

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, March 16, 2015
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*: E. Ammarell, N. Bernstein, H. Castillo, C. Elster, S. Hays, G. Kessler, K. Mattson, R. Palmer, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, C. Snyder, D. Tees, K. Uhalde
- *College of Business*: K. Hartman, T. Luce, Z. Sarikas
- *College of Fine Arts*: C. Buchanan, K. Geist, A. Hibbitt, D. Thomas
- *College of Health Sciences and Professions*: T. Basta, A. Sergeev, B. Sindelar
- *Group II*: D. Duvert
- *Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine*:
- *Patton College of Education*: G. Brooks, D. Carr, K. Machtmes
- *Regional Campus – Chillicothe*: B. Trube
- *Regional Campus – Eastern*: J. Casebolt
- *Regional Campus – Lancaster*: L. Trautman
- *Regional Campus – Southern*: D. Marinski
- *Regional Campus – Zanesville*: A. White
- *Russ College of Engineering*: C. Bartone, J. Cotton, B. Stuart, G. Suer
- *Scripps College of Communication*: B. Bates, L. Black, B. Reader
- *Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs*:

Excused: S. Carson, S. Doty, G. Holcomb, S. Inman, N. Manring, J. Taylor, S. Williams, S. Wyatt

Absent: R. Althaus, A. Babrow, A. Ruhil, S. Walkowski

MEETING AGENDA

- I. President Roderick McDavis and Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit
- II. Password Requirements Update: SAVP Joe Lalley, Director of Information Security Matthew Dalton, and Interim CIO Duane Starkey
- III. Roll Call and Approval of the February 9, 2015 Minutes
- IV. Chair's Report—Beth Quitslund
 - COIA report: Betty Sindelar
 - Nominating Committee: Steve Hays
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: April 13, 2015
- V. Executive Committee—Beth Quitslund
 - Resolution Temporarily Permitting Certain Benefits Eligibility and Policies Contradicting the Faculty Handbook—First Reading
- VI. Finance & Facilities Committee—Ben Stuart
 - Resolution on Shared Governance in Faculty Compensation—Second Reading
 - Resolution on Guidelines for the Year 2 Faculty Compensation Implementation Plan—Second Reading

- Update from the Ad Hoc ICA Subcommittee

VII. Professional Relations Committee—Ben Bates

- Resolution to Revise the Faculty Handbook as Appropriate for the Revised University Policy on Sexual Misconduct—First Reading

VIII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ruth Palmer

IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Kevin Mattson

X. New Business

XI. Adjournment

I. President McDavis

McDavis discussed higher education in the state of Ohio. He remarked that it is an interesting time for higher education in Ohio and nationally. There has been extensive discussion both nationally and in the state about higher education funding. Specifically, he stated that the prevailing attitude in Columbus is that public institutions of higher education can operate more efficiently, which can save millions of dollars in the process and return that savings to our students.

- ❖ Topic 1: Senate Bill 4. Senate President Keith Faber has introduced Senate Bill 4. If passed, Senate Bill 4 will require each public institution in Ohio to develop a plan to reduce in-student student cost of attendance by 5% by 2016-17. Senate Bill 4 has had two hearings in the Senate Finance Committee and has been sent to the Finance Higher Education Subcommittee. Because SB4 was introduced by the Senate President, it is a safe assumption that the Senate will pass it quickly.
- ❖ Topic 2: Governor’s Task Force on Affordability & Efficiency in Higher Education. On February 10, Governor Kasich signed an executive order to create a nine-member task force on affordability and efficiency in higher education. The Governor has named Ohio State Senior Vice President and outgoing CFO Geoff Chatas as the Chair of the task force. Four additional members will be appointed by the Governor; the remaining four members will be appointed by legislative leadership. In conducting its review and developing its report with recommendations, the task force has been instructed to examine the following areas: administrative staffing levels, bureaucracy and related costs; teaching loads for professors not significantly involved in research; organization of departments, with a view toward ways to reduce overhead; space utilization; opportunities for shared services, energy savings, shared procurements and other cost; low-enrollment and low-performing programs and courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels; asset utilization and opportunities for monetization; standard course requirements for degree completion; use of technology to reduce cost for students; and best practices for regional campuses that are collocated with community college. The Task Force is required to complete and submit its report to the Governor and General Assembly on or before October 1, 2015.
- ❖ Topic 3: House Bill 64. The state operating budget legislation continues to be debated in the House Finance Committee. The Committee is in the process of hearing testimony from state agencies. The opportunity for public testimony will begin Tuesday, March 24.

