proposal was a realignment within an existing unit and was ruled out.
9. The Task Force looked at faculty input and agreement from faculty in the affected units as criteria in coming up with the final proposals. Typically, faculty agreement was indicated on the proposals.
10. A few of the proposals reported on votes taken by affected faculty.
11. As faculty in the college, the Task Force members were well aware of the discussions going on in the college.
12. The Task Force felt that their job was to come up select proposals that had fiscal viability and were viable.

13. The selected proposals were discussed at the open College Council meeting.
14. The Task Force was unanimous in the final proposals that were selected for faculty vote.
15. It would have been difficult to have other viable realignment models (other than the two selected) that did not involve changes to T&L.
16. The Task Force did not want to come up with any grouping that too far from the submitted proposals.
17. The Task Force discussed the perception that Unit C in the proposed 3-unit model could be considered the old College of Human Ecology. However, Unit C includes the Physical Activity section from PAES.
18. The Task Force realized that there was more faculty support for the 4-unit rather than the 3-unit model among the affected faculty.
19. Unit B in the 3-unit model is a combination of proposals from Educational Policy and Leadership and Educational Services from PAES. Unit B came together very well and was a compelling case to be as one.
20. Given the strong sense of Unit B being a good choice, the constraints meant that any 3-unit proposal would configure Unit C as in the proposal.
21. Some of the issues that are coming up are related to a small department vs large department culture. Perhaps Unit C needs to be convinced about the advantages of a large unit.

Notes from meeting with Randy Smith, Kay Wolf and Susan Williams

August 2, 2012

Attending: Ashok Krishnamurthy, Leslie Alexander, John Wilkins, Sarah Lang, Mary Ellen Wewers, Randy Smith, Kay Wolf and Susan Williams

1. The primary purpose of the meeting was for the CAA ad hoc committee to discuss possible ways of proceeding with the EHE realignment proposal.
2. Each of the members of the ad hoc committee considering the realignment talked about their view of the realignment proposal.
3. Randy Smith discussed previous major academic realignments considered by CAA including the creation of the John Glenn School.
4. Stipulations that can be placed on the approval of the realignment by CAA were discussed.
5. Since the major concerns with the realignment are arising from the faculty in the proposed Unit C, discussions primarily focused on this unit.
6. Discussions led to the following:
 - a. It is important to clearly measure and report progress towards the academic and administrative goals of the realigned college.
 - b. It is suggested that a template to measure and document the progress be created by the Dean in collaboration with the faculty of the college and CAA. It is further suggested that the template metrics be determined before March 2013.
 - c. Suitable metrics to measure progress on the goals of the realignment should include the following:
 - i. Documentable synergies such as new collaborations, new programs, new external partnerships etc that are facilitated by the realigned structure of the college.
 - ii. Student enrollment at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
 - iii. Research expenditures.
 - iv. Faculty recruitment and retention.
 - v. Survey of faculty to measure their sentiment on progress towards the academic goals of the realignment.
 - d. Suggest that the Dean have an increased level of involvement in the success of Unit C.
 - e. Suggest that the Dean undertake a Program Review of the college in the next 1-2 years.

- f. Require 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.
- g. CAA should evaluate realignment of the college in 5 years to ensure that the goals have been successfully met.



Office of Academic Affairs
172 Arps Hall, 1945 N. High Street
614 688-4571

Date: February 27, 2011
To: Cheryl Achterberg, Dean
From: Jackie Blount, Associate Dean and Point Person for College Re-alignment
RE: Report on EHE Re-Alignment Proposal Process and Voting Outcome

On February 22nd, I learned that EHE faculty have approved the college re-alignment proposal in a convincing fashion. In this memo, I will outline key milestones in the development of the EHE re-alignment model. Also, I will describe steps taken to create the full re-alignment proposal that addresses University Rule 3335-3-37. This will be followed by a brief discussion of the voting process and results. Finally, I will describe the next steps in the re-alignment process.

Milestones

October 22, '10	Dean Achterberg announces the need for college re-alignment.
November 3, '10	Provost Alutto and Achterberg convene a meeting in the Ohio Union for EHE faculty, explaining that the college must “complete the merger” – with a plan for college re-alignment submitted by June, 2011.
November 15, '10	Blount is appointed as Point Person for College Re-Alignment.
January 5, '11	College-wide faculty kick-off event for developing possible re-alignment models.
January 12 – February 25, '11	Faculty submit re-alignment proposals to Jerry D’Agostino, Chair of EHE Re-alignment Task Force and also President of College Council.
February & March, '11	Re-alignment Task Force reviews submitted proposals.
March 30, '11	Re-alignment Task Force presents its recommendations to EHE Deans, Chairs, and Directors for review and discussion.
April 1, '11	The Re-alignment Task Force presents its recommendations to the College Council.
May 6, '11	College Council/Open College Forum on Re-Alignment. (Archived

webcast can be found here: <http://go.osu.edu/C9c>

- May 6 – May 10, '11 EHE faculty vote online regarding 3- vs 4-unit model and departments vs. schools.
- May 11, '11 Re-alignment Task Force Chair/President of College Council, Jerry D'Agostino, announces outcome of the vote in favor of a 3-department model.
- June, '11 Dean Achterberg submits her final recommendation on college re-alignment to Provost Alutto.
- August, '11 Provost Alutto indicates that EHE may proceed in developing full proposal for college re-alignment, which addresses University Rule 3335-3-37 regarding the alteration or abolition of units.
- September, '11 – January 6, '12 Blount coordinates drafting of full college re-alignment proposal. Faculty in proposed Units A, B, & C choose names for their new units. Concurrence/support is sought from faculty in each of the other units. Faculty in Unit B meet to fully integrate their graduate curricula. Faculty representatives in Unit C meet to determine mission, structure, and function.
- January 9 - 17, '12 Blount submits re-alignment proposal draft to key staff, faculty, and college leaders for technical review. *Feedback is incorporated.*
- January 24-31, '12 Blount presents re-alignment proposal to all EHE faculty and staff for feedback. *The proposal is revised to address all responses.*
- February 3, '12 Blount and Achterberg present updated re-alignment proposal to the College Council. Suggested revisions are gathered during the meeting and through the end of the day on February 6, '12. *Proposal is revised accordingly.*
- February 7, '12 Most current version of re-alignment proposal is posted so that all in the college may review it in advance of the Town Hall meeting.
- February 10, '12 Achterberg and Blount lead a Town Hall meeting to discuss the re-alignment proposal. Barbara Kiefer, College Council President hosts the event. Students, faculty, and staff are invited. Video can be found here: <http://osu-edu.adobeconnect.com/p6z02retsmr/> *A few small changes are suggested and revisions are incorporated accordingly.*
- February 13, '12 The final version of the re-alignment proposal is posted. It addresses all feedback submitted at each step.
- February 14 – 22, '12 Electronic vote on the proposal by tenure-track faculty. Faculty also may send attributed comments that will be submitted along with the full

proposal. (None are submitted.)

- February 22, '12 College Council President Barbara Kiefer announces the results of the faculty vote.
- February 27 –
March 2, '12 Re-alignment package is submitted to OAA for next steps in the review process
- February 27 –
March 9, '12 Blount coordinates the drafting of the EHE Re-alignment Implementation Plan

Voting Process and Outcome

Once the final version of the EHE re-alignment proposal was posted, tenure-track faculty received electronic ballots with the following text:

Given that the College of Education and Human Ecology already has voted on and approved the 3-department model proposed this past year, and per the requirements to follow up with Phase II of the college merger, do you approve the *EHE Re-alignment Proposal*, addressing University Rule 3335-3-37, section (B)2? [Note: The text of University Rule 3335-3-37, section (B)2 is embedded in the proposal.]

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Abstain

PLEASE NOTE:

Faculty also are invited to submit any comments they may have about the *EHE Re-alignment Proposal*. Comments received before the end of the electronic voting period will be compiled and submitted as a separate document that will accompany the *EHE Re-alignment Proposal* and, as such, will become a public record. Faculty comments should be sent to Anita Donaldson (adonaldson@ehe.osu.edu) by way of an OSU or EHE e-mail account and should use the subject line, "Re-alignment Proposal Comments." These comments also must be accompanied by the submitter's name.

THANK YOU FOR BEING PART OF THIS IMPORTANT PROCESS!

A total of 165 tenure-track faculty were to have received these ballots on the morning of February 14, '12. However, a problem with the university's spam filtering system removed some of these ballots without faculty ever having received them. To address this problem, a staff member in our Office of Technology and Enhanced Learning (OTEL) sent individual e-mail ballots out to each tenure-track faculty member. This time, all but one ballot was received. OTEL worked to resolve the problem with the one missing ballot. Because of these issues, the deadline for electronic voting was extended from the end of the day on February 17th to the end of the day on February 22nd.

After 5 pm on February 22nd, EHE College Council President Barbara Kiefer worked with OTEL staff to review all votes received. She then notified Dean Achterberg and Blount of the voting outcome:

There were 126 total votes cast (Given that there are 165 eligible tenure-track faculty members, this represents a 76.4% participation rate).

94 yes – 74.6%

20 no – 15.9 %

12 abstain – 9.5%



On February 23rd, Anita Donaldson, who was compiling any attributed comments received from faculty regarding the re-alignment proposal, notified Blount that no such comments had been submitted.

Next Steps

Given the outcome of the faculty vote, I now am working with faculty and staff leaders in the college to frame the *EHE Re-alignment Implementation Plan*. This document will chart the administrative details that must be addressed to ensure a smooth re-alignment process. This plan will include:

- Fiscal coding
- HR coding
- Curriculum coding
- Facilities coding
- Negotiation issues to be resolved between the School of Educational Policy & Leadership and the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services (PAES) regarding how to apportion staff and resources as PAES splits between Units B and C.
- Detailed timeline
- Estimates of staff time/resources necessary for completing the above and other processes

I estimate that a draft of the *EHE Re-alignment Implementation Plan* will be ready by March 9, '12.

*PROPOSAL TO RE-ALIGN ACADEMIC UNITS OF THE COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION AND HUMAN ECOLOGY*

Proposal as per Faculty Rule 3335-3-37

Introduction

Pursuant to rule 3335-3-37 on the alteration or abolition of units, the Dean of the College of Education and Human Ecology (EHE) presents this proposal to re-align the academic units of the college.

The College of Education and Human Ecology was established in 2006 when faculty in the former Colleges of Human Ecology and of Education secured full approval to merge their colleges. Essentially, they sought the “alteration or abolition of a unit,” according to the *OSU Policies and Procedures Handbook*, the unit in this case being a college. In the years that have followed, the newly merged college has consolidated and centralized many services; established new patterns of administration, promotion & tenure processes, and by-laws for its governing bodies; and created unified organizational entities for alumni and other allied groups – all of which were intended outcomes of the merger.

The academic units of the college, however, have remained largely unchanged from the way they existed in the former colleges. Consequently, achieving the “synergy of mission and purpose,” described as one of the fundamental reasons for initiating the college merger, has yet to be fully realized.

This current proposal, then, is a necessary follow-up to the original proposal for the merger. Once again, we wish to pursue the “alteration or abolition of a unit,” but this time the unit of focus has shifted from the *college* level to the *academic unit* level. In what follows, we propose a plan for re-aligning our academic units, reducing them in number from six to three. Furthermore, we seek the designation of “department” for all of our academic units rather than continuing with a mixture of “schools” and “departments.” If approved, this proposal will, in effect, complete the merger process described in Appendix A of the original 2006 college merger proposal, Phase I being the actual combining of the two constituent colleges and Phase II an “internal inspection of the structure of programs,” or re-alignment within the new college to realize promised synergies.

In 2011, EHE faculty engaged in an intensive process to determine how our academic units might be re-aligned. After a period in which self-identified faculty groups initiated a number of exploratory meetings with other faculty groups across the college, faculty (including chairs and directors) submitted eight viable proposals for review by a Re-Alignment Task Force. The Task Force considered several key factors in weighing these proposals. After extensive analysis, the

Task Force proposed two academic unit models for college-wide deliberation. When put to a full faculty vote (May 6-10, 2011), the proposed three-unit model was favored over a four-unit model, with a vote of 110 to 41 (84% of eligible faculty voted). Faculty also approved the designation of these units as “departments” rather than “schools.”

Given the faculty vote on the re-alignment of our academic units, *this* proposal represents the next step in the process by describing how the three-department model will be implemented. In the sections that follow, each of the proposal requirements of faculty rule 3335-3-37 are addressed. Our intention is to ensure that the re-alignment of our academic units is done in a fair and transparent manner that will not harm faculty with regard to promotion and tenure. Neither will it otherwise adversely affect students, alumni, staff, diversity, governance, or our fiscal strength.

Responses to Proposal Requirements of Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 on the Alteration of Units

(a) Rationale for alteration or abolition of the unit which includes a history of the formation, activities, and evaluation of the performance of the unit.

Rationale

When the college merger originally was proposed in 2006, several different rationales were expressed. These included:

- The combined college would be notably larger than either constituent college, which would raise its visibility on campus.
- Both constituent colleges were highly ranked among colleges of their respective kinds, so presumably their reputations would be mutually enhancing.
- Because of the “compatible and complementary missions” of both colleges, new synergies among faculty would enrich programs and open the way for new collaborations.

The degree to which these rationales have been fulfilled to date varies. EHE is now one of the largest colleges on campus in terms of student enrollment and credit hour revenue generated. The reputation of our academic programs remains strong in many areas when compared with those in peer institutions across the nation, but we will not know the full impact on our rankings for a few more years when we are more fully established.

Undoubtedly, though, we have not yet fully achieved the intended synergies and collaborations among faculty that we initially anticipated. In large part, this is because such synergies require a change in academic unit structure to foster and support collaboration. Such a re-examination was described in the original 2006 proposal as Phase II of the larger process. This current proposal is our attempt to address this matter head-on and, in essence, complete the merger.

We propose that the Department of Consumer Sciences, Department of Human Development and Family Science, Department of Human Nutrition, School of Educational Policy & Leadership, School of Physical Activity and Educational Services, and School of Teaching &

Learning be re-aligned into three larger units. The following table shows the program areas for each of these units.

Unit A – Teaching & Learning ¹	Unit B – Educational Studies	Unit C – Human Sciences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adolescent Literacies • Children’s and Adolescent Literature • Early Childhood and Elementary Education • English Education • Foreign and Second Language Education • Language and Literacy Education • Math Education • Middle Childhood Education • Multicultural and Urban Education • Social Studies and Global Education • Science Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Foundations, Technology, and Qualitative Inquiry (EPL) • Educational Administration (EPL) • Educational Psychology and Philosophy (EPL) • Higher Education and Student Affairs (EPL) • Quantitative Research, Evaluation, and Measurement (EPL) • Workforce Development (PAES) • Special Education (PAES) • Counselor Education (PAES) • School Psychology (PAES) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Nutrition (HN) • Consumer Sciences (CS): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fashion and Retail Studies ○ Hospitality Management ○ Consumer and Family Financial Services • Human Development and Family Science (HDFS) • Kinesiology (PAES) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Physical Education ○ Exercise Science ○ Sport Management

New synergies may be possible within these proposed units, including the following examples:

- Special Education (PAES), Counselor Education/School Psychology (PAES), and Educational Psychology and Philosophy (EPL).
- Workforce Development/Adult Education (PAES) and some faculty in Cultural Foundations, Technology, and Qualitative Inquiry (EPL) who are deeply interested in educational technology. This collaboration already has netted the semester conversion proposal for a Graduate Minor in Teaching in Virtual Environments.
- Human Nutrition (HN) and Kinesiology/Physical Activity (PAES) faculty, who already have collaborated during the semester conversion process to propose a new B.S. degree in Health Promotion, Nutrition and Exercise Science.
- Consumer and Family Financial Services (CS), Fashion and Retail Studies (CS), Hospitality Management (CS), and Sport Management (PAES).
- Human Development and Family Science (HDFS) and Consumer and Family Financial Services (CS).
- Higher Education and Student Affairs (EPL) and Workforce Development (PAES).

Beyond these realized and potential synergies, this configuration of academic units:

- Is relatively balanced in terms of faculty per unit. In the past, wide discrepancies existed in the size of EHE academic units, putting a strain on smaller units in providing faculty

¹ This list represents program areas with three or more faculty members.

representatives for college and university entities. These larger units allow for a more equitable distribution of service responsibilities and general engagement.

- Consists of three large units, each with ample undergraduate enrollments (where previously, some units had few, if any undergraduate students) and vibrant graduate enrollments (where previously, some units had very few graduate students).
- Promotes and balances the teaching, research, and service elements of the land-grant mission.

History

In July of 2006, the OSU Board of Trustees approved a faculty proposal to merge the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology to become the College of Education and Human Ecology. Faculty, staff, and administrators across the new college then commenced the process of bringing these two long-standing academic entities together. Over the years since, the changes that have been enacted as a result of the merger have focused primarily on re-structuring the college's administrative documents, units, and services. For example, fiscal and human resource services are in the process of centralizing through satellite service centers for processing functions. So too have information technology services and undergraduate student services centralized, among others. As a consequence, access to these services is more evenly distributed. Academic unit structure, however, has remained unchanged – with the same three departments (from the Human Ecology side of the college) and three schools (from the Education side of the college) as had existed before the merger. In essence, the full merger of these constituent colleges – in spirit and in action – has not been completed.

In November of 2010, Provost Alutto and Dean Achterberg convened a meeting of EHE faculty to discuss the incomplete status of the merger. Provost Alutto explained that the college must move forward with re-aligning its academic units. Furthermore, a faculty- and dean-approved plan for merger completion would need to be submitted to Provost Alutto by June, 2011.

To this end, Dean Achterberg outlined guiding principles for how this academic unit re-alignment proposal development process would unfold. She appointed a Re-Alignment Task Force consisting of faculty members from across the college. Achterberg and Associate Dean Blount, the point person for the re-alignment process, convened a re-alignment kick-off meeting on January 5, 2011, during which they encouraged individual faculty members and groups to meet with one another and explore possible new academic unit structures. Data sheets describing each of the current academic units were distributed so that faculty could more quickly come to understand the characteristics and workings of units beyond their own. Those wishing to pursue new unit structures were to complete and submit proposals by February 25th using a standard proposal template.

The Re-Alignment Task Force received eight viable proposals for new academic units. The Task Force reviewed these proposals qualitatively; they considered quantitative metrics; and they evaluated the degree to which each proposal succeeded in demonstrating five key points:

- 1) effectiveness
- 2) efficiency
- 3) impact

- 4) fiscal responsibility
- 5) collective responsibility

Furthermore, the Task Force was empowered to combine proposals or even to explore new academic unit configurations in light of proposals submitted.

After substantial deliberation, the Task Force settled on two possible academic unit models for faculty to consider: a three-unit and a four-unit model. They also decided to pose the question of whether these units should be departments or schools. The Task Force discussed these two models and the question of departments vs. schools with the college Administrative Team (deans, directors, and chairs). As a result of this discussion, the Administrative Team strongly encouraged the Task Force to move forward in presenting its recommendations to the College Council on April 1, 2011, which it did. A college-wide forum was held on May 6th during which anyone in the college could discuss these proposed configurations. A four-day electronic vote commenced immediately following this forum. In the end, 153 faculty members cast votes (84% of all EHE faculty). Of these, 110 favored the proposed three-unit model and 41 favored the four-unit model. On the question of departments vs. schools, 82 favored departments and 70 preferred schools. Given that EHE's by-laws require a simple majority, faculty essentially approved re-aligning the college to form three departments.

Dean Achterberg reviewed the outcome of the vote and then in June of 2011, sent Provost Alutto a memo reflecting her approval of the three-department structure. By the end of the summer, Provost Alutto responded by indicating that the college could proceed in formulating this re-alignment proposal per the terms of Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 for review by the college, CAA, University Senate, Provost Alutto, President Gee, and the Board of Trustees.

Over the course of the Autumn '11 quarter, the following events transpired: Some faculty altered their semester conversion program proposals to reflect their anticipated new academic unit structures; faculty from "Unit B" (all faculty in the School of Educational Policy & Leadership and the Educational Services faculty from the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services) came together and chose the proposed name of their new unit, "Educational Studies"; faculty in "Unit A" commenced a vigorous examination of the unit's structure and programs and, after considerable deliberation of alternatives, chose to retain the name, "Teaching & Learning"; faculty in the proposed "Unit C," who currently span four different academic units, began working through a facilitated process to determine the name of their new unit, "Human Sciences" (name chosen January 2012), their structure, and how decisions will be made; faculty in our current units reviewed and approved the proposed names for other re-aligned units in the college; and finally, the groundwork was completed for drafting this proposal.

(b) An enumeration of all faculty affected by the alteration or abolition of the unit.

All EHE faculty members will be able to retain their tenure-line positions in the college. Some faculty members essentially will remain in their same Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU) while others will become part of newly combined TIUs. In the vast majority of cases, faculty members who change TIUs will do so with others in their program area. However, in a few cases, individual faculty may change TIUs for reasons such as to optimize programmatic synergies or to eliminate

very small and/or unsustainable program areas. The table below describes the new as well as the current TIU for every faculty member in the college. In broad strokes:

- Unit A (Teaching & Learning) faculty will remain in their same TIU.
- Unit B (Educational Studies) will be comprised of faculty from two different TIUs, including all faculty members in the School of Educational Policy & Leadership and the Educational Services faculty in the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services.
- Unit C (Human Sciences) will be comprised of faculty from four different TIUs: Departments of Consumer Sciences, Human Development and Family Science, and Human Nutrition, and the Kinesiology faculty of the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services.

Regardless of which re-aligned unit EHE faculty members join, they will have comparable appointments to those of their prior TIU. They will work with other faculty whose research and instructional responsibilities accord with their own. In many cases, new collaborations across curricular areas will be enhanced. None of EHE’s faculty members will be left without a TIU.

Faculty Assignments by Current and Proposed Academic Unit – Fall 2012²

Name	Title	Tenure Status	Current TIU	Campus
Unit A - Teaching & Learning N = 54 Columbus: 38 Regional: 16				
Battista, Michael T C	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Becher, Rhoda Mcshane	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Marion
Bendixen-Noe, Mary Kay	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Newark
Berlin, Donna F	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Blackburn, Mollie	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Bloome, David M	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Brosnan, Patricia A	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Bucci, Terri Teal	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Mansfield
Clark, Caroline	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Cristol, Dean Stuart	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Lima
Ding, Lin	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Columbus

² This list includes chairs, directors, and deans because each of these administrators has a faculty appointment in a Tenure-Initiating Unit should/when they return to faculty.

Dornoo, Michael	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Newark
Edmiston, Brian W	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Enciso, Patricia E	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Erchick, Diana Brandy	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Newark
Farland-Smith, Donna	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Mansfield
Flevaras, Lucia Marie	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Columbus
Fresch, Mary Jo	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Marion
Hancock, Charles Raymond	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Haury, David L	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Hirvela, Alan Richard	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Irving, Karen Elizabeth	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Jin, Hui	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Columbus
Justice, Laura M	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Katz, Laurie J	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Kiefer, Barbara I	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Kinloch, Valerie F	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Lee, Hea-Jin	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Lima
Lee, Young Ah	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Columbus
Lehman, Barbara Alice	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Mansfield
Lightbody, Mary	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Newark
Manouchehri, Azita	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
McGee, Lea M	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Merryfield, Merry Marc	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Moore, Leslie C	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Columbus
Nehm, Ross H	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Newell, George Edward	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Parsons, Linda T	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Marion
Paul, Peter Vincent	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Piasta, Shayne	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Columbus

Post, Paul Erich	Assistant Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Richardson, Elaine B	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Rodgers, Adrian R	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Newark
Rodgers, Emily M	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Samimy, Keiko Komiya	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Scharer, Patricia Louise	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Soter, Anna	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Subedi, Binaya	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Newark
Trundle, Kathy C	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Tyson, Cynthia Aleace	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Warner, Christine D	Associate Professor	Tenured	T&L	Newark
White, Arthur L	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Wilkinson, Ian A G	Professor	Tenured	T&L	Columbus
Winterbottom, Christian	Assistant Professor	ONT	T&L	Mansfield

Unit B - Educational Studies

N = 53
Columbus: 51
Regional: 2

Allen, Ann Marie	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Anderman, Eric Mitchell	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Anderman, Lynley Helen	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Anthony, Anika Sangai	Assistant Professor	ONT	EPL	Columbus
Blount, Jackie Marie	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Calabrese, Raymond L	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Cilesiz, Sebnem	Assistant Professor	ONT	EPL	Columbus
D'Agostino, Jerome Victor	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Daniel, Philip Terrie	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Errante, Antoinette	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Gallant, Dorinda Joyce	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Gimbert, Belinda G	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus

Gordon, Beverly Mabel	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Hoy, Anita Woolfolk	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Hoy, Wayne Kolter	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Jones, Susan Robb	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Kimball, Bruce A	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Lather, Patricia Ann	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Lomax, Richard G	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Macbeth, Douglas Harrison	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Marks, Helen Marie	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Nespor, Jan Kent	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
O'Connell, Ann A	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Strayhorn, Terrell Lamont	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Suspitsyna, Tatiana	Assistant Professor	ONT	EPL	Columbus
Sweetland, Scott R	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Tuckman, Bruce W	Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Voithofer, Richard J	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Warnick, Bryan R	Associate Professor	Tenured	EPL	Columbus
Cartledge, Gwendolyn	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Dohner, Ruth Elaine	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Gardner III, Ralph	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Granello, Darcy Haag	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Granello, Paul F	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Growick, Bruce Steven	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Hawley, Joshua D	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Herner-Patnode, Leah Mary	Assistant Professor	ONT	PAES	Lima
Hessler, Theresa L	Assistant Professor	ONT	PAES	Newark
Joseph, Laurice Marie	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Klein, Michael Allen	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Konrad, Moira R	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus

Malone, Helen Irene	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Miranda, Antoinette Cecilia	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Moore III, James L	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Morgan, Sheila Alber	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Neef, Nancy A	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Radliff, Kisha Marie	Assistant Professor	ONT	PAES	Columbus
Saintato, Diane Marie	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Stein, David S	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Wheaton, Joe Edward	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Zirkle, Christopher J	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Glassman, Michael J	Associate Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Columbus
Lawton, Kathy	Assistant Professor	ONT	PAES	Columbus

Unit C - Human Sciences

N = 54

Columbus: 53

Regional: 1

Binkley, Margaret M	Assistant Professor	ONT	CS	Columbus
Cunningham, Patricia Anne	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Fox, Jonathan Jay	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Hanna, Sherman Davie	Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Jakes, Kathryn Angela	Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Johnson, Wayne Allan	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Kandampully, Jay A	Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Loibl, Caezilia	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Montalto, Catherine P	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Rudd, Nancy Ann	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Scharff, Robert L	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Seiling, Sharon Lee	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Stafford, Kathryn	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus
Stoel, Leslie Denise	Associate Professor	Tenured	CS	Columbus

Bonomi, Amy Elizabeth	Associate Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Columbus
Buettner, Cynthia	Assistant Professor	ONT	HDFS	Columbus
Feng, Xin	Assistant Professor	ONT	HDFS	Columbus
Gavazzi, Stephen Micheal	Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Mansfield
Goldstein, Howard	Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Columbus
Haring, Suzanne Bartle	Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Columbus
Kamp Dush, Claire	Assistant Professor	ONT	HDFS	Columbus
Schoppe-Sullivan, Sarah J	Associate Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Columbus
Slesnick, Natasha	Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Columbus
Snyder, Anastasia Rebecca	Associate Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Columbus
Wilkinson, Deanna Lynn	Associate Professor	Tenured	HDFS	Columbus
Achterberg, Cheryl L	Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Belury, Martha	Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Bird, Amanda Jane	Assistant Professor	ONT	HN	Columbus
Bomser, Joshua A	Associate Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Disilvestro, Robert Arnold	Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Everts, Helen Breitmaier	Assistant Professor	ONT	HN	Columbus
Failla, Mark L	Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Harrison, Earl Howard	Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Kinder, James Edward	Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Melgar Quinonez, Hugo	Associate Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Miller, Carla K	Associate Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Smith, Anne Marie	Associate Professor	Tenured	HN	Columbus
Ziouzenkova, Ouliana	Assistant Professor	ONT	HN	Columbus
Adelman, Melvin Leonard	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Buckworth, Janet	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Chelladurai, Packianathan	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Devor, Steven Thomas	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Fields, Sarah K	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus

Focht, Brian Carl	Assistant Professor	ONT	PAES	Columbus
Goodway, Jacqueline Dawn	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Hodge, Samuel Russell	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Li, Weidong	Assistant Professor	ONT	PAES	Columbus
Pastore, Donna Lee	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Petosa, Rick Allen	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Poretta, David Louis	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Stroot, Sandra Ann	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Sutherland, Susan Linda	Assistant Professor	ONT	PAES	Columbus
Turner, Brian Allen	Associate Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus
Ward, Phillip C	Professor	Tenured	PAES	Columbus

(c) A person-by-person analysis of the proposed reassignment or other accommodation of the faculty identified in paragraph (B)(2)(b) of this rule, including a statement of the impact on promotion and tenure. No tenured faculty member shall be involuntarily terminated as a result of this process. However, faculty may be transferred to another unit in accordance with paragraph (C)(2) of rule 3335-47-06 of the Administrative Code and with regard to the teaching, research, and service expertise of the individual.

