

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, June 6, 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 7:12 p.m.

In attendance:

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, R. Palmer, B.

Quitslund, L. Rice, A. Rouzie, G. Van Patten, S. Wyatt

College of Business: B. Roach, T. Stock

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

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

College of Osteopathic Medicine: H. Akbar, P. Coschigano (for J. Wolf)

Group II: H. Burstein, M. Sisson

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

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: N. Kiersey

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt

Regional Campus—Lancaster: S. Doty, P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Southern: D. Marinski

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

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

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

Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: A. Ruhil

Excused: J. Dill, L. Lapierre, V. Marchenkov, J. Wolf

Absent: B. Branham, J. Dill, T. Heckman, L. Hoshower, R. Knight, W. Roosenburg, S.

Titsworth, D. Thomas, M. Tomc

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. EVPP Pam Benoit
- II. Roll Call and Approval of the May 16, 2011 Minutes
- III. Chair's Report
 - Announcements
 - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: September 19, 2011, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
- IV. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly
 - Resolution on the Formation of a First-Year Council (Second Reading & Vote)
 - Resolution on the Establishment of Junior Composition Equivalency (JE) Courses (First Reading)
- V. Professional Relations Committee—Sherrie Gradin
 - Resolution on Creation of Clinical Faculty Designation (Second Reading & Vote)
 - Resolution Clarifying Handbook Language on Procedures in the Event of Allegations of Violation of Professional Ethics (Second Reading & Vote)
- VI. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom

- Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Replacement Hiring for Group I Faculty (Second Reading & Vote)
- VII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade
 VIII. New Business
 IX. Adjournment
-

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

Updates and announcements:

- Interim Deans and Searches: Scott Titsworth has been named Interim Dean of Scripps College of Communications. Joe Shields has been named Interim Vice President for Research and Creative Activity/Dean of the Graduate College. Search committees for all four of the vacant deanships on the Athens campus have been formed, and a search firm has been selected.
- Correction to the message on the budget proposal for the Board of Trustees, sent out by President McDavis on 6/6/11 (http://campaign.r20.constantcontact.com/render?llr=Zr9rcicab&v=001EXWmPNxFGZvuUr0RFLXsmFY9lf6-49vs88BRxMkNzfpNf7O4B-Fi0CMJ5IGSrbYaStIvM6ZfuJFiQYe8v8y2B8QgjJxv7sZMf73fqedOIWKRBSMpjNexHplk8Bx6haD29fjEB_RlyI4XWXtQhmlvhl0PESOm51qUdVzX_oIXsJA%3D) said that the difference between the cuts to academic and academic-support units will be .85%, but that number was based on an outdated spreadsheet; the actual difference is 1.36%.
- The EVPP also thanked the Faculty Senate for its accomplishments over the academic year, and for representing the faculty well during that time. She extended special thanks to outgoing senators, recognizing that serving on Faculty Senate takes time but that in the current political and economic climate, faculty governance is increasingly important and sends a message to those who are applying ever-greater scrutiny to the affairs of public institutions. Finally, she thanked **Joe McLaughlin** for his leadership, calling him “smart, knowledgeable, and collegial,” and adding that he “does the Senate proud.”

Discussion:

Ken Brown asked whether steps had been taken to replace Marty Tuck as Associate Provost for Academic Affairs while he is serving as Interim Dean of the Chillicothe campus. Benoit replied that her office had not gotten there yet, but that it is a very important position and next on their list.

Bernhard Debatin commented on the faculty hiring plan announced on 5/31 (<http://www.ohio.edu/compass/stories/10-11/5/faculty-hiring02911.cfm>). Although happy to see that it acknowledged the importance of tenure, he was less happy to see that the guidelines would make tenure-track hiring so difficult, and he expressed the concern that tenure-track faculty would be more the exception than the rule at OU in the future. In addition, he indicated that if the university was serious about creating teaching-only positions in real cooperation with the tenure-track faculty, Group II and IV instructors would need better pay, commensurate with their high qualification, and longer-term contracts. Benoit responded with two points. First, with respect to the concerns about

