

**Ohio University Faculty Senate
Agenda for Monday, February 22, 2010
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
Approved 3/15/2010**

Note: The meeting scheduled for 2/15/10 was postponed to 2/22/10 due to inclement weather.

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:10 p.m.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: T. Anderson, D. Bell, R. Boyd, K. Brown, C. Coski, C. Elster, J. Gilliom, S. Gradin, S. Hays, B. Heckman for J. Lein, D. Ingram, P. Jung, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, W. Roosenburg

College of Business: L. Hoshower

College of Education: T. Franklin, T. Leinbaugh

College of Engineering: C. Bartone, J. Dill, J. Giesey, H. Pasic

College of Fine Arts: D. McDiarmid, M. Phillips, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas

Group II: H. Burstein, M. Sisson

College of Health and Human Services: M. Li,

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

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: R. Knight, A. Rumble

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt

Regional Campus—Lancaster:

Regional Campus—Southern: E. McCown

Regional Campus—Zanesville: P. Kanwar, M. Nern

Scripps College of Communication: E. Graham for J. Bernt, G. Newton, J. Slade, S. Titsworth

Excused: C. Kalenkoski, T. Stock, A. Reilly, P. Munhall,

Absent: S. Patterson, A. Gupta for R. Frost, D. Bolon, J. Thomas

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit
- II. Jim Sand—Director, University Judiciaries
- III. Roll Call and Approval of the January 11, 2010 Minutes
- IV. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
 - Updates and Announcements
 - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: March 15, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
- V. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
 - Resolution to Establish Drop/Add and Withdrawal Deadlines Under Semesters—Second Reading & Vote
- VI. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano

- Resolution on Correcting Inconsistencies in the P&T Appeal Process—
Second Reading & Vote
 - VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth
 - VIII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
 - IX. New Business
 - X. Adjournment
-

I. Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit

EVPP Benoit began by introducing Mike Angelini (Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration). She announced the appointment of Dianne Bouvier as the new university Ombudsman, effective March 1st, and thanked the members of the search committee for their work. Benoit also congratulated Peter Jung on his Distinguished Professor award and lecture.

Benoit continued with an enrollment update: while applications and final admits are down slightly compared to last year (12,664 applications, 754 fewer than last year; 659 final admits compared to 731 last year), the ACT scores and GPA of the application pool has increased (from an average 23.49 ACT last year to 23.77; and from an average 3.29 GPA last year to a 3.32 GPA). The ACT scores of the final admits are also higher (24.13 at this time last year, 24.20 this year), while the average GPA of 3.42 remains the same. Graduate application are up 241 from last year, and final admits are up 48 from last year.

Benoit then discussed the draft budget recommendations released February 15. She emphasized that these recommendations were made public early in the process so that the entire campus could provide feedback. The draft recommendations were extremely difficult to construct. Priority was given to activities that support enrollment objectives, protect graduation/retention rates, generate student credit hours, preserve the quality of the student experience, and advance research and creative activity; these criteria are also reflected in the Resolution on Budget Priorities passed by Faculty Senate and signed by Benoit. The draft recommendations need further refinement, more data can be gathered, a better understanding of the consequences of cuts can be gained, and new ideas brought forward. The process is experimental and "messy," but the goal is to make the process as bottom-up, as transparent and open, as multi-year, and as strategic as possible. Benoit reminded the faculty senate of the upcoming budget forums:

Budget Forum for Faculty: Tuesday, February 23, 4:00 - 5:30 p.m., Bentley 227

Budget Forum for Staff (Classified & Administrative): Wednesday, February 24, 12:00 - 1:30 p.m., Walter 235

General Budget Forum: Thursday, February 25, 4:00 - 6:00 p.m., Bentley 236

Budget Forum for Students: Thursday, February 25, 6:30 - 7:30 p.m., Baker Center 503

Benoit then invited questions.

Ken Brown: From the beginning of the process, we have been told we cannot continue to do across-the-board budget cuts as in the past. But in actual fact what has happened are the same old uniform cuts. How did the decision get made to change the process and principles and to spread the pain around, and when was that decision made? It does not look like we have restructured the budget, or that there won't be anything we're doing now that we won't be doing next year.

Benoit: I would disagree. I think we have maintained the principles articulated at the beginning. We asked units for strategic cuts using the criteria we set up at the beginning of the process, and looked at every proposed cut to see how it aligned with those criteria, regardless of the unit involved. It is important to realize that we need to look at activities, not units, and see how activities contribute to the mission of the University. Across campus, some things look very different; units are merging, and we are thinking differently about how we manage campus recreation and the OU Press. It is not a matter of whether we have eliminated a unit, but whether we can change how a unit thinks about doing business with respect to the priorities within the unit.

