Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Monday, December 8, 2014
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. – Adelbert Hall, Room M2

AGENDA

2:00 p.m. Approval of Minutes from the November 5, 2014 Executive Committee meeting, attachment  R. Savinell

2:05 p.m. President and Provost Announcements  B. Snyder W. Baeslack

2:10 p.m. Chair’s Announcements  R. Savinell

2:15 p.m. Honorary Degree Nominations, attachment  W. Baeslack

2:25 p.m. Revisions to Honorary Degree Provisions of Faculty Handbook, attachment  W. Baeslack

2:35 p.m. Senate Approval of MS in Anesthesiology, attachment  R. Savinell D. Feke C. Rozek

2:45 p.m. Revisions to Faculty Handbook: Research Committee Charge, attachment  L. Hoffer

2:50 p.m. Revisions to Faculty Handbook: Grad Studies Charge, attachment  E. Tracy D. Carney

3:00 p.m. Revisions to SON By-Laws, attachment  A. Webel

3:05 p.m. Draft Email Voting Provision for Faculty Handbook, attachment  D. Carney

3:15 p.m. Standing Committee Charges- Location in Faculty Handbook  D. Carney

3:25 p.m. Discussion of Questions re Tenure, attachment  R. Savinell L. Singer S. Case
3:45 p.m. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda, attachment R. Savinell
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of the December 8, 2014 Meeting
Adelbert Hall, Room M2

Committee Members in Attendance
Alexis Abramson, CSE
Bud Baeslack, Provost
Susan Case, WSOM
Juscelino Colares, LAW
Peter Harte, SOM
Zina Kaleinikova, SODM
Sonia Minnes, MSASS
Carol Musil, SON
Roy Ritzmann, CAS, Vice Chair
Sandy Russ, CAS, Past Chair
Robert Savinell, CSE, Chair
Barbara Snyder, President
Gillian Weiss, CAS

Others Present
David Carney, Chair, By-Laws Committee
Nicole Deming, Chair, Faculty Personnel Committee
Elizabeth Tracy, Chair, Committee on Graduate Studies

Guests:
Lynn Singer
Don Feke
Chuck Rozek
Matthew Norcia
Joseph Rifific

Call to Order
Professor Robert Savinell, chair, Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the November 5, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee were reviewed and approved. Attachment

President’s Announcements
The President made no announcements.

Provost’s Announcements
The Provost made no announcements.
Chair’s Announcement
Professor Elizabeth Click is leading the Tobacco Free Campus policy planning process. She would like 2 faculty members on each of the three planning subcommittees (facilities, marketing and addiction). Prof. Savinell will send an email to the Faculty Senate asking senators to volunteer or to nominate a colleague to serve on a subcommittee.

Honorary Degree Nominations
The Executive Committee voted to approve five honorary degree nominations. The nominations will be sent to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Revisions to Honorary Degree Provisions of the Faculty Handbook
The Executive Committee reviewed proposed revisions to the Honorary Degree policy and approved forwarding them to the Faculty Senate Committee on By-Laws for consideration. Attachment

Senate Approval of MS in Anesthesiology
At the November Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate had approved changing the name of the SOM’s MS degree in Anesthesiology to an MS in Anesthesia. Vice Provost Don Feke said that the current degree is an MS degree with anesthesiology being the field of study, not an MS in Anesthesiology as the program is described in the SOM proposal. Changing the name to an MS in Anesthesia would essentially constitute a new program. Vice Provost Feke questioned whether this should be discussed again with the Faculty Senate. Dean Chuck Rozek said that when he received the proposal, he had sent it to the Ohio Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS). Because there was no proposal to change the curriculum, the RACGS Committee and the Vice-Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents agreed that the proposal could be submitted as a degree name change. The Executive Committee discussed whether to allow this change as it might encourage other programs at CWRU to request name changes. Dean Rozek said that each department or school requesting a name change would have to make a sufficient case for the change, as the SOM had done. The Senate Committee on Graduate Studies should discuss what to do if there are other similar requests. The Executive Committee agreed to proceed with the degree name change as approved by the Senate.

Revisions to Faculty Handbook: Grad Studies Charge
Professor Elizabeth Tracy, chair of the Committee on Graduate Studies, presented a revised draft charge for the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies. Discussion of the charge had been tabled at the November Faculty Senate meeting because of objections from several senators. The senators objected to the fact that changes to the curricula in the JD, MD, and DMD degrees were exempt from review by the Committee on Graduate Studies. Prof. Tracy explained that these three degree programs are exempt from review by the Ohio Board of Regents (per the RACGS guidelines) and therefore are not reviewed by the Graduate Studies Committee. She also explained that changes to the curricula of other professional schools at CWRU would only be subject to review by Graduate Studies if changed by greater than 50%. The Executive Committee discussed whether the Senate should at least be informed of proposed changes to the JD, MD or DMD degree programs, but a decision was not made
on this issue. The Executive Committee voted to include the revisions to the Graduate Studies charge on the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting. Attachment

Revisions to the SON By-Laws
Professor Allison Webel presented revisions to the SON By-Laws. The revisions included changes to the membership of the PhD Council to include more faculty members at the ranks of assistant and associate professor, and to stagger the members’ terms. The Executive Committee voted to include the By-Laws revisions on the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting. Attachment

Draft Email Voting Provision for the Faculty Senate By-Laws
Professor David Carney, chair of the Senate By-Laws Committee, presented proposed language for the Faculty Senate By-Laws that allows Senate standing committees to vote by email. The provision limits email voting to those subjects considered non-controversial or which are time-sensitive. The standing committee’s decision whether to allow e-voting on a particular issues is to be made by unanimous vote of the entire committee. If the committee agrees to the e-vote, then the issue under consideration must be approved by a majority of the committee members (as opposed to a majority of the members who make up a quorum) within 14 days of the original motion for email voting. Prof. Carney indicated that if the standing committee has agreed to the email vote and a majority of members approve the issue under consideration in less than 14 days, then the voting need not remain open for the full 14 days. The Executive Committee voted to include the provision on the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting with two small changes. Attachment

Standing Committee Charges- Location in Faculty Handbook
Charges for several standing committees (Executive Committee, Nominating, FSCUE, Finance and Graduate Studies) are contained in the Faculty Constitution (Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook). Revisions to these charges require approval of the University Faculty as well as the Senate and the Board of Trustees. The Executive Committee discussed whether to move these charges to the Senate By-Laws so that changes do not require approval of the University Faculty. The Executive Committee decided that the current committee charges should remain in the Constitution since the work of these committees have the greatest impact on the Senate and the university and should not be revised without the approval of the University Faculty.

Discussion of Questions re Tenure
Professor Susan Case had circulated a list of questions to members of the Executive Committee prior to the meeting. The questions related to the subject of tenure. Prof. Case said that her intent had been three-fold; to discuss tenure and its value; to discuss the distinctions between tenure and non-tenure track faculty; and lastly, to discuss what she sees as being different hiring practices for tenure and non-tenure track faculty. Deputy Provost Lynn Singer reported that hiring practices are the same. There are differences in criteria for promotion and these are detailed in the Faculty Handbook. Principles of academic freedom pertain to faculty of all ranks. Prof. Case said that WSOM candidates for non-tenure track positions do not receive the same faculty vetting that candidates for tenure-track positions receive. Prof. Case is also concerned about the increase in non-tenure track faculty at the university. Provost Baeslack suggested that Prof. Case meet with Deputy Provost Lynn Singer and Lois Langell to
discuss the WSOM-specific issues. Prof. Savinell said that the Executive Committee is not the appropriate body to discuss these topics in depth. He suggested that Prof. Case and other interested members of the Executive Committee meet with him and the Senate vice chair to discuss how to proceed. They may want to consider establishing an ad hoc committee. Professors Peter Harte, Sandy Russ and Carol Musil expressed interest in joining the discussion. Attachment

**Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda**
The agenda for the December 17th, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting was approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

[Signature]

Rebecca Weiss
Secretary of the University Faculty
CONFIDENTIAL

To: Robert Savinell  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
Executive Committee

From: W.A. "Bud" Baeslack III  
Chair, Honorary Degree Committee

Date: December 1, 2014

The honorary degree committee reviewed recommendations for honorary degrees at a meeting on October 22 and by correspondence on November 25. After careful consideration, the committee voted to recommend that the following people be awarded honorary degrees in recognition of prominent achievements in areas of endeavor that relate to goals and strategic thrusts of Case Western Reserve University's mission:

- Norman R. Augustine, research engineer and proponent of innovation through engineering and technology
- Adel Mahmoud, expert in infection control, vaccine development, and public health policy
- Barry Meyer, respected executive in the entertainment industry who has played an important role as an advisor on industry-wide production, labor, and regulatory issues
- Gloria Steinem, social and political activist and spokesperson for human rights
- Prince Zeid Ra’ad Zeid Al-Hussein, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, advocate of peace through justice

Nominating letters and biographical information on these accomplished individuals are attached.

I hereby submit these recommendations for review by the Faculty Senate executive committee. If your committee approves them on behalf of the University Faculty, they will be conveyed to the president for her consideration for subsequent recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

The names of those approved to receive honorary degrees are not made public until shortly before the commencement at which they will be awarded, which is often a year or more after initial trustee approval. Therefore, in order to preserve the confidentiality of the process, we ask that the names of the nominees not be listed in meeting minutes or announced.

C: Rebecca Weiss, Secretary, Faculty Senate
TO: University Honorary Degree Committee

FR: Michael Scharf, Interim Dean, School of Law

RE: Nomination of Barry Meyer for an Honorary Degree

DATE: November 22, 2014

I have been notified that Case Western Reserve University School of Law graduate, Barry Meyer (Class of 1967), has been selected to be the 2015 CWRU Commencement Speaker. It is my pleasure to nominate him for an Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree from Case Western Reserve University.

For the past forty years, Barry Meyer has been one of the most respected executives in the entertainment industry. He served as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Warner Bros. from 1999-2013, after quickly rising through the executive ranks of the studio that he joined in 1971 as Director of Business Affairs for Warner Bros. Television.

Under Meyer's leadership, Warner Bros. consistently ranked as one of the strongest, most profitable and best-positioned studios in the industry. From 2011-2013, the Warner Bros. Pictures Group exceeded $4 billion at the box office annually, a milestone no other studio has ever achieved. At the same time, Warner Home Video emerged as the industry's leader, with an overall 21.9 percent marketshare in total DVD and Blu-ray sales.

During Barry Meyer’s tenure, Warner Bros. launched such blockbuster and award-winning films as "The Matrix," "Happy Feet," "The Departed," "Million Dollar Baby," "The Dark Knight," "Inception" and the seven “Harry Potter” films--which became the most successful motion picture franchise in history. He is also responsible for developing such hit television shows as "The Mentalist," "The Big Bang Theory," "Two and a Half Men" and "The Closer."

After retiring from Warner Bros., Meyer Co-founded North Ten Mile Associates, LLC, a strategic consultancy firm specializing in the entertainment industry, and currently serves as its Co-Chief Executive Officer and Manager.

An active leader in the entertainment industry, Meyer often serves as a key advisor on industry-wide production, labor and regulatory issues. He is a member of the Board of Councilors of the
USC School of Cinema-Television; a member of the Board of Directors of the Motion Picture Association of America; a member of the Board of the Museum of Television & Radio; a member of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences; a member and former Governor of the Academy of Television Arts & Sciences; and a member and past member of the Board of the Hollywood Radio and Television Society. He also is involved in numerous charitable and civic activities, including serving on the Board of Directors of Human Rights Watch and on the Advisory Board of the National Museum of American History.

In January 2010, Meyer was honored with the Directors Guild of America's Honorary Life Member Award. Meyer was also recognized with the American Jewish Committee's 2006 Dorothy and Sherrill C. Corwin Human Relations Award for his many humanitarian efforts. Also in 2006, Meyer, along with Alan Horn, then-President & Chief Operating Officer, Warner Bros., was presented with the Motion Picture Showmanship Award at the 43rd Annual ICG Publicists Awards. Most recently, he received an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree from University of Rochester in May 2014.

Meyer was the CWRU Law School commencement speaker in 2011. In his commencement address, he said: "The quality legal education and training I received at Case Western Reserve has been invaluable to me throughout my career. It taught me to identify issues and analyze problems, critical factors not just in practicing law, but in any and all forms of business endeavors." Meyer has helped a number of recent Case Western Law grads obtain legal positions in Hollywood, such as Rebecca Gilbert Weisberg (Law 08), who is now counsel in the Department of Legal Affairs for Warner Bros. Television. In 2013, the University’s Think Magazine did a Q&A with Meyer, available at: http://www.case.edu/magazine/springsummer2009/hollywoodhero.html.

Born in 1944 in New York City, Meyer holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Rochester and a law degree from Case Western Reserve University School of Law. He is a member of the bar in New York and Ohio.

Barry Meyer
Biography

Barry M. Meyer

J.D., Case Western Reserve University School of Law  
B.A, University of Rochester

Activision Blizzard, Inc., director since January 2014  
Co-founder of North Ten Mile Associates, LLC and co-chief executive officer and manager.  

He managed Warner Bros.’ general operations (including studio facilities, legal and business affairs, general administration, human resources, labor relations, strategic planning, real estate development and government affairs) as well as all the studio's television production and distribution operations, including the creation and ongoing operations of the WB Television Network, Warner Bros. Television, Telepictures Productions, Warner Bros. Television Animation, and the various domestic and international television distribution divisions

Member, Board of Councilors  
USC School of Cinema-Television and USC School of Cinematic Arts

Boards of directors¨  
Human Rights Watch  
Museum of Television & Radio  
City National Corp. and its principal subsidiary, City National Bank  
Hollywood Radio and Television Society

Trustee  
American Film Institute.

Advisory board  
Smithsonian National Museum of American History

Member:  
Academy of Television Arts and Sciences  
Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences  
Motion Picture and Television Fund Foundation Committee
INVITATION TO NOMINATE FOR HONORARY DEGREE

Case Western Reserve University invites nominations for honorary degrees by which the university can recognize persons who exemplify in their work the highest ideals and standards of “excellence in any valued aspect of human endeavor, including the realm of scholarship, public service, and the performing arts.” (Faculty Handbook, 3, III.X)

**Current members of the faculty, the staff, or the Board of Trustees are not eligible for an honorary degree.**

The honorary degree committee is chaired by Provost W. A. “Bud” Baeslack and includes:  Gerry Matisoff, Arts and Sciences; John Lewandowski, Engineering; Suchitra Nelson, Dental Medicine; Michael Scharf, Law; David Clingingsmith, Management; Nathan Berger, Medicine; Diana Morris, Nursing; Sharon Milligan, Applied Social Sciences; Patrick Kennedy, Physical Education and Athletics; and ex-officio members University Marshal Robin Dubin and Deputy Provost Lynn Singer. Nominations for honorary degrees to be conferred at a future commencement may be submitted at any time throughout the year for consideration during the fall semester.

The university community is invited to submit nominations, preferably by e-mail, to the office of the provost, c/o Lois Langell (lois.langell@case.edu), or to any committee member by October 15, 2014, for consideration during the fall semester 2014. **Nominees should not be informed of the nomination.**

For full review, please include the information listed below. Incomplete nominations cannot be considered.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD OF AN HONORARY DEGREE**

Submit by October 15, 2014, for review in the fall term. Please do not inform the nominee of his or her nomination

Nominee: ____________________________

Attachments:

✓ Nominating letter
✓ Nominee’s vita or biography
✓ Letters of support (optional; maximum of five)
☐ Other materials (optional)

Nominator: ____________________________

Karen Beckwith, Flora Stone Mather Professor of Political Science and Kathryn Karipides, Samuel B. & Virginia C. Knight Professor Emerita of Humanities

Contact information: klb56@case.edu and kxk8@case.edu

Status (student, faculty, staff, alumna/us) ____________________________

Faculty and Emerita Faculty
October 13, 2014

Dear Provost Baeslack and Members of the Honorary Degree Committee;

It is a pleasure and an honor to second the nomination of Ms. Gloria Steinem for an honorary degree from Case Western Reserve University. Ms. Steinem is a living legend and an inspiring role model for several generations of young women around the world. She has eloquently and successfully advanced the cause of women and minorities for equal rights through her powerful writings and speeches, and she continues to give tirelessly of her time for that purpose. She fights for peace and justice around the world especially with regard to exposing the roots of violence, child abuse and inequality.

Ms. Steinem recently spoke at the Town Hall Series at Severance Hall. The hall was standing room only with young women who enthusiastically welcomed and applauded her. It was immensely impressive to see the effect she had on the audience. I later had the privilege of meeting with her in a smaller group, and it was truly amazing how engaged she was with every individual present – even after a very long day on campus.

She exemplifies all the qualities that a University Honorary Degree denounces and she rightly deserves one from CWRU. She is an Ohioan by birth and a good friend of the Flora Stone Mather Center for Women. She is a worthy recipient and I warmly recommend her to you.

Best Regards,

Jeanette Grasselli Brown

Jeanette Grasselli Brown
MS, Western Reserve University, 1958; DSc (Honorary), CWRU 1995
October 1, 2014

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to strongly recommend that you recognize the contributions of social justice activist, journalist, and women’s rights pioneer, Ms. Gloria Steinem, by awarding her with an honorary degree from Case Western Reserve University.

A native of Toledo, Ohio, Ms. Steinem rose from humble, working-class roots to graduate from Smith College and become a founding editor and contributor to the esteemed quarterly feminist publication, Ms. Magazine. Her courageous journalism revealed the pervasiveness of discrimination and misogyny from within the walls of the Playboy mansion to the halls of the U.S. Congress. Ms. Steinem became a vocal and recognizable spokesperson for the American women’s movement in the 1960s-1970s, emerging on the international scene in the 80s as a key player in the transnational movement for women’s liberation and gender equity. After six decades as an activist, Steinem continues to enthusiastically champion equity and gender equality throughout the world and continues to serve as a speaker, policy adviser, advocate, and journalist, inspiring people of all ages from her own generation right down to the nascent “tween” feminists of the 21st century.

