

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

Members Present: George E. Billman, Mark A. Bullimore, Steven M. D'Ambrosio, Philip T.K. Daniel, Mark C. Ellis, Allen R. Firestone, Susan W. Fisher, Jared Gardner, Gerald S. Greenberg, David G. Horn, Kenneth A. Loper, Karen M. Mancl, William M. Masters, Brian W. McEnnis, Dennis B. McKay, Jeffrey K. McKee, Randolph L. Moses, Gene E. Mumy, John M. Parson, Jack A. Rall, Nancy R. Reynolds, Allan J. Silverman, Anne M. Smith, Michael D. Trudeau, Harald Emil F. Vaessin, Dale D. Vandre, Sharon C. West and Charlies E. Wilson

Guests Present: Joe Barr, Jane Hathaway, Ray Noe, Randy Smith, Barbara Snyder, George J. Valco and Stu Zweben

A. OSU plans for re-accreditation review: Provost Barbara Snyder and Vice Provost Randy Smith

1. Introduction and history: Randy Smith, Vice Provost for curriculum and institutional relations, stated that the University is preparing for regional re-accreditation. The country is divided into broad regions. Ohio State is part of the North Central Association (NCA) of Colleges and Schools. Institutions proceed through the re-accreditation process every ten years. OSU was last fully re-accredited in 1997 and is up again for re-accreditation in 2007. In 1987 and 1997, the regional campuses were included in the re-accreditation process. The liaison person from NCA assigned to OSU is Diane Nyhammer and she visited the campus in early December. Vice Provost Smith meets regularly with members of CIC accreditation network. The last time Vice Provost Smith oversaw the re-accreditation process at Ohio State as a faculty fellow. A three-volume document was produced for the re-accreditation.
2. Criteria: Beginning in 2005, new criteria were established. OSU must produce a document that responds to five specific criteria: 1. Mission and integrity, 2. Preparing for the future, 3. Student learning and effective teaching, 4. Research and 5. Engagement and service.
3. Special emphasis: There is an option to consider a special emphasis topic that is important to the University. The University of Michigan and Northwestern University have evaluated interdisciplinary as a special emphasis topic. Michigan State University is doing international and the University of Chicago is working on research infrastructure. OSU needs to decide soon if it wants to do a special emphasis topic.
4. Timeline and process: OSU will need a faculty fellow by July 1 to lead the initiative. This person will have a 75 or 100% appointment. A Steering Committee will be established for the review process. All colleges will be involved in the process. Last time OSU had one volume that contained ten to fifteen pages from each of the eighteen colleges or regional campuses.
5. Site visit: An external team will come in two years from this spring to review the submitted documents and to make comments. Last time the group consisted of eighteen people. They were divided into groups of three and visited different areas of the campus. They then write a report and recommended to NCA whether OSU should be

re-accredited or partially re-accredited. OSU does not get to pick the people but can insist that the reviewers come from peer institutions.

