

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

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

In attendance

Group I

- *College of Arts and Sciences*: J. Andrews, S. Carson, H. Castillo, S. Gradin, K. Hicks, G. Holcomb, G. Kessler, N. Manring, J. McLaughlin, R. Muhammad, N. Reynolds, C. Snyder, D. Tees
- *College of Business*: K. Hartman, R. Thacker
- *College of Fine Arts*: C. Buchanan, K. Geist, A. Hibbitt, D. Thomas
- *College of Health Sciences and Professions*: 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*:
- *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
- *Scripps College of Communication*: A. Babrow, B. Bates, A. Chadwick, F. Lewis
- *Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs*: A. Ruhil

Group II and Clinical

- *Clinical*: J. Balbo
- *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: P. Patton, H. Perkins, A. Rosado Feger, Allison White

Absent: R. Brannan, D. Clowe, B. Schoen, K. Spiker, G. Weckman

MEETING AGENDA

- I President McDavis and Executive Vice President and Provost Benoit
 - II Roll Call and Approval of the October 10, 2016 Minutes
 - III Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Board of Trustees Meeting
 - Diversity & Inclusion Task Force
 - Textbook Cost Initiative Committee – Greg Kessler
 - Policy Review – Dates for Notification of Non-Reappointment
 - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: December 5, 2016, 7:10PM, Walter Hall 235**
 - IV Professional Relations Committee – Sherrie Gradin
 - a. Resolution to Revise Language on Comprehensive Review of Deans—Second Reading and Vote
 - b. Resolution to Clarify Language on the Annual Evaluation of Deans—First Reading and Vote
 - V Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee – Charles Buchanan
 - a. Resolution to Revise Credit Hours for Certificates—First Reading
 - VI Finance & Facilities Committee – Susan Williams
 - VII Promotion & Tenure Committee – Ben Bates
 - VIII New Business
 - IX Adjournment
-

I. President McDavis

- ❖ Topic 1: Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion. A coalition among the five OHIO Senates has formed a task force on diversity and inclusion. McDavis recently provided the charge: generate ideas and recommendations for OHIO to become more diverse and inclusive; research effective practices of other colleges & universities; gather information and seek input from the constituencies of the OHIO communities; review ideas proposed by students, student groups, faculty, administrators and staff; explore the feasibility and effectiveness of proposed ideas; develop potential action steps to implement ideas; work with communities to develop programs, events, and initiatives based upon input; and communicate transparently with all communities. The Office of the President has offered space to the task force on the President's website. The first meeting of the task force was November 7, 2016. McDavis thanked all those who have offered help and assistance.
- ❖ Topic 2: University Ranking. McDavis discussed a presentation to the most recent meeting of the Board of Trustees about OHIO's ranking in the [US News & World Report](#) ranking of universities. McDavis noted that the administration is sensitive to the rankings; efforts are being made by Barbara Wharton and her staff to analyze the data and OHIO's ranking more carefully. The goal is to explore our strengths and the challenges we face. McDavis stated that there will be a more in-depth presentation to the faculty at the December meeting.
- ❖ Topic 3: Budget. OHIO is in the process of reviewing multi-year projections for the budget. The Budget Planning Council Athens will vote on the campus fee proposal in November or December. OHIO will ask for Board of Trustee approval in January 2017; approval in January will help students and families to plan for tuition rates as provided through the OHIO Guarantee. McDavis reminded Senators that current freshman and sophomores already know their tuition rate for the duration of the four years under the OHIO Guarantee. As such, decisions made in the next few months will be for the incoming class of students and those not covered by OHIO guarantee. In terms of the State of

Ohio, universities will not know resources from the state until the state budget is passed (likely in June 2017). OHIO will continue to plan in the face of uncertainty with the ability to adjust as needed. Recently, the state adjusted the State Share of Instruction (SSI) formula. These changes resulted in a \$5.6 million decrease in OHIO's budget. In the last year, OHIO made up for deficiencies by using reserves; OHIO is working to make cuts for the upcoming year. McDavis is optimistic yet also states that plans may involve a reevaluation of priorities. McDavis plans to present the board with a balanced budget.

