

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, March 14, 2011
Room 145, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
MINUTES/DRAFT

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, C. Kalenkoski, J. Lein, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, W. Roosenburg, S. Wyatt

College of Business: B. Roach

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

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

College of Osteopathic Medicine: H. Akbar

Group II: L. LaPierre for Sisson

Patton College of Education and Human Services: T. Franklin, A. Paulins

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, M. Nern

Russ College of Engineering: J. Dill, J. Giesey, D. Gulino for B. Branham, R. Pasic

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

Excused: T. Stock, H. Burstein, M. Bowen, T. Heckman, N. Kiersey

Absent: K. Hicks, L. Hoshower, J. Wolf

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President & Provost
- II. Michele Morrone, President's Advisory Council for Sustainability Planning
- III. Roll Call and Approval of the February 21, 2011 Minutes
- IV. Chair's Report—Joe McLaughlin
 - Updates & Announcements
 - February Trustees' Meeting
 - Regional Campus Visits
 - Evaluation of President & Provost
 - Upcoming Faculty Senate Elections & Nominating Committee
 - **Upcoming Senate Meetings: Extraordinary Faculty Senate Meeting, TBA to discuss President's Draft Budget Recommendations & April 18, 2011**
- V. Executive Committee—Joe McLaughlin
 - Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Senate Bill 5 and the Inter-University Council
- VI. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

- VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
 - Resolution to Amend Withdrawal Deadlines on Semesters (Second Reading & Vote)
 - VIII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—John Gilliom
 - IX. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
 - X. Promotion & Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade
 - XI. New Business
 - XII. Adjournment
-

The Faculty Senate observed a moment of silence in honor of Hugh Bloemer, former chair of Faculty Senate, who died March 10th (see <http://www.ohio.edu/compass/stories/10-11/3/Hugh-Bloemer-death-983.cfm> for more information).

McLaughlin announced that President McDavis was not able to attend Senate because of a medical issue, and that McDavis will likely be out of the office for about two weeks.

I. Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President & Provost

EVPP Benoit (benoit@ohio.edu) provided an overview of OU's planned shift to responsibility-centered management (RCM). She noted that Steve Golding (golding@ohio.edu), VP of Finance and Administration, was also in attendance to answer questions.

Benoit said that RCM is also known as RCB (responsibility-centered budgeting) and VCM (value-centered management). RCM seeks to examine the balance between resources generated and academic activity across colleges, and to identify the relationship between resources generated by academic activity and the costs within academic support units. RCM also provides information about revenue and the cost of academic and support activities, which along with considerations of academic quality and strategic priorities can be used to make decisions about programs and resource allocations. RCM is intended to be transparent.

RCM is always tailored to a given institution. Benoit's team is examining the best practices of other institutions that have adopted RCM in order to formulate "RCM Ohio." The budget model is not yet complete. While they have updated the work done by the Vision Ohio Resources Implementation Team and the Deans in 2007, this need to be refined and expanded to create the final model. The new model should express OU's values, which in turn should inform and drive budgetary decisions. The model will link resources with revenue-generating activity and costs, while understanding that programs with higher costs due to pedagogical or disciplinary reasons will require different levels of investment. The model should be transparent, have accountability, be easy to administer, and be inexpensive to maintain. Ultimately the model aims to provide budget stability.

Academic quality indicators will be included in RCM decisions as well, but it has yet to be determined what these will be: they may include retention rates, graduation rates, participation in research/creative activity, and honors and interdisciplinary programs. Established forms of governance will provide input into creating the model (e.g. Deans and VPs, Budget Planning Council, the Senates, and various committees and planning units across campus). Although the full budget model does not yet exist, and academic quality indicators have not been established, some budget decisions — namely developing budget reduction targets—will be based on partial preliminary RCM data this spring, specifically revenues and total costs.

Fully implementing RCM Ohio is a 3-5 year process with three phases. We are currently in phase 1, in which the preliminary model is developed and begins to inform budget development, and rebasing across academic units occurs in order to address structural imbalances. In phase 2, full implementation occurs: academic and support unit budgets are connected to RCM, and re-allocations occur across units at a sustainable level. Phase 3 consists of a comprehensive review after five years with necessary adjustments.

