

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

Members Present: Gordon J. Aubrecht, Diane W. Birckbichler, Graeme M. Boone, William A. Brantley, Karen S. Bruns, Robert A. Buerki, Martha C. Cooper, Philip T.K. Daniel, Mark C. Ellis, Susan W. Fisher, Jacqueline Gargus, Ronald Glaser, Gerald S. Greenberg, E. Kay Halasek, David G. Horn, Jennifer J. Kuehn, Thomas R. Lemberger, Kenneth A. Loper, William M. Masters, Brian W. McEnnis, Jeffrey K. McKee, Boris S. Mityagin, Randolph L. Moses, Anthony Mughan, Gene E. Mummy, Berl R. Oakley, Jack A. Rall, Nancy R. Reynolds, Allan J. Silverman, Anne M. Smith, Harald E.F. Vaessin, Sharon C. West and Charles E. Wilson

Guest: Stephen Mangum, Brian McHale, Pamela Paxton, W. Randy Smith and George Valco

I. Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee update: Brian McHale and Pam Paxton

- A. The committee is continuing to collect information and is beginning to write down ideas. The purpose of the visit to Faculty Council is to elicit information to take back to the committee. The committee has developed questions about the objectives of the GEC and questions about the content of the GEC
- B. Discussion
 - Q. What groups do you communicate with across campus? A. Various groups of deans and associate deans, students in units and advisors. We have yet to speak to the students in USG. Not all of the meetings have been well attended. What we did hear has been very useful. We have also developed an idea of what these different constituencies want to see in our recommendations.
 - C. This was also discussed in the Arts and Sciences meeting as well. There was some consensus that the number of hours for graduation needs to be lowered to 180 - maybe by not trimming the GEC but trimming other degree requirements. One of the items discussed was the model being looked at by the committee where there are broad categories used to fulfill the GEC requirements.
 - Q. You have talked only about the GEC. Is this the only focus of the committee? A. This is one focus of the committee. The charge concerns majors as well.
 - Q. What is meant by an overemphasis on content? A. Is it more important that our students learn scientific method or that they learn content? We have had some meetings to think along these lines.
 - Q. Could there be different degrees of GEC requirements, more flexibility? A. The issue is that professional colleges make more demands with the use of the GEC's. These are issues that we want to rationalize.
 - Q. There is a question about the number of credit hours. There have been suggestions that we substitute four hour courses for five hour courses. Where is the semester issue? A. The semester issue is not in the charge. However, we thought we should make recommendations that could be used in a semester as well as quarter system.
 - Q. The perception we hear from students and advisors is that there is a disparity with three hour courses which are very demanding while five hour courses are considered easier.

- Q. The College of Arts and Sciences is in the process of developing a plan for the evaluation of the GEC. The overwhelming sentiment is to keep the structure as it is now and keep it in the College of the Arts & Sciences. A. There is no universal diagnosis about the GEC. Everybody sees the GEC differently and views what is wrong or right with them differently.
- Q. What are you expecting the average student to look like in 2007? A. I expect that we will be looking at the outgoing students instead.
- Q. What do you find other peer institutions doing? A. We are very interested in UCLA and what their models look like.
- Q. What is ideal for the GEC? A. Ideal is that everybody understands the GEC and is onboard across the campus.
- Q. What is adequate? A. I surveyed 78 faculty members in the College of the Arts and Sciences. Only five explained how the courses are taught, several mentioned that they are GEC courses and some said that they were the introduction to the major. This tells me that faculty are not very conscious about the nature of the GEC.
- Q. When your committee is finished, where does the proposal go? A. This committee has been commissioned by the Provost. The committee will present its report to the Provost; then it will be turned over to a commission with our recommendations.

