

**Ohio University Faculty Senate**  
**Monday, November 15, 2010**  
**Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.**  
**Minutes Approved 1/24/2011**

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

In attendance:

**College of Arts and Sciences:** E. Ammarell, K. Brown, C. Elster, J. Gilliom, S. Gradin, S. Hays, D. Ingram, J. Lein, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, A. Rouzie for S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, W. Roosenburg, S. Wyatt

**College of Business:** L. Hoshower, B. Roach

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

**College of Health Sciences and Professions:** M. Adeyanju, D. Bolon, M. Bowen

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

**Group II:** L. LaPierre for H. Burstein, M. Sisson

**Patton College of Education and Human Services:** T. Franklin

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

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

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

**Regional Campus—Southern:** D. Marinski

**Regional Campus—Zanesville:** J. Farley for J. Benson, M. Nern

**Russ College of Engineering:** J. Dill, J. Gieseey

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

**Excused:** A. Paulins, N. Kiersey

**Absent:** K. Hicks, T. Stock, B. Branham, H. Pasic, D. McDiarmid

---

**Overview of the Meeting:**

- I. Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President & Provost
- II. Roll Call and Approval of the October 18, 2010 Minutes
- III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
  - Status of Resolutions
  - Ohio Faculty Council Report
  - Updates & Announcements
  - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: January 24, 2011. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
- IV. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)
  - Presentation on State Funding Formula—John Day, Associate Provost for Academic Budget & Planning
- V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
  - Resolution on Faculty Fellowship Leave and Deferral for Curricular Reasons (First Reading)
  - Resolution on the Responsibility of Chairs/Directors in Responding to Professional Ethics Violations (First Reading)
  - Resolution on Early Retirement on Semesters (First Reading)
- VI. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade

- VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Adjournment

**I. Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President & Provost**

Executive Vice President and Provost Benoit briefly addressed several topics:

**1) Budget update:** Benoit referred to the email sent to all faculty on 11/15 that set a 10% reduction in base budget as a tentative budget scenario based on several factors: that 1% of state subsidy to the Athens Campus equals \$1.05 million; that the lapsed 2010-2011 State Share of Instruction (SSI) payment is \$7.04 million; and that OU's support from the state based on expiring federal stimulus funding is \$11.35 million. Benoit emphasized that at this point there are more "unknowns" than "knowns," and that the scenario will change as we know more.

**2) \$750,000 merit raise pool distribution by gender:** Benoit provided the chart below, indicating that women fared well overall under the latest merit pool distribution.

|                            | % Female Overall | % Female Receiving Raise | Average Raise Overall | Average Raise Female | % Salary Base Female | % Raise Pool Female |
|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Arts &amp; Sciences</b> | 30.68%           | 32.61%                   | \$1634                | \$1701               | 30.63%               | 33.94%              |
| <b>Business</b>            | 32.08%           | 23.81%                   | \$3755                | \$6696               | 27.32%               | 28.22%              |
| <b>Communication</b>       | 29.79%           | 38.71%                   | \$3006                | \$4673               | 29.43%               | 28.93%              |
| <b>Education</b>           | 50%              | 59.26%                   | \$1636                | \$1803               | 53.57%               | 61.59%              |
| <b>Engineering</b>         | 8.89%            | 12.12%                   | \$3016                | \$3451               | 9.04%                | 13.87%              |
| <b>Fine Arts</b>           | 37.37%           | 37.50%                   | \$1963                | \$1857               | 36.15%               | 35.48%              |
| <b>Health Sciences</b>     | 31.11%           | 44.44%                   | \$2268                | \$2338               | 33.50%               | 45.81%              |

**3) Preliminary group I faculty headcount:**

| Campus/College                  | 2009 | 2010 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|
| Athens campus                   | 727  | 727  |
| College of Osteopathic Medicine | 63   | 61   |
| Regional Campuses               | 131  | 128  |

**4) Blackboard/IT updates:** The Blackboard open forum (10/20/10) was well attended, and the answers are being disseminated. We will upgrade to Blackboard 9.1 for pilot courses during winter quarter. A task force to evaluate options other than Blackboard will be forming in winter quarter. IT will also update its environmental scan, and will set up a wiki for feedback on various IT issues. The Faculty Technology Advisory Group (FTAG) will report back to Faculty Senate during winter quarter.

