

**Ohio University Faculty Senate**  
**Monday, June 8, 2009**  
**Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.**  
**Approved September 21, 2009**

Faculty Senate President **Joe McLaughlin** called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

In attendance:

**College of Arts and Sciences:** T. Anderson, D. Bell, K. Brown, G. Buckley, S. Gradin, P. Jung, J. Lein, G. Matlack, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, A. Smith, D. Torres, J. Webster

**College of Business:** W. Gist, L. Hoshower

**College of Education:** T. Leinbaugh

**College of Engineering:** C. Bartone, H. Pasic

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

**Group II:** C. Naccarato

**College of Health and Human Services:** D. Bolon

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

**Regional Campus—Chillicothe:** R. Vance for S. Brogan

**Regional Campus—Eastern:**

**Regional Campus—Lancaster:** P. Munhall

**Regional Campus—Southern:** E. McCown

**Regional Campus—Zanesville:** K. Collins

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

**Excused:** S. Lopez-Permouth, V. Conley

**Absent:** J. Benson, T. Flynn, J. Giesey, A. Gupta for Stock, A. Hall, S. Hatty, S. Marinellie, D. Matolak, J. McKean, W. Roosenburg, J. Thomas, R. Wetzel

Newly Elected Senators in Attendance:

**Arts and Sciences:** C. Elster, J. Gilliom, D. Ingram, C. Coski for M. Holt, S. Hays, C. Kalenkoski

**Business:** R. Frost

**Education:**

**Engineering:** J. Dill

**Fine Arts:** M. Phillips

**Group II:** H. Burstein, M. Sisson

**Health and Human Services:**

**Osteopathic Medicine:** J. Wolf

**Regional Campus—Chillicothe:** R. Knight

**Regional Campus—Eastern:** J. Casebolt

**Regional Campus—Lancaster:**

**Regional Campus—Southern:**

**Regional Campus—Zanesville:** M. Nern

**Scripps College of Communication:** G. Newton

**Newly Elected Senators Excused:** M. Li

**Newly Elected Senators Absent:** T. Franklin, C. Wolfe

---

**Overview of the Meeting:**

- I. Robert Kidder, Chair of the Board of Trustees
  - II. Provost's Report—David Descutner
  - III. Roll Call and Approval of the May 8, 2009 Minutes
  - IV. Chair's Report—Joe McLaughlin
  - V. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Scott Titsworth
  - VI. Finance and Facilities (FFC)—Joe McLaughlin
  - VII. Promotion and Tenure (P&T)—Peter Coschigano
  - VIII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
  - IX. New Business
  - X. Adjournment
- 

**Minutes of the meeting****I. Remarks by Robert Kidder, Chair of the Board of Trustees**

Kidder articulated two main goals for the next year: 1) Clarifying strategic priorities, especially with respect to Vision Ohio; and 2) Improving communication between the Board and constituents of OU. He then addressed the several topics proposed by faculty. He first discussed the role and responsibility of the Board. This includes serving the citizens of the State of Ohio (affordability, accessibility, and academic excellence); and acting as the governing body of University, including duties such as the hiring and firing of the University President, and the oversight of finance, facilities, and institutional priorities. The Board is not involved in curricular issues or day-to-day activities. He added that the Board is mindful of shared governance and believes in it. He then discussed the Board's view of the University System of Ohio (USO). Because the USO will allocate capital, it's helpful for them to declare their priorities, and OU's track record of academic excellence will serve us well under the USO. We can also benefit from sharing services and personnel (e.g. auditors) across universities. The Board understands that there is faculty concern about intrusion into academic realms and about unfair allocation of funds. A clear strategy will help OU defend against this. Finally Kidder discussed the presidential evaluation process. The Board has defined three avenues to evaluate the President: a) informal discussions with all stakeholders; b) an annual review process that assesses performance based on a set of objectives; c) a comprehensive evaluation process led by a third-party outside evaluator, who talks with all groups, including alumni. In the comprehensive evaluation, all issues are addressed, not just performance on particular objectives.

