

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, October 13, 2014
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10pm
Meeting Minutes

Meeting called to order by Beth Quitslund (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:10pm

In attendance

- *College of Arts and Sciences*: N. Bernstein, H. Castillo, C. Elster, S. Hays, G. Holcomb, K. Mattson, R. Palmer, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, C. Snyder, D. Tees, K. Uhalde, S. Wyatt
- *College of Business*: K. Hartman, T. Luce, Z. Sarikas
- *College of Fine Arts*: C. Buchanan, G. Kamile, A. Hibbitt
- *College of Health Sciences and Professions*: T. Basta, J. White [for A. Sergeev], T. Cooksey-James [for B. Sindelar]
- *Group II*: R. Althaus, D. Duvert
- *Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine*: S. Walkowski, S. Williams
- *Patton College of Education*: G. Brooks, K. Machtmes
- *Regional Campus – Chillicothe*: B. Trube
- *Regional Campus – Eastern*: J. Casebolt
- *Regional Campus – Lancaster*: S. Doty, L. Trautman
- *Regional Campus – Southern*: D. Marinski
- *Regional Campus – Zanesville*: J. Taylor, A. White
- *Russ College of Engineering*: C. Bartone, J. Cotton, B. Stuart
- *Scripps College of Communication*: A. Babrow, B. Reader
- *Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs*: A. Ruhil

Excused: E. Ammarell, B. Bates, D. Carr, S. Inman, G. Kessler, N. Manring, A. Sergeev, B. Sindelar, G. Suer, D. Thomas

Absent:

MEETING AGENDA

- I. Board of Trustees Chair David Brightbill and Vice Chair David Wolfort
- II. Vice Provost for Global Affairs Lorna Jean Edmonds
- III. Roll Call and Approval of the September 8, 2014 Minutes
- IV. Chair's Report
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Report from Ohio Faculty Council
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, November 10, Walter Hall 235
- V. Executive Committee (Beth Quitslund)

- Resolution to Update the Composition of the Committee on Committees—Second Reading
 - Resolution to Change the Date of Election for the Ohio Faculty Council Representative—Second Reading
 - Resolution to Change the Update Methods of Notification for Faculty Senate Meetings—Second Reading
 - With EPSA: Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Proposed Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletes—First Reading
- VI. Professional Relations Committee (Sarah Wyatt)
- Resolution to Provide Consistent Language in Sections II.C and II.D of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to Faculty Rank and Status and Appointments—Second Reading
 - Resolution to Provide Clarity in Sections II. C. of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to Faculty Rank and Status—Second Reading
 - Resolution to Provide Clarity in Sections II. C. of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to the Position of Assistant Lecturer—Second Reading
 - Second Resolution to Provide Consistent Language in Sections II.C and II.D of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to Faculty Rank and Status and Appointments—First Reading
 - Resolution to Clarify Procedure for Group II Annual Evaluations—First Reading
 - Resolution to Revise the Workload Necessary to Move a Faculty Position from Group III to Group II—First Reading
 - Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Need to Need to Establish a University-Wide Group II Teaching Award—First Reading
- VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ruth Palmer)
- VIII. Finance & Facilities Committee (Ben Stuart)
- IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)
- X. New Business
- XI. Adjournment

Meeting called to order by Beth Quitslund (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:10pm

