

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
**February 3, 2005**  
**3:30 – 5:30 PM**  
**Faculty Club North**

Members Present: George E. Billman, Mark A. Bullimore, Daniel E. Collins, John R. Current, Steven M. D'Ambrosio, Philip T.K. Daniel, Mark C. Ellis, Steven S. Fink, Allen R. Firestone, Susan W. Fisher, Deborah Yale George, Ronald Glaser, Gerald S. Greenberg, E. Kay Halasek, Kenneth Hinchcliff, David G. Horn, J. Craig Jenkins, William M. Masters, Brian W. McEnnis, Dennis B. McKay, Jeffrey K. McKee, Anthony Mughan, Gene E. Mumy, Stephen C. Myers, Glen R. Needham, Berl R. Oakley, John M. Parson, Jack A. Rall, W. Michael Sherman, Allan J. Silverman, Anne M. Smith, Michael D. Trudeau, Harald Emil F. Vaessin, Sharon C. West and Charles E. Wilson

Guests Present: Paul Beck, John Bruno, Reinhard Gahbauer, Jane Hathaway, Nina Mayr, Deborah Merritt, Bert Rockman, Randy Smith and George J. Valco

**AGENDA:**

**A. Proposal to form a Department of Radiation Medicine: Nina Mayr, Director Radiation Oncology**

1. Introduction: Jack Rall
  - a. An issue of this type normally is dealt with by CAA and then sent directly to the University Senate floor for a vote. But since the formation of this department involves fewer than ten regular faculty members, it was considered important to bring the issue before Faculty Council for presentation and discussion so that the faculty Senators would have a better sense of why this department should be formed with less than ten faculty.
  - b. This discussion is a prelude of a discussion that we will probably have in the spring about the rule of ten faculty members in a department - whether it should be changed or stay as it is.
  - c. Nina Mayr is making the presentation today. She is the current director of the division of Radiation Oncology and if a new department is created she will be the department chair. She joined OSU during the past year.
2. Dr. Mayr thanked the council for allowing her to present the proposal.
  - a. Around the country Radiation Medicine Departments are separated from Radiation Oncology. Radiation Oncology is a very important part of cancer management. There are major expansions in research in the Comprehensive Cancer Center. Radiation Medicine is scientifically, educationally and clinically a separate entity from Radiation Oncology. We treat benign tumors while Radiation Oncology treats cancerous tumors.
  - b. It is desired to hire high caliber faculty who can achieve growth in research funding. In turn, this will enhance visibility and the University will receive recognition nationwide and internationally. At other universities, it has been difficult to recruit high level faculty if you are integrated in a Radiology Department. Individuals are reviewed by peers outside of their own specialty. If we want to grow, we must

recruit. I appreciate the support from Dr. Gahbauer, Director of Radiation Oncology.

- c. Financial support for the department will be self-generated from clinical work. The College of Medicine has committed significant support for future expansion.
- d. There are presently three faculty in Radiation Medicine. In 2008, we plan to have six more faculty members. There is strong interest and commitment for a particle beam center at OSU. If we do get funding for this and it comes to fruition, we will have additional faculty committed to this.
- e. We currently have a resident training program, Oncology physicist program and Radiation therapist program. We also want to establish a fellowship program.
- f. We want to develop interdisciplinary research. There have been collaborations with the Department of Physics and Nuclear Engineering. As we grow, we will be able to take care of more patients in a very specialized way.
- g. Questions, comments and discussion
  - Q. How many of the six faculty that are going to be hired would be tenure-track faculty? A. All of them.
  - C. There has been precedent in presenting departments with fewer than ten faculty.
  - Q. What is being done about recruiting? A. Dr. Gahbauer reported that recruiting is on-going.
  - Q. Why can't the Radiation Medicine Department wait until they have ten faculty before forming a department. A. Dr. Mayr said that the science and technology has been advancing rapidly and OSU will be behind if we wait to hire ten faculty members before forming the department.
  - Q. Is it ten tenure track or ten regular faculty that are required by rule? A. Dr. Fisher said it is ten tenure track because when the rule was formed there were no other faculty categories.
  - C. Dr. Rall said that this is one of the issues that Faculty Council will need to address because of the different kinds of faculty categories that now exist.
  - Q. What is the relationship of the Physics Department to Radiation Medicine? A. The relationship between medical physicists and Radiation Oncology naturally go together.
  - Q. Why this name for your department? A. We are treating benign brain tumors, coronary arteries and lung cancer. We felt it was more appropriate to separate ourselves from Radiation Oncology because of these specialties.