Group I hiring, the staffing plan is in three phases: 1) to fill immediate instructional needs, which, given the hiring calendar, means temporary instructors; 2) assess steps to be taken next year—deans are pointing to critical needs for a few key Group I positions, which will comprise next year’s searches; 3) draw up a plan for strategic Group I hires. Rather than hiring replacements similar to faculty who have left, she contended, the university should be thinking about reshaping departments according to a strategic plan that deploys Group I hires in the places where they will be most valuable. Faculty will, she said, be involved in discussions about these plans. Second, she agreed that this should never be an institution where adjunct instructors are primary. Group II is important, however, as is professional development for continuing faculty. Multi-year contracts would need further discussion. Debatin worried that the second phase of the hiring would become what defines us, and, given the effects of RCM, create a feedback loop reinforcing some departments and starving others. The EVPP noted that we will not hire back 100% of those who retire, because doing so would defeat the cost-saving intention of the ERIP/VESP plan.

When Debatin asked about specific ratio of tenure-track to adjunct hires, Benoit said that it would vary by department, and that each unit would need to develop its own staffing plan. He responded with the concern that these staffing plans would lead to pig cycles (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pork_cycle). Further, he noted, Provost Krendel had told his unit to cut its Group II lines, and now it is being chastised for not using Group II instruction. The EVPP said that the world around us has changed dramatically and rapidly, and that the current approach to staffing is a response to outside pressures. What has not changed, however, is that Group I faculty remain a priority. **Rudy Pasic** wondered if that had really not changed, noting that the percentage of Group II faculty seemed to have gone up during his time at the University. Benoit said that we will not have whole departments made up of Group II, and that our data for adjunct faculty doesn’t look much different from other institutions around the country; she promised to bring data to demonstrate as much. Pasic asked if we shouldn’t be trying to be better than average, but the EVPP responded that in her view we should be looking for the mix of faculty ideal for our own institution. **Debatin** asked if the percentage of Group II and IV faculty would increase; Benoit said that she didn’t know. **Pasic** reiterated that the ratio of Group I to adjunct faculty should increase. **Charlotte Elster** noted that we would not solve the problem tonight, but that the discussion should focus on what constituted a healthy mix of Group I and Group II for the departments. The Provost agreed that such discussion was important, and that Group I hires should leverage our best resources—build up programs and parts of programs that are currently strong, and that can afford more Group I faculty.

Debatin then asked about the requirement in the “Hiring/Staffing Plan” document that the hiring department have adequate funds (“funding for the Group I position is available in the unit’s continuing budget, that plans are in place to preserve that funding into fiscal year 2013, and that adequate funding exists to maintain the overall level of instructional capacity needed for AY 2012-2013”). Would such funding come from a line that the department had lost? The EVPP said that if the college used a retirement to meet its budget reduction target, that line had been spent, but otherwise could fund a new hire. In other cases, grant, RDP, or endowment funds could be used to finance Group I hiring, as long as it was base money, rather than one-time funds: it is not acceptable, she insisted,

to be in the position of having to fire probationary faculty for budgetary reasons. When Debatin pointed out that many units had no way to meet budget cuts other than through retirements, Benoit commented that those units would need to find ways to generate revenue in order to fund further Group I hires.

Brown noted that faculty are responding to an evolutionary or historical perspective on hiring at OU. Fifteen years ago, his department had 23 Group I faculty, and now have 18 (after the ERIP, 17). He commented that it seemed like the slope was accelerating. Benoit replied that pressures from the State are creating budget difficulties. Although attempting to preserve Group I numbers, Group II are less expensive and help cover instruction; given that tuition is an increasingly large share of revenue, we need that instructional capacity to ensure our income. The Ohio economy appears to be improving slightly, but we still need to be creative about generating revenue to invest back into Group I. **McLaughlin** noted that faculty are most worried about the second year of the hiring plan: the University has had several years of little to no Group I faculty hiring, and units have been strategically planning for six straight years. In that context, it seems that we don't need a whole year to determine strategic hiring priorities. The Provost responded that she had yet to see any strategic staffing plans that captured the right information about where Group I would be best placed. **Duane McDiarmid** commented that units have more incentive to ask for Group I faculty because they cannot be cut in the next round of budget reductions, as had consistently happened in his school with Group II and IV instructors. While he would like to see a mix of adjunct and tenure-track faculty in his unit, his experience is that adjunct faculty represent resources that can (will) be taken away: Group I are the only delivery trucks that won't have their tires stolen. Benoit said that it had worked that way in some departments, but not in others. Currently, we need to keep the doors of the University open, which requires some temporary or teaching-only faculty. McDiarmid asked that planning happen from the bottom up rather from the top down; the Provost indicated that it would be a combination.