I. Board of Trustees Chair Brightbill and Vice Chair David Wolfort

- ❖ Quitslund Introduction. Quitslund first thanked the Board of Trustees for their participation/visit and explained that the Board visit has become an annual event over the last few years. Quitslund noted that it is only one of the ways that the Board encounters faculty voices. There are two faculty representatives at all meetings: the Vice Chair of Faculty Senate (currently David Thomas) for the Academics Committee and the Chair of Finance & Facilities (currently Ben Stuart) for the Resources Committee. In addition, the Senate Chair usually attends Board meetings and talks informally with Trustees as well as gives a formal presentation once a year; Quitslund will be doing that in January 2015. Quitslund also noted that the Board has been genuinely committed to hearing faculty perspectives in recent years, even when the Trustees' own views differ. For this meeting, the Board will address questions submitted by the faculty to the Board. Although there is not enough time during this meeting to address all questions submitted, the Board has received all questions.
- ❖ About the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees includes nine voting trustees, appointed by the Governor to serve 9-year, staggered terms. These are volunteer positions. The Board also includes two non-voting student trustees as well as the two faculty representatives. Quitslund provided a brief introduction of each member of the Board of Trustees in attendance.

- **Chair David Brightbill** graduated from Ohio University in 1970 (and returned in 2010 to participate in commencement ceremonies with 125 other members of his class whose graduation had been cancelled after the shootings at Kent State). He has been an Executive Director of the Community Action Program Corporation of Washington-Morgan County since 1987, and is a past president of the Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies and the Corporation of Appalachian Ohio Development. Among the Chair's several relatives who are graduates of Ohio University is his son, class of 2002, and he has mentioned that grandchildren are being groomed to be Bobcats.
- **Vice Chair David Wolfort** graduated from Ohio University in 1974, having worked in the cafeterias all four years. He has served as the president of Olympic Steel since January 2001 and chief operating officer of the company since 1995. He also serves as director of the Metal Service Center Institute (MSCI). David is a regional board member of the Northern Ohio Anti-Defamation League and is currently a trustee of the Musical Arts Association (The Cleveland Orchestra).
- Interestingly, both Trustees would now be counted among our first-generation students.
- ❖ Brightbill Introduction. Quitslund asked Trustee Brightbill to say a couple of words about the Board responsibilities with regard to the University's governance as well as what kinds of decisions they expect the academic leadership on campus to make.
 - Brightbill provided an introduction of the Board of the Trustees and described the statement of the Board's Statement of Expectations. First, the Board believes in shared governance and hearing the voice of all constituents at OHIO. Second, the Board is responsible for the hiring of the President and believes that it is in the best interest of the University to leave the day-to-day operations to the President. Individuals on the Board are volunteers who put time and thought into the University but are not associated with the day-to-day operations of University.
- ❖ Question 1: Service learning and the local community. With the understanding that the Board does not make curricular decisions, but is interested in maintaining OU's programmatic quality and the character of the institution: Research has shown that community engagement by undergraduates increases deep learning as well as retention and graduation rates. In addition, OHIO is situated in the poorest region of the state where there are many community needs that students could help address. What role do you think community service and service-learning programs, especially those tied to the curriculum, should play in helping improve the quality of a student's academic experience?
 - Response. Brightbill believes in the importance of service learning to the educational experience for all students and shared a personal story about how service learning shaped the path of his life. Brightbill noted the benefit of providing students with opportunities to bring classroom learning into real-life situations while also providing opportunities for students to share service learning experiences with other students inside the classroom. From his own personal experiences within the region, Brightbill also believes that OHIO brings resources in the form of faculty and students to the regional community. Although many of members of the Board attended University when service learning was not part of the curriculum, the Board supports the integration of service learning into the curriculum and anything that allows students to engage with the community. This is even more important in within this community's geographic and demographic region in Ohio.
- ❖ Question 2a: OHIO's responsibility to its global community. What roles do you think that the institution—faculty, Trustees, and administration—can play in constructively responding to climate change? What kind of examples can we set for students, particularly in decisions about whether to

divest from fossil fuel corporations, how rapidly we reduce our university's carbon footprint, and other questions relating to climate change and environmental sustainability?