## **B. Intercollegiate Athletics: John Bruno, Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)**

### **1. Duties of the Faculty Athletics Representative**

- a. This is a position that is mandated by the NCAA. Every University that is a member of the NCAA has such a person. The three representatives are the President of the University, the Athletic Director and the Faculty representative. The Athletic Council submits a list of names to the University President and the president makes the final selection. The NCAA handbook reads that the FAR is recognized as the representative of the institution and its faculty in the relationship between the NCAA and the local campus.
- b. The charges are fourfold: The FAR: 1. participates in the insurance of academic integrity of the athletics program; 2. monitors the student athlete experience; 3.

participates in the insurance of institutional compliance; and 4. advises the president and the director of athletics.

2. Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA): Academic Integrity Proposal

a. The COIA is a group of faculty members around the country that believe that academics should drive athletics. The COIA has prepared a series of documents; one such document is the Academic Integrity Proposal. Feedback is being solicited from faculty around the country. Ohio State has been asked to support or not support this document. A coalition group has been organized at OSU. There are athletic council members serving on this group. Staff members and faculty council members are also part of this group. Comments will be taken from this group today as well as from other groups on campus to this coalition. The executive summary summarizes the document. If Ohio State votes in support of this document, we are stating that we embrace the guidelines or best practices that are defined in the document.

b. Questions, comments and discussion

C. Dr. Rall commented that the COIA was formed about four years ago. Last year Ohio State joined the group. Now the group consists of 40 plus major universities. An endorsement of this document is not an endorsement of every aspect of the document but an endorsement of the general document. Are there things in here that we could do better? Are there things in here that don't fit well with the way we do business? I think this is the way the document would be voted on and used.

Q. Is this a code that will be adopted by the NCAA? A. Dr. Bruno said that three of the proposals are specific and the committee hopes that they would percolate up to the NCAA governance structure. The other 87 are guidelines or recommendations that COIA would like each institution to consider.

C. If one school adopted certain of these proposals and other schools didn't, this would put one school at a disadvantage to others. A. Dr. Bruno said that placing an institution at a competitive disadvantage is a mortal sin of any kind of NCAA legislation.

C. Dr. Daniel said he would like to see a return visit of this issue to the Faculty Council because what we are talking about is discrimination. There are some aspects of the entire document that we disagree with, we will note this, and we ought to let this body know as well. My concern is precedential value. What I mean is that if we approve this document, it appears on the surface that we approve the entire document.

Q. Is this the same group (COIA) that distributed that unattributed document several years ago. A. Dr. Bruno said the document distributed earlier was the precursor of this document.

Q. What problems have been raised by the coalition in this document? A. Sensitivities about- expenditures of monies, capital debt, facilities, lines of division between the athletic department and the office of academic affairs with respect to advising of student athletes. How much is under control of athletics and how much is under control of academic affairs; salaries of coaches; missed class time; students missing classes or final exams; whether scholarships should be granted on an annual basis or on a five year basis. This is a flavor of the

concerns. Dr. Bruno said he shares some of Dr. Daniel's concerns about the document; the document is discriminatory with some ethnic groups.

- Q. Dr Horn asked if it was possible to draft a resolution that states that the university supports the spirit of the document but not all its resolutions? A. Dr. Bruno said that this is probably the sense of the OSU working group at this time.
- C. Dr. Rall said that a commentary should accompany the vote on this proposal. He said we should redistribute this document for your comments. Send comments to Dr. Bruno (bruno.1) or rall.1.
3. Academic State of OSU Athletics
- a. There are a large number of dedicated faculty and staff members who try to watch over this complex activity. Dr. Bruno said he is impressed with what is being done with student athletes. The NCAA clearly recognizes that OSU is dedicated to graduating students. The graduation rate of the student athlete over the past six years reveals that the rate of student athletes meets or exceeds the general student body graduation rate by as much as 4 to 8 percentage points. Student athletes who have exhausted their four years of athletic competition eligibility at OSU graduate at a rate of 88%.
  - b. The NCAA values graduation and progress toward a degree. Each quarter the Department of Athletics will be asked for what is called an Academic Progress Rate (APR). This quarter will be the first one published by the Big Ten and NCAA for the public record. What it values are three things: 1. retention; 2. remaining academically eligible; and 3. student graduation. This is the metric that we will be tracking each quarter. Beginning in 2007, the NCAA will establish penalties for institutions or sports in institutions that fall below the tolerance value. This is an objective metric.
  - c. Admission criteria continue to go up each year and that is what we value as an institution. The admission requirement for student athletes is keeping up with this. However, there is a discernible difference. One of these is the person with a variety of talents. There is a set structure for how we deal with students that fall below the admission criteria. I feel that Athletics has some work to do on recruiting athletes that are prepared to do college level work. These are complex issues.