This fall, CWRU was fortunate to have Ms. Steinem come to campus in honor of the 10th Anniversary of the Flora Stone Mather Center for Women and the inaugural Town Hall of Cleveland at Case Western Reserve University. Her ongoing relevance within the CWRU and Northeast Ohio communities was apparent when we sold out the new Ballroom of the TVUC in less than thirty days and filled Severance Hall’s 2,000 seats by the evening of her public lecture on September 9, 2014. At eighty-years old, Gloria Steinem inspired a 2,000+ crowd to rise to its feet upon both her entrance to and exit from the stage; the reach of Gloria’s ideas and the ongoing impact of her efforts on behalf of women cannot be overstated. She continues to inspire the younger generation into activism and intellectual engagement as evidenced by the thirty-five students who earned a coveted spot at a pre-lecture exclusive meeting with Ms. Steinem in the Women’s Center just prior to her public talk. Students continue to refer to this session as the “opportunity of a lifetime” and as a catalyst for ongoing efforts to end sexist and racist oppression.

A hero and a thought leader for progressive policies, legislation, research, and activism on behalf of women and gender equality, I can think of no other individual who is more deserving of an honorary degree from our prestigious University than Ms. Gloria Steinem. I sincerely hope you will agree that Ms. Steinem’s decades of leadership and public service in the arenas of civil rights, women’s rights, and social justice merit our University’s highest form of praise and recognition.

Sincerely,

Shannon B. Lundeen, Ph.D.
Director, Flora Stone Mather Center for Women
Assistant Professor of Bioethics
Adjunct Associate Professor of Philosophy
15 October 2014

The Honorary Degree Committee
Case Western Reserve University
Office of the Provost
Adelbert Hall 216
2040 Adelbert Road
Cleveland, Ohio 4106

Attention: Ms. Lois Langell

Dear Provost Baeslack and Members of the Honorary Degree Committee:

We are writing to nominate Gloria Steinem, social and political activist, writer, lecturer, and humanitarian, for an honorary degree from Case Western Reserve University.

Born on March 25, 1934 in Toledo, Ohio, Gloria Steinem has dedicated her life to advancing her vision of a better tomorrow where there would be no hierarchy of gender, race or income. She is recognized as a trailblazer of the women’s liberation movement of the late 1960s and 1970s.

Since the late 1960s, Ms. Steinem has been an outspoken champion of feminism and women’s rights. She speaks eloquently on behalf of those people who have voices and are not heard. She has worked tirelessly to promote equality and social justice for women nationally and globally and has been a role model and inspiration to women as they struggled to advance toward equality. A professional journalist and Founding Editor of Ms. magazine, Ms. Steinem established a visible and respected venue for news and information about feminism, women’s rights, and women’s lives. Women throughout the world are indebted to Ms. Steinem because she gave them the courage and stamina to stay the course. Ms. Steinem’s voice continues to resonate across the world.

Now at the age of 80, Gloria Steinem diligently continues to fight what she considers to be “the longest revolution,” keeping a keen focus on moving the feminist movement forward. In her words, “This is no simple reform. It really is a revolution. Sex and race, because they are easy and visible differences, have been the primary ways of organizing human beings into superior and inferior groups and into the cheap labor on which this system still depends. We are talking about a society in which there will be no roles other than those chosen or those earned. We are really talking about humanism.”

Ms. Steinem’s influence here at Case Western Reserve University is demonstrated in innumerable ways. The Flora Stone Mather Center for Women stems from the organizing, at universities and colleges across the United States, that strove to gain recognition of women’s needs on campus and to establish physical locations where women could meet and where those needs could be met. Recently, when she was the speaker for the tenth anniversary celebration of the founding of the Flora Stone Mather Center for Women, Ms. Steinem met with students and staff at the Center, and was the source of inspiration for them all. The CWRU Women’s and Gender Studies Program similarly is indebted to Ms. Steinem and others who insisted upon the inclusion of women’s history and women as human actors in academic research and study. The range of CWRU’s success in recruiting female faculty generally and Women and Gender Studies scholars specifically is a measure of Ms. Steinem’s far-flung influence and the impact of her work and that of others on our University.

Gloria Steinem was the “Town Hall of Cleveland” speaker in early September, inaugurating the sitting of the Series at CWRU. Introduced by our President Barbara Snyder and thanked, in conclusion, by our Deputy Provost Lynn Singer, Ms. Steinem lectured to a packed audience in Severance Orchestra Hall. High school and university students from northeast Ohio, members of the community, and members of our wide CWRU community — alumni, faculty, staff,
students, and supporters – filled Severance Hall. The spontaneous standing ovation Ms. Steinem received when she stepped to the lectern was heartfelt affirmation of gratitude and respect from the multigenerational audience. Needless to say, Ms. Steinem captured the full attention of the audience, particularly our CWRU students, who listened attentively and were inspired by her message. Beyond the lecture itself, Ms. Steinem’s presence served to raise funds for the Center for Women and helped to confirm it as the convener of women’s voices in Northeast Ohio.

As a native Buckeye, an educated woman, a tireless feminist fighter for social justice, and as a recent powerful and positive presence on our campus, Ms. Steinem exemplifies the spirit and intent of an honorary degree award from CWRU. Thank you for your consideration for this nomination.

Ms. Steinem’s brief biographical statement is attached.

Sincerely,

Karen Beckwith
Flora Stone Mather Professor of Political Science

Kathryn Karipides
Samuel B. & Virginia C. Knight Professor Emerita of Humanities
Biography of Gloria Steinem (long version, October 3, 2014)

Gloria Steinem is a writer, lecturer, editor, feminist activist, and recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom. She travels in the U.S. and in other countries as an organizer and lecturer and is a frequent media spokeswoman on issues of equality. She is particularly interested in the shared origins of sex and race caste systems, gender roles and child abuse as roots of violence, non-violent conflict resolution, the cultures of indigenous peoples, and organizing across boundaries for peace and justice.

In 1972, she co-founded Ms. magazine, and remained one of its editors for fifteen years. She continues to serve as a consulting editor for Ms., and was instrumental in the magazine’s move to be published by the Feminist Majority Foundation. In 1968, she helped to found New York magazine, where she was a political columnist and wrote feature articles. As a freelance writer, she was published in Esquire, The New York Times Magazine, Glamour, as well as publications in other countries.

Her books include the bestsellers Revolution from Within: A Book of Self-Esteem, Outrageous Acts and Everyday Rebellions, Moving Beyond Words, and Marilyn: Norma Jean, on the life of Marilyn Monroe. Her writing also appears in many anthologies and textbooks, and she was an editor of The Reader's Companion to U.S. Women's History.

Ms. Steinem helped to found the Women's Action Alliance, a pioneering national information center that specialized in nonsexist, multiracial children's education, and the National Women's Political Caucus, a group that continues to work to advance the numbers of pro-equality women in elected and appointed office at a national and state level. She was president and co-founder of Voters for Choice, a pro-choice political action committee for twenty-five years, then with the Planned Parenthood Action Fund when it merged with VFC for the 2004 elections. She was also co-founder and serves on the board of Choice USA, a national organization that supports young pro-choice leadership and works to preserve comprehensive sex education in schools. She was the founding president of the Ms. Foundation for Women, a national multi-racial, multi-issue fund that supports grassroots projects to empower women and girls, and also a founder of its Take Our Daughters to Work Day, a first national day devoted to girls that has now become an institution here and in other countries. In 2005 she co-founded the Women’s Media Center, with Jane Fonda and Robin Morgan, as a non-profit progressive women's media organization. She was a member of the Beyond Racism Initiative, a three-year effort on the part of activists and experts from South Africa, Brazil and the United States to compare the racial patterns of those three countries and to learn cross-nationally. Now, she is working with the Sophia Smith Collection at Smith College on a project to document the grassroots origins of the U.S. women’s movement.

As a writer, Ms. Steinem has received the Penney-Missouri Journalism Award, the Front Page and Clarion awards, National Magazine awards, an Emmy Citation for
excellence in television writing, the Women's Sports Journalism Award, the Lifetime Achievement in Journalism Award from the Society of Professional Journalists, the Society of Writers Award from the United Nations, and most recently, the University of Missouri School of Journalism Award for Distinguished Service in Journalism. She is also on the Creative Advisory Council for Hedgebrook writer’s retreat.

Ms. Steinem graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Smith College in 1956, and then spent two years in India on a Chester Bowles Fellowship. She wrote for Indian publications, and was influenced by Gandhian activism. She also received the first Doctorate of Human Justice awarded by Simmons College, the Bill of Rights Award from the American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California, the National Gay Rights Advocates Award, the Liberty award of the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, the Ceres Medal from the United Nations, and a number of honorary degrees. Parenting magazine selected her for its Lifetime Achievement Award in 1995 for her work in promoting girls' self-esteem, and Biography magazine listed her as one of the 25 most influential women in America. In 1993, she was inducted into the National Women’s Hall of Fame in Seneca Falls, New York and just this month, on October 2, 2014, she was inducted into the Ohio Civil Rights Hall of Fame. She has been the subject of three biographical television documentaries, including HBO's Gloria: In Her Own Words.

In 1993, her concern with child abuse led her to co-produce and narrate an Emmy Award winning TV documentary for HBO, “Multiple Personalities: The Search for Deadly Memories.” With Rosilyn Heller, she also co-produced an original 1993 TV movie for Lifetime, “Better Off Dead,” which examined the parallel forces that both oppose abortion and support the death penalty.

She lives in New York City, and is at work on a book about her more than thirty years on the road as a feminist organizer, due out in 2015.
It is my pleasure to nominate Prince Zeid Ra’ad Zeid Al-Hussein from Jordan for an Honorary Degree from Case Western Reserve University.

With the strong support of the United States, Prince Zeid was appointed UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in July 2014. He is the first Muslim to ever hold that position.

He previously served as Jordan’s Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 2010-2014, as President of the Security Council in 2014, and as Jordan’s Ambassador to the United States from 2007-2010. Before that, he served as a political affairs officer in UNPROFOR (the UN forces in the former Yugoslavia) from 1994-1996, and as Jordan’s Deputy Permanent Representative at the UN from 1996-2000.

Prince Zeid has argued before the International Court of Justice on behalf of his country, and following allegations of widespread abuse being committed by UN peacekeepers in the summer of 2004, he was appointed as Adviser to the Secretary-General on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse.

I got to know Prince Zeid when he served from 2002-2007 as President of the governing body of the International Criminal Court. We’ve been on several panels and expert working groups together since that time, and have become good friends. Most recently, he spoke at the conference our Law School co-sponsored at the Chautauqua Institute on August 24-26, 2014. (See photo below). I am confident that he would accept the invitation to come to Cleveland if he is selected for an Honorary Degree (he travels to NYC every month for his work).

Prince Zeid has a stellar reputation in the field, as a moderate voice in the Middle East, as an advocate of peace through justice, and a friend of the United States and Israel. He is on the short list to be the next Secretary-General of the United Nations.

He earned his BA from The Johns Hopkins University in 1987, and his PhD from Cambridge (Christ’s College) in 1993. He is married to Sarah Butler, an American from Houston, and they have a son and two daughters.

He has written several excellent publications, most notably “A Nightmare Avoided: Jordan and Suez” in Israel Affairs (Winter 1994), and “Religious Militancy in the Arab Middle East: Threats and Responses 1979-1988” in the Cambridge Review of International Affairs (Spring 1989).

Prince Zeid delivered the prestigious Grotius Lecture at the 102nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of International Law in Washington, DC in April 2008. Having seen him speak on several occasions, I can attest that he is an incredible speaker, who comes across as, thoughtful, down-to-earth, humorous, and charismatic. He has accepted our invitation to deliver
the Law School’s Endowed Klatsky Lecture in Human Rights in 2015. He would make a great commencement speaker as well as someone worthy of our Honorary Degree.
The Honorary Degree Committee  
Office of The Provost  
Adelbert Hall

Dear Committee:

I hereby nominate Norman R. Augustine, Retired Chairman and CEO of the Lockheed Martin Corp. for an Honorary Degree. This man’s life and accomplishments in private enterprise, public service and scholarship are truly remarkable.

Augustine was raised in Colorado and attended Princeton University where he graduated with a BSE in Aeronautical Engineering, magna cum laude, and an MSE (the first of his family to obtain a university degree). He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, Tau Beta Pi and Sigma Xi.

In 1958 he joined the Douglas Aircraft Company in California where he worked as a Research Engineer, Program Manager and Chief Engineer. Beginning in 1965, he served in the Office of the Secretary of Defense as Assistant Director of Defense Research and Engineering. He joined LTV Missiles and Space Company in 1970, serving as Vice President, Advanced Programs and Marketing. In 1973 he returned to the government as Assistant Secretary of the Army and in 1975 became Under Secretary of the Army, and later Acting Secretary of the Army. Joining Martin Marietta Corporation in 1977 as Vice President of Technical Operations, he was elected as CEO in 1987 and chairman in 1988, having previously been President and COO. He served as president of Lockheed Martin Corporation upon the formation of that company in 1995, and became CEO later that year. He retired as chairman and CEO of Lockheed Martin in August 1997, at which time he became a Lecturer with the Rank of Professor on the faculty of Princeton University where he served until July 1999.

Augustine served on the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology under Democratic and Republican presidents and led the 1990 Advisory Committee on the Future of the U.S. Space Program (known as the Augustine Report) and the 2005 National Academies commission that produced the landmark report, Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future.

Augustine was Chairman and Principal Officer of the American Red Cross for nine years, Chairman of the National Academy of Engineering, President and Chairman of the Association of the United States Army, Chairman of the Aerospace Industries Association, and Chairman of the Defense Science Board. He is a former President of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics and the Boy Scouts of America. He is a current or former member of the Board of Directors of ConocoPhillips, Black & Decker, Proctor & Gamble and Lockheed Martin, and was a member of the Board of Trustees of Colonial Williamsburg. He is a Regent of the University System of Maryland, Trustee Emeritus of Johns Hopkins and a former member of the Board of Trustees of Princeton and MIT. He is a member of the Advisory Board to the Department of
Homeland Security, was a member of the Hart/Rudman Commission on National Security, and has served for 16 years on the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. He is a member of the American Philosophical Society and the Council on Foreign Affairs, and is a Fellow of the National Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Explorers Club.

Augustine has been presented the National Medal of Technology by the President of the United States and received the Joint Chiefs of Staff Distinguished Public Service Award. He has five times received the Department of Defense's highest civilian decoration, the Distinguished Service Medal. He is co-author of The Defense Revolution and Shakespeare In Charge and author of Augustine's Laws and Augustine’s Travels. He holds 23 honorary degrees and was selected by Who’s Who in America and the Library of Congress as one of “Fifty Great Americans” on the occasion of Who’s Who’s fiftieth anniversary. He has traveled in over 111 countries and stood on both the North and South Poles of the earth.

He also found time to write four provocative books in a witty and entertaining fashion:
“Augustine’s Laws” in which the complexities and conundrums of business management and his solutions are outlined.
“Augustine’s Travels” in which he looks at life, business, and what it takes to succeed at both. He also presents his observations of important business and social issues, including values, management, competition, and ethics.
“Shakespeare in Charge: The Bard’s Guide to Leading and Succeeding on the Business Stage” in which Shakespeare’s shrewd psychological insights are applied to the turbulent and unpredictable workings of the corporate world.

Augustine is a Renaissance man who has made profound contributions in industry, the public sector, and scholarship. He is regarded as the major voice for U.S. science and engineering policy. All of his outstanding accomplishments make him worthy of an honorary degree and I strongly recommend that he is awarded one. Further, as a long-time colleague of Dr. Augustine, one of us (Dr. Ostrach) is enthusiastic about extending the offer of the Honorary Degree with the expectation that he would warmly accept.

Sincerely yours.

Jeffrey L. Duerk
Dean and Leonard Case Professor of Eng.

Simon Ostrach, Ph.D., P.E.
Wilbert J. Austin Distinguished Professor Emeritus
Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Retired Director, National Center for Space Exploration Research
RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD OF AN HONORARY DEGREE

Submit by October 15, 2014, for review in the fall term.
Please do not inform the nominee of his or her nomination

Nominee:  Norman Augustine

Attachments:
X  Nominating letter
X  Nominee’s vita or biography
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Nominator:  Si Ostrach

Contact information:  sostrach@gmail.com

Status (student, faculty, staff, alumna/us)  professor emeritus of mechanical and aerospace engineering

Norman Augustine
CEO of CEOs. He was Acting Secretary of the Army and held many corporate positions. He was COO of the Martin Marietta Corp; he chaired the Advisory Comm. On the Future of the US Space Program (the Augustine committee); was President and COO of the Lockheed Martin Corp; Prof at Princeton; was Chairman and Principal Officer of the Red Cross; Chairman of the National Academy of Engineering; Chairman of the Defense Science Board; member of the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. He was awarded the National Medal of Technology and is considered to be "One of 59 Great Americans". He sits on numerous Boards and has received 20 honorary degrees. Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford. He was the recipient of the Enrico Fermi Award, the oldest and most prestigious given by the US Government that gives a stipend of $ 375,000.
FORBES Profile - Norman Augustine

Mr. Augustine served in various capacities with Douglas Aircraft Company and Vought Missiles and Space Company before joining the United States Department of Defense, where he served as Undersecretary of the Army. He joined Martin Marietta Corporation, a predecessor of Lockheed Martin Corporation, in 1977 as vice president of Aerospace Technical Operations, became a director in 1986, and rose to the position of chairman of the board and chief executive officer in 1988 and 1987, respectively. Following the merger of Martin Marietta and Lockheed Corporation in 1995, he served as president of Lockheed Martin Corporation and later as chairman of the board and chief executive officer. From 1997 through 1999, Mr. Augustine was a lecturer with the rank of professor on the faculty of Princeton University. Mr. Augustine was first elected a director of Black & Decker in 1997. He is also a member of the Deutsche Bank Americas Client Advisory Board. As a result of the merger, on March 12, 2010 Norman R. Augustine, ceased to be a director of Black & Decker as of the effective time of the merger.

Biography

Norman R. Augustine is the retired chairman and chief executive officer of the Lockheed Martin Corporation, the nation’s largest defense contractor, and a former under secretary of the Army. He is often compared to Microsoft chairman Bill Gates and former Intel CEO Craig Barrett for his national leadership in technology. He is a longtime proponent for ensuring the place of science and engineering on the nation’s list of priorities.

Augustine currently serves as a member of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Advisory Council. He was among several individuals who testified to Congress regarding the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report that was released on October 12, 2005 entitled, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future*. Augustine chaired the NAS panel that conducted the study, which was requested by Congress. The report recommends ways to strengthen research and education in science and technology.