**5) Furlough policy:** Benoit emphasized that there is no plan to institute a furlough in this fiscal year, even with the lapsed SSI payment from the state. She noted that a furlough cannot

address long-term budget problems. The furlough policy has been written to put the mechanism in place, not in anticipation of implementing a furlough in this fiscal year.

**6) Vice President for University Advancement search:** Invitations to serve on the search committee were sent last Friday. Responses are due by 11/19, and then the membership of the committee will be announced. While the search is in progress, President McDavis has been proactive in addressing the capital campaign. OU also has a consulting firm already under contract to help maintain momentum.

Benoit then asked for questions. **James Casebolt** requested data about the merit raise distribution for regional campuses; Benoit responded that she would provide these. **Ken Brown** clarified that a 10% cut would be 25-30 million dollars; Benoit added that this was about double last year's cut, and that it was unclear if group I faculty salaries could be protected. She re-emphasized that we know very little at this point, so these numbers will be continually updated. **Charlotte Elster** asked how much the university would save if all employees were furloughed for one day. Benoit responded that this is difficult to calculate exactly, because there are exceptions written into the furlough policy (e.g. graduate students, those supported by grant funding); **John Day** added that a rough calculation is a savings of \$725,000 per furlough day, which includes staff and faculty salaries, but not benefits.

**Willem Roosenburg** asked how OU and the University System of Ohio are communicating with Governor-elect Kasich about the importance of higher education. Benoit responded that there have been multiple opportunities to communicate with the state, and that it is incredibly important to communicate what we offer. **Lorrie LaPierre** asked how OU approached working with Kasich, given some of the political rhetoric that has been used. Benoit said that we need to emphasize that we serve as an economic engine for the state. **Roosenburg** suggested that the university ask private industry to speak on our behalf as well.

**Judith Lee** asked for more clarification of the additional raise pool of \$100,000 for "transformative" faculty. Benoit explained that money for this pool came from funds allocated but not needed for promotion and tenure raises. Unused money in this fund usually goes back into the general fund, but this year Benoit made the case that it should be used for faculty salaries. Benoit said that this pool was distributed according to a newly-developed set of criteria, aimed at those who have contributed to a transformative learning community: those who have worked directly with students, through either teaching, research collaborations with students, or support services. Colleges were asked to identify transformative faculty in their colleges, and the process is still ongoing.

**Allyn Reilly** raised concerns that the answers given at the Blackboard forum indicated that some problems were unknown to the Blackboard representatives, and that many problems were still in the process of being fixed. If there is another forum on Blackboard, **Lee** suggested that it be scheduled on more than one day, and not during advising week. **Sarah Wyatt** noted that contacting the help desk does not always result in a ticket being submitted. **Joe Slade** noted that all problems with Blackboard should be sent to Phyllis Bernt ([bernt@ohio.edu](mailto:bernt@ohio.edu)), chair of FTAG. Senators were pleased that continued use of Blackboard was up for discussion, and that other programs, including open source programs, were being considered.

Senators then returned to questions about the distribution process for the "transformative faculty" raise pool. **LaPierre** said that in some colleges, requiring nominations and self-nominations with a very short timeline meant that faculty were left out because of the process. **Debatin** noted that the existing P&T and merit processes are not set up to gather this type of information, and this year's new process was not systematic, so information gathered was

incomplete. If this type of special pool will continue in the future, it needs to be equitable, possibly with a parallel set of criteria to be included in the regular evaluation process. **Mark Phillips** suggested that local guidelines be used to filter up appropriate faculty automatically. **Ammarell** noted that the teaching portion of the existing merit evaluation could be used. Benoit emphasized that the criteria for this pool were different from regular evaluation criteria, in order to shift the culture of what constitutes merit and to place students at the center of what we do; she added that she would try get information out sooner next time, and thanked Senators for their suggestions.

