

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, May 17, 2010
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
Minutes, approved 9/20/10

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:11 p.m.

In attendance:

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

College of Business: B. Roach for L. Hoshower, T. Stock

College of Education and Human Services: T. Franklin, T. Leinbaugh

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

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

Group II: H. Burstein, M. Sisson

College of Health and Human Services: D. Bolon, 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: P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Southern: E. McCown

Regional Campus—Zanesville: J. Benson, M. Nern

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

Excused: C. Elster, S. Hays, C. Kalenkoski

Absent: A. Gupta for R. Frost, J. Thomas

Newly Elected Senators in Attendance:

Arts and Sciences: E. Amarell, K. Hicks, L. Rice, S. Wyatt

Business: T. Stock

Education and Human Services: A. Paulins

Engineering: H. Pasic

Fine Arts: D. McDiarmid, A. Reilly

Group II:

Health and Human Services: D. Bolon

Osteopathic Medicine: A. Huzoor

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: N. Kiersey

Regional Campus—Eastern:

Regional Campus—Lancaster:

Regional Campus—Southern:

Regional Campus—Zanesville:

Scripps College of Communication: B. Debatin, J. Lee

Newly Elected Senators Excused: B. Quitsland

Newly Elected Senators Absent: B. Branham

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. EVP&P Pam Benoit
 - II. Roll Call and Approval of the April 19, 2010 Minutes
 - III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Introduction of New Senators
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: June 7, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235
 - IV. Election of Faculty Senate Officers for 2010-2011
 - V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
 - Resolution on Appropriate Creation of Academic Units—First Reading
 - Resolution to Update Handbook on Professional Ethics Committees—First Reading
 - VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
 - Resolution to Approve Credit Hours for Minors and Certificates Under Semesters—Second Reading & Vote
 - Resolution to Change Full-Time Status for Undergraduate Students—First Reading
 - Resolution on Academic Probation for Undergraduate Students—First Reading
 - VII. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano
 - Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Addressing Interdisciplinary Activities for Faculty with a Singular Home Department/School—Second Reading & Vote
 - Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines—First Reading
 - VIII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth
 - Resolution on Shared Governance in Intercollegiate Athletics—Second Reading & Vote
 - Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Sustainability of Intercollegiate Athletics—Second Reading & Vote
 - Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletic Funding Sustainability—First Reading
 - IX. New Business
 - X. Adjournment
-

I. Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit

EVPP Benoit briefly addressed three issues: 1) current enrollment statistics; 2) the multi-year planning document disseminated Friday; and 3) the process for determining whether the additional \$750,000 merit raise pool will be funded.

1) Current enrollment figures are given below, with the change from this time last year indicated in parentheses.

	Apps	Admits	Final Admits	Average ACT	Average GPA
Undergraduate	13,263 (-812)	11,181 (-211)	3,724 (-129)	24.11 (+.18)	3.36 (+.02)
Masters	2900 (+24)	1007 (-2)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Doctoral	512 (+29)	116 (+4)	n/a	n/a	n/a

2) Benoit asked faculty members to read the multi-year planning document available at the multi-year planning web site. She emphasized that this process is not about re-doing VisionOhio, but

was meant to collect and analyze information about: a) current University activities and how those activities are funded and staffed; b) projected assumptions concerning key expenditures and revenues for the next 3-5 years; and c) environmental challenges that the University will face in the next decade. Benoit also said that the work done this summer when faculty are not on campus would be primarily research, which faculty typically would not be involved in, and that it was important to get this preliminary research done as soon as possible so that the multi-year planning process could begin. Benoit announced the members of University Environmental Scan Team: Pam Benoit (Chair), Terry Conry (Associate VP, Finance and Administration), Ralph DiCaprio (Professor & Chair, Biological Sciences), Rich Greenlee (Dean, Eastern Campus), Christine Knisley (Executive Director, Research and Grants, Osteopathic Medicine), Randy Leite (Interim Dean, College of Health Sciences and Professions), Joe McLaughlin (Chair, Faculty Senate and Associate Professor, English), Kent Smith, (VP, Student Affairs), Scott Titsworth (Associate Professor and Chair, Communication Studies), and David Descutner (*Ex Officio*, Interim Executive Vice Provost).

3) Benoit asked John Day to address the possible \$750,000 merit pool. Even if undergraduate enrollments are down this year, the pool may still be funded because revenue from tuition and fees depends on more than simply the number of students enrolled. Day walked through the tuition model and budget, including expected undergraduate tuition and non-resident fees, as well as deductions for OPIE, education abroad, and expected declines in revenue over the year. Deductions are calculated at the end of each quarter, but a rough estimate of the amount available for the raise pool will be available by September. Day will return in September with these estimated numbers.