Among Augustine’s many honors are the National Medal of Technology and the U.S. Department of Defense's highest civilian award, the Distinguished Service Medal, given to him five times. Most recently, he was awarded the 2005 AAAS Philip Hauge Abelson Prize and the 2006
Public Welfare Medal from the National Academy of Science.
Augustine served as chairman and principal officer of the American Red Cross for nine years and as chairman of the NAE, the AUSA, the AIA, and the Defense Science Board. He is a former president of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics and the Boy Scouts of America. He is a current or former member of the Board of Directors of ConocoPhillips, Black and Decker, Procter & Gamble and Lockheed Martin and is a member of the board of trustees of Colonial Williamsburg, a trustee emeritus of Johns Hopkins, and a former member of the board of trustees of Princeton and MIT. He holds eighteen honorary degrees.
Augustine is an avid outdoors enthusiast who has trekked extensively around the world, including dogsledding in the Arctic, exploring volcanoes in Antarctica, canoeing the Boundary Waters of Canada, and snorkeling on the Great Barrier Reef. He has stood on both poles of the Earth.
Born in Colorado in 1935, Augustine attended East Denver High School and graduated magna cum laude from Princeton University, where he earned bachelor's and master's degrees in engineering. He is the author of Augustine's Travels, The Defense Revolution, and Augustine's Laws.

Selected Awards
In a distinguished lifetime that has spanned seven decades, Norman Augustine has been honored numerous times for his service to the nation in a variety of capacities. Among the awards he has received:
Honorary degrees from seventeen colleges and universities
National Medal of Technology
Distinguished Service Medal, Department of Defense (five awards)
Defense Meritorious Service Medal
Army Distinguished Service Medal
Air Force Exceptional Service Medal
NASA Distinguished Public Service Medal
Department of Treasury Medal of Merit
INVITATION TO NOMINATE FOR HONORARY DEGREE

Case Western Reserve University invites nominations for honorary degrees by which the university can recognize persons who exemplify in their work the highest ideals and standards of “excellence in any valued aspect of human endeavor, including the realm of scholarship, public service, and the performing arts.” (Faculty Handbook, 3, III.X) **Current members of the faculty, the staff, or the Board of Trustees are not eligible for an honorary degree.**

The honorary degree committee is chaired by Provost W. A. “Bud” Baeslack and includes: Gerry Matisoff, Arts and Sciences; John Lewandowski, Engineering; Suchitra Nelson, Dental Medicine; Michael Scharf, Law; David Clingingsmith, Management; Nathan Berger, Medicine; Diana Morris, Nursing; Sharon Milligan, Applied Social Sciences; Patrick Kennedy, Physical Education and Athletics; and *ex-officio* members University Marshal Robin Dubin and Deputy Provost Lynn Singer. Nominations for honorary degrees to be conferred at a future commencement may be submitted at any time throughout the year for consideration in the fall semester.

The university community is invited to submit nominations, preferably by e-mail, to the office of the provost, c/o Lois Langell (lois.langell@case.edu), or to any committee member by October 15, 2014, for consideration during the fall semester 2014. **Nominees should not be informed of the nomination.**

For full review, please include the information listed below. Incomplete nominations cannot be considered.

----------------------------------------

RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD OF AN HONORARY DEGREE

Submit by October 15, 2014, for review in the fall term. Please do not inform the nominee of his or her nomination

**Nominee:** Adel Mahmoud, M.D., Ph.D. 

Attachments:

- [ ] Nominating letter
- [ ] Nominee’s vita or biography.
- [ ] Letters of support (optional; a maximum of five)
- [ ] Other materials (optional)

**Nominator:** Pamela B. Davis

Contact information: Pamela.Davis@case.edu

Status (student, faculty, staff, alumna/us) dean
October 11, 2014

Dear Dr. Baeslack and members of the honorary degree committee,

I am delighted to nominate Adel A.F. Mahmoud, MD, PhD — a world-renowned expert in infection control, vaccine development, and public policy — for a 2015 Honorary Doctor of Science degree from Case Western Reserve University.

Dr. Mahmoud has been a driving force to prevent infectious diseases around the globe and has had remarkable impact. As a young investigator who rose to Chair the Department of Medicine at Case Western Reserve University from 1987-1998, he led the definitive description of the life cycle of *Schistosoma mansoni*, a parasite common in waterways in the developing world. While he was president of Merck Vaccines and Merck’s Chief Medical Advisor for Vaccines and Infectious Diseases, Dr. Mahmoud has led the effort to develop and launch four new life-saving vaccines, including rotavirus, human papillomavirus, shingles and the combination of measles, mumps, rubella and varicella. Vaccination is not only cost-effective, but it saves worldwide morbidity and mortality. More recently his impact has extended to global policies on reemergence of infectious and deliberate use of infectious agents to cause harm. Dr. Mahmoud’s leadership in setting strategies for Global Health shaped the agenda of the Forum on Microbial Threats of the Institute of Medicine by tackling topical issues such as biological threats and bioterrorism; SARS; Pandemic Flu and others. Dr. Mahmoud currently serves as professor of molecular biology and public policy and a member of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University. He is also an adjunct professor of medicine at Case Western Reserve University and has chaired the School of Medicine’s Visiting Committee since 2009.

Dr. Mahmoud’s many awards and accolades include the Bailey K. Ashford Award from the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene and the Squibb Award from the Infectious Diseases Society of America. He is an elected member of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies of Science. He has also served on the National Advisory Allergy and Infectious Diseases Council and is a past president of the International Society for Infectious Diseases. His current professional and academic service appointments include the World Health Organization Expert Advisory Panel on Parasitic Diseases, the board of directors of the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative and the scientific advisory board of the U.S. Military Malaria Vaccine Program. He is currently serving as a member of the National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity and Committee on Scientific Communications and National Security (CSCANS) of the National Academy of Sciences. Dr. Mahmoud also sits on the boards of directors for Sanaria (biotechnology), Inovio Pharmaceuticals, ILIAD Biotechnologies and The Center for Disease Dynamics, Economics & Policy (CDDEP) in Washington, D.C. He is engaged in biotech innovation, as well as the humanistic implications of disease and its prevention.
Dr. Adel Mahmoud is an international superstar who has remained connected to Case Western Reserve University. His contributions to infectious disease, vaccine research and global health are stellar, and have informed public policy, and will do so for years to come. I can think of no one more deserving of the degree of Doctor of Science honoris causa. Please do not hesitate to contact me directly if there is additional information I can provide during the selection process. On behalf of the entire School of Medicine community, thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Pamela B. Davis, MD, PhD
Dean, School of Medicine and
Senior Vice President for Medical Affairs, Case Western Reserve University
October 13, 2014

Provost W.A. Baeslack
Chair
Honorary Degree Committee
Case Western Reserve University
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44106

Dear Provost Baeslack,

It gives me great pleasure to write in support of Dean Davis' nomination of Dr. Adel A.F. Mahmoud as a highly deserving candidate for an honorary degree from Case Western Reserve University. I have been a colleague of Dr. Mahmoud's since 1999, when he asked me to chair an external committee to advise Merck & Co. on the public policy issues surrounding the development of vaccines for the developing world. In 2005 upon his retirement from Merck I was delighted to welcome him to Princeton University as a member of my home department, the Department of Molecular Biology, as a Lecturer with the Rank of Professor. As I am certain that there will be many letters submitted to your committee that will attest to Dr. Mahmoud's dedication to Case Western Reserve School of Medicine, I will restrict my comments to the years since he left Case, when I have interacted with him regularly.

There are not many heroes left in this world, but I consider Adel Mahmoud to be one of them. As President of Merck Vaccines from 1999-2005, he oversaw the development of four vaccines that are going to save lives not just in this country, but around the world. From the moment he arrived in New Jersey, he was thinking about using the extraordinary resources of Merck to develop vaccines whose primary beneficiaries would be the poorest among us.

Let me highlight just two of them. Rotavirus used to be the leading cause of severe diarrhea among children under the age of 5 in the U.S. Thanks to Mahmoud's leadership in spurring the research and development of the RotaTeq oral vaccine at Merck, today it is estimated that 40,000 to 50,000 hospitalizations have been...
prevented in the U.S. alone. More significantly, Mahmoud worked with organizations like the Gates Foundation and the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization to ensure that the vaccine was available around the world, especially in the poorest countries, where rotavirus is a much greater health threat among children.

During his tenure at Merck Mahmoud also oversaw the development of the first vaccine that prevents cancer – Gardisil – that is directed at the human papilloma virus (HPV) that causes cervical cancer. This was a scientific, technological and political tour de force, from choosing the virus types to be included in the vaccine, to validating the antigenic targets and producing the vaccine, to orchestrating its challenging rollout to the public in light of the association of HPV with sexual activity. The vaccine has been shown to be stunningly effective, and once it is in broad use in a population, will save lives. As with rotavirus, the impact of Gardisil will be most felt in the developing world, where regular Pap smears, which have reduced the incidence of cervical cancer in the developed world, are unknown.

Although I believe that these technological achievements provide sufficient grounds to warrant an honorary degree, I would be remiss if I did not mention the extraordinary role that Adel has played at Princeton over the last eight years. He has been an invaluable member of the department and our Program in Global Health in the Woodrow Wilson School, teaching classes that overflow with eager students, and advising students on senior theses and career plans in medicine. He was an invaluable advisor to the university this past year as we contended with an outbreak of bacterial meningitis, a potentially lethal disease spread by close student interaction. As an expert in infectious disease, he was able to help design our response to the epidemic, and as a policy maker, he encouraged the Federal Drug Administration to let us use a new vaccine that had yet to be approved in the U.S. It is hard to imagine having a more effective advisor on the ground during those months.

I hope I have managed to convey my immense respect and admiration for Adel Mahmoud. I strongly urge your committee to consider his candidacy for an honorary degree seriously. I know it would mean a great deal to him, as he remains deeply loyal to Case Western.

Best wishes,

Shirley M. Tilghman

Professor of Molecular Biology and Public Affairs
Center for Global Health and Diseases

October 8, 2014

Dear Members of the Honorary Degree Committee,

I am delighted to write this most enthusiastic letter endorsing the nomination of Adel Mahmoud, MD PhD for an honorary degree from Case Western Reserve University. My enthusiasm for Dr. Mahmoud’s nomination is based on his internationally recognized scientific accomplishments in infectious diseases and global health issues in general, local and national leadership during his 25-year tenure on the faculty at CWRU and his subsequent position as President of Merck Vaccines, and most recently, his high level of continuing service to the University as chair of the visiting committee of the School of Medicine.

I have known Dr. Mahmoud since 1973 when he came to CWRU as a research associate studying the immunology of parasitic infections. His scientific and academic career had a remarkable upward trajectory over the following 25 years. By 1980, he had obtained the rank of Professor with tenure and served as chief of the newly created Division of Geographic Medicine, formed as a result of a major grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. This remarkable early phase of Dr. Mahmoud’s career at CWRU was accompanied by a prodigious output of scientific papers concerned with the role of host immunity in the pathogenesis of parasitic diseases (more than 200 primary research papers with multiple chapters in leading standard textbooks). Many of his papers appeared in top tier journals such as Nature, the Journal of Experimental Medicine, New England Journal of Medicine, and Lancet. Not surprisingly, this high level of productivity and scientific excellence resulting in induction into highly prestigious scientific societies (e.g. membership of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies in 1987), national honors for his accomplishments (e.g. Squibb Award of the Infectious Disease Society of America in 1984), and appointment to leadership and committees of the National Institutes of Health (e.g. National Advisory Group of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, 1988-1992) and World Health Organization.

On the administrative front, Dr. Mahmoud became chair of the Department of Medicine at CWRU in 1987 and served in this position until 1998. His tenure as chair of medicine was marked by a great increase in NIH funding along with institutional leadership that led to the award of a major grant from the MacArthur Foundation that supported interdisciplinary research and education efforts between the department of medicine and several basic science departments of the School of Medicine. From 1999 to 2005, he was President of Merck Vaccines. During his tenure at Merck Vaccines, he guided the company through many high level issues related to global vaccine development.
manufacture and distribution, safety concerns, and business considerations such as "go-no go" decisions for products still in the research pipeline (e.g. HIV vaccines). Perhaps one of the most noteworthy contributions during his tenure at Merck Vaccines was the development of a Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) vaccine. This vaccine will prevent infection from a virus that underlies the development of cervical cancer in women and anal cancer in men. Administration of the vaccine to young women will essentially reduce the lifetime risk of developing cervical cancer to nil. This is clearly important to women and men not only in the United States to many women in poor areas of the world where screening by Pap smear is unavailable or underutilized.

Other less obvious contributions of Dr. Mahmoud to the "world of global health" has been his unwavering advocacy of CWRU as a leading institution of higher learning and the many trainees who have continued his tradition of connecting basic science in the laboratory with real life issues facing millions of people exposed to infectious diseases in the developing world. He is a role model as an educator and has been exuberant supporter of young people throughout his career. In addition to myself, he has been a mentor to many individuals who now hold leadership positions as Professors at major universities in the United States and abroad. His past trainees now or have previously served as chair and/or dean of Schools of Medicine at the University of Minnesota, Medical College of Wisconsin, University of California Riverside, University of Virginia, and Memorial Sloan Kettering Institute. He is truly deserving of one of our University’s highest honors.

Sincerely yours,

James W. Kazura, MD
Distinguished University Professor
Director, Center for Global Health and Diseases
October 15, 2014

William A. Baeslack III, Ph.D.
Provost and Executive Vice President
Case Western Reserve University
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7001

Dear Dr. Baeslack:

I am delighted to nominate Dr. Adel Mahmoud for an honorary degree from Case Western Reserve University. A world-renowned authority on vaccines and infectious diseases, Dr. Mahmoud has played a vital role as a practitioner and scholar in seeking interdisciplinary solutions to issues that affect the health and wellbeing of billions of people around the globe.

Dr. Mahmoud’s quarter-century as a trailblazing scholar and physician at Case Western and University Hospitals of Cleveland—as well as his eight years of leadership at Merck Vaccines and his glittering collection of awards and honors—are certainly well known to the members of your selection committee. Allow me to offer some perspectives on his impact at Princeton since joining our faculty in 2007. His presence on our campus has helped Princeton become a locus for interdisciplinary global health studies. He is a highly sought collaborator and mentor who works with scholars and students to explore health issues from scientific and policy perspectives, reflecting his joint appointment in our Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and our Department of Molecular Biology. His research and teaching concentrate on some of the most pressing health challenges of our time, including the development and global deployment of new vaccines; strategies for controlling infectious diseases; and intersections between the life sciences and national and global security.

Perhaps Dr. Mahmoud’s greatest legacy at Princeton is the establishment of the Global Health Scholars program in the Woodrow Wilson School’s Center for Health and Wellbeing. The program, initiated in Dr. Mahmoud’s honor through a partnership between Princeton and Merck Vaccines, provides outstanding students with funding to pursue senior thesis research abroad and global health-related internships. Dr. Mahmoud is intimately involved in selecting and advising the fellows, whose projects address a range of important and complex global health challenges. The most recent cohort of
fellows, for example, spent this past summer studying the ecological and environmental
dynamics of infectious disease in Kenya; the tradition of incorporating health practices
into daily life in China; the effects of seasonal flooding in Bangladesh on the
transmission of cholera; and viral diarrhea and vaccination programs in Ghana.

Dr. Mahmoud upholds this University’s mission through his deep commitment to
scholarship and service, through his exceptional teaching, and through his collaborative
approach to tackling multifaceted health challenges. An honorary degree from Case
Western would be a fitting honor to recognize the powerful impact he has had on both of
our campuses and, indeed, on the world at large. I hope you will give this nomination
your thoughtful consideration.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Christopher L. Eisgruber
October 15, 2014

Ms. Rebecca A. Mason  
Senior Director of Development Programs  
School of Medicine  
Case Western Reserve University  
2109 Adelbert Road  
Cleveland, OH 44106

Dear Ms. Mason,

I am most pleased to offer my enthusiastic support for Adel Mahmoud’s nomination for an honorary degree from Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine. I have known Dr. Mahmoud for many years, and he is most deserving of this prestigious honor.

Dr. Mahmoud is a world renowned vaccine leader and infectious disease expert. His career has included extraordinary accomplishments in academia, industry and many areas of global public health. Dr. Mahmoud is currently Professor in the Department of Molecular Biology and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public Health at Princeton University. In this arena, Dr. Mahmoud is doing the critical work of training our next generation of global public health leaders. For 25 years, he was a dedicated and inspiring academician at Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, and I was most fortunate to be one of his students. To this day, I consider Dr. Mahmoud a tremendous mentor.

Dr. Mahmoud’s research has focused on two main areas related to global infection. One is the comprehensive investigation of the origins of emergence and re-emergence of microorganisms. The other is the discovery, development and global access to vaccines.

Dr. Mahmoud’s impressive scientific contributions to vaccines and infectious diseases brought him to Merck & Co. While at Merck, he was responsible for the development and launch of vaccines that have positively impacted the health of children, adolescents and adults worldwide and one day may even ELIMINATE a certain type of cancer. These include vaccines for human papillomavirus, varicella, rotavirus, shingles, and a combination of measles, mumps, and rubella.
Dr. Mahmoud has received numerous prestigious awards throughout his career, including most recently the Distinguished Medical Science Award. He is a member of and lends his expertise to a variety of scientific and policy organizations that include the International Society of Infectious Diseases, the Institute of Medicine/National Academy of Sciences and the Council on Foreign Relations. He also serves as a Board of Director for the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative, the International Vaccine Institute and is on the Scientific Advisory Board of Iliad.

Dr. Mahmoud’s accomplishments and contributions to infectious diseases and global public health are widely recognized around the world, and I am most proud to support his nomination for an honorary degree from CWRU School of Medicine.

Sincerely,

Julie Louise Gerberding, MD, MPH
President, Merck Vaccines
CWRU Board of Trustee
CURRICULUM VITAE
ADEL A.F. MAHMOUD

Born: 24 August 1941; Cairo, Egypt

Citizenship: USA

Spouse: Sally L. Hodder, M.D.

Office Address: Princeton University
Department of Molecular Biology and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public
and International Affairs
Lewis Thomas Laboratory, Room 229
Princeton, NJ 08544
Telephone: (609) 258-8557, Fax: (609) 258-4575
E-mail: amahmoud@princeton.edu

Education:
University of Cairo, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo, Egypt, (1957-1963), M.D. (M.B.,B.Ch.)
University of Ain Shams, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo, Egypt, (1965-1967), D.P.H.
University of London, School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and the Hospital for Tropical Diseases,
(1969-1971) (Clinical Tropical Medicine), Ph.D.