- Response. Brightbill noted that sustainability and climate change are incredibly important problems that face this country. Although there is not a universal acceptance of that, the faculty and University have the opportunity to use research and teaching skills to determine workable solutions for reducing our carbon footprint. Faculty members also have the opportunity to educate students about the issues and how students can get personally involved. The University can (and does) deal with the issue of divestitures. The University also has the Office of Sustainability and attempts to address deferred maintenance using green technology. The Foundation has also has a committee looking into socially-responsible investments and has provided substantial funds to student organizations for pilot programs for socially-responsible investments. In addition, the President has made a commitment to reduce OHIO's carbon footprint by 2075; the Board has endorsed these efforts. However, Brightbill noted that there is also more to do.
 - Guest faculty member **Alyssa Bernstein** asked for clarification about the socially-responsible investment program. Brightbill responded by explaining that the program was a pilot program designed to provide students with the Brightbill opportunity to look at the kinds of investments and the return on investments that can be made.
 - Guest faculty member **Alyssa Bernstein** asked whether or not the Board (or others) had familiarity with [Ceres](http://www.ceres.org), which is an advocate for sustainability leadership (www.ceres.org). Ceres promotes business decision-making with sustainable strategies and practices. Brightbill noted that he was not personally familiar with the program but could not speak on behalf of the Foundation or the student investment groups.
- ❖ Question 2b (follow-up). Given that the University's funds are invested primarily through the Foundation, is it possible for the University's investments become transparent enough to allow students and faculty to know what we are funding as we generate income?
 - Response. Brightbill noted that he could only answer question from his knowledge because the Foundation and the Board are different bodies. To the best of Brightbill's understanding, the Foundation invests mostly in mutual funds to diversify holdings. On the one hand, the Foundation's efforts – the student investment groups and the Foundation committee for about this topic – suggest that it is committed to socially-responsible investing moving forward. On the other hand, it is also the Foundation's fiduciary responsibility to successfully manage a return on investment for the benefit of the University.
 - **Doty** asked whether or not there was currently transparency in the Foundation's investments. Brightbill responded by stating that the Board currently gets a general report but does not have information about specific investments.
- ❖ Question 3: Funding priorities and athletics. Although the Trustees do not develop OHIO's budgets or reallocate items within the budgets that are presented to them, they do help set major strategic spending priorities. For the past many years senators have explained to Trustees the reasoning and concerns of faculty concerning Inter-Collegiate Athletics (ICA) costs and policies. For example, the amount of instructional money (tuition and SSI) going to ICA this year is twice the amount raised by this year's 1.5% tuition increase. Could we reverse that explanation process this year? Could you talk about how in concrete terms the Trustees weigh all the costs of our athletic programs, including subsidy from academic units and scholarships as well as opportunity costs, against their benefits? In short, could you explain why this is a rational economic decision in the austerity of higher education budgets?