Day then addressed the data brought forward by Steve Hays/FutureOU a few months ago that showed a decline in A&S expenditures over the past several years. Day argued that budgeted rather than actual expenditures should be used; budgeted expenditures show slight increases each year. Day argued that the reason Hays/FutureOU's data showed declines was a result of volatility in income from grants, outside research dollars, etc. that are not included in base budgets. Faculty Senate will continue to look at this data.

Benoit then took questions. **Ken Hicks** asked Benoit to clarify several aspects of the newly announced tightening of the hiring freeze: positions submitted before May 14th are exempt from the new tightening of the freeze; Group I faculty will not be hired except under very limited circumstances (e.g. to maintain program accreditation); and staff who leave should be replaced by temporary employees. **Bernhard Debatin** noted that a Group I hiring freeze could cause the percentage of Group I faculty to continue to decline, and that Group I faculty lines could be permanently replaced with non-tenure-track faculty. Benoit said this was not the intent. **Ken Brown** asked whether there was a target percentage for the number of credit hours taught by Group I faculty; Benoit responded she did not have a target. **John Benson** asked whether there would be new policies regarding base teaching loads, and if so, when those would be approved. Benoit responded that workload policies are working their ways through the colleges (and in some cases, through departments). **James Casebolt** noted that the regional campuses are waiting for decisions to be made on the Athens campus; Benoit responded that discussions are ongoing.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the April 19, 2010 Minutes

A quorum was present. The minutes of the April 19th, 2010 meeting were approved by voice vote.

III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

- McLaughlin welcomed and introduced new Senators.

- Nominations for standing committees have been sent out. Please urge your colleagues to participate and self-nominate.

- **Sense of the Senate Resolution to Commend Student Reporters**

McLaughlin introduced this resolution in recognition of the outstanding Faculty Senate coverage by student reporters Emily Grannis of *The Post* and Chelsea Toy of *The Athens News*. A motion to suspend the rules and move directly to second reading and vote was approved by voice vote. A motion to approve the resolution passed unanimously by voice vote.

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

IV. Election of Faculty Senate Officers for 2010-2011

The nominating committee consisted of Pete Coschigano, Tracy Leinbaugh, and Timothy Anderson. Coschigano reminded the Senate that the current officers were willing to stand for re-election, and announced that no other nominations were received. He then asked for nominations from the floor. None were made. A motion to dispense with the nominating speeches and to vote by acclamation was approved by voice vote. The current officers were re-elected: Joe McLaughlin, Chair; David Thomas, Vice Chair; Elizabeth Saysr, Secretary.

V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

Gradin announced that the second reading of the "Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School" has been postponed; the resolution might require amending the Faculty Senate's constitution, and further research is required on procedure.

- **Resolution on Appropriate Creation of Academic Units—First Reading**

The resolution asks for faculty participation when creating independent academic units (such as centers and institutes) that have an independent curriculum, or grant degrees and certificates, or retain faculty.

Senators discussed whether or not this should apply to research institutes. Gradin argued that even with research centers, there could be instances where faculty rights, responsibilities, and roles are involved. Other faculty suggested that Faculty Handbook language should be created to address this issue; that the resolution should be cross-referenced with the relevant policies and procedures related to the creation of centers and institutes; and that the resolution should account not just for the creation of new units, but also for the possibility of a center or institute transforming into an independent unit. Gradin emphasized that it is critical that faculty be protected by the faculty handbook, regardless of whether their appointment resides in a traditional department, or in a center or institute.

- **Resolution to Update Handbook on Professional Ethics Committees—First Reading**

Gradin noted that the current Faculty Handbook does not cover faculty in the Voinovich School with respect to professional ethics. This resolution keeps intact the existing Faculty Handbook language related to professional ethics, but adds the Voinovich School.

Senators noted that every time an academic unit similar to Voinovich is created, Faculty Senate would have to change the Faculty Handbook again; Gradin responded that this was intentional, and that revisiting this issue regularly would help construct an institutional memory as well as a paper trail of these changes.

VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly

Reilly announced that the "Resolution on Retakeable Courses" has been tabled for a month while discussions continue.

• Resolution Approve Credit Hours for Minors and Certificates Under Semesters—Second Reading & Vote

A friendly amendment to change the minimum credits for minors and undergraduate certificates from 16 to 15 was accepted. Reilly also clarified that departments could set their own minimums for minors and certificates. A motion to approve the resolution passed by voice vote.

• Resolution to Change Full-Time Status for Undergraduate Students—First Reading

The federal government defines full-time status for undergraduates as 12 hours; OU currently defines full-time status as 11 hours. This resolution brings OU in line with the federal government. In this resolution, the term "credit hours" refers to either quarter or semester hours. Senators clarified that this change will have negligible or no budget impact.

A motion to suspend the rules and move directly to second reading and vote was approved by voice vote. In order to clarify the effective date of the resolution, a motion to table the resolution until June 7, 2010 was passed by voice vote.