Languages:
Fluent: Arabic, English
Working Knowledge: French

Current Positions:
Lecturer with the rank of Professor in Molecular Biology and Public Policy, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ

Previous Professional Appointments:
University of Cairo Hospitals (1963-1965) - House Officer and Registrar
University of Ain Shams, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo (1965-1968) - Assistant Lecturer
University of London, School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, and the Hospital for Tropical Diseases
(1969-1972) - Clinical Research Assistant, WHO Fellow

Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine and University Hospitals of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio:
Research Associate (1973-1974), Senior Instructor (1974-1975), Assistant Professor (1975-1977), Associate
Professor (1977-1980), Professor with tenure (1980-1998)
Chief, Division of Geographic Medicine (1977-1987)
John H. Hord Professor - Chairman, Department of Medicine and Physician-in-Chief (1987-1998)
Adjunct Professor (1998-2013)

President, Merck Vaccines – 1999-2005
Member, Management Committee
Merck & Co., Inc.

Chief Medical Advisor, Vaccines and Infectious Diseases 2005-2006
Member, Management Committee
Merck & Co., Inc.
Awards:
World Health Organization Fellowship, 1969-1971
Josiah Macy Foundation Scholarship, 1980-1981 “Sabbatical leave at the Sir William Dunn School of Pathology, Oxford University”
Bailey K. Ashford Award, American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 1983
Squibb Award, Infectious Diseases Society of America, 1984
5-year Award of Achievement in Science, Northern Ohio Live, 1985
Distinguished Medical Science Award, 2008. “Friends of the National Library of Medicine”

Membership in Scientific & Policy Societies and Organizations:
British Society of Immunology, 1969
Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 1972; Local Secretary, 1977-1998
American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 1973
American Federation for Clinical Research, 1974
American Association of Immunologists, 1976
Infectious Diseases Society of America, 1976
American Society of Hematology, 1977
American Society for Clinical Investigation, 1978
Central Society for Clinical Research, 1978
Sigma Xi, 1979
Association of American Physicians, 1980
American Association for Advancement of Science, 1981
Alpha Omega Alpha, Medical Honors Society, 1982
International Society for Infectious Diseases, 1984
American Society of Microbiology, 1985
Institute of Medicine. National Academy of Sciences, 1987
American College of Physicians, Fellow, 1989
American Clinical and Climatological Association, 1995
Council on Foreign Relations, 2006

Professional and Academic Services in National and International Organizations:
Executive Committee, The Rockefeller Foundation's Great Neglected Diseases Program (1978-1988)
National Advisory Allergy and Infectious Diseases Council, NIAID, NIH (Ad Hoc Member) (1982-1983)
Committee on Research Grants, Board on Science and Technology, National Academy of Sciences (1983-1986)
National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, Member, Steering Committee - Study of "U.S. Capacity to Address Tropical Disease Problems" (1984-1985)
Member, Research Briefing Panel on "Biology of Parasitism" Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences (1984)
Member, Expert Advisory Panel on Parasitic Diseases World Health Organization (1985-)
Member, Board of Health Sciences Policy. Institute of Medicine. National Academy of Sciences (1986-1989)
Member, Board of Trustees, Cleveland Museum of Natural History (1987-1998)
Member, National Advisory Allergy and Infectious Diseases Council, National Institutes of Health (1988-1992)
Council Member, Central Society for Clinical Research (1989-1993)
President, International Society of Infectious Diseases (1990-1992)
President, Central Society for Clinical Research (1992)
Member, Editorial Board, Journal of Infectious Diseases, University of Chicago Press (1990-1994)
Member, Committee on "Emerging Microbial Threats to Health" Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences (1991-1992)
Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Residency Training Fellowships for Medical Students Review Panel (1992-1994)
Chairman, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Biological Defense Research Working Group (1994)
Member, Editorial Board, Journal of African Health Sciences (1994-)
Member, Fogarty International Center Advisory Board of the National Institutes of Health (1994-1997)
Member, Committee on the Department of Defense, Persian Gulf Syndrome Comprehensive Clinical Evaluation Program, Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences (1995)
Chairman, Board of Scientific Councilors, National Center for Infectious Diseases, Center for Disease Control and Prevention (1997-2000)
Member, Board of Directors, Global Health Council (1998-2001)
Member, Board on Global Health, Institute of Medicine, The National Academies (2000- 2004)
Member, Board of Overseers, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, New Jersey (1999- 2006)
Chair, Forum on Microbial Threats (Emerging Infections), Board on Global Health, Institute of Medicine (2001-2004)
Member, Pan American Health and Education Foundation Board of Directors (2001- 2006)
Member, Board of Trustees, The Foundation of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (2002-2005)
Member, Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) Board and Executive Committee (2005- 2006)
Member, Board of Directors, National Foundation for Infectious Diseases (NFID), (2002-2008)
Member, Health Advisory Board of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, (2002-2007)
Member, Scientific Advisory Committee, New England Regional Center of Excellence (NERCE)/Biodefense and Emerging Infectious Diseases Research (2003- 2006)
Member, External Advisory Board, Western Regional Center of Excellence (WRCE)/Biodefense and Emerging Infectious Diseases Research (2003- 2006)
Member, Board of Directors, McCarter Theater, Princeton (2004-2012)
Member, National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity (2005-2009)
Member CSCANS, The National Academy of Sciences (2005-2010)
Member, Board of directors, Becton Dickinson and Company (2006-2014)
Member, IIP, Military Infectious Diseases Research Program (2007-2008)
Member, Scientific Advisory Board, Genocea (2007-2009)
Chairman, Blue Ribbon Panel to Advise on the Risk Assessment of the National Emerging Infectious Diseases Laboratories at Boston University Medical Center. National Institutes of Health (2008-2012)
Member, US National Academy of Science working group with the Russian Academy of Science (2009-2011)
Member, Board of Directors, GenVec (2011-2013)
Member Board of Directors, International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (2012-)
Member Board of Directors, International Vaccine Institute, Seoul South Korea (2011-)
Chair, Board of International Vaccine Institute, Seoul South Korea (2013-)
Member, Scientific Advisory Board, U.S. Military Malaria Vaccine Program (2006-)
Member, Board of Directors, Sanaria Inc. (2007-)
Chair, Visiting Committee, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine (2009-)
Member, Board of Directors, Inovio (2013-)
Co-Chair NAS Committee on Science and Technology at the Department of State (2013-)
Member, Board of Directors, CDDEP (2013-)
Member, Scientific Advisory Board, Iliad (2013-)

International Leadership and Research Experiences:
Field Research on clinical, immunological and epidemiological aspects of infectious and parasitic diseases in the Philippines, Egypt, Kenya, Liberia, St. Lucia, and USA
Member, Executive Committee, International Society for Infectious Diseases (1982-2000)
President, International Congress of Infectious Diseases Nairobi, Kenya (1990-1992)
Member, African Health Forum (1994-)
Member, Board of Directors, Global Forum on Health Research, Geneva, Switzerland (2007-2009)
A. Original articles


King C, Jia X, Malhotra I, Mahmoud AAF, Oetjgen H Mice with a targeted deletion of the IgE gene have increased worm burdens and reduced granulomatous inflammation following primary infection with *Schistosoma mansoni*. J Immunol 158:294-300, 1997.
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PROPOSED REVISIONS FOR DISCUSSION:

X. Guidelines for Awarding Honorary Degrees*

An honorary degree is a means of recognizing excellence in any valued aspect of human endeavor, including the realm of scholarship, public service, and the performing arts. The conferring of an honorary degree is the University's way of recognizing those persons who have exemplified in their work the highest ideals and standards. By awarding such degrees to persons outside the University, an interest in and connection with the larger community is maintained.

Nominations are to be submitted to a faculty committee appointed by the president after consultation with the Nominating Committee of the Faculty Senate. The faculty committee, chaired by the provost of the University, will have representation from each constituent faculty. Between Approximately five and ten nominations will be recommended by the faculty committee to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. Those approved by the Executive Committee, acting for the University Faculty, and by the president will be transmitted to the president for submission submitted to the Board of Trustees. The candidates approved by the Board of Trustees will may be invited by the president to come to Case Western Reserve University to receive an honorary degree.

The faculty committee will begin its work early and will be ready to receive nominations from individuals by October 1. The recommendations will be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate no later than November 20.

A nomination should include a brief statement detailing accomplishments of the candidate that are especially worthy of recognition and giving reasons why the University should confer the degree.

Although not always possible, if the Commencement Speaker is to be awarded an honorary degree, it is hoped that selection of the speaker will occur early enough to allow the process to proceed on schedule.

Restrictions include:

A. An honorary degree will not be conferred on a person who is currently a member of the faculty, the staff, or the Board of Trustees.

B. Except in unusual circumstances, an honorary degree will be awarded only at the commencement or other major university convocation.

C. The number of honorary degrees awarded on any one occasion will be limited to no more than six.

*approved by the Board of Trustees 8/10/88.

---

i eliminate minimum to allow committee to nominate number sufficient to populate the pipeline and maintain selectivity from among nominees, the number and quality of which fluctuate from year to year

ii the president determines final recommendations

iii Does not bind current administration to invite choices of an earlier administration, nor to honor an approved potential recipient about whom disqualifying information is revealed

iv accommodates recipient’s inability to receive award in person, and retains intention that presentation occur at major event
# Master’s Degree Programs: 85 Fields of Study

**Master of Arts (19 Fields of Study)**
- Anthropology
- Art Education
- Art History
- Art History and Museum Studies
- Bioethics
- Cognitive Linguistics
- Communication Sciences
- Contemporary Dance
- English
- French
- History
- Music, Historical Performance Practice
- Music Education
- Music History
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Religious Studies
- Sociology
- World Literature

**Master of Science (44 Fields of Study)**
- Aerospace Engineering
- Anatomy
- Anesthesiology
- Applied Anatomy
- Applied Mathematics
- Astronomy
- Biochemical Research
- Biochemistry
- Biology
- Biomedical Engineering
- Cell Biology
- Chemical Engineering
- Chemistry
- Civil Engineering
- Clinical Research Scholars Program
- Computer Engineering
- Computing and Information Sciences
- Electrical Engineering
- Engineering, undesignated
- Environmental Health Sciences
- Epidemiology and Biostatistics
- Genetic Counseling
- Genetics
- Geological Sciences
- Macromolecular Science and Engineering
- Materials Science and Engineering
- Mathematics
- Mechanical Engineering
- Medical Physiology
- Molecular Biology and Microbiology
- Molecular Medicine
- Molecular Virology
- Neurosciences
- Nutrition
- Operations Research
- Organizational Behavior
- Pathology
- Pharmacology
- Physics
Physiology and Biophysics
Public Health Nutrition
Statistics
Systems and Control Engineering
Systems Biology and Bioinformatics
**Other Master’s Programs** (22)

Master of Accountancy  
Master of Business Administration  
Master of Engineering  
Master of Engineering and Management  
Master of Fine Arts (2 Fields of Study)  
  Contemporary Dance  
  Theater  
Master of Laws (4 Fields of Study)  
  International Business Law  
  International Criminal Law  
  Intellectual Property  
  U.S. and Global Legal Studies  
Master of Nonprofit Organizations  
Master of Nursing  
Master of Public Health  
**Master of Science in Dentistry**  
**Master of Science in Management** (5 Fields of Study)  
  Finance  
  Information Systems  
  Healthcare  
  Operations Research-Supply Chain  
  Undesignated  
**Master of Science in Nursing**  
**Master of Science in Positive Organizational Development and Change**  
**Master of Science in Social Administration**

---

1. Not admitting new majors  
2. Students admitted only to PhD program
August 5, 2014

Dear School of Medicine Faculty Council,

The CWRU Master of Science in Anesthesia Program, established in 1970, has set the bar for excellence in the training of Anesthesiologist Assistants for over 40 years. Though we were the first AA-training master’s program to use the term “Master of Science in Anesthesia”, we currently do not offer the degree as such; instead, the degree awarded for this program is currently a Master of Science (MS) in Anesthesiology. In an effort to clarify our mission and keep CWRU on the cutting edge of innovative education, we formally propose that CWRU change our conferred degree to a Master of Science in Anesthesia (MSA) degree.

Current degree offered:
MS in Anesthesiology

Degree offered with title modification:
MSA (Master of Science in Anesthesia)

Other CWRU Graduate programs already follow this pattern of specialized degree conferral, including the Master of Engineering Program (ME), the Master’s in Engineering and Management (MEM), and the Master of Public Health (MPH). Updating the MSA Program’s degree title would also serve to emphasize one of CWRU’s nationally recognized and unique programs; of the ten programs that train AAs nationally, three of them belong to CWRU.

Due to the unique nature of this degree, and the fact that CWRU trains students in three locations (Ohio, Texas, and Washington, D.C.), promotion of this specialized clinical program is extremely important. The seven other AA programs (listed below) have all already specialized this degree name to an extent, though only one has embraced a full MSA degree:

- Emory University: Master of Medical Science (MMSc) in Anesthesiology
- South University: Master of Medical Science (MMSc) in Anesthesiologist Assistant
- **NOVA University (2 locations): Master of Science in Anesthesia (MSA)**
- UMKC: Master of Science (MS) in Anesthesia
- Quinnipiac University: Master of Health Science (MHS) in Anesthesiologist Assistant
- University of Colorado: Master of Medical Science in Anesthesiology (MMSA)
All of these universities except Emory opened after CWRU's program was established, and have acquired our terminology for the names of their programs and the degrees conferred. As a leader in the field and one of the legacy programs in the profession, CWRU will continuously be emulated as long as we continue to fulfill our vision. Adjusting the conferred degree from an MS to an MSA will establish CWRU as a leader at the forefront of Anesthesiologist Assistant education, a field that will assuredly continue to expand in the years to come.

Respectfully,

Joseph M. Rifici, AA-C, MEd
Executive Program Director
Master of Science in Anesthesia Program

Matthew Norcia, MD
Executive Medical Director
Master of Science in Anesthesia Program

James R. Rowbottom, MD
Chair, Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine
University Hospitals Case Medical Center and
Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine
**Charge to the Committee on Graduate Studies**

In the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, Article VI., Section D:

**Par. 1.** The Committee on Graduate Studies shall consist of the dean of graduate studies, *ex officio*, the associate dean of graduate studies, *ex officio*, the associate vice president for research, *ex officio*, nine voting members of the University Faculty elected for overlapping three-year terms, and three graduate student members, and one post-doctoral scholar/fellow elected for one-year terms, and the professional school senator, elected for one-year terms, *ex officio*. The Nominating Committee, in consultation with the dean of graduate studies, shall select nominees for election to the committee on the basis of participation in graduate research and in graduate study and instruction. Such selection shall be broadly representative of graduate disciplines.

**Par. 2.** The Committee on Graduate Studies shall review and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate with respect to the academic standards, academic policies, and degree requirements of all departmental, inter-departmental, inter-divisional constituent faculty, and ad hoc and special programs under the administration of the dean, School of Graduate Studies. With respect to graduate degree programs, the Committee on Graduate Studies shall review and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on new graduate degree programs. New graduate degree programs include individual interdisciplinary degree proposals, new degree programs, joint/dual degree programs, as well as changes in degree program name, or delivery mode, or changes which modify the curriculum of an existing graduate degree program by greater than 50% as defined in the Ohio Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS) Guidelines and Procedures for Review and Approval of Graduate Degree Programs.

more than 50% of the curriculum of an existing graduate degree program Graduate degree program refers to any course of study that constitutes a specialization or concentration and leads to recognition or an award for completion of a prescribed course of study beyond the baccalaureate diploma. with the exception of th The committee also reviews and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate with respect to graduate certificate programs at Case Western Reserve University. The Ohio RACGS does not define the degrees of Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Dental Medicine and Doctor of Jurisprudence as graduate degree programs, are not defined as graduate degree programs by the Ohio Board of Regents, and therefore not reviewed by and the Committee of Graduate Studies therefore does not review these programs.

- degrees of Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Dental Medicine and Doctor of Jurisprudence. The committee also reviews and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate with respect to graduate certificate programs at Case Western Reserve University.

Par. 3. The Committee on Graduate Studies will provide oversight and guidance for academic and policy issues for postdoctoral scholars and fellows.
Ohio Board of Regents
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September 17, 1987
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February 4, 1994
April 1, 1994
May 6, 1994
July 23, 1999
October 24, 2003
November 30, 2012
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INTRODUCTION

The Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) has been charged by the General Assembly with the responsibility to approve, approve with stipulations, or disapprove all new degrees and new degree programs to be offered by institutions of higher education in the State of Ohio. As a part of the process needed to fulfill this general charge, the Chancellor of the OBR has delegated the responsibility for the assessment of new graduate degree programs to the Regents’ Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS), which is composed of the Graduate Deans of the Ohio public universities. Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) and the University of Dayton (UD), which have extensive doctoral programs, were invited to join and are included in RACGS. Graduate program evaluation by RACGS leads to a formal recommendation and report from RACGS to the Chancellor of the OBR. Responsibility for the final program decision, however, rests with the Chancellor of the OBR. Program assessment and evaluation are based on the criteria given in this document. Private institutions of higher learning that are not included in RACGS are encouraged to avail themselves of the very same processes outlined below.

Any institution of higher education utilizing this process for introducing a new degree program shall submit an institutional proposal for program development to RACGS with a copy to the Regent’s staff following the procedures outlined in the Program Development Plan section. If the institution decides that a formal proposal for a new graduate program is appropriate, then the Full Proposal section shall be followed.

All new degree proposals shall provide information in reference to the criteria given in Part A. A single approval procedure shall be required of all institutions for all new graduate degree programs.

The purposes of this document are: 1) to establish procedures for the review and approval of new graduate degree program proposals (Part A); 2) to set forth guidelines for universities to gain approval to offer different types of graduate degree programs (Part B); 3) to establish regulations for suspending graduate programs (Part C) and 4) to provide guidelines for the review of graduate programs (Part D).

DEFINITIONS

1. Graduate degree program refers to any focused course of study that leads to recognition or an award for completion of a prescribed course of study beyond the baccalaureate degree in an institution of higher education evidenced by the receipt of a diploma as differentiated from a certificate. The degrees of Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Dental Surgery, Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, Doctor of Optometry, and Doctor of Jurisprudence are not covered by these guidelines.