- Response. The Board believes that ICA is an important part of the college experience. As examples, ICA benefits student-athletes and provide students who are not athletes opportunities for involvement and learning including roles related to marketing, broadcasting, training, reporting, etc. In short, ICA offers a range of opportunities for students. The budget for ICA is not put together differently than the budgets of colleges or planning units. Budgets start at the unit level, move to the Budget Planning Council, and then go to the President. The President makes recommendations to the Board. Board reviews the budget at the macro, holistic level rather than the specific spending at the individual unit level. The budget for athletics is approximately \$21 million or approximately 3% of the total budget. The Board believes this spending is important for the college experience. For example, this past weekend was Homecoming, which allowed OHIO to provide students and alumni with events, recognition programs, etc. In addition, Homecoming weekend also increase revenue for local businesses. Athletics also bring diversity to OHIO.
- ❖ Question 4a: Funding priorities and compensation. When the Board considers raises for upper-level administrators, especially the President, do they consider the effects on what students must pay in tuition?
 - Response. Brightbill answered in the affirmative. Brightbill stated that OHIO students bring that to the Board's attention and that the Board considers the impact. OHIO has a history of student activism and involvement. The issue of affordability is a critical part of the Board's decision-making and important to the budgeting process. However, the declining funding available for higher education in Ohio (as a state) is problematic. The Board reviews budgeting needs and issues such as faculty / staff salaries, need for affordability, deferred maintenance issues, infrastructure, etc. The Board is also active in determining ways to help the neediest students such as increases in scholarships. However, the most recent increase in tuition was not a unanimous vote; one trustee voted to oppose the tuition increase.
- ❖ Question 4b (follow-up): The Board recently endorsed a generous plan to raise faculty salaries back to third place among IUC peers. Do the Trustees have a position on total compensation as well? That is, how much cost shifting from the University to the faculty (especially on the costs of healthcare) is acceptable if the goal was to increase the take-home pay of faculty?
 - Response. Brightbill noted that this is a question for the President initially. The President has committees / councils looking into this, which will report to the President. Ideas and recommendations will subsequently come to the Board's attention. However, Brightbill noted that this is not an easy task because healthcare is expensive.
- ❖ Question 5: Adjunct and part-time faculty. OHIO recently created long-term contracts and promotions for some non-tenure track faculty. We still, however, have a large number of adjuncts teaching piecemeal with contracts for individual courses and no benefits. Should the university have policies to improve the conditions for these faculty members?
 - Response. Brightbill noted that this is a question for the Provost initially. The Board is aware of the importance of all faculty members as well as aware of the mix of faculty. Periodically, the Board would expect the Provost to provide a description of the mix of faculty. The Board reviews the information and asked questions. Brightbill also noted that the Provost does an excellent job of keeping the Board informed and that the Board values all faculty.

Questions and Discussions

- **Hays** asked what other units had similar or equivalent budgets to the ICA 3% budget. Brightbill responded by stating that he did not know a specific answer to that question.

- Quitslund asked **Vice Chair Wolfort** if he wanted to add any comments. Wolfort stated that the Board's interest in the long-term sustainability of the University along all aspects including (but not limited to) student retention, faculty development, student recruitment, infrastructure, etc. The Board discusses how to handle issues associated with economic constraints and how to make the University's branding, infrastructure, etc. lend themselves to long-term sustainability. Wolfort thanked the faculty for their service and expressed an appreciation for the sacrifices made during recent economic constraints.

II. Vice Provost for Global Affairs Edmonds

- ❖ **Topic 1: Office of Global Affairs and International Studies.** Edmonds discussed the domain of the Office of the Global Affairs including five areas: (1) University Global Strategy including the SIMT Committee and the UIC Committee, (2) Academic including the Center for International Studies, Education Abroad, and Global Leadership Center, (3) Consulting including the Global Services Program, (4) Service and Support to International Students, Staff, and Faculty, and (5) Relationship Management. The Office has approximately 30 staff members plus 150 faculty members who are affiliated with the Office.
- ❖ **Topic 2: International Education Week.** Edmonds stated that this year is OHIO's second year hosting International Education Week. There is a full program planned, which is available [online](http://www.ohio.edu/iew) (www.ohio.edu/iew). The full program has a number of activities throughout the week including days designated for geographic regions. The Keynote Speaker will be held on Wednesday, November 19; the Global Engagement Awards Ceremony will be held on Thursday, November 20. Edmonds also mentioned that this year marked 50th Anniversary of the Center for International Studies.

Questions and Discussions

- **A. White** asked if there were opportunities and events for the Regional Campuses. Edmonds responded in the affirmative; there are a number of opportunities available through the Regional campuses.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the September 8, 2014 Minutes

- ❖ Roll call (**Hartman**)
- ❖ **Doty** moved to approve the minutes, seconded by **Wyatt**. The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

IV. Chair's Report (Beth Quitslund)

- ❖ **Topic 1: Updates and Announcements**
 - *Professional Ethics Committees.* Many of the college / campus are complete while there is one still short of Senate appointees.
 - *Dean Evaluation Committees.* Quitslund is still working on a couple of colleges for Senate nominees. Howard, Institutional Research, and Quitslund have been making arrangements for the dean evaluation process to happen much earlier this year, with the actual surveys finishing before spring break. Although some faculty may believe they do not have enough of the year to evaluate, the proposed timing is the only way to have the evaluation reports complete before the end of the academic year.