McDavis remarked that there was an IUC (Inter-University Council) day in which representatives from all public universities in Ohio sent delegates to Columbus last Tuesday. OHIO sent four students with the President and the Director of Public Relations. The delegation visited six different legislations during the visit to advocate on behalf of OHIO and higher education. The President encourages faculty and staff to tell our story to elected officials as frequently as possible.

I. Executive Vice President and Provost Benoit

- ❖ Topic 1: Accreditation. The Provost provided updates about OHIO’s accreditation process and details. The site visit for the AQIP review team will be November 2-4, 2015. The review team will

include seven visitors to the OHIO campus; they will review AQIP documents and other OHIO documents in order to make a determination about whether or not we have met all standards for re-accreditation. OHIO has taken steps prepare for the visit. First, consultant Dr. Douglas Eder has visited twice to meet with departments & units and to review assessment documents and to provide advice to units. All units have been asked to prepare assessment documentation and reports for the visit. The documentation and reports are not just for the review; they are also designed to demonstrate and document OHIO's continuous improvement. Second, we will also attend the HLC conference in March 2015 and an AQIP conference in April 2015. In addition, OHIO has also formed the Teaching & Learning Advisory Committee, which is working on ways to continuously improve teaching, learning, and assessment. The committee has wide representation from across campus; the co-chairs are Laurie Hatch (College of Arts & Sciences) and Scott Titsworth (College of Communications). Our efforts will provide us with information about the quality of education and to continuously improve those efforts.

- ❖ Topic 2: Enrollment. OHIO enrollment numbers are very good, and we continue to watch those numbers for the fall 2015 semester. Applications are 20,548 (increase of 81 compared to last year at this time). Admissions are currently 14,568 (increase of 296 compared to last year at this time). Housing deposits are currently around 14%.
- ❖ Topic 3: Default Rate. Although the numbers are preliminary, student loan fault rate has decreased from approximately 15% to approximately 11.2%. This is the largest decrease in the default rate as compared to the other IUC schools.
- ❖ Topic 4: Academic Calendar. OHIO has been trying to coordinate the OHIO calendar with the calendar of the Athens City School system in order to match vacations such as Spring Break. Unfortunately, this does not appear to be possible. The difficulty is the testing schedule of the Athens City Schools, which is unable to be changed. In 2016, OHIO's spring break will during the middle of the spring semester: February 28 – March 5. In 2016, the spring break for Athens City Schools is March 28 – April 1. If OHIO were the same week as the Athens City Schools, it would require having spring break after week 12.

Questions and Discussions

- **White** asked if the AQIP review team will visit regional campuses. Benoit remarked in the affirmative. McDavis reinforced the importance of accreditation from the standpoint of financial aid, our reputation, and a number of other issues. As such, accreditation will be discussed frequently in the near future. Benoit and McDavis also added that accreditation occurs only every seven years, so it is important to be ready.
- **Luce** asked for clarification of the default rate. Benoit remarked that this is the student loan default rate. McDavis added that this is a percentage calculated using the number of students who do not pay back their loans.
- **Trautman** asked if regional campuses are represented on the AQIP task force. Benoit responded in the affirmative.
- On behalf of a colleague, **Mattson** asked for clarification about a committee s/he had heard about that had been characterized as a post-tenure review committee. Benoit said that there is a new committee yet the task of this committee is not to be a post-tenure review committee. Instead, the task for this committee is to develop strategies for dealing with faculty members who are no longer meeting the minimum expectations of their position's responsibilities such as not attending or teaching their classes. In other words, these are situations in which faculty members have effectively stopped doing their jobs. These are difficult cases and represent a very small number of situations. Provost said that Deans started this conversation by asking for strategies designed to address situations in which faculty members are not doing their jobs. In these situations, is there a strategy or method for which faculty members can be provided assistance to get them back