2. Entry level graduate program is defined as a program of advanced study which admits: a) post-baccalaureate students into a master’s or doctoral degree program who do not possess undergraduate academic preparation in the specific area of advanced study or a closely related area, or b) postsecondary students directly into an extended master’s or doctoral program where they first receive the customary baccalaureate experience in the given discipline or professional area. Standard graduate education in a discipline or professional area requires entry through a baccalaureate program. Therefore, if an initial knowledge base
equivalent to the respective undergraduate degree is required for entry into a
given graduate program, it cannot be considered entry level. Entry level graduate
programs are expected to fully reflect the level of intellectual process and
knowledge characteristic of standard high quality graduate programs. For this
purpose specific additional program quality questions are posed under Part A,
Section A.II.B.1.

3. **Minority student** refers to traditionally underrepresented American citizens
including the following designations: African-American, a person not of Hispanic
origin coming from any of the Black racial groups of Africa; Hispanic, a person of
Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish
culture or origin, regardless of race; American Indian or Alaskan Native, a person
having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains
cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition; and
Asian or Pacific Islander, a person having origins in any of the original people of
the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands, an
area including, for example, China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and
Samoa. There are disciplines in which women should also be considered as an
underrepresented group.

4. **Discipline** refers to a recognized body of knowledge such as chemistry,
psychology, history, or sociology.

5. **Department** refers to the organizational unit for administering one or more
disciplines.

6. **Field** refers to a major subdivision of a discipline and is characterized by a
particular feature such as organic or analytical chemistry.

7. **Research graduate degree program** involves preparation to carry out significant
research and to discover new knowledge, whether the particular field of learning
is pure or applied. The recognized graduate degree titles which correspond with
successful completion of a research graduate degree program include Master of
Arts (M.A.), Master of Science (M.S.), and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) (see
Example Table 1).

8. **Professional graduate degree program** implies preparation for professional
and/or clinical practice. Generally, professional graduate degrees represent
terminal degrees in their field. The resulting professional activity usually
involves the giving of service to the public in the chosen field. The completion of
preparation for professional practice is recognized by the award of the
professional master’s or doctoral degree. The following master’s degree titles are
representative: Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.), Master of Public
Administration (M.P.A.), Master of Occupational Therapy (M.O.T.), Master of
Public Health (M.P.H.), Master of Social Work (M.S.W.), and Master of
Architecture (M.Arch). Representative professional doctoral degree titles include:
Doctor of Audiology (Au.D), Doctor of Management (DM), Doctor of Education
(Ed.D.), Doctor of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.), Doctor of Musical Arts (DMA) and
Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.). “Intermediate” professional graduate degrees
signifying work beyond the professional masters yet remaining short of the
professional doctoral degree, such as the educational specialist degree (Ed.S) are
also appropriate professional credentials in certain fields. Professional graduate degree programs are expected to fully reflect the level of intellectual process and knowledge characteristic of standard high quality graduate programs. However, generally these are not research graduate degrees (see Example Table 1). For this purpose specific additional program quality questions relating to the admission criteria, field experience, faculty experience, faculty qualifications, accreditation, curriculum, time to degree, and research are posed under Part A, Section A.II.B.1.b (see Example Table 1).

9. **Subdisciplinary program** refers to a focused program based upon one or more fields within a discipline. (See Example Table 1)

10. **Interdisciplinary program** refers to two or more interrelated disciplines or fields combined to constitute a program; for example, American Studies, Geopolitics, Biomedical Engineering. (See Example Table 1)

**TABLE 1: Examples Program Types and Program Names**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research:</th>
<th>Disciplinary</th>
<th>Subdisciplinary</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D. in Psychology</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Counseling</td>
<td>Ph.D. in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional:</td>
<td>Doctor of Psychology</td>
<td>Doctor of Counseling</td>
<td>Doctor of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **Short Courses and Workshops:** Generally, courses that meet for less than a full term (i.e., short courses and workshops) limit the opportunity for student thinking and understanding to develop and mature over time. Courses that require too little work outside the classroom limit the opportunity for self-directed learning to occur. At the same time, however, for some types of subject matter, advantages can accrue from the intensity resulting from offering the instruction in a time-shortened format. In these circumstances, it is appropriate for graduate credit to be awarded for courses of less than a full term’s duration.

However, graduate credit should only be awarded for courses in a time-shortened format when the amount of learning is at least equivalent to that which would occur if the courses were offered for the same number of credit hours over the course of a full term. It is the responsibility of each institution offering short courses and workshops for graduate credit to ensure that the limitations imposed on the opportunities for (i) student thinking and understanding to develop and mature over time and (ii) self-directed learning to occur are addressed in a way which ensures that the learning taking place is at least equivalent quantitatively and qualitatively to that which would occur if the course were offered for the same number of credit hours over the course of a full term.

3
GRADUATE CREDIT

Graduate education involves a greater depth of learning, increased specialization, and a more advanced level of instruction than undergraduate education. Selected faculty instruct carefully selected students in courses or clinical experiences that emphasize both student self-direction and dynamic interaction with the subject matter, the instructor, and other students. Interaction involves more than simply the transmission of what is known. It focuses on the generation of new knowledge through research and/or the application of knowledge to new areas of study.

All courses offered for graduate credit, regardless of whether they are offered on- or off-campus, should meet the following criteria:

1. **Course Level**
   
   Graduate courses build upon an undergraduate knowledge base. The approval process for all graduate courses should require a clear indication of the knowledge base the course presupposes, and how the course goes beyond that base. In the event that a graduate course is co-listed with an advanced undergraduate course (as is appropriate in some cases), the approval process should require clearly defined expectations of graduate students that go well beyond the expectations of the undergraduates in the course.

2. **Learning**

   Graduate courses involve dynamic interaction with the subject matter, the instructor and other students. Although this can be accomplished through a variety of instructional approaches, all graduate courses should involve learning both during and outside of classroom sessions, as well as dynamic interchanges with the instructor and other students. Offering a formula for graduate education is not appropriate; however the work expected at the graduate level should exceed that expected at the undergraduate level both qualitatively and quantitatively.

3. **Faculty**

   Faculty teaching graduate courses should possess the terminal degree and contribute to the knowledge base of the discipline they teach through scholarship, as exemplified by creative activity and/or publication. It is the responsibility of each institution offering graduate courses to ensure that only fully qualified faculty teach graduate courses.

4. **Students**

   Institutions offering graduate courses should have a formal admission process that selects only those post-baccalaureate students who have been highly successful as undergraduates for the pursuit of graduate work. It may be appropriate to allow qualified students who possess other attributes which suggest that they will be successful at graduate work to attempt a limited number of graduate courses on a trial basis.
GRADUATE PROGRAM CURRICULAR REVISIONS

Thoughtful revision of graduate program curricula can be an important part of the necessary evolutionary process of quality assurance, as well as an effective mechanism for maintaining program quality. Graduate program directors are encouraged to review their curricular offerings periodically to assess curricular relevance with respect to recent developments in the field or discipline. The revision of graduate program curricula, however, is of more general concern when its extent goes beyond that dictated by the development of new knowledge in a field or discipline; i.e., when a new degree program is created under the guise of curricular revision. If changes in the program curriculum (in contrast to the method of delivery) equal or exceed 50% based on the total number of credit hours in the degree program as published in the current graduate catalog or bulletin, the institution will need to use the new program approval process described in Part A, below.

The Graduate Dean (or equivalent administrative officer) at each institution is responsible for determining whether or not a new degree program is created when any existing graduate program undergoes a revision of its curriculum.

PART A.

PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF NEW GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSALS

Any institution of higher education desiring to introduce a new degree, a new degree program or a significant revision of an existing program as defined above, shall have the degree or program evaluated through the following peer-review process. The process is to be driven by the institution proposing the new degree, and involves the submission to and evaluation by RACGS member institutions, of a Program Development Plan (PDP) followed by a Full Proposal (FP), and culminating in the submission of a Response Document and formal presentation of the Full Proposal to RACGS members. Under certain circumstances institutions may be able to forego the preparation of a Response Document and the formal presentation of the Full Proposal to RACGS members (see Part A., Section C).

I. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT PLAN

A. Preparation and Submission of the Program Development Plan

Any institution of higher education desiring to introduce a new degree or new degree program shall submit a Program Development Plan (PDP) to RACGS with a copy to the Regent’s staff prior to formal application for degree authority. The Program Development Plan should be submitted at the earliest time consistent with the availability of the information requested below and as early as possible within the institutional approval processes. A separate PDP will be submitted for each new degree program proposed.

The PDP should address, in a summary narrative of no more than five pages (exclusive of appendices, which should be kept as brief as possible), the following concerns:
1. Designation of the new degree program, rationale for that designation, definition of the focus of the program and a brief description of its disciplinary purpose and significance.

2. Description of the proposed curriculum.

3. Administrative arrangements for the proposed program: department and school or college involved.

4. Evidence of need for the new degree program, including the opportunities for employment of graduates. This section should also address other similar programs in the state addressing this need and potential duplication of programs in the state and region.

5. Prospective enrollment.

6. Special efforts to enroll and retain underrepresented groups in the given discipline.

7. Availability and adequacy of the faculty and facilities available for the new degree program.

8. Need for additional facilities and staff and the plans to meet this need.

9. Projected additional costs associated with the program and evidence of institutional commitment and capacity to meet these costs.

B. **Review of the PDP by RACGS Member Institutions**

Members of RACGS will review the PDP and seek the advice of campus experts in the program area. The RACGS member institutions shall review the PDP and provide a response on the following issues:

1. Market need for the proposed program and the distinctions or differences between the proposed program and other similar programs across the state;

2. Opportunities for collaboration with the RACGS member’s own institution;

3. Concerns with substantive elements of the proposed degree program; and

4. Suggestions that might help the submitting institution strengthen the proposal or refine its focus.

The purpose of the review of the PDP is to provide the proposing institution with an assessment of the probability that the new degree or program would be approved by RACGS upon submission of a Full Proposal, and to highlight initial areas of concern that should be addressed in the Full Proposal should the proposing institution decide to move forward.

Each RACGS member will provide, via e-mail, written comments, both from the campus expert(s) as well as the RACGS member’s own summary evaluation, to all RACGS members with a copy to the Regents’ staff, within six weeks of receipt of the PDP.
Based on the RACGS reviews and their own assessment, the proposing institution will decide whether the PDP should be expanded to a Full Proposal and be submitted for RACGS review. Universities will employ institutionally approved processes for Full Proposal development and will submit such Full Proposals to RACGS, with a copy to Regents’ staff for further consideration as outlined in Part A, Section II of this document. The transmittal of the Full Proposal to OBR is the formal application for degree authority.

II. FULL PROPOSALS

A. Preparation and Submission of the Full Proposal

A Full Proposal (FP) for new degree programs is an expanded version of the PDP. The expansion should include: 1) clarification and revisions based upon the reviews of the program development plan (PDP); 2) any additional information needed to address the review criteria for new programs (see Part A, Section II.B); and 3) appendices containing such items as faculty vitae, course descriptions, needs surveys, and consultants’ reports.

A FP must be submitted to RACGS member institutions within two years of the submission of the PDP. If the FP is not prepared and submitted within this two-year limit, the proposing institution must re-initiate the process by submitting a new PDP.

B. Review of the FP by RACGS Member Institutions

FPs for new graduate programs will be sent by the initiating institution to all RACGS members with a copy provided to the Regents’ staff. Evaluation of a FP for a new graduate program by RACGS involves the following elements: 1) consideration of written comments provided by each RACGS member, 2) preparation and assessment of the response to these comments by the institution submitting the proposal, 3) a formal presentation of the proposal by the initiating institution to RACGS followed by a full discussion of the proposal in the larger context of graduate education, and 4) a formal vote by RACGS, by written ballot, advising the Ohio Board of Regents whether the program should be approved.

Reviewing RACGS members will refer FPs to experts within their institutions, provided that the Graduate Dean (or equivalent administrative officer) of that institution is convinced, beyond reasonable doubt, that the person(s) to whom the proposal is referred is (are) genuinely expert in the program area which is addressed. The peer expert(s) will provide the Graduate Dean (or equivalent administrative officer) of their institution with written comments within six weeks of receipt of the FP reviewing the following points, which are expected to be addressed in the proposal:

1. Academic Quality

Competency, experience and number of faculty, and adequacy of students, curriculum, computational resources, library, laboratories, equipment, and other physical facilities, needed to mount the program.
a) In addition to this analysis, for **entry level graduate degree programs**, academic quality assessment will focus on the adequacy of the answers provided in response to the following questions:

   i. Is the program distinctly different, both conceptually and qualitatively, from the undergraduate degree programs in the same or related disciplines? If so, is there a detailed listing of the specific differences?

   ii. Does the program emphasize the theoretical basis of the discipline as expressed in the methods of inquiry and ways of knowing in the discipline?

   iii. Does the program place emphasis on professional decision making and teach the use of critical analysis in problem solving?

   iv. Is the program designed to educate students broadly so that they have an understanding of the major issues and concerns in the discipline or professional area?

   v. Is there an adequate description of the required culminating experience such as an exit project (which would not necessarily be a research experience)?

   vi. Does the proposed program identify faculty resources appropriate for the research component of the program?

   vii. Does the program curriculum offer what students need to know for competence at the expected level of professional expertise?

   viii. What plans have been made to address standards and guidelines for professional accreditation, if applicable? What are the core courses required for the program?

b) In addition to the analysis given in the first paragraph above under Part A, Section II.B.1.a for **professional graduate degree programs**, academic quality assessment will also focus on the adequacy of the answers provided in response to the following questions:

   i. What admission criteria, in addition to the traditionally required transcripts, standardized test scores, letter of recommendation, and personal statements of purpose, are relevant to assess the potential for academic and professional success of prospective students? Will there be special consideration of student experience and extant practical skills within the admission process? If so, please elaborate.

   ii. Is field/clinical experience subsumed within the academic experience? If so, how does that experience relate to the academic goals of the professional graduate degree program? Provide a description of the involvement of supervisory personnel. Describe the nature of the oversight of the field/clinical experience by the academic department. Provide an outline of the anticipated student activities as well as student requirements.
iii. Are the faculty qualifications associated with the professional graduate degree program appropriate for such faculty? Provide the specific qualifications for such faculty.

iv. How does accreditation by the appropriate professional organization relate to the academic curriculum and experience outlined in the program plan? Describe the specific aspects of the program plan, if any, that are necessary to achieve professional accreditation. Is completion of the degree program required for professional accreditation in the field?

v. How are theory and practice integrated within the curriculum?

vi. What is the national credit hour norm for this degree program in your field? How was this norm derived? Is the number of credit hours required for graduation influenced by mandated professional experiences? If so, how?

vii. Describe the required culminating academic experience and how it will contribute to the enhancement of the student’s professional preparation.

c) The Special Case of Professional Science Master’s Programs (PSMs)

i. There is a special category of professional graduate degree programs recognized by the Council of Graduate Schools and the National Professional Science Master’s Association. Such programs can be granted the designation “Professional Science Master’s” or, “PSMs.”

ii. The criteria for obtaining such a designation can be found at: http://www.sciencemasters.com/Default.aspx?tabid=116

iii. For informational purposes only, do you contemplate seeking such recognition as a PSM from the National Professional Science Master’s Association? Is the program going to be seeking such recognition?

2. Need

Examples of potential metrics of program need include:

a) Student interest and demand
   Potential enrollment;
   Ability to maintain the critical mass of students.

b) Institutional need
   Plan for overall development of graduate programs at the proposing institutions.

c) Societal demand
   Intellectual development;
   Advancement of the discipline;
   Employment opportunities.
d). Scope
Local, regional, and national needs;
International need.

3. **Access and Retention of Underrepresented Groups**
   a) Plan to ensure recruitment, retention and graduation of
      underrepresented groups within the discipline.
   b) Provide as background a general assessment of:
      i. Institution and departmental profiles of total enrollment and
         graduate student enrollment of underrepresented groups within the
         discipline; and
      ii. Compare underrepresented groups degree recipients from the
          department and university at all levels compared to **national norms**. Supply data by group where available.

4. **Statewide Alternatives**
   a) Programs available in other institutions;
   b) Appropriateness of specific locale for the program; and
   c) Opportunities for inter-institutional collaboration.
   d) Institutional Priority and Costs
      i. Support and commitment of the proposing institution’s central
         administration.
      ii. Adequacy of available resources committed for the initiation of the
          program.

5. **External Support**
   a) Community, foundation, governmental, and other resources.

C. **Preparation of Response Document and Formal Presentation**
Written comments from each RACGS institution, consisting of the campus reviewers’ comments along with the RACGS member’s summary evaluation will be forwarded electronically to the Graduate Dean (or equivalent administrative officer) at the proposal-submitting institution with copies being forwarded to Regents’ staff and other RACGS members within six weeks of the receipt of the FP.

When no review raises any questions about or objections to the proposed program, the proposing institution may request that the chair of RACGS, with the concurrence of the Regents’ staff, conduct a mail ballot to approve the program, thereby waiving the preparation of the Response Document and the formal hearing. A Fiscal Impact Form must be prepared for circulation with the mail ballot. Any objection to the approval by mail will necessitate the preparation of a Response Document and a formal presentation at a future RACGS meeting.

If a review or reviews raise questions about but no serious objections to the proposed program, the proposing institution may request that the chair of RACGS, with the
concurrence of the Regents’ staff, conduct a mail ballot to approve the program by including a Response Document with the ballot. Any objection to the approval by mail will necessitate a formal presentation. A Fiscal Impact Form must also be prepared for circulation with the mail ballot. The FIS form can be accessed at:
https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs

When reviews raise significant questions about or objections to the proposed program, the proposing institution will prepare a Response Document and plan to make a formal presentation to RACGS members.

1. After receipt of the review comments on the FP, the proposing institution will develop a written response to the reviewers’ individual comments called a Response Document. Copies of the Response Document are to be sent to all RACGS members as well as to Regents Staff.

2. The Response Document must include an OBR Fiscal Impact Statement and should be used to demonstrate institutional plans for the judicious use of resources in terms of physical plant, personnel, and student support, and appropriate institutional commitment of resources to the new program.

3. The chair of RACGS, in concert with OBR and the proposal-submitting institution, will schedule a formal presentation of the proposal at a forthcoming RACGS meeting. The response document from the proposing institution must be received by the RACGS members at least ten (10) days advance of this meeting.

