

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, October 10, 2016
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 135, 7:10pm
Meeting Minutes DRAFT

Meeting called to order by Joe McLaughlin (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:10PM

In attendance

Tenure / Tenure-Track

- *College of Arts and Sciences*: J. Andrews, S. Carson, H. Castillo, D. Clowe, S. Gradin, K. Hicks, G. Holcomb, G. Kessler, N. Manring, J. McLaughlin, R. Muhammad, P. Patton, H. Perkins, N. Reynolds, C. Snyder
- *College of Business*: K. Hartman, A. Rosado Feger, R. Thacker
- *College of Fine Arts*: R. Braun [sub for A. Hibbitt], C. Buchanan, K. Geist, D. Thomas
- *College of Health Sciences and Professions*: R. Brannan, F-C. Jeng, A. Sergeev
- *Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine*: S. Inman, S. Williams, J. Wolf
- *Patton College of Education*: G. Brooks, S. Helfrich, K. Machtmes
- *Regional Campus – Chillicothe*: Allison White
- *Regional Campus – Eastern*:
- *Regional Campus – Lancaster*: C. Thomas-Maddox
- *Regional Campus – Southern*: O. Carter
- *Regional Campus – Zanesville*: J. Taylor, Amy White
- *Russ College of Engineering*: D. Arch, J. Cotton, D. Masel, G. Weckman
- *Scripps College of Communication*: A. Babrow, B. Bates, A. Chadwick, T. Roycroft [sub for F. Lewis]
- *Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs*: A. Ruhil

Career Teaching and Clinical

- *Clinical*:
- *College of Arts and Sciences*: D. Duvert, C. Schwirian
- *College of Business*: T. Barnett
- *College of Health Sciences and Professions*: M. Clevidence
- *Regional Higher Education*: T. Pritchard

Excused: J. Balbo

Absent: B. Schoen, K. Spiker, D. Tees

MEETING AGENDA

- I President Roderick McDavis
 - II David Wolfort, Chair & Janetta King, Vice-Chair, Board of Trustees
 - III Roll Call and Approval of the September 12, 2016 Minutes
 - IV Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
 - Updates and Announcements
 - AAUP Conference on Shared Governance
 - Policy Review – Classroom Privacy (Faculty Handbook IV.A.9)
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: November 7, 2016
 - V Executive Committee – Joe McLaughlin
 - a. Resolution on Revising the University Naming Policy and Practices—Second Reading & Vote
 - VI Finance & Facilities Committee – Susan Williams
 - VII Professional Relations Committee – Sherrie Gradin
 - a. Resolution to Revise Language on Comprehensive Review of Deans—First Reading
 - b. Resolution to Clarify Language on the Annual Evaluation of Deans—First Reading
 - VIII Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Charles Buchanan
 - IX Promotion & Tenure Committee—Ben Bates
 - X New Business
 - XI Adjournment
-

I. President Roderick McDavis

- ❖ **Topic: Cultural Competency.** McDavis asked the faculty to participate in a group addressing issues related to recent events associated with OHIO's graffiti wall. Although McDavis noted that freedom of speech is one of the most fundamental principles and rights on OHIO's campus, there have been some images and messages on the OHIO graffiti wall that have prompted discussion and action focused on cultural sensitivity and training. OHIO has introduced a program entitled CATS: Cultural Awareness Training for Students; this is a voluntary program for students. McDavis has met with a number of student groups to discuss this and other actions; some of these groups have suggested offering and/or requiring cultural competencies classes for students. Because curriculum is the responsibility and purview of the faculty, the President is asking the faculty to participate in organizing a working group or task force in partnership with the Office of the President and Office of the Provost to develop recommendations and ideas for cultural competency classes / courses available to students. McDavis remarked that OHIO wants to be an open, inclusive campus welcoming to all.

