

10/06/2025 (12:40 pm)
Executive Committee Minutes

Present: Amy Brunell, Cynthia Callahan, Delaney Beuchner, Kip Curtis, Joe Fahey, Dawn Kitchen, Michelle Kowalski, Del Lindsey, Phil Mazzocco, Andrew Mueller, Agus Muñoz-Garcia, Jason Opal, Heather Tanner.

1. Approval of the minutes from the last two Executive Committee meetings

A motion to approve the minutes from the 4/1/25 Executive Committee (EC) meeting was made by Andrew Mueller (second by Kip Curtis). The motion carried unanimously with 5 yes votes, 0 no votes, and 0 abstentions.

A motion to approve the minutes from the 9/3/25 Executive Committee (EC) meeting was made by Andrew Mueller (second by Kip Curtis). The motion carried unanimously with 5 yes votes, 0 no votes, and 0 abstentions.

2. Discussion on collaboration among faculty and academic support teams (Advisors, CLC, etc.)

Agus Muñoz-Garcia presented a plan to facilitate collaboration and communication between faculty, Regular and Associated, and academic support teams:

On our campus, we all work very hard to maximize academic performance of our students. We can agree that the Conard Learning Center (CLC), the faculty body, and our academic advisors are all doing a great job in their respective areas. However, the work we do for students can be further improved if we increase the efficiency of the communication channels among the three bodies.

Learning Resources

One thing that can be done easily is that Andrew Mueller, Director of the CLC, or the student tutors, can use five minutes at the beginning of each class during the first week/two weeks of the semester, and give students information about what the CLC does and to make students aware that they can be tutors as well in the future. Right now, when a tutor is hired for a specific course, Andrew sends a message to all the students that are taking that class via OnCourse. But, in addition to that, if we inform students in person about the resources we have, we might see an increase in the use of these resources, and thus, an increase in academic success.

To make this process more efficient, Agus suggested the dissemination of a survey among faculty, with the following questions:

a. Would you need a student tutor for your course next semester? Please consider that the tutors are not teaching assistants, that they will have assigned tutoring hours and that they must do their job in the CLC (except under rare circumstances when Andrew can hire an embedded tutor or a current student from within the class).

b. If you need a tutor, can you please recommend 1-3 students for the job?

c. Are you willing to let Andrew or the tutors visit your class for 5 min the first week of the semester to promote tutoring? Can you consider ways to maximize your students' use of the service?

The survey would be disseminated by early November for the Spring semester, and by early March for the Fall semester. Reminders will be sent in December and late April.

An Executive Committee member suggested that requests for writing tutors and assistance from the Writing Center should be added to the survey as well.

It was suggested that Associate Dean of Student Enrichment, Cynthia Callahan, and Andrew Mueller collaborate on this survey and receive the responses and that moving forward the Associate Dean of Student Enrichment would take ownership of this process.

Advising

There is also room to improve the collaboration between faculty and academic advisors as well. Agus suggested the dissemination of another optional survey among faculty, with the following questions:

a. Could you list a course/courses that you consider that students should have taken to be successful in your class? Please, do not list pre-requisites unless you are willing to waive pre-requisites or allow for co-requisites (advisors need to know this each term as it varies by instructor).

b. Do you have a list of background topics or skills that you consider students in your class should master? We will share this list with academic advisors, so they can communicate this information to those students interested in enrolling in your class.

c. Optional: blurbs about your courses exist in Schedule Planner as well as on this website (for REGD and Theme courses): <https://asccas.osu.edu/general-education-program/gen-race-ethnicity-and-gender-diversity-themes-information/approved-gen>. However, if you have a more compelling write up, please share it here (sometimes students are put off by titles and overly academic descriptions of GE courses outside their field).

d. Optional: if you have a sentence or two about course expectations that might alleviate nerves from non-majors fearing a >3000-level course, please add that here.

This proposal will likely benefit students, who will have more information about the nature of the courses they are enrolling in, and more information to decide if they are ready to take one course or another, and in which semester.

The proposal should also benefit Academic Advisors, who will have more information about courses, and more tools to make recommendations to students.

In addition, Faculty will likely have a lower proportion of unprepared students or students with lack of appropriate background in their courses.

An EC member suggested that Advisors should be advised to frame instructor recommendations as distinct from University pre-req policies.

Another EC member recommended to include in the survey whether the course was appropriate for College Credit Plus students.

3. Discussion on the re-structuring of the committees and service load.

We will be using the current Standing Committee structure for the current Academic Year. But we should continue to discuss a revision of the Committee structure in light of the creation of the administrative Teams and the AD positions for Faculty Enrichment and Student Enrichment forthcoming administrative Teams policy. Agus disseminated a document with the current committee structure, highlighting charges that will be taken over by various teams, as well as charges that may be outdated or redundant.

A committee member suggested we focus on professional development, curriculum and planning and coordination of academic or para-academic activities.

After some discussion on the most efficient method to come to consensus on charges, a motion was made by Kip Curtis to accept the document that Agus prepared (second Phil Mazzocco). The motion was unanimously approved with 8 “yes” votes.

4. Jason Opal, Dean and Director, Report

Dean and Director Opal provided information and updates on the following topics:

- Enrollment is up in general, and especially among the incoming first-years. We are well-placed to be one of the premier on-campus locations in Ohio, especially considering the new tuition policy unveiled by University Administration recently.
- Facilities update: Both the bridge and the field project are awaiting completion. Both should be completed by the end of the semester. There is between 30k-60k to be allotted to further facilities concerns.
- Our bi-annual capital budget has been 1.7 million dollars. Analyses have indicated that it should be set at approximately 2.2 million dollars to fully meet our campus needs. However, we are now allowed to increase it to 2 million dollars, which is a step in the right direction.
- Regarding the new Pattern of Administration, the document is now going through various levels of vetting and will be disseminated to the EC and Faculty Assembly in the near future.

With no further issues to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.

*Minutes taken and prepared by Phil Mazzocco, Faculty Secretary.