

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, May 16, 2011
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
Minutes

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

In attendance:

Continuing Senators

College of Arts and Sciences: E. Ammarell, K. Brown, C. Elster, J. Gilliom, S. Gradin, S. Hays, K. Hicks, D. Ingram, C. Kalenkoski, J. Lein, J. McLaughlin, G. Negash (for W. Roosenburg), R. Palmer, S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, S. Wyatt

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

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

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

College of Osteopathic Medicine: H. Akbar, T. Heckman, J. Wolf

Group II: H. Burstein, M. Sisson

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

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: N. Kiersey

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt

Regional Campus—Lancaster: P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Southern: M. Crawford (for D. Marinski)

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

Russ College of Engineering: J. Giesey, R. Pasic

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

Excused: S. Doty, D. Marinski, M. Nern, W. Roosenburg

Absent: M. Bowen, B. Branham, J. Dill, T. Franklin, T. Heckman, R. Knight

Newly-elected Senators (*also listed above)

College of Arts and Sciences: K. Brown*, G. Negash*, S. Patterson*, A. Rouzie, G. Van Patten

College of Business: L. Hoshower*

College of Fine Arts: V. Marchenkov, E. Sayrs*

Group II: L. Lapierre

Patton College of Education and Human Services: B. Vanderveer

Regional Campus—Lancaster: S. Doty*

Regional Campus—Zanesville: J. Farley

Scripps College of Communication: B. Bates*, J. Slade*

Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: A. Ruhil

Excused (resigned): G. Matlack

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. EVPP Pam Benoit
- II. Roll Call and Approval of the April 11 & April 25, 2011 Minutes

- III. Chair’s Report
 - Update on Resolutions
 - Announcements
 - Report on Elections & Introduction of New Senators
 - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: June 6, 2011, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
 - IV. Faculty Senate Officer Elections—Sherrie Gradin
 - V. Professional Relations Committee—Sherrie Gradin
 - Resolution on Faculty Fellowship Leave Under Semesters (Second Reading & Vote)
 - Resolution on Creation of Clinical Faculty Designation (First Reading)
 - VI. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom
 - Sense of the Senate Resolution on Planning Unit Reduction Targets and Budget Priorities (Second Reading & Vote)
 - Resolution to Establish a Parental Leave Policy (Second Reading & Vote)
 - Sense of the Senate Resolution on Replacement Group I Hires (First Reading)
 - VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly
 - VIII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade
 - IX. New Business
 - X. Adjournment
-

I. Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

EVPP Benoit provided updates to the Senate on five issues.

- Strategic investments from the possible 3.5% tuition increase: A tuition increase of 3.5%, the maximum allowed in the state budget, would generate about \$5.4 million. The draft list of high-priority investments that the Provost’s Office has identified thus far comes to just under \$8.3 million; some, obviously, will not be funded.

FY 12 Potential Investments (Draft)

Undergraduate Scholarships—inflation & true up	873,558
Graduate Fee Waivers	456,806
Summer Budget Increase (reflecting 1.66% salary increase	357,758
Nursing (3 rd year of 4-year implementation)	517,341
Enrollment Management—Recruiting/Marketing	750,000
Graduate Stipends	215,037
Disability Services staffing	140,000
Learning Community expansion and semester inflation	140,000
Maintenance—safety items	1,000,000
Upgrade to Emergency Response System	77,500
Baker—Enhanced Operations Staffing	141,000
Baker—equipment repair/replacement	267,000
Oracle annual base increase (applications and databases)	117,512
Oarnet funding to increase bandwidth capacity by 1GB	100,000
Rufus Support—licenses/staff net of savings from mainframe	1,313,256
Rufus Hardware Refresh (5-year replacement cycle, annualized)	400,000

Enrollment Reserve (\$700,000 now)	500,000
Instructional Capacity	1,000,000
	=====
	8,366,768

- Compensation changes for faculty and staff next year. Employees will receive base salary increases to offset the new parking fee and the increase in health care premium costs. Employees will be responsible for about 15% of the premium cost of their plan (up from a bit under 10% now). Each employee will receive a salary increase equivalent to their increased premium costs (after the conclusion of Open Enrollment) plus the parking fee, with the intention that total compensation be unchanged.