Questions and Discussions

- **McLaughlin** added to the President's remarks by providing additional information. The Chairs of the five OHIO Senates met to discuss issues that have come to the forefront as related to the graffiti wall language. Together, the Chairs wrote a letter to the President asking for the Office of the President to appoint a task force that would make recommendations about these issues. McLaughlin signed the letter because he believes faculty provide value to our students and

community when faculty initiate and engage in discussions about such issues. The President responded favorably and agreed to support efforts to appoint a task force. McLaughlin asked Senators for ideas for and interest in serving on the task force. McLaughlin shared that there have already been discussions about reviewing Tier II – General Education requirements to determine if cultural competency classes could be embedded into already existing requirements.

II. David Wolfort, Chair & Janetta King, Vice-Chair, Board of Trustees

- ❖ **Topic 1: Introductions.** Chair Wolfort and Vice-Chair King thanked the Faculty Senate for inviting them to visit. As an introduction, each shared background information. **Wolfort** shared that he attended OHIO 1970 – 1974 (graduated in four years) and started his second relationship with OHIO in the mid-1990s. This year is his ninth (and final) year on the OHIO Board of Trustees. He stated that he has had a “46-year love affair” with OHIO. Although **King** did not attend OHIO for her undergraduate degree, she was reared in Appalachia and has fond memories of OHIO from her childhood. She founded Innovation Ohio in 2011 and served as the deputy chief of staff for policy for Ohio Governor Ted Strickland. She has completed seven years on the board and continues to enjoy serving OHIO. For additional details, please read profiles for [David Wolfort](#) and [Janetta King](#) online.
- ❖ **Topic 2: Presidential Search.** Wolfort shared information about the Presidential Search. The Board of Trustees has appointed a 21-member search committee and worked hard to ensure that the committee represents voices from the entire OHIO community. The Board strives to make the process as transparent as possible. OHIO has also hired a search firm to assist in the process; this firm has the knowledge and expertise to steward OHIO’s efforts to recruit ideal candidates for the position. Information about the Presidential Search can be found online at <https://www.ohio.edu/presidential-search/Search-Update.cfm>.

Questions and Discussions

- **Senator Brennan** noted that there is a great deal of competition among public universities in the state of Ohio and asked how well OHIO is positioned to be competitive – in terms of both the Presidential Search as well as securing resources from the state. Specifically, the senator asked Wolfort for advice for making OHIO competitive now and in the future. **Wolfort** stated that OHIO is positioned to be very attractive for the right candidate; OHIO has a number of positive qualities including outstanding faculty, strong academics, a strong financial position, and strategic initiatives for the future. Wolfort further remarked that the President McDavis, administrators, and faculty have contributed to creating an attractive university for the right candidate. With reference to securing state resources, **King** remarked that the total of money available from the state is limited and competition for that money is strong. OHIO has been and will continue to be very engaged in how the state allocates money. At the state level, OHIO is seen as a good investment. To reinforce this image, King remarked that it is important to continue to tell the OHIO story and take the lead on innovations that support students (such as affordability and access). For example, the state was particularly impressed by the OHIO Guarantee. **Wolfort** remarked that OHIO has received increases in real dollars from the state because we have been good stewards of the state’s investment in higher education. This includes retaining graduates for the state, putting graduates to work in the state, and meeting state expectations for outcomes. **McDavis** added that resources from the state are derived from retention rates and graduation rates; OHIO is third best in the state of Ohio.
- **Senator Hicks** asked about a recent open-forum about the Presidential Search. Members of the faculty and community attended and provided input to the Board of Trustees. The senator asked if the Board learned anything new from the open forum and, if so, how any new information was integrated into the Presidential Search process. **Wolfort** noted that although there were no surprises from the discussions at the forum, the Board listened to the input seriously – especially

key points that were specific to academics – and incorporated the input into the profile. This meeting was an important opportunity to share opinions and provide insights; the Board appreciated the input. **McLaughlin** stated that the profile integrated feedback from the open forum beyond his expectations; the profile is available online at <https://www.ohio.edu/presidential-search/upload/Presidential-Profile-Document.pdf>. **King** noted that getting the document right was important to the Presidential Search Committee because it guides future discussions and considerations. She expressed her gratitude to all of those who participated. **Wolfort** noted that the search for a new leader is an important undertaking; a variety of constituencies have been consulted.