Benoit then clarified several "myths" about RCM. 1) RCM leads to more transparency and autonomy, but it doesn't allow unit to opt out of central expenses or university policies. 2) The "overhead" tax rate has not yet been determined, because the model has not been finalized. 3) RCM does not eliminate differential investments across units, because we cannot have differential tuition. There has to be some redistribution of revenue for units that cannot ever recover their costs (for pedagogical or disciplinary reasons, for example). Ohio University will invest in programs that are more expensive to deliver in order to maintain a comprehensive university; at what level is still under discussion.

NOTE: Materials on RCM can also be found on the EVPP's website at http://www.ohio.edu/provost/RCM_EVPP.cfm; highly recommended by members of the Faculty Senate's Finance and Facilities Committee is the Hearn *et al* article about the University of Minnesota's transition to RCM, available at http://www.ohio.edu/provost/RCM_EVPP.cfm. See also "Budget 101" at <http://www.ohio.edu/provost/budgetplanningEVPP.cfm> for an overview of OU's budget.

Benoit then answered questions:

James Casebolt noted that using an "every tub on its own bottom" system at regional campuses has been problematic, and was glad that RCM will not be implemented in this way.

Ken Brown asked how we could avoid the "race to the bottom" that RCM might engender (e.g. grade inflation to keep students within a College, larger classes taught by adjuncts). Benoit responded that there are concerns about reduction in quality because of the push toward student credit hours. But a reduction in quality would reduce student interest in that program, so in the long run it is not in a program's best interest. There has to be a balance between efficiencies and quality, and not focus only on student credit hours. We have to pay attention to who delivers student credit hours, and it is very important to have a strong curriculum committee that does not allow colleges to generate duplicate courses just to generate more credit hours. There was disagreement about how to address grade inflation and attendance issues.

Sherrie Gradin asked why, in the midst of the semester change, budget cuts, changes at the state level, etc., this was a good time to implement RCM. Benoit responded that RCM allows more transparency about the budget, helps us understand the full costs of our programs, and helps us make decisions about rebasing the colleges. Golding added that one benefit of RCM is that it creates incentives for generating revenue, and revenue generation will be critical in the next five years.

John Gilliom asked why, if RCM is a 3-5 year process that involves a discussion about values, metrics, what we are going to support, etc., we are using the quick first draft of RCM to inform emergency budget cuts in the next few weeks. The tool is not ready yet. Gilliom also raised the concern that the RCM process could be damaged by linking it to a set of catastrophic cuts. Benoit responded that they had been working on RCM since 2007. It is not completely finished, but Benoit said that the process could lose traction if not implemented. Golding added that he worried that budget cut targets might appear arbitrary if not linked to RCM.

Beth Quitslund responded that discussions about RCM have not been held with faculty since 2007. The only thing that has been consistent is that quality measures have still not been

decided; how can we say where we are going to end up if we have not decided what needs to be invested in? Benoit answered that we are beginning the process of rebasing now, but it will take 3-5 years. There will be time to have discussions about values, but we have to start implementing RCM now. We know where we need to begin rebasing colleges just based on updating the 2007 data.

Bernhard Debatin noted that there are many variables right now—early retirement, budget cuts, semesters, the new student information system—that are likely to interact in unpredictable ways. Debatin also objected to the language shifts in RCM to a deficit model, such as describing programs as having "higher costs," when in fact it is academic programs that create revenue in the first place. Schools/departments that are forced to have small classes (because of labs, pedagogical models, or accreditation requirements) are then labeled as "cost producers." Benoit responded that they recognize that some programs have higher costs. It does not mean that those programs are less valued, but they do require more of an investment. Debatin pointed out that the heavy weighting of student credit hours ignores other factors such as headcount. John Day responded that models take both into account, with a headcount factor of 15%, and that it is important to know how credit hours and headcount will be weighted in order to make decisions.

Charlotte Elster asked about the relationship between graduate and undergraduate programs, and **David Ingram** pointed out that RCM could create perverse incentives to skew graduate populations. John Day and Benoit said that cost factors and revenues are allocated across the colleges for graduate programs as well as undergraduates. Graduate students teaching undergraduate generates revenue. Benoit added that you do need to look out for perverse incentives, such as a college generating its own programs simply for weighted student credit hours (WSCH). We also need to create incentives for interdisciplinary programs, because the RCM model works by college. **David Thomas** pointed out that the emphasis on WSCH might create an incentive to bring in more students than we are capable of teaching.