EHE faculty members will not be harmed in terms of promotion and tenure on account of this proposed re-alignment of academic units. Provision will be made to give faculty members reasonable choices should they desire or need to undertake promotion and/or tenure review while academic units transition to their new configurations. Finally, as indicated in section (b) above, no tenure-line faculty member will be involuntarily terminated as a result of this proposed re-alignment process subject to [rule 3335-5-48.9\(B\)2](#).³

Faculty members in proposed Unit A (Teaching & Learning) will undertake a thorough review of their A, P, and T documents within one year of when re-alignment takes effect. If this review leads to significant changes in the promotion and tenure process, then faculty who will undergo promotion and/or tenure review over this transition period will have a three-year window of time during which they may choose either: Option 1 – the promotion and tenure process for T&L during the 2011-12 academic year, or Option 2 – the revised T&L promotion and tenure process. Otherwise, if there are not significant changes to the T&L promotion and tenure process as a result of the review, then T&L faculty members who undertake promotion and tenure review will default to the existing/slightly modified T&L promotion and tenure process.

³ Thanks to T.K. Daniel for providing this clarification.

Faculty members in proposed Units B (Educational Studies) and C (Human Sciences) will either create or significantly modify their A, P, and T documents within one year of when re-alignment takes effect. To address the needs of Unit B and C faculty who will undergo promotion and/or tenure review over this transition period, individual faculty will have a three-year period during which they may choose either: Option 1 - the promotion and tenure process of their 2011-12 TIU, or Option 2 – the promotion and tenure process of their new TIU. More specifically:

Option 1:

- Utilize the 2011-12 A, P, and T document from the 2011-12 TIU.
- The unit-level committee will be comprised of faculty representing the 2011-12 TIU.
- In the event that a faculty member becomes part of a new TIU on account of re-alignment, the new department chair will serve as her/his chair for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure with the understanding that the new chair will abide by the A, P, and T document of the faculty member's 2011-12 TIU.

Option 2:

- Utilize the new A, P, and T document for the new TIU.
- The unit-level committee will be comprised of faculty representing the current (new) TIU.

Timeline for Faculty Choice:

- 2012-13: All faculty members undergoing promotion and/or tenure review will do so with Option 1.
- 2013-14: All faculty members undergoing promotion and/or tenure review will choose either Option 1 or Option 2.
- 2014-15: Same as above.
- 2015-16: Same as above.
- 2016-17 onward: All faculty members up for promotion and/or tenure review will undertake their review using the A, P, and T guidelines from their new TIU.

Other Considerations:

- In the event that faculty members who seek promotion and/or tenure during the transitional period should choose Option 1, but not enough faculty exist in the unit/program to serve on the promotion and tenure review committee, [*OAA Policies and Procedures Guidelines \(2.4.1\)*](#) will be followed to appoint faculty from (a) another program area within the department, or (b) another program area within another department in the college.⁴
- Untenured faculty in their first or second year of employment will be encouraged to choose the promotion and tenure process of their new TIU when they go up for 4th year review.
- If extenuating circumstances should arise, every reasonable effort will be made to accommodate faculty during this transitional period for promotion and tenure processes.

⁴ Thanks to Kathryn Jakes for her important clarifications in this and other sections.

(d) An analysis of the academic courses now taught by the unit and provisions for their reassignment to other units, if relevant.

All of the EHE academic programs and courses for which semester conversion plans have been submitted will continue to be offered by the college regardless of academic unit re-alignment. Some academic programs and courses will move as a result of re-alignment. However, no academic programs or courses will be eliminated because of re-alignment. Students will have the same opportunities to take needed courses and pursue desired degrees as they would have had otherwise.⁵

The following is a summary of what will happen with each (proposed, semester-converted) academic program offered in the college. Included in the list are the newly created or re-instated undergraduate teacher education degree programs in Teaching & Learning.

Academic Degree or Program⁶	Current Unit	New Unit
Ph.D. Consumer Sciences	CS	Unit C
M.S. Consumer Sciences	CS	Unit C
B.S.H.E. Consumer and Family Financial Services	CS	Unit C
B.S.H.E. in Fashion and Retail Studies	CS	Unit C
B.S.H.M. in Hospitality Management	CS	Unit C
Minor in Consumer Sciences	CS	Unit C
Minor in Fashion and Retail Studies	CS	Unit C
Ph.D. Educational Policy and Leadership	EPL	Unit B
Ed.D. Educational Policy and Leadership	EPL	Unit B
M.A. Educational Policy and Leadership	EPL	Unit B
Graduate Minor in Teaching in Virtual Environments	EPL	Unit B
Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in College and University Teaching	EPL	Unit B
Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Quantitative Research Methods	EPL	Unit B
Minor in Education	EPL	Unit B
Licensure – Superintendency (non-degree)	EPL	Unit B
Licensure – Principalship (non-degree)	EPL	Unit B
Ph.D. Human Development and Family Science	HDFS	Unit C
M.S. Human Development and Family Science	HDFS	Unit C
B.S. in Human Development and Family Science	HDFS	Unit C
Minor in Human Development and Family Science	HDFS	Unit C
Ph.D. Ohio State University Nutrition (OSUN)	HN	Unit C
M.S. Human Nutrition	HN	Unit C

⁵ During the February 3rd, 2012 EHE College Council meeting, several Council members indicated that it is essential to protect our curricula from any changes strictly on account of re-alignment, but also to recognize that in the future when the new academic units have settled into place, faculty – in exercising their faculty rights and responsibilities – may choose to change their curricula for programmatic reasons.

⁶ This table of our academic program offerings is organized by our **current academic units** so that EHE faculty may more readily scan and assure that each is included. A separate table will be posted on the EHE Re-alignment web site that is sorted by our proposed new units.

B.S. Nutrition	HN	Unit C
B.S. Health Promotion, Nutrition and Exercise Sciences	HN and PAES	Unit C
Minor in Human Nutrition	HN	Unit C
Ph.D. Kinesiology	PAES	Unit C
M.S. Kinesiology	PAES	Unit C
Ed.S. School Psychology	PAES	Unit B
B.S.Ed. in Sport Industry	PAES	Unit C
B.S.Ed. in Technical Education and Training⁷	PAES	Unit B
B.S.Ed. in Special Education	PAES	Unit B
B.S.Ed. in Physical Education, Sport, and Physical Activity	PAES	Unit C
B.S. in Exercise Science Education	PAES	Unit C
Minor in Coaching Education	PAES	Unit C
Minor in Family and Consumer Sciences Education	PAES	Unit B
Interdisciplinary Minor in Youth Development⁸	PAES (multiple colleges)	Unit C (multiple colleges)
Licensure – School Nurse (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Endorsement – Pre K Special Needs (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – Business Education Teacher Education (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – Career and Technical Education (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – Family and Consumer Sciences Education (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – Special Education Early Childhood Intervention Specialist (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – Special Education Mild to Moderate Intervention Specialist (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – Special Education Moderate to Intensive Intervention Specialist (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – Counselor Education – School Counseling (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – Counselor Education – Clinical Mental Health Counseling (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Licensure – School Psychology (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Endorsement – Adapted Physical Education (non-degree)	PAES	Unit C
Endorsement – Career Based Intervention (non-degree)	PAES	Unit B
Ph.D. Teaching & Learning	T&L	Unit A
M.A. Teaching & Learning	T&L	Unit A
M.Ed. Teaching & Learning	T&L	Unit A
Ed.S. Teaching & Learning	T&L	Unit A

⁷ The B.S.Ed. in Technical Education and Training includes four program areas: Family and Consumer Sciences Education, Career and Technical Education, Business/Teacher Education, and Corporate Training and Development.

⁸ This interdisciplinary program is based in the College of FAES.

Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Applied Developmental Science in Education	T&L	Unit A
B.S.Ed. in Foreign Language Education	T&L	Unit A
B.S.Ed. in Integrated Language Arts/English Education	T&L	Unit A
B.S.Ed. in Middle Childhood Education	T&L	Unit A
B.S.Ed. in Science and Mathematics Education	T&L	Unit A
B.S.Ed. in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages	T&L	Unit A
B.S.Ed. in Early Childhood Education	T&L	Unit A
B.S.Ed. in Early and Middle Childhood Studies	T&L	Unit A
Endorsement – Early Childhood Generalist (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
Endorsement – Middle Childhood Generalist (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
Endorsement – Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
Endorsement – Reading (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
Endorsement – P-6 Mathematics Specialist (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
Endorsement – Computer/Technology (non-degree)	EPL	Unit B
Endorsement – Literacy (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
Endorsement – Science (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
American Language Program (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
Spoken English program for International Students (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A
ESL Composition Program (non-degree)	T&L	Unit A

(e) An analysis of the students affected by the proposal, including majors, non-majors, professional, and graduate students.

All students currently enrolled in EHE academic programs and courses will be able to continue their progress unimpeded by re-alignment. In a few cases, degree programs will move to different academic units as described in part (d) above and students will follow accordingly, but this should not negatively impact students in pursuit of their degrees, majors, minors, specializations, licenses, or endorsements. Students will have the same access to faculty and staff, to courses and programs, and to services and support as they would have had prior to re-alignment. Because we anticipate that our academic units will be re-aligned by the start of the Autumn 2012 semester, all students in EHE courses and programs will be accommodated by their semester conversion transition plans. There should be no further impact on students on account of re-alignment. This will be true for majors, non-majors, professional students, and graduate students alike.

(f) Specific proposals regarding support for currently enrolled students until degree completion.

Undergraduate Student Services

There should be no adverse effects on undergraduate students enrolled in the college in terms of academic advising and other student services. In anticipation both of semester conversion and re-alignment of academic units, we centralized all undergraduate student services staff in the college as of July 1, 2011, forming our new Undergraduate Student Services (UGSS) unit. Because of this important administrative shift, students will experience continuity in their academic advising and other student services. For example, students will not change advisors on account of re-alignment. The semester conversion assistance they have been receiving from our UGSS staff will be as pertinent for students in our re-aligned units as would be the case if students were to remain in our current units. Essentially, because undergraduate student services are no longer tied to academic units, the re-alignment of academic units will have no adverse effect on the delivery of these services.

Graduate Programs and Advising

Graduate students will be minimally impacted by re-alignment of our academic units. Basically, students will continue to work with the same faculty as they would have prior to re-alignment. Students will be able to complete their studies with the expectation that the policies and procedures with which they must comply will be those in effect at the time of their admission and for the unit of their admission. New academic units will have one year from the point of re-alignment to review and make any desired changes to their admissions processes and criteria as well as any operational processes. Students subsequently admitted will complete their studies under these new terms. In all cases, students will be held harmless in implementing any change on account of unit re-alignment.

Financial Support

We expect that students will have the same access to scholarships and other college-based financial support as they would have had in the absence of academic unit re-alignment. The same total scholarship funding will be distributed annually. Scholarships that are tied specifically to certain academic program areas or academic units will continue to be attached in the same manner so that donor wishes can be honored. This will be true regardless of where those programs or academic units are located in the re-aligned college.

Similarly, total funding for graduate assistantships and fellowships in the college will be unaffected by the re-alignment of academic units. We expect comparable enrollments of graduate and professional students following re-alignment. Consequently, students should expect that the competitiveness for such awards will be roughly the same as it is at present.

(g) An analysis of the budgetary consequences to all relevant units as a consequence of the proposal.

In the College of Education and Human Ecology, schools and departments receive annual operating budgets. Faculty and staff lines account for most of these budgets. When faculty and

staff positions are vacated, however, those lines return to the college. Academic unit leaders who want to hire replacements must present a case that aligns with the college strategic plan and then negotiate with the dean. Beyond faculty and staff lines, additional funds flow to academic units in part in accord with past budgetary basing. Also, annual funding is influenced by data such as enrollments and other metrics, but not determinatively linked with them.

When our academic units are re-aligned, faculty and staff lines will move to new units in the manner detailed in section (b). Academic unit budgets will be re-based then. Additionally, an ongoing college fiscal advisory committee will be created to review and suggest updated fiscal policies including, for example, when new degree programs begin admitting students (such as the set of new/re-instated undergraduate teacher education programs).

We expect that the fiscal outlook for EHE will be strong, with more than adequate resources to support the re-alignment of our academic units. Our student enrollments, already healthy, will increase over the next few years in particular as we bring our new undergraduate teacher education programs into existence. Our graduate programs, especially those that will be in Units A (Teaching & Learning) and B (Educational Studies), have substantially updated their curricula as part of the semester conversion process. Not only do we think students will find these new curricula stronger, but these programs also will reduce low-enrollment courses. EHE also brings in a substantial amount of external funding with significant annual Indirect Costs. Taken together, the fiscal health of the re-aligned college should be robust for the foreseeable future.

(h) An analysis of the services lost to the rest of the university as a consequence of the proposal.

None identified.

(i) An analysis of impact on constituencies external to the university, including alumni.

The changes proposed to shift from six academic units to the three contained in this document will streamline communications with alumni, donors, external stakeholders and other friends of the college. As all degree programs are preserved, all parties will be able to find the particular program with which they might identify themselves. However, explaining the constituent parts of the college and its organization will now be more intuitive and sense-making, a boon for student recruitment as well as in speaking to the public at large. Our web pages should also be more navigable with this new structure and organization. Our marketing, Advancement Team, and other efforts to reach our external constituencies will endeavor to explain and clarify our new structure. The Department of Teaching & Learning can readily be explained and understood to serve educators and students engaged in academic teaching and learning.⁹ Educational Studies can be explained and understood as contributing to the analysis and formation of sound policy and effective leadership/services for educational institutions in all settings and levels. The Department of Human Sciences aligns with the name most commonly used to describe contemporary family and consumer sciences programming in Cooperative Extension circles,

⁹ More specifically, the Department of Teaching and Learning can readily be explained and understood to serve primarily teacher preparation and educational research that investigates questions about the instructional dynamic at play in contexts related to schooling and the formal educational process.

[USDA](#), and [APLU](#). Our Human Sciences programs include nutrition, human development and family science, consumer science, and kinesiology.¹⁰ Altogether the changes should enhance development and other advancement team activities.

Alumni Organization

After the college merged in 2006, three different alumni organizations chose to combine into a single entity, the *EHE Alumni Society*. This group will continue to exist as it currently does regardless of the academic unit re-alignment process.

Community and State

There will be no adverse impact on our community and state constituencies on account of the re-alignment of our academic units. This is primarily because our academic programs, faculty, research agendas, outreach, and engagement will not be diminished.

(j) An analysis of the impact on governance at all relevant levels as a consequence of the proposal.

University Level

EHE faculty representation on university-level committees and other entities may shift as the college changes from having six academic units to three. These changes will be made in accordance with university-wide by-laws or other governing policies.

College Level

Patterns of Administration, Promotion & Tenure processes, as well as faculty-approved By-Laws already exist for the college, but will require revision. Adjustments that will need to be made to these documents include changing the number of existing academic units where this is mentioned or altering references to academic unit names. Also, the EHE College Council, which currently includes representation from each of the six academic units, will necessarily change to include representation from each of the three re-aligned academic units and may also include representation from each of the program areas within those three new units. In accordance with *OAA Policies and Procedures Guidelines*, the college will conduct a thorough review and revision process for its Patterns of Administration and Promotion & Tenure processes with changes taking effect within one year of the point at which academic units are re-aligned. Similarly, the EHE College Council will undertake a review and revision process for the college's By-Laws within one year of the point at which academic units are re-aligned. Faculty approval will be sought for these revised documents.

In the case of Promotion & Tenure, faculty who elect to follow their 2011-12 APT documents in the period of 3 years after completion of re-alignment should be reviewed by a college-level Promotion & Tenure committee that will be constituted in a manner similar to what has existed

¹⁰ The mission statement of the proposed Department of Human Sciences is "to advance and improve the human experience by integrating academics, research, and outreach in the areas of nutrition, human development and family science, consumer science, and kinesiology. We work to identify and promote healthy physical and social behaviors through effective intervention and prevention strategies."

in the past; i.e., two full professors from each of the schools and departments as they stand in the 2011-12 year.

Finally, because a notable number of EHE faculty are at regional campuses and because faculty from regional campuses serve in each of our proposed new academic units, the college will initiate a re-examination of the relationships of Columbus campus and regional campus faculty in college affairs. The results of this re-examination will be reflected in new Patterns of Administration and Promotion & Tenure documents both at the college and department level.

Department Level

Because academic units are the unit of “alteration” at the center of this proposal, Patterns of Administration and Promotion & Tenure documents for academic units will need to be drafted (Unit C, Human Sciences), fundamentally revised (Unit B, Educational Studies), and/or significantly reviewed (Unit A, Teaching & Learning). Patterns of Administration and Promotion & Tenure documents generated in each unit must be consistent with those for the college as well as the university. These documents will need to be reviewed and approved by faculty in each respective unit, with changes taking effect within one year of the point at which academic units are re-aligned. It is anticipated that:

- Unit A (Teaching & Learning) will remain essentially the same in terms of faculty membership. However, this department will need to undertake a deep review of its Patterns of Administration as well as its Promotion & Tenure documents nonetheless.
- Unit B (Educational Studies) will consist of all faculty members from the School of Educational Policy & Leadership and the Educational Services faculty from the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services. Faculty members from these two units already have been working together. They have chosen their new unit name, “Educational Studies.” They also have come to agreement about combining their graduate degree programs, including the creation of a mutually agreeable common core. Provided the resulting semester conversion proposals are approved, these degree programs will be ready for students at the start of the Autumn 2012 semester.
- Unit C (Human Sciences) will bring together faculty from the Departments of Consumer Sciences, Human Development and Family Science, and Human Nutrition, as well as the Physical Activity faculty from the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services. A representative “Design Team,” consisting of two faculty members from each of these four constituent academic units, has been meeting since the Autumn 2011 quarter with the intention of: determining unit structure, choosing a unit name, laying groundwork for drafting Patterns of Administration as well as a Promotion & Tenure document, and charting future directions.

(k) An analysis of the impact upon diversity.

The re-alignment proposed in this document concerns changes in the structure of academic units, or tenure-initiating units (TIUs) in the college. For this reason, the table that follows describes diversity of tenure-line faculty, specifically along the dimensions of sex and race/ethnicity. In

short, the proposed re-aligned units will have a better overall balance of faculty by sex and race/ethnicity than exists now. In the current configuration, the percentage of women varies from 50 to 81.8%, but in re-aligned units, the percentage of women varies only from 54.7 to 66.7%, a much tighter range. Similarly, in the current configuration of units, the percentage of faculty of color varies from 7.7 to 20.4%, while in the re-aligned units, the percentage of faculty of color varies only from 13% to 20.4%, again, a considerably narrower and preferred range.¹¹

**Sex and Race/Ethnicity of EHE Faculty by Current and Proposed TIUs
(Compared with OSU Data)¹²**

	Sex				Race/Ethnicity						Total n			
	Female		Male		Asian		Black		Hispanic			2 or More		White
EHE Current Configuration	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Consumer Sciences	8	61.5	5	38.5	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	92.3
Educational Policy & Leadership	15	51.7	14	48.3	0	0.0	5	17.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	82.8
Human Development and Family Science	9	81.8	2	18.2	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	90.9
Human Nutrition	8	57.1	6	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	14.3	0	0.0	11	78.6
Physical Activity and Educational Services	20	50.0	20	50.0	2	5.0	5	12.5	0	0.0	1	2.5	32	80.0
Teaching & Learning	36	66.7	18	33.3	5	9.3	5	9.3	1	1.9	0	0.0	42	77.8
Total	96		65		9		15		3		1		131	161
EHE Re-aligned Configuration	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unit A: Teaching & Learning	36	66.7	18	33.3	5	9.3	5	9.3	1	1.9	0	0.0	42	77.8
Unit B: Educational Studies	29	54.7	24	45.3	0	0.0	9	17.0	0	0.0	1	1.9	43	81.1
Unit C: Human Sciences	31	57.4	23	42.6	4	7.4	1	1.9	2	3.7	0	0.0	46	85.2
Total	96		65		9		15		3		1		131	161
OSU	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
All tenure-line faculty*	948	32.3	1988	67.7	370	12.6	114	3.9	84	2.9	na	na	2237	76.3

*OSU HR database - Oct. 2011

¹¹ These data describe tenure-track faculty because this proposal concerns the re-alignment of Tenure Initiating Units. Several faculty members have made the important observation that data describing the diversity of students also should be included here. Unfortunately, university data systems do not readily allow us to separate student demographic data for units smaller than TIUs, such as program areas. To provide accurate student demographic data for the proposed new units, it would be necessary to divide student demographic data by program area in the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services. The EHE Office of Academic Affairs commits to creating data systems going forward that will allow our ongoing analysis of student demographics by program area.

¹² Data for EHE faculty is drawn from the OSU HR Database for individuals listed in section (b) of this proposal. Data for OSU also is drawn from the OSU HR Database (October, 2011). Finally, because some faculty have chosen not to identify their sex or race/ethnicity, the sum of the individual columns shown may be less than the total.

(I) An analysis of the impact on the academic freedom and responsibility of all affected faculty.

The academic freedom and responsibility of the faculty in the College of Education and Human Ecology will not be adversely affected by the re-alignment of academic units proposed. There will be no fundamental changes in the responsibilities of faculty on account of re-alignment. Faculty in current as well as proposed units will distribute their efforts across teaching, research, and service in similar ways. The college's By-Laws, Patterns of Administration, and Promotion & Tenure document will remain largely the same as they have been, pending minor updates to reflect different names and numbers of academic units. Faculty in each of the proposed new units will have a year to review, formulate or re-formulate their Patterns of Administration as well as their Promotion & Tenure processes. There will be no change in academic programs by course or by major. Hence, there is nothing inherent in the proposed re-alignment of our academic units that would prove detrimental to academic freedom.



EHE Re-Alignment Principles & Process

Winter and Spring Quarters, 2011

Principles for Discussion:

- The goal is conceptual cohesiveness, integration and a synergy that advances the quality of faculty work.
- Proposed changes should consider all five points of the quality star: effectiveness, efficiency, impact, fiscal responsibility, and collective responsibility.
- No TIU (tenure initiating unit), per Ohio State University policy, can contain fewer than 10 tenure-track faculty.
- As a general rule of thumb, departmental size is optimized around 30 faculty members (plus or minus 5); small numbers of faculty have difficulty fulfilling the expectation for shared governance and larger numbers tend to be unwieldy and disjointed.
- Programs with two or fewer faculty should be consolidated into other programs; programs with five or fewer faculty may also find it difficult to meet quality expectations as defined by the five-point quality star.
- All faculty lines will stay within the college.
- Moves driven by individual agendas are discouraged (although individuals in very small programs should seek alternative placement within the college schema).
- Moves of faculty lines within the college must follow these guiding principles and are to be negotiated with the dean and unit leader(s).
- The total number of academic units in the college may not increase and should decrease.

Timeline:

- January 5: Faculty Social (College Commons). Proposal template, data, and principles/process document distributed.
- January 12: Proposals accepted and encouraged. Early submission will allow iterative review.
- February 25: Deadline to submit proposals to Jerry D'Agostino, Task Force Chair.
- February & March: Re-Alignment Task Force reviews proposals and makes recommendations.
- March: Executive Council of College Council discusses Task Force's re-structuring recommendations.
- March and April: Dean, Chairs, School Directors, and Associate Deans review recommendations.
- April 1: College Council discusses Task Force's re-structuring recommendations.
- May 10: College-wide vote.
- June: Final recommendation from Dean Achterberg to Provost.



TEMPLATE FOR PROPOSALS Re-alignment of EHE Academic Units

Winter and Spring Quarters, 2011

1. Programs/units seeking to join together.
Please list.

2. Anticipated benefits of joining. Please describe the benefits of joining by addressing each of the 5 points of the quality star in more detail. Consider the following examples:

- Enhanced scholarly synergies (including interdisciplinary studies).
- Potentially greater grant-seeking capacity.
- More optimal size for governance (i.e., representation on college or university committees).
- Broader and/or deeper curricular offerings for students.
- Improved faculty coverage of courses (appropriateness, quality, faculty:student ratios, more balanced responsibilities, possibility of team-teaching...).
- Improved graduate student advising quality.
- Opportunity for new degrees/programs/courses.
- Additional rationale(s):



3. Fiscal sustainability.

Will this joining yield a unit that can fiscally sustain itself over time? Explain in general terms. Note that each unit must have:

- Undergraduate curriculum and enrollments,
- Graduate curriculum and enrollments,
- Research funding opportunities,
- Sufficient credit hour generation, and
- Faculty:student ratios that are sustainable.

APPENDIX B

4. Extent of agreement.

a. Unit/program A: _____

Exploring

Committed

▪ Indicate vote: _____

b. Unit/program B: _____

Exploring

Committed

▪ Indicate vote: _____

c. Proposal submitter(s): _____

d. Comments about process or conditions:

5. Preliminary plan for joining curricula (adjustments needed for semester conversion plans).



Info Sheet
CONSUMER SCIENCES
Winter 2011

The Department of Consumer Sciences, through teaching, research and service activities, addresses issues related to meeting consumer needs through customer service and the acquisition and provision of products in the marketplace.

Data - FY10	Consumer Sciences
Total Faculty FTE	14.42
Assistant Professors FTE	2.42
Associate Professors FTE	8.20
Professors FTE	3.80
Instructional FTE	4.21
Salary & Benefits Faculty	\$2,070,946.68
Salary & Benefits Instructors	\$235,925.27
GTAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GTAs)	8.50
GTAs per Faculty FTE	0.59
GRAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GRAs)	2.00
GRAs per Faculty FTE	0.14
Weighted* Grad Student FTE	70.88
Weighted* Undergrad Student FTE	1,253.75
Weighted* Student FTE per Faculty FTE	91.86
Weighted* Student FTE per Total Instructional FTE	48.82
Grad & Prof Credit Hours Instruction	717.00
UG Credit Hours Instruction	33,251.00
Grad & Prof Credit Hours as % of Total	0.02
Credit Hours Instruction per Faculty FTE	1,823.30
Graduate Majors	32.00
Undergrad Majors	1,519.00
Majors per Faculty FTE	83.25
Honors Students	11.00
Square Footage Assigned	21,585.00
Indirect Costs Generated	\$33,954.00
Grant Expenditures	\$243,496.00
Grant Expenditures per Faculty FTE	\$16,885.99
Faculty Salary Release	\$28,910.00

* Note: Weighted student FTEs take into account different costs by student level; i.e., undergraduate, graduate, professional....

CONSUMER SCIENCES PROGRAMS AND FACULTY

Consumer and Family Financial Services

Jonathan Fox, Interim Chair
Sherman Hanna
Golden Jackson-Mergler
Caezilia Loibl
Catherine Montalto
Robert Scharff
Sharon Seiling
Kathryn Stafford

Fashion and Retail Studies

Jae Eun Chung
Trish Cunningham
Kathryn Jakes
Nancy Rudd
Leslie Stoel
Susan Zavotka

Hospitality Management

Margaret Binkley
Tom George
Wayne Johnson
Jay Kandampully



Info Sheet
EDUCATIONAL POLICY & LEADERSHIP
Winter 2011

Our school has a distinguished tradition of pursuing scholarship and offering graduate programs in academic fields that contribute to the formation of sound policy and effective leadership for educational institutions in all settings and levels. EPL faculty incorporate expertise from a broad range of disciplines across the social sciences, humanities, and cognate disciplines.

Data - FY10	Educ Policy & Leadership
Total Faculty FTE	29.85
Assistant Professors FTE	7.00
Associate Professors FTE	11.85
Professors FTE	11.00
Instructional FTE	6.55
Salary & Benefits Faculty	\$3,850,695.42
Salary & Benefits Instructors	\$492,962.58
GTAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GTAs)	11.00
GTAs per Faculty FTE	0.37
GRAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GRAs)	7.25
GRAs per Faculty FTE	0.24
Weighted* Grad Student FTE	1,154.62
Weighted* Undergrad Student FTE	422.94
Weighted* Student FTE per Faculty FTE	52.85
Weighted* Student FTE per Total Instructional FTE	33.28
Grad & Prof Credit Hours Instruction	12,438.00
UG Credit Hours Instruction	12,731.00
Grad & Prof Credit Hours as % of Total	0.49
Credit Hours Instruction per Faculty FTE	659.74
Graduate Majors	296.00
Undergrad Majors	na
Majors per Faculty FTE	7.76
Honors Students	na
Square Footage Assigned	20,749.00
Indirect Costs Generated	\$125,226.00
Grant Expenditures	\$2,276,895.00
Grant Expenditures per Faculty FTE	\$76,277.89
Faculty Salary Release	\$89,589.00

* Note: Weighted student FTEs take into account different costs by student level; i.e., undergraduate, graduate, professional....