Kidder then took questions from the faculty. **Joseph Slade** said that the faculty thinks the Board is indifferent to the faculty and to the academic mission (e.g. cutting library funds while increasing football funding); we're often assured we will have input, but we rarely do. Slade then asked Kidder whether he had specific objectives for how to achieve collegiality. Kidder responded that this begins with a faculty representative on the Board, Kidder's visit to faculty senate, having an open office for comments, and

working with the administration to make sure we're achieving ideals; when talk matches actions, it is easier to build trust. Although there is no magic wand, if we could agree on strategic priorities that would help lead to a collegial relationship. Slade added that he appreciated Kidder coming to faculty senate, and that the problems have been numerous, and the faculty would like to be listened to. Kidder responded that he was personally committed to that, as was the Board. The Board is committed to shared governance as well. The difficulty is that the Board hears that faculty is involved in decision-making processes, but if that involvement is not sufficient, the Board can't tell—that's why communication must be improved. **Chris Bartone** asked for clarification about the role of evaluations. Kidder responded by recapping the roles of the different types of evaluations used by the Board. In response to a question about increasing the affordability of OU, Kidder remarked that Ohio is under pressure right now, and there will not be additional money in the next few years. OU needs to have priorities for allocating funds, and needs to look to development to raise more money. For example, student information is not an articulated priority, so we should not invest a lot there. It comes down to choices and the need to make priorities clear. **Allyn Reilly** noted that we have worked for a long time on Vision Ohio, and asked what are some specific things that need to be clarified? Kidder responded that Vision Ohio is fuzzy—what are our top 10 priorities? Is it scholarships, more targeting of high-performing students once they're here, learning communities, or residential experience? Then we have to get specific about funding and our strategy for development. How many scholarships do we need? You know you have a strategy when someone is able to disagree; no one can disagree with the main goals of Vision Ohio. In response to a questions from **Douglas Bolon** about prioritizing his time (given that he is extremely busy), Kidder responded that he has pared back other commitments to devote time to this and to Chrysler, and is focused on using time wisely and intensively; for example, he reorganized the agenda for the Board's retreat around strategic priorities. **Ken Brown** pointed out that OU is one of few state-assisted schools that won't have raises, and that OU has been in a financial crisis for years now – why is OU always in financial difficulties when other state schools are not? Kidder responded that state money is tight, and there are caps on tuition, as well as cost pressures on things other than faculty salaries and benefits. Kidder pointed out that one of the strategic priorities was raising faculty salaries, and that the Board supported that last year. But the only way we'll get more money in the near future is development. **Charlotte Elster** asked for examples of how the USO could bring efficiencies by sharing. Kidder gave the example of accounting systems that are bought separately now.

## **II. Provost's Report—David Descutner**

Descutner reported for Provost Kathy Krendl. He noted that enrollment is promising; now matriculation is the focus. He thanked faculty for their work on recruiting. He also thanked faculty for teaching in the first-year experience, and emphasized that it was important have group I faculty in the classroom with first-year students. There was a 1% increase in retention from quarter to quarter, and he thanked faculty for that as well.

**Joseph Slade** asked what the enrollment projections were for next year. Descutner replied that because of the economy, we should expect next year to be as

unpredictable as this year. **David Ingram** said that he was struck by the criteria for the Centers of Excellence: did OU know about them, and what does the Provost's office think about this? Descutner replied that these came rather late from the Chancellor.

The full report is online at <http://www.ohio.edu/provost/>.

### **III. Roll Call and Approval of the May 8, 2009 Minutes**

A motion to accept the minutes from the May 8, 2009 faculty senate meeting was approved by a voice vote.

### **IV. Chair's Report—Joe McLaughlin**

- Interest in faculty senate is higher this year—there was 36% response rate in elections this year, up from 22% last year.
- The online presidential evaluation was discontinued because it could not control for multiple submissions, and could not track faculty by group I or group II. A new evaluation will be conducted in the fall.
- Senate Committee Preferences (2008-2009) were distributed and turned in; committee assignments will be made around the beginning of July.
- The at-large members of the FS Executive Committee are Tracy Leinbaugh and John Gilliom. A Finance and Facilities chair will be appointed soon; other committee chairs will remain in place. Steve Patterson will chair the Faculty Grievance Committee for Sherrie Gradin while she is on leave during fall quarter.
- Nominations are still being accepted for standing committees. The nomination form and descriptions of the standing committees are available at <http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/standingcomm/>.
- The Executive Committee met with incoming Provost and Executive Vice President Pam Benoit.
- There are seven outstanding resolutions awaiting response from the EVPP's office; 60 days is the limit for responses to resolutions, so we should have responses soon, including one resolution from the April meeting, which should be acted on by the end of the week.
- Several senators are on a committee formed by the registrar to address compliance with federal requirements to post textbook information for all classes taught at OU; more will be forthcoming.
- Recognition of Retiring Senators: outgoing senators were thanked for their service.
- McLaughlin noted that retiring, continuing, and new senators were all eligible to vote at this June meeting.
- Upcoming Senate Meeting: September 21, 2009. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235

Note: All resolutions considered this year are available under the "Updates and Info" tab at <http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/>.