David Ingram noted that the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) couldn't get the data it needed from the SIS, and asked what is being done to make the Rufus Project come in on time. The EVPP passed the question to **David Descutner** (Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies), who has been point person for the project in the Provost's Office. Descutner agreed that it is behind, and that in response more people have been brought into meetings about the SIS implementation, including Vice Provost for Enrollment Management Craig Cornell; his presence has helped force necessary issues. The award letters have now gone out, albeit late, and orientation letters are about to go out. They are, however, very aware that a lot of critical actions need to happen quickly. Benoit commented that she has been through a PeopleSoft SIS implementation before, and that bumps on the road are to be expected.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the May 16, 2011 Minutes

A quorum was present. The minutes were approved by a voice vote (Joe Slade moved, Sherrie Gradin seconded).

III. Chair's Report—Joe McLaughlin

- Update on Resolutions
- Announcements

- get form for committee assignments. Will work on after school ends.
- standing committee call for volunteers. Prod colleagues to volunteer; sometimes we get enough, sometimes not especially for those with representational makeup. If we need more bodies, will contact senators from those colleges.
- Some colleges have no or 1 alternate for next year. Will be getting in touch with senators to help obtain alternates.
- Today's ANews has article by local AAUP chapter regarding tenure, phrase was "death by a thousand cuts."
- Next couple of days, results of appraisals of President and Provost. Have numerical results and written comments, have been working with Executive Committee on summary of written comments. Scott Titsworth helped put survey together, but he has not worked on results at all—no conflict of interest. Greg VP: what was rate of return? Joe: don't have final figure, but about 25%. Will include historical return rates. Last one was about 31% for President, previous in 2007 was about 20%. Slightly better for pres than provost.
 - Berhard: were there qualitative comments? Publicized? Joe: yes, identifying themes and quoting representative comments.
- David Ingram question: has Exec committee thought about Handbook problems for Fac Sen governance (like elections, etc.)? Joe: Gary Nieman suggested that it be done, Ken Brown combed through Handbook and identified needs to change; some cosmetic, some require thought. During summer will go through himself, and assign to appropriate committees, also run by Provost's office to see if they see controversies we don't. Will do omnibus resolution in fall for the cosmetic ones. If do that at first reading, gives others a chance to chime in.

- **The next faculty senate meeting will be on September 19, 2011, at 7:10 p.m.,**

Walter Hall 235.

IV. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly

- **Resolution on the Formation of a First-Year Council (Second Reading & Vote)**

Deferred discussion last month because still working on it and still divided on some issues. Changes: got rid of syntactic bungle in whereases. In this version, recognizing the close connectin of this committee and EMAC; FYC will be more sharply focused on first-year retention.

Helene Burstein: No designated Gp 2, objects to that. Also, might be worthwhile to have grad student. Res is dismissive of fact that in biological sciences (with terrible retention), curriculum chair and woman who run learning communities are group 2. Grp 2 and grad students spend a lot of time with first-year students. Allyn: definitely true in your department. But that is rather an anomaly. And committee decided that assigning Group 2 is exploitative—Group 2 is not paid for service, and shouldn't be required to do it. Burstein: But could assign it and not have any group 2 take it; shame to disregard that expertise. Allyn: 2nd page has consultation. Burstein: consultation isn't the same thing. Elster: if we want better climate of cooperation, need to not have it look like Group I make all the decisions. I'm for Group 2 slot. Steve Hays: Could we say at least 4 faculty members, of which at least 3 are Group I? Allyn: committee? David Ingram: Actually, we need consultation. Prior first-year group did a good job of that. One committee member is not going to to fix the group II problem, and Fac Handbook is very clear about who ought to be serviing on committees. Hays: Well, suggest flexibility—could take advantage of enthusiasm in a group 2.