**C. Proposal for merger of John Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management: Kay Halasek, Council on Athletic Affairs**

1. Proposal: the School of Public Policy and Management would move outside the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and would join the John Glenn Institute and report directly to the Provost.
2. Process to date: there have been meetings with Mary Marvel, professor in Public Policy and Management, Bert Rockman, Director School of Public Policy and Management, Deborah Merritt, Director John Glenn Institute, Paul Beck, Dean College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and myself. There is a meeting planned next week with Provost Barbara Snyder and Vice Provost Carole Anderson. There was an informational meeting held in late October. Randy Smith and other members of CAA attended that meeting. This was followed by a vote which is required by faculty. There are two items: 1. the merger of the two units and 2. the reporting line. Faculty were asked to vote on each of

these two items. The vote was in favor of the merger, 114 in favor; 18 opposed with 2 abstentions; the reporting line was 22 in favor and 110 opposing with 2 abstentions. The subcommittee has not yet voted or forwarded their recommendations to CAA but there was an open discussion in CAA with Dean Beck, Deborah Merritt and Bert Rockman in attendance. The subcommittee, as required by the University rules about alteration and abolition of units, does include additional members who are Steve Fink, English Department, Karen Hebut, College of Nursing, George Valco, Engineering, Peg McMann, FAES, and Barb Pletz, CCS.

3. Each representative, Dean Beck, Deborah Merritt and Bert Rockman, was asked to make a statement about the possible merger.
  - a. Deborah Merritt said the key issue is the reporting line. Nationally Schools of Public Affairs report centrally. The School of Public Policy has been going downhill for more than ten years. It began as one of the top twenty schools in the country; one of the top fourteen. It began to decline when it became part of the Fisher College of Business. In 1994, the accrediting team who reviewed the School's position recommended that it should report to the provost where most schools in public affairs report. The university tried to upgrade the School by moving it into the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; however the decline is still occurring. This proposal is truly a faculty driven proposal. It is best if the School reports centrally rather than to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.
  - b. Bert Rockman deferred to Deborah Merritt's comments. He reinforced Dr. Merritt's recommendation that it would be best if the School of Public Affairs reported centrally. He said he felt it would be a wonderful opportunity for the School to be joined with the institute.
  - c. Dean Beck said that there are two issues. The first issue is the merger. From his perspective, the merger makes good sense. It would strengthen both units but still leave the academic structure. The Institute would benefit by having an academic side. The School would benefit from the resources the university has invested in the Glenn Institute. The reporting line is something that is not in the university rules. Only colleges report to OAA. There is one exception and that is the School of Public Health. There is presently a proposal that will turn the School of Public Health into a College. The reporting line to OAA for an institute is one thing; for an academic unit it is rather odd. OAA does not deal with the kinds of things colleges and departments address. Some kind of structure would have to be created for handling this sort of business. There are also questions about budget. The College handles funds for programs and units. There would be a great possibility for students at the graduate level to provide monies for this School of Public Affairs.
  - d. Questions, comments and discussion
    - C. Dr. Mumy, Department of Economics said there are two issues. The alteration of colleges and the change in the reporting line. Departments should have ten tenure track faculty members. Departments report to colleges; schools report to colleges. This proposal creates a merged unit that would not have ten faculty members. The key issue is that the merged Glenn School as a TIU would be a course offering unit and as such should report to a College because that is where you get the quality control in course offerings. He urged all faculty senators to vote against the proposal if the reporting line is not changed.