**Slade** argued that when special pools act as a substitute for normal raises, especially since standard raises have been essentially absent for two years, resentment is created when small amounts of money are distributed inequitably. Benoit said she respected that position but disagreed, arguing that the amount was irrelevant, and that everyone received a 1% raise—regardless of merit—in a year when the Social Security cost of living adjustment (COLA) was 0%.<sup>1</sup> Benoit added that many institutions were unable to give raises at all this year, so what OU was able to do was remarkable. **James Lein** emphasized that the selective nature of the merit raises was especially problematic in the context of the 0% raise last year. **Lee** broadened the context, and noted that historically, previous raises did not cover increases in the cost of living, increasing insurance premiums, etc., and sometimes administrative raises were higher than faculty raises, and that has generated resentment. **LaPierre** argued that facility maintenance should have priority over faculty raises; Benoit responded that the amount of money allocated for raises would not begin to make a dent in facilities issues.

**Steve Hays** asked whether we could continue to afford Blackboard; Benoit responded that this was part of the current open source discussion. **Debatin** asked Benoit to check on the policy of submitting personal credit card statements for reimbursement; Benoit agreed to check on that. **Nern** said that raise and salary inequities were causing morale issues at the Zanesville campus because the current salary structure doesn't reflect faculty contributions. **Knight** agreed, and said that this type of raise distribution would emphasize competition rather than collaboration between faculty.

## II. Roll Call and Approval of the October 18, 2010 Minutes

A quorum was present; the October 18<sup>th</sup> minutes will be approved at the January meeting.

## III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

### • Status of Resolution

The Resolution on Process to Determine Necessity of Furloughs passed last month was not signed by EVPP Benoit, although as a result of the resolution, consultation with the Budget Planning Council has been added to the furlough policy. The Board of Trustees (BOT) was not included in the process, in part because the Executive Committee of the BOT does not have the power to act in that capacity, and partly because the administration believes that the decision to

---

<sup>1</sup> Secretary's note: 2008-2009 OU raise pool: 3%, 2009 Social Security COLA: 5.8%; 2009-2010 OU raise pool: 0%, 2010 Social Security COLA: 0%; 2010-2011 OU raise pool: 1% across-the-board, plus \$850,000 special pools (>2% total); 2011 Social Security COLA: 0%. The Social Security COLA is based on the increase of one of the Consumer Price Indices (the [CPI-W](http://www.bls.gov/cpi/), which is an index of urban wages earners and clerical workers) only during the third quarter of the current year compared to the third quarter of the last year in which a COLA was implemented (currently 2008). Thus annual CPI-W increases are different from the Social Security COLA. See <http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/COLA/latestCOLA.html>, and <http://www.ohio.edu/institres/factbook/budget.html>, and <http://www.bls.gov/cpi/>.

implement a furlough is an operational decision, in which the BOT is not usually involved. Practically, it is likely that the President would consult with the BOT before a furlough was implemented. A copy of the resolution has been sent to the BOT, so they know that we supported their involvement in the process.

- Ohio Faculty Council Report — Louis Wright

Louis Wright represented Ohio University at the most recent Ohio Faculty Council (OFC) meeting (11/12/10). A special meeting with Chancellor Fingerhut, whose term is scheduled to expire in 2012, preceded the OFC meeting. Fingerhut emphasized the economic success of the University System of Ohio (e.g. the Third Frontier Initiative encouraging high tech companies to come to Ohio). Fingerhut also discussed a possible scenario in which tuition caps could be imposed on 2-year and regional campus programs while caps would be raised or removed on 4-year schools; such a policy might require more of the student subsidy going to the 2-year schools. The OFC voted by 5 to 4 with 4 persons abstaining to draft a letter supporting House Bill 365 (which allows part-time faculty and graduate assistants to form collective bargaining units). There was a lot of speculation about potential cuts in the state subsidy, but no firm information. Other topics discussed included furlough policies, retention rates, and STRS.

- Updates & Announcements

- The January meeting will include a presentation by FTAG members Phyllis Bernt and Joe Slade on IT issues.

- We will try to address to parking problems during athletic events, perhaps with passes for faculty. See also the resolution under New Business.

- Laura Myers will give a presentation to Faculty Senate concerning the 2009-2010 Provost's Women's Commission [annual report](#).

- Faculty Senators on leave during winter quarter should contact McLaughlin and Laura Tuck ([tuckl@ohio.edu](mailto:tuckl@ohio.edu)) to arrange a replacement.