Now they are excluded. Allyn: also need faculty who are on EMAC. And need the committee not to be too large—look at the number of ex-officio members. The group 2 issue is a large one, and one that is going to require a lot of deliberation on the part of a lot of people. I hope we won't derail discussion on this much-needed committee. Hays: don't want to derail anything. Just seems strange to exclude them. Don't know much about it, actually, but don't see logic of excluding individuals who would be great. David Ingram: if the committee is interested in solving a particular problem, it would form a working group that pulled in experts and people involved in that issue.[GET NAME OF PREVIOUS DEFUNCT COMMITTEE] Elster: Shouldn't we have neutral language, and not slap those whose trust we need in the face? Wrong to have exclusive rather than inclusive language. Like Steve's language. Probably people wouldn't insist on being there every year. Why rule individuals out? Ingram: No other standing committees call for term faculty. Hays, Elster: well, this wouldn't either. Ammarrell: can't support it unless language is inclusive.

Judith Lee: When first brought up, was sympathetic to Helene's point of view, that GP wanted rep. And would be happy to sub a Gp 2 for an administrator. But given threats to Gp I leadership, don't want to further blur distinctions between Gp I faculty and other teaching personnel. Gp I have governance and research responsibilities, and should serve. If other people have expertise that should be represented, then either expand or push an administrator off. David Descutner: No standing, but how about if "three members representative of . . ."

- **Resolution on the Establishment of Junior Composition Equivalency (JE) Courses (First Reading)**

In Q2S, demand will outstrip supply of J courses. As with Tier 3 a few years ago, can't fulfill mission without developing more courses. This is similar to solution found to Tier 3 a few years ago. UCC has responsibility for establishing guidelines for curriculum, so resolution asks the UCC to establish JE category, and also a means of monitoring all J and JE courses for minimum quantity and quality of writing. Completion of one J course or two JE courses (at least one in own program, other approved by dept if not two in dept.).

Kalenkoski: Depts will be encouraged. We have one, but no one to teach it b/c inadequate staff. Two, what is monitoring? Allyn: UCC will create monitoring. With regard with programs that have courses ready to go, this would encourage it to be offered; if demand is shown, instructors might be provided by Dean.

Joe Slade: seems watered down at point when so many of our students can't write at all. A lot of schools and depts. don't have instructors qualified to teach writing in own disciplines. ALlyn: how does it water it down.> Joe S.: Very broad criteria. Taught comp for 25 years, now teach communications. I am probably the only one in my school that is qualified to teach composition; when colleagues suggest teaching writing, their suggestions are at variance with accepted practice. Allyn: Don't have agreement here on what good writing instruction is. May need WAC committee again, and standards in depts.. Joes: Shudder.

Lein: Don't think we can pull this off with resources we don't have. Writing is a major issue, and putting a new course on the books is a challenge, and there would be difficulty with huge variety of disciplines.

Sherrie: Equivalency bothers me because it's not. Should be alternate rather than equivalent (same with Tier 3). This is two courses for one; shouldn't say equivalent because students will be confused. To answer Jim, can use existing courses that use writing already, and say, gosh, it's a writing-intensive course. Not a course where content is writing, but disciplinary course where writing is done. That is distinction between this route and J-course. Call it Writing Intensive.

Albert R: OK, but where are WI courses that already have all of point #8—talking about writing, revision, peer critique... That is a course with a writing pedagogy component. If it doesn't have that, it's a give-away, not real writing instruction. Not the intent to give it away, but does. We don't have WAC support, no training.

James Casebolt: I teach one of these, Psych 101. Now, I teach it at regional campus, never more than 9 students. (laughter) Yes, students can't write (try a regional!); but contextualizing in curriculum makes it relevant to students, not just something to check off the list. Meaningful to have someone in own discipline who says, you need to learn how to write to work in this field, and here are the ways to do it in that discipline.

John Gilliom: have been teaching J course in dept for years, love the course. Supports flexibility Proposes 2 corrections(see pen version); good because encourages faculty involvement with students.