- C. Dr. Halasek said that she believes if the reporting line does not go to the Provost, the merger will most likely not happen.
- C. If we think outside the box, there is a merger in name but the reporting line stays in the college so curricular items can be taken care of at the College level. The John Glenn Institute can keep reporting to the Provost, while the School reports to the SBS College.
- C. Dr. Silverman said he had three questions. 1. What would be the tenure structure? 2. What would be the funding for additional faculty? 3. What is the consideration of how they will or will not have undergraduate instruction?
- A. Dr. Halasek said the tenure question from assistant to associate would take place in the School, Director and then the Provost, just as it does now in the College of Nursing. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor, OAA would convene a special committee to handle this issue. Any revisions or additions to undergraduate curricular would go to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee. This group does not anticipate any growth in this area. Dr. Merritt said that there may be a minor program available in the future. There are three or four courses offered in the Glenn Institute through the Political Sciences Department. The real growth to this School is professional growth. Dr. Halasek referred the budget question to Dr. Merritt. Dr. Merritt said that Dean Beck said a School like this with a central reporting line could succeed if there was central investment. When she came to the University about five years ago, the budget was a little less than 1M dollars. That budget has grown to almost 3M dollars. This is a very successful enterprise. This money will be invested in the School. Presently, the School is very small and strapped for resources. Dr. Halasek said if the School reports directly to the Provost, it will have to solicit money from the Provost.
- C. Dr. Silverman asked if the School would expect more money from the Provost if the merger takes place.
- C. Dr. Merritt said that more money would be available through increased enrollment – professional master degrees.
- C. Dr. Mughan said the major problem here is that the program has not prospered under SBS. He said he would like a much better explanation of its decline.
- C. Dean Beck said there are numerous reasons for the decline. Under the new budgeting system, there has been an erosion of revenues. Decline in Master's students has hit the School very hard. The budget figures will not change if the Glenn Institute reports to SBS. It doesn't matter where they report. The students don't know who the School reports to. Visibility is earned by how well the School publicizes what it has to offer and over time the quality of students and faculty it attracts. SBS has a new dean; I began on 7/1/04. I am very interested in this program and am willing to support this endeavor. I believe that the chances of doing this are much better if it is connected to a college almost half of whose faculty are policy interested in one sort or another. The college also has many relationships outside of SBS.
- C. What happened to the undergraduate courses that were going to be offered?
- C. Dr. Rockman said there was some discussion about offering a minor in the School. There was a proposal several years ago. Dr. Halasek said that this

proposal does not include a major in the John Glenn Institute. There is currently no undergraduate minor.

- C. Dr. Merritt said there is a debate in the School as to whether there should be an undergraduate minor. She said she felt that if there is going to be a minor it should be under the Federation of the Arts and Sciences.
- C. Dr. Horn asked if the Federation had taken a position on this.
- C. Dr. Halasek replied that Interim Dean Royster said no comment at this time.
- C. Dr. Rockman said that the School is beginning to improve with the proposal between the Glenn Institute and the School becoming more visible. He also said that it would be difficult to expand and prosper being in the confines of a College. He said he feels we can do better if we can operate outside of a college.
- C. Dr. Silverman said he had two more questions. 1. I don't understand why funds can't be obtained by being part of a college. 2. How long will it take for you to get to the size where you can compete with other colleges?
- C. Dr. Merritt said that in one sense the School can complete immediately if the merger goes through. There is a lot of recognition of Ohio State as a leader of the School and giving it the visibility of becoming the John Glenn School would be good. There is a plan that states that in five years the School will have fifteen faculty, not all fulltime some would have joint appointments with other units.
- C. Dr. Halasek said that external funds are more likely to come to the School if it has a central reporting line.
- C. Fundraising would come no matter how the unit reports.
- C. Dr. Mughan said he had an observation. Faculty are a division of labor and to breach this division of labor is something that we should not do.
- C. Dr. Rall said that the purpose of this discussion was to provide input to CAA who is still deliberating on the proposal and to let members of Faculty Council better understand the basic issues of the proposal.
- C. Dr. Halasek told the group if they have additional questions or comments that they should email them to her at [halasek.1@osu.edu](mailto:halasek.1@osu.edu).

#### **D. New Business**

1. Dr. John Current is the Faculty Council representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. The council met last month with the chancellor of the Board of Regents. He said that if the economy goes down, funding for higher education goes down and therefore the economy goes down further and thus funding for higher education goes down further, etc. He has two proposals to deal with the uncertain funding for higher education in Ohio. One is to improve the student graduation rate and the second is to get the community involved. He wants to set up blue ribbon commissions. One is to look at the economic impact of college degrees, collect data and put it in an executive format. The other is to see if we can generate community based activism to generate support for higher education. Send comments to [current.1@osu.edu](mailto:current.1@osu.edu).
- C. It was suggested that Mike Dewine be contacted to see if CEO's who give contributions could encourage the State Legislature to encourage funding for higher education.

2. Dr. Silverman, Chair of the Program Committee, asked if there was any sense if there is going to be controversy about the Radiation Medicine proposal or should he assume that the will of the Faculty Council is to back the CAA recommendation. He asked if there are any problems that he should anticipate. There were no comments. Dr. Silverman also said that the featured speaker at the next Senate meeting is Dean Sanfilippo who will be speaking on three topics having to do with the college of medicine. He will speak about the relationship between the College of Medicine and the University about rankings, etc. He will address better communication between appropriate committees and third, the finances of the many structures that are being built at the university.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.