Benoit was also asked how this might increase dependence on non-tenure-line faculty. Benoit said she thought tenure was important and not going away, but that we need to think about the proportion of Group I to Group II faculty. The faculty buyouts and RCM allow us to create staffing plans. **Lori LaPierre** asked about the current faculty to "administrator" ratio, because there are more administrators than faculty members. Benoit said that since administrator is broadly defined at OU, that data needs to be broken down before being discussed. **Teresa Franklin** asked whether Benoit could provide that break down; Mike Williford replied that we had that data by planning unit. McLaughlin said he would get that data for discussion at a later meeting.

Joe Slade asked if WSCH's are so important, what would lead the university to invest in those programs that need support? What kind of values would they rely on? Benoit said that it was simplistic to rely only on WSCH. For example, in the fine arts, the pedagogy makes the programs more expensive. But you cannot have a university without having the fine arts. So there is a value statement that says you have to invest in fine arts. Then we need to decide how much and at what level, and fine arts also needs to be efficient. **Slade** asked who would make that decision. Benoit said that this would be discussed with the governing structure of the university. **Duane McDiarmid** said that focusing on jobs as the only outcome of education was too narrow: some study for other reasons. Benoit agreed, but said it was important for students to know whether a job was likely after completing a course of study.

McDiarmid said that a lot of faculty were struggling with the sense that though there is lip service to shared governance, current trends seem to be about limiting the real impact faculty can have in shared governance. This makes us concerned when we hear all the talk that "we" are making decisions. There is less and less real faculty input ending up in real end-line decisions. It is

hard to be comforted by "we" simultaneous to our leadership supporting taking away our opportunity to participate in shared governance. Benoit responded that she does her best to listen and take comments seriously.

Steve Hays asked how checks and balances would operate under RCM. Even though academic units cannot opt out of centralized overhead costs, it is not clear how academic units will have input into shaping decisions about how expensive that overhead is. In the absence of a structure where academics can have a formal say or veto power, this model could proliferate expenses at the central level. Golding responded that several checks and balances are built into the system, including that every administrative overhead unit should have a public budget hearing; every Dean should know the overhead rate, and be able to give input about the fairness of the rate; and what is included in the overhead rate needs to be clear. Individual colleges may also have the ability to set the level of services they would like to receive in some areas. **Hays** noted that just because something is transparent does not mean that it is equitable. At least on some line items, academic areas really need to be able to impose some shape on the institution. Non-academic units can decide that they absolutely "need" to have something, but there comes a point where Deans need to be able to say that this is changing the nature of the place as an academic institution. Golding said he thought that was fair.

Debatin said that Benoit's promise to listen and have conversation was appreciated, but that there is a high level of frustration and low morale among faculty because there is no real participation by faculty in decision-making. Most committees are advisory, which means ignorable. People are disgusted by the shift away from the core academic mission, and the inequitable way that non-academic units are bailed out. This is a very dangerous situation where faculty and staff are turning away from this institution internally and externally. Benoit said that input from faculty has led her to change her mind about some decisions, and that it was important to continue the dialogue.

II. Michele Morrone, President's Advisory Council for Sustainability Planning (morrone@ohio.edu)

The Sustainability Plan is in draft form, and the Advisory Council is asking for feedback from the university community by April 5th, 2011. To read the plan and provide feedback, go to <http://www.ohio.edu/pacsp/>.

About 64% of student and parents say that sustainability has some influence on the decision to apply to a school. This suggests that it is time to look at environmental policies and frame those as recruitment opportunities. The Advisory Council was formed in 2009, and has drafted recommendations for a campus-wide sustainability plan, developed through many working groups and through campus- and community-wide discussions. The Advisory Council has three large goals: Citizenship, Stewardship, and Justice.

Ken Brown asked how the Advisory Council was related to the student group Beyond Coal. Students from that group participated in the working groups. **Eugene Ammarell** said that he worked with this committee for a year, and that he had never been part of a process that was more open, democratic, and more thorough, and congratulated those who put a lot of work into it.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the February 21, 2011 Minutes

A quorum was present. The minutes of the February 21, 2011 meeting were approved by voice vote (moved Paulins, seconded Quitslund).

IV. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

- Updates & Announcements

Ohio Faculty Council is meeting this Friday to talk about a resolution on Senate Bill 5. The agenda also includes a resolution in honor of Hugh Bloemer. Please send suggested language to include in the resolution to McLaughlin (mclaughj@ohio.edu).