EDUCATIONAL POLICY & LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS AND FACULTY

Cultural Foundations, Technology, and Qualitative Inquiry

Jackie Blount
Sebnem Cilesiz
Antoinette Errante
Beverly Gordon

Patti Lather
Doug Macbeth
Jan Nespor
Rick Voithofer

Educational Administration

Ann Allen
Anika Ball Anthony
Raymond Calabrese
Philip T.K. Daniel

Belinda Gimbert
Wayne Hoy
Helen Marks
Scott Sweetland

Educational Psychology and Philosophy

Eric Anderman, Interim Director
Lynley Anderman
Anita Woolfolk Hoy
Bruce Kimball

Philip Smith
Bruce Tuckman
Bryan Warnick

Higher Education and Student Affairs

Leonard Baird
Ada Demb
Susan Jones

Terrell Strayhorn
Tatiana Suspitsyna

Quantitative Research, Evaluation, and Measurement

Richard Lomax
Ann O'Connell

Jerome D'Agostino
Dorinda Gallant



Info Sheet
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT & FAMILY SCIENCE
Winter 2011

The Department of Human Development and Family Science engages in research, teaching, outreach, and the preparation of scholars and professionals to enhance the lives of individuals and families.

Data - FY10	Human Development & Family Science
Total Faculty FTE	14.30
Assistant Professors FTE	3.00
Associate Professors FTE	4.50
Professors FTE	6.80
Instructional FTE	2.75
Salary & Benefits Faculty	\$2,390,198.47
Salary & Benefits Instructors	\$225,920.15
GTAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GTAs)	5.50
GTAs per Faculty FTE	0.38
GRAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GRAs)	12.63
GRAs per Faculty FTE	0.88
Weighted* Grad Student FTE	114.03
Weighted* Undergrad Student FTE	999.65
Weighted* Student FTE per Faculty FTE	71.06
Weighted* Student FTE per Total Instructional FTE	36.79
Grad & Prof Credit Hours Instruction	1,170.00
UG Credit Hours Instruction	28,100.00
Grad & Prof Credit Hours as % of Total	0.26
Credit Hours Instruction per Faculty FTE	1,040.35
Graduate Majors	41.00
Undergrad Majors	425.00
Majors per Faculty FTE	22.21
Honors Students	12.00
Square Footage Assigned	21,610.00
Indirect Costs Generated	\$1,002,181.00
Grant Expenditures	\$5,238,060.00
Grant Expenditures per Faculty FTE	\$366,297.90
Faculty Salary Release	\$541,366.00

* Note: Weighted student FTEs take into account different costs by student level; i.e., undergraduate, graduate, professional....

APPENDIX C

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SCIENCE
FACULTY

Suzanne Bartle-Haring
Amy Bonomi
Cynthia Buettner
Xin Feng
Stephen Gavazzi
Michael Glassman
Howard Goldstein
Claire Kamp Dush
Stephen Petrill
Sarah Schoppe-Sullivan
Julianne Serovich, Chair
Natasha Slesnick
Anastasia Snyder
Deanna Wilkinson



Info Sheet
HUMAN NUTRITION
Winter 2011

The Department of Human Nutrition at The Ohio State University has as its mission to generate, disseminate, and apply knowledge in the areas of human nutrition and dietetics to improve the quality of life for individuals, families, and associated organizational systems.

Through intensive research, scholarly discourse, and outreach we aspire to become a nationally and internationally recognized model for excellence in research, education, and service. Central to our goals is a strong commitment to learning and the development of new knowledge. To this end, we encourage critical thinking among our students and faculty in an environment of mutual respect.

Data - FY10	Human Nutrition
Total Faculty FTE	8.34
Assistant Professors FTE	2.80
Associate Professors FTE	2.80
Professors FTE	2.74
Instructional FTE	0.33
Salary & Benefits Faculty	\$1,895,937.83
Salary & Benefits Instructors	\$23,726.34
GTAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GTAs)	3.50
GTAs per Faculty FTE	0.42
GRAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GRAs)	6.50
GRAs per Faculty FTE	0.78
Weighted* Grad Student FTE	151.74
Weighted* Undergrad Student FTE	708.86
Weighted* Student FTE per Faculty FTE	103.19
Weighted* Student FTE per Total Instructional FTE	70.71
Grad & Prof Credit Hours Instruction	1,493.00
UG Credit Hours Instruction	20,179.00
Grad & Prof Credit Hours as % of Total	0.07
Credit Hours Instruction per Faculty FTE	2,499.65
Graduate Majors	12.00
Undergrad Majors	431.00
Majors per Faculty FTE	51.10
Honors Students	24.00
Square Footage Assigned	22,510.00
Indirect Costs Generated	\$332,530.00
Grant Expenditures	\$1,961,582.00
Grant Expenditures per Faculty FTE	\$235,201.68
Faculty Salary Release	\$60,825.00

* Note: Weighted student FTEs take into account different costs by student level; i.e., undergraduate, graduate, professional....

APPENDIX C

HUMAN NUTRITION
FACULTY

Cheryl Achterberg
Martha Belury
Amanda Bird
Joshua Bosmer
Robert DiSilvestro
Helen Everts
Mark Failla
Earl Harrison
James Kinder, Chair
Joyce McDowell
Lydia Medeiros
Hugo Melgar-Quinonez
Carla Miller
Anne Smith
Ouliana Ziouzenkova



Info Sheet
PHYSICAL ACTIVITY & EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
Winter 2011

To describe and explain basic and applied phenomena associated with teaching and learning, focused especially on those who participate in sport and exercise, those who have special needs, those who supply educational services, and those who pursue lifelong learning in the workplace.

Data - FY10	Physical Activity & Ed Services
Total Faculty FTE	36.60
Assistant Professors FTE	6.00
Associate Professors FTE	22.60
Professors FTE	8.00
Instructional FTE	15.50
Salary & Benefits Faculty	\$3,994,493.44
Salary & Benefits Instructors	\$761,488.20
GTAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GTAs)	34.10
GTAs per Faculty FTE	0.93
GRAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GRAs)	3.75
GRAs per Faculty FTE	0.10
Weighted* Grad Student FTE	876.65
Weighted* Undergrad Student FTE	1,683.53
Weighted* Student FTE per Faculty FTE	69.95
Weighted* Student FTE per Total Instructional FTE	29.70
Grad & Prof Credit Hours Instruction	9,652.00
UG Credit Hours Instruction	46,743.00
Grad & Prof Credit Hours as % of Total	0.17
Credit Hours Instruction per Faculty FTE	1,082.44
Graduate Majors	292.00
Undergrad Majors	720.00
Majors per Faculty FTE	19.42
Honors Students	30.00
Square Footage Assigned	97,227.00
Indirect Costs Generated	\$241,069.00
Grant Expenditures	\$1,391,682.00
Grant Expenditures per Faculty FTE	\$38,024.10
Faculty Salary Release	\$116,620.00

* Note: Weighted student FTEs take into account different costs by student level; i.e., undergraduate, graduate, professional....

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES PROGRAMS AND FACULTY

Counselor Education

Michael Casto
Darcy Haag Granello

Paul Granello
James L. Moore, III

School Psychology

Antoinette Miranda
Laurice Joseph

Kisha Radliff

Special Education

Gwendolyn Cartledge
Ralph Gardner, III
Leah Herner-Patnode
Teri Hessler
Moiria Konrad

Helen Malone
Sheila Alber Morgan
Nancy Neef
Diane Sainato
Joe Wheaton

Physical Education

Jackie Goodway
Sam Hodge
Phillip Ward
David Porretta

Sandy Stroot
Sue Sutherland
Weidong Li

Sport Humanities

Melvin Adelman

Sarah Fields

Sport Management

Packianathan Chelladurai
Brian Turner

Donna Pastore

Health and Exercise Science

Janet Buckworth
Steven Devor

Rick Petosa
Brian Focht

Workforce Development and Education

Ruth Dohner
Josh Hawley
Ron Jacobs
Susan Nell

James Pinchak
David Stein
Chris Zirkle



Info Sheet
TEACHING & LEARNING
Winter 2011

Highly ranked both nationally and in the state of Ohio, the School of Teaching and Learning offers innovative programs for those seeking a license to begin a teaching career, those who seek to add an endorsement to their license or to deepen their research-based knowledge, and those seeking to become a researcher. Through the combination of a rigorous curriculum and a supportive social environment, students become scholars who investigate issues of learning and teaching in classrooms, schools, families, and other communities.

Data - FY10	Teaching & Learning
Total Faculty FTE	43.75
Assistant Professors FTE	4.00
Associate Professors FTE	20.00
Professors FTE	19.75
Instructional FTE	21.59
Salary & Benefits Faculty	\$4,917,910.14
Salary & Benefits Instructors	\$1,233,307.64
GTAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GTAs)	23.60
GTAs per Faculty FTE	0.54
GRAs FTE (Note: 1 FTE = 2 20-hr/wk GRAs)	12.25
GRAs per Faculty FTE	0.28
Weighted* Grad Student FTE	2,593.14
Weighted* Undergrad Student FTE	434.29
Weighted* Student FTE per Faculty FTE	69.20
Weighted* Student FTE per Total Instructional FTE	34.04
Grad & Prof Credit Hours Instruction	29,222.00
UG Credit Hours Instruction	12,312.00
Grad & Prof Credit Hours as % of Total	0.70
Credit Hours Instruction per Faculty FTE	635.66
Graduate Majors	603.00
Undergrad Majors	70.00
Majors per Faculty FTE	10.30
Honors Students	0.00
Square Footage Assigned	69,949.00
Indirect Costs Generated	\$1,175,434.00
Grant Expenditures	\$6,341,143.00
Grant Expenditures per Faculty FTE	\$144,940.41
Faculty Salary Release	\$416,470.00

* Note: Weighted student FTEs take into account different costs by student level; i.e., undergraduate, graduate, professional....

TEACHING AND LEARNING FACULTY AND PROGRAMS

Michael Battista	Math Ed
Donna Berlin	Math Ed, Mid Childhood Ed
Mollie Blackburn	Adol. Lit, Lang & Lity Ed, Mid Childhood Ed, MC & Urban Ed
David Bloome	Adol. Lit, Lang & Lity Ed
Patricia Brosnan	Math Ed
Caroline Clark	Adol. Lit, , Eng Ed, Lang & Lity Ed, MC & Urban Ed
Scot Danforth	Disabilities & Deaf Ed, MC & Urban Ed
Cynthia Dillard	Early Childhood & EI Ed, MC & Urban Ed
Lin Ding	Science Ed
Adrienne Dixon	Mid Childhood Ed, MC & Urban Ed, Soc Studies & Global Ed
Brian Edmiston	Early Childhood & EI Ed, MC & Urban Ed
Patricia Enciso	Children's & Adol. Lity, Lang & Lity Ed, Mid Childhood Ed, MC & Urban Ed
Marcia Farr	Lang & Lity Ed
Lucia Flevaris	Early Childhood & EI Ed, Math Ed
Charles Hancock	Foreign & 2 nd Lang Ed
Mari Haneda	Foreign & 2 nd Lang Ed
David Haury	Science Ed
Alan Hirvela	Adol. Lit, Foreign & 2 nd Lang Ed
Karen Irving	Science Ed
Hui Jin	Science Ed
Laura Justice	Lang & Lity Ed
Rebecca Kantor-Martin, Director	Early Childhood & EI Ed
Laurie Katz	Early Childhood & EI Ed, MC & Urban Ed
Barbara Kiefer	Children's & Adol. Lity, Lang & Lity Ed
Valerie Kinloch	Adol. Lit, , Eng Ed
Lea McGee	Lang & Lity Ed
Azita Manouchehri	Math Ed
Merry Merryfield	MC & Urban Ed, Soc Studies & Global Ed
Leslie Moore	Foreign & 2 nd Lang Ed, Lang & Lity Ed
Ross Nehm	Science Ed
George Newell	Adol. Lit, , Eng Ed
Douglas Owens	Math Ed
Peter Paul	Disabilities & Deaf Ed
Paul Post	Technology Ed
Elaine Richardson	Adol. Lit, , Eng Ed
Emily Rodgers	Early Childhood & EI Ed, Lang & Lity Ed
Keiko Samimy	Foreign & 2 nd Lang Ed
Patricia Scharer	Lang & Lity Ed
Barbara Seidl	Early Childhood & EI Ed, MC & Urban Ed
Anna Soter	Adol. Lit, Eng Ed, Holistic Ed, Lang & Lity Ed
Barbara Thompson	Science Ed
Kathy Cabe Trundle	Early Childhood & EI Ed, Science Ed
Cynthia Tyson	Children's & Adol. Lity, Early Childhood & EI Ed, Lang & Lity Ed, MC & Urban Ed
Arthur White	Science Ed
Ian Wilkinson	Lang & Lity Ed



College of Education & Human Ecology

School of Educational Policy and Leadership
Office of the Director
121 Ramseyer Hall
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Phone (614) 688-5721
Fax (614) 688-3415

MEMORANDUM

To: EHE Restructuring Committee
From: Eric Anderman, Interim Director
Re: Summary of EPL Proposals
Date: March 3, 2011

I am providing this memorandum as an overview of the proposals for restructuring that have been submitted that involve the School of Educational Policy and Leadership. Fiscal and enrollment data are provided in the individual proposals that already were submitted; therefore, this document is being provided to serve as an overview of the School's current and proposed future structure.

I CURRENT STRUCTURE

The School currently houses five sections. These include:

- Educational Administration (EA)
- Educational Psychology and Philosophy (EPP)
- Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA)
- Cultural Foundations, Technology, and Qualitative Inquiry (CFTQI)
- Quantitative Research, Evaluation, and Measurement (QREM)

II NEW PROPOSALS

Three units have submitted proposal to become part of the School of Educational Policy and Leadership. These include:

- Counselor Education and School Psychology
- Special Education
- Workforce Development

As will be described in the next section, the proposal from Workforce Development actually involves the formation of a new interdisciplinary section, combining faculty from both Workforce Development and some from the current CFTQI section.

III. POSSIBLE NEW STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL

The three proposals referenced above are being submitted with enthusiasm from both EPL and PAES. All of these groups have held multiple meetings with faculty representatives from both EPL and PAES, and the groups had many open and honest discussions. We have agreed that Special Education and Counselor Education/School Psychology will potentially move to EPL as independent, in-tact sections, so that individual program identities can be maintained. Nevertheless, we are all open to the possibility of internal restructuring later on (e.g., combining some sections with others). However, we all agree that it will take time to make those decisions, so we are not rushing into that level of internal restructuring. Nevertheless, as outlined in the individual proposals, there is much synergy and much potential for cross-sectional and interdisciplinary teaching and research. In addition, there are national models that support some of these types of units, and we will consult with colleagues at other universities as we possibly move forward later with additional internal restructuring. As an example, the College of Education at Penn State University recently restructured by joining their programs in Educational Psychology, School Psychology, and Special Education into one department; we will be able to consult with colleagues at Penn State and other institutions to learn about how they have configured similar units within their colleges.

EPL also acknowledges that the QREM area has not decided where it will be within the larger College. Therefore, whereas this document includes QREM as a section within EPL, we understand that QREM may decide to align with another School or department, and may not be a part of the proposed new overall EPL structure that is described below.

The proposed structure, considering sections as they currently are structured, is presented below in Table 1:

Table 1. Proposed Structure of P & L Using Current Section Configurations

Section	Current # Tenure Track Faculty	# Tenure Track Faculty if Fully Staffed	# Full-time Lecturers
Educational Administration	8	8	2
Higher Education & Student Affairs	6	7	4
Educational Psychology & Philosophy	7	9	1 (shared with QREM)
CFTQI	7	9	1
QREM	4	5	.5 (shared with EPP)
Workforce Development	5	6	2
Special Education	10	11	1
Counselor Education/School Psychology	7	9	1

APPENDIX C

In addition, two groups have proposed new sections within EPL. One of these (Technology, Work, Inquiry, and Learning – *TWIL*) consists of faculty from both the current CFTQI section and faculty from Workforce Development; the other (Curriculum, Foundations, and Inquiry) contains faculty from CFTQI and EPP. Both of these sections are potentially viable, but may ultimately involve some necessary internal rebalancing as well. If both sections are ultimately created, then the new structure for EPL would be similar to the following (see Table 2):

Table 2. Proposed Structure of P & L Using New Proposed Section Configurations

Section	Initial # of Tenure-Track faculty	# Full-time Lecturers
Educational Administration	8	2
Higher Education & Student Affairs	6	4
Educational Psychology & Philosophy	6-7*	1 (shared with QREM)
Curriculum, Foundations, and Inquiry	4-5*	1
QREM	4	.5 (shared with EPP)
TWIL	9	2
Special Education	10	0
Counselor Education/School Psychology	7	1

**Dr. Warnick has expressed potential interest in both of these sections.*

In summary, this document is being provided to give an overview of what the structure of EPL might be in the future. We acknowledge that this is a work in progress, and that this plan will develop over time. Please feel free to contact Eric Anderman (anderman.1@osu.edu) for any additional information.



Counselor Education and School Psychology / School of Educational Policy and Leadership Realignment Proposal

1. Programs/units seeking to join together

- a. Counselor Education (CE) and School Psychology (SP) with Educational Policy & Leadership (EdP&L)

A meeting with faculty from CE & SP and faculty from Ed P&L (including faculty representatives from Technology, Educational Administration, Educational Psychology & Philosophy, Quantitative Research, Evaluation, and Measurement) highlighted many areas of scholarship that could be enhanced, funding opportunities that could be created, and interdisciplinary research and instructional opportunities that could be developed.

Examples of these potential opportunities are highlighted below, with the understanding that many more benefits and potential collaborations will come to the surface once faculty spend more time together and come to even better understand each other's research interests and programs.

2. Anticipated benefits of joining

- a. Efficiency

- i. Scholarly Synergies

Faculty in many of the programs share similar interests in the mental health and academic achievement of K-12 students.

1. Research in student motivation, faculty/student relationships, and the social & cognitive factors that influence success (Ed Psych) are a natural fit with programs in School Counseling and School Psychology (CESP). The CE program has student success centers in two Columbus City Schools (CCS) sites, and enhanced connections between faculty (and graduate students) in these programs could have a direct benefit to the students served by these centers. Faculty expertise in the Educational Psychology area in student motivation aligns extremely well with school-based work of both the School Counseling and School Psychology faculty. These overlapping areas will allow for some sharing of instruction and potential combining of courses. In addition, there is great potential for faculty to co-chair doctoral students and serve on each other's committees, thus allowing for more effective use of faculty time.
 2. Faculty in Educational Administration, CE, and SP have shared interests in bullying, cyber-bullying, and suicide prevention.
 3. There are shared interests among faculty in Cultural Foundations, Technology, and Qualitative Inquiry (CFTQI/TWIL) and CE for research in the role of technology in education, including the role that on-line simulations can play in the training of future counselors and educators. Potential

APPENDIX C

collaborations between faculty who focus on counseling (CE and SP) and the development of technological innovations (CFTQI/TWIL) that can be applied in the field of counseling are plentiful.

4. The CESP Clinic on the 4th floor of the PAES building has the potential for many different scholarly synergies, including the potential for funding for outreach counseling, testing, and programming to the campus and larger community.

b. Effectiveness**i. Undergraduate Education**

1. The CE and EdP&L programs both have courses to assist undergraduates in their transition to college. EdP&L courses offered through the Walter E. Dennis (WED) Learning Center assist with study skills and academic barriers; CE courses focus on non-academic barriers to college student success. Together with the undergraduate wellness course offered through CE, these courses could be conceptualized as a series that meets the overall needs undergraduates in their transition to college. In addition, Ed P & L has very strong ties with the office of Student Life through the HESA/SPA programs; we anticipate eager cooperation from Student Life to support the growth and enhanced enrollment of potential new collaborative courses aimed at undergraduate populations. We have already discussed using some of the facilities at the WED Learning Center to develop and pilot new courses focusing on undergraduate wellness, which could lead to quite large potential enrollments.

ii. Graduate Education

1. Currently, graduate students in CE and SP are already enrolled in courses offered through the EDP&L programs, so the fit appears to be a natural one.
2. Faculty in CE and Educational Psychology have already discussed the potential for faculty to teach courses in each other's programs. Specifically, CE and SP students would benefit from courses in understanding student motivation and cognition.
3. Faculty already have been members of each other programs' doctoral general examination and dissertation committees, and these connections would certainly be strengthened through the proposed realignment.
4. Opportunities for faculty and student research forums on common topics of interest are very likely across programs.

c. Impact**i. Greater Grant-Seeking Capacity**

Faculty in all programs already have begun initial conversations about potential funding opportunities.

1. K-12 Mental Health. Faculty in CE, SP, and Ed. Psych share a common interest in K-12 student mental health and academic functioning. An RFP for a federal grant to develop a model for mental health centers in the schools has already been identified, demonstrating clear potential for future funding in this area.
2. Suicide Prevention (K-12). Faculty in CE are continuing their work in K-12 suicide prevention and will be submitting a federal grant in this area in spring.

2011. There are clear opportunities for involvement from Ed. Psych (several faculty members have expressed interest already) and from Ed. Admin (particularly in the role of suicide prevention in K-12 schools from a legal perspective). The CE faculty work in suicide prevention aligns very well with previously funded work of Ed P & L faculty on the prevention of risky behaviors during adolescence, and motivation in school settings.
3. Suicide Prevention. Faculty in CE already have a federal grant in campus suicide prevention, and there are important opportunities for faculty from Higher Ed/Student Affairs to become involved in these efforts, including the development of future funding proposals for sustainability of the project.
 4. The Role of Technology in Graduate Education. There are funding opportunities available to research the role that technology can play in education, and the area of on-line simulations for graduate training in counseling and psychology seems like a particularly important next step. Initial research from the medical fields demonstrates the promise of this type of education.
 5. A faculty member in school psychology is currently preparing a submission to Institute of Education Sciences (IES) in collaboration with a special education faculty member under the IES area of Cognition and Human Learning to explore whether particular instructional methods are more efficient than others in increasing students' learning rates and generalization. Collaboration with Educational Psychology Faculty would strengthen this line of inquiry by examining alternative ways to measure instructional efficiency and by exploring behavioral and cognitive factors such as motivation that may influence the efficiency of various instructional methods.
 6. Possibilities for funding from IES are plentiful. In particular, the IES Social and Behavioral Context panel focuses on funding research that incorporates principles of counseling to enhance student achievement and motivation. Collaborative proposals among CE, SP, and Ed Psych faculty will be extremely competitive due to the interdisciplinary approach that can be taken.
- d. Fiscal Responsibility
 - i. CE, SP, and P & L all offer programs with strong enrollments. Faculty from CESP and P & L have been productive in the area of grant writing and procurement, and the aforementioned potential collaborative efforts should increase grant productivity. There also is great potential to enhance revenue generation for the CESP clinic. The current P & L interim director (E. Anderman) had previous experience while the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies at the University of Kentucky in working with several revenue-generating clinics, and is committed to working with the CE faculty to effectively market the services of the clinic.
 - e. Collective Responsibility
 - i. Governance – current patterns of administration in PAES and ED P & L are very similar. Our faculties have discussed issues of governance, and we are all in agreement about certain important issues (e.g., the agreement to continue to maintain the structure of independent sections of faculty within the larger unit). Of paramount importance is the need for faculty to be able to maintain their

professional identities, and we are all in agreement that our internal governance procedures will allow for strong collaborations and innovations, while maintaining individual professional identities.

ii. Shared Interests

The proposed realigned unit would offer faculty in CE & SP an academic home with faculty who share common interests in both research and teaching. This would enhance unit cohesiveness and strength, as we understand the external pressures and demands as well as the internal needs and goals of each other's programs. We all anticipate the result of this merger would be a strong sense of commitment and engagement by all faculty. This realignment also would provide a strong group of colleagues and collaborators for the faculties in P & L in Educational Psychology and Educational Technology in particular.

iii. Quality

The programs to be merged already have very strong national and international reputations, high rankings, and evidence of funding. When merged, we anticipate that these metrics will only improve U.S. News & World Report Rankings.

1. Several of the programs are already highly ranked by *U.S. News & World Report*
 - a. Counselor Education: Current ranking: 8
 - b. Educational Administration: Current ranking: 8
 - c. Educational Psychology: Current ranking: 13
 - d. Higher Educational and Student Affairs: Current Ranking: 6

Graduate Student Metrics

2. CE brings strong graduate metrics to this merger.
 - a. GRE (2010): 628 Q; 552 V
 - b. Applicants > 100 (accepted 24 M.A.; 4 Ph.D.)
 - c. Currently enrolled: 1 Ford Fellow (M.A.), 1 McNair Scholar (Ph.D.)
 - d. Applicants (2011): 1 Fulbright Foreign Scholar (Ph.D.)
 - e. Approximate average credit hours generated annually (MA & Ph.D.): 2,377
3. SP brings strong graduate metrics to this merger
 - a. GRE (2010): > 500 Q; >500 V
 - b. Applicants > 70 (accepted 12 MA; 5 Ph.D.)
 - c. Approximate average credit hours generated annually (MA & Ph.D.): 1,738

Faculty Scholarship

4. CE scholarly productivity, last 5 years (4 faculty members):
 - 5 books
 - 8 chapters
 - 68 journal articles (avg. 17/faculty member)
5. SP scholarly productivity last 5 years (3 faculty members)
 - 1 book

12 chapters
32 journal articles (avg. 10/faculty member)

Faculty Grants & Funding

6. CE Funding, last 5 years
 - Colette Dollarhide: \$400,000
 - Darcy Haag Granello: \$540,000
 - Mike Casto : \$750,000
 - Paul Granello: \$2 million
 - James Moore: \$2.6 million
7. SP Funding, last 5 years
 - Joseph: \$68,000
8. EPL Funding, last fiscal year: \$2,276,895.

3. **Fiscal sustainability:** if CESP joins Ed P & L, the combined faculties will represent a highly sustainable group in terms of fiscal matters.

- a. *CESP Fiscal Data:* during FY 2010, CESP generated \$1,375,555 in instructional revenue, while also earning \$56,521 through development and contracts. Expenses for salary, fee authorizations, supplies, and equipment totaled \$1,393,368, resulting in a net profit (revenue less expense) of \$38,708. Additional fiscal details are provided in the Appendix. Faculty also have procured in excess of \$5 million in external grant funds over the past five years (detailed above). Enrollments in CESP are strong, and by collaborating with faculty from educational psychology, enrollments may be able to grow. There is high demand for the CE program – in 2009, out of 102 applicants, 23 M.A. and 2 PhD students were admitted; in 2010, out of 83 applicants, 23 M. A. and 5 Ph.D. students were admitted. Combined, the two programs generate approximately 4,115 credit hours annually. In addition there are approximately 2,300 undergraduate hours generated in a typical year by the FEEP program supervised by Dr. Casto.
- b. *Educational Policy and Leadership Fiscal Data:* P & L is already fiscally strong, and will continue to grow and thrive with the addition of Special Education. In FY 2010 alone, P & L had \$2,276,895 in grant expenditures, and generated 12,438 graduate and professional credit hours, and 12,731 undergraduate credit hours. School-level fiscal data by section is described in the Appendix.

4. **Extent of agreement**

- a. Unit/program A: Members of the Special Education Faculty in PAES
Committed
Indicate vote: Faculty voted unanimously in favor of this proposal (8-0).
- b. Unit/program B: Members of the P & L faculty
Committed
Indicate vote: Faculty discussed this at faculty meeting, no formal vote was taken, but there was full support for this realignment (no opposing comments); meeting was held February 8, 2011. Details available in published minutes.
- c. Proposal submitter(s): Faculties of P & L and Counselor Education/School Psychology: Eric Anderman (P & L), Darcy Granello and Joe Wheaton (PAES)
- d. Comments about process or conditions: The faculties of CESP and P & L are in agreement that Counselor Education/School Psychology would join P & L as its own

"section," and be able to maintain its own identity and resources. Future internal reconfigurations within the larger unit are possible in the future, once faculty become better acquainted (we are all open to that possibility).

5. **Preliminary Plans for Joining Curricula (adjustments needed for semester conversion plans)**

Because both units support existing students in current degree and program structures, there will be no need for initial adjustments to the semester conversion plans. Eventually, courses from Educational Psychology, Counselor Education, and School Psychology will be able to be re-aligned to provide for exciting new possibilities for interdisciplinary instruction.



- I. Program/Units Seeking to Join Together: Special Education and The School of Educational Policy and Leadership
- II. Anticipated Benefits of Joining

The anticipated benefits of Special Education joining the School of Educational Policy and Leadership are described below, based on the five indicators of quality.