**Rudy Pasic** suggested faculty senate meetings need to be streamlined; **Chuck Naccarato** added that any kind of administrative report should come at the end of faculty senate business.

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

Titsworth gave a brief end-of-year report. EPSA presented six resolutions that were approved and signed this year, including resolutions related to academic integrity, and resolutions establishing the curricular framework for the transition to semesters. EPSA also worked with the registrar to eliminate the deadline that required grades to be submitted within 48 hours of the final exam in favor of a single final grade deadline. Next year the committee will address the revised Honor Code ratified by Student Senate; continue to monitor the status of AP credit within the USO; and continue to work on Q2S transition issues.

Titsworth then presented the following resolutions for second reading and vote:

- Resolution on Graduate Contract Grievance Resolution (for second reading and vote)

**David Ingram** raised the concern that because we are deleting language from the Handbook, this will only have standing as a university policy. Titsworth responded that the resolution deliberately says that the graduate council has power, which is appropriate. Right now the language is vague.

EPSA moved and seconded the resolution. By consensus, a voice vote was taken. The resolution passed unanimously.

- Resolution on Graduate Council Composition (for second reading and vote)

This resolution changes “faculty” to “faculty status” to clarify that the majority vote on graduate council is people with faculty status. **Charlene Kalenkoski** asked whether faculty status was defined somewhere; Titsworth answered that this is in the faculty handbook. **Chris Bartone** asked whether this would include Group II as well. Titsworth affirmed this. He also clarified the role of the Dean of University Libraries in graduate education.

EPSA moved and seconded the resolution. By consensus, a voice vote was taken. The resolution passed unanimously.

#### **VI. Finance and Facilities (FFC)—Joe McLaughlin**

McLaughlin presented FFC’s end-of-year report. This year, the FFC worked with administration to institute a health care premium holiday; helped compile various scenarios for cuts and benefits changes, and presented several resolutions. Most notably, the resolution to approve the Budget Planning Council’s proposal to increase the cost of health care benefits by \$3 million was not approved by Faculty Senate; Faculty Senate did approve a resolution calling for \$860,000 in increases. When the administration instituted larger increases over the objection of the Faculty Senate, FFC introduced a resolution noting that the administration had violated Faculty Handbook policy, and asked that these increases be rescinded. This resolution was passed by FS and awaits

response by the Provost. A resolution to make faculty participating in the ARP eligible for OU's early retirement program also passed Faculty Senate. Next year the committee will continue to monitor the budget situation, begin to address the status of the early retirement program under semesters; and participate in discussions about revisions to the education benefits program for faculty.

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

Coschigano presented P&T's end-of-year report. The committee heard two promotion and tenure cases, one non-reappointment case, and five tenure clock extension requests; participated in P&T workshops. The committee also presented two resolutions that were approved by Faculty Senate: one that streamlined the P&T appeals process, and one that outlined recommendations for department/school and college P&T guidelines.

### **VIII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin**

Gradin presented PRC's end-of-year report. This year the committee examined the Faculty Handbook and the Policy and Procedures Manual for discrepancies. A discrepancy relating to domestic partnership was resolved when HR decided to make opposite sex domestic partners eligible for benefits. Other discrepancies related to research misconduct policies, and workplace violence and harassment policies are being worked on. The PRC also worked on the Deans' evaluation process, and began a discussion with Legal Affairs about whether Chairs and Directors have faculty status with respect to Faculty Handbook policies. In addition, the committee is addressing two grievances received in May; these will continue in the fall.

**Joe Bernt** asked for more information about the status of chairs and departments. Gradin replied that currently chairs and directors have faculty status, and it's not clear how the grievance policy applies—are they managers, or are they covered by faculty grievance procedures? Bernt asked what brought this up, because the lore of campus is that chairs of departments maintain faculty status. Gradin said that it came up in the context of grievances, but could not be more specific at this point, and that she hoped no decision had been made at this point. **McLaughlin** added that it's fair to say that other discussion have brought this up as well, such as whether or not chairs can turn in cards for collective bargaining, and that the faculty senate tried to limit chairs/directors on Dean search committees, etc.