- **Wolfort** discussed OHIO's Capital Improvement Plan. This plan is a significant effort for the University that is enormously robust. Although much of this work is not necessarily exciting, it is important. **Wolfort** remarked that parents and students trust us to serve them well during their experience; it is important that we act to earn and maintain that trust. OHIO needs to prove the structure and the facilities necessary for students to be successful. OHIO has accomplished a number of goals to continue to support students' educational experiences including new dormitories, building improvements, continued building maintenance, etc. The Board reviews the plan annually and considers a variety of issues such as disruption to students' experiences. The goal is to improve the institution, which the Board firmly believes is sustainable for the long-term. **Wolfort** thanked several administrators and faculty for their efforts.
- **Senator Hartman** asked about Board discussions focused on what they believe the future of higher education will look like in the next ten years. **Wolfort** remarked that the Board does discuss and consider the future; they believe that OHIO has a strong, sustainable outlook for future success. They also are cautionary about over-investing given changes to the landscape in and demands for higher education. The Board considers the residential campus experience, online educational experience, changes to demands for programs, changes to how courses are delivered, etc. **Wolfort** thanked Pam Benoit and faculty for their leadership. The Board also recognizes that students have choices and wants to make sure that students choose OHIO. **Wolfort** noted that the OHIO Guarantee is a competitive win for OHIO; it is a way for families to plan for a four-year education. Although the state of Ohio supported it, this support was tentative until OHIO proved it as a viable model. **King** added that the Board has a specific role at the macro-level and tries to focus on that role. **King** noted that this is one reason for the importance of shared governance; the Board seeks advice from experts. **Wolfort** noted that OHIO provides a transformational educational experience for students; this is a big deal. For him personally, the education received from OHIO was transformative; later in life, the lessons learned helped him grow a company from a million-dollar business to a billion-dollar business. **Wolfort** said that all of OHIO's employees should be proud of the educational experience provided to students. The Board wants to make sure the experience can be delivered in a structure and environment conducive to the best educational experience for our students.
- **Senator Andrews** asked about the expansion of the OHIO footprint. Specifically, is it unusual for a state institution of OHIO's size to have the number of developments that OHIO currently has? **Wolfort** said that it is unusual. OHIO is taking advantage of the OHIO university brand. Because the OHIO brand travels, OHIO can expand our footprint and reach throughout the state of Ohio to serve populations currently underserved.
- **Senator Snyder** asked about Board's consideration of the Dublin campus and its relationship to the existing OHIO campuses. **Wolfort** stated that the Board does think about the Dublin campus and its relationship to existing OHIO campuses; this is not taken lightly. The Board considers the plan as it currently exists as a long-term (25-year) vision. Furthermore, **Wolfort** noted that the Dublin expansion is not designed to cannibalize existing programs in OHIO. At a recent Board meeting, several Deans discussed opportunities and plans designed to complement existing offerings. The vision is to serve a population that is discrete and unique from the main campus.

For example, programs offered in Cleveland serve populations that other campuses cannot adequately serve. **King** emphasized that the Deans' remarks at the recent Board meeting highlighted the complementary nature of Dublin programming. The Dublin footprint expands opportunities to main campus students including (but not limited to) internships and corporate partnerships that may not be available to main campus students in the Athens area.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the September 12, 2016 Minutes

- ❖ Roll call (K. Hartman)
- ❖ **Muhammad** moved to approve the minutes, seconded by **Patton**. Minutes were approved by a voice vote.

