

**Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, January 12, 2009
Room 145, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.**

Sergio López-Permouth called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: T. Anderson, D. Bell, K. Brown, G. Buckley, S. Gradin, P. Jung, J. Lein, S. López-Permouth, G. Matlack, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, K. Sullivan for S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, W. Roosenburg, J. Webster

College of Business: L. Hoshower, T. Stock

College of Education: V. Conley, T. Leinbaugh

College of Engineering: C. Bartone, J. Gieseey, H. Pasic

College of Fine Arts: A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, L. Steele, D. Thomas, R. Wetzel

Group II: A. Hall, M. Lucas for C. Naccarato

College of Health and Human Services: S. Marinellie, J. Thomas

College of Osteopathic Medicine: P. Coschigano, T. Heckman

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: S. Brogan, J. McKean

Regional Campus—Eastern: T. Flynn

Regional Campus—Lancaster: P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Southern: M. Crawford for E. McGown

Regional Campus—Zanesville: K. Collins

Scripps College of Communication: J. Bernt, N. Pecora, J. Slade, S. Titsworth

Excused: E. McGown, D. Matolak, C. Naccarato, S. Patterson, A. Smith, D. Torres

Absent: J. Benson, D. Bolon, W. Gist, S. Hatty

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. President Roderick McDavis
 - II. Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl
 - III. Roll Call and Approval of November 10, 2008 Minutes
 - IV. Chair's report—Sergio López-Permouth
 - V. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee Report—Scott Titsworth
 - VI. Finance and Facilities Committee Report—Joe McLaughlin
 - VII. Promotion and Tenure Committee Report—Pete Coschigano
 - VIII. Professional Relations Committee Report—Sherrie Gradin
 - IX. Resolution to Defend the Faculty Handbook—Ken Brown
 - X. New Business
 - XI. Adjournment
-

Minutes of the meeting

I. President Roderick McDavis

- **McDavis** wished senators a happy new year and noted that the winter break seems shorted every year. He acknowledged that the senate had a full agenda and stated that he would therefore try to keep his remarks brief.
- **McDavis** began his report by acknowledging that the Faculty Handbook procedures were not followed when changes were made to health care benefits. He explicitly stated, “I did not follow that procedure.” He acknowledged that, as a new president at the time, he did not know how changes to health care benefits were to be approved. He assured senators that he intends to follow Faculty Handbook procedures and that the failure in this instance to do so does not negate the primacy of the Faculty Handbook. He announced that he is having an on-going conversation with the Executive Committee on how to get from here to where we need to be. He stated that in the future the procedure for making changes to benefits would need to start in the fall, so that changes can go through the Faculty Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees before the beginning of the fiscal year. **McDavis** stated that no one at the table could recollect the exact procedure outlined in the handbook. He noted that it was a healthy conversation that will bring us back to a point to get Faculty Senate approval. He stated that this conversation continues. **McDavis** announced that the conversation with the Executive Committee has led to the creation of a budget summit. What we ought to do in response to health care benefits will be part of that summit, which will take place in early February. He announced that health care benefits will be part of the conversation and that everything will be on the table. He stated that whatever process we have will come back to the Faculty Senate in February. **McDavis** concluded his remarks on health care by acknowledging once again that he accepts full responsibility for the mistake in procedure.
- **McDavis** then moved to a report on the search for a new Executive Vice President and Provost. He acknowledged the “great contributions” of Kathy Krendl over the last four years. He noted that Krendl will be with us until June. He stated that this gives us time to get the search up and going in order to find a replacement to start by July 1st. **McDavis** stated that the search committee will have 23 members, six of whom are faculty. He stated that he had met earlier in the day with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, which expressed concerns about the number of faculty members on the committee. He stated that he is considering appointing alternates so that there would always be six faculty members at every committee meeting. He is also considering additional faculty leadership on the committee but has not yet decided on that issue.
- **McDavis** then provided more details about the proposed budget summit. He stated that he intends to have a full discussion of the budget at this meeting. He stated that Ohio has a governor who has kept his commitment to higher education and that for the most part state subsidy has remained in tact. He reminded senators that universities across the state agreed to not raise tuition in exchange for additional state resources. **McDavis** stated that the university’s budget is intact

through July 1st. The Budget Planning Council is discussing the future and preparing for any possible cuts in state subsidy. He stated that he will have more details after the governor's state of the state address later in January. He reminded senators that colleges across the country are facing budget cuts; he stated that so far Ohio University is doing better than most.

Questions for President McDavis

- **Joe Slade** asked whether the fact that including only six faculty members on the search committee for an Executive Vice President and Provost is a violation of the Faculty Handbook was due to carelessness. **McDavis** replied that the Executive Vice President portion of this position changes the nature of the search. He stated that this position is primarily an administrative appointment and noted that no other constituency group has more representatives than the faculty and that some have no representative. He stated that this is not a search for a provost but for an executive vice president and provost.
- **Beth Quitslund** stated that, while she understands that this position comes with administrative duties, the Executive Vice President and Provost is still the chief academic officer of the institution. She noted that this sounds like an academic appointment. **McDavis** replied that Human Resources considers this an administrative appointment. He stated that this is not an academic appointment even though this person will still be the chief academic officer. He stated that there are now added responsibilities that lie outside the academic arena. He stated that this led him to appoint a university-wide committee that reflects the larger community. **Quitslund** stated that the idea of appointing alternates makes it sound like the individual members appointed to the committee matter solely as part of their faculty status. She asked whether the faculty members' schedules shouldn't determine when the committee meets. **McDavis** replied that it is very difficult to get everyone together for committee meetings. He stated that no less than six faculty members will be present when any meeting is held.
- **Ken Brown** asked whether the person hired under this process will have an academic appointment. He noted that the Faculty Handbook speaks to such appointments in Section VII.E.!

All sections of the following Board of Trustees policy that deal with the appointment, evaluation, and reappointment/termination of deans are a matter of Faculty Handbook policy.

This policy provides for the appointment and evaluation of the major administrative officers of the University, including the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education, Deans, and the Director of the Center for International Studies. It outlines regularized procedures for the search, appointment, evaluation, reappointment, and termination of these officers.