- University cash reserves: Some state legislators have implied that because the state's universities hold significant cash reserves (about \$2.9 billion in total), that money should be spent before the state raises the SSI or permits institutions to increase their tuitions. Provost Benoit brought copies of a recent editorial in the Columbus Dispatch that made the case for holding onto cash reserves. (See <http://dispatchpolitics.com/live/content/editorials/stories/2011/05/06/prudence.html?sid=101>). She further noted that S.B. 6 requires us to maintain sufficient reserves to meet exigencies, and that much of Ohio Universities cash reserve is not held centrally but is spread across planning units.

- Legislative update. H.B. 202 (which would have limited the amount of income that retired teachers could make from teaching) seems unlikely to be taken up this session. Similarly, legislation making changes to public employee pension funding are probably on hold until the fall. The final state budget did not include language about faculty workloads, and the requirement that academic programs provide 3-year degrees is more flexible than the initial drafts.

- Dean searches and replacements: Howard Dewald has been appointed Interim Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, and the election of faculty members to the search committee is being conducted now. The process for appointing an interim dean for Scripps College is underway, as is the solicitation of nominations for faculty representatives on that search committee. Similarly, the process for appointing an interim Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College is underway, and the Provost is discussing the constitution of the search committee with Senate Chair McLaughlin. All three searches will utilize search firms, and possible firms are currently under review.

The first set of questions from senators concerned workload policy under semesters and RCM. **Gene Ammarell** asked whether it should be based on courses taught by each instructor? The number of Weighted Student Credit Hour each instructor generated? Would HTC instruction count, as well as online time with students? **Charlotte Elster** pointed out that some activities that generate few or no credit hours, like advising doctoral students, can take up large amounts of faculty time and energy, and are actually a mix of teaching, advising, and research. Provost Benoit agreed that WSCHs are important under RCM, and advised that departments try to think flexibly about what constitutes workload based on the kinds of responsibilities that their faculty undertake: it should include more than time in the classroom, extending to academic advising, directing graduate students, work with the Honors Tutorial College, and service. Teaching does, however, have to be covered with the resources the department has. **Steve Hays** noted that

workload definitions could affect instructional quality, if, for example, course sizes were overly inflated in order to reduce the number of courses.

Considerable discussion focused on the list of strategic reinvestments. **Scott Titsworth** asked why items that didn't seem optional, like safety improvements, were on a list of "strategic" spending—aren't those covered in other budgets? Benoit explained that applying more base funding to facilities maintenance and repair is a way to deal with declining state support for capital projects. In the past, major renovations and repairs have been paid for through capital bills allocating money to the state's institutions; it looks like there will not be one this year, and we have no certainty about the future, either. The Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Facilities are working on new models for funding our maintenance needs, which is made more difficult by a very long list of deferred maintenance projects throughout the campus. The funds from the tuition increase represent a small proportion of what will be needed, and address only pressing, basic safety issues. **Ken Hicks** asked for clarification about the funds for replacing faculty lost through the ERIP and VESP programs. The Provost said that the line item on the strategic funding list was in addition to what was budgeted in the ERIP/VESP program itself (replacing 60% of the positions at an average of 75% of the retiree salary). The kind of faculty hired—tenure-track or not, long- or short-term—would vary, depending on the assessment of demand for instruction in particular areas.