• Resolution on Academic Probation for Undergraduate Students—First Reading

Reilly explained that PeopleSoft cannot accommodate our current academic probation policy (deficiency points). In consultation with the Assistant Deans, a policy based on Auburn's probation policy has been proposed. Data analysis by Bob DeLong suggests that results of the proposed plan would be similar to our current probation policy. Reilly noted that the impact on part-time students would be more severe with the proposed policy.

Senators raised concerns that the proposed policy might allow for indefinite probation, while our current policy does not. Senators asked for more data, and for an outline of how the policy will function under semesters. EPSA will continue to develop this.

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

• Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Addressing Interdisciplinary Activities for Faculty with a Singular Home Department/School—Second Reading & Vote

The Interdisciplinary Council drafted this resolution by adapting part of a resolution passed last year by Faculty Senate but not signed by the Provost. Surveys of certificate and interdisciplinary programs four years ago found that one of the major problems was how interdisciplinary activities were recognized and valued in the P&T process. This resolution introduces handbook language that asks departments/schools to ensure that their P&T guidelines address how and to what extent interdisciplinary activities will be evaluated and included in annual faculty evaluations, and in P&T decisions. This resolution specifically excludes those who have joint appointments. Jerry Miller of the Interdisciplinary Council was also available for questions.

Senators raised concerns about how interdisciplinary work is defined. Faculty emphasized the need for all the work that a faculty member does for the university to be classified and evaluated as teaching, research, or service. Miller clarified that it is still up to the school or department to decide how interdisciplinary work is counted toward P & T; this resolution simply requires that this be made explicit to the candidate, and puts the burden on departments to clarify their guidelines. There was enough discussion about the specific language of the resolution, particularly how strong the language should be,

that a motion to table the resolution until June 7, 2010 was passed by voice vote. Senators were asked to send their recommendations to Jerry Miller.

• Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines—First Reading

Coschigano explained that this resolution is also based on the resolution that was passed last year by Faculty Senate but not signed by the Provost. This resolution addresses many of same concerns, but in more general terms in order to reflect the diversity of different units across the university. The resolution proposes that: 1) Faculty should know what the expectations are for P&T; 2) Annual progress toward tenure letters should be clear and cumulative; some departments may wish to do a mid-term review as well; 3) Criteria for P&T should be revisited every five years, and grace periods are established for changes to P&T criteria (this language is currently in an appendix to the Faculty Handbook, but will be moved to the body of the Faculty Handbook); and 4) Faculty hired with credit toward tenure should be given credit for prior accomplishments.

Senate discussion focused mainly on clarifying language. Senators were asked to send suggestions to Coschigano.

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

• Resolution on Shared Governance in Intercollegiate Athletics—Second Reading & Vote

This resolution is based on a draft resolution template from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), the UC Berkeley Faculty Senate, and The Drake Group. The template has been adapted for OU to work within the existing Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC), which is a standing committee.

Changes from the first reading include the following: the elimination of a section on the charge of the committee, and inclusion of that content in other areas; that the committee report concerns about travel and practice schedules, and concerns about the budget, to the President, rather than directly approve these items; and the addition of one more faculty member to the committee (rather than shifting an existing committee slot from classified senate to faculty).

In addition to clarifying some language, a friendly amendment that concerns about the budget be reported to the EVPP and VP for Finance and Administration as well as to the President was accepted. A proposal to add additional faculty members to the committee was not accepted as friendly. A motion to approve the resolution as amended passed by voice vote.

• Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Sustainability of Intercollegiate Athletics—Second Reading & Vote

After minimal discussion, a motion to approve the resolution passed by voice vote.

• Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletic Funding Sustainability—First Reading

Titsworth explained that approximately \$90.6 million goes toward supporting ICA across Ohio. The disparity between mid-size conferences and big programs will only be exacerbated as large conferences realign. This resolution asks that the President direct the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee to examine and prepare a report on the sustainability of Division 1/FBS intercollegiate athletics at Ohio University; that the President begin discussions on the sustainability of intercollegiate

athletics with Chancellor Fingerhut, officials of the Mid-American Conference and other FBS schools in the state; and that the President or an appointed representative provide a report to faculty senate detailing progress on these initiatives during the 2010-2011 academic year. Senators were asked to send suggestions to Titsworth.

IX. New Business

None.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20.

**Sense of the Senate Resolution to Commend Student Reporters
Executive Committee
Approved Unanimously May 17, 2010**

Whereas an engaged Press, in its role as a provider of thorough and accurate information about issues, activities, and viewpoints, is essential to shared governance; and

Whereas the Faculty Senate and the Ohio University community have benefitted greatly during the past three academic years from the unprecedented quantity and quality of coverage by two campus reporters, Emily Grannis of *The Post* and Chelsea Toy of *The Athens News*;

Be it resolved that the Ohio University Faculty Senate expresses its gratitude and best wishes to graduating seniors Emily Grannis and Chelsea Toy for their journalistic excellence in the coverage of the Senate and the University.