1. *A search committee will be established by the person responsible for making the appointment to assist in the identification, evaluation, and recommendation of highly qualified candidates.*
 - a. *The committee should be small enough to work effectively but large enough to accomplish its task. (A reasonable range is six to fourteen.)*
 - b. *In case of an academic appointment, the chairperson of the committee will be a faculty member.*
- **Brown** continued by pointing out that if this person has a faculty appointment then the search committee should be chaired by a faculty member. **McDavis** replied that it is an administrative appointment with faculty status. He repeated that this position is classified as an administrative one by Human Resources. **Brown** reiterated that if the person hired for this position has an academic appointment, then the search committee must be chaired by a faculty member. **McDavis** stated that this position is an administrative appointment with faculty rank. He maintained that this person's duties are primarily administrative and that this is not a faculty appointment. **Brown** asked whether this holds for deans as well. **McDavis** stated this appointment is different from that of deans.
 - **Joe McLaughlin** pointed out that 12 other recent provost searches were chaired by a faculty member and had a majority of faculty members on the search committee. He noted that we would be an outlier in every category. He also stated that the current search committee had three trustees on it; of the other 12 recent provost searches, only 1 had a trustee on the search committee. He stated that he did not understand why this committee had three trustees. **McDavis** stated that he had looked at the other committees. He noted that some did not have representation from various areas. He stated that he wanted to have representation from as many constituent groups as possible. He noted that different institutions have different configurations. **McLaughlin** replied that no one has less than 51% faculty on the search committee. He reiterated that we are a complete outlier. **McDavis** replied that there are five deans on the committee, four of which have academic appointments. He stated that the chair of the committee has three academic appointments. He stated that this adds five additional faculty to the six listed as faculty appointments.
 - **Pete Coschigano** asked on what basis Human Resources classifies someone as an academic or administrative appointment. **McDavis** stated that he did not know. He stated that the argument is going both ways, that deans are academic appointments versus the fact that their day-to-day work is what matters. **Coschigano** stated that the consistency the president is trying to achieve is based on Human Resources classification, but then deans can't count as faculty members. **McDavis** replied that if we agree that the provost is an administrative appointment then we have no debate.
 - **Brown** noted that the Faculty Handbook doesn't say this. He pointed out that it talks about "academic appointment." If someone has an academic appointment, then the search must be chaired by a faculty member.

- **Tracy Leinbaugh** asked how Human Resources determines if a person is administrative or faculty? She asked, “Who tells them how to classify someone?” **Quitslund** noted that such definitions are based on 51% of workload being administrative. She stated that being executive vice president seemed at least 51%.
- **Allyn Reilly** stated that the faculty have the most at stake in hiring a provost and that it’s very difficult to justify minimizing faculty contributions to this search. **McDavis** replied that the largest single group on the committee is the faculty.
- **Joe Slade** asked whether the president really thought that argument was going to fly. He stated that the faculty should have more say, regardless of whether this position is classified as administrative or not. He stated that faculty have enormous stakes in this hire. **McDavis** replied that he’s paying a lot of attention to senators’ concerns. **Slade** stated that the rest of the faculty is really “pissed.” **McDavis** stated that there will be plenty of opportunity for faculty input through open forums. He stated that opportunities for feedback will be “ample.”
- **Quitslund** stated that there is currently a lot of tension on campus. She stated that this is an opportunity to mend fences and to heal the breach between faculty and administration. She stated that she would hate for this opportunity to get messed up.
- **Joe Bernt** asked the president why Human Resources no longer provides the library with salary data in a timely fashion. He noted that this information used to be placed in the library by November and that Mike Williford always got it there by then. He stated that keeping this information in the library makes sense. **McDavis** stated that this is the first he’s heard of this issue. He assured senators that his office would facilitate getting this information to the library as quickly as possible.

II. Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl

- **Krendl** thanked senators who joined her and her staff for pizza and conversation before the meeting. She stated that it was a good opportunity to catch up on some issues and that she will continue with these informal meetings if it seemed helpful.
- **Krendl** introduced the new Vice Provost for Diversity, Access, and Equity, Dr. Brian Bridges. Krendl summarized his qualifications for this position: A Ph.D. from Indiana University-Bloomington, Bridges has been an adjunct faculty member at George Washington University and has taught graduate and undergraduate courses at Indiana and GWU. She noted that before joining Ohio University, Bridges was an associate director at the Center for the Advancement of Racial and Ethnic Equity at the American Council on Education. **Bridges** briefly stated his interest in working with faculty and invited senators to contact him with questions and suggestions. **Krendl** stated that Bridges will make the rounds to deans, etc.
- **Krendl** stated that her report can be found on her website. She announced that, due to sensitive information about enrollment figures, she had decided to make

the document password protected. She stated that she would like to keep this information within the institution. She reminded senators that this coming year is the first year to see the state's population decline, which will increase competition for students. She noted that recruitment strategies across the state are going to be more aggressive. She stated that this necessitates care about what information we share.

- **Krendl** stated that recruitment will be more challenging this year. She noted that last year OU had a record year in applications. She stated that, since next year the population will begin declining, yield activities will be the university's focus. She stated that compared to the year before last this year's application numbers are good. She stated that the campus is always an easy sell; the real key to yield is connection with faculty and meeting one on one. She stated that this is what makes OU a special place. She asked for faculty to respond positively to deans' calls for help in this year's recruitment and yield activities. [See the Provost's report for specific application numbers and for information on the academic profile of the incoming class.]
- **Krendl** stated that this year's application numbers are a little behind those for last year, but that the admissions office's move to a document imaging system may be creating a small lag in reporting the actual numbers. She indicated that these numbers should be caught up by the end of January. Currently, the College of Health and Human Services, the Russ College of Engineering, and the Honors Tutorial College are up in applications.

Questions for Krendl

- **Willem Roosenburg** asked about the new nursing program on the Athens campus. He stated that departments were told that they would get additional faculty to support the increase in students due to the creation of this program. He stated that this doesn't seem to be happening. **Krendl** responded that she has met with Ben Ogles, Dean of Arts and Sciences, and they are looking at the numbers. She stated that she should be able to find these positions. Another senator asked how this program will affect the regional campuses. **Krendl** responded that it will not affect the regional campuses, since the full curriculum will be offered on the Athens campus and the existing programs will be retained on the regional campuses.
- **Rudy Pasic** asked whether the provost preferred this room or the previous one for senate meetings. **Krendl** stated that this room seems more comfortable.
- **Beth Quitslund** congratulated the provost on her appointment as President of Otterbein.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the November 10, 2008 Minutes

- **Beth Quitslund** moved for the approval of the minutes, which was seconded by **Joe Slade**. The minutes were approved by a unanimous voice vote.