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: January 24, 2011. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall TBA**

#### **IV. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F) – John Gilliom**

- Presentation on State Funding Formula—John Day, Associate Provost for Academic Budget & Planning

John Gilliom noted that 21% of the Athens campus budget comes from the state subsidy, and then introduced John Day, who gave a presentation on the new state funding formula.

Disciplines are grouped into Arts and Humanities (AH); Business, Education, and Social Science (BES); and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). At the undergraduate and Master's level, courses are designated by level (level 1 = introductory courses); doctoral courses have a different formula. The new undergrad/Master's formula calculates the statewide average cost for an FTE (45 quarter hours) in each discipline. Then Master's courses, and upper-level and Master's STEM courses are given additional weighting factors. The statewide average cost X the weights = reimbursement cost. (Thus STEM and Master's courses have higher reimbursement costs than other courses.) Then the formula considers what percent of the statewide FTE's a university produces, also factoring in overall course completion rates and course completion rates for at-risk students. Ohio University produces about 10% of the statewide FTE's; we are higher in A&H, and lower in STEM. Finally, the reimbursement cost is

multiplied by the percent of statewide FTE's, and then by 32.55% (subsidy percentage), and then by 91.8% (a reduced appropriation) to determine the state subsidy. In short:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \text{statewide} & & & & \text{OU's \% of} & & \\
 \text{average} & & \text{weighting for} & & \text{statewide FTE's} & & \\
 \text{cost for} & \times & \text{grad \&} & \times & \text{(w/course} & \times & 32.55\% & \times & 91.8\% & = & \text{Subsidy} \\
 \text{FTE} & & \text{STEM} & & \text{completion} & & & & & & \\
 & & & & \text{factors)} & & & & & & \\
 \hline
 \text{reimbursement cost} & & & & & & & & & & 
 \end{array}$$

OU's actual cost for FTE's is below state average in most areas. When OU's cost is compared to how much revenue is received through tuition and state subsidy combined, AH costs \$4,042,690 more than the amount received from tuition and subsidy; BES generates \$4,259,036; and STEM is about even (-\$36,796).

Doctoral subsidies follow a different formula. Historically, this was based on a frozen credit hour production target. As long as we maintained 85% of the target enrollment, we received 100% of our allocation, but additional FTE's did not generate extra subsidy, so there was no incentive to grow doctoral programs. The new doctoral formula, still under development, proposes using several factors including the historical allocation, the number of degrees granted, funded research dollars, and an "other" factor related to mission. We fare well on the number of degrees granted, but less well on funded research, so under the proposed new formula, OU's doctoral subsidy would be identical to what it is now. In ten years, as the historical allocation is phased out of the formula, OU's doctoral subsidy will drop slightly. Day then asked for questions.

**Judith Lee** raised concerns that currently 45 quarter hours constitute an FTE, but our students typically need to take 48 hours to graduate on time; when this goes to 30 semester hours (less than 2/3 of 48) for an FTE, that may affect the subsidy. **David Ingram** asked whether the consideration of degree completions will change as we go forward. Day responded that it will be phased in at the undergrad level, but not at the grad; **Mike Williford** noted that it changes from a weighting to an allocation. **Ingram** added that Day's data shows how much of our income comes from undergraduate education, so it is important to recruit and retain those students. We also need to have this kind of information, especially as we start to consider options such as differential tuition. Rathindra Bose added that some institutions use Master's programs, especially in STEM areas, to increase subsidy. Graduate students teach 20% of all courses on the Athens campus, and it would be very expensive to replace that teaching with Group I faculty. Senators also requested a copy of the presentation, which will be circulated with the meeting summary later this week.

## V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

### • Resolution on Faculty Fellowship Leave and Deferral for Curricular Reasons (First Reading)

Gradin noted that if a faculty fellowship leave (FFL) has been approved, but you are asked to defer leave for a year for curricular reasons, you lose a year of credit toward the next and all future FFL's. This resolution changes the Faculty Handbook to allow a faculty member who has been granted a leave at all levels (e.g. department, college, Provost), but is subsequently asked by their department to voluntarily defer leave to begin accruing years toward the next FFL

immediately. Legal Affairs has been consulted, and agrees that this resolution complies with the State Code addressing faculty leaves. Gradin also added that the resolution will eventually contain an endnote clarifying the process for tracking deferred leaves.