6. Request: What suggestions does the Faculty Council have for special emphasis topics?
7. Discussion.
 - Q. Is this focus mostly on undergraduate or the entire University? A. The entire University - all of its missions and its colleges.
 - Q. Were there specific changes that resulted from the process ten years ago? A. What they commented on last time was the support of academic enrichments and selective investment initiatives and suggested that the institution continue these initiatives. They suggested that we have staff members who were concerned that they were not plugged into the process fully or early enough when decisions were being made about the institution. One thing that came out of the last review was that OSU needed to address undergraduate outcomes assessment in the Arts and Sciences. If OSU selects a special topic such as interdisciplinary, the review group will not deny or approve OSU based on interdisciplinary but this topic will “piggyback” on other topics. The team evaluates an institution for accreditation and lets you know how you are doing in the specific topic area. The five criteria will be addressed and the team will look at the specific areas and recommend improvement in each area.
 - Q. The last assessment was to address outcomes in the undergraduates in the Arts and Sciences. Are we now returning to this? A. Plans were developed in the College of the Arts and Humanities, and over the past two years we have begun to talk about how we can make these things happen.
 - Q. How will you decide what the specific emphasis will be? What is your timeline? A. No later than spring quarter would be the timeline. It has to be a topic that we can embrace.
 - Q. Are you looking for suggestions? What about funding of higher education and the effect OSU has on the economy in Ohio? But I’m not sure what the benefit of this would be. A. Provost Snyder said the benefit is that if you want to change something, this would be an opportunity. All of the institutions have to go through the process and they will either be accredited or have to do something to become accredited. If we do a specific emphasis topic something good can come out of the process. In some ways, this process is an add on but the panel will be more focused on what we have chosen as our special emphasis. Vice Provost Smith added that in doing a special emphasis it will bring a lot of engagement in the process rather than just following the five criteria.
 - Q. How much latitude will we have in picking a special emphasis topic? Provost Snyder said that she feels that we can negotiate with NCA on just about anything. Vice Provost Smith said that we need to get something manageable.
 - C. During the last ten years there has been some discussion about diversity. Provost Snyder said we could do this.
 - C. Outreach was another topic mentioned. Provost Snyder said it is a matter of getting the information together and presenting it to NCA.
 - C. Chair Rall said that possible special emphasis topics can be discussed at a subsequent Faculty Council meeting and a recommendation sent to the Provost.
 - C. Vice Provost Smith asked the Council to think about whom a good person would be to assume the faculty fellow position.

B. Proposal from CAA regarding the formation of a Clinical Faculty track in the College of Engineering: Jane Hathaway and Ray Noe

1. Proposal background: Jane Hathaway, Chair of the Council of Academic Affairs, said the proposal is still in subcommittee and comment was sought from the Faculty Council. The proposal has been in development since 2002. In 2003 the College of Engineering faculty approved an earlier version of the proposal.
2. Rationale: The rationale behind the proposal is that some of the curriculum offered by the College of Engineering and the School of Architecture could best be taught by practical engineers. The College wants the clinical faculty track because it would be easier to recruit and retain high quality empirical faculty. The College of Engineering intends to follow the rule that requires that clinical faculty comprise no more than 20% of the total faculty in the departments or schools.
3. Process: The proposal came to subcommittee A, Chaired by Ray Noe, of CAA in autumn 2003. The committee has met repeatedly with Robert Gustafson, Associate Dean, of the College of Engineering. The subcommittee asked for a number of clarifications of the proposal.
 - a. The subcommittee asked for more forceful rationale for the establishment of a clinical faculty track including data from benchmark institutions and the position of the engineering accreditation body ABET. The current proposal states that 13 benchmark institutions have significant numbers of full and part time non-tenure track faculty. These faculty are not necessarily labeled clinical faculty but have alternative titles such as fixed term faculty, specialists, etc. The overriding finding seems to be that the engineering programs at most of these benchmark institutions benefit from having such faculty members. ABET does not distinguish between tenure track and clinical faculty in its evaluation but clearly values faculty that have experience as practicing engineers.
 - b. The subcommittee also asked for a more detailed rationale for having clinical faculty offer specific courses in place of tenure track faculty. The current proposal lists 156 courses in 13 departments that could be taught by clinical faculty and actually provides a brief rationale for many of these courses. The over arching point is students would be better served by courses offered by instructors who are experienced as practicing engineers who can offer course content in line with current engineering design factors.
 - c. The subcommittee also asked the College of Engineering to elaborate on the point that the clinical faculty would be well suited to teach courses containing a design component. The current proposal explains that tenure track faculty are more research oriented and thus well equipped to instruct students in theoretical science based solutions to problems. In contrast, practitioners are better equipped to instruct students in solving design problems that is, applying practical knowledge to real world applications of engineering expertise.
 - d. The proposal makes the following points: clinical faculty would strengthen the college ties to industry, and would thus be a value for setting up new internship opportunities for students. Clinical faculty by offering engineering majors this empirical training would make majors more marketable and clinical and tenure track faculty would reinforce each other. Clinical faculty would strengthen the connection

of tenure track faculty to the engineering industry while tenure track faculty would strengthen the connection of clinical track faculty to research.