- ❖ Topic 4: Fall Commencement. Fall Commencement is scheduled for December 10, 2016 at 2:00PM. This will be OHIO's second fall commencement. OHIO is projecting that up to 884 undergraduate, graduate, and doctorate students will participate. Dr. Jenny Chabot, Associate Professor of Child and Family Studies in the College of Health Sciences and Professions, will address graduates as Ohio University's Fall 2016 Commencement Speaker. McDavis noted that the plan is to have a faculty member speak at each fall commencement. McDavis encouraged faculty participation in the event.
- ❖ Topic 5: Town & Gown Survey. In cooperation with the City of Athens and others cities in which OHIO campuses are located, an online survey was sent to residents and faculty to assess relationships between the city and the University. The intent is to identify areas in which we can improve relationships. Surveys are unique to each OHIO campus location; OHIO is conducting surveys for the main campus (Athens) and its regional campuses.

Questions and Discussions

- None

II. Roll Call and Approval of the October 10, 2016 Minutes

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

III. Chair's Report (Joe McLaughlin)

- ❖ Topic 1: Updates and Announcements
 - **International Education Week Awards Gala** will be held on Wednesday, November 16, 5:00 – 7:00PM in the Baker Center Ballroom. The event will recognize campus champions for international engagement.
 - **Beyond Teaching & Research: A Panel on Academic Service and Shared Governance** will be held on Wednesday, November 9, 7:00PM in the Friends of the Library Room. Panelists included Joe McLaughlin, Elizabeth Sayers, Chris Schwirian, and Beth Novak.
 - **Presidential Search Committee** was discussed at the most recent Board of Trustees meeting. The goal is to identify a list of 8-10 candidates by some time in December. The committee will interview them and then determine finalists. Currently, the consulting firm and others are attempting to identify candidates. The position is advertised. McLaughlin encouraged faculty to identify candidates and share names.
 - Beth Quitslund and Joe McLaughlin are OHIO's representatives to the **Ohio Faculty Council**, which is a group of representatives from the four-year universities in Ohio. The Chair of the Ohio Faculty Council (Dr. Dan E. Krane, Wright State) wrote an op-ed article about affordability and efficiency; this has been published in *The Post* and can be found [online](#). The letter emphasizes that quality should be first in public universities. In addition, Bruce Johnson attended the most recent meeting; Johnson has been serving as the President of the IUC. Johnson stated that the next budget cycle is likely to be challenging for all institutions. Johnson recommended

that the universities need to be more visible and public about their efforts to reduce the total cost of education for students. McLaughlin remarked that telling this story is important for OHIO; faculty, staff, and administrators should share those efforts widely.

❖ Topic 2: Diversity & Inclusion Task Force

- McLaughlin provided additional information about the Diversity & Inclusion Task Force. As McDavis noted, OHIO created a task force. Information can be found [online](#) on the Office of the President website. The Faculty Senate is represented by three faculty: Charles Buchanan, Julie White, and Devika Chawla.
- McLaughlin noted that a related yet distinct group will be formed to discuss OHIO's current general education requirements and the extent to which they are sufficient to deal with learning goals related to diversity and inclusion topics. McLaughlin has already had initial meetings with Buchanan (Chair, EPSA) and Thomas (Chair, UCC).

❖ Topic 3: Textbook Cost Initiative Committee – Greg Kessler

- Kessler provided an update about the textbook cost initiatives committee. He noted that the committee has already saved students over \$1 million in textbook costs during the past year. This was accomplished by identifying alternative options for textbooks including identifying textbook rental options, adding textbook requirements into the system early in order help students avoid seasonal price increases (e.g., immediately prior to and at the beginning of the semester), and eliminating some textbooks in favor of open source materials.
- The committee first targeted courses that are typically offered in larger sections. The committee will now move to smaller classes. Kessler remarked that the committee would like to help faculty identify resources and find alternatives for students. For example, Kessler remarked that the library has a variety of high quality instructional resources for faculty.