Discussion clarified that this is only for FFL's that have been approved through the Provost's level before the deferral is requested; that chairs/directors are not supposed to approve FFL's if they know that the faculty member can not be spared; and that State Code does not allow for the accrual of years toward the next year if an FFL has been *denied* for curricular reasons – it must first be "granted."

#### **• Resolution on Role of Chairs/Directors in Responding to Professional Ethics Violations (First Reading)**

Gradin pointed out that in the Faculty Handbook, there are timelines for every layer of the grievance process except in the case of ethics allegations, where it just says that the chair will respond in a "timely manner." It has taken over a year for chairs to respond in some cases. Changing the timeline to 30 days is in line with other timelines in the Faculty Handbook.

Senators asked for clarification about whether a "day" was a work day or a calendar day, and whether breaks were included in the count. Gradin responded that current practice is to treat the 30 days as calendar days; for faculty, days during university breaks (including summer) are not counted, while they are counted for administrators. McLaughlin asked that Senators share this resolution with their chairs/directors, and send any feedback to Gradin ([gradin@ohio.edu](mailto:gradin@ohio.edu)).

#### **• Resolution on Early Retirement on Semesters (First Reading)**

This resolution converts the existing Early Retirement (ER) program to semesters, maintaining the current structure of a 1/3 teaching load for 1/3 pay. Added is a requirement that the teaching of early retirees be reviewed.

Senators asked whether the teaching load included teaching, service, and research. Gradin responded that the ER program is a teaching program. Senators were also concerned about how raises were being calculated for early retirees; the Faculty Handbook says that ER faculty salaries will be "adjusted by the average percentage increase afforded the Group I faculty." But in years with separate merit pools, it appears that the ER faculty have only received the across-the-board amount in their raises; as we move toward more merit pay, this needs to be addressed for ER faculty. Gradin noted that the resolution also needs to clarify that not all STRS participants are eligible for health care through STRS.

#### **VI. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade**

Slade said that in absence of P&T appeals, the committee will discuss other issues, including support for pre-tenure faculty (see the *Inside Higher Ed* article on pre-tenure faculty satisfaction at <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/11/15/coache>). Slade also praised EVPP Benoit for the high level of transparency and consultation she has initiated on P&T issues.

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

Reilly said that EPSA will continue to monitor the Q2S transition, examine articulation agreements with secondary schools that grant OU credit, and will also prepare some resolutions to address housekeeping issues related to the semester conversion.

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

• **A Resolution on Special Event Parking in Academic Building Parking Lots**

David Thomas moved (seconded by Sayrs) a new resolution to allow faculty with appropriate permits to park in designated faculty parking lots without having to pay extra during special events. Senators asked where money collected for parking in academic lots during special events goes; McLaughlin said he would work on this issue as well.

**IX. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned (moved by Quitslund, seconded by Slade) at approximately 9:50 p.m.

---

**Resolution on Faculty Fellowship Leave and  
One-year Deferral for Curricular Reasons**

**Professional Relations Committee**

**November 15, 2010**

**First Reading**

Whereas, faculty who defer Fellowship Leave for one year in order to support curriculum integrity within their department or unit are currently penalized for their good citizenship;

Whereas, a change in language would act as an incentive for faculty to consider deferral of one year for purposes of maintaining curricular integrity;

Whereas, it would help alleviate a backlog of Fellowship Leaves in departments and colleges;

Whereas, the state code 3345.28 allows for this change because it references time between granted leaves ["A faculty member who has been granted professional leave shall complete another seven years of service at the college, university, or branch at which he is employed before he becomes eligible for another grant of professional leave at that college, university, or branch"];

*Be it resolved that* the language in the Faculty Handbook Section V. A. 2, 7, and 8 and the Endnotes be changed to the following [V.A. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9-18 do not change]:

**V. UNIVERSITY FACULTY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, RESEARCH GRANTS, AND AWARDS**

**A. University Faculty Fellowships**

2. At the end of each seven-year teaching period at Ohio University, each tenured faculty member having faculty status shall be eligible for a University Fellowship leave. Department chairpersons accrue time toward eligibility in the same way as other members. All academic service to Ohio University will count toward eligibility performed. Every faculty member who has *been granted* a University Fellowship leave shall complete another seven years of service at