IV. Chair's Report – Sergio López-Permouth

- **López** announced that David Ingram is our new representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. He asked Ingram to report on the OFC's activities since the last Faculty Senate meeting. **Ingram** stated that the first meeting of the OFC was on December 12, 2008. He stated that in this meeting Dr. Barbara Gellman-Danley, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, outlined her priorities in her philosophy of education, of which her top two were making sure that: every student takes a course in public speaking which is taught by public speaking professionals; and to improve the writing skills of students. **Ingram** noted that other important tasks for Gellman-Danley this year are: maintaining high standards in transfer and articulation programs; getting data on transfer students, and accessing the strategic plans of all institutions. **Ingram** further reported that a website is being set up for OFC that is supported by the Board of Regents. He stated that a funding formula document entitled "A Funding Formula for Ohio Universities is circulating but is not yet public. He stated that Wright State University reported progress in developing a plan to change to semesters; Kent State University reported that problems have surfaced in trying to implement Responsibility Based Budgeting; Bowling Green reported that their search for a president continues, that an "excused" football coach received a \$250k "parachute," that the Faculty Senate is working on representation for non-tenure track faculty, and that a fledgling AAUP chapter has been established with the plan for a card campaign in the Spring; Youngstown State reported that their president has survived evaluation by their trustees; and that the University of Cincinnati reported that a proposal to combine their colleges of engineering and applied sciences had raises issues of governance in all colleges. **Ingram** then summarized the January 9th meeting of the OFC. He stated that the OFC website should be running in 3 to 4 weeks. He summarized a discussion on governance models for the University System of Ohio. He drew attention to Lindley J. Stiles's "[Can Faculty Governance Survive](#)." Ingram stated that there was a general discussion of models of governance in other state-wide systems. He explained that the following issues are of concern in Ohio:
 - What is the current decision making process in Ohio?
 - What do the Ohio Revised Code (ORC) and the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) say about universities, colleges and the Board of Regents?
 - What are the decision making processes and councils/committees of the Board of Regents?
 - Where are the IUC and the OFC in the decision process?
 - The USO is made up of 13 four year institutions and 24 two year institutions. If there are common councils and committees how will the universities fare in the decisions?

Ingram stated that the OFC will set up a subcommittee to examine the current processes, in particular the role for faculty seen by the ORC, the OAC, and the Board of Regents in making decisions. He stated that a resolution by the OFC in support of Senate Bill 305 and House Bill 502, “The Employment Nondiscrimination Act,” was made. He explained that OFC representatives are being asked to vote on a motion to support these bills at a subsequent meeting. [A copy of the resolution is contained in the appendix below.] **Ingram** reported that this raised an immediate question about whether we could vote on a motion without the explicit support of our sponsoring faculty senates or councils. He stated that no one objected to the motion; rather, it was just the principles regarding OFC representatives voting on anything that were questioned. He stated that the resolution will be formally presented at a later meeting. **Ingram** then summarized the individual institution reports: Wright State reported on their budget cuts, that a formal vote of their Board of Trustees on moving to semesters is expected at their March meeting, and that their union will negotiate workload during the change and after; Central State reported on their budget cuts and that their faculty is working without a contract and are in a fact finding process; Ohio State reported that there is great consternation at OSU regarding the decision by the USO to accept AP credit 3 for TAGs courses across the system, which helped drive the earlier discussion on the role of faculty in the governance structure of the USO, that OSU is planning to strengthen their government affairs office, that their trustees are considering a proposal to add faculty representatives as non-voting trustees, which may be voted on in their April meeting (Cleveland State reported that they have two faculty observers as part of their board), that there are moves to combine colleges at OSU, in particular to create an Arts and Sciences College from five smaller colleges, and that they are planning to set up a Faculty Ombudsman as they consider their grievance procedure too complex; Akron reported that they have just split a college of Fine Arts and Applied Arts into two, which the applied arts being moved to their Health College and that their dean of Arts and Sciences has just stepped down; Youngstown State reported that they have a new building for their business college and that their head of Human Resources has stepped down following problems with implementing a state standard for classifying administrative workers; Cleveland State reported on their budget cuts, which include a hiring freeze, and that there will be an internal hire for a dean of Engineering; Toledo reported on their budget cuts and that faculty searches are going back to the provost for reapproval; Bowling Green reported that they have a “new” president, the interim president, that their provost has stepped down, but the two events are not connected, that there is new interest in a union card campaign, and that there have been 43 administrative staff laid off.

- **Ken Brown** noted that the USO’s decision regarding AP credit violates policies in some departments. He stated that this violates local control over curriculum. **David Descutner** stated that he and Sherrie Gradin, along with colleagues at other institutions, argued against the change, but were outvoted by the state’s two-year schools. **Ingram** stated that the Board promises assessment of the change in the next four years.

- **David Thomas** stated that it seems like the Chancellor and Board of regents is making decisions and consulting with institutions later. **Ingram** agreed that that is the perception. **Thomas** if there were ways that faculty could get involved earlier in the decision making process. **Ingram** replied that there were not, because it's not clear what the Board of Regents' goals for these committees are.
- **Brown** suggested that the senate pass a "Sense of the Senate" resolution concerning the AP issue. He stated that the change promotes the lowest common denominator in students' education. **Sherrie Gradin** stated that university writing directors wrote a letter pointing out how wrong and stupid this change was when it was proposed. **López** suggested that maybe the OFC could funnel resolutions through individual senates. He recommended that we communicate with other OFC members about this.
- **López** announced that he would be making the chair's annual presentation to the Board of Trustees meeting on January 23rd. He stated that he has already submitted an abstract of his report to the Board, as requested by Tom Davis, the Board's secretary, but that he could still add elements to his talk if senators had additional recommendations. He noted that his presentation will occur at the same meeting in which the initiative for faculty representation to the Board will be made. He reminded senators that he, David Thomas, Becky Watts, and Kathy Krendl have worked together on this project. He explained that they had created comparison with other institutions and that at the previous meeting the Board had asked for more information.
- **López** announced that progress has been made on the instrument for a faculty evaluation of the president. He stated that he hopes to have the instrument ready for discussion at next month's senate meeting.
- **López** then moved to a discussion of the search committee for a new Executive Vice President and Provost. **López** stated that he had contacted the president several times about the composition of the committee. He stated that, as many senators had already pointed out, this is an opportunity to put this back on track. He noted that, according to Outlook, there will be 23 members of the search committee, 6 of which are faculty. He informed senators that the Executive Committee met with the President to express its concerns about the current composition. He stated that, after electronic discussions over the weekend, the Executive Committee decided to present a resolution for discussion tonight. He noted that this resolution is informational for now, not an official resolution. He stated that he wanted to have a conversation about this issue and see where it leads. **López** then read the resolution, the final version of which is attached in the appendix of these minutes.
 - **Ken Brown** stated that there must be a resolution from the Faculty Senate on this issue. He stated that, if we didn't speak up now, we might as well disband.
 - **Joe Slade** agreed and suggested that faculty should decline to give faculty status to anyone hired by this committee.