❖ Topic 4: Trustees Meeting

- McLaughlin discussed information shared with the Board of Trustees at the most recent meeting. This included information about advancement plans after the Promise Lives campaign, Title IX efforts, and plans for the Park Place corridor.
- McLaughlin discussed the presentation about OHIO's ranking in the *U.S. News & World Report* University Rankings. Of the seven components, McLaughlin stated that "Faculty Resources" is the lowest ranking for OHIO; OHIO has dropped from #174 to #259 in this category between 2013 and 2017. McLaughlin plans to look at the other universities – especially those in the State of Ohio – to understand their rankings in these areas. McLaughlin noted that the President and/or Provost would provide a presentation to the faculty in December.
- In terms of faculty McLaughlin mentioned that there is additional information related to faculty resources in the [Ohio University Fact Book](#) (pages 33 & 34 of the document). The % change of Ohio University's headcount for full-time, Group 1 faculty between 2009-2015 is a decrease of 7.7%, 7.9%, and 12.2% for the Athens Campus, Osteopathic Medicine, and Regional Higher Education, respectively. The document provides a link to the details about the [total number of full-time faculty by headcount](#) for the Athens Campus, Osteopathic Medicine, and Regional Higher Education.
- Please refer to **Appendix A** for information from the presentation

❖ Topic 5: Policy Review – Dates for Notifications of Non-Reappointment

- McLaughlin reminded Senators that the Faculty Handbook specifies dates for notifying faculty who will not have contracts renewed.

- Please refer to **Appendix B** for the full-text of the Faculty Handbook language
- ❖ Topic 6: Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, December 5, 2016

Questions and Discussions

About the Presidential Search

- A senator asked if there would be open forums for the presidential search candidate finalists. Although there was an article in The Athens News that indicated that there was no commitment by the Board of Trustees to have open forums, **McLaughlin** said it is likely that there would be. However, McLaughlin also noted that the decision will likely be weighed against candidates' need for confidentiality.
- A senator asked if faculty could share opinions about having open forums with the Presidential Search Committee. **McLaughlin** stated that faculty (or anyone) may send letters or emails to the Presidential Search Committee to express opinions. Comments can be sent to the Board of Trustees at the following address: trustees@ohio.edu. A senator encouraged Senators and other faculty to share opinion about open forum.
- Chair of the Graduate Student Senate, **Ian Armstrong**, shared that the Graduate Student Senate had a first reading of a Resolution about having open forums as part of the presidential search process. Armstrong stated that the Graduate Student Senate would welcome opinions, letters, and/or emails from faculty in support of the Resolution from the Graduate Student Senate.
- **McLaughlin** remarked that communications between the Board of Trustees and faculty are very positive. The Trustees are engaged and pay attention to what is happening on campus, the media, faculty, staff, etc. McLaughlin also remarked that he believes the communications provided to them are not being filtered.

About Textbook Cost Initiatives

- A senator asked if the committee has explored the resources available to the library. **Kelly Broughton** (Assistant Dean for Research & Education Service, OHIO Libraries) shared that the library is well represented on the committee.
- A senator asked if the committee had explored alternatives for medical school textbooks for graduate students; these are very expensive for many students. **McLaughlin** said that this has not be explored because the focus has mostly been on undergraduate education. McLaughlin noted that this was a good idea for the future.
- A senator mentioned that Clinical Key is a good resource available through the library as an alternative for some courses.