4. After presentation and discussion of the proposal with representatives of the proposal-submitting institution, RACGS will by written ballot vote on a motion as to the disposition of the program as a recommendation to the Ohio Board of Regents. Ballots shall include the name of the Institution and the vote of that institution (“yes” or “no”) on the motion. Recommendations for approval will require an affirmative vote from two-thirds of all members of RACGS in attendance, with the stipulation that no program will be recommended for approval with less than 8 “yes” votes. No member in attendance may abstain from voting. Absentee or proxy votes cannot be utilized to constitute the two-thirds majority or the required one-half of all RACGS members voting in the affirmative. A summary of the vote and the RACGS discussion of the proposal will be presented to the Board by Regents’ staff. Responsibility for the final decision rests with the Chancellor and the OBR.

5. Occasionally, RACGS may find that, even after the review and discussion with representatives of the proposal-submitting institution, substantive issues remain unresolved. In such unusual cases, and given a two-thirds affirmative vote, RACGS may recommend that, prior to the formal RACGS vote, the Chancellor convene a panel of nationally recognized experts to review the program proposal and to conduct a site visit. The charge to the panel of outside experts shall focus on the specific unresolved issues identified by RACGS but need not be restricted to those specific issues. After the written report of the consultants has been received and
distributed to RACGS members, RACGS will review the new information and forward a formal recommendation to the Chancellor.

6. The final decision of the Board will be accomplished as expeditiously as possible. If an unforeseen delay is encountered, the Chancellor’s office will inform RACGS of the reason(s) for the delay as well as the probable duration of the delay.

III. TYPES OF PROGRAM APPROVAL

A. Full Approval

RACGS may recommend program approval without any associated conditions or provisions if adequate academic strength and quality are apparent.

B. Contingent Approval

Program approval may be recommended with the stipulation that certain institutional resources be secured prior to program initiation. The institution will notify RACGS and Regents’ staff through its representative on RACGS that the required resources have been put in place. RACGS will determine if all contingencies have been satisfied prior to the formal recommendation for program initiation.

C. Provisional Approval

In the case of proposed programs that are academically unique because of novelty in structure, content or instructional delivery format, or because of other factors, RACGS may recommend provisional approval:

1. The recommendation for provisional approval will be for a specified period of time.

2. At the completion of the provisional period, Regents’ staff will ask the institution to prepare a report for submission to RACGS and the Board of Regents. The report will address the following areas, as well as any others specified in the provisional approval resolution:

   a) General effectiveness of the program in meeting its stated goals.
   b) Effectiveness of academic control mechanisms.
   c) Professional activities of the faculty associated with the program.
   d) Continuing availability of various support services.
   e) Overall academic productivity of the program.

3. All members of RACGS will receive and read this report. The reports may be referred to experts within their institutions for written comments in accordance with the criteria cited above.

4. Written reviewer’s comments will be forwarded to the Graduate Dean (or equivalent administrative officer) at the report-submitting institution with copies to Regents’ staff and other RACGS members. In most instances, the
report-submitting institution may wish to provide a written response to the reviewers’ comments. Copies of these responses are to be sent to all RACGS members.

5. The Chair of RACGS, in concert with Regents’ staff and the report-submitting institution, will schedule a formal review of the proposal at a regular monthly meeting. Written responses to reviewers’ comments must be presented well in advance of this meeting.

6. After review and discussion of the report with representatives of the report-submitting institution, RACGS will forward to the Board a recommendation for one of the following actions:

   a) Full approval of the program, with or without modifications.
   b) Continuation of the provisional status of the program for a finite period, not to exceed five (5) years.
   c) Withdrawal of program approval, provided that motions for full approval or continuation of the provisional status for the program, under Section III.C.6 a. and b. above, do not receive the necessary recommendation for approval.

IV. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR CHANGING DEGREE NAMES, TITLES AND DESIGNATIONS

Definitions

A. Degree name refers to the name of the degree awarded (i.e., Ph.D., Doctor of, Master of Arts, Master of Science, and Master of ....) and requires a full proposal and full review to RACGS and Chancellor’s staff.

B. Degree title indicates the field in which the degree is awarded (e.g., Physics, Education, Public Administration, etc.) and requires the completion of a change request form for a ‘Degree Title Change.’ The form will be circulated to RACGS and Chancellor’s staff.

C. Degree designation is given by the combined name and title of the degree (e.g., Ph.D. in History, Master of Public Health, Master of Science in Computer Science, etc.) and requires a full proposal and a full review to RACGS and Chancellor’s staff.

A. Degree Name Change

When an institution wishes to replace a single degree name with another at the same level (e.g., Master of Arts with Master of Science or a professional degree), the RACGS Guidelines and Procedures for Review and Approval of Graduate Degree Programs must be followed. Generally speaking, replacing a professional degree with a research degree requires more extensive documentation and justification than does replacing a research degree with a professional degree. When an institution seeks to change a research degree to a professional degree name, and the desired change requires neither curricular modifications nor additional staff, and will not affect enrollments significantly, a full proposal may be submitted to RACGS without undergoing the preliminary
Program Development Plan review process as given in the Guidelines and Procedures for Review and Approval of Graduate Degree Programs.

B. **Degree Title Change**

When an institution desires to replace a single obsolescent degree title with a more appropriate one, the completion of a change request form for a ‘Degree Title Change’ is required and can be accessed at: [https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs](https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs). The form will state why the title change is being proposed and contain sufficient information to justify the change. The request is reviewed by the Chancellor’s Office and the members of RACGS. Although replacing a disciplinary degree (e.g., Ph.D. in Psychology) with a subdisciplinary degree (e.g., Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology) may constitute a title change, replacing a subdisciplinary degree with a disciplinary degree does not. The latter situation requires appropriate review as a new program proposal under the RACGS Guidelines and Procedures for Review and Approval of Graduate Degree Programs. In unclear cases, the Chancellor’s Office makes the final determination of what constitutes a title change.

C. **Degree Designation Change**

When an institution seeks to create a separate degree designation for a specialization currently offered within an existing degree without eliminating the original degree designation, and the desired change requires no additional staff and will not affect enrollments significantly but may involve minor curricular modifications from the original specialization, a full proposal may be submitted to RACGS without undergoing the preliminary Program Development Plan review process as given in the Guidelines and Procedures for Review and Approval of Graduate Degree Programs.

V. **GUIDELINES FOR RACGS OVERSIGHT OF OFF-CAMPUS GRADUATE PROGRAMS: ‘OFF-SITE’ (FACE-TO-FACE), DISTANCE/ELECTRONIC MEDIA, AND ‘BLENDED’ (ON-SITE/VIA DISTANCE/ELECTRONIC MEDIA) DELIVERY MODELS**

The following guidelines will be used by the RACGS in overseeing currently approved graduate degree programs that are provided at specific off-campus sites or via various delivery models including the use of teleconferencing, web-based or other electronic means, as well as a mixture of on-site/off-site delivery. The intent of these conditions is to permit flexibility in adapting degree requirements to alternative audiences, while not permitting institutions to design and deliver essentially new degrees within the format of a previously approved degree. The completion of a change request form for ‘Online or Blended/Hybrid Delivery’ is required. The form can be accessed at: [https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs](https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs). If the program leads to teacher licensure, the completion of ‘Form A’ is required. ‘Form A’ can be accessed at this same link. Form A will be submitted to the OBR Office of Program Development and Approval.
A. Programs Requiring Notification Only

RACGS will be notified in writing on those occasions when a previously approved degree program will be offered at an off-campus site, or extended to a different audience via electronic or blended means. Under these guidelines, a degree program will be considered “previously approved” when less than 50% of the credit hour requirements for a degree previously given approval has been changed (see Introduction: Graduate Program Curricular Revisions, page 5.) A program will be considered to have been “extended to a different audience via electronic or blended means” when 50% or more of the course delivery is off-site or via alternative delivery models. The completion of the appropriate change request form is required and can be accessed at: https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs. If the program leads to teacher licensure, the completion of ‘Form A’ is required and can be accessed at this same link. Form A will be submitted to the OBR Office of Program Development and Approval.

1. Universities desiring to provide a previously approved degree program under the conditions above must inform the Chancellor’s staff and RACGS members via email at least six weeks prior to the initiation of the degree program. A brief, concise description of the program that addresses the conditions noted above and describes the general nature of the program and its delivery mechanism or site location and that assures that all participating faculty are permitted to teach at the graduate level will suffice in informing Chancellor’s staff and RACGS members.

2. If a RACGS member does not respond with an objection within 30 days of notification, it will be assumed that the RACGS member has no objection to the proposal. If there is no substantive objection, the program will be included as an information item on the agenda of the next RACGS meeting and entered into the minutes of the meeting.

3. In the event that a member objects to an informational item, the proposer will be notified and asked to respond to the objection; if no resolution is reached via email, a discussion at the next RACGS meeting will ensue and a formal vote for approval must be taken, with majority approval, at that meeting before the program’s acceptance is entered into the record.

B. Program Standards

To ensure that off-site and alternative delivery models adhere to the same standards as on-campus programs, RACGS member institutions will be responsible for utilizing the following guidelines and shall use the same guidelines in those cases where new degree programs using alternative delivery models are being brought forward for approval (these may supercede new degree program criteria as outlined earlier in these guidelines).

1. The program is consistent with the institution’s role and mission.

2. The institution’s accreditation standards are not appreciably affected by offering the program, especially via alternative delivery mechanisms.
3. The institution’s budget priorities are sufficient to sustain the program in order for a selected cohort to complete the program in a reasonable amount of time.

4. The institution has in place sufficient technical infrastructure and staff to support offering the program, especially via alternative delivery mechanisms.

5. The institution has in place sufficient protocols for ensuring instructional commitments are met, including instructor/staff training, compliance with copyright law, and quality instruction among other variables.

6. The institution has in place a relevant and tested method of assessing learning outcomes, especially in the case of alternative delivery mechanisms.

7. As new delivery mechanisms are brought into course instruction, students and faculty are presented with sufficient training and support to make appropriate use of new approaches.

8. The institution assures that the off-site/alternatively delivered program meets the same quality standards for coherence, completeness and academic integrity as for its on-campus programs.

9. The institution assures that the faculty delivering the program meet the same standards and qualifications as for on-campus programs.

10. The institution assures that, for all off-site and alternative programs, students will have access to necessary services for registration, appeals, and other functions associated with on-campus programs.

11. In those instances where program elements are supplied by consortia partners or outsourced to other organizations, the university accepts responsibility for the overall content and academic integrity of the program.

12. In those instances where asynchronous interaction between instructor and student is a necessary part of the course, the design of the course, and the technical support available to both instructor and student are sufficient to enable timely and efficient communication.

13. Faculty are assured that appropriate workload, compensation, and ownership of resource materials have been determined in advance of offering the off-site or alternatively delivered course.

14. Program development resources are sufficient to create, execute, and assess the quality of the program being offered, irrespective of site and delivery mechanism employed.

15. Procedures are in place to accept qualified students for entry in the program—it is imperative that students accepted be qualified for entry into the on-campus program. In addition, program costs, timeline for completion of the cohort program and other associated information is made clear to prospective students in advance of the program’s initiation.
16. Assessment mechanisms appropriate to the delivery approach are in place to competently compare learning outcomes to learning objectives.

17. Overall program effectiveness is clearly assessed, via attention to measures of student satisfaction, retention rates, faculty satisfaction, etc.

VI. APPROVAL PROCESS FOR GRADUATE CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS THAT LEAD TO EDUCATIONAL LICENSURE

There are many types of certificate programs at the graduate level, ranging from a diploma attesting to satisfactory completion of a short course or workshop to the equivalent of a graduate degree program. The award of the certificate may accompany receipt of a graduate degree, or it may take place upon completion of a specified number of credit hours, independent of receipt of a graduate degree. There are already agreed-upon review procedures for programs leading to regular graduate degrees. The question is: Under what conditions and according to what criteria should graduate programs leading to a certificate be reviewed?

A. Classification of Graduate Certificates

Three classes of graduate certificates can be distinguished as given below:

1. A certificate awarded with a master’s or doctoral degree, indicating that a specific program of course work has been followed within regular program options. For example, upon completion of the M.A. degree in Political Science, candidates who have taken a specified series of courses in public administration within the accredited degree program may be awarded an appropriate certificate upon completing their degree requirements. As all new graduate degree programs are subject to review by other procedures, certificates of this type, descriptive of a concentration within a degree program only, not requiring any additional credits beyond those for the degree, do not require further review.

2. A certificate awarded for completing a specified program of post-baccalaureate or post-master’s work, not constituting a regular graduate degree program, and awarded independently of a regular degree. Certificates awarded for completion of a program of graduate level study involving fewer than 21 semester credit hours or 31 quarter credit hours where all courses have been approved for graduate credit according to institutional mechanisms do not require further review.

3. Certificates awarded for completion of a substantial program of graduate study in a discipline(s)/professional area(s) where the university already has graduate degree authorization require further review. A substantial certification program is defined as one requiring the successful completion of 21 or more semester credit hours, or 31 or more quarter credit hours of graduate-level courses.

Graduate programs that lead to educational licensure and that involve earning 21 credits or more or, degree programs that include licensure or,
stand-alone “certificates” for licensure must seek approval through both the OBR Office of Program Development and Approval and RACGS. Template forms for teacher licensure, endorsement and teacher preparation-continuing program requests can be accessed at: https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs

B. Review and Program Approval Procedures for Graduate Certificates

Certificate programs requiring review (A.3 above) must submit a written request to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. Requests must be submitted three (3) months prior to the intended implementation date. The request to offer a certificate program must include a narrative statement that addresses the following issues:

i. Approved graduate program(s) sponsoring the certificate program.
ii. Need and demand for the certificate program.
iii. Statement of educational objectives of the certificate program.
iv. Curriculum for the certificate program.
v. Justification for the number of credit hours for the certificate program.
vi. Entrance, performance, and exit standards for the certificate program.
vii. Faculty expertise contributing to the certificate program.
viii. New resources, courses, etc., if any, necessary to support certificate program.

A brief, concise description of the certificate program that addresses the above points will assist RACGS by allowing review by mail or email. The narrative statement will be circulated to RACGS members for review and a recommendation for approval, disapproval, or for formal review and vote at a RACGS meeting. RACGS members should respond by mail or email within 45 days of receipt of the proposal. If a RACGS member does not respond by that date, it will be assumed that the RACGS member has no objection to the proposal.
Part B.
Guidelines for Seeking Approval for Innovative and Nontraditional Graduate Degree Programs

As new fields of study and new disciplines emerge, research and educational demands in these developing areas will increase. To meet these demands new, innovative graduate degree programs will need to be developed. These programs may differ significantly from more traditional graduate programs in structure, mode of instructional delivery, and the ways research is conducted. Whether the structure calls for interdisciplinary integration, inter-university cooperation, business/industry collaboration, or novel modes of instruction and research, this section provides guidelines and procedures for the development of new graduate programs that may not fall within traditionally defined fields or disciplines.

Academic quality is a primary consideration in the development of these different types of graduate programs. In addition, the other major criteria that must be considered are program need, statewide alternatives, institutional priority and costs, and external program support. A proposal for such a new degree program is initiated by the submission of a Program Development Plan (PDP) to Regents staff and RACGS members. Based upon review of the PDP, Regents staff will determine the extent to which additional approval will be necessary for new graduate programs as outlined in Part A of this document.

I. New Degree Programs Derived from Sub-disciplines

Approval of a new graduate degree program in a sub-discipline requires instructional capabilities across the full range of the discipline, but research capability only in the sub-discipline. For example, approval of a graduate degree program in bioorganic chemistry does not extend the need for doctoral-level research capability in environmental chemistry. Such limitation does not preclude a university from providing enrichment and breadth drawn from related fields within the discipline.

A. Review and Approval Process

A PDP must be submitted to the Regents staff and to RACGS members for review. Based upon this review, Regents staff will determine whether or not the proposed degree program is a more appropriate designation than the existing sub-disciplinary option under the current degree authority, and whether or not additional approvals are required.

II. Interdisciplinary Programs

Interdisciplinary degree programs are the primary means by which newly emerging fields of study can organize and support a focused research agenda and academic experience for faculty and graduate students. Such degree programs also allow universities to focus their resources more effectively and promote coherent research activities in areas where new bodies of knowledge are evolving.
A. **Review and Approval Process**

Interdisciplinary programs can be configured in a variety of ways. Normally, the institution must present a PDP to Regents staff and RACGS for evaluation and review. Regents’ staff, upon advice of RACGS, will notify the institution whether or not further levels of approval are necessary.

III. **Inter-Institutional Degree Programs**

Graduate degree programs may sometimes be offered in the form of joint programs between RACGS institutions, as joint programs between a RACGS institution and a non-RACGS Ohio institution, as joint programs with a RACGS institution and an out-of-state or international institution, as a joint program between multiple Universities or with non-university institutions, or as a cooperative degree program as described below. When submitting a PDP for an inter-institutional degree program, the following definitions and distinction should be taken into account:

A. **Joint Degree Programs**

In a joint degree program, two or more universities share the administrative, supervisory, and academic responsibility for the proposed program. Degree authority resides jointly in all participating institutions. Individual institutions do not have independent authority to offer the degree.

B. **Cooperative Degree Programs**

Institutions participating in a cooperative degree program must obtain RACGS approval. The primary administrative and academic responsibilities fall to one of the participating institutions.

C. **University and Non-University Degree Program Collaboration**

Graduate programs can, in some instances, be strengthened through cooperation between a university and a non-university agency or laboratory. Examples include: governmental research units, private research organizations, and other public and private institutions such as museums, art galleries, libraries and industrial organizations.

D. **Review and Approval Process**

In all cases when an inter-institutional degree program is proposed, the principal concern is academic quality. All institutions participating in the degree program must be identified and the roles of each institution in the degree program must be fully described. Approval of new degree programs which entail joint, cooperative or collaborative inter-institutional arrangements require, in addition to the PDP a statement of policies and procedures for ensuring:

1) The provision of complementary *educational* experiences for students;
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2) Supervision of students by qualified scientists or scholars at all institutions;

3) Mechanisms for advising and evaluation of students;

4) Mechanisms and procedures for program administration;

5) Mechanisms to maintain academic quality (this should include a description of how faculty members/collaborators at each institution are qualified and how quality is maintained);

6) Procedures for covering the costs involved in shared administration;

7) Compliance with policies on such essential matters as academic freedom, intellectual property rights, and affirmative action;

8) Safeguards against possible exploitation of the time and talents of students;

9) Official confirmation that ultimate academic responsibility rests with a RACGS university; and

10) In instances when inter-institutional arrangements involve non-RACGS institutions, a RACGS institution must be designated as the primary institution for the purpose of functioning as the prime contact with the Ohio Board of Regents and for assuring compliance with academic and administrative standards.