### **IX. New Business**

- Resolution to Censure President Roderick McDavis and Vice President William Decatur – Ken Brown (for second reading and vote)

Brown reminded the FS that the first reading was at the extraordinary meeting in late April: to avoid interfering with the presidential evaluation, the second reading was postponed. The current version removes Krendl from censure. Brown noted that a question was raised at the first reading about whether the charges in the resolution were arguable, and added that when you claim that something that someone has done is wrong, it's always arguable. Brown continued that the President has claimed that changes to benefits must be brought to the senate for approval, but is arguing that the fact that the

senate didn't approve them doesn't matter, because the Handbook doesn't explicitly say that it has to be approved.

**David Ingram** proposed that the Vice President for Finance and Administration should be removed, because he is working for the President. **Chris Bartone** seconded. **Brown** replied that he believed that Decatur had lied about the negotiations with Holzer clinic, and he was therefore culpable. **Bartone** reiterated that the two people being censured should be separated. **Steve Hays** asked whether it was Bartone's point that we would have two motions. **Beth Quitslund** pointed out that there were also many things in the resolution that did not speak to actions that Decatur was involved in, such as restructuring, so they should be different resolutions. **David Thomas** asked to be removed as parliamentarian so that Thomas could rise and speak; **Jeremy Webster** then acted as parliamentarian. Thomas asked that we be more careful about language, and it would be wise to be judicious, deliberative, and back down from name-calling, and try to earn back some of the respect the faculty senate used to have. Brown and Thomas then discussed the nature of the evidence related to the Holzer clinic. Thomas concluded that it was hard to see the harm in removing Decatur from this resolution. **Chuck Naccarato** recommended that the language be less negative and strident.

**McLaughlin** directed the senators to return to the motion on the floor [to remove Decatur from the resolution]. **Rudy Pasic** suggested another possible option: that no specific names be mentioned, because the message we want to send is that the rules are not being obeyed. **McLaughlin** asked whether the senate was ready to vote on the amendment. **Bernt** said that he was in favor of keeping both names in the resolution. **McLaughlin**, hearing no further discussion, called for a vote. The amendment to remove Decatur's name from the resolution passed.

**Quitslund** pointed out that as written, the penultimate "whereas" seems to be about the Deans. Brown said he wasn't suggesting that. **Geoffrey Buckley** asked whether he was then suggesting removing the Deans. **Robert McKnight** added that the line about "in complete secrecy" is false; Dean Evans came to his faculty and asked for input. Brown responded that this clause refers to Human and Consumer Sciences in HHS who came to senate *en masse* and read a prepared statement that this was done in complete secrecy. **Steve Hays**, **Ken Brown**, **James Casebolt**, and **Patrick Munhall** discussed the timing of the notification of restructuring. Brown argued in favor of keeping "in complete secrecy." **Ann Fidler** argued that it wasn't true, and that they're trying to set record straight. **Norma Pecora** supported removing "in complete secrecy" because it's a stumbling block. Brown accepted this as a friendly amendment.

**Munhall** asked what the censure was supposed to accomplish. If the handbook's been violated, why aren't we addressing this directly? What will this censure accomplish apart from further deteriorating relationships? **Buckley** asked what our positive outcome was, whether this passes or not. Buckley also noted that interest in FS has gone up, and wondered if there something positive we could do to galvanize this support. What does FS stand for? How do you continue on from a censure resolution in September? **Munhall** suggested we bring the President in and have a conversation about what's taken place, and how it can be fixed. **Arthur Smith** voiced his support for those who oppose this resolution because it doesn't solve anything, and will sever rather than build relationships. **Bernt** replied that the censure provides an incentive for two things: 1)

acknowledgement that faculty members have a role; and 2) to not diminish faculty health benefits year in and year out. It's not just a slap across the President's face; it will be very public, and could lead us to a conversation. **Thomas** wanted to return to Buckley's idea of principles, of a "contract" with the administration, in which we request that the President and administration adhere to faculty handbook, restore health benefits, etc. Brown replied that we've been doing that all year: they came in and said the handbook was a contract, and then they broke it. Thomas said that the clause containing "any pretense of shared governance" was not accurate, in this case because of the new faculty representative to Board of Trustees; some of the language was too strong. Brown replied that he doesn't think there's any pretense of shared governance. Thomas and Brown discussed the non-voting role of the faculty representative to the Board. **Glenn Matlack** said that taking out a very small number of words would not change the resolution but would make it more palatable. **Quitslund** said that this resolution is what we pass if we are sure that we are not going to get what we want, and that she has not seen the President's office respond to belligerence yet; there's a temporary bridge burning quality to this resolution. **Scott Titsworth** said that by definition a vote of censure doesn't do anything to perpetuate dialogue. There are other options: under our constitution the faculty can require a meeting with the President, and we've not had a broad-based appeal to our colleagues to make their opinions known. Good outcomes are not articles in the press or the President withdrawing from dialogue.