- *President McDavis's Advisory Council on Sexual Misconduct* has been formed and will begin its work imminently.
- ***Elizabeth Sayrs: Update on Opportunities.*** Sayrs discussed two opportunities: the Konneker Fund for Learning and Discovery and the Margaret Boyd Scholars Program.
 - The Konneker Fund supports innovative, high-impact initiatives designed to advance undergraduate learning and research and graduate education. Applicants may request \$50,000 for two years or \$100,000 overall. Faculty and staff are eligible to submit proposals; collaborative projects are strongly encouraged. The proposal deadline is November 17, 2014.
 - As OHIO's first women's scholars program, the Margaret Boyd Scholars Program seeks to inspire and encourage undergraduate women to become engaged, confident and connected leaders. The program is collaboration between the Division of Student Affairs, University College, the Ohio University Women's Center, and Ohio University faculty. During the four-year program, this diverse group of scholars participate in a first-year, interdisciplinary seminar with Ohio University women faculty, a second year residential component, a third-year internship or education abroad experience and a fourth-year capstone seminar. The program selects approximately 20 students for each year.
- *Board of Trustees* is meeting on the Athens campus this week. Meetings will be live-streamed on Thursday and Friday morning starting at 10:00AM.
- *Parental Leave Pilot Program* is being extended through December 2015. To date, fewer faculty members are taking advantage of this program as compared to staff members. This suggests that there are some barriers to the program such as some confusion by faculty. For example, some faculty may not know that leave can be taken as a partial semester. Quitslund noted that she will get more information to faculty soon.
- *The Benefits Survey.* Quitslund strongly encouraged all faculty members to participate in and complete this survey. However, the specific date in which the survey will be sent via e-mail is to be determined. Faculty will receive an email about this. Quitslund remarked that this is a chance to have a direct influence on the recommendations of the Benefits Advisory Council.
- *Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA).* Quitslund discussed the composition of COIA. It is a group of 64 Faculty Senates from Division I football schools; OHIO is a member (joined in 2005). COIA is intended to be a faculty voice on intercollegiate athletics, concerned with "academic integrity and quality, student-athlete welfare, campus governance of intercollegiate athletics, commercialization, and fiscal responsibility." The OHIO representative is Betty Sindelar, who is also the chair of OHIO's standing committee on InterCollegiate Athletics. Because OHIO is a member, Quitslund wanted faculty know about recent COIA actions. The group has been very concerned about the NCAA restructuring that is likely to make the five most powerful conferences effectively much more like professional ones, with much less NCAA oversight. As the vote to override that restructuring failed, the COIA steering committee has supported a request to Arne Duncan by another ICA reform organization, the Drake Group, that he work with President Obama to create a President's Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics Reform. Quitslund offered to provide more information. In addition, faculty may contact Sindelar.
- ❖ **Topic 2: Report from Ohio Faculty Council.** There have been two meetings of the Ohio Faculty Council since the last Senate meeting. During the two meetings, there were presentations on proposed legislation, including a three bills far enough along to have numbers but not necessarily likely to pass:

- H.B. 593 would prevent overload fees for less than 18 hours/term. (Note: this would not affect OU, because our tuition covers up to 20 hours.)
- H.B. 616 would prevent assignment of textbooks by an Ohio public university professor or from an Ohio public university press.
- H.B. 609 would require institutions to have a suicide prevention policy.

The Council is also working on a faculty-perspective SWOT analysis (i.e, analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats). In the future, the Council will address policy recommendations and how to target the appropriate audiences for them. The Council approved an op-ed by OFC Chair Dan Krane about how to think rationally about student debt (and how current college funding mechanisms create it). In addition, there is an op-ed by Krane and Quitslund about the economic returns on state higher education funding. The goal is to place these in newspapers across the state.