onto a productive and functional pathway? If not, what is the next step? The committee includes faculty members recommended by the Senate and has been formed to help determine how other institutions manage seriously dysfunctional issues. More specifically, the committee is tasked with determining a strategy designed to help the person get back onto a more productive path and to determine if we can create another tool to help with managing specific cases. As such, this is not a committee designed to do a widespread post-tenure review.

- **Mattson** asked if the committee has a name. Benoit said that it does not currently have a name. Quitslund added that the Senate's PRC committee is well represented on this committee. Furthermore, Benoit emphasized that this is a very, very small number of faculty members yet the impact of the issues may have a larger impact.
- **Mattson** asked if it would be incorrect to describe it as a post-tenure review committee. Benoit remarked that it is not limited to just post-tenure cases because extreme situations could even occur before tenure. These specific cases are situations in which faculty members have a certain set of behaviors that may be characterized as no longer fulfilling job responsibilities. However, Benoit also remarked that the challenge will be to define the specific set of behaviors that would put a faculty member into that category.
- **Reader** asked how long ago the committee was formed and how much activity has the committee had. Benoit responded by saying that the committee started sometime during the fall semester (approximately) and has met approximately three times. Currently, the committee is reviewing policies and strategies of other institutions.
- **Hibbitt** asked if these specific cases are related to problems with climate among faculty and within departments. Benoit noted that this could be an issue, but the cases that have been discussed are situations in which a faculty member is no longer fulfilling a job responsibility such as teaching classes.

II. Password Requirements Update: SAVP Joe Lalley, Director of Information Security Matthew Dalton, and Interim CIO Duane Starkey

SAVP Joe Lalley provides a brief overview of needs for a password policy. Specifically, Lalley noted that OHIO has been reviewing (and noticing an increase) in the number of compromised accounts. The office has then been working with various groups to develop a password policy to improve the security of information. This presentation is to provide the Faculty Senate with information about the current version of draft policy and to bring forth a recommendation for consideration.

❖ **Topic: Password Policy.** Director of Information Security Matthew Dalton presented information about a proposed new password policy (91-004). (Draft is available at the end of this document.)

Topics for discussion included:

- Why passwords matter including information about the average cost per record of a breach and the number of password failures from outside the United States last week for OHIO;
- Background summary about authentication credentials;
- Review of password policies at other institutions including IUC, select peer institutions, and recommendations from OHIO system auditors;
- Recommendation model to implement at OHIO that includes two-levels that varies maximum password age by the strength of the password;
- Request of Faculty Senate to endorse the policy draft and authentication credential standards; and
- Summary of next steps including request for feedback, communications plan, slow roll out plans, and tools/techniques for generating and remembering complex passwords.

For additional information or to provide feedback, please Matthew Dalton at daltonm@ohio.edu.

For detailed information provided via the PowerPoint presentation, please refer to Appendix A.