- a. Efficiency: The joining of Special Education with P & L will allow for greater contributions to the common good of all involved in the new comprehensive grouping of faculty. There are many synergies that run across areas, and we will be able to collaborate in teaching and research in novel ways; this will result in more cost-effective use of faculty time. For example, in the area of teaching, faculty from Special Education and Educational Psychology will be able to collaborate in a number of ways, including the team-teaching of courses related to learning in exceptional populations, serving on and co-chairing doctoral and masters degree committees, and collaborating on grant proposals that cut across both areas (e.g., learning and motivation in special education populations). Special education faculty will also be able to collaborate with educational leadership faculty on grant proposals that focus on training school leadership to work more effectively with students with exceptional backgrounds; there is much funding available in this area, and the combined faculties will be at a competitive advantage to seek those funds. As a specific example, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) has funded many studies in recent years that have focused on using broad psychological perspectives to address the needs of exceptional students; the new synergies that will exist with this proposed alliance will allow us to more easily work on collaborative proposals of this nature.
- b. Effectiveness: The combined faculties will be in a stronger position to set specific goals, develop workable objectives, and accomplish those goals. We provide several examples of goals that may be set by the combined group.
 - i. *Increasing external funding*: Most external funding agencies now require *interdisciplinary* approaches to research. The combined expertise of faculties from Special Education and P & L will allow us to set specific funding goals (attached to specific RFAs), and to submit proposals in a more timely manner. Faculty from the Special Education area, in collaboration with faculty from P & L, will be able to submit and be more competitive for interdisciplinary funding opportunities focusing on educational interventions that are enhanced by broad perspectives on educational policy, psychology, and technology.
 - ii. *Increasing policy-related funding*: P & L is committed to applying for more research funds in the policy arena. There is much money available to examine policy-related issues, however the faculty in P & L have not consistently sought these funds. Working with special education faculty,

- the P & L faculty will be very well positioned to submit competitive collaborative proposals that focus on contemporary educational policy issues, with a particular focus on special education populations.
- iii. *Training doctoral students in multiple methodologies*: This alignment will increase the potential for Special Education students and P & L students to be trained in the use of mixed- and multiple-methodologies. Expertise of P & L faculty in both qualitative and quantitative methods complements expertise of Special Education faculty in single-subject designs. Students from all areas will be able to learn a broader array of research methodologies; this will make all of our students more marketable when they apply for faculty and research positions.
 - iv. *Goal of increasing training grants*. Our new combined foci on special education, educational psychology, and technology (which is already well established in P & L and hopes to grow into a larger unit working with Workforce Development and Education) will allow us to apply for and more readily obtain training grants, particularly related to the use of technology that will enhance the learning of children and adolescents with exceptional characteristics.
- c. Impact: The potential for this combined group to impact research, policy, and practice is great. We will be in a unique position to develop interventions for students with special needs, while simultaneously focusing on how policy, technology, and the psychology of human learning interface with the success and fidelity of those interventions. In addition, impact also will be demonstrated by combining many highly-ranked programs into the same School (i.e., Special Education and Educational Psychology are both ranked in the top 20 in US News, and Higher Education/Student Affairs and Educational Administration are in the top 10). Special education faculty have been highly productive (e.g., 13.25 peer-reviewed journal articles per faculty member since 2005), and this productivity is likely to increase now that collaborative opportunities with faculty in educational psychology, technology, and educational administration will be more feasible.
- d. Fiscal responsibility: The combined groups will come into this partnership with strong fiscal histories, and will continue to have strong future potential. The Special Education section has bachelor's (B.S.), master's (M.A.), and doctoral (Ph.D.) programs. The undergraduate program has three tracks: early childhood intervention, mild-moderate intervention, and moderate-intensive intervention. The M.A. program has four tracks: early childhood intervention specialist, mild-moderate intervention specialist, moderate-intensive intervention specialist, and applied behavior analysis (this program is sought mainly by persons working with students with autism). The Ph.D. program is full-time and prepares leadership personnel in special education. Additionally, there are three post-baccalaureate licensure-only programs in the three areas specified for the bachelor's program. Special education faculty also have been very productive in obtaining extramural funding; since 2005, faculty in Special Education have received grants in the amounts of \$669,000 (Sainato), \$2,039,682 (Neef), \$100,000 (Hessler), and \$505,672 (Malone).

Special Education currently has 13 MA and 13 Ph.D. students, who generate approximately 776 credit hours annually. The undergraduate program has 88 students with an approximate credit hour generation of 3,860 annually. In addition, two introductory courses (PAES 251, for SE pre-majors, and PAES 650, or non-SE majors) generate approximately 2,400 credit hours a year. The income for these two courses for FY2008 – FY2010 was \$73,485 for 251, and \$305,787 for 650, or more than \$125,000 per year.

P & L is already fiscally strong, and will continue to grow and thrive with the addition of Special Education. In FY 2010 alone, P & L had \$2,276,895 in grant expenditures, and generated 12,438 graduate and professional credit hours, and 12,731 undergraduate credit hours.

- e. Collective responsibility: The Special Education faculty have had several very productive meetings with P & L faculty. The cultures of the current P&L and PAES faculties are similar, and our current patterns of administration are very similar. Our frank conversations about issues of governance have convinced all of us that we will be able to productively work together and collaborate, so that the “sum” will be greater than the “parts.” We all are in agreement about entering into this arrangement as partners, and committed to working together on grant proposals, course development, service activities, and the mentoring of our graduate students and junior faculty.

III. Fiscal Sustainability: if Special Education joins the School of Educational Policy and Leadership, the combined faculties will represent a highly sustainable group in terms of fiscal matters.

- a. Special Education Fiscal Data: Special Education is currently a fiscally productive unit. Last year, the section generated \$1,349,139 in instructional revenue, and earned an additional \$3,365 through development and contracts (total revenue = \$1,352,504). Total expenses last year amounted to \$1,128,606 (i.e., salaries, supplies, equipment, etc.), yielding a net profit (revenue less expense) of \$223,898. See Appendix for additional data.
- b. School of Policy and Leadership Fiscal Information: data for the School (broken down by sections and for the School as a whole) are presented in the attached appendices.
- c. Research funding opportunities are plentiful. This alignment will increase the potential for special education, educational psychology, educational technology, and educational administration, in particular, to compete for the rather bountiful IES grant opportunities in this area. The new alignment will allow for the faculty to become more competitive with larger grant proposals. We have already identified finding sources through IES, via both the Education Research Grants Program and the Special Education Research Grants Program. Potential research panels include Basic Processes, Social and Behavioral Contexts for Academic Learning, Educational Leadership, and Teacher Quality. Funding opportunities also exist through NICHD and NSF.

IV. Extent of agreement

- a. Unit/program A: Members of the Special Education Faculty in PAES

Committed

Indicate vote: Faculty voted 8-0 in favor of this proposal (1 person was unable to vote)

- b. Unit/program B: Members of the P & L faculty

Committed

Indicate vote: Faculty discussed this at a faculty meeting, no formal vote was taken, but there was support for this realignment (no opposing comments); meeting was held February 8, 2011. Details available in published minutes.

- c. *Proposal submitters:* Faculties of P & L and Special Education; contacts: Eric Anderman (P & L), Gwen Cartledge and Joe Wheaton (PAES)

- d. *Comments about process or conditions:* All parties are in agreement that Special Education would join P & L as its own "section," and be able to maintain its own identity and resources. Future internal reconfigurations within the larger unit are possible in the future, once faculty become better acquainted (we are all open to that possibility).

V. Preliminary Plans for Joining Curricula (adjustments needed for semester conversion plans)

Because both units support existing students in current degree and program structures, there will be no need for initial adjustments to the semester conversion plans. Eventually, courses from Educational Psychology, Educational Administration, and Special Education will be re-evaluated so that they can be taught in an interdisciplinary manner.



1. Programs/units seeking to join together.

The proposed new section in EPL would create a cross-disciplinary unit that combines areas of focus from the CFTQI (Cultural Foundations, Technology, and Qualitative Inquiry) section in EPL and the WDE (Workforce Development and Education) section in PAES into a cooperative academic entity. The new unit would preserve the relative independence of each focus area while linking them through a shared emphasis on technology, broadly defined.

Proposed Section Name:

Technology, Work, Inquiry and Learning (TWIL)

Rationale:

From the workforce development side, the alliance reflects the increasingly important role that technology plays both in providing access for diverse populations to educational and training opportunities in formal and informal settings, and technology's key place in the development and implementation of new models of learning and professional practice. The proposed section would include existing undergraduate programs, both licensure and non-licensure, focusing on business education, career and technical education, corporate training and development, and family and consumer sciences.

From the cultural foundations, qualitative inquiry, and technology side, the proposed section reflects a recognition of the central role of work and labor as sites of education and learning around the world, of the transformative possibilities of technology for qualitative inquiry and collaborative knowledge production, and of the necessity of grounding technology in socially and conceptually committed practice. The elements of the previous CFTQI included in the proposed alliance would continue to provide service and graduate courses in educational foundations, history of education, comparative education, the study and use of qualitative inquiry methods, educational technology, the technology endorsement for teachers, and graduate courses in educational technology.

As a combined unit, the proposed section would also include graduate courses related to studying adult learning, learning and performance in the workplace, public policy related to all contexts of education and workforce development and the study and use of qualitative inquiry methods. Future program initiatives include developing professional M.A. programs in the areas of human resource development, distance education, and educational technology; and a range of collaborative research initiatives.

The section would consist of core and affiliated faculty. Affiliate faculty would regularly teach (already existing) courses that would be considered part of some of the program's normal student pathways. The idea in effect is to allow faculty to participate in the program without forcing them to break away from current program affiliations, and to utilize relevant existing course offerings as part of the unit's curriculum.

APPENDIX C

Core Faculty:

- Jackie Blount (CFTQI)
- Ruth Dohner (WDE)
- Antoinette Errante (CFTQI)
- Josh Hawley (WDE)
- Ron Jacobs (WDE)
- Patti Lather (CFTQI)
- Jan Nespor (CFTQI)
- David Stein (WDE)
- Rick Voithofer (CFTQI)
- Chris Zirkle (WDE)

Affiliated Faculty:

- Anika Anthony (Ed Admin)
- Sebnem Cileliz (CFTQI)
- Scot Danforth (T&L)
- Joe Wheaton (Special Ed)

2. Anticipated benefits of joining.

- Create a nationally and internationally identifiable program unique in its emphasis on technology, work, learning, and qualitative inquiry
- Develop a clear and focused identity for funders
- Increase visibility to prospective students
- Expand the opportunities to provide undergraduate majors in business and family education, corporate training and development.
- Realize the potential of the College's investments in ICT infrastructure
- Position the college as a leader in the development and use of new technologies of qualitative inquiry, representation, and public access
- Generate new enrollments streams in and out of education
- Provide community involvement in service learning
- Use information structures (e.g., webpages, etc.) to grow a variety of public research archives
- Develop a rich library of interdisciplinary publications in a variety of venues

3. 5 Point Quality Star**Efficiency**

With the move to EPL, WDE makes it possible to teach collaboratively on several existing and new classes. For example, the Educational Psychology area does not currently have a course related to Adult Development, while WDE classes (principally PAES 932 and PAES 648) incorporate much of the literature on adult development. Secondly, WDE offers classes on distance education (PAES 701 and PAES 914.02) that can serve as platform for collaborative instruction on distance learning. The Educational Administration area of EPL has been working this year to put courses on line and further develop distance programs, and this new collaboration will facilitate their ability to develop those courses (by having new colleagues with expertise in that area); specifically, the new PAES expertise in distance programming will help the

Educational Administration faculty to become more efficient at developing on-line versions of their courses.

Effectiveness:

This proposal is a response to opportunities from changes in educational technology, qualitative inquiry, workforce development and transitions in public policy that offer possibilities for synergisms if current faculty are reorganized into a new work unit. EHE is investing heavily in ICT infrastructure. Configuring a new unit around *Technology, Work, Inquiry, and Learning* is one way to establish the distinctiveness of the College's efforts, as well as meet a confluence of emerging needs and issues represented in the following list:

1) Educational and workforce-related Policy and policy-making globally are undergoing unprecedented changes in spatial, communicative, and organizational form that both depend on and are best studied through new technologies and interdisciplinary forms of inquiry. Educational policy and politics are being re-scaled – from the growth of what Steiner-Khamisi calls “transnational regimes in education” (the supra-national forms of articulation taking place in Europe post-Lisbon Declaration; various cross-national policy borrowings of educational structure and practice, the increasingly complex transnational flows of students, and so forth), and within the US, the introduction of a “Common Core,” the centralization of state control, the emergence of cross-state policy advocacy coalitions and networks, and so forth. All of these efforts depend on new and emergent forms of technology for coordinating communications and strategy, conducting research, and connecting that research to policy activity.

2) Formal and informal educational contexts themselves are increasingly technologically mediated and can only be explored through new technologies of inquiry. Some of these contexts include:

- Online K-12 Schools
- Distance education courses and programs in post secondary settings
- Web-based tools as sites of cultural and curricular production
- Schools using the web, blogging and marketing themselves
- Parents using blogs and webpages to critique and review schools
- Educational practices that are increasingly multi-site, both in the sense multiple sites coordinated with each other or some central agency; and in the sense of teachers and others in engagement with others through email, skype, etc.
- Increasing use web based learning technologies in workplace and informal learning environments
- Video and video analysis are becoming integral parts of teacher education (see e.g., a NSF-funded project on teacher education <http://www.professional-vision.org/index.html>). Data are increasingly available on the web and as web-based representations.
- Online oral history archives provide students with a far greater understanding of the impact of educational policies on diverse (and often under-represented) groups as well as potential repositories for their own life histories and oral history work.

3) “Qualitative Inquiry” is under inexorable pressure to change. New technologies of data collection and analysis are transforming the field, creating pressures for new forms of training and practice, and for the integration of technology and technology development into research practice. Examples of this transformation include:

APPENDIX C

- The use of digital audio and video recording devices
- The use of note taking and annotation software
- The use of computer assisted qualitative data analysis systems (CAQDAS, see e.g., <http://caqdas.soc.surrey.ac.uk/>)
- New archiving systems (now government mandated in the UK, but offering important as-yet unexplored possibilities in a US context)
- GIS Mapping (Choi, 2009)
- Study of new computer-mediated phenomena now require new skills and techniques (e.g., Internet Inquiry – <http://internetinquiry.org/>)

4) New technologies for presenting research, archiving data, soliciting public engagement in research, and providing access to research, are creating successive waves of transformation in research practice, and have become essential for conveying the richness of qualitative data, and making research more accessible.

- The use of social media to merge scholarship and activism: <http://www.facebook.com/uclaidea>
- Social cartographies: <http://www.radicalcartography.net/index.html> [chicagodots]
- Mapping issues: <http://www.demoscience.org/>
- Sound studies: http://www.soundportraits.org/on-air/ghetto_life_101/
- Language & Popular Culture in Africa: <http://www.lpcsa.socsci.uva.nl/> [This is a site that proposes to archive "texts that express and mediate forms of African popular culture"]

5) The section being proposed would provide a visible space of congregation for undergraduates interested in human resource development, urban education, teacher education distance education, adult education, and qualitative research. In addition, there are new markets in and out of the university for technology oriented and technologically-mediated qualitative research offerings. Within the university the business school, for example, remains an untapped market for students. Qualitative research has a long history of use in marketing, and qualitative researchers remain in demand in the corporate sector. The corporate training undergraduate major offered by WDE is an expanding major and offers an alternative to those students who may not choose to enter the business college. It is also envisioned that the resources available in this section would be able to offer in the future a new major focusing on distance education.

Impact

To our knowledge, no other universities in the US have programs devoted to this integration of disciplines. We have the potential to implement and publicize a truly novel, cutting-edge program that combines two vitally important areas needed for individuals to thrive in educational and work environments in the coming decades. The expertise in this section will facilitate scholarship and instruction that will make tangible connections between educational experiences and professional success and will impact a broad range of local, state, national, and transnational educational and work practices and policies.

Fiscal Responsibility

This section will be financially sustainable from the first day based on the individual courses and programs that participating faculty will bring into the section. As the faculty in this section

APPENDIX C

integrate their interests into cohesive programs and medium term efforts come to fruition new enrollment streams will evolve and will be described below.

Existing Revenue Streams

1. WDE has two undergraduate programs (Technical Education and Training (TET) and Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS)). Technical Education and Training has three different strands (Career and Technical Education, CTE; Business Education, BE; and Corporate Training and Development, CTD). At any given time, there are approximately 100 students enrolled in these programs, and since 2005 approximately 63 students have graduated. The non-degree students in the CTE licensure track provide substantial enrollments in the undergraduate classes, and over 200 have completed between 2005- 2010. On average, these WDE undergraduate programs generate approximately 2,700 credit hours per year.
2. WDE has a single M.A. program that includes two strands (Career and Technical Education and Human Resource Development/Adult Learning). There is a single Ph.D. program. Since 2005, approximately 61 students have finished the MA and 27 have completed the Ph.D.
3. WDE has a long history of funding to support the undergraduate and licensure-only programs in FCS and CTE from the State of Ohio. This annual agreement between ODE and OSU provides funding for two full-time A & P staff. Secondly, through work with OBR/ODJFS, WDE works extensively with policy makers and state agencies to evaluate and research the impact of a broad range of educational interventions. In any given year, the graduate programs in WDE generate approximately 1,200 credit hours.
4. Jan Nespor and Patti Lather coordinate the qualitative research sequence that attracts students from across the college and university. This three course, one lab sequence (EPL 800, EPL 966, EPL 967, Tools Lab) serves approximately 100 students each year.
5. Rick Voithofer coordinates the technology integration courses taken by about 250 pre-service teachers in the early childhood, middle childhood, English education, Foreign and Second Language, and Social Studies teacher education programs. Sebnem Cilesiz teaches approximately 100 of these students each year.
6. Antoinette Errante coordinates EPL 306 (American Schools and Society) an Educational Foundations requirement taken by approximately 300 undergraduates a year.
7. The section also offers undergraduate and graduate versions of EPL 650.02 (History of Modern Education) an Educational Foundations requirement taken by approximately 200 undergraduate students a year.
8. Both WDE and CFTQI are fiscally healthy sections of their respective schools; thus bringing them together should result in a continued fiscal health. During FY 10, WDE generated \$883,940 in revenues from instruction and development/contracts; WDE had \$725,030 in expenses (salary, supplies, benefits, etc.), yielding a net profit of \$158,910. Also during FY 10, CFTQI generated \$1,290,731 in revenues from instruction and development/contracts; CFTQI had \$1,132,625 in expenses (salary, supplies, benefits, etc.), yielding a net profit of \$158,106 (see Appendices A and B for additional fiscal data).

APPENDIX C

Middle Term Revenue Streams

1. David Stein and Rick Vorthofer, along with colleagues from T&L are developing a graduate minor in teaching virtual environments. The purpose of the minor is to provide an opportunity for future higher education faculty and others interested in Distance Teaching an opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills to be effective online teachers. David Stein has been shepherding the proposal through the approval process. We anticipate admitting 15 students into the minor during the first year and then adding as our resource base permits.
2. EPL just received approved from the Regents to offer an online teacher endorsement program in computer leadership. This four-course endorsement will service teachers from across the state of Ohio. The endorsement will first be offered to 25 teachers in summer 2011. As demand increases the program can grow to accommodate new enrollments.

Long Term Revenue Streams

We believe the global and technology-based approach of TWIL's structure, curriculum, and work context will facilitate the College's efforts to increase its international presence. Funding is available through the U.S. and international governments (our Gateway partners for example) as well as non-governmental organizations for professional development opportunities of policy makers as well as scholars. We believe we could provide model short-term professional development opportunities in multiple areas (e.g. research methods, technology) that maximize the use of technology in comparative and global knowledge production.

Extramural Funding Opportunities

We will actively seek foundation funding for exploring and developing learning technologies, including new technological infrastructure for public forms of inquiry (and inquiry into public education), for community and family participation in public education, and for the promotion of public knowledge and participation in policy making. Indeed we think the visibility of the unit and our distinctive integration of technologies, policy, and inquiry will give us an edge in seeking such funds. All major federal funding agencies include NSF, DOE, and IES, in addition to large foundations like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the WT Grant Foundation, support the interdisciplinary research that is being proposed in this section. The Ford Foundation, for example, has a grant program to support for research, public education, citizen action and peer coordination to defend citizens' rights in the emerging digital culture (<http://www.fordfoundation.org/grants/grantdetails?grantid=71675>)

Collective Responsibility

There are strong scholarly reasons for WDE to move into EPL and be a part of this proposed section. As WDE practice has moved more toward postsecondary settings and online delivery, WDE research interests overlap with Technology. Specifically, we expect increased scholarly linkages on issues of Community and Technical Colleges, leadership in Career and Technical Education, and Educational Technology.



SD 2005-36

Office of Academic Affairs

203 Bricker Hall
190 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210-1358

Phone (614) 292-5881
Fax (614) 292-3658

Memorandum

To: University Senate

From: Raymond A. Noe, Chair
Council on Academic Affairs

Date: May 26, 2006

A PROPOSAL FROM THE COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS TO MERGE THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND THE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY TO BECOME THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN ECOLOGY

WHEREAS the faculty in each college embraces a shared vision and mission that reflect the holistic approach necessary to have an impact on the well-being of individuals, families, schools, and communities; and

WHEREAS national trends show that colleges of this type have merged to develop new and innovative programs, and faculty in these colleges have already explored cross-cutting opportunities made available by the merger; and

WHEREAS faculty from both colleges voted overwhelmingly in favor of the merger; and

WHEREAS the proposal adheres to the guidelines for the alteration or abolition of units, and the Faculty Council reviewed and endorsed the proposal at its meeting on May 25, 2006; and

WHEREAS the proposal was reviewed and approved by a Subcommittee, and then by the full Council on Academic Affairs on May 26, 2006.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approve the proposal to merge the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology to become the College of Education and Human Ecology, and respectfully request concurrence from the Board of Trustees.

TO: Council on Academic Affairs
Ray Noe, Chair

FROM: Subcommittee C
Electra Paskett, Chair

DATE: May 15, 2006

RE: Proposal to Merge COE and CHE into CEHE

Subcommittee C has evaluated a proposal to merge the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology to form the College of Education and Human Ecology. The Subcommittee submitted questions on the proposal to Dean David Andrews. We met with Dean Andrews last week and had additional questions/clarifications for the proposal. All questions were addressed to the satisfaction of the sub-committee and a revised proposal will be sent to everyone by Dean Andrews today.

We now recommend approval of this proposal.

Rankin, Joyce

From: David Andrews [DAndrews@hec.ohio-state.edu]
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2006 4:50 AM
To: Electra Paskett; Smith, Randy
Cc: Rankin, Joyce; Patricia Longbrake; George Valco; Dobos, Lora (.1); eyswim@gmail.com; Scott Pearson
Subject: RE: Proposal to merge HEC & COE

Dear Professor Paskett,

Thank you so much for working so diligently to get this through your committee. I will make these helpful edits and have a copy back to you and Randy by Monday morning. It was a pleasure meeting with your sub-committee. The questions were thoughtful and I got the full impression that you were all focused on the best interests of our faculty, the new College, and the institution.

With sincere appreciation,

David

David Andrews
Dean, College of Human Ecology
Interim Dean, College of Education

From: Electra Paskett [mailto:Electra.Paskett@osumc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 3:12 PM
To: David Andrews; randy.smith@admin.ohio-state.edu
Cc: Rankin, Joyce; Patricia Longbrake; George Valco; Lora Dobos; eyswim@gmail.com; Scott Pearson
Subject: RE: Proposal to merge HEC & COE

Dean Andrews:

Thanks so much for meeting with us today. To summarize, the following were items you will edit in the proposal or response:

1. Provide an example of a matrix with similar themes/areas in the two colleges.
2. Q 10 -- add a paragraph (from the proposal) in response to the question about alumni responses and change the vote of the Dept of Nutrition faculty to a majority.
3. Q 9 -- clarify the location of senior administration.
4. Q 4 -- change the wording in the proposal to what was said on the ballot.
5. Proposal, pg 2 -- delete Appendix 2; add a history about the merger.
6. Q 8 -- clarify that you are not going to see an increase in IDC and student enrollment right away but will see increases in the future with new efforts and new recruits.

Please forward your edited proposal and response to Randy Smith and me. Thank you again for your help with this.

Electra D. Paskett, Ph.D.
Marion N. Rowley Professor of Cancer Research
School of Public Health
Associate Director for Population Sciences

2

Rankin, Joyce

From: Electra Paskett [Electra.Paskett@osumc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 10:40 AM
To: Smith, Randy; valco.1@osu.edu; Dobos, Lora (.1); eyswim@gmail.com; pearson.142@osu.edu; Andrews, David
Cc: Rankin, Joyce; Noe, Raymond
Subject: RE: Proposal to merge HEC & COE
Attachments: Proposal to Merge COE and HE.doc

Dean Andrews:

Subcommittee C of CAA met to review and discuss your proposal to merge HEC and COE. The sub-committee has a significant number of questions regarding this proposal which are detailed in the attachment. Before proceeding to the full CAA with this proposal, we would like to ask you to do the following:

1. Respond to each of our issues, revising the proposal as needed.
2. Submit a response to our questions in addition to a revised proposal. These materials need to be sent to Randy Smith's office as well as to me for distribution.
3. After you submit the material mentioned above to us, we would like to set-up a meeting with you. This meeting will be at least one week after you have submitted the materials (to give us time to review everything). My assistant Patricia Longbrake, will work with you to schedule this meeting.
4. Contact me if you have any questions. Electra.paskett@osumc.edu or 293-3917

Thank you for your assistance with our review of your proposal.

Electra Paskett
Chair, Subcommittee C
CAA

From: Smith, Randy [mailto:Smith.70@osu.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 8:35 AM
To: Electra Paskett; valco.1@osu.edu; Dobos, Lora (.1); eyswim@gmail.com; pearson.142@osu.edu
Cc: Rankin, Joyce; Noe, Raymond; Smith, Randy
Subject: Proposal to merge HEC & COE

Electra, Lora, George, Elaine, and Scott:

Attached is a proposal from the Colleges of Education and Human Ecology to merge the two colleges.

Please review this proposal within the guidelines for the "alteration and abolition" of units (Academic Organization and Curriculum Handbook p. 7).

The contact for this proposal is David Andrews, Dean, College of Human Ecology and Interim Dean, College of Education (andrews.128@osu.edu or 2-8119).

Thanks.

Randy

W. Randy Smith
Vice Provost

**Proposal to Merge the
College of Education and the College of Human Ecology
Into the College of Education and Human Ecology
As per Faculty Rule 3335-3-37.**

Pursuant to rule 3335-3-37 on the alteration or abolition of units, the collective faculty of the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology present this proposal to merge these two colleges into a college to be called the *College of Education and Human Ecology*.

In August of 2005 the faculties of the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology began discussing an initial proposal and a process forwarded by David Andrews (Dean of the College of Human Ecology and Interim Dean of the College of Education) to merge the two Colleges. The initial proposal is attached as Appendix A. Faculty staff, students, and alumni met on numerous occasions in multiple formats to discuss the proposal. Early discussions of this proposal resulted in general support, but a desire to have a more detailed portrayal of how such a college would be structured and governed. Consequently in February 2006 a proposed Pattern of Administration for a new College of Education and Human Ecology was presented to the faculty. This proposed Pattern of Administration is presented in Appendix B.

On February 3, 2006, The following ballot was presented independently to the faculty and staff of the College of Education and the faculty and staff of the College of Human Ecology.

Ballot for the Merger of the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology

I support the merger of the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology into a new unit called the College of Education and Human Ecology.

Prior to its functioning as one College of Education and Human Ecology the faculty of the existing Colleges must independently and collectively approve a new Pattern of Administration, new College Bylaws, and new College promotion and tenure guidelines. Furthermore, the university must approve a comprehensive proposal for restructuring as per Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 on the alteration of units.

YES _____ NO _____ ABSTENTION _____

The results of the faculty votes are presented as follows.

College	School Dept	Votes Cast	Eligible Voters	% Voting	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	% of voters YES	% of faculty YES
Education		116	137	84.67%	100	13	3	86.21%	72.99%
	PAES	37	44	84.09%	31	6	0	83.78%	70.45%
	P&L	26	32	81.25%	25	1	0	96.15%	78.13%
	T&L	53	61	86.89%	44	6	3	83.02%	72.13%
Human Ecology		39	47	82.98%	38	1	0	97.44%	82.61%
	CS	19	22	86.36%	19	0	0	100.00%	86.36%
	HDFS	12	16	75.00%	12	0	0	100.00%	75.00%
	HN	8	9	88.89%	7	1	0	87.50%	77.78%
TOTAL		155	183	84.70%	138	14	3	89.03%	75.41%

While not required to vote by Faculty Rule 33335-3-37, staff members from both colleges were polled with the same ballot. Staff votes were as follows.