Ammarell: used to do WI, but because overwhelmed with work. Need incentive and support—course reductions, etc. Too much work. Allyn: distribute writing over 2 courses, to make less onerous. Also, implies support. Gene: make explicit. What about portfolio, rather than J-course? John G: also, have worked with dozens of students each year who are good, and should have that just checked off.

Ken Hicks: so, not enough English professors to teach, so go to non-English professors? Sherrie: WAS NEVER SUPPOSED TO BE JUST ENGLISH. But English teaches 77%. Supposed to already be distributed model. Joe McLaughlin: numerical issue in conversion—not 5/6 of the composition courses, but a one-to-one conversion. Ken: Well, makes more sense to say “we need more resources for the people who can teach this the best.” David Ingram: Two assumptions in resolution. 1, these courses already exist—we can use them. 2, if you can do this with existing program, you allow another elective in field of study, because they don't have to take J course. Jeff Giesey: looking at original Gen Ed docs, J course was SUPPOSED to be in discipline. So Q2S may be a means for putting it back where it was supposed to be. Mark Phillips: benefit to program is that you recapture those WSCH dollars for own department. Kalenkoski: worried about mandating something we can't afford. Allyn: not mandate.

Sisson: teach J course. At first, it didn't fill, now always fills. But may not be able to offer next year because of staffing.

Burstein: philosophically is good: one reason students can't write is that they can't read. If in discipline where they also have to read, then they may be able to write

Quitslund: Already have mandate that we can't afford. Q2S means we have a requirement we can't provide. This is attempt to mitigate that cost.

Joe Slade: can justify anything that way. This seems like slush. Allyn: what is alternative? Joe: need WAC support. This is just farming it out to people who won't make it happen. People will cave to student pressure, and in a couple of years we have half-assed courses. Allyn: but otherwise, we won't have enough J courses for students to graduate, and we'll be forced to eliminate the requirement. Joe agrees that's worse.

Joe McLaughlin suggests second first reading in September, vote in October to give enough time for discussion and thought.

Judith Lee: writing shunted aside both by students (“this isn't a writing course”) and faculty who say that only highly trained people ought to teach writing—should think carefully about what counts. Minimum page limit isn't enough, need to think about what we want to accomplish and present resolution that gives resources to get there.

Greg Van Patten: lots of write a lot and well, but that is not qualification for teaching writing. Need support and training. Committee should take a hard look at #7.
Bernhard: Net effect is that student will have one less writing course, because of double-dipping—fulfill other dept requirements, and end up just with less writing.

V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

• **Resolution on Creation of Clinical Faculty Designation (Second Reading & Vote)**

After last time discussed the sticking points. Queasiness about moving from tenure to non-tenure track. So put in that you have to make that move by end of third year. Concern about appeal process, so decided to use already established appeal process. Worked with senators in OUCOM and Dean Brose.

Joe Slade: reinforce 3rd year rule. P&T will be working on what happens when Group I becomes Group 2; they are looking at situation now where faculty member by her own request is moving from t-t to Group 2. Do not want Group 2 to be a booby prize; they, too, are also looking at a third-year limit. Before negative review, in other words. Same logic should apply for this resolution. Sherrie: we also felt it was enough time for someone to say that they really did want to be a clinician.

Bernhard: Move to table resolution. Do not have enough information about need. Other universities have multi-year renewable positions with reviews. We have to protect these people, and not have year-by-year contracts. Cites lots of institutions.

Seconded by Michael Sisson

Mary Bowen: lots of other medical schools.

Ann Paulins moves to call question. Passes by voice.

Vote on tabling. 13 for tabling. 29ish for not. By hand count.

Sherrie: Pass, and work hard for 3 or 5 year contracts.

Ken B: if Joe's committee is talking bout escape hatch for whole university, shouldn't pass resolution for one college only; strike section 9.

Sherrie: doesn't accept amendment.

Casebolt: then change "then" to "than"

Munhall: table to October to allow committee to present data. Seconded by Doty.

Discussion of tabling motion: Judith Lee—consistency externally means contract length is important; and in the university, should have consistency with other units.

Elster: seems different from other group 2; these people are not funded by teaching as teachers, but by own clinical practice. They could just go next door and open own practice.

Lee: ok, not equal, but consistent.