IV. Chair's Report (Joe McLaughlin)

- ❖ Topic 1: Updates and Announcements
 - **AAUP Conference.** McLaughlin shared his recent experience at the AAUP Conference. He was able to attend a number of workshops including sessions about faculty handbooks, Title IX, budgets, and how to make a senate more effective. McLaughlin's primary conclusion was that OHIO is in pretty good shape as compared to other institutions – yet there is always room for improvement. McLaughlin numerated three issues that could make Faculty Senate operations more effective. First, communication – including communications from leadership of the Senate as well as communication from Senators to faculty constituencies – could improve understanding of topics and actions. Second, having limitations on Faculty Senate meeting length could improve continued engagement. For example, some of the other OHIO Senates post an end-time for meetings. Third, building a culture of shared governance across campus is important. This is important among faculty as well as with students.
 - **Panel on Shared Governance with Graduate Student Senate.** McLaughlin and the Chair of the Graduate Student Senate, Ian Armstrong, have discussed having a panel on shared governance to discuss the role and importance of shared governance. Although graduate students are given mentorship in research and teaching, little attention is provided to shared governance and its importance to the operations of a University. McLaughlin asked for volunteers to participate.
 - **Dean Evaluations.** McLaughlin reminded senators that it is the responsibility of the senators within each unit to select half of the members of the Dean Evaluation Committee for the unit. For this year, there will be some relatively new evaluations for Deans of the Graduate College, International Studies, Cleveland, and Dublin. There are also comprehensive reviews scheduled for Deans of Arts & Sciences, Business, HCOM, Education, and Engineering. Faculty Senate nominations will be due within the next couple of weeks. Senators who have served the longest term within each unit will be tasked with the responsibility of ensuring that nominations on submitted in a timely manner.
 - **Presidential Search.** McLaughlin asked faculty to visit the Presidential Search website (<https://www.ohio.edu/presidential-search/upload/Presidential-Profile-Document.pdf>) and to share the link with potential nominees. Alternatively, faculty can send names to Joe McLaughlin or Dave Moore via e-mail.
 - **Joint Senate Letter & the Formation of the Task Force.** As McLaughlin previously discussed, the five Chairs of the OHIO Senates submitted a letter to the Office of the President asking for a task force to address issues about and prepare recommendations for creating a culture of diversity and inclusion.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked about annual evaluation for the Dublin and Cleveland HCOM Deans. On both campuses, there are very few faculty. **McLaughlin** stated that this matter has not been resolved, so assistance is needed in this matter.
- A senator asked what other institutions are doing with respect to the diversity and inclusion. **McLaughlin** said that researching best practices of other institutions would likely be task of the group. McLaughlin also stated that OHIO may be a bit behind on this topic. Students have been among those who have asked the faculty and the university as a whole to look into recommendations; we owe it to them and the community to have a conversation. This conversation should be very visible and done with full consideration of all perspectives. For example, reviewing other institutions to determine what has worked and what has not worked in terms of curriculum change is an important step. This group will likely have open forums and other methods for input. McLaughlin asked for volunteers to serve, and any other ideas regarding the task force.

❖ Topic 2: Policy Review – Classroom Privacy (Faculty Handbook IV.A.9)

- McLaughlin reviewed OHIO’s policy on classroom privacy. He noted that the issue has had some notice because people have been recently discussing and/or serving on OHIO’s Surveillance Oversight Committee. This committee is responsible for making decisions about installing surveillance cameras on campus. Groups need to make proposals about installing cameras; proposals need to be approved by a variety of offices. As such, it is important for faculty to understand the policy. According to the policy, people cannot record what is happening in the classroom without specific permission to do so. However, given that there may be expensive equipment in some instructional spaces, this may be an issue in the future. Because is this an older policy, there is likely to be a revision to update the language – such as changing the term “classroom” to “instructional spaces.”
- Please refer to **Appendix A** for the full-text of the policy.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked why the Surveillance Oversight Committee was not in the Faculty Handbook. **McLaughlin** noted that the handbook pre-dates the committee. In previous years, the Faculty Senate was approached about installing cameras in public spaces in the dorms. There is a University Policy ([44.119](#)) about video surveillance systems. McLaughlin further noted that he is looking into revising and updating this policy.
- A senator asked about recording lectures and presentations made by students. For example, what is the policy about recording students’ presentation for evaluation and feedback? A senator noted that HCOM has a policy that a faculty member has the right to refuse being recorded inside the classroom. Another senator said that faculty need permission to record students. **McLaughlin** said that it is something the Faculty Senate should understand better; he will try to find out.
- A senator asked about recording devices used for academic accommodations. If you allow for this, then you are allowing for recording during lectures and discussions. If you do not allow for this, then you are accommodating students’ needs. **McLaughlin** said that the current handbook language pre-dates accessibility services, so this is not addressed in the handbook language. This might be another reason to revise the language.
- A senator noted that there is a permission form from Marketing & Communications for photographing students. **McLaughlin** noted that this form is linked to using students’ images on websites or other University-owned communication material.
- A senator noted that faculty need to be aware of FERPA issues associated with recording devices.