About the University Ranking by the U.S. & News Report

- A senator remarked that the Faculty Resources slide does not appear to have large changes. This may imply that other universities must be doing better if OHIO has dropping in rankings that much (#174 to #259). **McLaughlin** noted that there are several declines – such as an 8% drop in the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees and a 10% drop in the percentage of courses with fewer than 20 students. However, McLaughlin also agreed that the rankings are relative to others.
- A senator asked if the numbers were only for Athens campus. **McLaughlin** noted that the numbers only counted the Athens campus.
- A senator mentioned that the decline of faculty has happened simultaneously with increases in enrollment. For example, HCOM had a 7% decline in Group 1 faculty while enrollment nearly doubled.
- A senator mentioned that Benoit provided a presentation to the Board of Trustees in 2014 about the rankings. Benoit had studied the data extensively. The senator suggested that the Faculty

Senate would benefit from her insights. **McLaughlin** remarked that, on the one hand, we should not get too invested in the rankings. However, on the other hand, the Board of Trustees expressed that rankings do matter to students and parents. In addition, the data used to develop the rankings demonstrates there have been changes; faculty should be interested in knowing more.

- A senator remarked that we should have some skepticism about the rankings, numbers, and data. However, some of these relative numbers – such as a decrease in the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees – is an issue worth discussing.
- A senator asked for clarification about the faculty who were included in the number of faculty with terminal degrees. **McLaughlin** stated that this is full-time faculty.

About the Dates for Notifications of Non-Reappointment

- A senator asked if the renewal dates for Clinical faculty should be added. **McLaughlin** noted that this should probably be done. **McLaughlin** also noted that it is likely that we need to review the Handbook for all the places in which Clinical faculty should be added the Handbook language.
- A senator asked if the dates were established pre-transition from quarters to semesters; these appear to be late in terms of semesters. **McLaughlin** explained that the dates were established after the transition to semesters.

IV. Professional Relations Committee (Sherrie Gradin)

- ❖ Resolution to Revise Language on Comprehensive Review of Deans—Second Reading and Vote
 - The resolution is offered by the Professional Relations Committee to revise Faculty Handbook language to correct number-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 B** for the full-text of the resolution.
 - ✓ Approved by vote voice (with two no votes).
- ❖ Resolution to Clarify Language on the Annual Deans' Evaluation— Second Reading and Vote
 - The resolution is offered by the Professional Relations Committee to revise Faculty Handbook language 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 C** for the full-text of the resolution.
 - ✓ Approved by vote voice (with two no votes).

Questions and Discussions

- A senator suggested a minor word change (from “a” to “the”) to clarify language.
- A senator asked about adding language to the Handbook that restricted serving on Dean Evaluation Committee to only Group I faculty. Specifically, the senator asked if it is necessary to add this language if it had not been a problem previously. **Gradin** explained that the PR Committee had extensive discussion about this and mentioned that all full-time faculty have a voice in the evaluation even if all full-time faculty do not serve on the committee. **Gradin** further remarked that it is necessary to add the language to make it clear who is responsible for serving on the committee.
- A senator remarked that the University make-up is changing; it may not always be possible to guarantee that Group I faculty are available to serve in this role. As such, the senator asked if adding “typically Group I faculty” had been discussed or considered. **Gradin** responded by

stating that this happens sometimes in other situations; faculty from other groups may be asked to serve.

- A senator remarked that there is some overall concern about protecting the role of Group I faculty. **Gradin** argued that protecting tenure should be important to faculty. The Dean Evaluation is one situation in which protecting the rights and role of Group I is important.
- A senator remarked that it is important to protect the rights and role of faculty – especially when evaluating Deans. However, some faculty may think the term “shared governance” is effectively restricted to shared governance between administration and Group I faculty – thus excluding other faculty groups. **Gradin** explained that this sentiment is understandable yet that this is not the intention.
- A senator remarked that we had not discussed rationale about why Group II should serve on this committee yet we had discussed reasons why they might not want to do so.
- Chair **McLaughlin** noted that one of the driving forces behind changing the Handbook language was that there were reappointments made recently for which there were not recent comprehensive reviews.
- Two senators remarked that the policy is an improvement because the new language adds a voice for Group II and Clinical faculty in the evaluation process. Prior to this resolution, there was no language to ensure that Group II and Clinical faculty had a voice in the annual and comprehensive reviews. Chair **McLaughlin** noted that Group II and Clinical have been participating the past couple of years, but the change in language affirms and mandates this as part of the process.
- Chair **McLaughlin** noted that PRC met to discuss proposed changes between the first reading and second reading. **Gradin** confirmed this and explained the changes between the first reading and second reading.

