COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

200 BRICKER HALL

September 6, 2007

11:00 AM -1:00 PM

MINUTES

Present:

Professors: Sheryl Barringer, James Beatty, Daniel E. Collins Lora Gingerich Dobos, Richard Gunther, E. Kay Halasek, W. Randy Smith (Vice-Chair), George Valco, Brian L. Winer (Chair)

Student Members: Robert Calhoun (Council of Graduate Students), Rose Babington (Undergraduate Student Government)

Guests: Professor Edward H. Adelson, Associate Executive Dean, and Kate Hallihan, Director of Curriculum and Assessment, Colleges of the Arts and Sciences; Jed Dickhaut, Associate Registrar, Office of the University Registrar; David Roy, Senior Assistant Director, Enrollment Services; Professor Elliot Slotnick, Associate Dean, Graduate School; Professor Deborah Larsen, Director, School of Allied Medical Professions; Professor Jacqueline J. Royster, Executive Dean, and Julie Graber, Colleges of the Arts and Sciences; Professors Elizabeth Lenz, Dean and Linda Bernhard, Graduate Studies Committee Chair, College of Nursing


• Gunther moved approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 30, 2007. The motion was seconded by Beatty and passed unanimously.

• Collins moved approval of the Minutes of the meeting of June 20, 2007. The motion was seconded by Calhoun and passed unanimously.

• Dobos moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of August 22, 2007. The motion was seconded by Babington and passed with two abstentions.
COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR – PROFESSOR BRIAN L. WINER

• There were no comments from the Chair

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

• The Board of Trustees will meet on September 21, 2007. The proposal requesting use of the term “center/institute” to establish the Ohio House of Science and Engineering will be on the agenda for approval.

• Incoming President E. Gordon Gee will address the Faculty Council on October 4, 2007 and chair the University Senate meeting on October 11, 2007.

• This will be the last meeting for three members. George Valco is finishing his 3 year term and now will be the chair of the College of Engineering Council on Academic Affairs; Jim Beatty, after just one year, will become a member of the University Senate Fiscal Committee; and Richard Gunther, after two years, will now serve as Chair-elect of the Faculty Council. Smith thanked each for his service to the Council.

• This will be the last meeting for Brian Winer as the Chair of the Council. However, he has agreed to stay an additional year to help with the transition to so many new Council members. Winer’s performance as Council Chair has been exemplary - handling very difficult initiatives and showing tremendous leadership. His work is very much appreciated by the Council, the University Senate leadership, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Halasek will serve as Council Chair for the 2007-2008 academic year, effective October 3, 2007.

• In Spring 2007, an ad hoc committee on Centers reviewed the current guidelines/rule for Centers and Institutes and reworked them. This proposal will be brought to Council soon. Smith apologized for the delay. This will be a Rule change, and thus will need action by the University Senate and Board of Trustees.

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE MINIMUM CUMULATIVE POINT HOUR RATIO, SCHOOL OF ALLIED MEDICAL PROFESSIONS – PROFESSORS BRIAN L. WINER AND W. RANDY SMITH, SUBCOMMITTEE D

Winer noted that the proposal from the School of Allied Medical Profession (SAMP) requesting change in the cumulative point hour ratio (CPHR) had been discussed by Council at its last meeting. Professor Deborah Larsen, Director of the School, is here to respond to some of the concerns raised:
• How will the new CPHR affect the different programs within the School?
• Why is there a concern about advising when it appears that there are so few students on whom there will be an impact?
• Will student demographics and diversity be affected?

Larsen indicated that she does not have an answer to the question about demographics. Currently, students with < 2.5 CPHR do not seem to be successful in the major, and there is no mechanism to encourage them to transfer out. This new CPHR of 2.5 will not force out the pre-majors currently in the program, but those who are planning “Health Science” as pre-major will be counseled to go elsewhere. It is a small number of students affected by this change.

Why a CPHR of 2.5? Usually students with a CPHR of 2.5 or above seem to be successful in the program. They do not want to short-change students by raising the CPHR beyond 2.5. Although the number of students with a CPHR below the threshold is small, the “Health Science” major is expected to see considerable growth in the future.

There were no further questions but Halasek was not convinced that there was a strong rationale for the proposal and suggested that, if approved, an update on implementation of the proposal be required. Smith agreed.

Subcommittee D moved approval of the proposal. It was seconded by Gunther and passed unanimously.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A INSTITUTE ON WOMEN, GENDER AND PUBLIC POLICY, COLLEGES OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES – PROFESSOR GEORGE VALCO, CHAIR, SUBCOMMITTEE C

Valco summarized the proposal. The Institute on Women, Gender, and Public Policy is proposed to provide a forum for scholars to collaborate to research complex societal problems with the objective of enhancing the capacity for women to change their lives for the better. The proposed Institute will fill a void left open with the demise of the formerly government-based Ohio Women’s Policy and Research Commission that collected, analyzed, and disseminated data on the status of women. In so doing it is expected to take a leadership role in providing information resources with a reputation for independence and intellectual rigor.