II. Conflict of Commitment document: Todd Guttman

- A. Todd Guttman is the Associate Vice President of Research and Compliance. He coordinates activities as well as develops new policies. Outside activities that faculty are involved in is one reason for the need for the document, such activities include teaching at other institutions, forming start-up companies, consulting, and pro bono work. Deans, Chairs and outside sponsors are concerned about the amount of time faculty are spending on these various activities, away from teaching, research and service for the university.
- B. Discussion
- Q. There are two sentences of definitions in the proposal. One has to do with reality whereas the second one has to do with perception. The one that has to do with perception bothers me. A. This bothered many faculty members. We helped mitigate this by saying reasonably appear. We tried to modify this by giving it the standard of reasonableness.
- Q. This sentence could be moved down to the management of conflict of commitment. A. This is a good idea.
- Q. What is the benefit for the university if a faculty member is teaching at Columbus State as well as Ohio State? A. This is one of the examples that I use. Library Science at Kent State is taught by OSU faculty because the program at the university has been dropped.
- C. There needs to be discretion on the part of the decision makers. The sentence mentioned earlier could be moved down to the second paragraph under policy. It would be the second sentence. As I looked at the last paragraph, this could be changed to say that if an activity cannot be managed by the faculty member to avoid a conflict of commitment he or she must refrain from participating in the activity. What that would do would allow both parties in the activity to make the decision.
- Q. How would it be viewed if a faculty member held an office in a professional organization which involved a lot of time? A. Again, asking your Dean or Chair

about this type of commitment would be the best way to handle this type of commitment.

III. Financial fraud rule: Susan Fisher and David Horn

- A. This is the second Faculty Council meeting where this proposed rule is being discussed. The proposal has been discussed in Steering, CAFR, and Rules. We have until the June Senate meeting to develop a rule concerning financial fraud that is acceptable to the Board of Trustees. The trustees have also added that they will add their own rule if we don't develop the rule ourselves. Jack Rall, T.K. Daniel, Susan Fisher and David Horn have met with Provost Snyder to discuss the rule. The goal has been to keep as much of the 04 rule as possible. Susan Fisher reported that the 04 rule had been updated to include financial fraud. We don't know for sure how the Board will react to the proposed changes. The Provost said that she thinks that the Board can live with the length of time the 04 rule takes as long as the case cannot be made to disappear by a chair or dean. This is a compromise. Some Board members would like to fire the faculty member immediately if he/she was found guilty. This is a procedural compromise but in the end it makes it possible for the Board to get the outcome that they want; the provost and/or president can fire the individual if they want. The trustees have made it clear that they will not accept any kind of threshold for a dollar amount as a definition of financial fraud.
- B. Discussion
- C. If they just want to punish serious violators that is one thing but I am very worried about the nickel and dime items. A. I think that there should be another adjective in the definition such as reasonable financial misconduct. They are not willing to accept any threshold.
- C. I think intentional helps but it is still a threshold problem.
- Q. Who decides how suspended with pay is interpreted. It is one thing to work at home; but quite another if you need to work in a laboratory to complete your work. A. Susan Fisher said that the interpretation could be made by the provost.
- C. Who can file a charge? A. All of the charges must go through a chair or dean.
- C. Why is financial misconduct placed at the top under definition? A. The definition is always upfront in the rules.
- C. This idea of threshold could be a major stumbling block. If anyone has wording that is useful, please let us know about this.
- Q. What is driving this? A. A case of theft occurred at the university which was informally managed by a dean and didn't reach the provost. The person admitted the theft and pleaded guilty; \$4,400 was taken. The Board of Trustees learned about the case and was outraged. There is also another case like this that is pending.
- C. This issue will need to be brought up at the May or June Senate meeting. The first part of the May 12 University Senate meeting will be blocked for discussion of this 04 rule.

IV. Clinical faculty track in the College of Business: Steve Mangum and Kay Halasek

- A. Subcommittee B of CAA is deliberating the proposal to establish a Clinical Track faculty in the Fisher College of Business. The proposal originally came to CAA in February 2004. It came before the subcommittee in December and the review began in

January. The new draft was returned with questions. The committee met with Associate Dean Steve Mangum in February regarding that draft. It was discussed again in subcommittee on March 30. A few other provisions were added. The April 05 version is currently before the subcommittee. The subcommittee wants to consider comments from Faculty Council before voting on the proposal and bringing it before the full CAA committee.