- **Joe McLaughlin** offered a friendly amendment to clarify “faculty status” in the resolution. **Brown** stated that the Faculty Handbook is clear on faculty status.
- **McLaughlin** pointed out that in a list of other searches currently or recently conducted there are no deans, associate deans, etc. listed as members of the search committee. He concluded that there is a template for these kinds of searches and that we are “out of whack” with other institutions.
- **Rudy Pasic** asked about the addition of “Executive Vice President” to the position. **McLaughlin** responded that some of the positions on the list also have that title. He stated that his concern is about the executive vice president is that we have been told by Provost Krendl that there are things she doesn’t have jurisdiction over. He therefore wondered what that “executive vice president” title really means in practice. **Pasic** clarified that it is McLaughlin’s opinion that the position is primarily as provost.
- **Tom Flynn** stated that he had googled the Case Western search and found that it was for an Executive Vice President and Provost. He stated that the search committee at that institution has 12 members, 8 of which are faculty.
- **Joe Bernt** pointed out that there was a time when search committees for even the president were chaired by faculty members. He suggested that this has to do with the shift in who controls the university. He stated that our president thinks it’s the administration.
- **Chris Bartone** stated that the Handbook is very clear and that the resolution is clear, but he questioned whether the call for faculty not to serve on the committee could really be implemented. He suggested that language recommending the Board of Trustees address this issue be added to the resolution.
- **Bernt** offered suggestions for changing the resolution to call for departments and schools not to consider granting an academic appointment to anyone hire by this committee.
- **Norma Pecora** stated that she did not want to involve the Board of Trustees in this resolution.
- **Beth Quitslund** stated that, as a practical matter, Chris Bartone is right: we don’t have a lot of options to get what we want. She stated that the trustees are the only ones who can force the issue.
- **Bernt** replied that the only thing we can do is discredit this illicit process.
- **James Lein** stated that he agreed. He indicated that the resolution needs language stating that the senate supports hiring a provost but objects to the way this search is being handled. He suggested that the resolution needs language explaining why this is a stupid thing to do.
- **Bernt** concurred and stated that we need a process that will be respected by the faculty.
- **McLaughlin** made three comments: 1) this president is someone who wants to marginalize faculty, 2) the Faculty Senate has no confidence in the current search process, and 3) we’re being stonewalled on

representatives to the Board of Trustees and the evaluation of the president, which suggests that going to the trustees with this would be fruitless.

- **Bartone** stated that we cannot just say nothing. He stated that we have to say that we disagree. **McLaughlin** noted that the trustees will get the resolution whether we explicitly give it to them or not. **Bartone** responded that we have to put them notice.
- **McLaughlin** stated that, if this is a rushed process, as the president claims, it is not our fault.
- **Geoff Buckley** stated that 2/3rds of the 12 schools on the list are Executive Vice President and Provost positions.
- **Willem Roosenburg** suggested that we consider suspending the rules and vote on the resolution tonight.
- **Bartone** stated that we are naïve to think that faculty will not serve on this committee. **Bernt** responded that these 6 people will know that they will not have the approval of this body.
- **Flynn** provided further amendments adding to the resolution's language. **Quitslund** asked whether the changes were all based on the Faculty Handbook. **Flynn** replied that they are also based on common practices for university searches.
- **Ken Brown** asked how many of the faculty appointees were recommended by the senate. **López** replied that 5 were recommended by the Executive Committee. He explained that the president asked him for a list of names.
- **Pecora** suggested that we send the resolution to the Board of Trustees with a cover letter explaining that these are common practices.
- **Bartone** stated that he still believes language asking the Board of Trustees to address this issue at their January meeting should be added.
- **McLaughlin** stated that he's not opposed to adding such language but suggested that, if it is added, it not come last, which would sound like an afterthought.
- **López** stated that the biggest divide we have with the trustees is that, when we talk about shared governance, they see faculty as merely protecting their own interests. He stated that the goal of his report to the trustees this month will be to try to get them to see that for us the educational mission is the reason we're in this business. **López** stated that he believed this resolution should not go to the Board of Trustees but to the president. He stated that it is important for the president to see that this really matters. He stated that the board should not be meddling in this kind of affair. He indicated that this is our problem with our president and that the president needs to hear the voice of the senate.
- **Pecora** stated that this is similar to her point and that we should notify the board but leave them out of the resolution.
- **Bartone** stated that the president is pretty firm and isn't going to change his mind. He stated that this is an uphill battle.

- **Sherrie Gradin** stated that we may have colleagues who participate in the search who are not seeing “boycott” but “sanction.”
- **López** stated that he’s worried about the coercive spirit of such a line. He thought that it might rub people the wrong way.
- **Pete Coschigano** noted that the resolution also calls on *departments* not to give the provost an academic appointment.
- **Valerie Conley** proposed that the last sentence of the resolution be stricken and suggested that the point be rearranged so that they parallel the language in the handbook. **Brown** stated that such a change should be voted on as an amendment.
- **McLaughlin** stated that he understands what Gradin is saying but thinks that if we take this language out we have a resolution saying we don’t like what the president is doing. He stated that this then has no consequences attached.
- **Conley** suggested that we are saying is that we can’t control the appointments so let’s control each other.
- **Toby Stock** asked what happens if find 6 faculty members to serve on the committee. He stated that he’s worried the senate will then look weak.
- **Brown** stated that they might be able to find 6 faculty but they probably won’t find a department to give this person an academic appointment.
- **Joe Slade** stated that he thought the resolution must be strong. He stated that, as Quitslund has stated to the president, this is an opportunity to start mending fences.
- **McLaughlin** stated that this is not about locking horns with the president. He stated that this is about following the Faculty Handbook and following other similar searches.
- **Roosenburg** reminded senators that publications will get a hold of this.
- **Conley** asked power we have to call on colleagues not to participate. **Bernt** replied that we are also asking departments not to give such a provost an academic appointment or a tenured professorship.
- **Stock** suggested making the phrase “have no confidence” stronger by explicitly condemning the process. **Flynn**, however, stated that has reservations about that, since it doesn’t give the president any way out of this. He indicated that he thought it was strong as it is.
- **Brown** moved that the senate suspend its rules to vote on the resolution. **Roosenburg** seconded the motion. The motion to suspend the rules passed in a unanimous voice vote.
- **Roosenburg** moved that the senate vote on the resolution. **Slade** seconded the motion. The resolution passed in a unanimous voice vote.
- **David Thomas** asked that senators thank Quitslund for her words to the president, which he believes summed up what we all want, an opportunity to heal the divide between faculty and administration.