Brown then asked whether it was correct to assume that things in the difficult column will come up as probable cuts next year? **Benoit** responded that they are possible rather than probable cuts, because some cuts were not included on the list this year because they take longer to implement (e.g. reorganizations). We have told the units that this is a multi-year process, and we need to plan for it now.

Alyssa Bernstein stated that she was pleased that the largest percentage cuts come from President and Provost offices, but noted that in Arts and Sciences, cuts are coming from teaching, particularly adjunct teaching. How do you reconcile the goal of increasing enrollment – bringing in more students at the same level of quality – while at the same time reducing the teaching lines of people who teach larger numbers of students? Large sections are usually introductory, and usually taught by adjuncts, and they're being let go. Upper level courses (taught by Group I faculty) have to be small. If the goal is to increase enrollment and maintain quality, we need more teaching lines, not fewer.

Benoit: The aim is not to increase enrollment across the board, but in targeted areas. We have to think about where we want to increase enrollments ("smart growth"). Also, as we reduce instructional capacity (which will have to happen because of the budget cuts), we have asked units to reduce capacity where it will have the least impact. Also, it is a fallacy to assume that quality is always related to class size. We need to think about where we can increase class size, and where we can't. We need to look at other models for teaching upper-level electives: can we alternate courses, or teach the courses in a different way? We are not at the point of laying off tenure-track faculty; we are trying to protect that which is core to us. In order to do that, we have to think about how to do things differently.

Duane McDiarmid commented that we are at the point of effectively cutting Group I faculty, because we are not filling empty Group I lines. Benoit offered to send some data about the number of group I faculty.

Charlotte Elster asked the EVPP to elaborate on the proposed cuts listed under Graduate College/Research.

Benoit: Maintaining research/creative activity is really important, and we tried to protect that as much as possible. **Rathindra Bose** (Vice President for Research/ Dean of the Graduate College) added that the 7% proposed cut is not really 7%, because some expenses were moved to other funds (e.g. endowment).

Willem Roosenburg pointed out that in the College of Arts & Sciences, when the 5% & 10% scenarios were submitted, the Provost's office chose to cut some items from the 10% scenarios in order to protect faculty lines; did that happen across the board?

Benoit: Arts & Sciences submitted their cuts by department, so it was hard for us to make strategic cuts across the College. So we went back to those criteria, and tried to protect instructional capacity in Arts & Sciences the most. Then we met with the Dean, and asked for more information about which cuts are more strategic, and adjustments will be made. You are seeing the messy part of the budget process, because we are not done yet.

John Gilliom asked whether pulling proposed reductions of the 10% list was unique to Arts & Sciences. **Benoit** responded that they did choose some items from the 10% scenarios in other units. If the 5% cuts did not align with the criteria, we looked at the 10% cuts to see if something was less strategic there.

David Ingram raised concerns about the way our business process has developed in the last 5-10 years. For example, P-cards, Concur, and Oracle were supposed to make life easier, but actually it's harder. This is a concern because it is an inefficient use of our time – we have more forms, and less efficiency.

Angelini: I arrived here a little under 2 years ago, and I have been amazed at how little we do get from Oracle. We're trying to figure out how to get more out of it and make things easier. I am not willing to throw in the towel on Concur, but it has been a problem. We would like to talk with people about where it went wrong, and how to improve it.

Teresa Franklin added that we always talk about getting new systems, but we never get a cost benefit analysis about whether these systems work. **Angelini** responded that we do very little of that, but we are starting to do some cost/benefit analysis with the endowment.

Several Senators expressed frustration with these systems, particularly the amount of faculty time necessary to work with the systems.

Joe Slade asked who is keeping track of the budget numbers during this process: is it internal or do we have a consultant? And are there any plans to realign Colleges?

Benoit: We are running the numbers internally, primarily John Day, Rebecca Vazquez-Skillings, and Mike Angelini. Part I of restructuring is under way; some additional restructuring may be coming, but there will need to be a separate process for any further restructuring.

Steve Hays began by thanking the Provost's office for the transparency of the budget process. He went on to criticize the term "smart enrollment," adding that departments are already pretty smart about this. By firing adjuncts (the people who teach the most for the least amount), we will unbalance enrollments. In a few years we will see bad consequences from cutting what is actually already smart enrollment. It is going to hurt financially.

Benoit: I want to clarify what I mean by smart enrollment. Which areas do we target for bringing in new students? We need to be careful, because we know we have

places where we can increase capacity, and places where we can't. We want to increase enrollments for a lower cost.

Promod Kanwar asked Benoit to talk about the status of the merged office of University Outreach and Regional Campuses, and about the recommendations contained in the Report of the Task Force of the Future of Regional Campuses, noting that it was difficult to tell if any actions have been taken.