A number of questions focused on the \$750K allocated for marketing and student recruitment in the strategic investment list. **Steve Patterson** asked for data about the effectiveness and return on investment of previous marketing efforts, including the Promise campaign. Benoit wished that Craig Cornell (Vice Provost for Enrollment Management) were there to answer questions directly. She pointed out OU for many years did not advertise, and that previous marketing campaigns were funded with one-time money. Putting base funds into advertising is a response to an increasingly competitive market in which the number of potential students is dropping and we are trying to maintain the quality of our incoming classes. She suggested that an increase in out-of-state students might be attributable to the launch of our first out-of-state ads, placed last year in the Pittsburg area. **Hajrudin Pasic** agreed that advertising was necessary, noted that the Senate had discussed it three or four years ago, and suggested that having students involved with social media advertising would be cost-effective. Benoit commented that social networking was being used recruitment, and invited **David Thomas** to repeat a comment he had made at another meeting; he complied by (re)stating that advertising is our future. **Ammarell** said that he had thought that we weren't increasing the number of students on the Athens campus. Benoit replied that the goal is to increase enrollment in Athens by 1,000 students over the next five years, but that we are also competing in a shrinking market to maintain the quality of our incoming classes. **Mark Phillips** suggested that it would be cheaper and more effective to target individual students for recruitment than whole markets. Benoit responded that effective university marketing requires two phases or steps: 1) creating a positive impression of the institution, and 2) selling particular programs more specifically to interested students. The Capital Campaign is crucial for ensuring scholarships to the particular students we especially want. **Toby Stock** commented that given the apparently remarkable returns on out of state advertising, he was befuddled that so little new money was being committed for marketing. He suggested that other sources of funding be found for recruitment campaigns, such as borrowing from College budgets. The Provost agreed that marketing is important, but underlined that there are many competing needs for money on campus. **David Ingram** noted that we need to

create an institutional culture attuned to look carefully at the returns on investments—as, for example, in recruiting out of state students.

Judith Lee asked about preferred vendor relationships, especially Concur. While P-Card training suggests that travel arrangements must be made through Concur, her colleague who recently wrote to VP Golding was told that using Concur was optional. Given that Concur and TravelWorld often seem not to have the best prices, she asked whether that flexibility for purchasing should be more widely publicized. VP Golding responded that while preferred vendors might not offer the best deal on specific purchases, they tend to save money in the aggregate. Currently, employees must use their university MasterCard for purchases with university funds, but that arranging travel through Concur is not required. He also noted that his office is taking a look at the Concur system, and that he hopes there will be clearer rules of the road in the future.

Compensation issues also generated comments from senators. **Ken Brown** asked about the administration's plans if the state legislature did require that employees pay a greater proportion of retirement contributions. Benoit said that there are no current discussions about how the university would respond. Addressing the health care premium increase offset, **Elster** argued that because those on a family plan will receive larger increases to their base salary, they will be in an advantaged position on retirement, or even when their children age out of family coverage, and that this seemed like a discriminatory compensation policy. Provost Benoit responded that the University's General Counsel had affirmed that having a family or not does not constitute a protected category, so legally the offset is not discriminatory. She also pointed out that there are already other benefits only available to employees with families, including children's educational benefits and certain medical procedures. The point of the offset, she contended, is to offset new costs and thus protect employees. **Elster** countered by noting that the compounding effect of the addition to base salaries would be quite significant over the course of a career. VP Golding agreed, but also pointed out that there is a compounding effect in the insurance premiums as well, which means that family rates will increase more than individual rates. In addition, it is a one-time aberration: new employees won't have a "bump," regardless of whether they have dependents. **Bernhard Debatin** pointed out that if health care costs continue to rise at a rate greater than salaries, the premium costs to those with family coverage will rise more quickly than to those only paying for themselves. VP Golding confirmed that the projections provided to his office suggest that health care costs will increase by 10% per year over the next six years, compared to a 3% per year increase in the CPI.

Pasic asked the Provost if she had seen the President in the previous month. Benoit answered that they had jointly opened the new Walter International Center the previous Saturday.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the April 11 and April 25, 2011 Minutes

A quorum was present. Both sets of minutes were approved by a voice vote (April 11: moved by Titsworth, seconded by Ingram; April 25: moved by Allyn, seconded by Gradin).

III. Chair's Report—Joe McLaughlin

- All pending resolutions have now been signed by the Provost. These included the resolution providing for the continuation of the FFL clock in the event of a one-year deferral; the resolution on the role of chairs and directors in professional ethics procedures; early retirement guidelines for semesters; a resolution incorporating several catalogue changes for semesters; the

new deadline for Incomplete grades on semesters (two weeks into the next term); and a resolution setting Withdrawal deadlines on the semester calendar (the end of the tenth week). These can be viewed at <http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/>.

