

**Ohio University Faculty Senate**  
**Monday, June 7, 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 Vice Chair David Thomas in the absence of Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:10 p.m.

In attendance:

**College of Arts and Sciences:** E. Ammarell, R. Boyd, C. Coski, C. Elster, J. Gilliom, S. Gradin, B. Heckman in for J. Lein, K. Hicks, D. Ingram, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, S. Patterson, S. Wyatt

**College of Business:** T. Stock

**College of Education:** T. Franklin, T. Leinbaugh, A. Paulins

**College of Engineering:** C. Bartone, J. Dill

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

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

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

**College of Osteopathic Medicine:** T. Heckman, A. Huzoor

**Regional Campus—Chillicothe:** R. Knight, A. Rumble, N. Kiersey

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

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

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

**Regional Campus—Zanesville:** P. Kanwar in for M. Nern

**Scripps College of Communication:** G. Newton, J. Slade, S. Titsworth, B. Debatin

**Excused:** S. Hays, C. Kalenkoski, P. Coschigano, W. Roosenburg, J. Giesey, E. Sayers

**Absent:** T. Anderson, D. Bell, J. Benson, R. Boyd, E. Graham for J. Bernt, A. Gupta for R. Frost, L. Hoshower, P. Jung, J. Lee, M. Li, H. Pasic, B. Roach in for Frost, J. Thomas, J. Wolf

**Overview of the Meeting:**

- I. EVP&P Pam Benoit
- II. Roll
- III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
  - Updates and Announcements
  - 2010-2011 Committee Assignments
  - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: September 20, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
- IV. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
  - Resolution to Change Full-Time Status for Undergraduates—Second Reading & Vote
  - Resolution on Undergraduate Probation Policy—Second Reading & Vote
  - Resolution on Retakable/Repeatable Courses—Second Reading & Vote
- V. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano
  - Resolution on Addressing Interdisciplinary Concerns in P&T Guidelines—Second Reading & Vote
  - Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines—Second Reading & Vote
- VI. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
  - Resolution on Appropriate Creation of Academic Units—Second Reading & Vote
  - Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School—Second Reading & Vote
  - Resolution to Update Handbook on Professional Ethics Committees—Second

Reading & Vote

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

- Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletic Funding Sustainability—Second Reading & Vote

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

**I. Executive Vice-President and Provost Pam Benoit**

EVPP Benoit briefly addressed three issues: 1) Office of Information Technology (OIT); 2) current enrollment statistics; and 3) the search for the Vice-President of Finance and Administration, and then thanked the Faculty Senate for the work they have done this year.

1) Benoit reported on the allegations that have been made about progress in the Office of Information Technology. She stated that the allegations are being examined. Due diligence is underway here. It is worth noting that there are and have been a variety of reporting mechanisms related to the projects underway in OIT.

- VPFA receives monthly financial reports
- The Board of Trustees receives regular progress reports.
- There are advisory groups that include faculty both for the operations of OIT as a whole and for the Rufus Initiative.

Benoit assured the Faculty Senate that what must be done to make sure that the necessary work is completed in a timely manner will be done.

2) 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	13,301 (-809)	11,258(-203)	3,956 (-83 )	24.03 (+.18)	3.35 (+.02)
Masters	2977 (+170)	1097 (+24)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Doctoral	518 (+31)	125(-9)	n/a	n/a	n/a

3) Benoit reported on the status of the Vice-President for Finance and Administration search. Stephen Golding participated in an on-campus visit during the week of May 24. We are still in the process of reviewing his candidacy.

Benoit then stated that, as this is the last Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year, she wanted to thank Faculty Senate for the work that they have done this year. She has enjoyed working with members of Senate during the year and has been grateful for the contributions that each of the Senators has made. She also thanked Senate for their patience. She has appreciated their willingness to help her learn about the university, the role of the Senate, and the responsibilities of her position. One of the things that she has been most struck by during the course of her first year here is the quality of the faculty and their deep-seated passion for this place. She feels very fortunate in being able to be able to work with such a dedicated and talented group of scholar-teachers.

Questions were invited. Boyd asked if data were available on in-state vs. out-of-state admissions. Benoit said she would check on that. Chris Bartone asked if Concur is hindering us. Benoit stated that they are working on issues in Concur and are attempting to find ways to make it more user-friendly. Ken

Hicks asked why admissions are down. Benoit replied that last year the numbers were very high which was unusual. Also, the trends are changing and applicants are now applying to fewer schools. Joe Slade stated that committees he is on would like to work more closely with OIT in order to advance faculty concerns and make recommendations regarding modifications and to work more closely regarding the budget. Scott Titsworth expressed frustration regarding the policies and procedures regarding Concur, which seem to change quickly and without warning. Benoit said the advisory board should provide feedback for that. Chris Bartone asked if there is a representative for Centers and Institutes on the advisory board. Benoit stated no, we cannot have every individual group represented on the advisory board because it would then be too large to function effectively. Bernhard Debatin pointed out the policies regarding private credit card information being required for reimbursement of expenses is a concern. Benoit said that is currently under review.