	Human Ecology		Education		TOTALS	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
YES	77	90%	90	87%	167	88%
NO	6	7%	6	6%	12	6%
ABSTAIN	3	3%	7	7%	10	5%
Totals	86		103		189	

Aggregated and disaggregated votes of faculty and staff were overwhelmingly supportive of a merger. Eighty-nine percent of the faculty members who voted on the merger were supportive with 85% of the faculty casting a vote. Eighty-eight percent of the staff members who voted were supportive of the merger.

Students were consulted through three different open forum opportunities, but did not vote. Students posed questions regarding the impact of the merger on their programs of studies, but none expressed serious concern about the organizational structure of the college. No programmatic changes are being considered as part of the initial merger of the two colleges.

The vote to merge the two colleges was contingent upon faculty approval of new college by-laws, new college level promotion and tenure documents, and a new college pattern of administration.

The College of Education has approved faculty by-laws that outline faculty governance in the College. The College of Human Ecology has no such by-laws. The current by-laws of the College of Education were modified to address representation from the College of Human Ecology. At the end of March 2006, the faculty of both colleges voted on these modified by-laws and approved them for use in the new college. The new by-laws (Appendix C) were approved as follows.

	Human Ecology		Education		TOTALS	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
YES	20	74%	65.00	92%	85	87%
NO	5	19%	4.00	6%	9	9%
ABSTAIN	2	7%	2.00	3%	4	4%

Note: The vote requirement for modification of the existing COE by-laws, as per the existing College of Education by-laws, was the "majority of voting faculty", not the majority of faculty eligible to vote. Despite multiple reminders, the number of faculty who chose to vote was quite low.

Two committees, with representation from each school and department, are currently working on revisions of the College Pattern of Administration (current draft presented in Appendix B), and promotion and tenure guidelines for the new College. Both of these documents will need to be approved by the faculty of the new College. One technical dilemma posed by the process is that these documents should be approved by the faculty of the new college. However, approval of these documents may be deemed necessary by the university governance structures that will ultimately approve the creation of the new college. Given this dilemma, the college faculty decided upon ballot wording that would allow us to start moving the merger through the university process while finalizing and approving (by vote) the POA and P&T documents. Consequently, the faculty voted affirmatively to merge the Colleges noting that "rior to its functioning as one College of Education and Human Ecology the faculty of the existing Colleges must independently and collectively approve a new Pattern of Administration, new College Bylaws, and new College promotion and tenure guidelines."

Responses to Proposal Requirements of Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 on the Alteration of Units

- (a) A rationale for alteration or abolition of the unit which includes a history of the formation, activities and evaluation of the performance of the unit.

The full rationale for merging these two colleges is presented in Appendix A. The faculty of the two colleges spent six months exploring shared mission and vision and assessing whether the programs within the two colleges would be "stronger together than apart." This exploration was partially motivated by national trends in which colleges of these types have come together to develop new and innovative programs. For example, there are only five free standing units of Human Ecology/Human Science at Research I institutions in the United States. A decade ago, there were three times as many. The majority of the merged units have a restructured element that includes Education and Human Ecology programs.

More importantly, the faculty of these two colleges embrace a shared vision and mission (see Appendix A) that reflects the holistic approach necessary to impact the well-being of individuals, families, schools and communities. The field of Education has sometimes worked in a vacuum, not being able to fully address the non-academic barriers that affect learning and development. Inversely, disciplines that interface with schools and formal educational systems, often find cultural challenges in engaging these institutions. It is clear that the significant educational and developmental challenges facing our society need to be addressed with a more holistic approach.

The resulting college will allow us to build upon the historical individual strength of the two colleges in unique ways and re-strengthen OSU's national reputation. The last national rankings for Colleges of Human Ecology/Human Sciences were published in 1998 in an outlet called the Gourman Report. The College of Education was ranked #1 in the nation in this publication. This ranking was consistent with a century old reputation as being one of the best colleges of its type in the nation. There are no US News and World Report Rankings for Colleges of Human Ecology/Human Sciences and there are no plans for colleges of this type to be ranked by NRC. In the same year – 1998, The College of Education was ranked #3 in the nation by US News and World Report. The current 2007 Best Graduate Colleges ranks the OSU College of Education #24.

Many colleges of education that are now ranked higher than the College of Education at OSU have strong programs in less traditional educational fields. These fields are often in areas where external grant dollars are available to research more holistic approaches to growth and development. Such approaches focus on attracting world-class faculty and building interdisciplinary graduate programs. Restoration of the national ranking of the College of Education is contingent upon broadening the scope and creating a more comprehensive approach.

The faculty of both colleges have already explored new crosscutting opportunities afforded by the potential merger in such areas as nutrition and exercise, family and school involvement in early childhood development, consumer behavior and school choice, and educational policy and community development. These opportunities, and others, will positively impact the productivity of our current faculty while attracting additional world-class faculty to our ranks. In the past year alone, six recruits for faculty positions have requested interview time with faculty in the "other" college participating in the merger.

The highly compatible vision and mission statements of the two colleges were easily merged into statements embraced by the faculty. The faculty expressed a strong desire to capitalize on a more comprehensive approach that is captured by this merged vision and mission. The proposal is to bring together the programs within the two colleges without initially altering the existing school and department structure and without modifying programs. However, the faculty agreed that a second phase of the merger is absolutely necessary to take full advantage of the opportunities. A second phase is planned in which there will be further consideration of the internal structure of the new college. Substantive future changes in structure would be subject to additional approvals under faculty rule 3335-3-37.

(b) An enumeration of all faculty affected by the alteration or abolition of the unit.

The faculty in the College of Education and the faculty in the College of Human Ecology will be affected by this merger. There are 137 faculty in the College of Education and 47 faculty in the College of Human Ecology. However, there will be no changes in faculty TIU as a result of this merger. And, there will be no changes in employment status of any current faculty. College level administrative positions will be reduced (see item c; paragraphs 2&3).

The merger is expected to facilitate growth in the number of faculty in the new college. As indicated in the rationale, the new College will bring together faculty to develop new interdisciplinary programs that will generate additional student credit hours and provide new external funding opportunities for faculty. Nationally, those colleges that have been able to create more holistic views of education and well-being for individuals and families have been able to develop innovative programs and recruit a wider range of faculty than those colleges who have maintained more fragmented approaches.

Faculty from the two colleges are already meeting to develop new program options, prepare new proposals for external funding, and redefine faculty lines considering the joint needs of program areas. For example, faculty members in nutrition are working closely with faculty members in exercise science to develop a college wide focus on preventing childhood obesity. Similarly, faculty members focusing on early childhood (appointed in both colleges) are working together to recruit a new research director for the Weinland Park Early Childhood Development Center. The combined resources of the School of Teaching and Learning and the Department of Human Development and Family Science have allowed these faculty to seek a world class faculty member to lead this innovative project. This would not have been possible for either unit individually. The candidates being considered for this position are very productive researchers with well funded projects. It is important to note that even within the past year, multiple candidates for faculty positions have referenced the vision of the new College as one factor that motivated them to apply.

There is a level of excitement around the creation of a new college that provides a window of opportunity for growth. The increased student credit hours and IDC that is generated from new

programs, new faculty, and re-engaged faculty will be reinvested in new faculty lines.

The new college will also provide an opportunity to establish a new culture. The faculty understand and support the creation of a new culture founded in innovation and entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial activity in research and program development will yield new resources for individual faculty as well as departments, schools, and the college. The creation of a stronger culture of innovation will allow us to better attract additional world class faculty members.

- (c) A person-by-person analysis of the proposed reassignment or other accommodation of the faculty identified in paragraph (B)(2)(b) of this rule, including a statement of the impact on promotion and tenure. No tenured faculty member shall be involuntarily terminated as a result of this process. However, faculty may be transferred to another unit in accordance with paragraph (C)(2) of rule 3335-6-06 of the Administrative Code and with regard to the teaching, research, and service expertise of the individual.

The proposed merger will not directly impact the promotion and tenure of any faculty member. The tenure initiating unit of faculty members will not change. Faculty are currently appointed in one of six schools or departments (School of Educational Policy and Leadership, School of Physical Activity and Educational Services, School of Teaching and Learning, Department of Consumer Sciences, Department of Human Development and Family Science, and Department of Human Nutrition). These six units will continue as the tenure initiating units for faculty. The college level promotion and tenure documents are being rewritten and will be submitted to the combined faculty for approval by majority vote. The current promotion and tenure documents of both colleges focus on the college committee's responsibility to assure that the procedures outlined in the promotion and tenure documents of the TIU are appropriately applied to each case.

While faculty appointments will not be altered, the total number of administrative appointments will be reduced. Currently, there are a total of eight associate and assistant deans appointed within the two colleges. The new college will have four associate deans. Current administrators who are not appointed to administrative positions within the new College will return to their faculty positions. In total, the new college will have five fewer senior administrative positions than the two existing colleges (this includes one less dean).

Each of the current associate or assistant deans in the two colleges has been consulted regarding their interest in an appointment as an administrator in the new college. In cases where there are multiple administrators seeking appointment to a single position, the dean will make the appointment decision. Such a strategy does not preclude the option for outside searches. Existing letters of offer for current associate and assistant deans who are not assigned to administrative appointments in the new college will be reviewed. Transition strategies will be negotiated based upon the letter of offer and discussions of the career goals of the affected administrator.

- (d) An analysis of the academic courses now taught by the unit and provisions for their reassignment to other units, if relevant.

No courses are affected.

- (e) An analysis of the students affected by the proposal, including majors, non-majors, professional and graduate students.

Students will not be immediately affected by the merger. However, the merger will stimulate new majors and minors as faculty from the two colleges look for integrated programming opportunities. In addition, the flow of potential educators from undergraduate programs in Human Ecology to masters programs in Education will be facilitated by the merger. The existing coordination of educator preparation programs that include articulation of undergraduate and masters programs will be enhanced by having programs in the same college (e.g. early childhood undergraduate majors in HDFFS transition into M.Ed in Teaching and Learning).

- (f) Specific proposals regarding support for currently enrolled students until degree completion.

Not applicable.

- (g) An analysis of the budgetary consequences to all relevant units as a consequence of the proposal.

The budget process for both Colleges is quite similar in that schools and departments receive annual operating budgets and have substantial control over staff budgets. Faculty positions are held centrally in both the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology. Faculty lines are discussed by the colleges' leadership teams and ultimately negotiated with the dean. This process for distributing faculty lines will be continued in the new college.

The principles of budget restructuring (toward more responsibility based budgeting) has not been fully implemented at the department/school level in either college. That is, the distribution of resources to schools and departments are "informed" by revenue versus expenditure data, rather than "driven" by these data in a formulaic manner. Prior to a discussion of a merger, both colleges had plans in place to move toward a budgeting system that would be more consistent in allocating funds based upon revenues and expenditures, combined with performance metrics. During FY 06-07 the administration and faculty of the new faculty will move forward with a combined version of the two colleges plans to restructure the budgeting process.

The school and department budgets for FY06-07 will not be immediately altered as a result of the merger. Future budgets will be adjusted as per any new fiscal policies that emerge within the new College. As outlined in the by-laws of the new college, a faculty budget/fiscal committee will be involved in the establishment of fiscal policies.

The proposed merger will yield over \$400,000 in administrative savings. While this was not the purpose of the merger, it is a benefit. These savings will be reinvested in either a) infrastructure support for faculty and students (i.e. support for research proposal development, support for developing new courses, or support for implementing new majors or minors) or b) new faculty positions. Consequently, the total availability of funds for unit budgets (schools and departments) will increase.

The longer term budgetary consequences of the merger will be positive. New curricular opportunities will emerge that take advantage of the opportunity to offer more interdisciplinary coursework. Additionally, new faculty members will be attracted who are conducting interdisciplinary research that is externally funded. The proposed College has already elicited interest from potential faculty hires who are seeking a more integrated, applied setting to conduct their work with individual, families, schools, and communities. These faculty all have substantial portfolios of federally funded projects.

- (h) An analysis of the services lost to the rest of the university as a consequence of the proposal.

None.

- (i) An analysis of impact on constituencies external to the university, including alumni.

There are currently three different alumni groups representing the two colleges. The College of Education has two groups – Edlums, and PAES Alumni. The College of Human Ecology has an HEC Alumni Council. All three groups have been consulted on multiple occasions regarding the potential merger and are supportive.

Eight letters from Human Ecology alumni expressing questions and concerns about the merger were received. These letters were written in response to an appeal from one alum to "write the dean" about the proposed merger. The primary concern expressed in these letters was the potential lack of identity for the fields within Human Ecology when they exist in larger college. Many of the letters outline the history of the College and its quest for independence from what was the College of Agriculture. The Dean responded to all of these alumni with letters and met personally with four of the letter writers.

There have been at least two dozen events involving the alumni of at least one of the colleges since the proposed merger was announced. At these events, scores of alumni have expressed their support for the merger. The leadership councils of all three alumni groups have been consulted regarding the merger and all three are supportive. In addition, the two alumni representatives of the Colleges to the OSU Alumni Board are both fully supportive of the merger. The current President of EdLums (the College of Education Alumni Society) has degrees from both the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology and has openly expressed the benefits that such a structure

would have had on his degree completion were it in place when he was a student.

The two Colleges share many external constituents in industry, education, and social services. The most common response from these constituents has been, "it's about time." Support for the merger has been verbally expressed to the Dean by the Superintendent of Columbus Public Schools, the Franklin County Superintendents Association, the Ohio Superintendent for Public Instruction, the State Auditor, the Director of the Ohio Department of Mental Health, the Director of the Ohio Department of Youth Services, and many other community leaders in education and human services.

There are approximately 80 thousand living alumni of the two colleges. Through the use of mass communications, we have attempted to notify our alumni and external constituents of the positive faculty vote. With the exception of less than a dozen Human Ecology alumni, support for the merger has been expressed.

(j) An analysis of the impact on governance at all relevant levels as a consequence of the proposal.

Faculty governance at the department and school level will be unchanged. College level faculty governance in Education is more formalized than in the Human Ecology. The faculty voted to use the more formalized College Council approach that has been being used in the College of Education. The by-laws of the College Council have been modified and voted upon to reflect the new structure (see page 2). The university allocation of senators to the new college will need to be adjusted and it is anticipated that the new allocation will be a simple aggregate of the current allocation.

(k) An analysis of the impact upon diversity.

Both colleges have a strong commitment to diversity. This year is the final year of a five year diversity plan in the College of Education. An external review of this plan and its outcomes was previously scheduled for this spring. The review will be completed and the recommendations from this review will be used to craft a new plan. The College of Human Ecology's diversity plan was not time limited. The external review team for the College of Education's plan will also assess the efforts in Human Ecology and the recommendations for a new plan will encompass the programs in the new College.

Faculty and staff diversity data are presented next. The three tables represent the faculty and staff of the two colleges independently and combined. Also presented are the student data of each college, the colleges combined, as well as the Columbus and all campuses data.

Diversity Data for
Faculty and Staff
Unit Level Statistics

Summary: Human Ecology 2005

Part 1. Section A - University Diversity Demographics as of 4/30/2005

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity						Undisclosed									
	Female		Black		Asian		Am Ind		Hispanic		White		Other		Undisclosed			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Regular Faculty																		
Professor	7	58.3%	5	41.7%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Associate Professor	8	42.1%	11	57.9%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	89.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Assistant Professor	5	55.6%	4	44.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	8	88.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Auxiliary Faculty																		
Auxiliary Faculty	3	21.4%	11	78.6%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	92.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Graduate Associates																		
Teaching (GTA)	5	14.3%	30	85.7%	3	8.6%	18	51.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	34.3%	0	0.0%	2	5.7%
Research (GRA)	2	5.7%	33	94.3%	4	11.4%	8	22.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	40.0%	3	8.6%	6	17.1%
Administrative (GAA)	2	20.0%	8	80.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	70.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%
Staff																		
Academic Leadership	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Executive, Administrative	5	33.3%	10	66.7%	2	13.3%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	73.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Professional	12	26.7%	33	73.3%	0	0.0%	3	6.7%	0	0.0%	2	4.4%	40	88.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Clerical, Secretarial	2	11.8%	15	88.2%	3	17.6%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	58.8%	0	0.0%	3	17.6%
Paraprofessional, Technical	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Note: Each individual is counted only once, according to main University function, with the following exceptions: Faculty who have administrative appointments at chair level and above appear within their TIU in the appropriate faculty rank and also appear within the Academic Leadership category in the unit of their main administrative appointment.

Office of Human Resources
Information and Technology Services

Diversity Data for
Faculty and Staff
Unit Level Statistics

Summary: Education 2005

Part 1. Section A - University Diversity Demographics as of 4/30/2005

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity										Undisclosed					
	Male	Female	Black	Asian	Am Ind	Hispanic	White	Other	White		Other		Undisclosed					
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Regular Faculty																		
Professor	17	48.6%	18	51.4%	3	8.6%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	31	88.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Associate Professor	26	49.1%	27	50.9%	6	11.3%	3	5.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	43	81.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Assistant Professor	11	55.0%	9	45.0%	2	10.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Auxiliary Faculty																		
Auxiliary Faculty	32	32.0%	68	68.0%	4	4.0%	4	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	85	85.0%	0	0.0%	7	7.0%
Graduate Associates																		
Teaching (GTA)	41	31.8%	88	68.2%	16	12.4%	20	15.5%	0	0.0%	7	5.4%	73	56.6%	4	3.1%	9	7.0%
Research (GRA)	17	27.0%	76	73.0%	5	7.9%	4	22.2%	0	0.0%	5	7.9%	33	52.4%	3	4.8%	3	4.8%
Administrative (GAA)	22	25.6%	64	74.4%	9	10.5%	22	25.6%	2	2.3%	4	4.7%	43	50.0%	1	1.2%	5	5.8%
Staff																		
Academic Leadership	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Executive, Administrative	12	32.4%	25	67.6%	3	8.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.7%	31	83.8%	0	0.0%	2	5.4%
Professional	50	34.5%	95	65.5%	6	4.1%	6	4.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	126	86.9%	0	0.0%	7	4.8%
Clerical, Secretarial	5	7.5%	62	92.5%	11	16.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%	53	79.1%	1	1.5%	1	1.5%
Paraprofessional, Technical	11	57.9%	8	42.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	94.7%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%

Note: Each individual is counted only once, according to main University function, with the following exceptions: Faculty who have administrative appointments at chair level and above appear within their TTU in the appropriate faculty rank and also appear within the Academic Leadership category in the unit of their main administrative appointment.

Office of Human Resources
Information and Technology Services

Diversity Data for
Faculty and Staff
Unit Level Statistics

Summary: Combined Colleges of Education and Human Ecology 2005

Combined data from Part 1. Section A - University Diversity Demographics as of 4/30/2005

	Gender				Race/Ethnicity								Undisclosed							
	Male		Female		Black		Asian		Am Ind.		Hispanic		White		Other		Undisclosed			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Regular Faculty																				
Professor	24	51.1%	23	48.9%	3	6.4%	3	6.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	41	87.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Associate Professor	34	47.2%	38	52.8%	7	9.7%	4	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	60	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Assistant Professor	16	55.2%	13	44.8%	2	6.9%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.5%	24	82.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Auxiliary Faculty																				
Auxiliary Faculty	35	30.7%	79	69.3%	5	4.4%	4	3.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	98	86.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	6.2%
Graduate Associates																				
Teaching (GTA)	46	28.1%	118	72.0%	19	12.0%	38	23.2%	0	0.0%	7	4.3%	85	51.8%	4	2.4%	11	6.7%		
Research (GRA)	19	14.8%	109	85.2%	9	10.2%	12	13.6%	0	0.0%	5	5.7%	47	53.4%	6	6.8%	9	10.2%		
Administrative (GAA)	24	25.0%	72	75.0%	9	9.4%	23	24.0%	2	2.1%	4	4.2%	50	52.1%	1	1.0%	7	7.3%		
Staff																				
Academic Leadership Executive,	8	72.7%	3	27.3%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Administrative Professional	17	32.7%	35	67.3%	5	9.6%	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	42	80.8%	0	0.0%	2	3.9%		
Clerical, Secretarial	62	32.6%	128	67.4%	6	3.2%	9	4.7%	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	166	87.4%	0	0.0%	7	3.7%		
Paraprofessional, Technical	7	8.3%	77	91.7%	14	16.7%	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	63	75.0%	1	1.2%	4	4.8%		
	12	57.1%	9	42.9%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	90.5%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%		

Diversity Data for Students

Summary: HUMAN ECOLOGY 2005

		Race/Ethnicity												Total			
Gender		Female		Black		Asian		Am Ind		Hispanic		White		Non-Resident Alien		Unknown	
Male	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students																	
Undergraduate	29.1%	1,665	70.9%	217	9.2%	92	3.9%	10	0.4%	49	2.1%	1,915	81.5%	37	1.6%	30	1.3%
Graduate	15.6%	81	84.4%	9	9.4%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	51	53.1%	34	35.4%	1	1.0%
Professional																	

Summary: COLLEGE OF EDUCATION 2005

		Race/Ethnicity												Total			
Gender		Female		Black		Asian		Am Ind		Hispanic		White		Non-Resident Alien		Unknown	
Male	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students																	
Undergraduate	50.7%	372	49.3%	48	6.4%	12	1.6%	2	0.3%	15	2.0%	644	85.3%	16	2.1%	18	2.4%
Graduate	27.1%	1,161	72.9%	169	10.6%	34	2.1%	5	0.3%	22	1.4%	1,123	70.5%	162	10.2%	77	4.8%
Professional																	

Summary: COMBINED DATA, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY 2005

		Race/Ethnicity												Total			
Gender		Female		Black		Asian		Am Ind		Hispanic		White		Non-Resident Alien		Unknown	
Male	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students																	
Undergraduate	34.4%	2,037	65.6%	265	8.5%	104	3.3%	12	0.4%	64	2.1%	2,559	82.4%	53	1.7%	48	1.5%
Graduate	26.4%	1,242	73.6%	178	10.5%	35	2.1%	5	0.3%	22	1.3%	1,174	69.5%	196	11.6%	78	4.6%
Professional																	

Summary: TOTAL COLUMBUS CAMPUS 2005

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity										Total						
	Male		Black		Asian		Am Ind		Hispanic		White			Non-Resident Alien		Unknown			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		
Students																			
Undergraduate	19,644	52.5%	17,767	47.5%	2,852	7.6%	2,011	5.4%	153	0.4%	930	2.5%	29,455	78.7%	1,186	3.2%	824	2.2%	37,411
Graduate	4,440	45.2%	5,384	54.8%	554	5.6%	291	3.0%	34	0.3%	167	1.7%	5,723	58.3%	2,565	26.1%	490	5.0%	9,824
Professional	1,576	48.2%	1,693	51.8%	162	5.0%	339	10.4%	15	0.5%	61	1.9%	2,367	72.4%	48	1.5%	277	8.5%	3,269

Summary: TOTAL ALL CAMPUSES 2005

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity										Total						
	Male		Black		Asian		Am Ind		Hispanic		White			Non-Resident Alien		Unknown			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		
Students																			
Undergraduate	22,726	51.3%	21,581	48.7%	3,167	7.1%	2,118	4.8%	183	0.4%	1,013	2.3%	35,668	80.5%	1,202	2.7%	956	2.2%	44,307
Graduate	4,488	44.1%	5,684	55.9%	562	5.5%	293	2.9%	34	0.3%	168	1.7%	6,048	59.5%	2,567	25.2%	500	4.9%	10,172
Professional	1,576	48.2%	1,693	51.8%	162	5.0%	339	10.4%	15	0.5%	61	1.9%	2,367	72.4%	48	1.5%	277	8.5%	3,269

(l) An analysis of the impact on the academic freedom and responsibility of all affected faculty.

The academic freedom and responsibility of the faculty in these two colleges will not be adversely affected by the merger of these units. There will be no fundamental changes in the responsibilities of the faculty. The distribution of effort (across teaching, research, and service) is similar within both colleges. Each college has a long-standing commitment to a balanced approach to teaching, research, and service.

The college will provide opportunities for interdisciplinary scholarship, but the faculty will maintain the choice to pursue these opportunities, or not. There is nothing inherent within the proposed new structure that would adversely impact academic freedom.

A larger College will require more structured faculty governance. The faculty have already made changes to the existing governance structure of the College of Education (e.g., the College Council and its by-laws) to accommodate the merger. As stated in a previous response, this governance was more structured than that used in Human Ecology and the faculty agreed that a more formalized structure would be necessary in a larger college.

APPENDIX A

PROCESS PROPOSAL TO EXPLORE A MERGER OF
THE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN ECOLOGY
AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITYProposal and Rationale

The Colleges of Education and Human Ecology at The Ohio State University have a long history of excellence. Both colleges are perennially ranked among the very best in the nation.¹ This document is a proposal outlining a process to be used to consider merging these two colleges. Collectively, we own this decision.

Should the Colleges decide to merge, the resulting college would be one of the largest, most highly ranked colleges at The Ohio State University. These two highly ranked colleges have compatible and complementary missions. The stated purpose of the College of Human Ecology is "to contribute to the well-being of individuals, families, and communities and the effective functioning of systems that serve these entities, through the generation and dissemination of knowledge, the education of professionals, and the provision of research-based *educational programs*." Similarly, the College of Education states a purpose to "*promote outstanding teaching [and] research...that impacts and influences our global society in meaningful ways...[through] preparing educators, researchers, and practitioners to inspire, develop, promote, implement, and evaluate learning that is essential to a successful society.*" Furthermore, the primary objective of the College of Education "*is to ensure that our graduates are prepared to be leaders and collaborators in a changing and diverse world as they work in educational, health, community, social, cultural, sport, employment, and government settings in the United States and abroad.*"

The shared purpose of the two colleges is centered on strengthening individuals, families, schools, and communities. While strengthening education and learning within the broadest, most diverse context is a shared purpose, there is additional overlap in a commitment to promoting environments that stimulate holistic development. Whether we are focusing on physical, social-emotional, or cognitive development, the complex role of contributing factors in the near environment is important to both colleges. Improved quality of life in our communities is contingent upon a holistic approach that encompasses a focus on education, the nurturance of multiple domains of development, and increased access to appropriate goods and services.

Together, the Colleges of Education and Human Ecology at The Ohio State University serve over 3,000 undergraduate students and more than 2,500 graduate students. Over 10% of the total student body at The Ohio State University is enrolled in one of these two colleges. During this past academic year, the two colleges awarded a combined total of 2,081 degrees. This total was exceeded only by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (2,280 degrees awarded). Size, especially the size of the student body, is important in a responsibility-based budgeting system in which the primary driver of revenue is student credit hours. The combined balance in undergraduate and graduate education also enhances the combined strength of the two colleges.

The long-standing national reputations of Education and Human Ecology, the synergy of mission and purpose, and the fact that the combined unit would be one of the largest colleges at OSU are clearly enough to justify serious consideration of a merger. The following process and timeline is offered to structure our deliberations and decision-making.

¹ The College of Education has been ranked as high as #3 in the nation by *U.S. News and World Report* and currently stands at #20. The College of Human Ecology has been consistently ranked as #1 in size and stature by both the FAIS Report and the *Gourman Report* (FAIS is produced annually by USDA; the *Gourman Report* is no longer published). The *U.S. News and World Report* does not have a category that encompasses Colleges of Human Ecology/Human Science.

Process and Timeline

The proposal to consider combining the College of Human Ecology with the College of Education to create a new college at The Ohio State University is stated in this document along with a process and timeline for deliberations and decision-making. This document has been reviewed and is supported by the Executive Vice-President and Provost and the administrative teams of both colleges. The document will be shared with all faculty and staff in early October.

A two-phased approach will be used to deliberate and decide upon a new structure. In Phase I, faculty and staff will address the basic question of whether or not the programs in the two colleges should be combined under the same administrative structure to create a new college. In essence, should we merge?

Once this question is answered, a specific proposal will be developed to merge the colleges keeping departments and schools relatively in tact. Should a new college be created, Phase II would be initiated. In phase two, a more introspective look at the structure of the new college would be undertaken. New school and department structures may, or may not, result from this more comprehensive and detailed inspection of structure. Phase I will be completed during the 2005-2006 academic year, and should a combined college result from this phase, Phase II would be conducted over the course of the next two academic years.

Phase I: In this phase, the advantages and disadvantages of merging the two colleges will be explored. Data will be compiled and presented to faculty, staff and students, and we will create multiple opportunities to discuss and debate the merits of this information. Face-to-face and electronic venues for deliberation will be established.