*For detailed information about the Authentication Credentials, please refer to Appendix B.
For a draft of the proposed policy, please refer to Appendix C.*

Questions and Discussions

- **Sergeev** asked about the difference between risk level two and credential. Specifically, the question was about whether or not 10-character passwords are better than 8-character passwords. Dalton responded that 10-character passwords are better; this was the original recommendation for credential level two. For credential level three, the original recommendation was 15-character passwords. However, the number of characters was part of a negotiation with the larger community. Lalley noted that those who provided earlier feedback wanted fewer characters; using 8-character passwords as a standard was a compromise. Dalton also noted that the data stewards will review annually the policy to determine the level of risk. Based upon the reviews, the standards may change. As such, the policy as proposed is for initial adoption that may change based upon changes in technology.
- **Sergeev** asked if there would be a way to check the OHIO credentials. Dalton noted that OHIO can technically check to make sure passwords comply with policy before passwords are changed. Lalley also noted that part of the roll out would be a set date for people to change their password that would include reminders prior to the password change deadline. After the deadline, the standards will be enforced such that if password has not yet been changed, then users must change passwords in accordance with the standards. Lalley also noted that they are asking senators to speak with colleagues and to provide feedback about the policy proposal. Feedback will be sought from staff and other groups as well.
- **Hays** asked whether or not other characters than just ascii character codes can be used. In other words, can character codes of other languages be used? Dalton responded that characters from other languages can be used yet also noted that, based upon his previous experience, some using characters from other languages may still use dictionary words. As such, they are still at-risk. Dalton further added that communications about level of risk of passwords in something in the next steps.
- **Castillo** asked whether or not there was a lockout procedure for a certain number of failed attempts. Dalton responded by stating that we have a lock-out system for a number of failed attempts and for blocking out specific systems such as blocking out computers in other countries. The lockout procedure protects all systems using OHIO credentials.
- **A senator** asked about biometric authentication. Dalton responded that credential level four is multi-factored. For example, this level of credential may require the user to have an application on his/her phone in order to have a double-verification for logging into systems.
- **Ammarell** asked if we currently communicate with users about the strength of the password. Dalton responded that we do not but this could be something done in the future. Furthermore, Dalton mentioned that password standard enforcement would have a roll-out such that users may change passwords at a time that is most appropriate for their schedule. In addition, Dalton noted that there will be efforts for providing the community with tools to create stronger passwords that can be more easily remembered.
- **Sarikas** shared a story about his previous experience using a stronger password that didn't work all the time. Dalton responding by asking to discuss this situation with him personally.
- **Elster** mentioned that we need a practice that allows enough time to create a password and make changes to the password. Dalton noted that there will probably be 12 months for the rollout.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the February 9, 2015 Minutes

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

IV. Chair's Report (Beth Quitslund)

- ❖ Topic 1: COIA Report: Betty Sindelar
 - Sindelar attended the COIA (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics) Conference on February 20-22, 2015 and provided a summary of the Conference. For a detailed summary of the COIA Conference provided by Sindelar, please visit the Faculty Senate [webpage](#).
 - COIA was developed to be the faculty senate's voice when looking at the place and function of intercollegiate athletics at FBS universities. COIA views itself as a different voice from the FARs (faculty athletic representatives) in that COIA representation should be appointed or voted on by the faculty senate as opposed to the Presidential appointment of the FARs.
 - Select topics from the 2015 COIA Conference included academic integrity, the welfare of the student/athlete, NCAA restructuring, and fiscal responsibility of ICA programs. One point of note is the results of a survey conducted by COIA regarding faculty oversight of athletics on university campuses; the results suggested there is variance in faculty interest in ICA, faculty oversight of ICA, and selection and function of the FARs.
 - Sindelar also explained a presentation by the Drake Group. The Drake Group is working on HR 5743, which would create a Presidential Commission to investigate ICA on a national scale and to propose legislation to deal with issues that come up. There appears to be bipartisan and White House support for the bill. However, no formal lobbying efforts have been created. If passed, the bill will create funding for the commission and set a year time-line for the process. Tentatively, it appears that Obama supports HR 5743 while the NCAA has been less favorable. COIA is also making efforts to have a COIA member on a committee. For a copy of the report, please visit the Faculty Senate [webpage](#).
 - Sindelar also mentioned [College Athletes Rights and Empowerment Faculty Coalition](#) (CARE-FC), which is a national coalition of faculty concerned with the academic and economic mistreatment of college athletes in the profit sports of football and basketball. According to the website, "The mission of CARE-FC is to support college athletes in their quest to fundamentally change the existing college sport industry by recognizing they are employees who deserve protections afforded such status."
 - Sindelar noted that there is a need to appoint a representative for a multi-year appointment to COIA. Quitslund noted that OHIO does not currently have an official policy to select a COIA representative and suggested that OHIO needs such a policy. As such, Quitslund remarked that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is likely to bring forth a proposal for the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- ❖ Topic 2: Nominating Committee: Steve Hays
 - Quitslund explained that the nominating committee includes senators in their sixth year of their service. According to term limits, six years is the maximum a senator can serve. The purpose of the Nominating Committee is to manage nominations for those who want to serve as Faculty Senate Officers.
 - Hays stated that no one volunteered to be nominated for one of the officer positions. However, the current officers are willing to serve for another year. In addition, senators may make nominations from the floor at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.
- ❖ Topic 3: Updates and Announcements