Benoit: I just asked Dean Evans to highlight what he thought were the most important ideas to take out of that report, and we need to develop a set of action steps that we can implement to make some headway on these issues. In terms of University Outreach and Regional Campuses, we're looking at how to continue improving the merging of regional and outreach.

XI. Jim Sand—Director, University Judiciaries

Jim Sand gave a brief presentation on the University Hearing Boards and Appeal Boards. He asked faculty to help in three ways:

- 1) Serve on a Hearing Board or Appeal Board.
- 2) Share the information with colleagues who might be interested in serving.
- 3) Help recruit students to apply to serve on the boards (students must apply and interview).

Faculty are asked to commit to one hearing every two weeks, although they are often less frequent and there is some flexibility in scheduling. Willem Roosenburg added that serving on hearing boards was satisfying and interesting, and recommended participation. Faculty may contact Kelly M. Pero (593-2629, perok@ohio.edu). Students may pick up applications in the Office of Judiciaries beginning April 5, 2010, or may email judiciaries@ohio.edu.

XII. Roll Call and Approval of the January 11, 2010 Minutes

A quorum was present. The minutes of January 11th, 2010 were approved by voice vote.

XIII. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

- Updates and Announcements
 - McLaughlin asked senators to encourage participation in the upcoming Dean's evaluations in order to increase response rates.
 - Faculty senate nominations for next year will be requested soon; begin thinking about potential nominees. We would like to strive for more diversity in the Faculty Senate.

–McLaughlin also recognized Peter Jung as Distinguished Professor. Six of the last eight Distinguished Professors are people who have served on Faculty Senate recently.

–McLaughlin and Ming Li attended the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) meeting. We will start looking at specific COIA recommendations on best practices.

Joe Slade asked whether there was any way to get information from Colleges and Universities that have dropped out of division I, noting that other universities are making hard decisions, and it would be helpful to get feedback from colleges/universities that have gone through this. McLaughlin responded that very few MAC schools belong to COIA; we are hoping to take a division approach and get more MAC schools involved.

Steve Hays encouraged all those interested in these issues to attend **Budget Cuts Happen, II: What about Intercollegiate Athletics?** This is sponsored by FutureOU and the Graduate Student Senate, and will take place this **Friday (2/26), 3:30-5:30 in Baker Center Ballroom A**. Hays will present historic and comparative data on the cost of Intercollegiate Athletics at OU as the basis for discussion among faculty, students, and staff of ICA's appropriate future in view of ongoing budget constriction.

–McLaughlin also reminded faculty of the upcoming budget forums (see page 1 for dates/times).

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: March 15, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

XIV. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Jeff Giesey

- Resolution to Establish Drop/Add and Withdrawal Deadlines Under Semesters—Second Reading & Vote

Minor changes were made from the first reading to reflect the calendar change to a 14-week semester (with 55 minute classes), and to adjust summer terms. The resolution was passed by voice vote.

Scott Titsworth asked if there was any update on whether Graduate Council had passed a recommended for the minimum number of credit hours for full-time graduate status, noting that this will impact whether departments make their graduate classes 4 or 3 credits. **Giesey** said he has not heard back from Graduate Council yet; **Dean Bose** said that a resolution is coming forward in Graduate Council.

XV. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano

- Resolution on Correcting Inconsistencies in the P&T Appeal Process—Second Reading & Vote

Coschigano explained that while revising the appeal process in the case of denial of tenure last year, some parallel language was not incorporated in all sections of the Faculty Handbook. This resolution makes the process consistent in all areas. The resolution was passed by voice vote.

XVI. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth

- Titsworth reported that the committee brought in someone to discuss the potential public/private partnership for upgrading and maintaining dorms on South Green. One concern is that the increasing level of programming related to academics that takes place in the residence halls be maintained under a public/private partnership. The committee that is overseeing the public/private partnership will form a working committee to make sure that this is not lost. With \$480 million in deferred maintenance across Athens and regional campuses (and \$140 million of this in auxiliaries), a public/private partnership seems like the best of a bad situation. The primary benefit is to transfer responsibility for deferred maintenance.

- Howard Lipman (Vice President For University Advancement) met with the committee to talk about development, and the upcoming capital campaign (about \$350 million). About 67% of development money goes toward academics; 29% goes toward scholarships; and the remaining 4% goes to athletics, capital, and unrestricted funds. Development has a consistent record of over-attaining their goals. The committee thought this was a very helpful presentation, and Titsworth will make a PowerPoint with the numbers available.