V. Educational Policy and Student Affairs (EPSA)—Scott Titsworth

- **Titsworth** presented three resolutions to the senate. The first resolution was on syllabus statements about academic integrity. **Titsworth** stated that the handbook says that syllabi should have language about academic integrity but does not specify levels of penalty for violations. EPSA therefore proposed changes to the handbook specifying what should be included on a syllabus. He stated that the syllabus is the first place for students to find information on academic integrity. He indicated that this change just asks teachers to state that there is a range of penalties for academic misconduct. **Titsworth** also summarized one of his colleagues' concerns about this change, stating that additional jargon is unnecessary and that adding this language to syllabi potentially diminishes the moral responsibility of the student.
 - **Joe Bernt** asked about whether the added language for syllabi is a suggestion or a requirement. **Titsworth** replied that it would be required. He explained that any ambiguity in the resolution is meant to allow instructors to refer to college policies rather than individual ones.
 - **Bernt** stated that the colleague from the Scripps College of Communication noted that there is less latitude for instructors when everything is listed on the syllabus. **Beth Quitslund** stated that this is one of the most important aspects of the syllabus. She pointed out that this language also protects instructors when they have students who violate the policy.
 - **Bernt** stated that he has a paragraph on his syllabus that meets the current requirements. **Rudy Pasic** asked whether he could put all four things listed on the resolution under what's already on his syllabus.
 - **Titsworth** stated that this resolution says to add what may occur if a teacher finds that a student has committed academic misconduct. He indicated that it's good to have this range on the syllabus.
- **Titsworth** called for a vote. The resolution passed in a voice vote. There were two no votes and one abstention.
- **Titsworth** then presented a resolution on grade appeals involving academic misconduct. He read aloud the proposed language for section IV.C.3.d and stated that this language explains what happens when grade appeals involve academic misconduct. Since there were no questions, he called for a vote. The resolution passed in a voice vote with one negative vote.
- **Titsworth** presented the third resolution, one on academic dishonesty. He indicated that there had been substantial changes since the previous reading. He stated that the resolution was simplified to avoid discontent with consulting anyone else.
 - **Chris Bartone** asked whether an instructor could report academic misconduct to a graduate chair, for example. **Titsworth** responded that one could, since the graduate chair would have an academic interest in the issue.
 - **David Thomas** read the additional language beginning in line 29 of the resolution and asked whether this places the burden of proof on the instructor. **Titsworth** acknowledged that it does. He stated that the

student being accused of academic dishonesty deserves to know in writing. He stated that the instructor should have a reason why s/he thinks the student has cheated and should be able to demonstrate this with evidence.

- **Bartone** asked what happens if a student agrees that s/he cheated and does not appeal it. **Titsworth** replied that any agreement should be put in writing and should be signed by the student. He stated that students currently have the right to appeal grades in a certain time and that a teacher has to be able to prove it.
- **Bernt** stated that the burden is being placed on the faculty member. He stated that the more we provide the students with a pseudo-legal process the more we have to do to cover ourselves.
- **Quitslund** asked whether this was really anything different than what we do now. Other senators stated that it is different. **Quitslund** expressed surprise at this.
- **Jeff Giese** stated that when EPSA hopes these changes will express that faculty really care about academic dishonesty.
- **Titsworth** called for a vote. The resolution passed in a voice vote. There were 3 no votes and 1 abstention.

VI. Finance and Facilities (F&F)—Joe McLaughlin

- **McLaughlin** stated that he needs committee members' teaching schedules so he can schedule a F&F meeting.
- **McLaughlin** indicated that he had two items to present for senators' feedback. He asked, however, the senators not kill the messenger. The first item concerned the possibility of a zero percent raise pool this year. He stated that the Budget Planning Council is looking at scenarios that would include \$40M, \$30M, and \$20M shortfalls. He stated that if we assumed we would normally have a 3% raise pool and \$1.2M faculty compensation pool, a zero raise pool would subtract \$6M from the budget shortfall. He stated that BPC received a motion to consider buffering the zero percent raise for employees making below \$35k to \$40k a year.
 - **Willem Roosenburg** asked whether this would affect raises associated with promotions. **McLaughlin** stated that it would not. **Roosenburg** asked whether the zero percent pay increase would be the same for everyone. **Tracy Leinbaugh** asked whether it would apply to the president, for example. **McLaughlin** replied that it would.
 - **Ken Brown** asked whether this zero raise was accompanied by threats of job losses again. **McLaughlin** that is was presented in that context. He also stated that there was pushback about executive administrators' raises.
 - **Brown** pointed out that all of the unionized campuses are preserving their raises. **McLaughlin** stated that Bill Decatur had indicated that no four-year institutions in Ohio were giving raises this year, except unionized campuses. **Brown** replied that the

faculty should be the first claimant and not the last claimant. He stated that faculty raises come last at OU. **Chris Bartone** stated that when the union contracts are up, those institutions may actually see faculty salaries decline. **McLaughlin** stated that union talk has been negligible in BPC.

- **McLaughlin** then presented information about BPC's efforts to save money centrally. He stated that part of this effort is to look at health care costs. The Health Benefits Advisory Committee is looking at \$1M, \$3M, and \$5M shifts in health care costs and will report back on what this would look like. He stated that any changes would be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval before going back to BPC.
 - **Ken Brown** stated that the senate has no authority on what the benefits are.
- **McLaughlin** stated that Greg Fialco says that we are the only institution without a deductible, which would occur in the \$1M shift.
- **McLaughlin** stated that health care decisions will have to be made by late February, since the final decisions have to be made 120 days before implementation. He stated that the shift from calendar year to fiscal year changed when decisions have to be made. He is currently working with administrators to clarify the process delineated in the Faculty Handbook.

VII. Promotion and Tenure (P&T)—Peter Coschigano

- **Coschigano** reported that P&T has two appeals cases in process. He stated that the committee supported both appeals and the faculty members have requested appeals hearing committees, which are currently being put together.
- **Coschigano** stated that it has come to the committee's attention that the language in the Faculty Handbook on appeals is not clearly spelled out and will need to be clarified.
- **Coschigano** announced that Associate Provost Marty Tuck is organizing promotion and tenure workshops with individual colleges. As the P&T committee works with Tuck to prepare these workshops volunteers may be needed for some college meetings.

VIII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

- **Gradin** announced that the committee will meet on Wednesday for the first time this quarter.
- **Gradin** stated that the committee is examining some issues with policies. She explained that the committee is examining how to handle requests to reexamine policies and procedures. She stated that the committee needs clarification on how to participate in that process.
- **Gradin** stated that the committee is looking at differences between the Faculty Handbook and Policies and Procedures. One example is domestic partner benefits.

She stated that the committee is comparing Policies and Procedures to the handbook, looking for discrepancies. She indicated that the committee is also looking at who initiates policies and changes and how the process should work.