**Resolution on Appropriate Creation of Academic Units
Professional Relations Committee
May 17, 2010
First Reading**

Whereas, the Faculty Senate does not oppose alternative or interdisciplinary academic structures, but does believe the Voinovich School was established as a college-like planning unit without appropriate feedback and policy review by faculty;

Whereas, the administration sought and received the Board of Trustees approval (April 2010) to establish the Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership and the Violet L. Patton Center for Arts Education;

Whereas, faculty should be aware of the plans to create academic units;

Whereas, it is especially critical for faculty to know about and help construct any academic unit that has the potential for an independent curriculum, or granting degrees and certificates, or for retaining faculty;

Whereas, Faculty Senate and the University Curriculum Council are central in curricular decision making, program review, and procedures that govern faculty roles, responsibilities, and rights (see, for instance, *Faculty Handbook*, Section VI. Article 3.1 and VII. B);

Be it resolved that

In the event that other such initiatives are created, faculty should be involved and consulted. The form of such initiations should be officially sanctioned by the faculty. Creation of centers, institutes, and college-like units not housed in an existing college should be reviewed by UCC and policies and procedures such as promotion and tenure, ethics committees, and senate representation should be codified and approved by the faculty senate prior to the creation and operation of such units.

Resolution to Update Handbook on Professional Ethics Committees
Professional Relations Committee
May 17, 2010
First Reading

Whereas, the Faculty Senate and the Provost of Ohio University have adopted a statement on Professional Ethics. (See Section I.A of the *Faculty Handbook* .) In Sections IV.L.2 and IV.L.3 procedures for the investigation and resolution of alleged violations of Professional Ethics are specified. Section IV.L.2 applies to alleged violations of Professional Ethics not involving professional research misconduct, while section IV.L.3 applies to alleged Fraud and Misconduct in Professional Research (See Policy No. 19.048 in the Policy and Procedures Manual). Procedures for Loss of Tenure are in Section II.D.5 of the *Faculty Handbook*;

Whereas, the Voinovich School functions like a college and has faculty who must be protected by the *Faculty Handbook*;

Be it resolved that the *Faculty Handbook* be revised as follows (changes in bold and italics):

2. Violations of Professional Ethics not Involving Research Misconduct

a. **College Professional Ethics Committee**^[1]

Each college, Regional Campus, and *the Voinovich School* will have a standing Professional Ethics Committee consisting of six faculty members in the college, regional campus, *and the Voinovich School* unless it is necessary to supplement the Committee by faculty from other colleges or regional campuses. At least four of the six faculty must be tenured Group I faculty. The other two may be selected from among the untenured Group I or the Group II faculty. Three of the six members of the College Professional Ethics Committee are selected by the faculty senators from that college or regional campus while the remaining three are

appointed by the Dean of the College, Regional Campus, *and the Voinovich School (the Director is the Dean's equivalent in the case of the Voinovich School)*^[2]. The Chair of the Committee will be appointed by the Dean from among the Group I faculty on the Committee. The term length for members on the College Professional Ethics Committee will be three years and service is restricted to two successive terms. Initial appointments will be staggered so that each year the senators from the college or regional campus and the Dean will each need to select a new Committee member. The College Professional Ethics Committee will be provided access to appropriate university resources to assist it in carrying out its investigations.

b. **Departmental and College Procedures**

Cases of apparent violations of professional ethics not involving Research Misconduct should be brought to the attention of the department Chair^[3]. . . .

[1] For those committees whose representatives are chosen by the faculty senators, the chair of faculty senate will appoint one senator from each college who is responsible for reporting the nominations in writing to the chair of faculty senate. This senator should also contact the nominees to determine their willingness to serve on the committee prior to submitting the names to the chair of faculty senate. Nominations will be sought at a meeting of the senators from each college immediately after the September senate meeting.

[2] Director is equivalent to Dean in the case of the Voinovich School.

[3] Department Chair is equivalent to School Director or Division Coordinator at the Regional Campuses and to the Associate Director in the Voinovich School.

**Resolution to Approve Credit Hours for Minors and Certificates Under Semesters
Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee
Approved May 17, 2010**

Whereas, undergraduate minors under the quarter system are fixed at a minimum of 24 and a maximum of 35 credit hours, and

Whereas undergraduate certificates under the quarter system are fixed at minimum of 24 credit hours with no maximum, and

Whereas graduate certificates under quarters are fixed at a minimum of 20 credit hours and a maximum of 30,

Be It Resolved, that minors and certificates be fixed at the following levels of semester credit hours beginning with the University conversion to semesters in the Fall of 2012:

	Minimum	Maximum
Minors	15	24
Undergraduate Certificates	15	none
Graduate Certificates	14	20

Resolution to Change Full-time Status for Undergraduate Students
Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee
May 17, 2010
Tabled to June 7, 2010

Whereas, full-time status for undergraduates at Ohio University is fixed at 11 hours, and

Whereas, for scholarship purposes full-time status is defined as 12 hours because of federal regulations,

Be It Resolved, that beginning Summer 2011 full-time status for undergraduates at Ohio University be defined as enrollment at a minimum of 12 credit hours.