Bernhard: support Judith, and asks OUCOM to provide extensive info on contract length and academic freedom. Ken Brown: and how many use tenure track lines for this! Bernhard: academic freedom comes up with this a lot. SHouldn't be bottom-up "consistency", but make it genuinely attractive. As with longer-term contracts.

Steve Hays: could we hear from Dean Brose what problems we would cause for him if we put this off? We have our tenure issues, but he should have voice here. Dean Brose: big problems till October, maybe not; clinical faculty are very anxious to get this done, and view it as all good. Brought in fall of 2005 or 2006, then tabled to last meeting of year to integrate with other group 2 issues. Then tabled for 5 years. About increased number of years, we'd be happy to look at that and amend to do that. Would rather pass this now, and deal with that later. Just got huge grant, and are hiring top faculty—this would make our hand stronger in those hires. Steve Hays: work

with PRC over summer and have resolution concerned with longer-term contracts and academic freedom, if we pass this now. Dean Brose: would welcome that.

Joe McLaughlin: the Handbook and the resolution have built so much context that OUCOM is a special case, it really can't be a precedent for other units in university. Will do best to have new PRC chair get to that amending quickly. Charlotte: like Steve's suggestion; wouldn't 3-year contracts get you even better people?

Dean Brose: would love to have longer contracts. Tried to make language strongly imply that renewal would be more or less automatic.

Judith asked Bernhard about his objections. Bernhard says that a two group system shouldn't be "at the bottom," with one-year contracts. Would be happier with tenurable clinical track. Ken: why can't these people be tenured? Brose: have clinicians in tenure-track. But clinical track is focused on clinical delivery. They are now Group 2. Bernhard: but some have tenure track for non-researchers. Brose: Michigan (??) has 11 different tenure tracks. They are very unhappy with it.

McDiarmid: is this best practice across the nation? Brose: saying, you've seen one medical school, you've seen one medical school. McDiarmid: optimal for your faculty? Brose: tweaking, like increased number of years, could be done, but this is excellent.

James Casebolt called question. Seconded by? Vote to vote on table. Passed by voice vote. Vote to table: By hand. Failed by voice vote.

Vote on resolution.

But first Ken Brown wants to talk about whether these should be tenurable. Tenure does not mean research. There can be a clinical tenure track with appropriate criteria.

Brose: the vast majority of med schools require research for tenure. I don't know of any medical schools with tenure track for clinical faculty who are only with students on rotation.

Ken: but my department has tenure without research.

Brose: but if we had a tenured faculty member who only practiced medicine and they couldn't do it well anymore, we're stuck. It is more critical and much more common in medicine for it to happen that a medical practitioner stops being able to competently practice.

Call question: Giesey, Wyatt seconded. Passed by voice vote.

Resolution passes by voice vote.

- **Resolution Clarifying Handbook Language on Procedures in the Event of Allegations of Violation of Professional Ethics (Second Reading & Vote)**

Not one in packet; revised #2..

David Ingram points out infinite loop in referents. Renumbered to letters. Passed by voice vote.

Joe says Sherrie finishing 6 years on senate, mostly as chair of PRC, and much of the hard work of the committee (grievances) is invisible. Thanks to her for hard work

VI. Finance and Facilities Committee—John Gilliom

- **For the summer:**

working on handbook language about health care costs, premiums. Pinkie swear with Joe Mc to work on it. (David Descutner tacitly pinkie swore at meeting). We will pay 15% of premium, but about 23% of total costs.

Suggests blue ribbon fac sen committee on status of group I faculty. Joe says John volunteered to chair it.

- **Sense of the Senate Resolution on Replacement Group I Hires (Second Reading & Vote)**

As we move forward with process, aspire to the goals outlined in resolution.

Judith Lee: change “contingent faculty” to “non tenure-track” (accepted)

Vote: passed by voice vote.

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

Working on some stuff. There will be emails to committee over summer on issues that are arising.

IX. New Business

None.

X. Adjournment

moved Adeyanju, seconded sherrie.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:33 p.m.