❖ Topic 3: Upcoming Senate Meeting. Monday, November 10, Walter Hall 235

Questions and Discussions

- There were no additional questions or discussions.

V. Executive Committee (Beth Quitslund)

❖ Resolution to Update the Composition of the Committee on Committees—Second Reading

- The resolution is offered by the Executive Committee to amend language in Section VII.A (“University Committees”) of the Faculty Handbook. The Committee on Committee requires representation from each of the campus constituents who provide nominations for standing committees. The Committee’s practice is well established and differs from the description in the Faculty Handbook. The amended language modifies select position titles from chairperson to chair, adds the chair of the Classified Senate, and adjusts the Student Senate representative from Vice-President to President.
- The resolution was approved by a voice vote.

❖ Resolution to Change the Date of Election for the Ohio Faculty Council Representative—Second Reading

- The resolution is offered by the Executive Committee to amend language of the faculty senate bylaws in Section VI.C (“Ohio University Representative to the Ohio Faculty Council”) of the Faculty Handbook. The amended language modifies the month of the Ohio Faculty Council Representation election from April to May. Electing the Representative in May is consistent with the Faculty Senate chair’s term start date.
- The resolution was approved by a voice vote.

❖ Resolution to Change the Update Methods of Notification for Faculty Senate Meetings—Second Reading

- The resolution is offered by the Executive Committee to amend language of the faculty senate bylaws in Section VI.B.4.a of the Faculty Handbook. The current language requires notification of meetings by campus or U.S. mail or by telephone. The current language also requires telephone notification be provided to a responsible person at the member’s house or office in the event that the member cannot be reached personally. The amended language allows for notification via electronic communication and removes the requirement that telephone messages must be provided to a person.

- The resolution was approved by a voice vote.
- ❖ With EPSA: Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Proposed Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletes—First Reading
 - The sense of the senate resolution is offered jointly by the Executive Committee and the EPSA Committee to (1) thank donors who invest in OHIO students’ success, (2) encourage the President and Advancement Office to work with academic leaders to align private giving for academic facilities with OHIO’s academic needs, and (3) to encourage the University to integrate academic support, study space, and recreational facilities for student-athletes with those for other OHIO students.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked how far along in the process the Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletes was, if the money was earmarked for this specific use, and if the gift would be lost otherwise. Quitslund explained that approximately half the funding has been provided by a single donor; additional gifts have also been secured. Quitslund explained that the terms of the gift specify the facility and the naming of the facility.
- A senator asked whether or not anyone had provided an explanation / justification for not permitting students who are not student-athletes to be permitted to use the facility. Specifically, if the Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletes is only open to student-athletes, this could be interpreted as indicating that students who are not student-athletes are “second-class citizens” of OHIO. Quitslund explained that she was unaware of the justification and did not have the knowledge to respond.
- A senator asked if the operating funds / costs were to be provided from the University’s general fund. Quitslund did not know the source of revenue for the operating funds. Quitslund also remarked that she was unaware of a need for additional funding associated with the beyond what is currently in the ICA budget (e.g., hiring additional staff).
- A senator asked if there was knowledge about how the need was identified. In other words, did the donor approach the University with the idea or did the University suggest the idea?
- A senator asked how the funding and gift works. Does the gift only pay for part of the building? If so, how will the operating cost be covered? Quitslund stated that there is no reason to believe that the funding model will change from the current model.
- A senator asked if we [the Faculty Senate] would have the opportunity to find out the background and process of the gift [for the Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletics].
- A senator stated that the operating budget [for the Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletics] would probably be paid by the University (as it is now).
- Quitslund noted that there is a [website](#) currently in operation requesting donations for the Center; the cost is projected to be \$5.5 million. Athletics hope to raise more to pay for on-going operating expenses.
- A senator noted that many units within the University have dealt with tensions when donors want to gift the University with money for specific purposes. Some units may refuse donations when the donations compromise values and/or the impartiality of education.
- A senator asked for the reason(s) regarding why the Senate believes that the Senate needs to have a Sense of the Senate Resolution [about the Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletics]. One perspective is that donor is donating money and has the abilities to put stipulations on what/how that money will be used. For example, a donor may donate money to an academic program only for that academic program. Quitslund clarified the purpose of the Sense of the Senate Resolution.