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

- ❖ Resolution to Revise Credit Hours for Certificates—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by EPSA to fix minimum and maximum hours for certificate programs including undergraduate certificates, graduate interdisciplinary certificates, graduate specialized certificates, and graduate specialized stackable certificates.
 - Please refer to **Appendix D** for the full-text of the resolution.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked about the rationale for minimums for undergraduate certificates. Specifically, had the committee considered a minimum of nine credit hours instead of 15 credit hours? **Kelly Broughton** (Assistant Dean for Research & Education Service, OHIO Libraries) explained that there were differences with financial aid for stackable certificates.
- A senator asked for examples of current certificates. **Broughton** noted that there are many certificates currently offered at both the undergraduate and graduate level. However, these proposed names and differences between types of certificates are new. (The new names for the differing certificates are noted in bold in the Resolution.)
- A senator asked how these new certificates might impact the Individualized Interdisciplinary Graduate program. **Broughton** explained that these certificates would not be developed at the individual level; the stackable certificates would be approved by the University and offered to students as a course of study. Through the Colleges, certificates would be approved by UCC as fully articulated programs with learning outcomes, course of study, sequences, etc. This is the same as all other programs offered.

- A senator asked if EPSA (or UCC) compared minimum and maximums with other universities. **Buchanan** noted there is a limit to the number of credit hours a graduate program (20 credit hours) can offer without having to be approved by the State of Ohio as a new program. A senator remarked that her own research in her own field (data analytics) found a minimum of 9 hours with a maximum of 24 hours at other universities across the United States.
- A senator asked if there have been requests for exceptions that have and have not been granted. **Broughton** responded by explaining that some programs have requested exceptions; some have been granted and others have not.

VI. Finance & Facilities Committee (Susan Williams)

- ❖ Topic 1: Union Negotiations (Staff). The contract for staff within the union is up for negotiations. There is a possibility of negotiations for faculty and staff benefits in the new contract. There has been some discussion about how this might impact benefits overall.
- ❖ Topic 2: Eastern Campus HMO. There may be some changes to the Eastern Campus HMO. Discussions about the changes are ongoing.
- ❖ Topic 3: Benefits Advisory Committee. The Benefits Advisory Committee has been in discussion about possible changes to benefits. They will be a presentation to the Faculty Senate at a future Faculty Senate monthly meeting.
- ❖ Topic 4: RCM Liaisons. There have been a few discussions about the role of the RCM Liaisons to the units. A survey was sent to past and current RCM Liaisons about what they think their role was and what they did in their role. As expected, the results of the survey suggest that there is some confusion about the role. As such, there is a need to rethink the purpose and responsibility of the role. One possibility is to potentially change it to a broader budget advisory role.

Questions and Discussions

- None

VII. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Ben Bates)

- ❖ Topic: Appeals. Bates noted that the P&T committee met to discuss current appeals.

Questions and Discussions

- None

VIII. New Business

- ❖ None

Questions and Discussions

- None

IX. Adjournment

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

Appendix A

US News Rankings Overview

- Universities elect to participate in the rankings through response to surveys from U.S. News.
- There is a one-year or greater lag in the data. Current (2017) rankings are based on 2015-16 or on multi-year averages.
- 310 National universities, 189 public, 114 private, 7 for-profit (not all schools are ranked).
- Ohio University ranked 146th overall and 74th among public

US News Rankings Criteria

- 22.5% Academic reputation: Peer assessment; high school counselor ratings
- 22.5% Graduation and retention rates: Freshmen retention; 6-year graduation rate
- 20% Faculty resources: Class size; faculty compensation; faculty with terminal degrees; student/faculty ratio, percent of full-time faculty
- 12.5% Student selectivity: Test scores; high school ranking; acceptance rate
- 10% Financial resources: Educational expenditures per student
- 7.5% Graduation rate performance: Difference between predicted and actual graduation rate
- 5% Alumni giving: Percent of alumni making donations