Resolution on Academic Probation Policy for Undergraduate Students
Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee
May 17, 2010
For First Reading

Resolution on Academic Probation Policy for Undergraduate Students

Preamble: Ohio University's current probation policy permits a student to remain enrolled provided his/her accumulative GPA remains at least a 2.0. Once a student's accumulative GPA drops below 2.0, the student is placed on probation and a student may remain on probation for up to four consecutive terms provided his/her deficiency points do not increase. A student may be dropped for increasing deficiency points or not removing all deficiency points within the designated time period. In addition, part-time students are not reviewed for probation until exceeding 10 hours of enrollment.

Whereas many people do not understand deficiency points or how to calculate them;

Whereas the current probation policy permits students to remain on probation without making academic progress or making very little academic progress;

Whereas PeopleSoft cannot be safely or expeditiously modified to calculate deficiency points:

Be It Resolved that effective Summer Quarter 2010-11 the probation policy be changed as follows:

At the close of the academic term, the academic record of each enrolled undergraduate student will be reviewed to verify the accumulative GPA.

If at the time of the review the student does not have the required 2.0 minimum accumulative GPA, the student will be placed on academic probation. Once a student is placed on probation, he/she is removed if his/her accumulative GPA reaches or exceeds 2.0.

If he/she is not removed from probation, he/she is either continued on probation or dropped. This student is continued on probation if either: 1) his/her term GPA is at least 2.0; or 2) his/her accumulative GPA is equal to or greater than the minimum GPA defined for his/her total hours earned:

Total Hours Earned	Minimum Accumulative GPA to be Continued on Probation
0 – 44.99	1.6
45.00 – 89.99	1.8
90.00 – 134.99	1.9
135+	1.97

If a student who is on probation fails both of the criteria described above, he/she will be academically dismissed.

Notes:

- * Part-time students are no longer excluded from being reviewed each term.
- * Reinstatement policy is not being changed.
- * The deans continue to require a 24-hour review period after the automatic assignment of probation status and before the student is notified of his/her probation status.

**Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Addressing Interdisciplinary Activities for
Faculty with a Singular Home Department/School**

Interdisciplinary Council – 2009-2010

May 17, 2010

Tabled until June 7, 2010

Introductory Notes:

- It is recognized that this proposal, intended to support faculty interests during annual review and promotion & tenure processes, may generate other questions dealing with organizational structure and funding.
- The members of the Interdisciplinary Council, a Standing Committee of Ohio University, argue that addressing P & T guidelines for faculty with a singular home department/school is a first step in improving the organization structure on which ID programs/faculty rely.
- Questions and challenges related to the organizational structure/policy of dual/shared faculty appointments are not addressed in this proposal.
- It is not the intent of this proposal to require interdisciplinary endeavors of faculty, but to ensure that when faculty engage in interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service that their efforts are recognized and included in annual review and P & T decisions.

Whereas

We must perfect organizational structures at Ohio University to support interdisciplinary endeavors. Interdisciplinarity emerges from and relies on the foundational strengths of our individual disciplines which, in turn, enable faculty and students to explore the most pressing questions of today. Through an organized effort to identify, support and reward such endeavors, including interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service, Ohio University will be better positioned to provide academic experiences for our students, attract and retain nationally recognized faculty, and become more competitive in securing external funding.

Whereas

Since Ohio University has not established university or college-wide policies for faculty in dual or shared appointments, it is necessary in the meantime to clarify responsibilities of faculty who have home departments but assume responsibilities in interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service.

Whereas

Reports from faculty and constituent groups “call for a better integration of research and creative activity into undergraduate and graduate academic priorities and noted that special consideration should be given to interdisciplinary efforts. . .”

(http://www.ohio.edu/vision/upload/VisionOhioFinal_11072006_web.pdf, page 13).

Whereas

Vision Ohio challenges the Ohio University community to explore methods of “how to foster more interdisciplinary partnerships in teaching, scholarship and creative activity”

(http://www.ohio.edu/vision/upload/VisionOhioFinal_11072006_web.pdf, page 13).

Whereas

The formal and informal arrangements through which interdisciplinary work is currently accomplished vary widely and appropriately across the university. Examples include formal dual or joint appointments, recognized interdisciplinary responsibility in a department or program not in the home department, and emerging or relatively short-term research interests or teaching interests. All exist and present different challenges in evaluation within the P&T process. One policy cannot address all of those situations. First attention should be given to those faculty with recognized and expected interdisciplinary responsibility across department or program lines.