- *Self-Nominations.* Quitslund noted that the deadline for faculty members wanting to self-nominate to serve on Faculty Senate has been extended to Wednesday, March 18. Quitslund asked senators to inform their colleagues. To date, there are some colleges without enough nominees to fill all open-positions for senators and other colleges without enough nominees to have an alternate. In addition, Quitslund extended a thank you to Senators who have served and who are standing for a second term.
 - *Two-Way Communications between Faculty and Senate.* Quitslund noted that the Campus Climate data from last spring shows reasonably high levels of satisfaction with communication coming from Faculty Senate. However, there was notably less confidence in the Senate as a representative body. The Executive Committee is meeting in a couple of weeks to put together some preliminary strategies to address our need to better hear and react to the interests of the faculty at large. We also need to better communicate Faculty Senate goals and what our appropriate role in shared governance is with respect to both the extent and limitations of the role. In other words, there is a need for effective communication loops rather than just a one-way communication of information. The Senate will probably need to start with gathering more data. In addition, the Executive Committee also needs any suggestions senators have for building a better communication infrastructure between Senate and the faculty at large as well as a more effective culture of representation. Please send suggestions via e-mail to Quitslund (quitslund@ohio.edu).
 - *Ohio University Foundation.* Quitslund announced that Ohio University Foundation will report quarterly on its investment portfolio. During the Senate’s conversation with Board of Trustees Chair Brightbill in the fall semester, some faculty had expressed a desire to be able to see how the Foundation is investing its funds. Last month, Graduate Student Senate Chair Eddie Smith approached Quitslund to ask for support for a joint resolution between the two student senates asking for retrospective disclosure of Foundation investments. Rather than bringing forward a resolution, however, Quitslund happily reported that the Foundation moved extremely quickly after Quitslund reached out to them. As of today (March 16, 2015), the Foundation is officially committed to quarterly retrospective disclosure of investment holdings. The information will be available 60 days after the end of each quarter, and the December 31, 2014 report is available now. While these will soon be posted to the Foundation web site, at the moment one can get a copy of the December report by emailing a request to Candice Casto, the Foundation’s CFIO (castoc@ohio.edu). Quitslund thanked Candice, Bryan Benchoff, and Steve Golding for their responsiveness on this issue.
 - *OHIO Women’s Basketball.* Quitslund congratulated the women’s basketball team for their MAC championship and their NCAA tournament slot.
- ❖ Topic 4: Upcoming Senate Meeting. Monday, April 13, 2015 in Walter Hall 235

V. Executive Committee (Beth Quitslund)

- ❖ Resolution Temporarily Permitting Certain Benefits Eligibility and Policies Contradicting the Faculty Handbook—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the Executive Committee to address a contract issue with select Group III faculty who qualify for health benefits. The resolution states that Group III faculty in specific circumstances be given contracts as “Group III ACA Qualifiers” during the period that ACA requires benefits to be offered. Furthermore, the resolution officially acknowledges the currently-existing Handbook Sections III.A-D and K are non-binding. The resolution shall be in effect for a maximum of two years.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked about the impact of this Resolution on Group III faculty who are not working in the summer. Quitslund responded by stating that OHIO does not provide benefits during periods in which people are not employed, so this Resolution does not change that situation.