Facilities Planning Advisory Committee (FPAC): There is still no capital bill for this biennium. The original plan was to fund the renovation of the old Baker Center; the HVAC system in Clippinger; and a renovation of the Athena to convert cinema space into large classroom space. It is not clear when the bill will come, or what the priorities are among those projects.

A very preliminary estimate indicated that the proposed indoor practice facility would cost about \$250,000 per year to be heated at 60 degrees; this funding is not included in the donation. We need to know from a sustainability and economic view what this facility will cost.

- February Trustees Meeting

The Trustees met at OU-Zanesville. There was an extensive conversation about the housing plan. They are proceeding cautiously by phasing in both the project and the financing, so we are not committed to the full plan. The Trustees approved the concept of the plan, but they have not yet approved the financing. The financing will be voted on at the April meeting, after more is known about the state budget and the delayed capital bill. The first of the new dorms are scheduled to open in fall of 2013, so the Trustees did approve planning for this. The Trustees gave final approval to adding a representative from the Voinovich School; the first election of a Voinovich representative will be next spring.

The Trustees were also presented with some of the same budget strategies we have seen. The Trustees asked very good questions about the buyouts, focusing on maintaining quality, the level of hiring back, the quality of new hires, etc. Trustees also wanted to know what the feedback was like on campus, and were interested in the general fee/tuition rebalancing issue. Faculty Senate representative were at the table with the Trustees, and McLaughlin was impressed with the both the types of questions the Trustees were asking, and with the continuing good relationships being built with the Trustees.

- Regional Campus Visits

McLaughlin visited Zanesville and Eastern campuses. Many of the concerns were the same as at the Athens campus. At both campuses, faculty members wanted to discuss the merit raise limits imposed by the Provost this year; this was also damaging to morale at regional campuses.

- Evaluation of President & Provost

In accordance with the resolution passed 5/12/08, the President and Provost will be evaluated this year during spring quarter, probably in April.

- Upcoming Faculty Senate Elections & Nominating Committee

Faculty senate elections will occur in about a month. Nominations will be open at the beginning of spring quarter, and McLaughlin encouraged the Senate to recruit strong colleagues to serve. He also announced the Nominating Committee, consisting of Senators in their sixth year: David Thomas, Sherrie Gradin, Willem Roosenburg, and Patrick Munhall.

• **Upcoming Senate Meetings: Extraordinary Faculty Senate Meeting, TBA to discuss President's Draft Budget Recommendations & regular Faculty Senate Meeting April 18, 2011**

Spring quarter meetings will be back in Room 235, Walter Hall. The Extraordinary Meeting may be moved from April 4th to April 11th, dependent upon when OU budget information becomes available.

V. Executive Committee—Joe McLaughlin

• Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Senate Bill 5 and the Inter-University Council (first reading)

It was recently reported that Bruce Johnson, President and CEO of the Inter-University Council, was responsible for inserting language into Senate Bill 5 barring university professors from collective bargaining by defining faculty as "management" if they perform certain standard faculty duties (http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_SB_5_PS_N.html). President McDavis has said that he is "not opposed" to SB5. This resolution asserts that the Ohio University Faculty Senate does not support SB5, and calls upon Bruce Johnson, Pres. McDavis, and other university presidents to retract their support for SB5. SB5 also requires that "public employees" pay at least 15% of their health care premiums; OU faculty currently pay about 9% of premiums, so SB5 would result in an increase by 66% in premiums.

A motion to suspend the rules and move to second reading was approved by voice vote (moved by Slade, seconded by Bates).

Some faculty Senators suggested including support for the proposed Ohio Faculty Council resolution against SB5. One Senator argued against this because the Senator supported SB5 and thought that public employee collective bargaining rights should be curtailed; other Senators wanted more information (e.g. about Johnson's salary and IUC's funding, and how SB5 might affect domestic partner benefits), or were uncomfortable supporting OFC's draft resolution because it had not yet been voted on, and thus were not in favor of adding language to support OFC's resolution.

A motion to amend the resolution to include support for the OFC's proposed resolution against SB5 was approved by a show of hands (24-9) (moved by Casebolt).

A motion to approve the resolution passed by voice vote (moved by committee).

VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
(reillya@ohio.edu)

• Resolution to Amend Withdrawal Deadlines on Semesters (Second Reading & Vote)

New data about the financial impact of withdrawal deadlines was received today. A motion that the second reading and vote on this resolution be postponed definitely to the next regular meeting on April 18th was approved by voice vote.

VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—John Gilliom (gilliom@ohio.edu)

Gilliom discussed the five fronts that F&F will be focusing through the current budget discussions: faculty strength and academic quality; workforce investment; RCM; tuition and fees; and targeting reductions.

Faculty strength and academic quality: F&F will focus on the loss of faculty from the buyout (and uncertain rehiring plans) and from morale, salary, and institutional priority issues; and the likely increase in non-tenure track faculty.

Workforce investment: This year compensation decrease is likely because of the proposed parking fees and the proposed health care cost shift. The administration wants faculty to cover 50% of the increase in health care costs, while SB5 requires that faculty pay a minimum of 15% of health care premiums. We could cover 50% of the estimated cost increase by paying only 13% of premiums. This means faculty compensation is likely to fall even further. McLaughlin added that the increase in health care costs previously estimated to be \$5 million is now likely to be about \$2 million.

RCM: Gilliom pointed out that it is important for department chairs and Deans to understand RCM, and to understand that RCM does not dictate decisions, but is merely a framework for making decisions. For RCM to work well, you need to place a strong emphasis on advisory groups, and we must not rush pivotal decisions—such as using RCM to direct budget cuts this spring—without having the necessary discussion and input about items like the academic quality indicators. While it is true that discussion began in 2007, that topic disappeared for a long time. **Ken Brown** noted that under Provost Krendl, there was documentation outlining the pitfalls of RCM, and there was an intent to set up safeguards against these problems. **David Ingram** added that we have to safeguard against models with too many rigid formulae. Gilliom reiterated that RCM should be a framework for making decisions, but not dictate decisions.

Gilliom then discussed RCM's "fateful premise," which may lead to a serious erosion of the academic mission of OU. RCM assumes that the SSI is "earned" by academic units; therefore cuts in the SSI are borne directly by the academic units. In turn, any non-academic unit cuts are derivative. General fee-funded areas (the Division of Student Affairs, Intercollegiate Athletics, the Graduate College and the OU Marching 110) may never receive cuts, even when the SSI is cut, because they do not "earn" SSI in the first place, and the general fee is unlikely to be cut. We have been working on rebalancing the current tuition/fee structure to better support academics. If we do not adjust this, any cuts will weigh very heavily on the academic mission.

McLaughlin said that one of the questions at the budget forums last month was if OU's cost to produce WSCH is low, why do we have the third highest tuition and fees in the state. One part of that is while we do have the third highest tuition and fees, we only have the fifth highest tuition, so those other schools are putting proportionately more into academics. We have the third highest fee in the state (with 47% going to Intercollegiate Athletics). **Roosenburg** said that other schools in Ohio had the same problems in state funding, and asked what solutions they are proposing, and whether all schools were protecting athletics as OU is doing. Anecdotal reports related by Senators seemed to indicate that other schools are preparing for a variety of budget cut scenarios, some higher and some lower than ours.

Gilliom pointed out several areas of strong, recent spending increases: executive salaries and staffing levels, ICA, the Foundation, IT, and Baker Center. Many of these are increasing at four times the rate of inflation, and will be untouched under the fateful premise. He added that there has not been transparency in the levels of proposed academic and non-academic cuts as there was last year.

Ann Paulins said that there are opportunities under RCM for all of us as well, and that it is important to understand that there are funding inequities between departments because of historical decisions. She added that Faculty Senate can lead the discussion about values in RCM (e.g. grade inflation), and that we need to have a more balanced discussion about what the future is going to be. It is going to be bleak and painful, but RCM does not tell us what to do, and we need to be at the table to say what is important to us rather than bash the process.