Ohio University before he/she shall become eligible for another University Fellowship grant [1]. *When an approved leave is deferred for one year in order to maintain curricular integrity, eligibility starts after seven years of service from the date of original approval [2].*

7. A faculty member who does not wish to apply for a University Faculty Fellowship the year he/she becomes eligible or who is denied a University Fellowship for any reasons, will not lose his/her eligibility and may apply in the following years. If a faculty member is denied a University Fellowship for the convenience of the department, in spite of the fact that his/her proposal merits approval, *every effort will be made to ensure that this denial is not continued another year. In the case of a one-year deferral of an approved leave for purposes of curricular integrity, the next eligibility starts after seven years of service from the date of original approval.*

8. Upon completion of a University Fellowship leave, a faculty member starts accruing time toward eligibility for the award of his/her next University Faculty Fellowship as of the date of his/her resumption of normal academic duties. *Except under the circumstance noted above in the case of deferral for one year for the purposes of curriculum integrity (in which case the eligibility starts after seven years of service from the date of original approval),* he/she does not begin to accrue time toward another Fellowship while the Fellowship for which he/she is already eligible is delayed either voluntarily or through denial of leave.

#### **Endnotes**

[1] See Board of Trustees' policy amendment of October, 1977 providing implementation guidelines, Appendix A.

*[2] For purposes of official record keeping, when an approved leave is deferred for one year in order to maintain curricular integrity thereby triggering the start of the next eligibility at seven years after the date of original approval, the Chair/Director is required to provide both the Dean's office and the Provost's office with an official memo indicating that this action has been taken.*

[3] Example Leave Pay Schedule, for \$48,000 9-month salary:

---

## **Resolution on the Responsibility of Chairs/Directors in Responding to Ethics Violations**

**Professional Relations Committee**

**November 15, 2010**

**First Reading**

Whereas, in cases of apparent violations of professional ethics not involving Research Misconduct, the Faculty handbook specifically indicates fifteen (15) to thirty (30) day time limitations in which the College Dean, the College Professional Ethics Committee, the Provost, the Professional Relations Committee, and the accused must act on, investigate, or respond to the

ethical misconduct allegations;

Whereas, the Faculty Handbook does not contain a defined timetable in which Department Chairs, School Directors, or Division Coordinators must investigate the allegations and attempt to resolve the problem between the complainant and the accused;

Be it resolved that, the language in the Faculty Handbook Section IV, L.2.b (Procedures in the Event of Allegations of Violation of Professional Ethics) be changed to:

Cases of apparent violations of professional ethics not involving Research Misconduct should be brought to the attention of the department Chair<sup>[1]</sup>. The Chair, possibly in consultation with faculty colleagues or a departmental grievance/advisory committee, shall investigate the allegations. The person accused of the violation of professional ethics will be informed of the charges *within thirty (30) days* and be given an opportunity to explain his/her behavior. If the Chair is not satisfied with the explanation, the specifics of the allegations will be given *within fifteen (15) days* to the person accused in writing. The person accused will have fifteen (15) days to respond to the Chair in writing and the Chair will attempt to resolve the problem. If resolution cannot be reached between the Chair, the complainant, and the accused *within fifteen (15) days*, the Chair will forward the specific allegations of violation of Professional Ethics by the faculty member, along with appropriate documentation, to the Dean in writing. The faculty member accused will be given the option of submitting his/her explanation of the alleged misconduct in writing as part of the documentation submitted to the Dean at the same time. If the Dean, Chair, the complainant, and faculty member accused of the violation cannot reach a resolution of the matter within fifteen (15) days, the specific allegations of violation of Professional Ethics along with appropriate documentation will be forwarded to the College Professional Ethics Committee. A final copy of the allegations will be given to the accused, and once the allegations are forwarded to the College Professional Ethics Committee, no additional charges can be added without beginning the process anew.

[1] Department Chair is equivalent to School Director, Division Coordinator at the Regional Campuses, or the Associate Director of the Voinovich School.