- A senator questioned comparisons between donations to specific academic program and this specific donation [for the Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletics]. Whereas specific academic programs are open to all students who qualify, this segregates student-athletes from the general population of students. As such, it was argued that it is acceptable for the Senate to object to something that segregates student-athletes.
- A senator asked whether or not the donors were courted for this specific purpose. In some situations, donors may be encouraged by University representatives to donate for specific purposes.
- A senator had questions about how the building will be used during game-days. Specifically, there were comments about intentions to use the facility as a hospitality area for donors on game days.
- A senator asked the purpose and potential outcome of the resolution. Is the purpose of the Resolution to influence the use of the donation? Quitslund responded this was not the purpose of the Resolution nor should there be expectations that Faculty Senate is trying to influence the use of the gift already provided.
- A senator asked whether or not student-athletes have special needs that the Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletics will address specifically. Quitslund said that she was not sure about entering ACT or SAT scores. Quitslund did note that student-athletes' academic achievement (e.g., GPA, retention, etc.) is marginally higher than the rest of student body.
- A senator asked for clarification about the current situation with existing academic support services for student-athletes and the facility for those services. Quitslund provided an explanation about the differences between the current Center and the planned Center.
- A senator asked the Senate to move in a different direction. Instead of the Resolution addressing the use of this gift, should the Faculty Senate do what it can to do something in the future to have a voice in Advancement? More specifically, because we do not know how the gift was provided, the Senate may be making assumptions or inferences about the process. Instead, it was suggested that the Senate make efforts with regards to future donations. In response, another senator stated that this Resolution does ask for changes in the future through the three statements and does not necessarily target this particular gift.
- A senator mentioned that student-athletes are able to use the University-wide Academic Center.
- A senator said that faculty members may need a voice in Development Office in order to express faculty concerns and to understand how projects get funded from (or not from) the list of needs identified by the University.
- A senator stated that student-athletes already have an Academic Center that segregates them from the general student body. This segregation may be a necessity for a variety of reasons. For example, the Academic Center may be important given student-athletes' demanding schedules.
- A senator argued that other students and student groups (e.g., Marching 110) may also have special academic needs due to schedules. These students make comparable investments and do not have special facilities and services.
- A senator asked about whether or not someone from the Office of Advancement might visit the Faculty Senate to explain how the process of donations and gifts works.
- A senator stated that the donation [for the Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletics] was provided for a specific purpose according to the terms of the gift similar to a donation to a specific college or other unit. Quitslund remarked that the Resolution [about the Academic Center

for Intercollegiate Athletics] is written to positively recognize the real generosity of donation and the importance of students' academic success.

- Quitslund noted that additional comments, questions, or concerns should be forwarded to Palmer (EPSA) or Quitslund (Executive Committee).