We will address the basic question of whether or not the current programs within the two colleges should be combined. The initial assumption of this process is that departments (Human Ecology) and schools (Education) would stay largely in tact during this first phase and that they would all be included in this new administrative structure. However, specific proposals for beneficial structural changes for schools and departments may originate from faculty groups or program areas and may be considered in this phase. Departments and programs always have the option of exploring other affiliations and structure. This option is available at all times, not just when major restructuring proposals are being considered. Faculty will be encouraged to explore their full range of options, but every faculty member and current program within the two colleges will be welcome to join the new unit. Any proposal to move a school, department, or program elsewhere would require full support of the faculty in the college that is losing the program as well as the faculty in the college that is receiving the program.

If there is faculty support for a merger (as determined by vote), with schools and departments staying largely intact through Phase I, the supported proposal will be forwarded through the official university approval process as per **Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 Alteration or abolition of units**. Support for a merger of the two colleges will be assessed at program, department, school, and college levels with disaggregated and aggregated tallies of votes. A complete profile of the support, or lack thereof, will be presented and discussed prior to the submission of a final proposal for university approval.

Phase II: Should Phase I lead to a new college that combines the programs of the Colleges of Education and Human Ecology, the faculty of the two colleges would be asked to explore the resulting structure (presumably three schools and three departments), to determine whether or not structural changes are necessary and would strengthen the programs within. The same consultative decision making process used in Phase I, will be used in Phase II.

Should there be a decision at the end of Phase I that the two colleges will remain separate, the faculty of each college would move into Phase II independently. An internal inspection of the structure of programs within the College of Education should occur regardless of the outcome of Phase I.

Timeline:

Fall Quarter 2005:

- The proposal outlining the process and timeline (this document) will be presented to faculty, staff, and students in early October.
- Multiple formal opportunities for discussion and feedback on the initial proposal will be scheduled and conducted in October and early November. Discussions will be scheduled with faculty, staff, students, alumni, and other friends and supporters of both colleges.
- A revised proposal will be developed and distributed in December. This proposal will outline the units/programs that will be part of the new college and provide more detail on the proposed structure of a new college. This document will address all requirements outlined in **Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 Alteration or abolition of units**. Should there be units/programs that prefer to align with another college; the details of this alignment will be presented in this new document.

Winter Quarter 2006:

- Formal discussions of the revised proposal will be conducted and any final modifications made in January.
- In February, faculty and staff will vote on the proposed merger. Faculty votes are required by university rule. Staff votes will be taken and tallied separately.
- Support for a merger would lead to a formal proposal to the provost and the University Senate in March. This proposal would include a decision on the name, or naming options, of the proposed new college.

Spring Quarter 2006

- Proposal for Phase I will move through the central approval processes.

Fall Quarter 2006

- Phase II will begin in either the new college or independently in the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology. Phase II will last for up to two years. The goal of Phase II is to create the optimal internal structure for the new college.

On the Decision-Making Process

Multiple open discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of structural changes will occur prior to any formal decisions being made. Input on the venues and format for these discussions will be solicited. Faculty votes will be the primary mechanism for determining support for, or against, any given proposal. **Faculty Rule 3335-3-37** clearly indicates that faculty votes must be reported as part of any proposal to restructure that is forwarded through the university approval process. While faculty votes are the only requirement for moving a restructuring proposal through the university approval process, the support of staff, students, and alumni is equally important to the long-term success of any restructuring effort. Consequently, input from staff, students, and alumni will be solicited and assessed.

Proposals to change structure rarely receive unanimous approval but should have very strong, widespread support before being considered. All voices will be heard and attempts will be made to honestly address all questions that are raised. We will openly report aggregated and disaggregated faculty votes and other constituent feedback from the college, schools, and

departments. Should there be strong support from multiple stakeholder groups, proposals will be forwarded to the university through the formal approval process.

Attempts to push unwanted or unnecessary structural changes through a large, complex system are both painful and largely unsuccessful. We should have no interest in such endeavors. If the results of our discussions of structural change are positive, productive, and energizing, a proposal to bring these two strong colleges together will emerge. If not, we will move forward independently to strengthen the wonderful programs in each college.

Appendix B

DRAFT

**College of Education and Human Ecology
Pattern of Administration**

PREAMBLE

The College of Education and Human Ecology (EHE) is comprised of six academic units, three schools and three departments. These tenure initiating units (TIU) are the School of Educational Policy and Leadership, the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services, School of Teaching and Learning, the Department of Consumer Sciences, the Department of Human Development and Family Science, and the Department of Human Nutrition. The academic leaders of the schools are Directors. The academic leaders of departments are Department Chairs. There are no departments within schools and Department Chairs and School Directors report directly to the Dean.

This Pattern of Administration (POA) is intended to enhance the intellectual, productive, professional, and efficient work environment for faculty, staff, and students. A major objective of this document is to provide principles and procedures that facilitate the professional and personal successes of the faculty and staff of the college. The principles in this document are equally applicable to the three schools, three departments and other affiliated organizations of the College of Education and Human Ecology. They serve to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Dean and other college administrators, the faculty, the staff, and the School Directors and Department Chairs. These principles explain how the schools and departments relate to each other and the college as a whole.

The POA, combined with the approved Bylaws of the College, and the College Promotion and Tenure Document represent the predominant policies, principles, and practices for administration and governance of the College of Education and Human Ecology. This document is designed to facilitate better communication among faculty, staff, and students and will allow for the smooth and efficient administration of the College.

The College POA was developed from existing POAs from the former independent Colleges of Education and Human Ecology. A draft of the POA has been reviewed collectively and approved independently by faculty previously organized under the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology. Staff members of both Colleges have also reviewed the document and provided feedback. Likewise the document has been reviewed and approved by the College Council of the College of Education and the leadership teams of both the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology. The final version of a POA for a new College of Education and Human Ecology will need to be approved by the newly constituted leadership teams, College Council, and joined faculty that is outlined in this document and is subject to the approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

This document provides a description of the College of Education and Human Ecology, its organizational structure, and references formal policies and procedures of the college. The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) policies and College of Education and Human Ecology policies are referred to as appropriate (e.g. fiscal policies, compensation policies, leave policies). This document supplements the Rules of the University Faculty, the Office of Human Resources Policies, and other policies and procedures of the University and the State of Ohio. Those rules, policies and procedures, and changes in them, take precedence over statements in this document (i.e., university and State of Ohio policies/procedures and laws prevail). Each school and

department is required to have a pattern of administration. The College POA clarifies the academic responsibilities and decision-making authority of the Dean as the administrative head of the college. It also clarifies the relationship of the Dean's office to the Schools and Departments and their leadership. The School/Department and College of Education and Human Ecology POA documents are intended to complement and support each other. The schools'/departments' POA documents are referenced as appropriate throughout.

The College Pattern of Administration is subject to continuing revision. It should be reviewed and revised or reaffirmed on appointment or reappointment of the College Dean. However, revisions may be made at any time. The dean can make changes or additions, after full consultation with the Dean's Executive Leadership Team and College Council and designated committees, as appropriate. Substantive changes in the POA will require faculty approval. Changes must be consistent with policies and practices outlined in the College Bylaws. Any changes in the POA will be noted and will be disseminated to faculty and staff and the POA will be updated on the College web site as changes are made. A revised document will be reaffirmed according the procedures previously noted.

COLLEGE MISSION, VISION, AND CORE VALUES

The mission of the College of Education and Human Ecology is to build upon a tradition of excellence in promoting outstanding teaching, research, and service that significantly and positively impacts individuals, families, schools, and consumers within our global communities. The mission simultaneously embraces the land-grant mission of The Ohio State University as expressed in its Academic, Diversity, and Outreach plans.

Our vision is to lead institutional efforts to extend and improve lifelong learning and lifespan development toward improved quality of life across our diverse society. We aspire to be a center of excellence in research and scholarly programs focusing on the complex issues affecting individuals, families, schools, and consumers in our global communities.

Purpose and Content: Within the above stated mission and vision, the purpose of the College is to prepare educators, researchers, and practitioners to inspire, develop, promote, implement and critically evaluate the lifelong learning and lifespan development that is essential to the equitable success of domestic and global societies. The primary objective is to ensure that our graduates are prepared to be ethical and innovative leaders and collaborators in a changing and diverse world as they work in education, business and industry, health, community, social, cultural, sport, leisure, hospitality, employment, and government settings in the United States and abroad.

The content emphasis in instruction, research, and service is directed to the human ecosystem as it is concerned with the well-being and interdependence of individuals, families and social groups and specifically in regard to a) their aesthetic, functional, educational, economic, and social environment; b) their cognitive, physiological and psychosocial development; and c) their effective management of resources.

Core Values

The College derives its mission and vision from a set of seven core values. These values influence college relationships and decisions as it relates to faculty, staff, and student appointments and reviews, policy formation and implementation, and overall decision making.

- a) **Research:** The College is committed to the production and critical interpretation of high quality research and the notion that this high level of inquiry supports all of our activities. Research is interrelated with theory development, practice, pedagogy, community relations and all aspects of professional development.
- b) **Educating Professionals:** The College is committed to the highest quality preparation of professional educators, researchers, practitioners, and leaders to assume positions in

schools, universities, communities, business and industry, and government and private/public organizations whose primary purposes are consistent with the mission of the College.

- c) **Diversity and Equity:** The College is committed to equity and to celebrating and learning from our diversity as reflected in local, national and global demographics.
- d) **Collaboration:** The College is committed to formulating networks with and for professional and community based constituencies and fostering integrated and interdisciplinary activities among and between faculty and professionals.
- e) **Professional Development:** The College is deeply committed to improving the capacity of faculty and staff as exemplars of professional practice and actively supports the continued professional development of its faculty and staff.
- f) **Policy Formulation:** The College is committed to informing and interpreting policy to improve quality of life and guide professional practice.
- g) **Technology:** The College is committed to the innovative and relevant integration of technology into our programs, the preparation of students in and about technology and to developing, promoting and monitoring policies pertaining to the relationship between professional programs and technology to ensure excellence.
- h) **Land-Grant Mission:** The College is committed to serving the state of Ohio through the land-grant mission.

COLLEGE APPOINTMENTS

Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments

Regular Faculty

The college faculty is organized into six Tenure Initiating Units (TIUs) - three schools, and three departments. Regular faculty are faculty who hold 50% or more salaried appointments in one of the six TIUs: The Department of Consumer Sciences, the Department of Human Development and Family Science, the Department of Human Nutrition, The School of Educational Policy and Leadership, The School of Physical Activity and Educational Services, and The School of Teaching and Learning. Only Regular Faculty members (see College Bylaws for definition) of each TIU are eligible to vote. Auxiliary faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

The budget (i.e., salary and benefits) for a faculty position reverts to the College following a faculty resignation, retirement, or termination. Regular faculty position requests are presented to the Executive Leadership Team by the School Directors and Department Chairs following input from their faculty as per the School's/Department's Pattern of Administration. Decisions on regular faculty positions are the purview of the Dean following consultation by the School Director and Department Chairs and with input from the entire Executive Leadership Team. Program quality, research productivity, student enrollments, and centrality of program to College and School/Department priorities will influence these decisions.

Faculty appointments are recommended by the School Directors and Department Chairs to the Dean along with information about the search and faculty support for the appointment. The Dean's recommendation for appointment is submitted to OAA and the Board of Trustees (see the Faculty Search Policies for details on this process). The Dean signs all letters of offer.

Letters of offer for regional campus faculty are signed by the regional campus Dean and appropriate School Director or Department Chair. Candidates should be interviewed by the regional campus Dean, School Director or Department Chair, Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the search committee and should meet with representation of both

faculties.

Joint Appointments

A joint faculty appointment is defined as one in which a faculty member has a compensated FTE appointment in two or more tenure initiating units. In this case, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the colleges and their school/department is developed using the template developed by OAA. The School Director or Department Chair with the approval of the Dean will establish memorandums of understanding for appointments where a non-TIU such as an academic center provides part of the funding for a faculty appointment but such MOUs do not require OAA approval. (Refer to http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/ii_facjointappt.html for specific guidance on this process).

Auxiliary Faculty Appointments

Auxiliary faculty are those faculty who hold adjunct appointments or those holding appointments at less than 50% FTE in a School/Department. Adjuncts are non-compensated appointments whereas auxiliary faculty with a less than 50% FTE can be paid appointments. Neither appointment includes voting privileges on college matters.

Compensated Auxiliary Appointments are for persons holding a visiting professor position (at the rank of instructor, assistant, associate, and full professor) renewable annually for up to a maximum of three years. Appointments are recommended by School Directors or Department Chairs and approved by the Dean. The School Director/Department Chair signs the Letter of offer with pre-approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The titles of lecturer and senior lecturer shall be used for compensated instructional appointments where other titles are not appropriate. Lecturers' responsibilities shall be limited to formal course instruction.

Uncompensated Adjunct and Courtesy Appointments Uncompensated adjunct appointments are available. These are no-salary appointments at the adjunct instructor, assistant, associate, or full professor rank. The rank should be comparable to the credentials/qualifications of the School/Department faculty. Adjunct appointments are initiated by the Director/Department Chair and approved by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. These appointments are renewed annually. A statement of the actual services to be performed by the adjunct faculty member and an updated vita are presented with the request. The Director or Chair should establish formal expectations for adjunct appointments. Adjunct appointments should be discontinued when expectations are not met.

A regular faculty member may hold a courtesy appointment in one or more departments/schools outside of their TIU. That appointment is made with the faculty member's regular title.

Emeritus Appointments Emeritus faculty are persons who have served the university with distinction, are regular faculty at the time of their retirement, and who were recommended by the Director or Chair, the Dean, and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Resources, and to the Board of Trustees for emeritus status. Office space is provided at the discretion of the School, Department, or College as appropriate.

Requests for faculty emeritus status originate with the Director or Chair and should be directed to the Dean. The written request should include a copy of the faculty member's retirement letter and a short statement of justification including effective date of emeritus status.

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION AND DECISION-MAKING

Policy and program decisions are made in a number of ways: by the college faculty as a whole, by standing or special committees of the College Council, or by the Dean and School Directors/Department Chairs. College governance proceeds on the general principle that widespread informed agreement on a decision is the first priority. Open discussions, both formal and informal, constitute the primary means of reaching consensus on decisions of central importance. When consensus is not achieved on issues requiring faculty approval, such approval is determined by majority rule.

Dean

The Dean serves as the executive officer of the College. The Dean is responsible for the exercise of the powers and responsibilities vested in the office by the Ohio State University Board of Trustees, the President of the University, and by the Executive Vice President and Provost as per University Faculty Rule 3335-3-29. The Dean is given authority to carry out the responsibilities of the position. The Dean may delegate any of her/his responsibility and authority to another member of the faculty of the college. The Dean shall be a voting member of the faculty of each school/department per university rule 3335-3-29-4c. As per Faculty Rule 3335-3-29 B1-4 (quoted in italics):

The Dean is appointed and re-appointed by the Board of Trustees upon nomination of the President. Before making this nomination or recommendation for reappointment, the President shall confer with members of the College of Education and Human Ecology faculty and shall give substantial weight to faculty recommendations in reaching a decision. The President shall also consider the recommendations of the Directors of the schools and Chairs of departments.

The major responsibility of the Dean is to provide active leadership in the promotion, direction and support of educational and research activities of the university, in the maintenance of a high level of morale among faculty, and in the encouragement of a spirit of learning among students (Refer to University Rules 3335-329). In addition the Dean shall have general administrative responsibility for the programs of the college, subject to the approval of the President and the Board of Trustees. These administrative responsibilities include the duty:

~ (1) To preside at meetings of the college faculty and appoint all college committees unless their membership has been designated by faculty rule or by the college faculty.

~ (2) To approve courses of study for students in the college, to warn students who are delinquent in their studies and to recommend appropriate student disciplinary action to the appropriate university disciplinary body or official.

~ (3) To present candidates for degrees to the President on behalf of the college faculty and to serve as a member of the Council of Deans (see rule 3335-3-22 of the Administrative Code).

~ (4) To make recommendations to the executive vice president and provost concerning the college budget, and appointments to and promotions within the staff and the membership of the college faculty following consultation with the Directors of the Schools, Chairs of Departments, and faculty within the college.

Associate Deans

The College has four Associate Deans to carry out the services of the College. These persons are appointed pursuant to the procedures outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-5-02 of the Administrative Code, serve a four year term subject to reappointment, and report to the Dean. Each has responsibilities and authorities as delegated to them by the Dean. These appointments are subject to continuing satisfactory performance. During the last year of the Associate Dean's term, a formal review is conducted in consultation with faculty and staff.

Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs is the chief academic officer of the College and provides leadership to all academic programs and activities of the College. This position has responsibility for coordinating academic programs, curriculum development and implementation, instructional quality, accreditation and licensure, the College Honors Program, and academic support services for faculty and students. The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the staff reporting to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs works with School Directors and Department Chairs to recruit students, follow-up graduates, award scholarship, and enhance student leadership.

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs serves as a member of the Executive Leadership Team, reports to the Dean, and represents the authority of the Dean, as delegated, in the Dean's absence. In addition, the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs works collaboratively with the appropriate College Council committees including, but not limited to, the College Curriculum and Personnel Committees.

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs assures that College and unit level structures are in place to support faculty, their productivity, and their career advancement. The position assists the Dean, Directors, and Chairs in promotion and tenure processes, and all other faculty affairs.

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs works with the Office of Technology and the Technology Committee to assure that the College goals and values associated with integrated technology are achieved. The Director of the Office of Technology reports to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

In addition, the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs works with School Directors and Department Chairs to assure the high quality provision of academic advising and assistance to prospective students and their families, the availability of career and placement services for students and alumni, and the coordination of certification and licensure processing.

Associate Dean for Research

The Associate Dean for Research provides leadership to the College's research programs and serves as a liaison to campus research administration/activities. The Associate Dean for Research creates and supports a research culture and environment to enable faculty, research personnel, and center staff to expand their research, scholarship, and grant success. The position is responsible for increasing external funding, supporting and improving research productivity, increasing the college's research rankings and visibility, and enhancing communication and dialogue concerning research. The Associate Dean for Research serves on the Executive Leadership Team, reports to the Dean, and works closely with the College Council Research and Graduate Education Committee.

Associate Dean for Research has responsibility for implementing a full service support system for the development and submission of internal and external grants to support the College mission. Such service should include pre-award support with specific emphasis on proposal development and submission, and human/animal subjects IRB approvals. The services should also include liaison support for interactions with the Office of Research and the OSU Research Foundation.

College Centers with a primary mission of conducting research report to the Associate Dean for Research and are supported by the human resources and fiscal services of the Office of Administration and Planning. Centers reporting to the Associate Dean for Research currently include the Center for Family Research, Center for Special Needs Population, and the Center for Education Training and Employment (CETE).

Associate Dean for Outreach and Engagement

The Associate Dean for Outreach and Engagement provides leadership to teaching, research/creative work, and service activities that directly benefit external audiences and clientele. This includes providing leadership to a full range of extended professional development activities and outreach/engagement to the citizens of Ohio. Duties include, but are not limited to, leading the Family and Consumer Sciences Extension program and representing the College in OSU Extension leadership activities, serving as the primary contact with Columbus Public Schools and other Ohio school districts (including exchange of services and field placement support), working with Schools and Departments within the College to coordinate off-campus research and professional development activities including the Weinland Park project and the Metro School.

The Associate Dean for Outreach and Engagement represents the College at university and community outreach and engagement activities and creates a culture of involvement consistent with the philosophy of the contemporary land-grant institution.

College Centers with a primary mission of providing training, technical support, curricular materials and professional development report to the Associate Dean for Outreach and Engagement and are supported by the human resources and fiscal services of the Office of Administration and Planning. These currently include the Center for Learning Excellence, Ohio Resource Center, and the Ohio Collaborative. The Dean will remain involved as indicated in the charters and by-laws of specific centers.

Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban, and International Affairs

The Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban, and International Affairs administers programs that promote the value of individual talents and unique cultural perspectives. This position also helps focus the College efforts on our most challenging societal issues while maintaining a global orientation and diverse cross-cultural perspectives.

More specifically, this position oversees the efforts of College's Office of Equity and Diversity and the Office of International Affairs. In addition, this office will chart the course and provide leadership to the College's priorities in improving Urban Education and the development of high risk populations through holistic approaches to strengthening families and communities.

The Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban, and International Affairs will work closely with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, the International Affairs and Equity and Diversity Committees of the College Council, and the Dean to expand awareness of, and equity for, the unique cultural contributions of all members of our global society.

The Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban and International Affairs works closely with search committees and makes recommendations to the Dean related to interviewing and hiring potential faculty members.

School Directors and Department Chairs

The college has three schools led by school directors, and three departments led by department chairs: School of Educational Policy and Leadership (Ed P&L), School of Teaching and Learning (T&L), and School of Physical Activity and Educational Services (PAES), the Department of Consumer Sciences (CS), the Department of Human Development and Family Science (HDFS), the Department of Human Nutrition (HN). The School Directors and Department Chairs are appointed by the dean (with input from the TIU faculty and the Dean's Executive Leadership Team) and subject to the formal approval of the provost, president, and the Board of Trustees. The Director of a school or Chair of a department performs a dual function. In addition to being the administrative head of the unit, the director or chair represents the faculty of the unit in interactions with the dean or others in the university administration. The duties of directors and chairs (as per Faculty Rule 33353-35) include (quote from Rule in italics):

~ (1) To have general administrative responsibility for its program, subject to the approval of the dean of the college.

~ (2) To develop in consultation with the faculty a pattern of administration.

~ (3) To prepare, after consultation with the faculty and in accordance with the pattern of departmental administration, a statement setting forth the criteria and procedures according to which recommendations are made concerning appointments and/or dismissals, salary adjustments, promotions in rank, and matters affecting the tenure of the faculty.

~ (4) To operate the business of the department or school with efficiency and dispatch.

~ (5) To plan with the members of the faculty and the dean of the college a progressive program.

(6) To recommend to the dean of the college, after consultation with the faculty in accordance with paragraph (C)(3) of this rule, appointments, promotions, dismissals, and matters affecting the tenure of members of the department or school faculty.

The Dean, following consultation with faculty, determines whether the Director or Chair is to be drawn from the faculty within the unit, usually following an internal search; is to be selected following a national search; or is to be selected in some other way. The Dean appoints search committees for School Directors and Department Chairs. The Dean determines the terms of appointment in light of the needs of the School or Department, circumstances of the person to be appointed, and any other relevant considerations including Office of Academic Affairs compensation policies (Refer to http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/i_chairdir.html for details). School Directors and Department Chairs report to the Dean and serve on the Dean's Executive Leadership Team. School Directors and Department Chairs typically serve four-year terms. Reappointment of Directors/Chairs will follow a review in the final year of the contract that will include input from faculty and staff and the Dean's Executive Leadership Team.

College Offices

Several College offices support the mission of the college. These offices are organized to facilitate the professional and personal successes of faculty, staff, students, and external constituents. This overarching objective is to assure the highest quality programs of instruction and research and optimum service to students, faculty, and our external constituencies. The organization of central support and the appointment of leadership to these support functions are determined by the Dean in consultation with the College Council, and the Executive Leadership Team. Leadership of these support systems will be provided by an Assistant Dean or a Director, with the title designated at the discretion of the Dean, in consultation with the College Council and Executive Leadership Team and consistent with university rules and personnel policy.

Associate Deans may also label their operations as "Offices". In such cases the Associate Dean will have authority over the structure of the office and its operations in consultation with the Dean and the appropriate College Council committees.

Office of Administration and Planning

This office provides administrative support and institutional planning for the College its Schools and Departments. The office manages the financial and human resource operations of the college in a way that promotes the college's core values by initiating innovative ways of increasing and more efficiently utilizing essential resources in the delivery of high quality academic, research and public services.

The Office of Administration and Planning provides support to College, School, and Department administrators and staff in the development of business plans for program expansion. The office oversees the collection, analysis, reporting of institutional data (including fiscal and non-fiscal), and supports the strategic planning efforts of the College and its units. The office is responsible for enhancing and assuring stewardship of college funds, supporting

sound financial and human resource administration and processes, and compliance with University internal controls and State of Ohio legal provisions as delegated by the University

This office is charged with establishing a system to provide human resources and fiscal support for College centers in collaboration with the Associate Dean to which the centers are assigned (Associate Dean for Research or the Associate Dean for Outreach and Engagement). Policies and procedures related to the use of resources secured by the college are administered but not determined by this office. This office supports and works closely with the College Council Personnel Committee and Budget and Finance Committee to develop, institute, and regularly review College human resources and fiscal policy. The Director of the Office of Administration and Planning is a member of the Executive Leadership Team and reports to the Dean. The office also serves as the fiscal and human resources support for the central administration units of the Colleges.

Office of Advancement and External Relations

This office leads initiatives related to development, internal and external communications, alumni relations and special events. Its mission is to support the academic excellence of the College of Education and Human Ecology through enhancement of the college's reputation and resources. This office works closely with schools and departments to support their advancement and external relations goals. In addition the office coordinates its activities with university offices in development, communications, government relations, and the OSU Alumni Association. The Director of the Office of Advancement and External Relations reports to the Dean and the Vice President for Development and is a member of the Executive Leadership Team.

Office of Equity and Diversity

This office provides leadership to the College in its efforts to promote critical inquiry, diverse and dynamic teaching, and further those social changes that promote and value the individual talents and unique cultural perspectives of all members of our society.

A Director for Equity and Diversity oversees the activities of the Office of Equity and Diversity, facilitates the activity of the Diversity Coordinators, and has responsibility for equity and diversity initiatives for students, staff, and faculty of the college. This office supports and works closely with the College Council's Equity and Diversity committee. The Director for Equity and Diversity reports to the Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban, and International Affairs who, in turn, is a member of the Executive Leadership Team.

Office of International Programs

This office develops, implements, and evaluates programs and activities for students, faculty, and staff that promote global awareness. Such activities include, but are not limited to enhancing study abroad opportunities, establishing and maintaining faculty exchange programs, developing new international service-learning opportunities, facilitating international research activity, and enhancing global awareness through academic programs.

A Director of International Programs oversees this office and reports to the Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban, and International Affairs who, in turn, is a member of the Executive Leadership Team.

Office of Technology

The mission of the office is to coordinate the full range of technology resources used by faculty, staff, and students. The specific goals of the office are to support technology research and education; to provide facilities, infrastructure, and programming for building technology capacity; to provide a link with university, community, state, and national initiatives; and to

plan strategically for future growth. The Office of Technology reports to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Office of the Dean

The Office of the Dean provides administrative and clerical support to the Dean and supports the overall administration of the College. The office coordinates the Dean's representation of the College with internal external audiences through managing the Dean's schedule and assistance with communications and correspondence.

COLLEGE COMMITTEES

The College has five standing committees appointed by the Dean, seven committees organized under the College Council, and three advisory Committees. In addition, the College jointly administers the University Teacher Education Council with The Ohio State University Office of Academic Affairs.

The Five Standing Committees of the College Are:

1. Executive Leadership Team

The Executive Leadership Team advises the Dean on administrative matters, assists with coordination of activities in the College, and serves as the primary liaison between the Dean and the Schools/Departments. The thirteen member Executive Leadership Team consists of the Directors of the three Schools and Chairs of the three Departments, the four Associate Deans, the Director of the Office of Administration and Planning, the Director of the Office of Advancement and External Affairs, and the Chair of the College Council. In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-5-15, the Dean serves as Chair of the Executive Committee.

2. Faculty Salary Appeals Committee

The salary appeals committee exists solely for the purpose of reviewing faculty salary appeals. The Personnel Committee of the College Council shall serve as the Faculty Salary and Appeals Committee and will be called into action as needed. See the by-laws of the College for Personnel Committee responsibilities and membership. For specific procedures refer to the OAA web page (http://oaa.ohiostate.edu/handbook/xii_salaryprocess.html).

3. Investigation Committee

The purpose of the College Investigation Committee (as per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) is to review formal complaints against regular and auxiliary faculty. In consultation with the College Council Chair, the Dean shall appoint from each of the Schools/Departments two tenured faculty members, one as a committee member and the other as alternate, to the College of Education and Human Ecology Investigation Committee. A member of the committee and an alternate shall be appointed from a sister professional college for a term of one year. Appointees must be at the rank of associate or full professor. Each member shall serve three years, appointed on staggered terms. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms. The senior member of the investigation committee (years on the committee) can serve as chair. The committee conducts its investigations according to university policies (see <http://trustees.ohio-state.edu/rules5/ru5-04.html>). At the conclusion of an investigation, the committee reports its findings to the dean, including a recommendation concerning the merits of the complaint and if the complaint is judged meritorious, a proposed action/sanction. Findings of the committee shall be

based on clear and convincing evidence. When subcommittee members disagree on findings, recommendations, or proposed sanctions, the subcommittee report includes multiple perspectives to the Dean.