## **II. Roll Call**

A quorum was present. No minutes of previous meetings were presented for approval.

## **III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin**

- **Updates and Announcements**

McLaughlin announced that Board of Trustees Chair Perry would not be at the meeting tonight and can't come to Faculty Senate until October.

Assignments for Faculty Senate committees will be mailed when they are completed. In general, continuing Senators will stay on a committee if that is their first choice. He will try to give everyone their first choice if possible, but Senators may receive their second choice if the positions on a first-choice committee have been filled.

Standing committee assignments will be completed next. Volunteers are still coming in.

In the College of Business, Frost has resigned, and Bonnie Roach is filling in. In Arts and Sciences Charlene Kalenkoski is on leave for fall quarter and Steve Patterson is filling in for her. If any Senators will be gone for a meeting, please let us know so we can get an alternate.

The UCC has the first two OCEAN binders on the agenda for possible approval at tomorrow's meeting.

There has been no negative feedback to having the final Senate meeting of the year the Monday before graduation, so that will continue next year.

Outgoing Senators were thanked and applauded. All may vote tonight.

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: September 20, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

## **IV. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly**

- **Resolution to Change Full-Time Status for Undergraduates—Second Reading and Vote**

The parenthetical phrase has been added and the footnote has been removed. The committee moved to accept and the motion passed unanimously.

- **Resolution on Undergraduate Probation Policy—Second Reading and Vote**

The language has been changed slightly. The preamble and whereas are the same, but the chart has had the last line, which referred to seniors, deleted. Reilly presented a chart that compared the effects of proposed policy to the effects of old policy. The committee moved to accept and the motion passed unanimously.

- **Resolution on Retakeable/Repeatable Courses-Second Reading and Vote**

Individual courses can state number of accumulative hours that will be the cutoff or students may be pink-slipped into a course. The footnote was stricken. The committee moved to accept and the motion passed unanimously.

- Reilly thanked the committee members for their work this year. Joe McLaughlin announced that meetings are being held at least monthly with the registrar's office and PeopleSoft to work on our policies and their implementation and to let Joe, David Thomas or Allyn Reilly know about any concerns regarding implementation.

## **V. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade for Pete Coschigano**

- **Resolution on Addressing Interdisciplinary Concerns in P&T Guidelines—Second Reading & Vote**

Jerry Miller presented revisions made as a result of the discussion at the last Senate meeting. John Gilliom suggested changing the language to P&T evaluations rather than merit evaluations, but Jerry said that they mean both evaluation processes, so the wording was changed to include both. The committee moved to accept and the motion passed unanimously.

- **Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines—Second Reading and Vote**

This resolution is largely to address the insufficient paper trail. No extra requirements have been added. The committee moved to accept and the motion passed unanimously.

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

- **Resolution on Appropriate Creation of Academic Units—Second Reading and Vote**

References to the Walter and Patton Centers were removed. The committee added a policy number regarding the creation of centers and institutes and added that CRSCA and the EVPP must approve. The committee moved to accept and the motion passed unanimously.

- **Resolution on Senate Representation for Voinovich School—Second Reading and Vote**

This resolution needs a 2/3 vote of the Senate to pass, and then it must be presented to the faculty for a vote because this change is to the Constitution of the Faculty Senate. Joe McLaughlin explained that this will be looked at closely over the summer so that the proper procedure is followed and the vote is done in a format acceptable to faculty.

David Ingram read a statement in opposition to this resolution. It stated that the Faculty Senate Chair should appoint a senator. The way the school was determined was ill-advised. The faculty should be affiliated with an existing college. The faculty will lose control if this resolution passes. He urged all to oppose this resolution. Casebolt asked if this would get rid of the school and the answer was no, it would not. Gradin stated that with the headway we have made it is unlikely that something like this will happen again. Elster agreed and stated that they are looking forward to the future. Franklin followed-up and said the faculty are now doing what her college does and should be represented. Hicks stated that she respected Ingram but that the faculty needs to be represented by a represented in their planning unit. Bartone asked if a faculty-at-large representative had been discussed. Gradin answered that it doesn't give fair representation and we shouldn't abandon the intent of the Handbook regarding representation. Helaine Burstein pointed out that the language is very clear and that we now have 7 faculty members without representation. Joe McLaughlin stated that things are different now than when the school was formed and there is a better understanding of the issue. Coski asked if the previous resolution will prevent it again? The answer was that it probably would. Patterson pointed out that the dean's

understand this. Ingram said he doesn't understand the term "dean's equivalent." Gradin explained and added that we will have other innovative structures in the future that will need to be dealt with. Burstein suggested making sure they are always associated with a college in the future. Gradin added that there are consistencies and the committee is aware of them. There is method to their madness. Slade said we want to pull these people in and not make them a "rogue unit." Gradin agreed and said we need to enfranchise and not disenfranchise. Boyd said what signal it would send if we didn't pass the resolution.