IX. A Resolution to Defend the Faculty Handbook—Ken Brown

- **Brown** presented this resolution for a first reading and stated that he hoped the senate would vote on it next month. He stated that the president had alluded to earlier that the Faculty Handbook was violated when health care costs were increased without the approval of the Faculty Senate. **Brown** stated that the president argued that it was done in error and was not done purposely. He acknowledged that it was also an error of the senate, since no one remembered what senate approval was required. He then read the resolution.
- **Brown** stated that this is an important question because the Faculty Handbook is important. He stated that there is a dispute about the Faculty Handbook is and what it means. He stated that he claimed that it was a gentleman's agreement during the senate's October meeting. He stated that in November we were told that we all have valid contracts and that the Faculty Handbook is legally enforceable,. He stated that the response to this resolution will settle this question.
- **Beth Quitslund** stated that she agreed that we must defend the handbook as much as we can. She questioned, however, whether the benefit contributions can be backed up to the level they were before the change, especially in the current financial climate. **Brown** stated that he doesn't accept that. He stated that we can't say the handbook matters except when mistakes are made.
- **Allyn Reilly** agreed with the resolution and stated that in life there is no free lunch.
- **Chris Bartone** stated that the president apologized and acknowledged the problem and said he's working on fixing it. **López** explained that the Executive Committee met with the president to discuss this issue. He reminded senators that the president said that everything is still on the table but that remedies had to take place within the context of the budget. **López** stated that when the budget summit occurs, health care benefits will be part of the discussion. **Brown** stated that he was glad to hear that.
- **López** stated that he was reluctant to support this resolution. He stated that believes that the president really means what he says when he says he wants to remedy what's already happened.
- **Bartone** suggested that we keep this resolution in our back pocket and see what happens.
- **Brown** stated to Reilly that he would rather get the money back this year and then give it back in the form of deductibles next year than to ignore that the mistake was made. **Reilly** stated that he thinks that will cost us more.
- **Brown** stated that senators should note that the \$1M in faculty salary compensation is the same amount as the health care surplus. **McLaughlin** objected to this, since no one linked these items in the budget. **Brown** insisted that faculty gave up money in the health care cost increase, which was non-taxable,

and then received the salary increase, which was taxable. He indicated that there was no way the senate would ever have approved that.

- **López** stated that in the spirit of trying to work together we should perhaps add a whereas clause stating that President McDavis has acknowledged the mistake.
- **Brown** stated that would like for the senate to wait until next month to consider this resolution further.

There was no new business.

Beth Quitslund moved that the meeting be adjourned. **Sherrie Gradin** seconded the motion, which passed with a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM.

Resolutions:

A Resolution to Change Faculty Handbook Language on Syllabus Statements about Academic Integrity

Initial Draft October 26, 2008

WHEREAS: Academic integrity is a core value of Ohio University; and,

WHEREAS: Current language in the faculty handbook suggests that a statement on academic integrity/academic misconduct be included on the syllabus; and,

WHEREAS: Current handbook language fails to identify potentially important issues related to academic integrity/academic misconduct that should be included on a syllabus; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE OHIO UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE: That the faculty handbook be amended to include the following changes (deletions indicated by ~~strike through~~ and additions in ***bold/italics***).

Section IV/A/3 Information Given Class at First Meeting

At the first meeting of the class, the instructor shall distribute a syllabus which also provides students with the following information:

- a. The instructor's name, the call number, the descriptive title, and the catalog number of the course;
- b. The basis for grading in the course;

- c. A statement of the instructor's attendance policy (see Section IV.B.3) ~~and the penalty for academic dishonesty (see Section VIII.F);~~
- d. *A statement of the instructor's policy on academic misconduct that either refers to a policy approved by the academic unit or college or that includes the following:*
 - i. *A definition of academic misconduct if the field requires a more specific definition of academic misconduct than the one found in the Student Code of Conduct (see Section VIII.F);*
 - ii. *A list of the range of sanctions that the instructor might implement in the case of academic misconduct;*
 - iii. *A statement that students may appeal academic sanctions through the grade appeal process;*
 - iv. *A statement that University Judiciaries may impose additional sanctions.*

[Note: Sections “e” and “f” are not included because there are no proposed changes to those sections]

A Resolution to Change Faculty Handbook Language on Grade Appeals Involving Academic Misconduct

Initial Draft October 26, 2008

WHEREAS: Students have a right to appeal grades, even in cases involving academic misconduct; and,

WHEREAS: Current language in the faculty handbook is vague regarding procedures that should be followed with respect to appeals in cases of academic misconduct; and,

WHEREAS: The severity of academic misconduct charges and refutations requires that careful documentation be included in the appeal; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE OHIO UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE: That the faculty handbook be amended to include the following changes (deletions indicated by ~~strike through~~ and additions in *bold/italics*).

Section IV/C/3 Grade Appeals

[NOTE: Sections “a” and “b” are not included because no changes are recommended for those sections.]

- c. *In cases not involving academic misconduct*, the burden of proof for a grade change is on the student, ~~except in those cases involving charges of academic dishonesty~~. If the dean concludes that the student has insufficient grounds for an

appeal, there can be no further appeal by the student. If the dean concludes that sufficient grounds do exist for an appeal, the dean shall appoint a faculty committee of five members to consider the case. If a majority on the committee decide that the grade should be changed and the instructor does not accept the recommendation, the committee can authorize the Registrar to change the grade. The decision of the committee is not subject to further appeal. In appeal cases in which the dean is the instructor, the role of the dean will be assumed by the Provost. In those appeal cases involving courses taught by faculty from more than one college, the Dean of University College will review the appeal and, if necessary, appoint the appeals committee.

- d. *In cases of academic misconduct both the student and teacher must document their allegations and refutations in writing, including any supporting material (e.g., copies of the student's work, copies of other materials used but not referenced in the student's work, etc.) relevant to the case. Such written evidence will be reviewed in accordance with the grade appeal process followed by the college or unit.*

A Resolution to Change Faculty Handbook Language on Academic Dishonesty

Revised Draft January 6, 2009

NOTE: "Track Changes" notes below show how this revised resolution differs from the version presented for first reading in December.

WHEREAS: Academic integrity is a core value of Ohio University; and,

WHEREAS: Current faculty handbook language does not provide teachers with clear guidance on how to proceed with cases of academic misconduct; and,

WHEREAS: Faculty should assert their prerogative to handle academic misconduct as an academic issue while also recognizing the need to seek advice from others who have expertise on this issue; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE OHIO UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE: That the faculty handbook be amended to include the following changes (deletions indicated by ~~strike through~~ and additions in *bold/italics*).