4. Honors Committee

The Honors program contributes to the enhancement of the quality of teaching and learning in the college and seeks to support the College and the University Academic Plans. The program is to be administered by an Honors Committee. The chair of the Honors Committee is the Director of the Honors Program. This is a faculty member appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the faculty member's unit leadership. Directors serve for a term of three years. The Honors Director reports to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The responsibilities of the Honors Committee include the administration, promotion and development of the Honors program. The Honors Committee will consist of one representative from each of the six academic units and the Director of the Honors Program.

5. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee is charged with conducting promotion and tenure reviews at the college level to determine:

- a) Whether the School/Department has conducted its review and reached a recommendation consistent with university, college, and School/Department standards, criteria, policies, and rules (see Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) documents for each School/Department). The College review committee or the Dean may make a recommendation that is contrary to that of the School/Department if, in their judgment, the school/department recommendation is not consistent with those standards, criteria, policies, and rules.
- b) Where the weight of evidence lies in cases in which there is not a clear or consistent recommendation from the School/Department.

The Dean appoints the committee with input from Directors, Chairs, and College Council. The Committee consists of a full professor from each School or Department. Members shall not participate in the review of cases from their own school/department. The College committee prepares a written report of its assessment and vote for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and shall forward it to the Dean to whom the committee is advisory. When a College committee disagrees with a School or Department's recommendation or in cases where there is disagreement between the faculty and the Director/Chair within a School/Department, the College committee shall explain in detail the basis for its recommendation (See College of Education and Human Ecology APT document for details).

College Council and its Committees

The College Council is an elected body of the faculty and advises the Dean on college policies and procedures (e. g., program, fiscal, personnel, etc.). Elected faculty members of College Council oversee requirements for program admission and the adoption, alteration or abolishment of courses and curricula subject to the approval of the Council on Academic Affairs, the President, and the Board of Trustees. The roles and responsibilities of the College Council are outlined in the College Bylaws. Included in the College Bylaws are the membership of Council, the standing committees, and the voting procedures (see the approved College Council By Laws).

As a voting member, the Dean works with College Council in the promotion, direction and support of educational and research activities of the college, the encouragement of high quality programs for students, and in the maintenance of a high level of morale among the faculty.

The chairs of College Council Committee form the Faculty Cabinet. The Faculty Cabinet serves as the oversight committee for the College Council. The Faculty Cabinet established the agenda for College Council meetings and helps manage committee assignments and timelines. The Faculty Cabinet meets prior to all College Council meetings.

Standing Committees of the College Council are:

1. Budget and Finance Committee:

The Budget and Finance Committee shall counsel with the Dean's office and the College Council on major college budget activities, the budgetary articulation of the College and its units, and oversee, evaluate, and monitor the effects of major budget decisions. The committee is supported by, and works closely with, the Office of Administration and Planning.

2. Academic Affairs Committee:

The Academic Affairs Committee shall review and recommend action to the Council on all academic proposals and procedural issues pertaining to the operation of on and off-campus instructional programs. The Committee shall also develop curriculum policy recommendations for the Council, monitor on and off-campus self studies and program reviews, and advise the Personnel Committee on issues of faculty reassignment. This committee is supported by and works closely with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

3. Equity and Diversity Committee:

The Equity and Diversity Committee shall promote action to transform cultural, institutional, and personal practices of equity and diversity and promote the increase equity and diversity of faculty, students, and staff and monitor their retention and equitable participation in all aspects of the College. The Committee recommends initiatives, evaluates policies, and monitors implementation concerning, but not limited to, resource allocation, curriculum, administration, governance, research, promotion and tenure, recruitment and retention of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. This committee is supported by and works closely with the Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban and International Affairs, as well as the Office of Equity and Diversity.

4. International Affairs Committee:

The International Affairs Committee shall recommend action that assures equitable and excellent international policies and practices in the College. This committee works closely with the Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban, and International Affairs and collaboratively with the Academic Affairs Committee and the Equity and Diversity Committee on developing strategies to globalize our academic and research programs.

5. Personnel Committee:

The Personnel Committee develops, implements, and monitors personnel policy recommendations that address issues of importance to personnel in the College. The Committee reviews promotion and tenure guidelines, advises and monitors faculty evaluation based on the College Promotion and Tenure document, and serves as an

appeals committee for faculty grievance and salary appeals procedures. The personnel committee works closely with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs on issues related to faculty and are supported by the Office of Administration and Planning on issues related to human resources and fiscal matters.

6. Research Committee:

The Research Committee recommends, implements, and evaluates policy pertaining to the support, facilitation, and production of research throughout the College, encourages research collaboration within and outside the College, and oversees the integrity of the research initiatives of the College. The Research Committee develops college-wide policies for graduate education and monitors and reports on data related to graduate education in the College. This committee is supported by and works closely with the Associate Dean for Research.

7. Technology Committee:

The Technology Committee develops, promotes, and monitors policies pertaining to the relationship between educational excellence and technology, the College's leadership in the field of technology, and the technology infrastructure of the College. The Committee is supported by and works closely with the Office of Technology and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Advisory Committees

Administrative and Professional Staff Advisory Committee (A&P SAC)

The purpose of the committee is to act as an advisory body to the Dean. It provides a forum where professional and administrative staff can raise, discuss, and make recommendations on current nonacademic concerns and events; and facilitate good communication on behalf of and among staff members and governing bodies. Members of the committee are elected by A&P staff. Representatives sit on the College Council.

The Classified Staff Advisory Committee (CSAC)

The CSAC was established to represent the classified civil service staff in the College of Education and Human Ecology. The purpose of this committee is to act as a liaison between the staff and College administration and opportunity to present concerns of the staff to College administration. Additionally, it keeps staff informed of current issues and decisions; provide opportunities for professional development; encourage staff to participate in professional development activities; and initiate opportunities for staff to interact with the A&P staff and College administration. Members are elected to the committee by the CCS staff and representatives sits on College Council.

Student Leadership Council (SLC)

The SLC is recognized by the College and university as the primary organization representing all students enrolled in the College of Education and Human Ecology. The Student Leadership Council is composed of elected representatives the different majors within the College and the leadership of student organizations within the College. The SLC builds community as it promotes communication between the College administration and students as well as with the University community. It acts as a representative of and advocacy body for students in the College and the University community; coalesces student involvement in the activities and governance of the College, and the University community; and, promotes and enhances student professional

growth. Through the SLC, students provide important feedback to the faculty and administration of the College, and initiate, organize, and promote activities and events that enrich the experiences of all students in the College.

Ad hoc and Subcommittees

Any number of ad hoc and subcommittees may be constructed by the Dean, Associate Deans, School Directors, Department Chairs, Standing Committee Chairs, or Advisory Committee Chairs. These committees may function to advise, implement, or evaluate activities consistent with the College mission and vision and in accordance with this POA and the College Bylaws.

COLLEGE FACULTY MEETINGS

Per faculty rule 3335-5-16, the college faculty shall meet upon call of the Dean. The Dean schedules faculty meetings at least once every quarter during the academic year. The Dean informs the faculty about college- and university-wide issues and priorities at each of these meetings. Faculty is informed of these meetings (via email) at least two weeks in advance. A quorum for a faculty meeting is 30% of the faculty. Though votes are rarely taken at these meetings, a majority of those present and who voted is required for approval of a motion. Votes on policy matters are completed by electronic or paper ballot by all members of the faculty.

FACULTY SEARCH POLICIES

The Dean and faculty of the college are committed to attracting a world class and diverse faculty to the college. The Dean approves the commencement of all faculty searches and the academic rank for a faculty position. Prior to making these decisions, School Directors and Department Chairs review the status of their programs and confer with their faculty to determine their needs and key priorities for faculty positions. New faculty positions should provide support for and assistance with the goals of the college and university Academic Plans. School Directors and Department Chairs confer with the Dean and present their case for resources at an Executive Leadership Team meeting.

Fiduciary responsibility for faculty searches lies with Schools and Departments with anticipated search costs negotiated and factored into annual budgets. The budget (i.e. salary and benefits) for open positions reverts to the college. Decisions on new faculty positions for the coming academic year will be made early in the fall quarter.

Pools of candidates recommended for on campus interviews must be reviewed and approved by the Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban, and International affairs in consultation with the Dean.

Typically, a search committee makes written recommendations to the Director or Chair on potentially acceptable candidates. The Director or Chair provides a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean approves a candidate for the position, contacts the candidate and offers the position. Refer to the Guidelines for the Search Process (FY03) for details on policies and procedures. If there are special circumstances (e.g. prior service credit requested, senior rank hiring), OAA must first approve a letter of offer. Refer to the following web-site: http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/ii_seniorkrank.html. Letters of offer after April 30 must follow the procedure outlined by OAA (http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/ii_april30hire.html).

Targeted searches may be initiated in unique opportunistic situations with approval from the Dean. In such cases, a traditional search committee, may or may not be used. However, faculty within the future TIU of the targeted candidate must be supportive of the candidate and best practices and policies related to enhancing diversity must be utilized in the targeted search.

In addition, the Associate Dean for Diversity, Urban, and International Affairs will be consulted. The Dean, with approval from OAA and the Board of Trustees has final authority

over the initiation and completion of targeted searches.

FACULTY TEACHING WORKLOAD POLICY AND GUIDELINES

It is the responsibility of the Dean, in consultation with the provost and the School Directors/Department Chairs, to determine the appropriate division of workload expectations for each school/department according to their level of activity in the degree programs offered. The Dean expects each school/department to develop workload policies that are equitable and fiscally responsible. Directors and Chairs must establish a workload policy in consultation with faculty for approval by the Dean. This policy should be revised or reaffirmed by faculty and the Dean with the appointment or reappointment of Directors/Chairs. School/department workload documents must reflect the ranges in teaching, research, and service expectations among sections as well as among faculty within schools and departments as per OAA rules. See http://www.OAA.admin.ohio-state.edu/Handbook/v_teachingworkload.html.

PATTERNS OF ADMINISTRATION FOR SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS

Each Director/Chair should have a Pattern of Administration (POA) approved by the Dean within the first year of appointment or reappointment. It is then submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs for approval. It is recommended that the POA follow the outline from the Office of Academic Affairs for this document. (Refer to: http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/i_pattern.html).

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Upon approval of the Dean and Provost of the TIUs' Faculty Appointments, Re-appointments, Promotion and Tenure (ARPT) documents, the College delegates to the TIU the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to a TIU's mission and criteria. The College retains the responsibility to ensure that Schools/Departments have conducted their reviews consistent with University, College, and TIU policies, standards, and criteria. This is achieved by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee (see the section on College committees).

Each School Director or Department Chair, in consultation with faculty, must develop an Appointments, Re-appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (ARPT) document. The content required for this document is specified in the OAA handbook (Refer to http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/i_aptdoc.html). The document must be in agreement with the College of Education and Human Ecology's policies, procedures, and the College ARPT. The College ARPT document is updated with advice of the College Council's Personnel Committee and must be approved by College Council. These school/department documents (POA/ARPT) may be revised at any time but must be revised or reaffirmed with the appointment or reappointment of School Directors and Department Chairs. The College documents must be reaffirmed with the appointment or reappointment of the Dean.

COLLEGE COMPENSATION PRINCIPLES

The university and the college pursue merit based compensation strategies to maximize the recruitment, performance, and retention of quality faculty and staff, while adhering to the letter and spirit of applicable regulations.

The achievement of excellence is the primary measure of success in the compensation strategy of the college. The concept of excellence includes attracting and retaining quality faculty and staff, investing in performance, and achieving an equitable environment.

STAFF GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Staff employment disputes are addressed in University policy 8.20, Employment Disputes

and Complaints of Discrimination (<http://www.ohr.ohio-state.edu/policy/820pol.htm>).

COUNTEROFFER POLICIES FOR FACULTY

Highly productive faculty members in the College of Education and Human Ecology are attractive colleagues to other institutions. When a School Director or Department Chair wishes to retain a faculty member who receives an offer from another institution, a counteroffer may be appropriate. The college is not obligated to provide a counteroffer. A letter from another institution does not entitle faculty to a counter offer. All salary counteroffer proposals require prior approval by the Dean and the Office of Academic Affairs.

LEAVES AND ABSENCES

The College abides by the University's leave policies (refer to: http://oaa.ohiostate.edu/handbook/ix_loa.html) and the other absences from campus such as Faculty Professional Leaves (FPL) and Special Research Assignments (SRA).

The Faculty Professional Leave (FPL) Program

The Faculty Professional Leave (FPL) Program should be considered for any period of intensive study or research not to exceed one academic year. Statute 3345.28 of the Ohio Revised Code specifies that only tenured faculty with at least seven years of service as a regular faculty member at Ohio State are eligible for a Faculty Professional Leave at this institution. Years of service at another university and years served in auxiliary appointments cannot be credited toward the required years of service at Ohio State.

The definition of a "year of service" per Board of Trustees Resolution No. 78-21 is: "any academic year in which the full-time faculty member, while in such status, whether on nine months or eleven months appointments, had significant responsibilities to an instructional unit or units of the University."

A FPL must be for a continuous period but may bridge an off-duty quarter (refer to http://oaa.ohiostate.edu/handbook/ix_fpl.html). An SRA and FPL may not occur in contiguous on-duty quarters (including Spring-Autumn) since such an arrangement would circumvent the required salary reduction. Follow the College approved procedures for FLP requests. Refer to the college web-site for details.

Special Research Assignments (SRA)

The Special Research Assignment (SRA) releases a faculty member from regular duties for a period of up to one full quarter so that he or she may concentrate on a scholarly endeavor or invest in a relatively brief professional development opportunity. SRA proposals generally emphasize completion of a research project or enhancement of research skills and knowledge. However, an SRA may be used for investment in pedagogical or administrative skills and knowledge when these are judged to be mutually beneficial to the faculty member and his or her academic unit. SRAs are not to be used for course development or service assignments.

Any faculty member is eligible. An SRA is awarded on a competitive basis within TIU. No more than 10% of the faculty in the College of Education and Human Ecology or in any one School/Department may be on a Special Research Assignment (SRA) in any one academic year. Units must assure that sufficient faculty are on duty at all times to meet obligations to students and other constituencies, and to conduct regular business. Each School/Department must have a specific set of principles that guide the selection of SRAs annually. The Dean's Office monitors compliance with the 10% rule by school. Faculty should follow the college and school approved procedures for SRA requests. Refer to the college web-site for details.

Other Leaves of Absence

Faculty submit requests for leave of absence to their Director/Chair at the same time that SRA and FPLs are submitted to the School. For details refer to http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/i_xloa.html. School Directors/Department Chairs submit requests for approval to the Associate Dean for Faculty. If approved, the Dean will seek approval from the VP for Academic Policy and Human Resources.

Exclusionary Year from Faculty Probationary Period

Probationary faculty should be reminded annually of the exemption of probationary time option under Faculty Rule 3335-47-03. Faculty should submit a request for exclusion when submitting their annual report and not later than the end of the winter term. For details on requirements and the form see: http://oaa.ohio-state.edu/handbook/i_xexclusion.html). School Directors/ Department Chairs submit requests for approval to the Associate Dean for Faculty. If approved, the Dean will seek approval from the VP for Academic Policy and Human Resources.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION AND PAID EXTERNAL CONSULTING ACTIVITY

The college adheres to university policies with respect to the circumstances under which supplemental compensation for university work is considered and external professional service activities are approved.

University policies represent upper limits on what is possible and individual schools/departments are encouraged to consider whether amendments to these are appropriate to their circumstances. Refer to http://oaa.ohiostate.edu/handbook/iii_suppcomp.html. The School Director or Department Chair recommends approval of these requests and forwards them to the Dean and College Human Resource Manager for review and approval prior to beginning of service.

REHIRING RETIRED FACULTY

It is acceptable for Schools and Departments in the College, in consultation with the Dean, to negotiate some post-retirement work with non-retired faculty in order to facilitate retirement. However, long-term agreements are inappropriate and even short-term agreements should be made subject to availability of funds, programmatic needs, and performance. Re-employment of retired faculty is not an entitlement and cannot be guaranteed.

Faculty members who are rehired will be subject to the rules and policies of the OSU Office of Human Resources. It is the College of Education and Human Ecology policy that faculty:

- 1 Must be retired for at least two months before they can be rehired (in compliance with State Teachers Retirement System rules).
- 2 At the time of re-employment, individuals must have a reduction to their FTE. Individuals who take an FTE reduction must have their salary decreased commensurate with the FTE reduction.
- 3 Are rehired on a year by year basis with the position not to exceed 50% FTE except in rare circumstances.
- 4 Hires are made by approval of the Dean.

Appendix C
College of Education and Human Ecology
Bylaws

College Bylaws Ad Hoc Committee:

APPROVED BY THE COLLEGE COUNCIL, Date, 2006
RATIFIED BY THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN ECOLOGY
FACULTY, Date, 2006

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Article I. The College Faculty.....	1
Section 1: Identification.....	1
Section 2: Membership.....	1
Section 3: Participation.....	1
Section 4: Powers and Responsibilities.....	2
Section 5: Procedures.....	2
Article II. The College Council.....	3
Section 1: Identification.....	3
Section 2: Membership.....	3
Section 3: Voting Privileges of College Council Representatives.....	3
Section 4: Powers and Responsibilities of College Council.....	4
Section 5: Powers and Responsibilities of the Council Chair.....	4
Section 6: Procedures of the College Council.....	4
Section 7: College Council Standing Committees.....	5
Clause 1: Budget and Finance Committee.....	5
Clause 2: Curriculum Committee.....	5
Clause 3: Equity and Diversity Committee.....	5
Clause 4: The International Affairs Committee.....	6
Clause 5: Personnel Committee.....	6
Clause 6: Research Committee.....	6
Clause 7: Technology Committee.....	6
Section 8. College Council Standing Committee Procedures.....	6
Section 9. Office of the Dean.....	7
Article III College Academic Units.....	7
Section 1: Academic Units.....	7
Section 2: Powers and Responsibilities of the Academic Units.....	7
Section 3: Procedures of the Academic Units.....	8
Article IV. General Rules.....	8
Section 1: University Statues: Bylaws: Rules.....	8
Section 2: Parliamentary Procedure.....	8
Article V. Revision and Amendment of Bylaws.....	8
Section 1: Steps for Revision or Amendment of Bylaws.....	8
Article VI. Procedures Manual.....	9
Section 1: Procedures Manual.....	9

BYLAWS OF THE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN ECOLOGY

Introduction

The Faculty of the College of Education and Human Ecology, through its right of academic freedom [Rules of the University Faculty, Governance, and Committees (hereinafter Faculty Rules) 3335-5-01], its commitment to academic responsibility [Faculty Rules 3335-5-01], and its authority to adopt rules to effectuate the educational and academic policies within The Ohio State University [Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, 3335-1-04(B)(1)], do hereby prescribe and organize the College of Education and Human Ecology Bylaws. [Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, 3335-1-04(B)(2)].

Article I. The College Faculty

Section 1: Identification

The term Faculty shall include persons with regular, regular clinical, auxiliary, and emeritus faculty titles on full or part-time appointments with or without salary [Bylaws of the Board of Trustees 3335-1-04(a)(1)(2); Faculty Rules 3335-5-191].

Section 2: Membership

Membership within the College of Education and Human Ecology faculty includes those University faculty members who have contractual appointments in the College [Faculty Rules 3335-5-19].

Assignment to the College Faculty may be in terms of (a) Regular, (b) Joint, (c) Auxiliary, or (d) Emeritus Membership.

Regular Faculty members of the College of Education and Human Ecology are those tenured and tenure-track faculty members whose tenure-initiating unit is a unit of the College and whose appointment is at least 50% in the tenure-initiating unit.

Joint appointees of the College Faculty are those who hold primary appointment and faculty status in a tenure initiating unit of another College of the University.

Auxiliary appointees of the College Faculty are those in non-tenure accruing positions who do not hold regular faculty appointments in another academic unit in the University. Auxiliary appointees shall include those having Visiting, Adjunct, Clinical and Lecturer titles. Responsibility for recommending Auxiliary appointments resides with the Directors/Chairs of the Schools/Departments.

Emeritus Faculty: regular or regular clinical faculty who, upon retirement, were recommended by the School Director or Department Chair, the Dean, and the Senior Vice President and Provost for emeritus status and approved by The Board of Trustees. Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters, but may have such other privileges as individual academic units or the office of human resources may provide.

Section 3: Participation

Clause 1: Regular Faculty shall (a) participate fully in at least one academic unit, (b) participate fully in College deliberations, (c) have direct representation to the governance bodies of the College through elected representatives, (d) serve as members of College committees, (e) vote if appointed no less than 50% of full-time, and (f) have only one vote on issues related to the College.

Clause 2: Joint, Auxiliary, and Emeritus Faculty shall not participate in promotion and tenure matters, shall not vote at any level of governance, but may serve, with the

approval of the College Council, as non-voting members of appropriate College committees. [Faculty Rules 3335-5-19(C)(D)].

Section 4: Powers and Responsibilities

The Regular Faculty, in accordance with College and University policies and subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, shall have the power and legislative authority to establish the educational and academic policies of the College (Bylaws of the Board of Trustees 3335-1-04 and Faculty Rules 3335-5-14).

Clause 1: The Regular Faculty shall establish, and shall elect representatives from their respective academic units to serve on, the College Council.

Clause 2: The Regular Faculty shall review and regulate all educational and academic activities of the College and adopt, alter, or abolish courses, including on and off-campus courses and curricula, subject to the approval of the Council on Academic Affairs, the University Senate, the President, and the Board of Trustees.

Clause 3: The Regular Faculty shall create and assign academic and educational authority and responsibility to all College subunits.

Clause 4: The Regular Faculty shall organize into academic units in order to accomplish the mission and purposes of the College.

Clause 5: The Regular Faculty shall establish policy pertaining to academic and educational concerns including internal and external program review.

Clause 6: The Regular Faculty shall undertake regular review and evaluation of all administrators in the College, including the Dean, Associate Deans, and School Directors or Department Chairs.

Section 5: Procedures

Clause 1: The College Faculty shall hold at least one regular meeting each quarter during the academic year.

Clause 2: A quorum for a College Faculty meeting shall consist of at least 33 (33%) of the Regular faculty.

Clause 3: Special meetings of the College Faculty may be called by the (a) Chair of the College Council; (b) the Dean; or (c) a petition of twenty-five percent (25%) of the Regular Faculty of the College of Education and Human Ecology.

Clause 4: To convene a regular or special College Faculty meeting, the College Council Chairperson or Dean must notify the College Faculty by mail no less than seven (seven) days prior to the meeting.

Article II. The College Council.

Section 1: Identification.

The Regular College faculty, through the College Council, shall be the legislative governing body of the College of Education and Human Ecology. Elected representatives of the Regular Faculty to the Council may join with the Dean, and elected representatives of staff, students, and other teacher education faculties located in colleges other than the College of Education and Human Ecology to effectuate the activities of the College Council. These collaborations will not change the powers and responsibilities vested in the College Faculty as defined in the Introduction and Article I., Section 4 of these bylaws.

Section 2: Membership

- Clause 1: Faculty. Regular Faculty members whose full-time appointment is at least 50% in the tenure-initiating units within the College of Education and Human Ecology shall be eligible to be elected representatives to the College Council. One voting representative from every ten (10) Regular Faculty members or fraction thereof shall represent each tenure-initiating unit. Also, each tenure-initiating unit shall elect three to five alternates who will serve only in the absence of their representative(s).
- Clause 2: Dean. The Dean of the College shall be an ex-officio, voting member of the College Council.
- Clause 3: Staff. The Administrative and Professional Staff Advisory Committee and the Civil Service Advisory Committee shall elect two (2) representatives each to serve on the Council. Also, each advisory committee shall elect at least one alternate, who will serve only in the absence of their representatives.
- Clause 4: Students. Three (3) graduate students and two (2) undergraduate students shall be elected to serve on the College Council.
- Clause 5: Other Faculty. Colleges, other than the College of Education, with responsibilities for professional teacher education and whose professional teacher education programs are subject to review by the College of Education and Human Ecology, may be organized into academic units in the College of Education and Human Ecology may elect a total of two (2) Regular faculty representatives from the combined academic units so organized to serve as members of the Council.

Section 3: Voting Privileges of College Council Representatives

- Clause 1: College Faculty representatives shall vote on all matters before the Council.
- Clause 2: Staff representatives shall vote only on non-educational and non-academic policies.
- Clause 3: Student representatives shall vote only on non-educational and non-academic policies.
- Clause 4: Faculty from other colleges shall have voting rights restricted to those matters referred to the Council concerning teacher education programs of their Colleges.

Section 4: Powers and Responsibilities of College Council

- Clause 1: Review, adopt, alter, or abolish curricula and courses, including on and off-campus courses, subject to the approval of the Council on Academic Affairs and the President of the Board of Trustees.
- Clause 2: Establish policy pertaining to academic and educational concerns including internal and external program review and matters pertaining to overall College planning.
- Clause 3: Participate and counsel with the College Dean on the appointment of College Faculty and administrators.
- Clause 4: Counsel the Dean on the College Budget.
- Clause 5: Establish standing committees.
- Clause 6: Establish a Faculty Cabinet to counsel with the Dean on matters relating to the College. The Faculty Cabinet shall be comprised of the Chair of the College Council, the Chair-elect, the immediate past-Chair, and the chairs of the standing committees. It shall meet monthly, or as needed, with the Dean, with the agenda developed jointly by the Dean and the Chair of the College Council.
- Clause 7: Consider matters brought before it by its members, the Faculty, members of the College administration, the staff, or students.

Clause 8. Maintain an official record of its proceedings which shall be made available to the College of Education and Human Ecology.

Section 5: Powers and Responsibilities of the Council Chair.

Clause 1: Preside over and organize the agenda for College Council meetings, and other meetings relative to the business of the College Council.

Clause 2: Appoint members and chairs of the standing committees in counsel with the Dean.

Clause 3: Establish Ad Hoc Committees as necessary with the approval of the College Council.

Clause 4: Serves on the College Executive Leadership Team.

Section 6: Procedures of the College Council

Clause 1: Academic units shall elect faculty representatives to the College Council on the basis of one representative for every ten (10) faculty or fraction thereof. Elections will take place by the last day of classes in spring quarter. The Chair of the Council and the Dean will be notified of results within one week of the election. Newly elected faculty and staff representatives will serve three-year terms that begin at the summer College Council meeting. Newly elected student representatives will serve one year terms that begin at the summer College Council meeting.

Clause 2: No faculty, staff, or student representative to the council may serve consecutive terms.

Clause 3: Each Council member, when unable to attend a meeting of the Council or standing committee, shall be responsible for notifying an alternate representative.

Clause 4: If a representative changes from one tenure-initiating unit to another, the position of that representative shall be relinquished, and her/his alternate shall complete the term.

Clause 5: The Council shall meet at least once monthly during the academic year. Additional meetings may be scheduled. The Chair of the Council shall determine the schedule of meetings and set the agenda in consultation with the Faculty Cabinet.

Clause 6: The quorum for a meeting of the College Council shall consist of a majority of the duly elected representatives or their alternates. In matters on which only Council faculty may vote, a quorum of Council faculty representatives must be present.

Clause 7: The College Council shall elect a Chair-elect from the voting faculty members of the Council during autumn quarter. The Chair shall preside at meetings of the Council and the Chair-elect shall preside in the absence of the Chair. The Chair shall assume a term of office of one year beginning at the summer Council meeting.

Clause 8. Following his/her term of office, the Chair of the College Council shall become the immediate past Chair serving as an ex-officio voting member for one year.

Clause 9. All meetings of the Council and its committees shall be open unless the Council goes into executive session. Permission for non-Council/non-committee members to address the Council/committee is by a majority vote of the representatives in attendance.

Section 7: College Council Standing Committees

Clause 1: Budget and Finance Committee.

The Budget and Finance Committee shall counsel with the Dean's office and the College Council on major college budget activities, the budgetary articulation of the College and its units, and oversee, evaluate, and monitor the effects of major budget decisions.

Clause 2: Curriculum Committee.

The Curriculum Committee shall review and recommend action to the Council on all academic proposals and procedural issues pertaining to the operation of on and off-

campus instructional programs. The Committee shall also develop curriculum policy recommendations for the Council, monitor on and off-campus self studies and program reviews, and advise the Personnel Committee on issues of faculty reassignment.

Clause 3: Equity and Diversity Committee.

The Equity and Diversity Committee shall promote action to transform cultural, institutional, and personal practices of equity and diversity and promote the increase of faculty, students, and staff and monitor their retention and equitable participation in all aspects of the College. The Committee recommends initiatives, evaluates policies, and monitors implementation concerning, but not limited to, resource allocation, curriculum, administration, governance, research, promotion and tenure, recruitment and retention of administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

Clause 4: The International Affairs Committee.

The International Affairs Committee shall recommend action that assures equitable and excellent international policies and practices in the College.

Clause 5: Personnel Committee.

The Personnel Committee shall develop, implement, and monitor personnel policy recommendations that address issues of importance to personnel in The College. The Committee shall review promotion and tenure guidelines, advise and monitor faculty evaluation based on the College Promotion and Tenure document, and serve as an appeals committee for faculty grievance and salary appeals procedures.