- The annual faculty appraisal of the President and Provost have been sent out to faculty. Please complete these and return them promptly: the deadline is June 1.
- Nominations are needed to staff university standing committees. These are usually self-nominations, so please consider volunteering yourself for one of these committees.
- McLaughlin introduced the newly-elected senators. One senator from Arts & Sciences has resigned his seat and will need to be replaced, and some units will need to select alternates. Voting rate in the faculty senate elections was 27.24% this year, somewhat lower than the five-year average of 31.89%. McLaughlin said that this could be partly explained by the fact that some units did not have vacant senate seats but received ballots to vote only for alternates, and several, including Arts & Sciences, had the same number of candidates as open seats. Forms for requesting senate committee assignments will be distributed at the June meeting.
- **The next faculty senate meeting will be on June 6, 2011, at 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235.**

IV. Faculty Senate Officer Elections—Sherrie Gradin

The Nominating Committee was made up of senators who must rotate off of the Senate because they have served two consecutive three-year terms, and chaired by Gradin. In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, the Committee nominated a slate of officers at the April 25 meeting: **for Chair, Joe McLaughlin; for Vice Chair, Elizabeth Sayrs; and for Secretary, Beth Quitslund.** There were no nominations from the floor. McLaughlin was elected Chair by secret ballot with with 45 “yes” votes. A motion was made and passed by voice vote to elect the rest of the slate by acclamation.

McLaughlin offered appreciation for David Thomas’s service as Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, particularly for his work as the UCC Chair. He oversaw the curricular effects of a difficult academic reorganization and spearheaded the creation and implementation of OCEAN. Sayrs was lauded for the quality and speed of summaries and minutes during her time as Secretary.

V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

- **Resolution on Faculty Fellowship Leave Under Semesters (Second Reading)**

One revision was made from the first reading, the elimination of a footnote that referred to a chart that had already been deleted. There were questions about whether the number of paychecks in a semester would make a difference in how the FFL compensation was calculated (it will not). The resolution was passed by a voice vote.

- **Resolution on Creation of Clinical Faculty Designation (First Reading)**

Dean Brose of OU-COM attended the meeting in order to answer questions. The rationale for the creation of a Clinical Faculty designation is to allow for better recruitment and retention of physician-instructors and to bring OU-COM into line with national norms for medical schools. Clinical Track appointments would differ from Group II primarily by being promotable. These faculty members might do some lecturing, but their primary teaching role is precepting during clinic work. Dean Brose explained that some faculty arrive at OU-COM only to discover that they are not suited to the heavy research expectations of tenure-track faculty, even though they may be excellent physicians. The Clinical track would allow the college to keep keep difficult-

to-recruit specialists to supervise students and serve the medical needs of the community. A great deal of discussion centered on whether the creation of a track parallel to tenure at OU-COM represents a threat to tenure at OU in general, and several wondered why either some version of Group II or a tenure track with different tenure expectations would not serve as well as a non-tenurable clinical track. There was also concern about how the ability to switch from the tenure track to the clinical one would affect the integrity of the tenure process: would it make it easier to deny tenure, or represent an escape route for faculty who were not meeting tenure requirements? Several senators supported a proposal that the time during which a faculty member could switch from the tenure track into the clinical one be limited, and end significantly before the tenure review would normally begin, and Dean Brose agreed with this suggestion. Questions were also raised about what kind of appeal process would be available if a petition to switch tracks was denied.

VI. Finance and Facilities Committee—John Gilliom

- **Sense of the Senate Resolution on Planning Unit Reduction Targets and Budget Priorities (Second Reading)**

This resolution has been made considerably shorter since the First Reading, focusing now on only three issues: 1) the cuts to academic units are greater than the cuts to non-academic ones; 2) some non-academic units are protected without a clear rationale; and 3) the administration has not provided a sense of how the academic units are affected by or supposed to maintain quality after years of budget cuts. It asks that the FY 2012 budget be revised, and that (in accordance with RCM principles) future budgets clearly recognize costs and benefits to the institution. In discussion, friendly amendments to the second “Whereas” changed “protects several non-academic units” to “largely protects several non-academic units” to clearly refer to small cuts as well as the absence of any cuts, and “cogent rationale” was amended to “convincing and verifiable rationale.” The resolution was passed by a voice vote.