Section VIII/F. Academic Dishonesty

The Ohio University Student Code of Conduct prohibits all forms of academic dishonesty. These include but *are not limited to* cheating; plagiarism; forgery; furnishing false information to the University; and alteration or misuse of University documents, records, or identification. *Ohio University has a two-tiered approach to responding to*

cases of academic misconduct. First, academic misconduct typically occurs in the classroom and should be handled in accordance with policies specified in the syllabus of a particular class (see Section IV.A.3). If an instructor suspects academic misconduct she/he should carefully investigate and document the case and, if academic misconduct is discovered, provide the student with a written statement documenting the misconduct and explaining what sanctions, penalties, or other actions will be taken as a result.

~~If a student engages in course-related academic dishonesty, his or her grade on the work in question or in the course may be lowered by the instructor. Any student wishing to protest the instructor's action has recourse to the established grievance procedures, starting at the department level. (See the Undergraduate Catalog or Student Handbook or contact University Judiciaries for further information.)~~

Second, instructors may also report cases of academic dishonesty to the Director of University Judiciaries for further action; however, by so doing, an instructor does not in any way relinquish the right to ~~assign a grade in a course~~ **assign the student a grade consistent with the grading policy and academic dishonesty statement contained on the syllabus (See Section V.A.3.b and d). After consultation with the instructor, the Office of University Judiciaries may recommend that the instructor handle the situation solely as a classroom issue, that a letter of concern be sent to the student, and/or that the case be officially referred to the office so that formal hearing procedures can be initiated.** ~~The student may appeal the grade through the appeal of grade procedure of Section IV.C.3.~~ Any student ~~accused of academic dishonesty by~~ **referred to** University Judiciaries **because of academic misconduct** is entitled to notice of charges being made against him or her and to a full hearing. If suspension or dismissal is recommended, the student is further entitled to appeals procedures and will not be suspended or dismissed from the University while appeals are in process.

Resolution to Defend the Faculty Handbook

January 12, 2009

For first reading

Whereas the Ohio University Faculty Handbook is official university policy (see Faculty Handbook, p. 1), and

Whereas the Faculty Senate has an obligation to current and future faculty, as well as to its predecessor faculty senates, to uphold and defend the Faculty Handbook, and

Whereas the Faculty Handbook provides (section IIIA) that any changes to the rate of employee monthly contributions to the health care benefit must be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval, and

Whereas employee monthly contributions were raised on July 1, 2007, without consideration by the Faculty Senate, let alone the Senate's approval, and

Whereas this action is a clear violation of the Faculty Handbook:

Be it resolved that employee contributions to the health care benefit be immediately rolled back to the contributions in force during the 2006-2007 fiscal year, and

Be it further resolved that the excess contributions collected from employees since July 1, 2007, be returned via a "premium holiday."

DRAFT

**Resolution on the Provost Search
January 12, 2009**

For first reading

Whereas the *Faculty Handbook*, citing Trustees Policy, provides the following guidance on Search Committees:

E. Appointment and Evaluation of Deans and Executive Officers

All sections of the following Board of Trustees policy that deal with the appointment, evaluation, and reappointment/termination of deans are a matter of Faculty Handbook policy.

This policy provides for the appointment and evaluation of the major administrative officers of the University, including the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education, Deans, and the Director of the Center for International Studies. It outlines regularized procedures for the search, appointment, evaluation, reappointment, and termination of these officers.

Search

1. A search committee will be established by the person responsible for making the appointment to assist in the identification, evaluation, and recommendation of highly qualified candidates.

1. The committee should be small enough to work effectively but large enough to accomplish its task. (A reasonable range is six to fourteen.)

2. In case of an academic appointment, the chairperson of the committee will be a faculty member.

Whereas the Handbook designation "faculty member" is typically understood to mean a person who currently holds "faculty status";

Whereas the search committee proposed by President McDavis will include 24 members, only five of whom are faculty;

Whereas the Provost is the chief academic officer of the University;

Be it resolved that the Provost Search Committee be chaired by a faculty member;

Be it further resolved that a majority of the search committee be faculty members;

Be it further resolved that the committee "be small enough to work effectively but large enough to accomplish its task. (A reasonable range is six to fourteen.)"

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate calls upon Ohio University faculty not to serve on a Provost Search Committee unless the previous three conditions are followed.

Resolution on the Provost Search
Approved by the Faculty Senate on January 12, 2009

Whereas the *Faculty Handbook*, citing Trustees Policy, provides the following guidance on Search Committees:

E. Appointment and Evaluation of Deans and Executive Officers

All sections of the following Board of Trustees policy that deal with the appointment, evaluation, and reappointment/termination of deans are a matter of Faculty Handbook policy.

This policy provides for the appointment and evaluation of the major administrative officers of the University, including the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education, Deans, and the Director of the Center for International Studies. It outlines regularized procedures for the search, appointment, evaluation, reappointment, and termination of these officers.

Search

1. A search committee will be established by the person responsible for making the appointment to assist in the identification, evaluation, and recommendation of highly qualified candidates.

2. The committee should be small enough to work effectively but large enough to accomplish its task. (A reasonable range is six to fourteen.)
3. In case of an academic appointment, the chairperson of the committee will be a faculty member.

Whereas the Handbook designation "faculty member" is typically understood to mean a person who currently holds "faculty status", i.e. someone who is eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections;

Whereas the search committee proposed by President McDavis will include 23 members, only 6 of whom are faculty, i.e. someone who is eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections;

Whereas the Provost is the chief academic officer of the University and normally holds an academic appointment in an academic unit;

Whereas having a committee that is small enough to work effectively but large enough to accomplish its task, with a majority of members who are faculty members and chaired by a faculty member is a common practice even when searching for an Executive Vice President and Provost;

Be it resolved that the committee "be small enough to work effectively but large enough to accomplish its task. (A reasonable range is six to fourteen.)"

Be it further resolved that a majority of the search committee be faculty members, i.e. individuals who are eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections;

Be it further resolved that the Provost Search Committee be chaired by a faculty member, i.e. someone who is eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections;

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate has no confidence in the search process and calls upon Ohio University faculty not to serve on a Provost Search Committee unless the three common practices outlined above are followed.

Be if further resolved that the Faculty Senate calls upon academic units not to offer faculty appointments or tenure to any person hired under a search process that does not follow the three common practices outlined above.

Summary Table

The following table indicates the size and distribution of 12 Provost Search Committees. Ten of these searches are taking place this year; two, Michigan and Indiana, took place in 2007-2008.