- A senator mentioned that accessibility-specific recording devices used in instructional spaces may be problematic because there is the potential need to tell students if they are being recorded. If a faculty member is required to tell students that they are going to be recorded, then the faculty member would also be disclosing the accessibility needs of the student doing the recording. The need to protect the rights of both then becomes a problem.
- **McLaughlin** noted that the issue is complex. A revision of the policy will likely need to address many of these issues.

❖ Topic 3: Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, November 7, 2016

V. Executive Committee (Joe McLaughlin)

- ❖ Resolution on Revising the University Naming Policy and Practices—Second Reading & Vote
 - The resolution is offered by the Executive and Finance & Facilities Committees to ask the Executive Vice President & Provost “to strengthen the policy review process for the revision of Policy 37.010 by requiring at least one face-to-face meeting of all parties invited to comment on the revision” and to include the Faculty Senate among those groups who participate in the deliberations.
 - Please refer to **Appendix B** for the full-text of the resolution.
 - ✓ Resolved passed by a voice vote.

Questions and Discussions

- A guest asked about the time frame for the revised policy. **McLaughlin** noted that, according to the Provost, the first draft is close to being complete and may be discussed within the next few weeks.

VI. Finance & Facilities Committee (Susan Williams)

- ❖ Topic 1: Changes to Benefits. Williams provided an update about the Benefits Advisory Committee and its discussion of a change to the long-term disability benefits. It provides up to 60% of one’s salary with a maximum of \$72,000 per year. OHIO will increase the maximum payout to \$240,000. The increase will cover 230 more faculty than it does now.
- ❖ Topic 2: Meeting with Mercer. Williams stated that Mercer (an outside consulting firm) recently visited the Benefits Advisory Committee and provided a detailed report evaluating OHIO benefits. OHIO is 34% higher than the national average. This is for a number of reasons including a low deductible, higher aged employees, higher admission rates / complication rates, and low competition in the Athens geographical area. Mercer provided ideas for lowering costs including a review of current plans, annual review of all vendors, removal of the middle of the three-tier structure, dependent eligibility audits, consumer-driven plans, and participation in a healthcare consortium. The Benefits Advisory Committee has asked for a direct comparison with OHIO’s Inter-University Council (IUC) counterparts for a more direct comparison of plans.
- ❖ Topic 3: Facilities. Williams shared three topics about facilities. First, the Office of the President has formed the Park Place Planning workgroup. This group is charged with developing recommendations for use in building along Park Place and South Court Street that accounts such issues as student needs, community needs, pedestrians, and traffic flow. Second, OHIO plans to install new signage to better direct visitors using the Greens as landmarks. Third, OHIO will install new lighting in Bicentennial Park.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked about the healthcare consortium. **Williams** noted that some universities are participating in a consortium of healthcare providers, which are typically regionally distributed. The consortiums guarantee certain outcomes that may reduce overall healthcare costs. **McLaughlin** noted that the state of Ohio has pushed for this in order to reduce overall costs through increased buying power. However, OHIO is not attractive to the consortiums given OHIO's main campus geographical location.