Clause 6: Research Committee.

The Research Committee shall recommend, implement, and evaluate policy pertaining to the support, facilitation, and production of research throughout the College, encourage research collaboration within and outside the College, and oversee the integrity of the research initiatives of the College.

Clause 7: Technology Committee.

The Technology Committee shall develop, promote, and monitor policies pertaining to the relationship between educational excellence and technology, the College's leadership in the field of technology, and the technology infrastructure of the College.

Section 8. College Council Standing Committee Procedures

Clause 1: The College Council and its standing committees shall be chaired by elected, regular faculty members of the Council.

Clause 2: The Chair of the Council, in counsel with the Dean, shall appoint a chair of each committee for a term of one year.

Clause 3: Regular faculty members shall be included on all standing committees. The term of service shall be three (3) years. The Chair of the Council may also appoint other faculty serving as members-at-large for a term of one (1) year.

Clause 4: One staff member shall be included on standing committees. The term of service shall be three (3) years.

Clause 5: One student member shall be included on standing committees. The term of service shall be one (1) year.

Clause 6: Appointments to standing committees of the Council will seek to achieve continuity by staggering the appointments of members (e.g., 1/3 of committee membership changing each year.)

Clause 7: The chair of each standing committee shall prepare and submit a written report for each Council meeting. In addition, the chair will submit a written overall report on behalf of the committee to the Council at the end of the year.

Section 9. Office of the Dean

- Clause 1: The Dean shall serve as the executive officer of the College of Education and Human Ecology. The Dean shall be responsible for the exercise of those powers and responsibilities vested in the office by The Ohio State University Board of Trustees, the President of the University, and by the Executive Vice President and Provost (Faculty Rules 3335-3-29). The Dean shall serve as a voting, ex-officio member of the Council. Those members of the Dean's staff having primary responsibility for program, personnel, and budget shall serve as ex-officio non-voting members of the Council.
- Clause 2: The Dean or his/her Regular Faculty designee shall attend each College Council meeting and submit a report on topics relevant to the college at each College Council meeting.
- Clause 3: The Dean shall make an annual state of the College presentation to the faculty as a whole as well as staff and students.
- Clause 4: In the shared governance of the College, the Faculty shall follow the principle of majority faculty rule in matters of educational and academic policy. Whenever majority faculty rule is not followed, the Dean shall explain the reasons for the departure to enhance communication and to facilitate understanding within the College. The explanation shall be communicated to the faculty in writing, where possible, or at a faculty meeting, with an opportunity provided for faculty to comment. [Bylaws of the Board of Trustees 3335-1-04(A)(B) and Faculty Rules 3335-3-35(C)(2)(d), 3335-5-14].

Article III College Academic Units

Section 1: Academic Units

The basic academic units of the College shall be Schools and Departments. Every faculty member shall be a member of an academic unit of the College. A faculty member may be a member of more than one academic unit. If a faculty member is a member of more than one academic unit, that faculty member shall vote on promotion and tenure matters only in her/his tenure-initiating unit.

The academic units of the College of Education and Human Ecology shall be organized pursuant to the rules of the university, the approved College Bylaws, and the patterns of administration and Bylaws (should they exist) of the units.

Section 2: Powers and Responsibilities of the Academic Units

Clause 1: The responsibility for planning and execution of unit academic and service programs lies with the faculty of the academic units.

Clause 2: Each academic unit shall develop programs based on long-range planning that is consistent with the mission of College, the University, and the needs of people in Ohio, the nation, and the world.

Clause 3: Evaluation of faculty members for promotion in rank and tenure is a responsibility of each school, which must follow the guidelines established by the Office of Academic Affairs, the College, and the Academic Unit. [Faculty Rules 3335-47].

Clause 4: The faculty of each academic unit may establish minimum standards for admission, and retention for its programs; the College Council faculty, the Dean, and the University must approve such standards.

Section 3: Procedures of the Academic Units

Clause 1: Each School/Department shall have a Director/Chair. The method of appointment and duties of the Director/Chair are authorized in Faculty Rules 3335-3-35:

Clause 2: The Director/Chair protects the autonomy and prerogatives of the individual faculty members, but, at the same time, safeguards the program interests of the School, College and the University.

Clause 3: The Director/Chair shall develop in consultation with the faculty a pattern of administration. This pattern of administration shall be available to all present and prospective members of the faculty of the school, and a copy shall be deposited in the office of the dean of the college and in the office of the senior vice president and provost. [Faculty Rules 3335-3-35(C)(2)]

Clause 4: In the shared governance of the School/Departments, the Director/Chair shall follow the principle of majority faculty rule in matters of educational and academic policy. Whenever majority faculty rule is not followed, the Director/Chair shall explain the reasons for the departure to enhance communication and to facilitate understanding within the School/Departments. The explanation shall be communicated to the faculty in writing, where possible, or at a faculty meeting, with an opportunity provided for faculty to comment. [Faculty Rules 3335-3-35(C)(2)(d); Bylaws of the Board of Trustees 3335-1-04(A)(B); Faculty Rules 3335-5-14].

Article IV. General Rules

Section 1: University Statutes: Bylaws: Rules

Statutes applying to the University Bylaws of the Board of Trustees and Rules for the University Faculty shall supersede the provisions of this Bylaws document.

Section 2: Parliamentary Procedure

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of the meetings of the College Faculty, College Council, and academic units in all cases to which they are applicable. These Bylaws affirm the values of open discussion and the exercise of democratic procedure in conducting the business of the Council and its committees.

Article V. Revision and Amendment of Bylaws

Section 1: Steps for Revision or Amendment of Bylaws

Clause 1: Revision or amendment of the Bylaws may be initiated by the College Council or by petition signed by no less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the Regular Faculty members of the College.

Clause 2: Discussion of proposed revisions or amendments to the Bylaws shall take place at a College meeting of the Regular faculty at least three weeks before a final action is taken. A positive vote by a simple majority of the voting Regular faculty is required to revise or amend the Bylaws. Voting shall be conducted by mail ballot and revisions or amendments are effective immediately on passage, unless otherwise specified.

Clause 3: The voting process for revision or amendment of the Bylaws shall be conducted by a College Council ad hoc voting committee appointed by the Chair with the approval of the Council. The Chair shall report the voting results to the Council and to the faculty within one week of the ballot count.

Article VI. Procedures Manual

Section 1: Procedures Manual.

These Bylaws shall be implemented through a Procedures Manual. Such a Procedures Manual shall be adopted and revised by an affirmative vote of two thirds (2/3) of the

College Council. In the event of consistencies between the Bylaws and the Procedures manual, the Bylaws shall prevail.

educational policy and community development. These opportunities, and others, will positively impact the productivity of our current faculty while attracting additional world-class faculty to our ranks. In the past year alone, six recruits for faculty positions have requested interview time with faculty in the "other" college participating in the merger. Each of these high quality recruits has expressed an interest in joining a college with a more holistic, comprehensive approach.

The highly compatible vision and mission statements of the two colleges were easily merged into the following statements that are fully embraced by the faculty. "The mission of the College will be to build upon a tradition of excellence in promoting outstanding teaching, research, and service that significantly and positively impacts individuals, families, schools, and consumers within our global communities. The mission simultaneously embraces the land-grant mission of The Ohio State University as expressed in its Academic, Diversity, and Outreach plans. Our vision is to lead institutional efforts to extend and improve lifelong learning and lifespan development toward improved quality of life across our diverse society. We aspire to be a center of excellence in research and scholarly programs focusing on the complex issues affecting individuals, families, schools, and consumers in our global communities."

The faculty expressed a strong desire to embrace a more comprehensive approach that is captured by this merged vision and mission. The proposal is to bring together the programs within the two colleges without initially altering the existing school and department structure and without modifying programs. However, the faculty agreed that a second phase of the merger is absolutely necessary to take full advantage of the opportunities. A second phase is planned in which there will be further consideration of the internal structure of the new college. Substantive future changes in structure would be subject to additional approvals under faculty rule 3335-3-37.

- 2. Are there any problems with 4 assistant deans being asked to step down when the merger occurs? Will all 4 new assistant deans be from one of the 2 old colleges, a mix, or as a result of a search for these positions?**

Each of the current associate or assistant deans in the two colleges has been consulted regarding their interest in an appointment as an administrator in the new college. In cases where there are multiple administrators seeking appointment to a single position, the dean will make the appointment decision. Such a strategy does not preclude the option for outside searches when there are no viable internal candidates. Existing letters of offer for current associate and assistant deans who are not assigned to administrative appointments in the new college will be reviewed. Transition strategies will be negotiated based upon the letter of offer and discussions of the career goals of the affected administrator. Faculty feedback has been solicited by the dean, faculty representatives on the transition team, and department/school leaders as it relates to the job descriptions and performance of associate deans.

It is very unlikely that all of the new associate and assistant deans will be from one of the previous colleges. However, specific associate and assistant dean appointments cannot be announced until a new college is approved.

- 3. Participation in the by-law vote was from only 93 of the 183 eligible faculty. It is not clear from your by-laws (which college by-laws are you referring to?) if this is a majority of those who vote or a majority of those eligible to vote?**

The College of Education has approved faculty by-laws that outline faculty governance in the college. The College of Human Ecology has no such by-laws. The current by-laws of the College of Education were modified to address representation from the College of Human Ecology. At the end of March 2006, the faculty of both colleges voted on these modified by-laws and approved them for use in the new college. The new by-laws (Appendix C) were approved as shown in the following table.

The vote requirement for modification of the existing College of Education by-laws is the “majority of voting faculty”, not the majority of faculty eligible to vote. Despite multiple reminders, the number of faculty who chose to vote was quite low.

	<i>Human Ecology</i>		<i>Education</i>		<i>TOTALS</i>	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
YES	20	74%	65	92%	85	87%
NO	5	19%	4	6%	9	9%
ABSTAIN	2	7%	2	3%	4	4%

4. Faculty approval for the merger was contingent upon approval of the by-laws, POA and P&T document. Have all of these votes occurred? If so, what was the outcome?

Two committees, with representation from each school and department, are currently working on revisions of the College Pattern of Administration (current draft presented in Appendix B), and promotion and tenure guidelines for the new college. Both of these documents will need to be approved by the faculty of the new college.

One technical dilemma posed by the process is that these documents should be approved by the faculty of the new college. However, approval of these documents may be deemed necessary by the university governance structures that will ultimately approve the creation of the new college. Given this dilemma, the college faculty decided upon ballot wording that would allow us to start moving the merger through the university process while finalizing and approving (by vote) the POA and P&T documents. Consequently, the faculty voted affirmatively to merge the colleges, noting that “prior to its functioning as one College of Education and Human Ecology, the faculty of the existing colleges must independently and collectively approve a new Pattern of Administration, new College by-laws, and new College promotion and tenure guidelines.”

An eight member faculty and staff transition team is currently editing the draft POA (Appendix B) to present to the faculty for a vote in May. University rules do not currently require a college POA. However, OAA has requested such a document for several years. A new dean has one year to establish a POA. Faculty approval of a POA is not currently required by the university at the college, school, or department level. However, it is the intent of the new college to have faculty approval of the POA, by vote.

The P&T document for the College of Education and Human Ecology is being crafted by the existing Promotion and Tenure committees of each college and will be presented to the faculty for a vote in May. University rules govern the use of new P&T documents and clearly delineate faculty choices regarding new documents. Untenured faculty members seeking promotion or tenure have three years in which they can choose to be evaluated under new documents or the documents that were in place at their time of hire. Tenured faculty

members seeking promotion have one year to make the same choice.

In summary, the new college by-laws have been approved by the faculty and the new college POA and P&T documents will be approved prior to the end of June.

5. Page 3(g) – Too sparse of an answer was given. Please expand and answer why.

The budget process for both colleges is quite similar in that schools and departments receive annual operating budgets and have substantial control over staff budgets. Faculty positions are held centrally in both the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology. Faculty lines are discussed by the colleges' leadership teams and ultimately negotiated with the dean. This process for distributing faculty lines will be continued in the new college.

The principles of budget restructuring (toward more responsibility based budgeting) have not been fully implemented at the department/school level in either college. That is, the distribution of resources to schools and departments are "informed" by revenue versus expenditure data, rather than "driven" by these data in a formulaic manner. Prior to a discussion of a merger, both colleges had plans in place to move toward a budgeting system that would be more consistent in allocating funds based upon revenues and expenditures, combined with performance metrics. During FY 06-07 the administration and faculty of the new college will move forward with a combined version of the two college's plans to restructure the budgeting process.

The school and department budgets for FY06-07 will not be dramatically altered as a result of the merger. Future budgets will be adjusted based upon any new fiscal policies that emerge within the new college. As per the by-laws of the new college, a faculty budget/fiscal committee will be involved in the establishment of fiscal policies.

The proposed merger will yield over \$400,000 in administrative savings. While this was not the purpose of the merger, it is a benefit. These savings will be reinvested in either a) infrastructure support for faculty and students (i.e., support for research proposal development, support for developing new courses, majors or minors) or, b) new faculty positions. Consequently, the total availability of funds for unit budgets (schools and departments) will increase.

The longer term budgetary consequences of the merger will be positive. New curricular opportunities will emerge that take advantage of the opportunity to offer more interdisciplinary coursework. Additionally, new faculty members will be attracted who are conducting interdisciplinary research that is externally funded. The proposed college has already elicited interest from potential faculty hires who are seeking a more integrated, applied setting to conduct their work with individual, families, schools, and communities.

6. Page 4 (k) – Display the diversity of each college now (faculty and students for women and minorities) and in the future with the merger. Include reference to the Diversity Plan included in the POA.

Both colleges have a strong commitment to diversity. This year is the final year of a five-year diversity plan in the College of Education. An external review of this plan and its outcomes was previously scheduled for this spring. The review will be completed and the

recommendations from this review will be used to craft a new plan. The College of Human Ecology's diversity plan was not time limited. The external review team for the College of Education's plan will also assess the efforts in Human Ecology, and the recommendations for a new plan will encompass the programs in the new college.

Faculty and staff diversity data are presented next. The three tables represent the faculty and staff of the two colleges independently and combined. Also presented are the student data of each college, the colleges combined, as well as the Columbus and all campuses data.

Diversity Data for
Faculty and Staff
Unit Level Statistics

Summary: Human Ecology 2005

Part 1. Section A - University Diversity Demographics as of 4/30/2005

Faculty Rank	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other	Unknown
Professor	7	1	0	0	0	0
Associate Professor	8	1	0	0	0	0
Assistant Professor	5	0	0	1	0	0
Auxiliary Faculty	3	1	0	0	0	0
Graduate Associates	5	2	0	0	0	0
Teaching (GTA)	2	4	0	0	0	0
Research (GRA)	2	8	0	0	0	0
Administrative (GAA)	2	1	0	0	0	0
Staff	4	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Leadership	5	18	0	0	0	0
Executive,	12	8	0	0	0	0
Administrative	2	1	0	0	0	0
Professional	2	3	0	0	0	0
Clerical, Secretarial	2	1	0	0	0	0
Paraprofessional,	1	1	0	0	0	0
Technical	1	1	0	0	0	0

Faculty Rank	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other	Unknown	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other	Unknown
Regular Faculty	7	5	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	8	11	1	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0
Associate Professor	5	4	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant Professor	3	11	1	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
Auxiliary Faculty	5	30	3	8	6	0	12	0	0	0	0	2
Graduate Associates	2	33	4	11	4	0	14	0	0	0	3	6
Teaching (GTA)	2	8	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	2
Research (GRA)	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative (GAA)	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Staff	5	10	2	13	3	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Leadership	12	33	0	6	7	0	40	0	0	0	0	0
Executive,	2	15	3	17	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	3
Administrative	2	1	0	5	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Professional	2	1	0	5	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Clerical, Secretarial	1	1	0	5	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Paraprofessional,	1	1	0	5	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Technical	1	1	0	5	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Each individual is counted only once, according to main University function, with the following exceptions: Faculty who have administrative appointments at chair level and above appear within their TTU in the appropriate faculty rank and also appear within the Academic Leadership category in the unit of their main administrative appointment.

Office of Human Resources
Information and Technology Services

Diversity Data for
Faculty and Staff
Unit Level Statistics

Summary: Education 2005

Part 1. Section A - University Diversity Demographics as of 4/30/2005

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other	Hispanic/Latino	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	Other	Hispanic/Latino	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	Other	Hispanic/Latino	Black/African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian	Other
Regular Faculty	17	48.6%	18	51.4%	3	8.6%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	31	88.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Professor	26	49.1%	27	50.9%	6	11.3%	3	5.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	43	81.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Associate Professor	11	55.0%	9	45.0%	2	10.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Assistant Professor	32	32.0%	68	68.0%	4	4.0%	4	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	85	85.0%	0	0.0%	7	7.0%		
Auxiliary Faculty	41	31.8%	88	68.2%	16	12.4%	20	15.5%	0	0.0%	7	5.4%	73	56.6%	4	3.1%	9	7.0%		
Teaching (GTA)	17	27.0%	76	73.0%	5	7.9%	4	22.2%	0	0.0%	5	7.9%	33	52.4%	3	4.8%	3	4.8%		
Research (GRA)	22	25.6%	64	74.4%	9	10.5%	22	25.6%	2	2.3%	4	4.7%	43	50.0%	1	1.2%	5	5.8%		
Administrative (GAA)	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Staff	12	32.4%	25	67.6%	3	8.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.7%	31	83.8%	0	0.0%	2	5.4%		
Academic Leadership Executive, Administrative	50	34.5%	95	65.5%	6	4.1%	6	4.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	126	86.9%	0	0.0%	7	4.8%		
Professional	5	7.5%	62	92.5%	11	16.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%	53	79.1%	1	1.5%	1	1.5%		
Clerical, Secretarial	11	57.9%	8	42.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	94.7%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%		
Paraprofessional, Technical																				

Note: Each individual is counted only once, according to main University function, with the following exceptions: Faculty who have administrative appointments at chair level and above appear within their ITU in the appropriate faculty rank and also appear within the Academic Leadership category in the unit of their main administrative appointment.

Diversity Data for
Faculty and Staff
Unit Level Statistics

Summary: Combined Colleges of Education and Human Ecology 2005

Combined data from Part 1. Section A - University Diversity Demographics as of 4/30/2005

<p>REGULAR FACULTY</p>																			
Regular Faculty	24	51.1%	23	48.9%	3	6.4%	3	6.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	41	87.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Professor	34	47.2%	38	52.8%	7	9.7%	4	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	60	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Associate Professor	16	55.2%	13	44.8%	2	6.9%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.5%	24	82.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Assistant Professor	35	30.7%	79	69.3%	5	4.4%	4	3.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	98	86.0%	0	0.0%	7	6.2%	
Auxiliary Faculty	46	28.1%	118	72.0%	19	12.0%	38	23.2%	0	0.0%	7	4.3%	85	51.8%	4	2.4%	11	6.7%	
Teaching (GTA)	19	14.8%	109	85.2%	9	10.2%	12	13.6%	0	0.0%	5	5.7%	47	53.4%	6	6.8%	9	10.2%	
Research (GRA)	24	25.0%	72	75.0%	9	9.4%	23	24.0%	2	2.1%	4	4.2%	50	52.1%	1	1.0%	7	7.3%	
Administrative (GAA)	<p>STAFF</p>																		
Staff	8	72.7%	3	27.3%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Academic Leadership Executive,	17	32.7%	35	67.3%	5	9.6%	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	42	80.8%	0	0.0%	2	3.9%	
Administrative Professional	62	32.6%	128	67.4%	6	3.2%	9	4.7%	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	166	87.4%	0	0.0%	7	3.7%	
Clerical, Secretarial	7	8.3%	77	91.7%	14	16.7%	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	63	75.0%	1	1.2%	4	4.8%	
Paraprofessional, Technical	12	57.1%	9	42.9%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	90.5%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	

Diversity Data for Students

Summary: HUMAN ECOLOGY 2005

		Gender		Race/Ethnicity										Total				
		Male	Female	Black	Asian	Am Ind	Hispanic	White	Non-Resident Alien	Unknown								
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
685	29.1%	1,665	70.9%	217	9.2%	92	3.9%	10	0.4%	49	2.1%	1,915	81.5%	37	1.6%	30	1.3%	2,350
15	15.6%	81	84.4%	9	9.4%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	51	53.1%	34	35.4%	1	1.0%	96

Students
Undergraduate
Graduate
Professional

Summary: COLLEGE OF EDUCATION 2005

		Gender		Race/Ethnicity										Total				
		Male	Female	Black	Asian	Am Ind	Hispanic	White	Non-Resident Alien	Unknown								
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
383	50.7%	372	49.3%	48	6.4%	12	1.6%	2	0.3%	15	2.0%	644	85.3%	16	2.1%	18	2.4%	755
431	27.1%	1,161	72.9%	169	10.6%	34	2.1%	5	0.3%	22	1.4%	1,123	70.5%	162	10.2%	77	4.8%	1,592

Students
Undergraduate
Graduate
Professional

Summary: COMBINED DATA, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY 2005

		Gender		Race/Ethnicity										Total				
		Male	Female	Black	Asian	Am Ind	Hispanic	White	Non-Resident Alien	Unknown								
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
1,068	34.4%	2,037	65.6%	265	8.5%	104	3.3%	12	0.4%	64	2.1%	2,559	82.4%	53	1.7%	48	1.5%	3,105
446	26.4%	1,242	73.6%	178	10.5%	35	2.1%	5	0.3%	22	1.3%	1,174	69.5%	196	11.6%	78	4.6%	1,688

Students
Undergraduate
Graduate
Professional

Summary: TOTAL COLUMBUS CAMPUS 2005

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity										Total						
	Female		Black		Asian		Am Ind		Hispanic		White			Non-Resident Alien		Unknown			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		
Students																			
Undergraduate	19,644	52.5%	17,767	47.5%	2,852	7.6%	2,011	5.4%	153	0.4%	930	2.5%	29,455	78.7%	1,186	3.2%	824	2.2%	37,411
Graduate	4,440	45.2%	5,384	54.8%	554	5.6%	291	3.0%	34	0.3%	167	1.7%	5,723	58.3%	2,565	26.1%	490	5.0%	9,824
Professional	1,576	48.2%	1,693	51.8%	162	5.0%	339	10.4%	15	0.5%	61	1.9%	2,367	72.4%	48	1.5%	277	8.5%	3,269

Summary: TOTAL ALL CAMPUSES 2005

	Gender		Race/Ethnicity										Total						
	Female		Black		Asian		Am Ind		Hispanic		White			Non-Resident Alien		Unknown			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		
Students																			
Undergraduate	22,726	51.3%	21,581	48.7%	3,167	7.1%	2,118	4.8%	183	0.4%	1,013	2.3%	35,668	80.5%	1,202	2.7%	956	2.2%	44,307
Graduate	4,488	44.1%	5,684	55.9%	562	5.5%	293	2.9%	34	0.3%	168	1.7%	6,048	59.5%	2,567	25.2%	500	4.9%	10,172
Professional	1,576	48.2%	1,693	51.8%	162	5.0%	339	10.4%	15	0.5%	61	1.9%	2,367	72.4%	48	1.5%	277	8.5%	3,269

7. In the first table depicting the results of the vote for the merger: Display the data by department for all of the columns (there are 3 columns where no data by dept/school are provided).

College	School Dept	Votes Cast	Eligible Voters	% Voting	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	% of voters	% of faculty
								YES	YES
Education		116	137	84.67%	100	13	3	86.21%	72.99%
	PAES	37	44	84.09%	31	6	0	83.78%	70.45%
	P&L	26	32	81.25%	25	1	0	96.15%	78.13%
	T&L	53	61	86.89%	44	6	3	83.02%	72.13%
Human Ecology		39	47	82.98%	38	1	0	97.44%	82.61%
	CS	19	22	86.36%	19	0	0	100.00%	86.36%
	HDFS	12	16	75.00%	12	0	0	100.00%	75.00%
	HN	8	9	88.89%	7	1	0	87.50%	77.78%
TOTAL		155	183	84.70%	138	14	3	89.03%	75.41%

8. Page 2(b) – Provide more details. Some points do not make sense as the merger will not increase student credit hours or IDC. How will the merger facilitate expected growth?

The faculty in the College of Education and the faculty in the College of Human Ecology will be affected by this merger. There are 137 faculty in the College of Education and 47 faculty in the College of Human Ecology. However, there will be no changes in faculty TIU as a result of this merger. And, there will be no changes in employment status of any current faculty. College level administrative positions will be reduced (see item c; paragraphs 2&3).

The merger is expected to facilitate growth in the number of faculty in the new college. As indicated in the rationale, the new college will bring together faculty to develop new interdisciplinary programs that will generate additional student credit hours and provide new external funding opportunities for faculty. Nationally, those colleges that have been able to create more holistic views of education and well-being for individuals and families have been able to develop innovative programs and recruit a wider range of faculty than those colleges that have maintained more fragmented approaches.

Faculty from the two colleges are already meeting to develop new program options, prepare new proposals for external funding, and redefine faculty lines considering the joint needs of program areas. For example, faculty members in nutrition are working closely with faculty members in exercise science to develop a college-wide focus on preventing childhood obesity. Similarly, faculty members focusing on early childhood (appointed in both colleges) are working together to recruit a new research director for the Weinland Park Early Childhood Development Center. The combined resources of the School of Teaching and Learning and the Department of Human Development and Family Science have allowed these faculty to seek a world class faculty member to lead this innovative project. This would not have been possible for either unit individually. The candidates being considered for this position are very productive researchers with well-funded projects. It is important to note that within the past year, multiple candidates for faculty positions have referenced the vision of the new college as one factor that motivated them to apply.

There is a level of excitement around the creation of a new college that provides a window of opportunity for growth. The increased student credit hours and IDC that are generated from new programs, new faculty, and re-engaged faculty will be reinvested in new faculty lines.

The new college will also provide an opportunity to establish a new culture. The faculty understand and support the creation of a new culture founded on innovation and entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial activity in research and program development will yield new resources for individual faculty as well as departments, schools, and the college. The creation of a stronger culture of innovation will allow us to better attract additional world class faculty members.

9. Where will the new college be housed? Are the two current locations going to remain? Where will the Administration of the College be housed?

The College of Human Ecology is currently located in two on-campus sites and two off-campus sites (Campbell Hall, Mount Hall, The Human Ecology House, and the Center for Learning Excellence). The College of Education is currently housed in four sites on-campus and four sites off-campus (Arps Hall, Pomerene Hall, Ramseyer, RPAC Phase II, Center for Special Needs Population, Center for Education Training and Employment, Reading Recovery, and Ohio Resource Center for Math and Science Education). The new college will maintain its current sites and will open three new sites (RPAC Phase III, Weinland Park Early Childhood Development Center, Metro School for Math and Science Education). In addition, College of Education and College of Human Ecology faculty are located on each of the regional campuses. College administrative offices will be housed in both Campbell and Arps Hall. The specific location of these offices has not been determined.

10. What were the concerns of the faculty who voted “no” for the merger? On page 4, alumni input – there were 8 negative letters from HE alumni – what were their concerns and how were these concerns addressed?

Faculty votes on the merger were confidential. Consequently, it is impossible to list the concerns of those who voted “no.” There were ample public opportunities for faculty to express their concerns and support for the merger.

Two discussions that might be framed as concerns were witnessed in public settings. First was a discussion of whether or not the two “cultures” were compatible enough to merge. This discussion was held at a joint faculty meeting and was very useful. The second discussion was around maintaining “identity and representation” and focused on the challenges that some of the smaller departments in Human Ecology might face in trying to maintain an identity and adequate college level representation within a larger college. Interestingly, the department of Human Nutrition was most concerned about the issue of department size and identity/representation, yet all faculty members from this unit voted in support of the merger.

Again, it is difficult to determine whether or not those who presented the items for discussion were those who voted against the merger. The issue of identity was discussed primarily in relation to Human Ecology, and only one faculty member who voted in Human Ecology was against the merger.

11. Page 4 (l) address the question in more detail.

Academic Freedom and Responsibility

The academic freedom and responsibility of the faculty in these two colleges will not be adversely affected by the merger of these units. There will be no fundamental changes in the responsibilities of the faculty. The distribution of effort (across teaching, research, and service) is similar within both colleges. Each college has a long standing commitment to a balanced approach to teaching, research, and service.

The college will provide opportunities for interdisciplinary scholarship, but the faculty will maintain the choice to pursue these opportunities, or not. There is nothing inherent within the proposed new structure that would adversely impact academic freedom.

A larger college will require more structured faculty governance. The faculty have already made changes to the existing governance structure of the College of Education (e.g., the College Council and its by-laws) to accommodate the merger. As stated in a previous response, this governance was more structured than that used in Human Ecology and the faculty agreed that a more formalized structure would be necessary in a larger college.