Senators expressed some concerns about the proposed public/private partnership, especially with respect to controlling dorm prices, and ceding revenue (auxiliaries is one of the few university units that operates with a profit). **Alyssa Bernstein** asked if private businesses can get loans to renovate on the promise of future revenue from the dorms, why couldn't OU do the same thing?

McLaughlin responded: 1) While our loan amount is not high compared to other institutions, we have no cash in the bank, which makes it difficult to add more loans. 2) We have almost \$500 million in deferred maintenance, much of which is in the dorms. Titsworth added that some sources of revenue for deferred maintenance, such as the capital bill, are uncertain because of the state budget.

XVII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

Gradin reported on three items:

- 1) Voinovich School: The committee is trying to sort out how the Voinovich School operates, especially with respect to Faculty Senate representation, professional ethics committees, and in conjunction with the P&T committee, issues related to promotion and tenure.

- 2) Faculty Fellowship Leaves: There is frustration in Arts & Sciences because not all University faculty fellowship leaves were used last year (39 were awarded out of 55 available), even though Arts and Sciences had some leaves turned down by the

Provost's Office, creating a backlog. The committee is researching how faculty fellowship leaves are used across Colleges, why they are not being used, and so on, before presenting any resolutions.

McLaughlin pointed out that the Appendix A to the Faculty Handbook says that 5-6% of the faculty can be on leave at a time. We're trying to figure out if that quota still makes sense in 2010. A senator pointed out that if faculty members can go on leave every eighth year, 12.5% of the faculty should be on leave at any given time. Another faculty member asked what will happen this year in Arts & Sciences, and McLaughlin said that the Executive Committee has put this on the table with the Provost. One way to address this in the short term is to change how we count faculty leaves, and to apply the quota per quarter of leave rather than per person. Another senator noted that his department has a backlog as well, and that this does not just apply to Arts & Sciences.

3) The committee will be investigating the criminal background check policy and report back to Faculty Senate. They have just accessed the most recent draft of the policy. The background checks are across the board (not just for faculty); we need to determine what type of information is included (e.g. if it includes convictions only, or also arrests).

XVIII. New Business
None.

XIX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

**A Resolution to Establish Drop/Add and Withdrawal Deadlines Under Semesters
Ohio University Faculty Senate
Educational Policy & Student Affairs
Approved February 22, 2010**

Whereas Ohio University will convert to a semester calendar in the Fall of 2012;

And Whereas a complete academic calendar contains deadlines for students to add or drop classes;

And Whereas the present calendar establishes deadlines to add a class without the instructor's permission at 8 calendar days from the beginning of the quarter, adding a class with the instructor's permission at 15 calendar days into the quarter, and withdrawing from a class at 35 calendar days from the beginning of the quarter or 17 calendar days into a 5-week summer session term;

Be it Resolved, that the current deadline to add a class without the instructor's permission be Friday of the first week of the term, and that the deadline to add a class with the instructor's permission be Friday of the second week of the term;

And Be it Further Resolved, that the deadline for a student to withdraw from a class be established at Friday of the seventh week of the 14-week semester, and the closest Friday to the middle of the term for summer terms. The exact times of all these deadlines will be established by the Registrar's office. These changes will take effect with the beginning of the semester calendar, Fall 2012.

**Resolution on Correcting Inconsistencies in the Promotion and Tenure Appeal
Process
Ohio University Faculty Senate
Promotion and Tenure Committee
Approved February 22, 2010**

Whereas a resolution to Clarify the Grievance Procedures for Non-reappointment and for Denial of Promotion and/or Tenure was passed by faculty senate on 5/11/09 and signed by the Provost on 7/29/09; and

Whereas it became apparent that inconsistencies were created as this resolution was revised;

Be it resolved that, to remove these inconsistencies, the following text replace the current text in the faculty handbook section II.F.2:

b. Denial at the Dean level

If the department/school voted in favor of granting promotion and/or tenure but the dean denies the case, then the faculty member must direct the appeal to the dean. If the dean denies the appeal the faculty member may appeal to the Provost. If the Provost supports the appeal the case will be forwarded to the President for consideration. If the Provost denies the appeal, the faculty member may appeal to the Standing Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate. If the Standing Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate supports the appeal, the case will be returned to the dean for reconsideration. If the dean again denies the appeal the case may proceed to the formal hearing at the request of the faculty member (see Section II.F.7).

c. Denial at the Provost level

If the department/school and dean were in favor of granting promotion and/or tenure but the Provost denies the case, then the faculty member must direct the appeal to the Provost. If the Provost denies the appeal, the faculty member may appeal to the Standing Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate. If the Standing Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate supports the appeal, the case will be returned to the Provost for reconsideration. If the Provost again denies the appeal the case may proceed to the formal hearing at the request of the faculty member (see Section II.F.7).