VI. Professional Relations Committee (Sarah Wyatt)

- ❖ Resolution to Provide Consistent Language in Sections II.C and II.D of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to Faculty Rank and Status and Appointments—Second Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to amend language in Section II.C and Section II.D of the Faculty Handbook. The current language pertaining to faculty rank, status, and appointments is inconsistent with recently passed resolutions. The amended language revises the Handbook such that it is consistent with recently passed resolutions.
 - The resolution was approved by a voice vote.
- ❖ Resolution to Provide Clarity in Sections II. C. of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to Faculty Rank and Status—Second Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to amend language in Section II.C of the Faculty Handbook. The current language pertaining to faculty rank and status has resulted in confusion due to lack of clarity. The amended language revises the Handbook such that it provides better clarification of existing policy.
 - A senator asked if there was any consideration for whether the requirements for converting Group III to Group II could be the same as the ACA requirements for providing benefits, so that administrators don't have to keep track of two different sets of requirements. Wyatt mentioned that this has been discussed yet no decisions have been made.
 - The resolution was approved by a voice vote.
- ❖ Resolution to Provide Clarity in Sections II. C. of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to the Position of Assistant Lecturer —Second Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to amend language in Section II.C of the Faculty Handbook. The current language pertaining to faculty rank and status has resulted in confusion due to lack of clarity. The amended language revises the Handbook such that it provides better clarification of existing policy.
 - The resolution was approved by a voice vote.
- ❖ Second Resolution to Provide Consistent Language in Sections II.C and II.D of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to Faculty Rank and Status and Appointments—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to amend language in Section II.D.1.d of the Faculty Handbook such that appointments for Group IV faculty may be made for a total of no longer than three years. Currently, the language in Section II.C.3.d states that visiting professor and other full-term appointments (Group IV) are limited to a total of three years. The resolution changes language in Section II.D.1.d to be consistent.
- ❖ Resolution to Clarify Procedure for Group II Annual Evaluations—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to amend language in Section II.C.3.b.v of the Faculty Handbook such that the procedure for Group II annual evaluations is clarified. Currently, the language in Section II.C.3.b.v does not reference Section 2.E.1 of the Faculty

Handbook, which is a section describing appropriate procedures for evaluating all faculty. The resolution adds a phrase to the current language that references the section describing procedures.

- A senator mentioned that the change is important for Group II faculty to provide clarity about policy.
- ❖ Resolution to Revise the Workload Necessary to Move a Faculty Position from Group III to Group II—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to amend language in Section II.C.3.c.iii of the Faculty Handbook such that the requirements for moving Group III classification into Group II classification are changed from *equivalent to 0.5 FTE* to *above 0.5 FTE*. The change is useful for given the change to semesters and some units' workload policy.
- ❖ Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Need to Establish a University-Wide Group II Teaching Award—First Reading
 - The sense of the senate resolution is offered the PR Committee to recommend that the university develop a university-wide teaching award for Group II faculty that is similar in stature and requirements as the Presidential Teaching Award for Group I.
 - A senator asked if the Provost was the intended audience. If so, it was suggested that the Resolution should state it as such.
 - A senator asked about the need for clarifying the relationship between this award and college-level awards. Wyatt responded by stating that this award should not replace existing college-level awards.

Questions and Discussions

- There were no additional questions or discussions.

VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ruth Palmer)

- ❖ Topic: Student Code of Conduct. Recently, there were announcements made in the media outlets about changes to the Student Code of Conduct. Unfortunately, EPSA did not know about the proposed changes prior to the announcement. As such, EPSA is now working with the appropriate offices and persons to provide a faculty voice and input for such changes.

Questions and Discussions

- There were no additional questions or discussions.

VIII. Finance & Facilities Committee (Ben Stuart)

- ❖ Topic 1: ICA. Stuart stated that an F&F sub-committee is reviewing ICA spending. A report on spending will be coming soon. Questions can be addressed to Hays or Sindelar.
- ❖ Topic 2: Benefits Survey. Stuart echoed Quitslund's comments about the importance of faculty participation in the Benefits Survey and strongly encourages participation in order to provide feedback.

Questions and Discussions

- There were no additional questions or discussions.

IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)

- ❖ Topic: Appeals. P&T have been tasked with addressing three appeals this semester. Letters have been sent for two of the appeals. P&T is still deliberating on third.

Questions and Discussions

- There were no additional questions or discussions.

X. New Business

- ❖ None

XII. Adjournment

- ❖ **Doty** moved to adjourn, seconded by **Wyatt**. The meeting was adjourned at 9:06pm.