VI. Finance & Facilities Committee (Ben Stuart)

❖ Resolution on Shared Governance in Faculty Compensation —Second Reading

- The resolution is offered by the F&F Committee to ask the EVP&P, Deans, and Directors to engage in dialog with faculty regarding faculty compensation prior to establishing implementation guides for Years 2 and 3 of the current plan. Furthermore, the Resolution asks for Dean and Director level reporting to faculty that summarizes the factors identified in each unit and their relative priority/weighting; any data sets in addition to the average salary data that were used in the setting and/or justification of identified priorities; the progress realized via previous raise pools in addressing high priority factors; and how future raise pools will be utilized to address all identified factors.

✓ The resolution was approved by a show of hands.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator moved to table the motion until the next meeting. The reason provided for the motion to table was that the resolution in its current form was only provided to faculty the same day as the vote, which did not allow senators enough time to read/consider the resolution or discuss changes with their colleagues in order to get feedback. The motion was seconded. The motion to table the resolution failed by a show of hands.
- A senator asked about the use of the word *meaningful* (as an adjective to describe dialog regarding faculty compensation) in the resolution. Stuart responded by stating that there was not a specific definition for or discussion about the use of the word *meaningful*. Furthermore, Stuart explained that the word was simply used to imply that there should be a conversation with faculty.

❖ Resolution on Guidelines for the Year 2 Faculty Compensation Implementation Plan —Second Reading

- The resolution is offered by the F&F Committee requests that (1) a minimum raise of 1.5% taken from the standard FY16 raise pool be allocated as across-the-board increases to mitigate the salary erosion experienced by the majority of faculty over the past several years, (2) these across-the-board increases be distributed as fixed dollar amounts specific to each faculty rank or group as determined by dividing the total funds allocated to each rank or group by the FTE faculty within that rank or group such that the median salary in each rank is increased, and (3) the investment raise pool dedicated to “meritorious performance” consider faculty accomplishments over all the years when raise pools were insufficient to reward merit in that year be included in the consideration of any merit increases.

✓ The resolution was approved by a voice vote.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator moved to table the motion until the next meeting. The reason provided for the motion to table was that the resolution in its current form was only provided to faculty the same day as the vote, which did not allow senators enough time to read/consider the resolution or discuss changes with their colleagues in order to get feedback. The motion was seconded. The motion to table the resolution failed by a show of hands.
- A senator asked if the fixed dollar amount would be the same fixed dollar amount across all colleges. Stuart responded in the affirmative.