- **Resolution to Establish a Parental Leave Policy (Second Reading)**

A lively debate arose around whether the resolution should support family leave rather than only parental leave. This would help ameliorate additional benefits going only to employees with children, and the policy at the University of Iowa was noted as an example. It was pointed out that a committee is on the verge of recommending a parental leave policy to the Provost, and that this resolution would be a timely way to support efforts already underway. The suggestion was made that perhaps the resolution should ask for a policy on “family and parental leave,” to prepare the groundwork for future policies. Other senators pointed out the particular problems that child-bearing and rearing pose for female faculty, and offered examples of ways that not having a clear policy affects retention and recruitment. The resolution was passed by voice vote.

- **Sense of the Senate Resolution on Replacement Group I Hires (First Reading)**

This resolution asks that priority be given to Group I replacement hiring for any faculty lines vacated through the ERIP or VESP offers, and that the criteria for such replacement hires be open and fairly applied. Gilliom noted that this resolution is extremely preliminary, and that depending on further announcements about how replacement hires will be done, the resolution may be unnecessary or need to change substantially.

- Other discussion brought up the mismatch between new proposed employee costs and the language in the Faculty Handbook. Noting that the Handbook requires that faculty bear no more than 10% of the cost of health insurance premiums, a senator asked the senate leadership to bring forward a resolution. There is not yet a consensus on whether the resolution should discuss

total compensation, percentage of total health care costs, or simply raise the maximum percentage of the premium to 15%. Handbook language guaranteeing parking space to faculty may need revision. Further, the establishment of a parking fee has raised the possibility that the Parking Committee should extend its duties to review the budget of the Parking unit; should it do so, a mandate from the Faculty Senate and a change in the constitution of the committee's membership might be in order.

VII. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly

EPSA chose not to bring forward the resolution creating a First-Year Council for second reading. Some details are still in negotiation, and the committee is trying to find ways to integrate the proposed FYC with other related committees, as well as to differentiate it from the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (EMAC).

Reilly also offered his congratulations and thanks to David Thomas for his leadership of the UCC.

VIII. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade

The committee has received a petition for an extension to the probationary period. They are also in meetings about the possibility of allowing Group I faculty to transfer to Group II.

IX. New Business

None.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:50 p.m.

Resolution on Faculty Fellowship Leave Adjustment for Semester Calendar
Professional Relations Committee
Faculty Senate
May 16, 2011
Second Reading & Vote

Whereas, the language in the Faculty Handbook Section V.A needs to be adjusted for the semester calendar change;

Whereas, the PRC has followed the committee recommendations in a report on FFL submitted to the Provost in June of 2010;

Be it resolved that on the appropriate date, the language in the Faculty Handbook Section V. A. 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, and the Endnote containing a sample pay schedule replace the current language with the following:

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

A. University Faculty Fellowships

4. A University Fellowship leave may consist of **one semester at full pay or two semesters at two-thirds pay.**~~[3]~~ These rates are to be applied to the pay the faculty member normally would receive during the **semester(s)** in which the faculty member is to be on leave.

5. A University Fellowship leave may be granted for a maximum of **two semesters**. Faculty on nine-month contracts will be granted leave only during the **semesters** covered by a contract. A University Fellowship leave may not be taken during the **summer or other off terms**, though such **terms** do count toward eligibility for a University Faculty Fellowship. Faculty members on twelve-month contracts will be granted leave at any time during the twelve-month period of the contract, with the full **summer session considered to be one semester**.

10. Faculty members will be expected to teach at Ohio University for at least **two semesters** after completion of their University Fellowship leave.