- e. Subcommittee A is satisfied with the College's responses and revisions to the proposal and recommends approval. The full committee of CAA has not yet voted on the proposal.

4. Discussion

- Q. Professor Firestone asked for clarification of the expectations of participation in scholarly activity for the regular clinical track faculty. Q. Chair Rall asked what are the criteria for promotion for clinical track faculty? C. Because of the University rules, clinical track faculty could be treated as second-class citizens. For example, clinical track faculty cannot serve as members of the Faculty Council. A. William Baeslack, Dean College of Engineering, said that the expectations for advancement to Associate Professor and Full Professor would be based on the clinical track faculty member's scholarly activities in areas that relate to teaching.
- C. Something needs to be stated in the documentation about promotion. What is the exact title of the clinical track faculty? A. Professor of Practice is the title, Assistant, Associate and Professor of Practice.
- Q. Is there is a distinction between full and part time people? A. Stuart Zweben, Chair of Computer and Science Engineering in the College of Engineering, said that these people will be regular faculty with greater than 50% appointments. There will be multi-year appointments up to five years. At the end of five years, the contracts will need to reviewed and renewed.
- Q. Do these practical engineers want to be in academia instead of in industry? A. The purpose of having this position is their experience and the relationship that they have with industry. The expectation with these faculty is that they will continue to have an interaction with industry that will be facilitated by their experiences and their expertise in the practice of their profession. They will be much more involved in linking industry to understand how the profession continues to be practiced and will provide that capability to OSU students and to the university in a more sustainable basis than now exists. Dean Baeslack said that the best example is the Capstone Senior Design Course that is presently offered at OSU. This course is designed to link a team of students with a project from industry.
- Q. Why do the practical engineers need full time appointments at OSU if they are still working for industry? Q. Would this job become a career? Q. In five or ten years won't this person become like the faculty already here in academia? A. Professor Zweben said that these individuals will develop programs that will form a sustained basis of interaction with industry.
- Q. Are you going to evaluate these people? A. Professor Zweben said, absolutely.
- Q. Professor Gene Mumy said the question is sometimes asked where is the clinic. A. Dean Baeslack said a good example of a clinic would be the Center of Automotive Research in the College of Engineering. Students work directly with members of industry in this center. He said we need the balance of tenure track and clinical track faculty.
- C. The College of Engineering would be spending money on clinical faculty that it could have spent on tenure track faculty. How do you prevent the possibility that undergraduate education will now be taken on by clinical faculty? Are there any

- safeguards? A. Professor Zweben said that the list of courses is less than 10% of the courses taught in the college. Capstone courses are part of the list. Q. Are there any safeguards? A. The course must be on the list. C. The value of clinical faculty is to utilize the expertise that is not part of academia, a career path where they can enrich your program, raise its elevated standing. This is the way these faculty will be used. This approach is better than bringing them in on a part time basis.
- C. I would like to see the AP&T document appended with details of scholarly activity, which will lead to a continued appointment with advancement.
- Q. Any place for a part time clinical faculty member? A. The rules would prohibit a part time clinical faculty member on a regular track.
- C. Dr. Rall said that he wanted to reiterate the comments that relate to criteria for advancement. The clinical faculty are a natural fit for the College of Engineering. He said that his concerns were that they have proper opportunity to advance, how they would be evaluated for advancement and who would evaluate them.

C. Academic Integrity Proposal from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics: Joe Barr (see 2 attachments). Faculty Council vote required.