Whereas

Department/School, program directors and faculty should negotiate P & T guidelines to clearly establish procedures for departmental committees and administrators, as well as for candidates. Transparent and efficient guidelines are strongly in the best interests of the university as a whole.

Be it resolved that

the following be added to the Ohio University Faculty Handbook as II.E.2 of *Procedures for Tenure and Advancement in Rank and Recommendations for Salary Increase* and all subsequent numbers be increased accordingly.

2. To ensure proper recognition of faculty with a singular home Department/School who engage in interdisciplinary activities the home Department/School P & T Committee should ensure that the Department/School P & T guidelines explicitly clarify how and to what extent interdisciplinary activities (teaching, research/creative activities and/or service) will be assigned, evaluated and included in annual faculty evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions.

Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Promotion & Tenure Committee

May 17, 2010

First Reading

Whereas

Recent cases heard by the Faculty Senate P&T Committee suggest that the P&T process sometimes does not function as well as it could. These problems are often issues of process including following procedures, applying appropriate criteria, or providing clear guidance to candidates. Department/School P & T guidelines are sometimes vague, incomplete, or inconsistent with College guidelines. And

Whereas

It is desirable for Department/School P & T guidelines to clearly establish procedures for departmental committees and administrators, as well as for candidates. Transparent and efficient guidelines are strongly in the best interests of the university as a whole.

Be it resolved that

The following language should be added to the faculty handbook in Section II.E.8 of *Procedures for Tenure and Advancement in Rank and Recommendations for Salary Increase* and all subsequent numbers be increased accordingly.

8. Transparency, clarity, consistency, timeliness, and fairness should be overriding goals for all colleges, school, and departments as they establish guidelines and procedures governing tenure and promotion. The following broad guidelines are offered to aid in achieving these goals.
 - a. Faculty should know in advance, ideally at the time of hire, the criteria that will be used to arrive at a tenure decision. This includes matters of workload and balance between teaching, service, and professional activities; significant changes to this balance should be a matter for discussion and negotiation with the faculty member.
 - b. Ideally, the annual “performance and progress toward tenure letter” probationary faculty receive (see section II.D.1.c) should include information on cumulative progress towards tenure. In addition, departments/schools may choose to do a mid-way formal evaluation which affords the candidate clear, transparent, and formative feedback in terms of teaching, service and professional activities, and which is representative of all faculty who will eventually decide tenure.
 - c. The departmental/school criteria for promotion and tenure should be reviewed periodically (at least every five years). Changes in the criteria for tenure may be applied to those faculty members who are already in the tenure track only if the individual agrees in writing to be considered under the new criteria.

For changes in the criteria for promotion of a faculty member with tenure, a grace period of at least three academic years from the start of the academic year in which the changes are implemented should be allowed. During the grace period, faculty members who are already on Group I contract in the department may opt in writing to be considered under the old or new criteria. Newly hired faculty members and those who are promoted during the grace period would immediately come under the new promotion criteria. Procedural changes in departmental tenure and promotion policy may generally be implemented without delay, if so decided by the department faculty. Departments are encouraged to provide faculty mentors for all probationary faculty (see section II.C.6.d).

- d. Faculty who are hired with years of credit towards tenure should also be credited for professional accomplishments prior to their hiring.

Be it further resolved that

Section II.C.6.d be edited as follows to ensure consistency with the above changes:

The criteria used to make decisions on promotion and tenure must originate in the department, school, or division in consultation with the dean. Faculty should review these criteria periodically (at least every five years) in consultation with the dean of the college or regional campus. These criteria and any changes made to them must be approved by a majority of the Group I faculty of the department/school/division. In the event of an impasse between the department/school/division and the dean, the standing Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate shall act as arbiter.

Be it further resolved that

The last paragraph of Appendix A, Point F be removed as it duplicates above language.

**A Resolution¹ on Shared Governance
in Intercollegiate Athletics
Finance & Facilities Committee
Approved May 17, 2010**

Whereas, in response to concerns raised as part of public discussions over proposed budget priorities, Ohio University administration has indicated a commitment to maintaining a Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) intercollegiate athletics program;² and,

Whereas, financial and other systemic challenges facing intercollegiate athletics across the country will require collaborative and creative actions to protect institutions from skyrocketing subsidy of these programs;³ and,

Whereas, maintaining the academic integrity of the student-athlete experience is the responsibility of faculty, coaches, and administration; and,

Whereas, Ohio University has a standing committee, called the “Intercollegiate Athletics Committee,” (IAC) charged with assisting the President, Provost, Director of Athletics, and the NCAA Faculty Athletics representatives in the interpretation and implementation of athletic policies; therefore,

Be it resolved by the Ohio University Faculty Senate that Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) should have meaningful oversight from and collaboration with faculty from across the university.⁴

¹ This resolution is adapted, in part, from a “model resolution” issued jointly by the UC Berkeley Faculty Senate, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), and The Drake Group. Ohio University Faculty Senate is a member of COIA.