11. Application for a University Faculty Fellowship is to be made in writing to the department chairperson ordinarily no later than the first day of the **Spring Semester** preceding the summer and/or academic year in which the leave is to be taken. The decision by the President on his/her application is to be made known to the faculty member in writing no later than March 1, though this decision is subject to approval by the Trustees at their next meeting. The application must include a well-considered plan, presented with a reasonable degree of specificity, showing how the Fellowship leave will contribute to the professional effectiveness of the applicant and the best interest of the University, e.g., teaching efficacy, research, and creativity.

12. The department will evaluate the faculty members' applications and the chairperson will send all the applications and his/her recommendations to the appropriate dean. The dean will review all applications in the college and send them and his/her recommendations to the Provost, who will review them and make recommendations to the President for final approval or disapproval, subject to confirmation by the Board of Trustees. If the evaluation process results in a decision not to approve the application, the faculty member will be given, no later than March 1, written notification of the action and all reasons for the action. The written statement will be made by the person in the review process who first recommends disapproval of the application.

13. If a faculty member believes that his/her leave proposal has been denied unjustly, he/she will have the right to appeal the decision to his/her chairperson, to the dean, to the Provost, **and then to the Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate**. The grounds for the appeal may be allegations of (a) inadequate consideration, (b) denial of due process, or (c) personal bias or discrimination.

16. Regional campus faculty members shall submit requests for a University Faculty Fellowship to the division coordinator. The division coordinator may forward the faculty member's application to the appropriate department at the Athens campus or to the most closely related department if no corresponding department exists. He/she shall take such action at the faculty member's request. The Athens department shall

give advice on the merit of the faculty member's proposal and return it to the division coordinator in making his/her recommendations to the regional campus dean. The regional campus dean shall review all applications at his/her campus. He/she will send applications and his/her recommendations to the Provost, who will review them and make recommendations to the President for final approval or disapproval, subject to confirmation by the Board of Trustees. If the evaluation process results in a decision not to approve the application, the faculty member will be given written notification, no later than March 1. The written statement will be made by the person in the review process who first recommends disapproval of the application. The appeal procedure shall be through the division coordinator, the regional campus dean, the Provost, and then to the Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate.

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: (Delete)~~

**Resolution on Establishment of a Clinical Medicine Track in the College of
Osteopathic Medicine Faculty
Professional Relations Committee
Faculty Senate
May 16, 2011
First Reading**

Whereas, the descriptions of faculty rank contained in the Faculty Handbook are well suited to the activities of most Ohio University teaching personnel, but do not describe the roles of physician teaching faculty in the College of Osteopathic Medicine;

Whereas, in order to appropriately assign Medical and teaching duties to practicing physician faculty members, a Clinical Medicine Track, primarily devoted to patient care and the Medical educational mission of the College of Osteopathic Medicine, is needed;

Whereas, medical faculty tracks are present at the vast majority of American medical schools and such a track is found equally at public and private institutions. (Source: *The Ohio State University College of Medicine and Public Health, 2004*);

Whereas, the absence of a Medical Faculty Track adversely affects OU-COM's ability to hire physician faculty, particularly women and minorities;

Whereas, recruitment of Master Physicians to train the next generation of doctors at OUCOM requires a faculty category other than the listed Group I-IV in the faculty handbook;

Whereas, OUCOM proposes that a new designation of Clinical Medicine Track faculty be approved for physicians who will primarily engage in teaching/mentoring student physicians and residents and providing medical care to patients affiliated with UMA and/or other OUCOM affiliated health facilities including Hudson Health Center;

Whereas, Tenure Track faculty members cannot adequately satisfy the intensive need for continuity of care for patients and the training of medical students in the clinical setting due to significant research and teaching expectations, the Clinical Medicine Track faculty will create a practice environment that accommodates the broad scope of activities required of Tenure Track Medical faculty;

Whereas, a mechanism for promotion is necessary to attract and retain non-tenure line Clinical Medicine Track faculty members;

Be it resolved that a designated faculty classification of Clinical Medicine Track Medical Faculty be created.