**Glenn Matlack** said that it's not an issue of belligerence or burning bridges; the President seems to respond to very clear unequivocal statements, and our best chance is to speak plainly in public. **Steve Hays** added that collegiality can include confrontation; we're saying "you are not showing proper respect to us: stop it." **Allyn Reilly** asked whether censure was the best way to say that. **Jeff Dill** said that he supports the goal of this resolution, but it needs a lot of work. Maybe we should table it and do some more work on it. He then moved to table the resolution. **Reilly** seconded. **Brown** requested a secret ballot. **Dill** asked whether secret ballots were permissible under the state sunshine laws. Past FS president **Phyllis Bernt** responded that we have always said that we are not a decision making body, we are a recommending body, so we are not bound by sunshine laws. **McLaughlin** ruled that because we are not a decision-making body, and because it is consistent with tradition of this body, secret ballots will be used. We will look into this for the future. **Dill** responded that while he accepts the decision of chair, he is representing faculty who elected him, and he will make his vote public.

The resolution was tabled as amended until September 21, 2009 by a vote of 26 – 24, with no abstentions. The vote was by secret ballot.

## **X. Adjournment**

Ken Brown moved to adjourn; the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:48 p.m.



## **Student Contract Grievance Board**

### **Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee**

**Passed June 8, 2009**

Whereas, the Faculty Handbook (Section II, Subsection Q) contains a section on the Graduate Student Contract Grievance Board, and

Whereas, graduate students are not faculty, and

Whereas, the Handbook language is inconsistent with policies adopted by the Graduate Council in previous years, and

Whereas, two official documents containing inconsistent policies governing the same process is problematic, and

Whereas, the Graduate Council should be the primary governing body overseeing issues related to graduate student contract grievances, therefore

Be it resolved by the Ohio University Faculty Senate that Section 2, Subsection Q and all therein be deleted from the Faculty Handbook. Subsequent sections should be re-lettered as appropriate.

Be it further resolved that the Graduate Council will establish, oversee, and enforce all policy related to graduate student contract grievances.

### **Handbook Language In Question**

#### **Q. Graduate Student Contract Grievance Board**

1. The Graduate Student Contract Grievance Board is composed of four members as follows: two faculty members of the Graduate Council appointed by the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, and two graduate students appointed by the President of the Graduate Student Senate. Each member of the Board will serve for a period of one year. In the event that a member of the Board is a representative of the college from which a grievance is being submitted for consideration by the Board, that member will be replaced by a representative from another college. Such changes in Board membership will be recommended by the chairperson of the Grievance Board to the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and the President of the Graduate Student Senate. □
2. The Graduate Student Contract Grievance Board will consider only those cases which pertain to a graduate student's status as the holder of a Graduate Assistant contract (such as teaching assistant, graduate assistant, etc., hereinafter referred to as contract personnel). Before the Graduate Student Contract Grievance Board will consider a grievance brought by contract personnel, he/she must have presented his/her grievance in writing and have fully discussed the grievance with the chairperson of his/her departmental graduate committee or the chairperson of his/her department, and with the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies without receiving satisfaction from either within a period of one month. Grievances of a purely academic nature should be referred to (a) the dean of the appropriate college (for grade appeals), or (b) the Office of Judiciaries (for academic