² The document titled, “Academic Support Units,” linked off of the Provost’s website states that the university will maintain Division 1-A status to maintain potential for revenue generation by ICA and to maintain competitive advantage against Miami, Cincinnati, Ohio State, Akron, Bowling Green and Kent (all are D 1-A schools). See www.ohiou.edu/provost/Budget-Process.cfm

³ See “Sports Subsidies Soar” article in *Inside Higher Education*, January 19, 2010. Data reported in that article showed that Ohio University’s Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, when compared to other FBS universities, receives the 4th highest subsidy (approximately 75.02% of the ICA budget) from the University Operating Budget. In the top 21 programs for subsidy of Intercollegiate Athletics, 10 of those were Mid American Conference Schools.

⁴ The “Academic Support Units” document advances several arguments supporting the contention that Intercollegiate Athletics and Academics are strongly connected. Those arguments include: (1) Intercollegiate athletics “enriches the university experience...for all students in that it gives another framework for understanding excellence and witnessing the

Be it further resolved that the following changes be made to the composition and mission of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee:

Section 1: Specific Objectives for Academics. As the committee carries out its mission, the Faculty recommends the following:

1. In order to maintain academics as the top priority for all students, those students who also participate in intercollegiate athletics will maintain a G.P.A. of 2.0⁵ to be approved for participation.
2. The Director of Athletics, working in conjunction with the IAC, will present a yearly report to Faculty Senate on the activities of student-athletes. The report should also describe efforts undertaken to promote the physical, academic, and personal welfare of student-athletes.
3. The Committee will review practice and travel schedules for all sports and report any concerns to the President and/or athletic department officials.
4. Advising and academic support for student athletes will be integrated with other academic support services receiving oversight from the Provost's office.

Section 2: Specific Objectives for Finances. Given the financial complexity of ICA, the Faculty recommends:

1. The IAC will review the yearly budget for the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and refer any concerns to the President, Executive Vice President and Provost, and Vice President of Finance and Administration.
2. The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics shall present a balanced budget each year, detailing all anticipated revenue and all proposed expenditures.
3. If the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics runs a deficit at the end of a fiscal year, steps taken to cover the deficit should be approved by the President and reported to the campus community and Board of Trustees.
4. The Athletic Budget will be integrated with the Academic Budget and will follow the same processes and procedures as academic units.
5. A yearly report will be sent to Student Senate and Graduate Student Senate explaining the approximate dollar amount that each student pays in fees that are used to support Intercollegiate Athletics.

Section 3: Composition. Current composition of the IAC is 14 voting and 2 nonvoting members.⁶ To better reflect the connection between ICA and academics, the following steps will be undertaken:

1. The chairperson of the committee shall be appointed by the President and shall be selected from a list of faculty recommended by the Committee on Committees and selected by the President.
2. There is currently no process describing selection of the two NCAA faculty representatives. During the 2010-2011 academic year the IAC shall recommend to the President a process

lessons of teamwork;" (2) There are "significant academic connections" between ICA, Sports Management, and Athletic Training; (3) Competitive athletics and academics both draw on "the same deep wells of human possibility;" and, (4) Both ICA and academics "contribute significantly to those intangible elements that build passion for and loyalty to an institution."

⁵ NCAA regulations currently require second year students to have a cumulative GPA that equals at least 90% of the required GPA for graduation; third year students must have a GPA equaling at least 95% of the required GPA for graduation; fourth and fifth year students must have at least the minimum GPA required for graduation.

<http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/D110.pdf>

⁶ The IAC is a standing committee of the University. For a complete description of the committee membership and charge, see <http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/standingcomm/ICA-Committee-page.cfm>

through which those representatives should be nominated and appointed. The committee shall also recommend appropriate lengths of appointment for those representatives.

3. The number of faculty representatives recommended by the Committee on Committees and appointed by the President will be increased by 1, bringing the total number of faculty on the IAC to 8, and the total number of voting members to 15.
4. Current language specifying ex-officio, non-voting members could be perceived as sexist because the implication is that the Director of Athletics is a Male. Language should be altered to say that: "Two members of Intercollegiate Athletics administration, one female and one male, will be appointed as ex-officio, non-voting members."