1. Introduction: Chair Rall told members of Faculty Council that OSU is part of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) which consists of about 47 Division 1A universities. The organization is asking for a vote on the Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics proposal. An email will be sent to everyone who is not present at this meeting so that they will also have the opportunity to vote.
2. Document presentation: Professor Barr, Athletic Council chair, summarized the document. The mission of COIA is to obtain and maintain better academic integrity in intercollegiate athletics and to try to change the way intercollegiate athletics are financed. They have very broad goals. The goals cover the areas of admission of student athletes, financial aid (how scholarships are continued or discontinued), missed class time, curricular oversight and academic advising. This document is a list of best practices, i.e., recommendations that all universities should follow. The OSU Athletic Council has suggested to COIA that this document be limited to best practices. COIA insists on having a few bylaw proposals incorporated in the document. The current proposal includes some bylaw recommendations that must be approved by the NCAA. OSU made some recommendations for revision to the original document that were incorporated. OSU suggested that the recommendations be best practices but they wanted some bylaw changes.
3. Process: OSU formed an ad hoc group that included the Chair and Chair-elect of Faculty Council, a staff member from Student Affairs and one from the Athletic Department, student athletes, the athletic liaison to Academic Affairs, the NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, the Chair of Athletic Council and other members of the Athletic Council. This group reviewed the document carefully.
 - a. One of the major concerns the group had was that COIA did not adequately address the issue of diversity. Professor T.K. Daniel drafted a recommendation for changes in the document. As a result, in the first section, the document now reads “efforts to obtain and maintain diversity in the campus population of athletes should not be compromised so that athletes of all races and genders have access to the university.”

The group felt that it is important that diversity be taken into consideration just as it is when all students are admitted to a university.

- b. Professor Barr went to Vanderbilt University where the document was discussed at a national meeting.
4. Conclusion: Athletic Council Chair, Joe Barr, and NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, John Bruno, recommend that the Faculty Council vote to accept the document as it is now written. There are a number of things in the document that OSU already does and there are a number of things that are intended to happen at OSU. For example, to have an office for advising for student athletes where they will report to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Academic Progress and Eligibility Committee of the Athletic Council will work with Academic Affairs to make sure this works well.
5. Discussion
 - Q. Did you want to make it sound like SASSO (Student Athletic Support Services Organization) is handling academic advising? A. No, academic advising in the final sense is in the colleges. The counselors in SASSO communicate between student athletes and coaches.
 - Q. Professor Silverman asked what confidence do you have that the administration will push through the reforms and monitor what has to be done, i.e., bring a closer inspection of how the athletic department is handling the education of their students? A. Professor Barr said that there is a will to have this done. However, changing from the system that we have now needs to be done extremely carefully. This question brings up the issue of admissions. When I met with the people at Vanderbilt University, I was told what happens on other campuses. Faculty are not involved in admissions. Faculty are involved very little in the oversight of athletics on their campuses. Some athletic departments are islands at the university. I am confident that the will is there, the trick is to get it right in the mechanism.
 - Q. Professor Silverman asked are you confident that they will let you have oversight and input as needed in the Athletics Department? A. Professor Barr said that he is confident that those who are faculty members are going to say very loudly to the provost what needs to happen based on what we talk about at the Athletic Council meetings.
 - C. What are the recommended bylaw proposals and how does OSU feel about them? A. Professor Barr said that one proposed bylaw change had to do with how long a student athlete could be given a scholarship. This recommendation is in the document so coaches do not “run an athlete off”. We do better than this in our Athletic program. This bylaw forces this not to happen. The next bylaw proposal is to look at courses to see if unethical practice takes place. There are some concerns with this. We feel that our student athletes are everywhere on campus. Any student who finds an easy course is going to share it with others. One of the problems is how the NCAA is going to monitor these courses. OSU will most likely have problems with this proposal. The third bylaw proposal has to do with split season, missed classes. These students love their sport regardless of their GPAs. They love what they are doing and they are going to practice. We should do everything we can to get them into the classroom regardless of GPA. There are sports where split seasons make sense. We need to be diligent about dealing with missed class time.