VII. Professional Relations Committee (Sherrie Gradin)

- ❖ Resolution to Revise Language on Comprehensive Review of Deans—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the Professional Relations Committee to revise Faculty Handbook language in order to correct numerical sequencing errors and procedural errors in sections VII.3.a, VII.3.d.ii, and VII.4 (2016 Handbook 102-103) of the Faculty Handbook. Furthermore, the resolution modifies language to ensure adequacy of information from the faculty prior to Dean Reappointments.
 - Please refer to **Appendix C** for the full-text of the resolution.
- ❖ Resolution to Clarify Language on the Annual Deans' Evaluation—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the Professional Relations Committee to revise Faculty Handbook language in order to correct language related to collecting annual evaluation responses from Group II and Clinical faculty in section V.II.3.d (2016 Handbook 102) of the Faculty Handbook.
 - Please refer to **Appendix D** for the full-text of the resolution.

Questions and Discussions

- **McLaughlin** noted that there is some concern about the specific timing for comprehensive reviews such that the proposed language may be too constrictive to fit reasonable practices. **Gradin** noted that the PRC developed the specific timeframes in order to avoid ambiguous language; terms such as “recent” may be interpreted differently by different offices.
- A senator mentioned that the original interpretation of separating Group I faculty from Group II faculty would only be done when Group II faculty could maintain anonymity.
- A senator asked for the rationale for not including Group II eligible to serve on the Dean Evaluation Committee. **Gradin** explained that the Dean Evaluation Committees sometimes deliver less-than-favorable evaluations. In those circumstances, Group I faculty members are more protected than Group II faculty members.
- A senator agreed with some members of the PRC to not have Group II represented on the Dean Evaluation Committee membership. However, the senator also noted that there is an inherent contradiction with the argument of protecting Group II from service yet also separating Group I from Group II evaluations. **Gradin** noted that this was a good point; separation could lead to retaliation against an entire class of faculty.
- A senator stated that there is a clause elsewhere in the Handbook about triggering a comprehensive evaluation based upon the recommendation of the Group I faculty. This language would need to be changed if Group II evaluations were not separated from Group I evaluations.
- A senator noted that promoted Group II faculty have the protection of a long-term contract. **Gradin** noted that this is not always the case.
- A senator asked if there needs to be separate language for non-traditional Dean roles such as the Dublin campus. **McLaughlin** noted that this still being considered.

- A senator asked about the typical response rates to the Dean Evaluations. **Gradin** noted that they are typically low but it depends. When there are problems, response rates tend to be higher. **McLaughlin** noted that we can find those numbers.
- A senator asked why the annual evaluation reports are not distributed back to the college for review. **Gradin** noted that this may be the nature of the evaluations. **McLaughlin** stated that this is a good point; this may be something to consider given that the only time we hear about them is when they are publicized in the media. Having a feedback mechanism may avoid some of the sensational reporting.
- **McLaughlin** noted that there was not consensus within the committee; ideas from Senators and faculty are welcome.

VIII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Charles Buchanan)

- ❖ Topic 1: Updates & Announcements. Buchanan reported that ESPA is not currently offering resolutions for the full Faculty Senate, yet EPSA is working on two issues. First, EPSA is reviewing policies and practices regarding certificates including minimum and maximum credit hours. Second, EPSA is also discussing requirements related to graduate faculty status and serving on graduate student committees.

Questions and Discussions

- None

IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Ben Bates)

- ❖ Topic: Updates & Announcements. Bates stated that there were no updates or announcements from the Promotions & Tenure Committee.

Questions and Discussions

- None

X. New Business

- ❖ None

Questions and Discussions

- None

XI. Adjournment

- ❖ **Snyder** moved to adjourn, seconded by **Muhammad**. The meeting was adjourned at 9:05PM.