3. Classification of Faculty

3.e. Clinical Medicine Track Medical Faculty consists of physician faculty members who hold Medical faculty teaching contracts with the College of Osteopathic Medicine and who practice medicine in University Medical Associates or another practice formally affiliated with the college.

1. Clinical Medicine faculty are primarily hired to mentor/teach student physicians/Physician Residents and provide medical services at OUCOM and/or OUCOM affiliated healthcare facilities. Clinical Medicine faculty receive 12 month renewable contracts with extensive periodic reviews.

2. Clinical Medicine Faculty must be evaluated annually by the department Chair based on OUCOM guidelines.

3. Extensive reviews are performed at the 2nd and 5th anniversaries of initial appointment and every four years thereafter, with all stated benefits. Extensive reviews will be completed by a departmental committee with input from Chairs, and then sent on to the Dean for action of renewal or non-renewal.

4. Clinical Medicine Faculty members may be employed on the basis of full-time or part-time appointments.

5. Clinical Medicine Faculty members may negotiate a shift from a full-time to a part-time appointment, or from a part-time to a full-time appointment.

6. Percentage distribution of scholarship, teaching, and service responsibilities are negotiated with the department chair at the time of hire in the letter of offer and annually as appropriate to meet the needs of OUCOM.

7. Clinical Medicine Faculty may be promoted (without tenure) to Assistant Professor of Clinical Medicine, Associate Professor of Clinical Medicine, and Professor of Clinical Medicine as appropriate.

8. Faculty holding a Clinical Medicine Track position are eligible to apply for tenure track positions when they become available. The criteria for rank determination in the Clinical Medicine Track and the Tenure Track differ. Hence, a faculty member's rank in the Clinical Medicine Track is not necessarily transferable to the Tenure Track.

9. Tenure Track faculty are permitted to voluntarily petition for a one time transfer to a Clinical Medicine Track position. This petition must originate with the faculty member and be approved by the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Once this transfer is completed by mutual consent, the faculty member is not eligible to transfer back to a Tenure Track position.

A Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Planning Unit Reduction Targets and Budget
Priorities
Finance & Facilities Committee
Faculty Senate
May 16, 2011
Second Reading & Vote

Whereas, the proposed reduction targets undermine the academic quality of the University by demanding considerably higher reductions from academic units than from academic support and general fee units; and

Whereas the budget proposal largely protects several non-academic units (including, but not limited to, Advancement and Intercollegiate Athletics) without offering a **convincing and verifiable** ~~elegant~~ rationale or calculation of return on investment; and

Whereas the proposal fails to adequately acknowledge that reductions to the core academic function, which follow upon almost a decade of ongoing cuts to the academic budget, will yet further degrade the quality of teaching, faculty and student research, and the overall student experience at Ohio University;

Be it resolved that

- a) the 2012 budget proposal be revised to more effectively protect and advance academic quality by providing more adequate resources for teaching and research; and that
- b) the development of future budgets shall include mechanisms designed by administrators and faculty for clearly identifying the cost and benefits of all major functions and a clear evidence-based rationale for those costs.

RESOLUTION
ON A LEAVE POLICY FOR MATERNITY, PATERNITY, AND ADOPTION
Finance & Facilities Committee
Faculty Senate
May 16, 2011
Second Reading & Vote

The University's commitment to build an outstanding, diverse, and healthy workforce and to maintain a competitive profile of employee benefits and compensation will be advanced by the implementation of a Parental Leave Policy modeled on the best practices of our peer institutions. Such a plan shall be developed and implemented with all deliberate speed.

A Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Replacement Group I Hires
Finance & Facilities Committee
Faculty Senate
May 25, 2011
First Reading

Whereas the quality, continuity, and competitive standing of Ohio University can only be maintained if the vast majority of teaching, research and service is provided by tenure track faculty; and

Whereas, the voluntary separation plans have produced opportunistic cuts to Group I faculty, yet failed to provide specifications and criteria for refilling vacated lines;

Be it resolved that the University shall give priority to the hiring of Group I faculty to replace open lines and not cover those lines with contingent faculty;

Be it further resolved that the strategic planning for the allocation of replacement hires be done in an open and transparent manner.