- Q. Professor Mughan asked if the Athletic Department was receptive to change and would they cooperate. A. Professor Barr said that these reforms are going to take place. How we advise and counsel student athletes is going to change. This is a fact. Coaches are concerned about having really good athletes and winning. At OSU, coaches are divorced from faculty. Provost Snyder has been attending coaches meetings and letting them know that changes are going to occur.
- Q. Professor Mughan asked about sanctions occurring if things don't change. A. Professor Barr said that he has seen this occur and he thought it probably should happen more often.
- Q. Which of these best practices will OSU not agree to? A. Professor Barr said that the ones that are most complicated are the split season. The reason is that in some of these sports the students are doing very well. Overall, the student athletes on average are doing better than the rest of the student body.
- C. Professor Silverman said that athletes must have faculty advisors. This puts the faculty back in contact with coaches. A. Professor Barr said that every student should have a faculty advisor.
- Q. What if the football team drops out of the top five? Will this not cause more problems? A. Professor Barr said we have to hire coaches that do not pay lip service to academic integrity. I don't think that this is easy. We also need to hire an athletic director who is willing to deal with these issues.
- C. Chair Rall thanked Professor Barr for all of the work he has done on this including attending the national meeting at Vanderbilt University. Through his efforts, changes have occurred in the document. This is a document about getting the general faculty voice into the dialogue on intercollegiate athletics. He proposed that we support this document in the Faculty Council, that we send it to the Academic Progress and Eligibility Committee of the Athletic Council and ask them to report in a year and tell us which of these best practices are good and which are not good for OSU.
6. A motion was made and seconded to accept the proposal. The vote was unanimous for acceptance of the proposal. [Including the e-mail vote, the final vote was 37 for and zero against the Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics proposal.]

D. Update on evaluation of Deans (see attachment): Jack Rall

1. Proposal: Chair Rall said that the document was an assessment of where the committee was on the evaluation of deans. Professor Lynne Olson is the chair of the committee to undertake this project and would like to have some volunteers join her.
2. Issues: Who gets to participate in dean evaluation? The regular faculty in the unit. What is the format going to be? Web based. Who gets the results? The dean and the faculty. Who creates the questions? There would be some standard questions. There would be two questions from unit senators and two from the dean. The idea is to have the questionnaire fit the college but that there would also be some standardization. When should it be done? May was suggested. Professor Olson has suggested that it be done annually. What will it cost? Boomerang costs \$300.00. Who will conduct it? Who will collect and distribute results? These issues still need to be decided. Should there be a dry run with a willing dean? Who receives the results? Chair Rall said he felt the results should stay within each college. Should the project go forward? What are the standard

questions and who should approve them? A list of some standard questions is included with the document.

3. Chair Rall asked if the Council still feels that this is a useful effort to evaluate the deans for the positive purpose of providing feedback.
4. Discussion
 - Q. Professor Mughan said we still would not have input into their annual raise.
 - Q. Professor West asked if it would be Deans and/or Associate Deans.
 - Q. Would regional campus deans be included?
 - Q. Professor Silverman said it might be difficult to answer questions because we lack information? One issue would be how is the dean spending his money? Professor Silverman said he wouldn't know how to answer this question. He said he thought there should be more information available before doing the questionnaire.
 - C. Chair Rall said the senators could teak the document before faculty do the evaluation. There could be some general questions and some unit specific questions on the evaluation.
 - C. It was suggested that if the Office of Academic Affairs participated in this project, it would make more sense for faculty to get involved.
5. Chair Rall asked for two volunteers to help Professor Olson with this project. Professors Jared Gardner and Dennis McKay volunteered.

E. Other business

1. Announcement: Robert Levine, President of the AAUP, will attempt to generate a breakfast or luncheon meeting with state legislators. He wants to invite Faculty Council members to attend this meeting. If you cannot attend, he would like questions from you. A date has not been set yet. Chair Rall said that he would let everyone know the date as soon as he has the date from the AAUP.
2. Professor Allan Silverman, chair of the Senate Program Committee, reported that the March 10 Senate meeting had been cancelled because there was not enough business; the April 14 Senate meeting will focus on the State and OSU Budgets.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 PM