Gilliom clarified that he was not "bashing" RCM, and that he does not think RCM is being adopted in order to enact the fateful premise. There is real enthusiasm for the model itself, especially

as a way to rebase the Colleges. Rather, the fateful premise is an unintended consequence that we need to be vigilante about; if we do get a chance to have conversations about RCM, the faculty should be prepared with a set of shared concerns about RCM. Gilliom recommended the Hearn *et al* article about the University of Minnesota's transition to RCM, available at http://www.ohio.edu/provost/RCM_EVPP.cfm. McLaughlin added that the key desire in implementing RCM is to rebalance the academic units. **Brown** added rebasing could happen without RCM. McLaughlin responded that in conversations with Golding, Golding is convinced that RCM is a system that has brought success to universities that are using it. **Ingram** said that he takes exception to academic rebalancing: the entire university has to rebalance. **Roosenburg** asked whether this was an appropriate time to call for a vote of no confidence in upper administration. McLaughlin responded that we are already having conversations about how to respond this spring to proposed cuts. He indicated that his personal preference is to wait until we see the first set of budget recommendations from the President's office; he will also check what the handbook says about this.

Debatin said that RCM as a model is sensitive to bad input, and we need to be careful about accepting all the premises of RCM that might then become permanently embedded in the system (e.g. headcount vs. WSCH). We need to ensure that faculty have a real voice in the kind of RCM that will be implemented, and that there is transparency about how decisions are made. **Duane McDiarmid** added that he does not object to RCM as a basic tool, but it is unclear exactly what the tool is and how it will be used, and who will have input in critical decisions. **Beth Quitslund** added that RCM does not cut budgets: executives cut (or rebalance) budgets. **Steve Hays** asked for more detailed preliminary budget information (e.g. last year, the ICA budget was not clear until the fall). John Day said that he could help with those figures. **McDiarmid** noted that since academic units generate revenue, cutting academic units may actually decrease revenue overall, depending on the size of the cut. **Paulins** added that faculty need a voice, and need to decide which things we can most afford to invest in. **Charlotte Elster** pointed out that we have to keep a close eye on tuition and fees as well, so that students are not deterred by higher costs.

McLaughlin noted the updated budget timeline: Proposed targets will be announced April 6, after which scenarios will be developed. The proposed targets will reveal much about what is valued at Ohio University. Scenario planning will also be complicated by the buyouts, which go through May 1st.

The complete budget timeline is now:

Targets Announced: April 6th

Budget Forums: April 11 & 12

Planning Unit Head Meetings: April 13 - April 20

Proposed Scenarios Announced: April 29

Budget Forums: May 3 & 4

Presidential Review of University Input: May 5 - May 11

Final Budget Recommendations: May 12

VIII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin (gradin@ohio.edu)

Gradin briefly announced that the PRC would be bringing back resolutions about faculty fellowship leaves under semesters and about clinical faculty for OU-COM. They will also meet with the Provost about federal background checks and will report back to the Faculty Senate about this.

IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade (slade@ohio.edu)

Slade announced that one appeal is in process, and another is forthcoming.

X. New Business

None

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:11 p.m.

**Sense of the Senate Resolution on Inter-University Council and Senate Bill 5
Ohio University Faculty Senate
Executive Committee
Approved March 14, 2011**

Whereas Senate Bill 5 restricts the ability of faculty at public universities to determine their own form of organization; and

Whereas Senate Bill 5 restricts the autonomy which large public universities need to effectively manage their operations; and

Whereas Senate Bill 5 forces universities to raise employee health benefits contributions to a significantly higher level (an uncapped minimum on premiums), thereby eroding faculty compensation, the universities' ability to compete for quality faculty, and the quality of education they deliver;

Be it resolved that the Ohio University Faculty Senate opposes Senate Bill 5 and calls upon President McDavis, Inter-University Council head Bruce Johnson, and the other presidents of Ohio public universities to publicly retract their support for it and, in so doing, affirm the importance of academic quality at their schools.

Be it further resolved that the Ohio University Faculty Senate supports the resolution proposed for vote on Senate Bill 5 by the Ohio Faculty Council.

**A Resolution to Amend Withdrawal Deadlines Under Semesters
Ohio University Faculty Senate
Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee
March 14, 2011**

Second Reading & Vote postponed definitely to April 18th, 2011

WHEREAS

The Assistant Deans and other faculty and staff concerned with advising feel that the end of the seventh week is too soon under 14-week semesters for many faculty members and other instructors to adequately transmit their assessments of student work and for students to process the consequences of that information,

BE IT RESOLVED

That the deadline for a student to withdraw from a class be established at Friday of the eighth week of the 14-week semester, and the closest Friday to the fourth week of the term for seven-week summer terms. The exact times of all these deadlines will be established by the Registrar's office. These changes will take effect with the beginning of the semester calendar, Fall 2012.