EPSA
**Resolution of the Formation of a First-Year Council
 Second Reading and VOTE
 Faculty Senate, June 6, 2011**

Whereas

Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) is a standing committee of the University that has responsibility for all matters relating to recruitment, retention, marketing, financial aid, and scholarship policies;

And whereas

The ad hoc Foundations of Excellence Task Force of several years ago was successful at reversing the decline in retention at the Athens campus through many initiatives including: the establishment of Learning Communities, attendance tracking, the Allen Student Help center, improving the engagement of students, and other effective first year efforts;

Be it resolved

That Faculty Senate endorses the formation of a new University Standing Committee, related in mission to EMAC and containing a number of its members, entitled the First Year Council (FYC), with the membership and charge as attached.

Be it further resolved that

While the council will serve the needs of Athens-based students, it is expected that the Regional Campuses will be informed about what the council does and, where possible, will establish their own mechanisms to serve their First Year students; and

Be it further resolved that

Because of the close links between EMAC and the FYC, that there will be cross-membership of these committees, where possible, and at a minimum the co-chairs of FYC will be members of EMAC and the chair of EMAC will be member of FYC.

The First Year Council

The First Year Council will be charged with the following responsibilities:

- Gain knowledge of all initiatives/programs/policies on campus affecting first year students (and would be the successor to the Foundations of Excellence Task Force).
- Set campus wide priorities among competing first year initiatives.
- Coordinate and align first year programs, policies, and practices.
- Plan and advocate for first year student success initiatives.
- Increase the visibility of first year issues and programs within the university community.
- Sponsor regular First Year Forums/Open Meetings/Workshops to diffuse knowledge about, and commitment to, first year issues and programs across all campuses.
- Advocate for faculty development in first year teaching.
- Design and advocate for a faculty reward structure to encourage excellence in first year teaching and advising.
- Identify current first year student advocates among faculty on all campuses and recruit more.
- Consult widely with instructors of first year classes including but not limited to continuing faculty and teaching assistants.

Deleted: contingent

Composition

The council will be co-chaired by a group I faculty member and the Director of Retention. The rest of the voting membership will be: four group I faculty members, one of whom is the chair of EMAC, three members representative of the Assistant Deans, Student Affairs, and continuing faculty; and one undergraduate student member. Cross-membership of this Council and EMAC is expected and encouraged. If possible, one of the faculty members should come from the regional campus for the first three years after the Council is established.

Deleted: other university administrative units term

In addition there will be the following ex officio members or their representatives:

- Institutional Research
- Registrar
- Bursar
- Financial Aid
- Allen Student Help Center
- Residential Housing

Deleted: Student

EPSA
Resolution on the Establishment of Junior-Composition Equivalency (JE) Courses
Faculty Senate, June 6, 2011
First Reading

Whereas,

The University, through its Tier I General Education writing curriculum, is committed to developing undergraduates who can communicate in writing with clarity and precision;

Whereas,

There will be a demonstrated need for additional Junior-level writing courses as we move to semesters, since there are insufficient number of Junior Composition courses to fill demand;

Whereas,

It is the responsibility of the University Curriculum Council to establish guidelines for the creation and continued health of the curriculum;

Be It Resolved:

That UCC establish a category of composition courses at the junior undergraduate level called Junior Composition Equivalency courses (JE), and that departments and schools be encouraged to create such courses in their major curricula. These courses will meet the requirements outlined below. It is also expected that UCC will create a means of monitoring all J- and JE-composition courses at regular intervals so that each course requires at least the minimum quantity and quality of writing as specified below:

Completing the Junior-Level Composition Requirement

1. Students can complete the university's junior-level composition requirement by passing an approved "J" course, by passing two "JE" courses within their program of study, or by passing one "JE" course within their program of study and one "JE" course outside their program of study as approved by their department or school.

General Criteria for "JE" Courses

1. The aims of the course are sufficiently broad to justify its status as a writing course that fulfills a general education requirement.
2. The course should be a requirement or an elective within a major and must be taught at least once in either fall or spring semester.
3. Each "JE" course must have a minimum of 2 semester credit hours.
4. Pre-requisites for "JE" courses should be appropriate for junior-level students.
5. Writing assignments with varying purposes and different forms of writing appropriate to the department or school's discipline may be required.
6. Enrollments for such courses typically will be limited to 25 students to permit rigorous evaluation of students' writing. Departments and schools may request an exemption to this criterion. An example of an exemption request would be a department or school that plans to teach a "JE" course in a large lecture format that would offer 4 break-out sections with no more than 25 students in each section.