The senator would not be elected until the referendum has been completed. This would probably happen in the fall. There are 7 Group 1 faculty and 6 with joint appointments. Group 2 are already represented. Ammarell asked the rationale for the number of senators proposed. Gradin said that without that change someone would lose a senator. She reminded everyone that we must vote again to change the number of representatives can be raised again. Franklin added that if we are to be a representative body, everyone must be represented. Bolon ended with the statement that the Voinovich School is a college-like structure that needs representation.

The committee moved to accept. Paper ballots were distributed and the vote was: Yes-33, No-5, and Abstentions-2. As an amendment to the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, this motion requires 2/3 of the memberships of the senate, or 34 votes. The motion to approve the resolution was defeated.

#### **• Resolution to Update Handbook on Professional Ethics Committees—Second Reading and Vote**

No changes have been made but the footnotes have been reordered. Thomas stated that ethics committees usually have odd numbers since split decisions go to the PRC, and suggested an odd number of members instead of even. Gradin stated that if there was a split vote, it should go to the PRC for further review. The committee moved to accept and the motion passed unanimously.

#### **VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth**

##### **• Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletic Funding Sustainability—Second Reading and Vote**

Slade asked if the Chancellor would receive a copy of this and Scott Titsworth said he would. A discussion ensued regarding the NCAA's role vs. conferences' roles in the problem. Hicks said that it is stated that athletics increases visibility. Today the EVPP stated the applications are down; he sees no evidence of athletics helping us. The committee moved to accept and the motion passed unanimously.

Scott Titsworth thanked the committee members for their work.

#### **VIII. New Business**

Joe McLaughlin thanked everyone and stated, for Rudy (who is not present): The sun is still shining!

#### **X. Adjournment**

Patterson made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Gradin seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:46.

**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution to Change Full-time Status for Undergraduate Students**  
**Passed: June 7, 2010**

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

**Whereas**, for the purpose of federal financial aid regulations full-time status is defined as 12 credit hours,

**Be It Resolved**, that effective first Summer Session 2010-2011 (the summer following the 2010-2011 academic year), full-time status for undergraduates at Ohio University be defined as enrollment at a minimum of 12 credit hours.<sup>1</sup>

**Educational Policy and Student Affairs**

**Resolution on Academic Probation Policy for Undergraduate Students**  
**Passed: June 7, 2010**

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 (quarter or semester), the academic record of each enrolled undergraduate student will be reviewed to verify the accumulative GPA. At the time of the review, the student does not have the required 2.0 minimum accumulative GPA will be placed on academic probation. To be removed from probation, the student's accumulative GPA must reach at least a 2.0.

Students with fewer than 135 credit hours earned (90 semester hours):

A student who is not removed from probation is either continued on probation or is academically dismissed. The student is continued on probation if either: 1) his/her term quarter/semester 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 Quarters/Semesters	Minimum Accumulative GPA to be Continued on Probation
0 – 44.99/0—29.99	1.6
45.00 – 89.99/30.00—59.99	1.8
90.00 – 134.99/60—89.99	1.9

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

Students with 135 or more credit hours earned (90 or more semester hours):

If a student on probation in a given term has 135 or more credit hours (90 or more semester hours) earned at the end of that term, he/she must have achieved a 2.0 accumulative GPA to avoid academic dismissal.

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 Undergraduate Retakeable/Repeatable Courses  
Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee  
Passed: June 7, 2010**

Preamble: Ohio University has allowed any undergraduate course to be retaken for the purpose of improving the student grade; the number of retakes allowed is controlled by the department or school at the time the course is submitted for approval. In addition, an undergraduate course identified as being repeatable for credit may be repeated for an unlimited number of hours or a finite number of hours. Furthermore these numbers vary from course to course across the University,

**Whereas** the new Student Information System (PeopleSoft) cannot deal with retakeable classes--when the number of allowable retakes varies across campus--without expensive modification;

**Be It Resolved** that the number of times that a student may be allowed to retake an undergraduate class for the purpose of improving a grade be restricted to a maximum of two in addition to the first attempt, and undergraduate repeatable courses may be repeatable for an unlimited number of hours. Colleges, departments or schools will establish policies for additional retakes if and when appropriate. These changes are to become effective with courses offered Summer 2010-11.<sup>2</sup>

**Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines  
Addressing Interdisciplinary Activities for  
Faculty with a Singular Home Department/School  
Interdisciplinary Council – 2009-2010  
Passed: 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](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](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 and peer evaluation policies explicitly clarify how interdisciplinary activities (teaching, research/creative activities and/or service) will be evaluated and to what extent such activities will be included in all annual evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions.

**Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**  
**Promotion and Tenure Committee**  
**Passed: June 7, 2010**

**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;

**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.

9. 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 as well as workload and balance between teaching, service, and professional activities expectations. Significant changes to these workload/balance expectations should be a matter for discussion and negotiation with the faculty member.
  - b. The annual “performance and progress toward tenure letter” probationary faculty receive (see section II.D.1.c) should include clear, transparent, and formative information on progress towards tenure. Departments/schools may choose to do a mid-way formal evaluation and/or annual cumulative evaluations which afford the candidate feedback in terms of teaching, service and professional activities. Those who provide this feedback should be 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 and tenure 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.

**Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate  
Resolution on Appropriate Creation of Academic Units  
Passed: June 7, 2010**

**Whereas**, the Faculty Senate does not oppose alternative or interdisciplinary academic structures, but believes the process through which the Voinovich School was established as a college-like planning unit lacked feedback and policy review by faculty, especially in relation to matters regarding faculty rights and responsibilities as specifically defined in the Faculty Handbook;

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

**Whereas**, faculty should have knowledge of the Centers and Institutes that will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval;

**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 for granting degrees and certificates, or for retaining faculty;

**Whereas**, Faculty Senate and the University Curriculum Council are responsible for curricular decisions, 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**

If alternative academic structures are created, or created through restructuring, the administration follows a process that includes Faculty Senate review. The form of such initiations will be officially sanctioned by the faculty. Academic units that offer degreed programs or specialized curricula and are not housed in an existing college will be reviewed by UCC. Policies and procedures that are guided by the Faculty Handbook, such as promotion and tenure, ethics committees, and senate representation will be resolved and approved by the faculty senate prior to the operation of such units. Faculty in any new unit must be ensured the rights and responsibilities of the Faculty Handbook at the initiation of the unit.

**Be it further resolved that**

Upon approval of Centers and Institutes by the appropriate college dean(s) and the Vice-President for Research and Creative Activity, and prior to submission to the Board of Trustees, a list of approved Centers and Institutes and their locations within the University be communicated to the Chair of Faculty Senate. Procedure 01.015 of the Policy and Procedures should be changed to reflect this addition to the process.

**Finally, let it be resolved that**

In instances where a Center or Institute is not to be housed in a college or colleges, the Center or Institute will be approved by the Council on Research and Scholarship and Creative Activity (CRSCA) and the Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies. Procedure 01.015 of the Policy and Procedures should be changed to reflect this addition to the process.

**Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate  
Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School  
Defeated June 7, 2010**

**Whereas** the Voinovich Center has now been restructured and approved as a School by the Board of Trustees;

**Whereas** faculty in the Voinovich School are entitled to representation on the Faculty Senate; and

**Whereas** Section VI. A. Article 1 Reads:

**Article 1 Composition and Election**

1. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members with faculty status, with or without tenure. Forty-eight Senators shall be elected by the Group I faculty of the degree colleges of the Athens campus and Group I faculty of each of the regional campuses in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each degree-granting college or unit headed by a dean and having Group I faculty shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the Senate. Two Senators who are Group II faculty

shall be elected by the Group II faculty of Ohio University. The election shall be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Election stated in the Senate Bylaws.

**Be it resolved** that the Faculty Handbook VI. A. Article 1 be changed to the following [changes in bolded italics]:

**Article 1 Composition and Election**

1. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members with faculty status, with or without tenure. Forty-**nine** Senators shall be elected by the Group I faculty of degree-granting colleges ***with deans*** or academic units ***with a dean's equivalent (e.g. Voinovich School)*** of the Athens campus and Group I faculty of each of the regional campuses. **Representation shall be** in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each degree-granting college or unit headed by a dean ***or dean's equivalent*** and having Group I faculty shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the Senate. Two Senators who are Group II faculty shall be elected by the Group II faculty of Ohio University. The election shall be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Election stated in the Senate Bylaws.

**Resolution on Update to Language in the Faculty Handbook on Professional Ethics Committees  
Professional Relations Committee  
Passed June 7, 2010**

**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**<sup>[1]</sup>

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)***<sup>[2]</sup>. 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<sup>[3]</sup>. . . .

[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.

**A Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletic  
Funding Sustainability  
Finance & Facilities Committee  
Passed June 7, 2010**

**Whereas**, Ohio University's institutional subsidy of Intercollegiate Athletics was in excess of \$14.5 Million in 2008 and \$15 million in 2009;<sup>3</sup> 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 sustainable<sup>4</sup>; and

---

<sup>3</sup> These values were calculated using information reported in the USA Today College Athletics Finance database: <http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/ncaa-finances.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> 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](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 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.