22.5% of ranking based on Academic Reputation

- Peer assessment: surveys of presidents, provosts, admissions directors (39% current response rate)
- Counselor assessment: two-year average scores from survey of high school counselors (9% current response rate)
- Rating scale: 5-point 1=marginal to 5= distinguished

| Academic Reputation Measures Trend | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Peer Assessment | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| Counselor Assessment | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Peer Rank | 94 | 101 | 104 | 103 | 99 |
| Counselor Rank | 83 | 104 | 115 | 126 | 117 |

22.5% of ranking based on Graduation & Retention

- Retention: Based on a four-year average of first-year retention for full-time first-year entering cohorts.
- Graduation: based on a four-year average of six-year graduation of new full-time, first-year entering cohorts.

| Measures Trend | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Retention (4-year average) | 81 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 79 |
| 6- year Grad Rate (4-year average) | 65 | 64 | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| Retention/Graduation Rank | 124 | 132 | 135 | 133 | 133 |

20% of ranking based on Faculty Resources

- Classes <20: Percent of undergrad classes with fewer than 20 students
- Classes >50: Percent of undergrad classes with 50 or more students
- Compensation: Faculty average compensation (2-year average)
- Terminal Degrees: Percent full-time faculty with terminal degrees
- Student/faculty ratio: Number of students per faculty member
- Full-time Faculty Percent: Percent of faculty who are full time

| Measures Trend | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Classes <20 | 41% | 37% | 35% | 33% | 31% |
| Classes >50 | 14% | 15% | 16% | 18% | 18% |
| Compensation (in thousands) | 105.2 | 107.1 | 109.7 | 113.1 | 116.1 |
| Terminal Degrees | 86% | 81% | 80% | 78% | 78% |
| Student/Faculty Ratio | 20:1 | 19:1 | 18:1 | 18:1 | 18:1 |
| Full-time Faculty Percent | 90% | 87% | 86% | 88% | 88% |
| Faculty Resource Rank | 174 | 201 | 219 | 219 | 259 |

12.5% of ranking based on Student Selectivity

- SAT/ACT Scores: Middle 50% range for ACT scores of new first-time students.
- Top 10% of HS Class: Percent of first-time students in top 10% of high school graduating class.
- Acceptance rate: Percent of first-time freshmen applicants that are accepted for admission.

| Measures Trend | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| SAT/ACT Scores | 21-26 | 21-26 | 22-26 | 22-26 | 22-26 |
| Top 10% of HS Class | 15% | 16% | 17% | 15% | 16% |
| Acceptance Rate | 86% | 78% | 73% | 74% | 74% |
| Student Selectivity Rank | 171 | 153 | 151 | 156 | 163 |

10% of ranking based on Financial Resources

- Expenditures per Student: Two-year average of educational and general expenditures per student.

| Measures Trend | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures per Student (in thousands) | \$19.3 | \$19.8 | \$21.1 | \$22.5 | \$23.6 |
| Financial Resources Rank | 196 | 201 | 192 | 187 | 185 |

7.5% of ranking based on Graduation Rate Performance

- Graduation Rate Performance: The difference between the estimated graduation rate for an institution (based on incoming student characteristics) and the actual graduation rate.

| Measures Trend | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Predicted Graduation Rate | 53 | 53 | 52 | 56 | 58 |
| Actual Graduation Rate | 65 | 64 | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| Difference | +12% | +11% | +15% | +11% | +9% |
| Graduation Performance Rank | 8 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 29 |

5% of ranking based on Alumni Giving

- Alumni Giving: A two-year average of the percent of alumni who made a donation.

| Measures Trend | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Alumni Giving | 8% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 6% |
| Alumni Giving Rank | 168 | 173 | 178 | 167 | 187 |