- misconduct). □
3. All meetings of the Grievance Board will be held in closed sessions with only members and parties in a grievance present. Individuals and/or departments who are parties in a grievance heard by the Board will be present at all meetings of the Board at which evidence bearing on the grievance is to be heard. During the proceedings of the Board, either party will be permitted to have an academic advisor and/or legal counsel of his/her choice. The burden of proof regarding any grievance rests on the individual or individuals bringing the grievance. □
  4. Individuals and/or departments of the University who are parties in a grievance heard by the Board will be given not less than one week nor more than one month to prepare for the hearing. All parties will be notified in writing as to the time and place of the hearing. All matters upon which a decision may be based must be introduced into evidence at the proceedings before the board, and decisions should be based solely on such matters. □
  5. A recorded and written summary will be made of all proceedings of the Board. The written summary of the proceedings and the recommendations of the Board will be submitted to the President of the University for final disposition. Information copies of the written summary and recommendations will also be sent to the contract personnel, the chairperson of his/her department, the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, and the Provost. A copy of the recording will be available on request to any of the above-named parties. The requesting party will bear the cost of the copy. □
  6. Interpretations of these procedures will be made jointly by the Graduate Council and the Graduate Student Senate. Alterations of the procedures may be proposed by the Graduate Council and the Graduate Student Senate acting jointly, through normal channels, for approval by the President.
- 

## **A Resolution to Update Faculty handbook language on Composition of the Graduate Council**

### **Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee**

**Passed June 8, 2009**

Whereas, the Faculty Handbook (Section VII, Subsection C) contains a section specifying composition of the Graduate Council, and

Whereas, the Graduate Council has suggested through a unanimously approved resolution dated April 1, 2009, that the composition of the Graduate Council be changed, and

Whereas, the recommended changes to the Graduate Council would still give faculty a majority vote, and

Whereas, the suggested changes to the graduate council would integrate stakeholders who have a vested interest and/or working knowledge of graduate education at Ohio University, therefore

Be it resolved by the Ohio University Faculty Senate that Section VII, Subsection C be amended as follows:

### **Handbook Language In Question**

[Note: deletions are indicated with ~~striketrough~~ and additions are indicated with *emphasized text*.]

### C. Graduate Council

The Graduate Council reviews, coordinates, and serves as an advocate for graduate education at Ohio University. The Council has both advisory and policy-recommending responsibilities for graduate education. It initiates, reviews, and recommends University-wide policy and new directions for graduate education.

The Graduate Council recommends to the University Curriculum Council the initiation, implementation, and elimination of graduate programs and degrees at Ohio University. (See Section II.D.4.c for procedures for the elimination of graduate programs.) Other recommendations by the Council go through the Provost to the President for final approval.

Members of the Graduate Council are nominated by the Committee on Committees and appointed by the President. The Graduate Council shall have a voting majority of ~~faculty~~ members *with faculty status*.

Its membership shall consist of:

- a. fourteen ~~faculty~~ members *with faculty status* (with a minimum of five from doctoral programs and five from master's-degree-only programs), one of whom will be appointed as chair of the Council;
- b. deans (or their representatives) of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Communication, Education, Engineering and Technology, Fine Arts, Health and Human Services, and Osteopathic Medicine; and the Director of the Center for International Studies;
- c. four graduate students, including the President of the Graduate Student Senate (with a minimum of one student from a doctoral program and one from a master's-only program); ~~and~~
- d. the ~~Associate Provost for Graduate Studies~~ *Dean (or a representative) of the Graduate College* as a nonvoting member; and
- e. *the Dean (or a representative) of the Library as a nonvoting member*.

---

### Resolution to Censure President Roderick McDavis

**Tabled as amended (until September 21, 2009) on June 8, 2009**

Whereas the Ohio University *Faculty Handbook* is endorsed as official university policy by President Roderick McDavis and was defined for the Faculty Senate as a binding contract by University Counsel John Biancamano, and

Whereas the *Faculty Handbook* provides (section IIIA) that any changes to employee's costs for the health care benefit must be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval, and

Whereas recent changes to the health care plan - projected to increase employee costs by at least \$2,200,000 - were enacted without approval of the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas, unlike a similar increase in employee health care costs instituted for the 2007-2008 FY without approval of the Faculty Senate due to an oversight by the central administration and the Senate, the current instance occurred with full knowledge of the *Handbook* provisions and awareness that those provisions were being violated, and

Whereas the president has ignored the primary goal of improving the competitiveness of faculty salaries as stated in Vision Ohio, the University's recently approved strategic plan, and

Whereas a major academic reorganization has been planned without consultation with the faculty as a whole, the college faculty affected by the reorganization, the Faculty Senate, or any of its several committees, all of whom clearly have a vested interest in the organization of the academic structure of the university, and

Whereas these actions undermined shared governance at Ohio University, the faculty and their role in the academic enterprise, and collegiality between the central administration and the faculty;

**Be it resolved that the Ohio University Faculty Senate does hereby publicly censure President Roderick McDavis.**