Appendix A: Classroom Privacy

[From Section IV.A.9 of the 2016 Faculty Handbook]

IV. ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES

A. General

9. Classroom Privacy

While it is sometimes desirable for classroom practices to be observed for the purpose of improvement of pedagogy, and such observation is sometimes required for annual faculty evaluation and for tenure and/or promotion evaluation, faculty are entitled to classroom privacy, academic freedom, and professional courtesy. Consequently, observation and evaluation of any classroom (including those on-line) by any observer or evaluator requires the prior notification and mutual agreement of the class instructor and the observer or evaluator. Furthermore, recording of classroom activities by any electronic means or by students, other faculty, university administrators, or others requires permission of the instructor. All students in a class must be informed if permission has been given for a class to be recorded. Classroom lectures and associated course materials may be copyrighted by an instructor (see Section IV.A.3). Under no circumstances may verbatim recording of copyrighted classroom lectures and materials by electronic or any other means (including note taking) be conducted for 1) sale, whether or not it is for educational benefit, or 2) for the educational benefit of those not enrolled in the class. This does not apply to non-verbatim notes taken by students.

Appendix B

**Resolution on Revising the University Naming Policy and Practices
Executive and Finance & Facilities Committees
Faculty Senate
October 10, 2016 – Second Reading & Vote**

Whereas the University Policy on the Naming of University Buildings (37.010) has not been reviewed since its approval in March 2003;

Whereas a variety of naming practices, such as the naming of classrooms, laboratories, and conference rooms, are not covered under the existing version of this policy; and

Whereas the Executive Committee has been informed by the Executive Vice President & Provost that a substantial revision of the policy is currently underway;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the Executive Vice President & Provost to strengthen the policy review process for the revision of Policy 37.010 by requiring at least one face-to-face meeting of all parties invited to comment on the revision; and

Be it further resolved that Faculty Senate be included among those groups who participate in the deliberations.

Appendix C

Resolution to Revise Language on Comprehensive Reviews of Deans Professional Relations Committee Faculty Senate First Reading—October 10, 2016

Whereas the numbering sequence in the Dean Evaluation Section of the Handbook is incorrect;

Whereas Academic Dean evaluation surveys have been being distributed to Group II Faculty and Clinical Faculty;

Whereas in the recent past, various factors have impacted the synchronicity between Dean Comprehensive Reviews and Dean Reappointments;

Whereas ensuring adequacy of information from the faculty prior to reappointment is appropriate and useful;

Be it resolved that the following changes be made to section VII. 3.a, VII.3.d.ii, and VII.4 (2016 Handbook 102-103):

3. 4. Comprehensive Review

- a. There will be a more comprehensive review approximately every fifth year to provide a general appraisal of executive performance and accomplishment. The comprehensive review is more explicitly judgmental in nature than the annual evaluation described above. In the case of academic deans, the comprehensive review as outlined below is to provide a basis for determining if a reappointment should be recommended. ~~The next comprehensive review will occur within five years following reappointment.~~ **Comprehensive reviews should be completed as early as 24 months prior to but no later than 12 months prior to reappointment. Evaluations should be completed within the regular academic year.**
- b. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the comprehensive review of the President. The Board of Trustees will select a review committee including representatives from the University to assist with the comprehensive review.
- c. For executive officers other than the President, the person responsible for making the appointment (President or Provost) is responsible for the comprehensive review. For those executive officers other than academic deans ^[2], the review committee will be appointed by the President or Provost who will meet with the committee to discuss the scope, procedures, and goals for carrying out the review. These committees will prepare a report including recommendations that will be considered by the President or Provost prior to any action.
- d. In the case of academic deans, the majority of the review committee will consist of faculty from the college or regional campus, with a majority of these faculty members appointed by the faculty senator(s)^[3] from the college or regional campus in consultation with the chair of the Faculty Senate.

The remainder of the faculty and other members will be appointed by the Provost. The faculty members serving on the committee will elect the chair from their own number.