Overall Ranking Trend

| Measures Trend | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Overall | 131 | 135 | 129 | 135 | 146 |
| Public Institutions | 65 | 68 | 63 | 68 | 74 |

US News Ohio Public Ranks

- Rank Institution
- #54 Ohio State University
- #79 Miami University
- #135 University of Cincinnati
- #146 Ohio University
- #188 Kent State University
- #194 Bowling Green State University
- Not Ranked: Cleveland State University, University of Akron, University of Toledo, Wright State University

FACULTY HANDBOOK II.D.3. Renewal of Contracts for Appointments

Regardless of the stated term or other provisions of any appointments, written notice that a probationary appointment is not to be renewed shall be given to the faculty member in advance of the expiration of his/her appointment, as follows:

For probationary tenure track (Group I) faculty

- a. not later than February 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination;
- b. not later than November 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination;
- c. at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service at Ohio University. The notice of non-reappointment will be accompanied by an oral and, if the faculty member so requests, a written explanation of the basis for non-reappointment. The basis for non-reappointment must not violate the faculty member's academic freedom.

For non-tenure track (Group II) faculty

- d. not later than April 15 in the first 3 years of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that academic year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least 60 days in advance of its termination;
- e. at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after three or more years of service at Ohio University. The notice of non-reappointment will be accompanied by an oral and, if the faculty member so requests, a written explanation of the basis for non-reappointment. The basis for non-reappointment must not violate the faculty member's academic freedom.

Appendix C

Resolution to Revise Language on Comprehensive Review of Deans Professional Relations Committee Faculty Senate For Second Reading & Vote—November 7, 2016

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

Whereas Academic Dean evaluation surveys have already 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)

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 **and will be completed recently enough that it clearly provides meaningful feedback prior to any 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 an evaluation form to all Group I, II, Clinical faculty, and any other identifiable constituents deemed appropriate by the committee, 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. **As a general rule, different constituencies' responses should be disaggregated (e.g. Group 2, Clinical Faculty, office staff, etc.). However, if after the data has been returned, and if a committee determines that the number of Group II, Clinical Faculty, or other constituency responders is low enough to place any individual at professional risk, it can take the extraordinary action of not disaggregating data as appropriate.**
- 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.* 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.
- vi.* 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. Termination

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

Appendix D

Resolution to Clarify Annual Deans Evaluation Professional Relations Committee Faculty Senate For Second Reading & Vote—November 7, 2016

Whereas Dean annual 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 anonymous with no tracking of individual responses to different questions (such as "respondent 12 answered X to question 1 and Y to question 2"). **As a general rule, different constituencies' responses should be disaggregated (e.g. Group II and Clinical Faculty Responses). However, if after the data has been returned, and if a committee determines that the number of Group II or Clinical Faculty responses is so low as to place any individual at professional risk, it can take the extraordinary action of not disaggregating as appropriate.** 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).

Appendix E

**Resolution to Revise Credit Hours for Certificates
Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee
Faculty Senate
First Reading--November 7, 2016**

Whereas undergraduate certificates under semesters are fixed at minimum of 15 credit hours with no maximum, and

Whereas graduate certificates under semesters are fixed at a minimum of 14 credit hours and a maximum of 20 credit hours, and

Whereas the University Curriculum Council finds merit in expanding the variability of certificate programming offered at the graduate level, and

Whereas the University Curriculum Council desires certificate programs to be reasonably attainable for students working on a thoughtfully planned undergraduate degree,

Be It Resolved that certificate programs be fixed at the following levels of semester credit hours beginning with next academic year's catalog [changes from EPSA 2010 resolution noted in **bold**]:

| | Minimum | Maximum |
|--|----------|-----------|
| Undergraduate Certificates | 15 | 24 |
| Graduate Interdisciplinary Certificates | 14 | 20 |
| Graduate Specialized Certificates | 9 | 20 |
| Graduate Specialized Stackable Certificates | 9 | |