School	Size	Faculty	Admin/Staff	Students	Other	Chair (if known)
Kent State	25	14	7	4		Dean
Texas Tech	11	6	2	1	Regent; Community Member	Vice Provost
Michigan	11	7	3	1		President
Auburn	9	5	2	1	Trustee	Dean
Central Michigan	13	7	5	1		Faculty
Cornell	10	5	3	2		Faculty
New Mexico	18	9	8	1		Faculty
Case Western	11	7	2	2		Faculty
University of Houston	18	11	6	1		Faculty
Kansas	18	10	6	1	Alum	Faculty
Louisiana State	21	11	9	1		Faculty
Indiana	11	7	3	1		Faculty

* The average search committee had 14.67 members.

* 10 of 12 search committees had a majority of faculty; the other two ha 50% faculty.

* 8 of the 12 search committees were chaired by a faculty member who was not also an administrator.

*One committee had a trustee; 1 Regent; 1 Alumnus; 1 community member.

Kent State (25): 14 Faculty, 7 Administration & Staff, 4 students

Faculty

Dr. Claire Draucker, Distinguished Professor, Nursing

Dr. Janis Crowther, Department Chair and Professor, Psychology

Dr. Claire Culleton, Professor, English

Dr. Josef Knott, Director, Hugh A. Glauser School of Music; Professor, Music

Dr. Laura Leff, Professor, Biological Sciences

Dr. Paul Haridakis, Associate Professor, Communication Studies

Charles Harker, Associate Professor and International Studies Coordinator, Architecture and Environmental Design

Cindy Kristof, Associate Professor, Library and Media Services

Dr. Michael Mikusa, Associate Professor, Teaching, Leadership and Curriculum Studies

Dr. Susan Roxburgh, Associate Professor, Sociology
 Dr. Robert Sturr, Associate Professor, English, Stark Campus
 Dr. Kathryn Wilson, Associate Professor, Economics
 Bruce Gunning, Assistant Professor, Technology, East Liverpool Campus
 A'isha Ajayi, Assistant Professor, Non-Tenure Track, Management and Information Systems

Administration/Staff

Dr. David Creamer, Vice President for Administration
 Dr. John West, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (half-time on leave for 2006-07); Senior Research Fellow, Liquid Crystal Institute; Professor, Chemistry
 Dr. James Gaudino, Dean, Communication and Information; Chair
 Dr. Wanda Thomas, Dean, Trumbull Campus
 Dr. Melody K. Baker, Associate Dean and Director of KSU McNair Scholars Program, Research and Graduate Studies
 Dr. John Crawford, Interim Associate Dean, College of the Arts; Professor, Dance
 Judy Yasenosky, Administrative Secretary, Honors College

Students

William Franko, Vice Chair, Graduate Student Senate; Ph.D. Candidate, political science
 Preston Mitchum, Senator for Academic Affairs, Undergraduate Student Senate; political science major
 Edward Moreira, Chair, Graduate Student Senate; Ph.D. Candidate, Biomedical Sciences
 Kourtney Wolfgang, Senator for Research and Development, Undergraduate Student Senate; business management major

Texas Tech University (11): 6 Faculty, 2 Admin/Staff, 1 Student, 1 Regent, 1 Comm. Member

* Michael D. Shonrock, Ph.D., Vice President, Student Affairs & Enrollment Management

- * Mindy Brashears, Associate Professor, Department of Animal and Food Sciences
- * Hansel Burley, Associate Professor, College of Education
- * Jay Conover, Horn Professor, Rawls College of Business
- * Linda Donahue, Associate Professor, School of Theatre and Dance
- * Mark Griffin, Member, Texas Tech University System Board of Regents
- * Ron Nail, President, Staff Senate
- * Nancy Neal, Community Representative
- * Sandy River, President, Faculty Senate
- * Brian Shannon, Professor, School of Law
- * Kelli Stumbo, Student Regent, Texas Tech University System Board of Regents

University of Michigan, 07-08 (11): 7 Faculty, 3 Administrative, 1 Student

Lee C. Bollinger, President, Search Committee Chair
 William E. Bolcom, the Ross Lee Finney Distinguished University Professor of Music;
 Richard I. Ford, professor of anthropology and of botany, and curator, Museum of Anthropology;
 Linda K. Gregerson, associate professor of English;
 Linda P.B. Katehi, professor of electrical engineering and computer science;
 Earl Lewis, senior associate dean, Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, and professor of history and of Afroamerican and African studies;
 Michael A. Marletta, the John Gideon Searle Professor of Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacognosy, and professor of biological chemistry;
 Michael J. Nagrant, president, Michigan Student Assembly, and LS&A junior;
 Rebecca J. Scott, the Frederick G.L. Huetwell Professor, the Arthur F. Thurnau Professor, and professor and chair of the Department of History;
 Ctirad Uher, professor and chair of the Department of Physics;
 Janet A. Weiss, the Mary C. Bromage Collegiate Professor of Business Administration, professor of organizational behavior and public policy, professor of public policy, and associate dean of the School of School of Business Administration.

Auburn (9): 5 Faculty, 2 Admin., 1 Student, 1 Trustee (Chair is a Dean)

Central Michigan (13): 7 Faculty, 5 Admin./Staff, 1 Student (Chair is Faculty)

Cornell (10): 5 Faculty, 3 Admin/ Staff, 2 students (Chair is Faculty)

University of New Mexico (18): 9 Faculty, 8 Admin/Staff, 1 student (Chair is Faculty)

Case Western (11): 7 Faculty, 2 Admin/Staff, 2 students (Chair is Faculty)

University of Houston (18): 11 Faculty, 6 Admin/Staff, 1 Student (Chair is Faculty)

University of Kansas (18): 10 Faculty, 6 Admin/Staff, 1 Student, 1 Alum (Chair is Faculty)

Lousiana State University (21): 11 Faculty, 9 Admin/Staff, 1 student (Chair is Faculty)

Indiana University, 2007-2008 (11): 7 Faculty, 3 Admin/Staff, 1 Student (Chair is Faculty)

http://www.ur.umich.edu/9697/May06_97/artcl03.htm

http://www.auburn.edu/administration/provost_search/committee.html

http://www.cmich.edu/Office_of_the_President/Periodic_Update_63.htm

<http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/June08/provostSearch.html>

<http://www.unm.edu/~market/cgi-bin/archives/002227.html>

<http://www.case.edu/president/speeches/040408.html>

www.uh.edu/provost/provost_search/Provost-Search-Committee.doc

<http://www.ttu.edu/provostsearch/>

<http://www2.ku.edu/~oirp/ProvostSearch/>

[http://www.lsu.com/UNV002.nsf/\(NoteID\)/84579A77E9CF803E862571E20047983C?OpenDocument](http://www.lsu.com/UNV002.nsf/(NoteID)/84579A77E9CF803E862571E20047983C?OpenDocument)

http://www.uml.edu/Provost_Search/members.html

<http://newsinfo.iu.edu/news/page/normal/5555.html>