The proposal was reviewed in parallel by Subcommittee C and the University Research Committee (URC). Questions, comments, and requests for modification of the proposal from both reviews were sent to the authors of the proposal. The issues raised included: reporting frequency, research of faculty with an interest in the Institute, staffing, the organizational structure, the budget, what distinguishes the proposed Institute from
others, the use of “gender” in the title, the relationship to the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, and the scope of the Institute. The authors provided an item-by-item response to each issue raised in both reviews, along with a revised proposal. Subcommittee C is satisfied with the responses and revised proposal and unanimously recommends approval of the proposal.

Gunther expressed major concerns.

- Do we need a stand alone Institute for research concerning women, when the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, the Department of Women’s Studies and The Women’s Place all exist. If three units on campus are already involved in related activities, do we need a sizable office to do so?
- Among potential research network participants, 14 out of 35 are administrators. Are they credible active participants?
- The URC did not endorse this proposal.
- A budget of $400,000 is excessive, raising questions of cost effectiveness. The Institute’s endowment campaign for $10M to generate $400,000 is as large as the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences’ campaign and so far only $25,000 in funding has been secured.
- The administrative structure appears very large for a modest mission.
- The institute appears to rely on staff of Arts and Sciences (ASC). Using ASC’s development staff to raise funds could detract from raising funds for the ASC colleges themselves.
- Have the ASC Deans been consulted on using ASC development staff for fund raising for the Institute?
- Given that the Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences is about to be reviewed, this proposal should be tabled until the review is over and the future of the Federation is known.

Winer also questioned why a new organization is needed to do the kind of research that is already going on in other areas of the University. Winer asked Valco if this issue was discussed. Valco responded that they did get a response, but it was not as strong as expected/hoped.

Smith indicated that the Women’s Place and the Department of Women’s Studies are very supportive of this proposal. He said that although the acting director of John Glenn School of Public Affairs supported it, we need to know the new (since August 1, 2007) permanent director, Charles Wise’s, opinion.

There was concern that there will be a conflict of interest if Executive Dean Royster also assumes the responsibilities of the Director of the Institute. With the enormous responsibilities of the Executive Dean position, it is perceived that the majority of the responsibilities will need to be shifted to the associate director. There is also no oversight committee to oversee the Institute. There was concern that in the current absence of funds, funds from Arts and Sciences could be usurped.

4
DISCUSSION WITH EXECUTIVE DEAN JACQUELINE J. ROYSTER AND JULIE GRABER, COLLEGES OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES.

Winer indicated that the main questions about the proposal focused on the administrative structure and funding of the Institute. The following are among the concerns:

- Why do we need a new Institute, when the Women’s Place and the Department of Women’s Studies are involved in similar activity?
- The budget – its proposed size and sources of funds.
- Using Arts and Science staff for fund raising
- Holding dual appointments as Executive Dean and Director of the Institute may result in conflict of interest.
- Why not use Glenn School of Public Affairs as a base to accomplish all the activities outlined in the proposal?

Royster responded that all departments supporting this proposal are small. The Women’s Place is not equipped to do the kind of research the Institute wants to do. Women’s Studies may not be able to provide opportunities for collaborative interdisciplinary research efforts. When asked about the role of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in the Americas, the response was that it is a possibility but it is not a founding partner.

Royster said that she has had communication with the new Director of the Glenn School of Public Affairs, and he is very excited about the establishment of the Institute. He offered to attend a Council meeting to comment.

In response to the concern about her dual role as the Executive Dean of the College of the Arts and Sciences and Director of the Institute, Royster clarified that she is willing to be the Director because it is in her area of research interest.

A Council member wanted to know whether the number of research centers listed in the proposal is similar in scope to this Institute. Information was needed on exactly how much funding will be needed to run the Institute without financial support from the central administration. It was also felt that the Institute’s fund raising efforts will come at the expense of the cost of Arts and Sciences fund raising. Graber clarified the point that it is her responsibility to help with fund raising and that does not interfere with broader arts and sciences efforts.

DISCUSSION:

Gunther felt that the issues and concerns raised were not satisfactorily addressed. Issues such as size of staff and conflict of interest are of greater concern now than before. Indeed there is disagreement about the mission of the Federation, and what is or what is not the role of the Federation with regard to interdisciplinary work.
Winer was not convinced that the mission of the Institute cannot be accomplished within existing units. The Council needs to hear from the new Director of John Glenn School of Public Affairs, the Women’s Place, and the Department of Women’s Studies. The heads of these units should be invited to a Council meeting for discussion of the proposal. In addition, this proposal involves a diversion of ASC Federation resources over the first four years and those services were supposed to have been devoted to supporting the ASC colleges. The Council emphasized that letters of concurrences from Arts and Sciences dens approving diversion of their support services to this project is crucial.

Smith said that it was important to note that all year Royster had worked closely with former Executive Vice President and Provost Barbara R. Snyder on the early development of the proposal and had been supported at that level.