7. Instructors for “JE” courses should be dedicated both to teaching the craft of writing in their disciplines and to helping students achieve higher levels of competence as writers.
 8. Instruction in writing and evaluation of writing are significant parts of the “JE” course and specified as such on the syllabus. The typical expectations are that (a) students write regularly during the term, (b) a specific percentage of class time is devoted to discussions of writing, (c) students produce 10/15 pages of original writing, (d) students have the opportunity to revise and submit written work, and (e) peer critique, where appropriate, is used as a pedagogical strategy.
 9. Two courses within a program of study that satisfy the above criteria for “JE” courses must be passed to fulfill the university’s junior-level composition requirement.
 10. The Individual Course Committee of the University Curriculum Council is charged with reviewing and approving “JE” courses.
-

**Establishment of a Clinical Medicine Track in the College of Osteopathic Medicine Faculty
Senate Professional Relations Committee
Resolution for 2nd Reading and Vote: June 6, 2011**

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 hand-book;

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 petition for a one time transfer to a Clinical Medicine Track position no later than the end of their third year. In order to make a transfer, interested faculty need to demonstrate that they are good candidates for a Clinical Faculty position. A petition to transfer 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. In the event of a non-approval, a faculty member has a right to appeal. The appeal process parallels the process for grievance appeal as outlined in II.G of the Faculty Handbook. Once a transfer is completed, the faculty member is not eligible to transfer back to a Tenure Track position.

Faculty Senate Professional Relations Committee Resolution for 2nd reading and Vote REVISED VERSION Clarifications for Intro to Ethics Violations/ June 6, 2011

Whereas, many faculty remain unaware of important university policies as well as Faculty Handbook provisions that govern professional behavior; and

Whereas, language reminding faculty and staff about relevant principles of due process is currently absent in the Faculty Handbook;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Handbook be amended to include the following language noted in bold in Section IV.L.1:

L. Procedures in the Event of Allegations of Violation of Professional Ethics
Introduction

1. The Faculty Senate and the Provost of Ohio University have adopted a statement on Professional Ethics. (See Section I.A of the *Faculty Handbook*.) In Sections IV.L.2 and IV.L.3 procedures for the investigation and resolution of alleged violations of Professional Ethics are specified. Section IV.L.2 applies to alleged violations of Professional Ethics not involving professional research misconduct, while section IV.L.3 applies to alleged Fraud and Misconduct in Professional Research (See Policy No. 19.048 in the Policy and Procedures Manual). Procedures for Loss of Tenure are in Section II.D.5 of the *Faculty Handbook*.
2. **When an allegation of Professional Ethics is raised under Section IV.L.2, a faculty member shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. The process used should uphold academic freedom and individual rights, and requires diligent attention to fairness, dignity and respect. These proceedings may give rise to allegations of actual or perceived conflicts of interest. Conflicts of interest may be self disclosed, raised or alleged by others and should be avoided and mitigated to the greatest extent possible. Allegations alone shall not be grounds for a finding of a violation of professional ethics under IV.L.2. Someone alleged to have violated IV.L.2 shall not be judged to be accountable until culpability or responsibility is found by the standard of clear and convincing evidence.** If a violation is found, and a sanction recommended, no sanction or adverse action shall be imposed until the person found to have been in violation of professional ethics has exhausted all pending or authorized University appeals.
3. Members of the faculty should familiarize themselves with the University policies on Whistle-blowing and Retaliation (03.006), Workplace Violence (41.135), and Harassment (03.004).

A Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Replacement Group I Hires
Finance & Facilities Committee
Faculty Senate
June 9, 2011
Second 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;

Whereas the "Hiring Guidelines/Staffing Planning" document released by the EVPP on May 31 2011 raises substantial questions about the University's ongoing commitment to sustaining a robust and university-wide presence for Group I faculty by calling for "limited" hiring, effectively barring most hiring for two years, and reducing the autonomy of college processes;

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.