- A senator asked if the resolution also applied to Group II faculty. Stuart responded by noting that the resolution language refers to both ranks within Group I and those within Group II.
 - A senator asked for explanation about the rationale for dividing the standard raise pool by different faculty groups. More specifically, the guiding principles for the FCI raise pool does address different faculty ranks and groups given the goal of the funds (i.e., to raise the average salary rankings in the state). By contrast, the standard raise pool does not normally address different faculty groups in the same way. Stuart explained that an across-the-board raise that would be the same for all faculty groups may disproportionately provide raises such that lower salary brackets would receive higher raise percentage and higher salary brackets would receive lower raise percentages. Therefore, the resolution states that across-the-board raise increases should differ by faculty rank and group.
 - A senator asked for clarification about whether or not the resolution allowed units to not provide a minimum raise pool for specific circumstances such as faculty who are severely under-performing. Stuart responded by stating that the resolution did not allow for exceptions to across-the-board raises. Stuart also noted there was some discussion in the committee about this issue of allowing for exceptions yet requiring such exceptions to be documented and defended. Ultimately, the committee decided that allowing for exceptions might provide an opportunity for abusing the exception rule.
 - A senator argued that those who are not performing are still employed by Ohio University and that there are other mechanisms for addressing those issues in University policy, the Faculty Handbook, and department's promotion and tenure policies. If those are not being used and persons who are not performing job duties are still employed, then the person deserves to get a salary increase due to cost of living increases.
 - A senator asked if there was discussion in the committee about stating a 1% salary increase as a minimum increase to offset the 1% increase to retirement plan contributions. Stuart said that this issue was discussed in the committee and noted that there is justification for a 1% minimum salary increase in order to mitigate the 1% increase in contributions. However, the committee also considered cost of living increases and decreases in health care benefits. As such, the decision was made to endorse a fixed dollar amount.
 - A senator asked if it was more difficult to distribute by rank. Stuart stated that it is more difficult to do yet it can be done.
 - A senator asked for a point of order about using track changes between first reading and second reading so that senators could see how things changed between the first reading and second reading. Quitslund and Stuart responded that this was a good idea for the future.
- ❖ Topic 3: Update from the Ad Hoc ICA Subcommittee.
- Hays presented information about the work-to-date from the ICA Subcommittee. There was a significant amount of discussion yet little consensus. As such, instead of doing a report, the subcommittee decided that it would be a good idea to use the subcommittee's discussion as a launching pad for a larger discussion. Therefore, members of the subcommittee have put together a website with information, resources, and summaries of discussions/viewpoints. The website is available at <http://oudialogues.com/>. Faculty members and other interested parties are welcome to provide comments. (Site registration is required.) Some of the topics include how much NCAA Sports at OHIO cost (current and future), reasons for the spending, discussions about the reasons for the spending, and various other investment option ideas. The purpose of the website is to generate dialogue and discussion about the topic. It was also noted that the website is still in development (only developed over a period of a few days).
 - Carr provided a brief explanation about OHIO's funding model as a subsidy model, which is common for our peer institutions. This model requires subsidy funding for athletics from other sources because athletics does not generate enough revenue to be self-sustaining. If OHIO offers

student athletes necessary support to compete and other students with opportunities to participate, then this will have a cost to the University. Furthermore, Carr noted that there are thousands of students who benefit directly from intercollegiate athletics.

- Sindelar noted that the subcommittee's information collection efforts and discussions primarily contributed to the first few tabs on the website (i.e., information about current/future spending, reasons for the spending, and rating the reasons). The other tabs are still in development.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked if the website is complete. The subcommittee explained that it is a work-in-progress yet is available to those who would like to contribute viewpoints, ideas, or questions.
- A senator asked how much ICA cost per student per year (for a traditional Athens campus student). Hays said that information is available on the website; the best estimate is approximately \$800. Sindelar added that the majority of the money is from the general fee; it is estimated that approximately 31% of the general fee is for ICA funding.
- A senator asked about the extent to which the website has been distributed to students or parents. Hays noted that the website was just built the day before the meeting, so it has not been widely distributed. However, Hays noted that anyone can share it widely if they want to do so.
- Quitslund thanked the sub-committee for the tremendous amount of work and for being a model of people with different opinions effectively working together.

VII. Professional Relations Committee (Ben Bates)

- ❖ Resolution to Revise the Faculty Handbook as Appropriate for the Revised University Policy on Sexual Misconduct—First Reading
 - University policy 03.004 on Sexual Misconduct has been revised. The resolution is offered the PR Committee to amend Faculty Handbook language to be consistent with the revised policy.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked if there are any changes to the section of dual-partner relationships. For example, if two faculty members are in a relationship and in the same department in which one is a chair and one is not. Quitslund said that the policy as written is correct; this does not need to be updated.
- A senator remarked that we might want to change the wording from faculty member to instructional personnel in order to include graduate students.
- A senator asked about whether or not a faculty member can advise his/her own family member. Bates remarked that s/he cannot yet there is some language about exceptions to the rules.
- A senator asked about whether or not a faculty member can have his/her spouse as a teaching assistant. Bates remarked that s/he cannot.