---

**Resolution on Early Retirement on Semesters**  
**Professional Relations Committee**  
**November 15, 2010**  
**First Reading**

Whereas, both the faculty and the administration are committed to keeping the Early Retirement Program;

Whereas, the PRC has studied the recommendations from the committee charged with examining the Early Retirement Program;

Whereas, the above mentioned committee and the PRC were instructed that “the transition remain beneficial to both faculty and the institution as a whole, and . . . remain ‘cost neutral’ under a semester calendar;

Whereas, the section on Early Retirement needs updating in the Faculty Handbook;

Be it resolved that the language in the Faculty Handbook Section III. R be changed as follows:

**R. Early Retirement Policy**

- 1. General:** A tenured faculty member eligible for retirement under the STRS and wishing to continue to teach part-time may elect to do so under the early retirement policy. Those faculty enrolled in the Alternative Retirement Plan (ARP) will be eligible for the University's Early Retirement program if they meet the same eligibility requirements as those enrolled in STRS. Faculty enrolled in the ARP are not eligible for those benefits that STRS employees receive from STRS. The Early Retirement Agreement remains in effect as long as the faculty member wishes to continue part-time teaching and has not reached 70 years of age by **the start of fall term** of the upcoming year.
- 2. Teaching:** During early retirement, the faculty member will be permitted to teach **a third of an annual teaching load over the academic year each year. The distribution of those courses will be determined by the faculty member in discussion with his/her academic department head and after consideration of the needs of the department. For colleges that include summer session as a normal part of a faculty member's annual contract, the faculty member may, after consulting with his/her department head, choose to fulfill his/her obligation during summer.**

Currently reads:

**Teaching:** During early retirement, the faculty member will be permitted to teach the equivalent of one quarter each academic year. The term (Fall, Winter, or Spring) to be taught each year will be determined by the faculty member after discussion with his/her academic department head and after consideration of the needs of the department. For colleges that include summer quarter as a normal part of a faculty member's annual contract, the faculty member may, after consulting with his/her department head, choose to fulfill his/her obligation during Summer quarter.

- 3. Compensation:** The standard arrangement will be that the faculty member teaches the equivalent of one-third of the specified departmental teaching load for a third of the academic year salary. What constitutes one-third equivalency should be flexible enough for a department to support curricular innovations. The salary amount will be determined according to the following pattern: initially, to determine the salary for the year after retirement, the faculty member's nine-month salary for the academic year preceding retirement will be used as a base. The appropriate part of that salary will be adjusted by the average percentage increase afforded the Group I faculty as a whole. An adjustment based upon a similar procedure will be made annually. Any special financial arrangements for a faculty member teaching under this policy must be approved by the Provost.

Currently reads:

The standard arrangement will be that the faculty member teaches the equivalent of one quarter for one third academic year salary. The salary amount will be determined according to the following pattern: initially, to determine the salary for the year after retirement, the faculty member's nine-month salary for the last year of full-time teaching will be used as a base. The appropriate part of that salary will be adjusted by the average percentage increase afforded the faculty as a whole. An adjustment based upon a similar procedure will be made annually. Any special financial arrangements for a faculty member teaching under this policy must be approved by the Provost.

**4. Early retired faculty will have their teaching reviewed annually in accordance with departmental procedures.**

**(Note: point 4 above is new)**

**5. Insurance:** Beginning at retirement and continuing to age 70, the University provides life insurance under the University's group policy for faculty. Currently, medical insurance is provided for STRS members by STRS. (See Section III.G.) **Faculty members enrolled in ARP are not provided medical insurance. (See <http://XXXXX> for information.)**

**6. Special Arrangements:** During any academic term when the faculty member is on duty, appropriate office space, parking privileges, use of facilities and similar perquisites will be afforded the faculty member teaching under this policy. During the periods when the faculty member is not on duty, the perquisites as described under Emeritus Status (Section V.F) will be accorded the faculty member.

---

## **A Resolution on Special Event Parking in Academic Building Parking Lots November 15, 2010 First Reading**

Whereas, during special events, many academic building parking lots are closed to faculty unless they pay an extra \$5.00 fee; and,

Whereas faculty are often teaching, doing research, or are attending faculty senate representing the Ohio University faculty during such events; and,

Whereas the core mission of Ohio University is primarily carried out by the faculty;

Therefore be it resolved that faculty with appropriate faculty parking tags may park as usual in designated parking areas regardless of which special event is taking place.