**A Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Sustainability of Intercollegiate Athletics
Finance & Facilities Committee
Approved May 17, 2010**

Whereas, Ohio University's institutional subsidy of Intercollegiate Athletics was in excess of \$14.5 Million in 2008 and \$15 million in 2009;¹ and

Whereas, data reported in an Inside Higher Education article showed that, in comparison to other FBS (formerly Division 1-A) universities, Ohio University's Department of Intercollegiate Athletics receives the 4th highest subsidy (approximately 75.02% of the ICA budget) from the University Operating Budget. In the top 21 programs for subsidy of Intercollegiate Athletics, 10 of those were Mid American Conference Schools;² and

Whereas, data released in that report shows a substantial disparity in athletic department subsidy between major athletic conferences like the Big 10, Big 12, and SEC and "mid-major" conferences like the MAC and Mountain West; and

Whereas, revenue inequities between "major" athletic conferences and "mid-major" conferences place a greater funding strain on mid-major schools, like Ohio University, because of the proportionally greater subsidy required to maintain FBS status³; and

Whereas, a survey by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics revealed that less than ¼ of college presidents at Division 1-A/FBS schools believe that intercollegiate Athletics, in current form, is sustainable⁴; and

¹ These values were calculated using information reported in the USA Today College Athletics Finance database: <http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/ncaa-finances.htm>.

² See "Sports Subsidies Soar" article in *Inside Higher Education*, January 19, 2010. The same data revealed that all but 4 of the FBS schools receive significant subsidy from university operating budgets.

³ See Knight Commission report titled "College Sports 101: A Primer on Money, Athletics, and Higher Education in the 21st Century" available: <http://www.knightcommission.org/images/pdfs/cs101.pdf>

⁴ See the Knight Commission report titled, "Quantitative and Qualitative Research with Football Bowl Subdivision University presidents on the Costs and Financing of Intercollegiate Athletics" available at: http://www.knightcommissionmedia.org/images/President_Survey_FINAL.pdf

Whereas, a failure to address unsustainable expenditures in intercollegiate athletics will contribute to economic hardships of member schools and diminish institutions' abilities to prioritize academics; therefore

Be it resolved by the Ohio University Faculty Senate that the current funding model for intercollegiate athletics is incompatible with the academic mission of higher education institutions.

Be it further resolved that university Presidents and appropriate state and national government officials should seek rapid and meaningful alternatives to the current "arms race" approach to intercollegiate athletics funding, with the objective of meaningfully reducing institutional subsidy (including both operating budget and other revenue sources affiliated with the university) for ICA funding at all member schools. Creative approaches to achieve this objective could include but should not be limited to:

- Salary caps for coaches and athletic administrators, weighted to reflect the size of the university.
- Revenue sharing between "major" and "mid-major" FBS conferences.
- The NCAA should reduce the required number of coaches, athletic scholarships or other cost-incurring requirements to maintain FBS status.
- Explore alternatives to the current organizing structure based on conference affiliations and NCAA.

Be it further resolved that the Chair of the Ohio University Faculty Senate will share this resolution with other officials who oversee institutional and educational policies including, but not limited to: Governor Ted Strickland of Ohio, Chancellor Eric Fingerhut of the University System of Ohio, President Roderick McDavis of Ohio University, Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit of Ohio University, and the leaders of Faculty Senates at other Mid-American Conference schools.

**A Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletic
Funding Sustainability
Finance & Facilities Committee
May 17, 2010
First Reading**

Whereas, Ohio University's institutional subsidy of Intercollegiate Athletics was in excess of \$14.5 Million in 2008 and \$15 million in 2009;¹ and

Whereas, across the eight Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) schools in the State of Ohio, \$90.6 million in institutions' operating funds were used to subsidize intercollegiate athletics; and

Whereas, revenue inequities between "major" athletic conferences and "mid-major" conferences will continue to grow as larger conferences further capitalize on external revenue streams obtained through television contracts and other sources; and

Whereas, a survey by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics revealed that less than ¼ of college presidents at Division 1-A/FBS schools believe that intercollegiate Athletics, in current form, is sustainable²; and

¹ These values were calculated using information reported in the USA Today College Athletics Finance database: <http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/ncaa-finances.htm>.

Whereas, a failure to address unsustainable expenditures in intercollegiate athletics will contribute to economic hardships of member schools and diminish institutions' abilities to prioritize academics; therefore

Be it resolved by the Ohio University Faculty Senate that the President will direct the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee to examine and prepare a report on the sustainability of Division I/FBS intercollegiate athletics at Ohio University.

Be it further resolved by the Ohio University Faculty Senate that the President will begin discussions on the sustainability of intercollegiate athletics with Chancellor Fingerhut, officials of the Mid-American Conference and other FBS schools in the state.

Be it further resolved that the President or an appointed representative will provide a report to faculty senate detailing progress on these initiatives during the 2010-2011 academic year.

² See the Knight Commission report titled, "Quantitative and Qualitative Research with Football Bowl Subdivision University presidents on the Costs and Financing of Intercollegiate Athletics" available at: http://www.knightcommissionmedia.org/images/President_Survey_FINAL.pdf