Changes to the curriculum and/or mode of delivery for programs already approved under criteria described in Part B above are subject to the same rules for review specified in Part A.

V. Ad hoc Interdisciplinary Program for an Individual Student.

If a university offers approved graduate degree programs in two or more departments at the appropriate degree level, the institution may initiate and develop an ad hoc interdisciplinary program of study for an individual student with the understanding that additional resources are not required, a new administrative unit is not created, and the degree will be awarded by the appropriate degree-granting authority. No RACGS approval is required for this type of program.
PART C.

GUIDELINES FOR SUSPENDING A GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM

I. SUSPENSION OF A GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM

When a university has decided to suspend admission to a graduate degree program, the university will inform the Chancellor’s staff and members of RACGS. A ‘Program Inactivation’ form must be completed and circulated to the RACGS listserve. The form can be accessed at: https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs. A university may suspend a graduate degree program if the institution plans to reactivate the program at some future date. At any time within seven years of the initial suspension, the university may reactivate the program simply by informing OBR and the other RACGS members that the program will be admitting students once again. It is the responsibility of the university’s Graduate Dean to determine whether or not changes in the specific field of study, since the degree program was suspended, warrant the submission of a full planning proposal to OBR and RACGS.

II. DISCONTINUATION OF A GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM

A. If a suspended graduate degree program is not reactivated within the specified seven-year period, the program will be declared discontinued. If at a subsequent date after the seven-year period the university plans to reactivate a discontinued graduate degree program, the university must seek formal approval from OBR through RACGS in the same manner as required for approval of a new graduate degree program. In the view of RACGS, disciplinary changes in a specific area of study during a seven-year period may be significant enough that a new, or substantially revised, program may need to be developed.

B. When a university has no plans to reactivate a suspended graduate degree program, the Graduate Dean should inform OBR and RACGS that the degree program has been discontinued. It is understood that if the university ever plans to reactivate the suspended graduate degree program, it will be necessary to seek the approval of OBR and RACGS through the established procedures for development of a new graduate degree program.
PART D.

REVIEW OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

I. GUIDELINES FOR GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

The periodic review of graduate programs is necessary to ensure that graduate programs maintain quality and currency. The Chancellor and members of RACGS view graduate program review as an institutional responsibility. The process is designed to provide information to faculty and administrators at the local level, so that necessary changes can be made to maintain program quality. The process is not meant to be used to compare programs across the University System of Ohio or to determine state funding of graduate programs.

Although graduate program review is considered an institutional responsibility and will necessarily vary slightly from one university to another, all universities must employ graduate program review procedures that are consistent with the key features and elements outlined in the Council of Graduate Schools 2011 publication, Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs1, and must include a review of each element listed among RACGS “quality standards.”

A. Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) Key Features and Elements of Program Review

The CGS publication recommends that graduate programs be reviewed every five to ten years according to a published timetable. The document also outlines a number of important features of program review:

- the reviews should be evaluative and forward looking;
- the reviews should be fair and transparent as well as distinct from other reviews; and
- the reviews must result in action.

The CGS publication also provides guidelines regarding the elements that should be present in all graduate program reviews. The “key elements” are discussed fully in the CGS publication and include components such as:

- developing and disseminating clear and consistent guidelines;
- obtaining adequate staffing and administrative support;
- conducting a candid program self-study;
- incorporating appropriate surveys and questionnaires;
- including graduate students in the review;
- using both internal and external reviewers;
- obtaining a response from program faculty;
- delivering a final report with recommendations;
- implementing the recommendations; and
- following up over time.

---

B. Quality Standards

Members of RACGS have developed the quality standards listed below. Assessment of continued compliance with these standards must be included in the graduate program review process.

1. Program Faculty

A level of faculty productivity and commitment shall be required commensurate with expectations of graduate program faculty as indicated by the following:

- The number and qualifications of graduate faculty members are judged to be adequate for offering the graduate degrees in the specified areas, and faculty supervise an appropriate number of students.

- The preparation and experience of the faculty are appropriate for offering the graduate degree in an intellectually challenging academic environment as demonstrated by active scholarship and creative activity judged by accepted national standards for the discipline.

  o Faculty members have achieved professional recognition (nationally, internationally).

  o The faculty garners significant external funding, as defined by disciplinary norms, which enhance the graduate program.

  o Directors of dissertations and a majority of committee members generate new knowledge and scholarly and creative activity as determined by disciplinary norms.

2. Program Graduates Since the Most Recent Review

A level of student satisfaction, student accomplishment, and graduate accomplishment exists as evidenced by the following:

- Students express satisfaction with advisement, teaching, and program support services.

- The structure and conduct of the program lead to an appropriate degree completion rate and time-to-degree.

- The predominant employment of graduates within three to five years after graduation is in fields consistent with the mission of the program.
• Graduates demonstrate preparation for career-long learning and success as indicated by periodic surveys of career changes, job satisfaction, and relevance of doctoral training to various career opportunities.

• Accomplishment and potential of program graduates to generate new knowledge or new initiatives in teaching, public service, and/or other practice.

3. Program Vitality

A vital graduate program is dynamic and should possess the following indicators:

• The environment of the doctoral program promotes a high level of intellectual interaction among students, graduate faculty, and the larger academic community;

• The curriculum has been updated during the period under review with disciplinary developments;

• Essential resources are provided (e.g., library materials, computer support, laboratory facilities and equipment, student financial support, etc.); and

• Requirements for completion of the degree are deemed appropriate to the degree.

4. Program Demand

A graduate program should be able to demonstrate that there is demand on the part of prospective students and that it is fulfilling a clear need through the following:

• Student demand/enrollment during the period under review: application ratio, student GPA and GRE scores, or other indicators as appropriate; and

• The extent to which the program meets community, region and state needs and occupational societal demands.

5. Program Interactions

Graduate programs do not exist in isolation but rather in relation to and in comparison to similar programs in the discipline at other institutions and to cognate areas in the same institution. Information regarding appropriate interactions should include:
• Centrality of the program to advanced study in the specific discipline(s) regionally or nationally;

• The ability of the faculty and students to make a particular contribution in this field;

• Interactions, including interdisciplinary, among graduate, undergraduate, and professional programs, as appropriate;

• Interactions with and in collaboration with similar programs at other universities and organizations; and

• Programmatic access to special leveraging assets such as unique on-campus or off-campus facilities, non-university experts or collaborative institutions in the discipline, industrial or other support, endowments, as well as special funding opportunities.

6. Program Access

There should be evidence that the program has established or seeks to establish an appropriate level of diversity among its faculty and its graduate student body, as evidenced by:

• Trends and expectations in student demographics; and

• Proven efforts to sustain and enhance diversity of faculty and students.

7. Assessment Mechanisms Used in Program Review

Since quality indicators are increasingly becoming an integral part of ongoing program review, an enhanced recognition of the uses of outcomes assessment in the review process provides a useful tool for program improvement, as demonstrated by:

• A summary of the appropriate outcome measures used to assess program quality; and

• Procedures must be in place to ensure the use of assessment data for continuous quality improvement of the program.

II. REPORTS TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

A. Institutional Process

Each RACGS member must provide the Chancellor with a written document outlining the institution’s policies and procedures for conducting graduate program reviews. The document must describe the institutional process for
graduate program review and must indicate the cycle under which such reviews are conducted. When institutional policies and procedures for graduate program review are revised, the RACGS member must provide an updated document to the Chancellor.

B. Annual Report

By September 1 of each year, each RACGS member will provide the Chancellor and RACGS with an annual report of their existing graduate programs that were reviewed in the previous academic year. An ‘Annual Report’ form must be completed and circulated to Regents staff and RACGS via the RACGS listserv. The form can be accessed at: https://www.ohiohighered.org/racgs. The report must include:

- A list of the graduate programs reviewed;
- For each program reviewed, a summary of the findings related to program demand (i.e., student demand and the extent to which the program meets regional, state, national and societal needs);
- A list of graduate programs that have not been reviewed in the past 10 years with an explanation for the lack of review.
ARTICLE I
PURPOSE OF THE BYLAWS
These bylaws of the Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing of Case Western Reserve University (1) define the duties of the Faculty of Nursing, committees and officers, (2) provide for establishment of committees and (3) provide for election of representatives of the Faculty of Nursing to the Faculty Senate, and to university assemblies as requested.

ARTICLE II
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FACULTY OF NURSING
Section 1: This faculty shall have responsibility to:

a. Adopt rules to govern its procedures, provide for its committees and make recommendations to the dean for such organization of the teaching staff as it may determine.

b. Organize and execute the educational program of the School of Nursing including admission and progression policies, curriculum content, degree requirements, instruction, and establishment and dissolution of academic programs, other than degree programs which require additional review and approval procedures as noted in the Faculty Handbook.

c. Make recommendations to the dean of initial appointments to the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor.

d. Establish policies relating to appointment, re-appointment, promotion and tenure for voting faculty and policies for appointment and promotion for special faculty members.

e. Make recommendations to the dean for tenure and promotion of faculty.

f. Elect members to the Faculty Senate and to university assemblies as requested.
ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP

Section 1  Exception to Rule In Faculty Handbook

Because of the practice nature of the discipline, the Provost has granted the School of Nursing an exception to the Faculty Handbook provision requiring that a majority of the voting faculty shall be tenured or tenure track. The goal of the School of Nursing is to reach such a majority.

Section 2  Voting members

The president and the chief academic officer of the university next in rank to the president and all persons holding full-time tenured/tenure track and full-time non-tenure track appointments to Faculty of Nursing at the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor shall be voting members of the faculty.

Section 3  Special Faculty (Non-voting members)

Special faculty shall consist of faculty members who are appointed by the dean of the school and 1.) hold full-time academic appointments but have specific, limited responsibilities for the duration of a specific project or for a limited duration, or 2.) hold part-time academic appointments. Special faculty shall have voice but no vote except as noted in Article VII, Section I b. Subject to approval by the provost, the types and titles of special faculty are as follows:

a.  Lecturer

All persons designated as lecturer are those:

1. Who have responsibility for teaching one or more courses included in the school's curricula; and

2. Whose academic qualifications and competencies are other than those for established university ranks.

b.  Clinical Faculty

Includes all persons designated at the ranks of clinical professor, clinical associate professor, clinical assistant professor, and clinical instructor, and whose primary appointments are in service agencies whose resources provide settings, by agreement, for students and faculty to have opportunities to engage in education, research and service in accordance with policy and procedures of the School of Nursing.

c.  Preceptor

All persons designated as preceptor are those:

1. Whose academic qualifications and competencies are other than those for established university ranks

2. Whose primary appointments are in service agencies whose resources provide settings, by agreement, for students and faculty to have opportunities to engage in education, research and service in accordance with policy and procedures of the School of Nursing.

d.  Adjunct Appointments

Persons designated at university ranks of adjunct professor, adjunct associate professor, adjunct assistant professor, and adjunct instructor are those:

1. Whose special competencies can provide a desired complement for some designated service, activity or development of the School of Nursing; and

2. Whose academic qualifications meet criteria established for appointees at the same ranks and tracks as shown in Attachment A.
e. Research Faculty

Persons designated at university ranks of research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor are those whose primary responsibilities are related to the research mission of the school and university. Neither teaching nor service (other than that related to the research mission) is part of the responsibilities of the research faculty member.

1. Research experience and qualifications are comparable to those of tenured/tenure track faculty at corresponding ranks.

2. Appointment as a research faculty member is contingent upon the availability of research funds to totally cover costs of the research and compensation. The appointment will terminate either prior to or at the end of the current appointment period in the absence of sufficient funds to cover these costs.

3. In the case of new appointments and promotions, the Committee on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure will provide a full review, comparable for that done for appointments and promotions of regular faculty to the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor.

ARTICLE IV

SELECTION OF TRACK

Tenure or non-tenure track must be identified at the time of appointment or promotion to assistant professor or higher. The pre-tenure period in the School of Nursing begins at the rank of assistant professor or higher in the tenure track and is nine (9) years in length.

Tenured and tenure track faculty member obligations to the university include 1) teaching, 2) research, and 3) service to the university community. Non-tenure track faculty member obligations include two of the three.

ARTICLE V

OFFICERS

Section 1 Chairperson – The president of the university shall preside at faculty meetings. In the president’s absence, the chair of the Executive Committee shall chair the meeting; in the absence of the Executive Committee chair, the dean’s designee shall preside.

Section 2 Secretary – The secretary shall be appointed annually by the Executive Committee. The functions of the secretary are:

a. Monitoring the preparation of the minutes of the faculty meetings. Signing the official copy of the minutes.

b. Being responsible for distribution of these minutes to the faculty.

c. Serving on the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VI

MEETINGS

Section 1 Regular Meetings – At least four (4) regular meetings shall be held between September 1 and May 31.

Section 2 Special Meetings – Special meetings may be called by the president, by the dean or upon request of three members of the voting faculty.

Section 3 Executive Committee Meetings – At least four (4) meetings shall be held between September 1 and May 31.

Section 4 Quorum – Twenty five percent of the voting members of the faculty shall constitute a quorum.
Section 5. Voting Body – See Article III, Sections 2 and 3 of these bylaws.

Section 6. Notice - The Chair, or, on the Chair's designation, the Secretary shall notify each member of the faculty at least one week before each regular and special meeting. Such notification shall be in writing and shall specify the time and place of the meeting.

ARTICLE VII

STANDING COMMITTEES

Section 1. Membership and Voting Privileges

a. The president of the university and the dean of the School of Nursing shall serve as members ex-officio of all faculty committees. Ex-officio status here and in subsequent sections of the bylaws carries with it voting privileges.

b. Persons holding appointments as special faculty may serve on committees and may vote in committees unless otherwise indicated in these bylaws.

c. Students serving on standing committees of this faculty may vote in committees unless otherwise indicated by these bylaws.

d. A faculty member may serve in no more than two (2) elected positions per year on standing committees of these bylaws.

e. An elected member shall be eligible for no more than two (2) consecutive terms on the same committee. An appointment to fill a vacancy on a committee does not constitute a term.

f. An administrative person serving as an ex-officio member of a standing committee shall convene the first meeting of the year, assist with administrative functions of the committee and provide continuity in the committee activities.

g. A quorum of any standing committee shall be one half the voting members unless specifically stated in the by-laws.

Section 2. Election and Appointment – The members of all standing committees shall be elected by the voting faculty or appointed as specifically stated. Faculty nominate themselves for positions on the ballot prepared by the Executive Committee. Committee vacancies will be filled by Executive Committee appointment. Elections will be held spring semester with newly elected and appointed members assuming duties beginning fall semester.

Section 3. Term of Office – The members shall serve for a specified term on each appointed or elected committee as designated in Article VII, Sections 6-15 of these bylaws.

Section 4. Chairperson – When the chairperson of a standing committee is not designated, and an ex-officio member is not regularly a member of the committee, a faculty member selected by the Executive Committee shall convene the first meeting of the academic year. The chairperson of each standing committee shall be elected annually in the fall by committee members, unless otherwise specified.

Section 5. Reporting – Each standing committee shall submit a written report at least one time per semester and following each regularly scheduled meeting if they occur more often.

Section 6. Executive Committee of the Faculty

a. Membership – The committee shall be composed of:

1. Seven (7) faculty members: six (6) members shall be voting faculty; one (1) shall be special faculty.

2. The dean of the School of Nursing – ex-officio.

3. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or an administrative officer who has academic status, appointed by the dean – ex-officio.
4. The associate dean for research – ex-officio.

5. The secretary of the faculty – ex-officio.

6. School representative to Faculty Senate Executive Committee – ex-officio

b. Term - Faculty shall be elected for a term of two (2) years. Four (4) faculty members shall be elected in even years and four (4) faculty members elected in odd years.

c. Functions
1. Identify immediate and long-range issues needing faculty study and action.
2. Provide all faculty the opportunity for discussion of proposals for faculty action.
3. Prepare the agenda for each faculty meeting.
4. Prepare and submit proposed changes in the bylaws to all faculty.
5. Prepare a ballot and conduct an election for all elected positions within the school and university. Electronic ballots are permissible.
6. Appoint ad hoc committees of the faculty. The Executive Committee shall provide each such ad hoc committee with a specific charge stated in writing and the ad hoc committee shall confine itself to the fulfillment of this charge unless otherwise authorized in writing by the Executive Committee. The maximum term of any such ad hoc committee shall be twelve months, subject to extension at the discretion of the Executive Committee.
7. Act on behalf of the faculty between regular meetings of the faculty. Such action shall be reported by the chairperson of the Executive Committee at the next regular meeting of the faculty.
8. Make appointments to fill vacancies on standing and ad hoc committees unless otherwise stated in these bylaws.
9. Make recommendations to the dean on faculty-requested academic leaves of absence.
10. Evaluate specific cases of student progression/retention as requested by program directors, students, or academic integrity board.

Section 7 Budget Committee

a. Membership – The committee shall be composed of:
1. Six (6) voting faculty members three (3) of whom are elected and three (3) of whom are appointed. Appointments are made by the Executive Committee.
2. The Dean of the School of Nursing – ex-officio

b. Term – Voting faculty are elected or appointed for a three (3) year term with one (1) faculty elected and one (1) faculty appointed each year.

c. Functions
1. Review proposed budgets for consistency with strategic plan priorities.
2. Review fiscal reports biannually and as needed.
3. Advise the Dean on fiscal matters.
4. Advise the Dean on the number and type of faculty and staff positions.
5. Recommend to the Dean allocation of resources to faculty.
Section 8 Committee on Curricula

a. Membership – The committee shall be composed of:

1. Four (4) voting faculty members and one (1) special faculty member.

2. A minimum of one (1) student and no more than four (4) students from any of the following programs: BSN, MSN, GENP, or DNP.

3. Program directors for the BSN, GENP, MSN and DNP programs – ex-officio.

4. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs – ex-officio.