B. Steve Mangum said that clinical faculty tracks are common in Colleges of Business. They exist at many of our benchmark institutions. There are two types of clinical track faculty found in business schools. One group is PhD qualified; they have chosen to specialize in their careers. The other group includes individuals who have had careers in senior management. There is a strong market to attract these types of individuals. With the clinical faculty track, you can offer continuing rather than annual contracts. Without the track, the major problem is that all you have to offer is visiting title, lecturer or senior lecturer.

C. Discussion

Q. What is the difference between clinical track faculty and tenure track faculty in the business college? A. In a business school setting, most of these issues are handled by our accreditation. There is a set of rules in place that dictate that in any degree program there must be a certain number of courses in that program that are taught by tenure track faculty. If you compare a business setting with the health sciences or the law school, the law school has a number of settings where you have true clinics. In business school settings you use case studies. There are a number of courses that are theoretical and/or conceptual. Other courses are case based courses where students are given detailed facts and are asked to analyze that situation both in terms of strategy, formulation and implementation. It is often in that sitting where clinical track faculty, who have had real life experiences, are able to come in and talk about implementation of those cases.

Q. Five years from now what proportion of your graduate programs will be taught by clinical track faculty? A. According to the accreditation standards, in any undergraduate degree track, 60% of the courses or more must be taught by tenure track faculty. The target in the College of Business is 60% undergraduate level, 80% master's level and 100% PhD.

Q. Any rule about students' hours. A. Accreditation teams look at student contact hours and courses and if there is anything that looks amiss, this affects the accreditation.

C. I deeply regret ever voting in favor of the first clinical track faculty proposal that came before the Senate. As Colleges come forward with more elaborate clinical faculty track proposals, it seems to me that we are digging our own graves. This is tremendously detailed, very carefully thought out and it explains why we shouldn't increase the size of the tenure track faculty. I think we are making a mistake every time we do one of these things. We are eliminating tenure track faculty and we are making a case to eliminate them. A. I agree with the observation that you are making. First, we are not reducing the number or the percentage of tenure track faculty in the college. What is happening here is that with the existence of clinical faculty track, we will be able to use more full time people and fewer part time

people. We are upgrading the quality of those individuals who will be teaching our courses as opposed to people with jobs downtown who teach at OSU after work.

V. Proposed rule on College Patterns of Administration (POA): Charlie Wilson

A. This has been in the works for about three years. There is currently no university rule relating to College POAs; there are department POAs. OAA has required college POAs. In an OAA memorandum, it is said that while faculty consultation in the development of a college POA is desirable, it is a dean's document and the dean can do as he/she wishes, although consultation is advised. As a consequence of this memo, about three years ago AAUP wanted Faculty Council to investigate this issue and propose a rule. A draft rule was generated. An ad hoc committee was formed in June 2003 and suggested that there be a provision in the rule that would "grandfather" the POAs where the colleges already require faculty approval of either a new POA or an amendment to the POA. The Faculty Council rejected the ad hoc committee's proposal of grandfathering and wanted to expand democracy to all of the colleges whether they currently had it or not. That draft was then taken to then acting Provost Snyder and she said that she and the deans would not approve it and it was decided at that time to set up a working committee of three deans, Alutto, Herbers, Andrews and several faculty members and people appointed by faculty council. We have spent the last two years going through drafts. The draft we have now is the best we can come up with. At the present time, every college has submitted a POA. Is this rule preferable to what we have now? This is preferable to the status quo. In summary the proposed rule states:

1. There is no clean slate. Every college has a POA. The dean starts with what is there already.
2. The POA should be consistent with the principles of faculty governance.
3. The affirmation of the POA should be done with the consultation of the faculty.
4. Any revision should be done with broad faculty input.
5. If the dean insists on a POA without approval, the dean is required to explain in writing to the faculty and OAA why he/she is proceeding without faculty consensus.

B. Discussion

Q. Is there a rule for department POA's? A. Yes, there is a rule for department POA's. However, some college faculty do not meet and vote. The department rule states that the faculty have primary responsibility including curriculum subject matter, methods of instruction, research faculty status and aspects of college life. What is not in here is that there is no reference to workload or governance structure.

C. If we don't have a rule than we are governed by memos from OAA.

VI. Announcements:

A. Chair Rall asked for candidates for Chair-Elect of Faculty Council.

B. May 26 is our year-end gathering. We will have business and a party.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.