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

- ❖ There were no announcements from EPSA.

Questions and Discussions

- None

IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)

- ❖ Topic 1: Future Meeting. Mattson noted that the P&T Committee is working on scheduling a new meeting soon and asked members of the Committee to indicate availability using an online scheduling system.

Questions and Discussions

- None

X. New Business

- ❖ There was no new business introduced.

Questions and Discussions

- None

XI. Adjournment

- ❖ **White** moved to adjourn, seconded by **Palmer**. The meeting was adjourned at 9:25pm.

APPENDIX A:
Policy Draft 91-004: Authentication Credentials
Presented by Matthew Dalton

Why do passwords matter?

Quick Facts:

- Institutional Research:
 - 2012-13 the university received \$108 million in grants.
 - Student Headcount in 2013: 38,857
- Ponemon Institute puts the average cost per record of a breach at \$201.
 - A full breach of current students (avg): \$7.8 million dollars
- Over 15 million password failures from outside the US last week for OU
- Anecdotally, we have had an uptick in compromised accounts in the last 18 months.
- Not all accounts are created equal

91-004: Authentication Credentials Summary

Individuals

- Don't share your credentials
- If you suspect, change and report

Credentials

- Different levels based on risk
- Reviewed by Data Stewards

System Owners

- Use OIT authentication systems
- OR
- Use different credentials

Authentication Systems

- Rules to protect your passwords

School Password Policies Reviewed

IUC

- Akron
- Bowling Green
- Cleveland State
- Kent State
- Miami
- Ohio State
- Wright State

Peer Institutions

- Colorado State University
- Oklahoma State University
- University of Missouri
- University of New Hampshire
- University of South Carolina
- University of Utah
- West Virginia University

Password Criteria

	IUC	Peers	Auditor
Minimum Length	8-10	7-15	8
Password Age	180-365	120-365	60
Character Classes	2-4 of the 4	3-4 of the 4	All 4
Restrictions Against	Dictionary Words Name Username Phone Numbers SSN Etc.	Dictionary Words Name Username Phone Numbers SSN Etc.	
Password Re-Use	Prohibited at most	Prohibited at some	Cannot repeat last 12

Recommended Ohio University Model for Implementation

Credential Level 2

Password Age Maximum

- 180 days

Password Length Minimum

- 8

Password Complexity

- Upper Case Letter
- Lower Case Letter
- Number

Credential Level 2

Password Age Maximum

- 365 days

Password Length Minimum

- 10

Password Complexity

- Upper Case Letter
- Lower Case Letter
- Number
- Special Character

Request of Faculty Senate

- Endorse the policy draft 91-004
- Endorse the Authentication Credential Complexity Standards

Next Steps

- Continue vetting process/Adoption
- Develop Communications plan
- Roll out plans
- Tools/techniques for generating and remembering more complex passwords
- Slow roll out
- This allows people to choose what time of year works best for a password expiration

Data Steward Membership – Current

- Alumni and Development Data
 - Vice President for University Advancement
- Facilities Data
 - Associate Vice President for Facilities
- Financial Data
 - Senior Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration
- HR Data
 - Chief Human Resource Officer
- IT Data
 - Chief Information Officer
- Institutional Data
 - Associate Provost for Institutional Research and Effectiveness
- Research Data
 - Vice President for Research and Creative Activity
- Student Data
 - Vice President for Enrollment Management
 - Vice President for Student Affairs
- Medical Data
 - HIPAA Council Representative
- Staff Support
 - Senior Associate Vice President for Information Technology and Administrative Services
 - Director of Information Security