Halasek moved that the proposal be tabled. It was seconded by Babington. The motion passed unanimously.

PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP A DOCTOR OF NURSING PRACTICE (DNP) DEGREE, COLLEGE OF NURSING – PROFESSORS BRIAN L. WINER AND W. RANDY SMITH, SUBCOMMITTEE D

Winer gave highlights of the proposal. This program is being proposed in response to dramatic changes in the health care needs of this country and the global community, and is in keeping with a recommendation from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) that all advanced practice nursing education evolve to the DNP by 2015. It is a three year program with 148-168 credit hours. What is not clear from the proposal is whether they plan to eliminate the Masters degree in Nursing or modify the program.

DISCUSSION WITH PROFESSORS ELIZABETH LENZ, DEAN, AND LINDA BERNHARD, GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE CHAIR, COLLEGE OF NURSING

Lenz reiterated Winer’s comments about the basic rationale for the Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP). It is not the degree for entry into practice. It is an advanced practice degree for persons already holding a baccalaureate degree and licensed to practice professional nursing. The program will be offered by the College of Nursing and administered by the Graduate School. The proposed program was endorsed by the Graduate Studies Committee and approved by the faculty in the College of Nursing.

The DNP will differ from the Ph.D. by its emphasis on advanced clinical skills and practice related issues. The new degree (DNP) is a practice-focused doctorate and is a necessary alternative to the research-focused PhD; both are needed in a practice discipline, such as nursing. The DNP differs from the current masters’ program in that it places a stronger emphasis on the understanding of systems management, the
development and use of evidence based strategies for practice, a stronger interdisciplinary focus, and a greater opportunity for more extensive advanced clinical practice experience. Some courses will be shared between the DNP and the Ph.D. There are 50 such programs nationally and there are 2 in Ohio.

On page 11, it is stated that the proposed DNP will be phased in to replace the current masters program. Will the DNP program replace the current Masters in Nursing?

The Masters in Nursing will not be eliminated but revised. Advanced practice nursing refers to clinical nurse specialists, certified nurse practitioners, certified nurse midwives, and certified nurse anesthetists. The College of Nursing currently offers the first three of these advanced practice options at the master’s level, and all of these options require students to take significantly more credit hours than the 45-50 hours required for a master’s degree at Ohio State. This proposal would move the advanced practice masters program to the doctoral level by adding additional course work to support the expanding knowledge base needed by advanced practice nurses.

Where will the funding come from for this new program? No new funding will be required because the proposed DNP program will be phased in. The College has reserved annual rate to hire two additional faculty who are clinically expert and hold doctorates to facilitate the required advanced clinical and the immersion courses. The short-run costs necessary to accomplish the transition are already incorporated into the budge of the College. In the longer run, the additional costs are those associated with growth in any program and will be handled by the normal budget process of the University.

Winer asked to explain Table 6 on page 13. Lenz explained that the table indicates what subsidy they bring and what they will have to yet secure.

Subcommittee D moved approval of the proposal. It was seconded by Gunther. The motion passed unanimously.

PROPOSAL FOR A GRADUATE INTERDISCIPLINARY SPECIALIZATION IN FOLKLORE – PROFESSORS BRIAN L. WINER AND W. RANDY SMITH, SUBCOMMITTEE D

Winer gave a summary of the proposal. The proposed Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization (GIS) will allow students to tailor a program from a series of courses arranged as Tools, Theory, and Topics. 20 hours of coursework distributed among these categories will be supplemented with a three-hour independent study to be integrated with the student’s thesis or dissertation work and allows connecting folklore work with the needs of the primary program. A committee drawn from the participating colleges will administer GIS, with support provided by the Center for Folklore Studies. Ohio State has one of the largest and most prominent folklore faculties in the country. The GIS simply formalizes longstanding arrangements. The GIS will make one of Ohio State’s longstanding strengths more visible to students, the general public, and the
folklore profession. 12 students are expected in the first year. Within 3 years it is expected to go up to 30 and continue to grow.

Subcommittee D moved approval of the proposal. It was seconded by Babington. The motion was approved unanimously.

PROPOSAL TO REVISE THE ITALIAN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM – DEPARTMENT OF FRENCH AND ITALIAN - PROFESSOR GEORGE VALCO, CHAIR, SUBCOMMITTEE C

Valco summarized the proposal. The change in the undergraduate curriculum of the Italian Major was driven by changes in pedagogy. The rationale for the proposal was found compelling by the Subcommittee. All the issues raised by the Subcommittee were answered satisfactorily item-by-item, and a revised proposal was submitted. Subcommittee C recommends approval of the proposal.

There were no questions.

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

MISCELLANEOUS ARTS AND SCIENCES’ GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM ISSUES – BRIAN L. WINER, CHAIR

Winer indicated that after going through all the proposals submitted by the Arts and Sciences Senate relating to its modifications of the General Education Curriculum (GEC), there are no outstanding proposals/issues needing further review/action by the Council.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Randy Smith
Lakshmi Dutta