

Meeting Summary
University Senate Meeting
October 6, 2016, 3:30 PM
Saxbe Auditorium, located in Drinko Hall.

1. Secretary's Report #352

Tim Gerber, University Senate Secretary

The motion carries.

2. Proposals to Approve Changes to the University Faculty Rules

Stefan Niewiesk, Chair, Rules Committee

The proposal to change Rule 3335-5-47.1 *Steering committee* was withdrawn and sent back to the Rules Committee for further revisions and consideration at another meeting.

3. University Policy regarding Authorization for Out of State Educational Activities

Leslie Weibush, Program Manager of State Authorization

Robert Griffiths, Associate Vice President, Distance Education

We are in an era of growing accountability, including the need to meet federal requirements for out of state educational activities. Leslie Weibush and Robert Griffiths have been working with the University community over the past year on this policy.

Anytime Ohio State decides to offer educational or business activities to students outside the state of Ohio, that are credit bearing, we are required to seek approval from state regulatory agencies and professional licensing boards prior to conducting those activities. For example, if a nursing student wanted to complete a clinical rotation in another state, he or she would need this type of approval, as well as approval from the board of nursing in that state. Ohio State needs to be aware that these actions are taking place to complete applications. The application must be completed for every program or VP unit that is conducting business out of state. It is a very complex process, especially when involving a professional licensing board.

Ohio State joined NC SARA, the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements. It allows us to offer credit-bearing activities in all other SARA member states. As of right now, 44 states participate in SARA, and by the end of 2017, we anticipate that there will be 48 states. We have to report annually. We are still required to seek professional license approvals. Additionally, a cohort must be less than ten students, per program, per site. A larger group would have to reach to seek approval.

The goal is University Wide compliance. Leslie starting speaking with the policy development office in May of 2015. During this time, she gained online approval in every state and provided consultations to the University Community. A writing group, which consisted of faculty and staff, developed the first draft of the policy and took this draft to Senior Management Council for endorsement. They were asked to come back, and in April 2016, received endorsement to continue the development of the policy. The first draft of the policy went out to the University community for input. This policy will not work without feedback and support from everyone involved. Based upon this feedback, it has now been through a second, final draft.

The policy is divided into three points.

- i. The State Authorization Team, comprised of only two individuals, developed a State Authorization Advisory Committee to enable the University community to help the team prioritize their efforts. The committee will be appointed of deans, faculty, staff, and students, and will meet on a monthly basis. The goal is to help the team communicate to the community, and to serve on their behalf to regulators. This creates a unified voice.
- ii. The team has also developed state authorization liaisons. Their role is to serve as a point of contact within their college or VP unit. They will be appointed at the associate Dean level, because they have been an important point of contact. This a great role for them to assist the team. They will help funnel any questions within the college to the team.
- iii. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning has helped the team determine how to easily pull information for NC SARA reporting requirements from SIS (Student Information System). This report will be pulled on an annual basis and sent to state authorization liaisons in colleges to share.

The main goal for this policy is that we partner as an institution to get this work done. We are required to comply with state laws, but the policy is also important because we want our students to be protected.

For more information and resources, see the State Authorization website: <https://online.osu.edu/state-authorization>

Audience questions:

- o What is holding back the other two states? Massachusetts is not interested, perhaps because their board of higher education does not want to send their students away from their state. Florida has legislation issues standing in the way of joining SARA. There is an upcoming vote to possibly change their rules and regulations in order to join.
- o How can we prevent out of state students from registering for an online course? This is why the policy is so important. The State Authorization team does not believe it is their job to tell faculty and staff where student can be. They are interested in educating the community regarding where we have approval, and working to get that approval.

4. Presentation of Campus Framework 2.0

Jay Kasey, Senior Vice President

Luanne Greene, President, Ayers Saint Gross

Jay Kasey spoke to the Senate last year, informing members that Senior Management had authorized a reestablishment of the campus framework. The framework plan went into effect about six years ago, but because of tremendous progress, it was deemed that we are ready to renew that plan. We selected Ayers Saint Gross, a consulting firm, who is responsible for most campus plans at major American universities. This is an update, as we are now wrapping up the framework plan.

Ayers Saint Gross has been working on framework 2.0 for about a year. As a draft state, this is a good time for feedback from the community. A physical campus plan asks the question, does the campus adequately support programs and activities of the campus today, and where we are heading in the future. It does not set the priorities for implementation, but helps us understand where we have development capacity and challenges. The strategic plan is our options going forward. Financial planning is how the plan will be accomplished. Where will physical components go and fit in? We want to understand that we have a shared,

sustainable vision. These ideas evolve with consistent planning. We are building on past planning, and also projecting what will be happening in the future.

In the past, the St. John's site was targeted as a location for FAES. That thinking has evolved, so we need to think differently about this area. Instead of being cleared all at once, it will be targeted in a phase strategy. All of higher education is considering entrepreneurship and discovery, so how do we support this increasing need? All of this builds to a shared vision of the future. The ideas discussed now are a vision for the future, a strategy will be mapped as we move forward.

The four, highest level plans that resonated most with the majority of people are:

- i. Promote Student Success with instructional spaces and study spaces.
- ii. Support Academic and Research Mission with renewal of the core, strategic development of sites, and partnership opportunities
- iii. Strengthen Access and Connectivity, both internally and externally.
- iv. Transform Natural Systems and Open Spaces, like the river, while improving smaller, secondary spaces.

The western lands have components of these pieces, and there are ideas for increased partnerships around this area. We also want to take a closer look at transportation planning, with a focus on mobility and safety. Campus requires sustained investment. We need to think about what is next and how are mission is evolving. What is the infrastructure? We need to tie it all together holistically.

The plan includes new open spaces, potential new facilities, and infrastructure components as related to mobility. This campus has potential to develop much more than identified. The St. John's parcel is one area with structures that need to be renewed or removed. We might reinvest in this area with open space. We want to reinvest in what we have. Because this area is close to housing and the core, it may be a good location for recreational facilities. The mid-west also requires reinvestment or demolition, and has land holdings that can be utilized over time. This is an interesting time to be planning around the use of cars in our society, but for now, any parking area removed will be moved within campus. There is also need for renovations or removal in Medicine and the Health Sciences, as well as room to rethink those facilities. Circulation is critical when dealing with clinical care. The Wexner Medical Center is in the midst of its strategic planning right now. There are opportunities to invest in the land by Kinnear Rd. There are already activities around High and 11th with tech commercialization. The western lands have enormous capacity for development.

Audience questions:

- o Will green space taken out of western lands be replace? Yes, the plan is to integrate green space more holistically into the campus.
- o Is the default position to demolish or renovate outdated buildings? Many factors will be taken into consideration, but the default is to keep.

5. **Old Business**
6. **New Business**
7. **Announcements**
8. **Adjourn**