5. The Registrar for the School of Nursing will serve in an advisory (non-voting) capacity.

b. Term – Voting faculty shall be elected for a term of two (2) years. Two (2) voting faculty members shall be elected in even years and two (2) voting and one (1) special faculty member shall be elected in odd years. Students are selected by the appropriate student association and shall serve for one (1) year.

c. Functions

1. Evaluate the curricula and courses in the BSN, GENP, MSN, and DNP programs, and other approved academic programs.

2. Recommend to faculty changes to existing programs or courses, creation of new programs, specialties, majors or courses, and deletion of current programs, specialties, majors or courses.

3. Recommend policies to the faculty regarding the progression and graduation of students.

Section 9 Committee on Admission to the Graduate Entry Nursing Program (GENP)

a. Membership – The Committee shall be composed of:

1. Five (5) elected and up to three (3) appointed faculty members all of whom must be voting faculty.

2. Director of the GENP Program who shall serve as chair.

b. Term – Faculty shall be elected for a term of two (2) years; three (3) members shall be elected in even years and two (2) members elected in odd years. Up to three (3) faculty shall be appointed annually by the director of the GENP program.

c. Functions

1. Evaluate GENP program admission policies and criteria and recommend changes to the faculty.

2. Interview non-nurse, post-baccalaureate applicants to the GENP program.

3. Admit applicants to the GENP program.

Section 10 Committee on Admission to the Doctor of Nursing Practice Program (DNP)

a. Membership – The committee shall be composed of:

1. Three (3) elected and two (2) appointed faculty members all of whom must be voting faculty.

2. Director of the DNP program who shall serve as chair.

b. Term – Faculty shall be elected for a term of two (2) years; two (2) members shall be elected in even years and one (1) member elected in odd years. Two (2) faculty shall be appointed annually for one (1) year terms by the Director of Post-Master's DNP Program.

c. Functions

1. Evaluate DNP program admission criteria and policies and recommend changes to the faculty.
2. Interview applicants for admission to the DNP program.
3. Admit qualified applicants to the DNP program.

Section 11  
Committee on Admission to the Master of Science in Nursing (MSN) Program

a. Membership – The Committee shall be composed of:
   1. Four (4) members; all must be voting faculty.
   2. Director of the MSN Program, who shall serve as chair.

b. Term – Faculty shall be elected for a term of two (2) years; two (2) members shall be elected in even years and two (2) members elected in odd years.

c. Functions
   1. Evaluate admission policies and criteria, for the MSN Program and recommend changes to the faculty.
   2. Admit qualified applicants for admission to the MSN program.
   3. Interview applicants, if appropriate.

Section 12  
Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) Program Admission and Progression Committee

a. Membership – The committee shall be composed of:
   1. Two (2) elected and two (2) appointed faculty members all of whom must be voting faculty. Faculty shall be appointed by the director of the BSN program.
   2. Director of the BSN Program, who shall serve as chair.

b. Term – One (1) faculty shall be elected and one (1) shall be appointed in even years; one (1) faculty shall be elected and one (1) faculty shall be appointed in odd years; elected and appointed faculty shall serve two (2) year terms. Faculty shall be appointed by the director of the BSN program.

c. Functions
   1. Evaluate Bachelor of Science in Nursing admission policies and criteria and recommend changes to the Office of Undergraduate Admission.
   2. Evaluate applications as requested by the Office of Undergraduate Admission.
   3. Advise the director of the BSN program on issues of admission and progression of individual undergraduate nursing students.

Section 13  
Grievance Board
The Grievance Board will hear matters related to School of Nursing-related grievances which may include, but are not necessarily limited to; (1) All aspects of the educational process, involving student performance, evaluation, grading, status, and/or progression; (2) Data pertaining to student records, grades, etc., which are not covered by the Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act regulations and procedures; (3) Questions of professional conduct by or toward students; and (4) Actions perceived by students as unfair, discriminatory, or intimidating.

a. Membership
   1. Equal number of students and faculty.
   2. Three (3) voting members of the faculty shall be elected. Student representatives shall be appointed as needed from each of the three (3) student groups (Undergraduate Student Nurses Association for BSN, Graduate Student Nurses Association for MSN, MN, DNP, and PhD Student group for PhD). Each student group will appoint at least one student member to serve on the Board.
   3. One (1) of the elected faculty members will be designated as chairperson by the dean.
4. If for any reason there are not at least two (2) faculty and two (2) student members of the Grievance Board available to hear the grievance, the Executive Committee of the faculty shall designate faculty member(s) as replacements and the Executive Committees of the Student Associations designate student member(s) as replacements.

b. **Term** – Faculty shall be elected for a term of two (2) years. Two (2) shall be elected in odd-numbered years and one (1) in even-numbered years.

c. **Functions**

1. Schedule and conduct hearings according to policy and procedure after notification of an official notice of a grievance.

2. Submit recommendations to the dean upon adequate deliberations following the hearing.

Section 14 **Academic Integrity Board**

The Academic Integrity Board will hear matters related to any activity that compromises the academic integrity of the University, or subverts the educational process; as described in the student handbook. To the extent that the matter relates to student standing or promotion, it shall be considered by the Executive Committee instead.

a. **Membership**

1. Three (3) voting members of the faculty shall be elected. Three (3) student representatives (one each from the MN, MSN, and DNP programs) shall be appointed as needed by the Graduate Student Nurses Association. All will serve as voting members.

2. One (1) of the elected faculty members will be designated as Chairperson by the Dean or designee.

3. A quorum is defined as four (4) voting members.

4. If for any reason there are not at least two (2) faculty and two (2) student members of the Academic Integrity Board available to serve, the Executive Committee of the faculty shall designate faculty member(s) as replacements and the Executive Committee of the Graduate Student Nurses Association designate student member(s) as replacements.

5. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs – *ex officio* (non-voting).

6. Administrator from Student Services – *ex officio* (non-voting).

b. **Term**

Faculty shall be elected for a term of two (2) years. Two (2) faculty shall be elected in odd numbered years and one (1) in even numbered years.

c. **Functions**

1. Undergo training regarding Academic Integrity policies and processes.

2. Schedule and conduct hearing according to policy and procedure after official notification of a potential violation of academic integrity for which the School of Nursing has jurisdiction.

3. Submit recommendations to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs upon adequate deliberations following the hearing.

Section 15 **Committee on Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure**

a. **Membership**

1. The Dean of the school who serves as chairperson.

2. All voting members of the faculty holding rank of professor with tenure.

3. Additional members may be appointed from among the tenured faculty at the discretion of the Dean so long as the number does not exceed the number of professors with tenure.
b. **Functions**

1. Recommend to the faculty revisions or changes in the definitions of faculty appointments to the School of Nursing. (see attachment A)

2. Make recommendations for emeritus status.

3. Review university and school policies relevant to faculty appointments, reappointments, promotion and tenure and to make recommendations for needed change through appropriate channels to the faculty of nursing and to the Faculty Senate.

4. Review procedures relevant to faculty appointments, reappointments, promotion and tenure and make recommendations for needed change through appropriate channels to the faculty of nursing and to the Faculty Senate.

5. Recommend appointments, reappointments, promotions and tenure for the voting faculty.

6. Review the resources and time (taking into account rank and type of faculty appointment) needed for scholarly growth, academic achievement and professional development including the commitment of resources that accompanies an award of tenure, and recommend changes to the faculty of nursing and administration.

**Section 16 Committee for Evaluation of Programs**

a. **Membership**

The committee shall be composed of:

1. Four (4) voting faculty members and one (1) special faculty member.

2. A minimum of one (1) student and no more than four (4) students from any of the following programs: BSN, MSN, GENP, DNP or PhD. The student(s) will be selected by the appropriate student association.

3. The program directors for the BSN, MSN, GENP, DNP and PhD Programs – *ex officio*.

4. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs – *ex officio*.

5. The Director of Institutional Research for the School of Nursing – *ex officio*.

b. **Term**

Faculty shall be elected for a term of two (2) years; two (2) members to be elected in even years, and two (2) members elected in odd years. Student members shall be selected by the respective student associations annually.

c. **Functions**

1. Develop forms and procedures to evaluate educational process, course and program outcome criteria. Individual faculty members and program directors will be responsible for evaluating courses and teaching effectiveness.

2. Implement, monitor and revise an ongoing system for evaluation.

3. Report its findings and recommendations to the faculty for action.

**Section 17 PhD Council of the School of Nursing**

a. **Membership**

1. Nine Eleven (11) elected members with voting privileges; all voting faculty members with research committee; the composition of membership will include:

   a. Two (2) from each rank: Assistant Professor, Research doctorate (e.g., PhD, DNSc, EdD).

   b. And
ii. Eligible to chair PhD dissertations as defined by the School of Graduate Studies (SGS)
   (i.e. tenured, tenure-track, or special approval from the SGS)
   Or
   ii. Currently teaching a course in the PhD nursing program

b. Composition:
   i. Full professors = 3
   ii. Associate professors = 4
   iii. Assistant professors = 4

2. Four (4) ex officio members (Dean, Director of PhD program, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and Associate Dean for Research; these members will have voting privileges.

3. The Director of Institutional Research in the School of Nursing (non-voting).

b. Elections

1. Faculty members will nominate themselves or be nominated by colleagues. Members will be elected from the pool of nursing faculty members who meet the eligibility criteria defined above.

2. Eligibility for placement on the ballot and the determination of the composition of the Council.

c. Terms of office

1. Terms of office will be staggered with elections held in the Spring semester each year with the following rotating schedule: to serve a
   a. Year A: election of 1 full professor, 1 associate professor, and 2 assistant professors
   b. Year B: election of 1 full professor, 2 associate professors, and 1 assistant professor
   c. Year C: election of 1 full professor, 1 associate professor, and 1 assistant professor

2. Members may serve for not more than two (2) consecutive terms (unless otherwise deemed necessary by the PhD council).

3. If a Council member is unable to fulfill his or her term for any reason, the remaining members of the PhD Council will appoint another eligible faculty member to fulfill the term.

d. Functions

1. Establish and maintain criteria for appointment of PhD Council.

2. Establish and maintain all policies for admission, progression, candidacy, and graduation of students in accordance with the policies governing requirements for the PhD in Nursing and the School of Graduate Studies.

3. Develop, evaluate, and change the curricular requirements of the PhD in Nursing program.

4. Recommend to the School of Graduate Studies and evaluation of courses and PhD program.

5. Collaborate with the Office of Student Services at the School of Nursing in PhD student recruitment.

6. Communicate with and obtain feedback from the pool of nursing faculty members who hold research doctorates (e.g., PhD, DNSc, EdD).

7. Monitor the progress of the PhD program in meeting quality indicators.

e. Meetings

1. Monthly meetings will be held during the academic year and as needed during the summer months.

2. Meetings will be open to all nursing faculty members with research doctorates (e.g.,
Section 18 Committee on Admission to the PhD Program

a. Membership

1. Six (6) members; all voting faculty members with research doctorates (e.g., PhD, DNSc, EdD).

   a. Eligibility for election:
      i. Research doctorate (e.g., PhD, DNSc, EdD).
      ii. Eligible to chair PhD dissertations as defined by the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) (i.e., tenured, tenure-track, or special approval from the SGS)
      Or
      iii. Currently teaching a course in the PhD nursing program

2. Chairperson elected from PhD Council.

3. Director of the PhD program is a member Ex-officio.

b. Election

Faculty members will nominate themselves or be nominated by colleagues; members will be elected from the pool of nursing faculty members who meet the eligibility criteria to serve on the PhD Council as defined above.


c. Terms of office

1. Faculty shall be elected in the Spring semester of each academic year for a term of two (2) years; three (3) members shall be elected in even years and three (3) members elected in odd years.

2. If a committee member is unable to fulfill his or her term for any reason, the remaining members of the PhD Council will appoint another eligible faculty member to fulfill the term.

d. Function

Recommend to the Director of PhD Program and School of Graduate Studies qualified applicants for admission to the PhD in nursing program and for scholarships or fellowships.

ARTICLE VIII

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Special committees may be designated to carry on faculty business not otherwise specified in these bylaws. Members shall be appointed by the dean. Special committees shall submit regular reports to the faculty.

ARTICLE IX

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Section 1 Representation

a. The faculty of nursing shall elect senators to the Faculty Senate. The number of senators shall be in accordance with the Constitution of the University Faculty.

b. The student body of the School of Nursing may have elected members on the Faculty Senate in accordance with the Constitution of the University Faculty.

Section 2 Election
a. The senatorial elections shall be held in the spring term.

b. Faculty Senators from the School of Nursing shall be voting members of the faculty. These senators shall be elected to serve three (3) year terms; one-third of them shall complete their term of office on commencement day each year. A Senator shall not be seated unless at least 40% of the voting members have returned ballots in the election.

ARTICLE X

REVISION OF BYLAWS

These bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds affirmative vote of the voting members present at any meeting, provided copies of proposed changes have been distributed to all members, both voting and nonvoting, at least two (2) weeks before the meetings at which the vote is taken.

If changes have not been distributed at least two (2) weeks in advance, these bylaws may be amended by a 95% affirmative vote by the voting members of the faculty present at any meeting.

ARTICLE XI

PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised (most recent revision)
Permission of Procedure for electronic e-mail voting for standing committees

Faculty Senate By-Law VII. Committees
Item a. General Provision with Respect to Committees of the Faculty Senate
Proposed Par. 5

In lieu of an in-person meeting—physical assembly, electronic or telephonic—e-mail voting (herein referred to as “e-voting”)—shall be is permitted for standing committees on certain issues. Such issues can include E-mail voting should generally be used for issues those which do not require extensive discussion (i.e., non-substantive matters), or in extraordinary circumstances, those requiring a time-critical vote, on a situation in which timing is a factor, or a vote on an issue previously debated during a meeting that lacked a quorum. Any member of a standing committee may move to submit a matter for e-mail voting. The motion for e-mail voting decision to use an e-vote requires the unanimous consent of may be conducted if and only if all standing committee members. Any member wishing to veto the who objects to an e-mail voting motion must do so must note their objection within seven five business calendar days from the date of the motion, agree that a vote does not require extensive discussion. If the a motion to proceed with to e-mail voting vote is not accepted, rejected, an e-mail vote requires a special quorum. The issue under consideration is approved only passes if a majority of the total members of the standing committee members vote in favor of the issue within fourteen calendar days of the original motion for e-mail voting. If the issue does not receive a majority vote within fourteen days, the motion expires. motion: no motion may remain open more than fourteen days from the original motion.
FSEC discussion:
(1) The erosion of tenure within the university; (2) the distinction between tenure track and non-tenure track positions; and (3) hiring processes of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

Are there other questions that should be included? Are there better ways to ask these questions? What questions are most important to discuss? Should any questions be eliminated?

A draft of preliminary questions for discussion consideration follows. After adding to them and discussion in the executive committee, consider writing charge for personnel committee (and any other relevant committees) for revisions needed to Faculty Handbook.

- What is the purpose of tenure?
- Is it still necessary in academia? What are its benefits to the University and its faculty?
- Does tenure change the culture of the University?
- What are the criteria that distinguish tenure-track and non-tenure-track positions?
- What types of positions "qualify" for non-tenure track rather than tenure-track?
- Is publishing original scholarly research in peer-reviewed journals essential for tenure track appointments?
- What are the prerogatives and protections afforded to each? Do non-tenure track faculty have academic freedom (of speech or research)?
- Do financial considerations justify increasing the non-tenure track at the expense of the tenure track?
- Should the hiring of non-tenure-track faculty be subject to the same faculty search committee process as tenure-track faculty?
- Should mostly non-tenure-track faculty do any particular type of teaching? (E.g., intro courses, courses for non-majors, licensure and credentialing programs, Masters programs, writing instructors?)
- Does the non-tenure-track compete for resources (salaries) with tenure-track?
- Should there be academic units that can hire only non-tenure-track faculty?

For December or future FSEC meeting
(1) Erosion of tenure in the university; (2) the distinction between tenure track and non-tenure track positions; (3) tenure track and non-tenure track faculty hiring processes.

Are there other questions that should be included? Are there better ways to ask these questions? What questions are most important to discuss? Should any questions be eliminated?

A draft of preliminary questions for discussion consideration follows. After adding to them and discussion in the executive committee, consider writing charge for personnel committee (and any other relevant committees) for revisions needed to Faculty Handbook.

- What is the definition of "faculty"? Do all individuals termed "faculty" have the choice to participate in teaching, scholarly activity, and research?
- What is the purpose of tenure?
- Is tenure necessary in academia? What are its benefits to the University and its faculty?
- Does tenure change the culture of the University or the relationship between faculty and administration? Does the lack of tenure change the culture of the University or the relationship between faculty and administration?
- Does the University [faculty] support the concept that a majority of faculty should be tenured or on the tenure-track?
- Does the University [administration] support the concept that a majority of faculty should be tenured or on the tenure-track?
- What are the criteria that distinguish tenure-track and non-tenure-track positions?
- What types of positions "qualify" for non-tenure track or tenure-track?
- What are the differences in benefits, privileges, and status between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty?
- Does a tenure-track appointment assume financial support for scholarly activities?
- Is publishing original scholarly research in peer-reviewed journals essential for tenure track appointments or is scholarly activity alone sufficient?
- What are the prerogatives and protections afforded to each? Do non-tenure track faculty have academic freedom (of speech or research)?
- Do financial considerations (alone) justify increasing the non-tenure track at the expense of the tenure track? What types of financial considerations might be considered?
• Is the hiring of non-tenure-track faculty subject to the same faculty search committee process in each school and department as the hiring of tenure-track faculty?

• Are there particular types of teaching that should be (could be) done by mostly non-tenure-track faculty? (E.g., intro courses, courses for non-majors, licensure and credentialing programs, Masters programs, writing instructors?)

• In what ways does the non-tenure-track compete for resources (salaries) with tenure-track?

• Should there be academic units that hire only non-tenure-track faculty or special faculty (adjunct)? If so do these academic units have the same rights and privileges as traditional academic departments including the appointment of an academic chair with primary allegiance to the faculty in the academic unit?

Additional questions from SOM:
• When the SOM was granted exemption from the FH-required departmental ratios of non-tenure-track to tenure-track faculty, how was monitoring the outcome done?

• When the SOM was granted exemption to disallow tenure for teaching alone (2006), was monitoring the outcome required?

• Why are there time limitations for moving from tenure-track to non-tenure-track?

• Is the expectation of research funding, from federal sources or others that pay equivalent overhead and provide some salary support, essential for tenure track appointments?

• Is it possible for a non-tenure track faculty member to be appointed to a department chair or interim department chair position?