- i.* The Provost will meet with the committee to discuss the general description of the position, the goals and achievements of the college or regional campus, and the general areas of assessment of the dean and general procedures for carrying out the review. The review is to be an intensive one considering the overall performance and accomplishments of the dean.
- ii.* The review committee will gather and assess a full range of information including the dean's self-assessment, pertinent reports including the annual evaluation reports and other data, and written general assessments by faculty and appropriate administrators and other constituents. In addition, the committee is encouraged to use personal interviews. The faculty of the college or regional campus should be informed of the comprehensive review of their dean. **The faculty serving on the committee will be Group I faculty. The committee will provide all Group I, II, and Clinical faculty with a Dean's evaluation form, The committee will provide all Group I faculty of the college or regional campus with a dean's evaluation form,** which includes an outline of the areas of assessment and the opportunity to provide an anonymous evaluation. After completing the rest of the form, the faculty will be provided the opportunity to add observations and comments including their recommendation on the reappointment of the dean. **Group II and Clinical faculty responses will be dis-aggregated from Group I faculty responses.**
- iii.* The review committee will conclude its analysis by preparation of a report with preliminary recommendations, including a recommendation of non-reappointment or reappointment. The dean will be provided an opportunity to comment on the draft report before a final version is submitted to the Provost. The recommendations of the review committee are to represent their assessment of the full range of information obtained. The evaluation from the faculty of the college or regional campus is to be given critical weight in the development of recommendations by the review committee. In the case where a substantial number (approaching an absolute majority) of the Group I faculty summarize their concerns about the dean's performance by recommending non-appointment, but the committee recommends reappointment, the committee will recommend positive steps to be taken that would lead to the restoration of confidence of the faculty.
- iv.* The Provost will normally follow the review committee's recommendations, except in extraordinary circumstances and for reasons discussed with the committee, with an opportunity for its response prior to final action.
- v.* The content of particular interviews, communications addressed to the review committee, and other data gathered or presented to the review committee shall remain in confidence.
- vi.* Following the comprehensive review, the Provost will distribute a report to the faculty of the college or regional campus. The report will include the Provost's summary of actions taken as a result of the review and the committee's summary of their findings and recommendations.
- vii.* The questionnaire used in annual evaluations subsequent to the first comprehensive review will provide the opportunity for faculty to request that a comprehensive review be undertaken the next year. An absolute majority of the Group I faculty may thereby call for the Provost to schedule the comprehensive review for the next year.

5. 4 Termination

An appointment may be terminated by the President, the Provost, or the appointee.

Appendix D

Resolution to Clarify Language on the Annual Deans' Evaluation Professional Relations Committee Faculty Senate First Reading—October 10, 2016

Whereas Dean evaluations are being distributed to Group II and Clinical Faculty at the request of Deans;

Be it resolved that the following changes be made to section V.II.3.d (2016 Handbook 102):

3. Annual Evaluation

- d. In the case of academic deans,^[2] a committee of **Group I** faculty, half of whom will be appointed by the faculty senators^[3] from the college or unit, and half of whom will be appointed by the Provost, will conduct the annual review. At least one of the members of the committee appointed by the faculty senators from the college or unit will serve on the evaluation committee for two years. Each evaluation committee shall have access to previous annual and comprehensive evaluations of the dean being evaluated. Group I, **Group II, and Clinical** faculty in each college or area will participate in the evaluation of their dean by means of a questionnaire that contains both standard questions and questions specifically relevant to the academic unit of the dean. This questionnaire must be entirely anonymous with no ~~demographic data collected and no~~ tracking of individual responses to different questions (such as "respondent 12 answered X to question 1 and Y to question 2"). However, **Group I, Group II, and Clinical Faculty** responses will **be disaggregated**. The questionnaire may include space for written comments; however, colleges are encouraged to keep the questionnaire concise. After consultation with the Provost, the committee will issue its final report. It shall be the responsibility of the Provost to discuss the results of the committee's evaluation with the dean.
- e. Should the committee's report to the Provost identify a particularly serious problem, the Provost shall discuss the issue with the dean and report to the committee on the disposition of the matter. If significant concerns continue to be expressed in subsequent annual reviews and there are no clear indications of improvement in the dean's performance, the President or Provost should give serious consideration to terminating the contract of the dean.
- f. All annual faculty evaluation reports of academic deans become a part of their permanent personnel records and shall be on file in the office of the Provost and shall be available by application through the Office of Legal Affairs, subject to the same restrictions that apply to faculty files (see Section I.D).