

**Ohio University Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda:
Monday, November 7, 2022
Irvine 194 and Via Teams
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.**

- I Invited Speakers: President Sherman and Vice Provost Hartman
- II Roll Call and Approval of the Minutes (October 10, 2022)
- III Chair's Report – Sarah Wyatt
 - A. Updates and Announcements
 - B. Upcoming Regular Senate Meeting: December 12, 2022
- IV Professional Relations Committee – Daniel Karney
 - A. Update/Report/Items
 - B. PRC-RS1-Resolution to Clarify Grievance Procedures – Second Reading
- V Promotion and Tenure Committee – Cynthia Anderson
 - A. Update/Report/Items
- VI Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee – Jennie Klein
 - A. Update/Report/Items
- VII Finance and Facilities Committee – Aaron Wilson
 - A. Update/Report/Items
- VIII Faculty Senate Executive Committee – Sarah Wyatt/Todd Eisworth
 - A. TLA Teaching Excellence Resolution and Report Approved – First Reading
 - B. Resolution Adopting Parliamentary Authority Standard Code – Second Reading
- IX New Business
- X Adjournment

In Attendance

Faculty Senate Meeting Roster		
Monday, November 7, 2022		
Arts and Sciences	Comm	CHSP/HCOM Clinical
Jonathan Agensky	Ben Bates	Macario Llamas
Cynthia Anderson	Matthew deTar	Heritage College
Rebecca Challenger	Jatin Srivastava	Peter Coschigano
Gang Chen	Wolfgang Suetzel	Emily Guseman
Cory Crawford	Education	Zelalem Haile
Alexei Davydov	Donnie Brown	University College
Dominique Duvert	Allyson Hallman-Thrasher	Jim McKean
Jim Dyer	Sara Hartman	Voinovich
Todd Eisworth	Mike Hess	Leslie Johnson
Robert Ingram	Engineering	Regional - Chillicothe
Daniel Karney	Zaki Kuruppallil	John O'Keefe
Glenn Matlack	Shawn Ostermann	Regional - Eastern
Fred Drogula Alternate for Talinn Phillips	Valerie Young	James Casebolt
Julie Roche	Yuqiu You	Regional - Lancaster
Gary Sarver	Fine Arts	Jennifer Steele
Sarah Wyatt	Jennie Klein	Regional - Southern
COB	Vladimir Marchenkov	Kristi Barnes
Mick Andzulis	Duane McDiarmid	Regional - Zanesville
Ellen Gordon	Angela Sprunger	Susan Dowell excused
Andrew Pueschel	HSP	Gabriela Popa
David Stowe	Melvina Brandau	Regional At Large
Aaron Wilson	Debra Cox	Kim Cirolì
Athens: At Large	Molly Jonson	Brenda Miller
Ruger Porter		

Meeting called to order by Chair Sarah Wyatt at 7:04 PM

Chair Wyatt welcomes President Sherman and Provost Sayers

President Hugh Sherman 7:06 PM

- Greetings – Was asked about a couple of questions in advance:
 - First - No updates on Presidential search. All adds out; applicants are being accumulated by the search firm. Search firm expects it will be quiet for us until early December. Search firm will review them and pick eight for an airport interview (the next step).
 - Second - asked about the Vice President of Student Affairs and the CFO, Vice President of Facilities.
 - WittKiefer for the VP of Student Affairs [<https://www.wittkieffer.com/>]
 - AGB going to do the CFO and VP of Facilities [<https://www.agbsearch.com/>]
 - Meeting with both firms to talk about timing. Restart search in January so that new President can pick their candidate. Very difficult to hire because those folks want to know who their boss will be. Plan will be announced after meeting with those two search firms.
- Appalachia Builds Program: Investment Governor announced \$500 million investment in the region. Three buckets: workforce development, healthcare, and redevelopment of downtown areas for different cities and towns in the Appalachia area. Have been

meeting consistently with many of the cabinet directors for state government:

- Department of Aging
- Mental Health and Addiction Services
- Bruce Vanderhoff with Health Services Today
- Plus another [couldn't recall at moment]
- Excited to be a facilitator and collaborator. Preliminary planning grants due December 9th. Leaders are local mayors and local development districts. Collaborate with multiple counties to prepare planning grants.
 - Strong in healthcare and workforce development; will work on those areas.
- Two other announcements:
 - December 10th is Commencement (Saturday 2PM); Nukhet Sandal is the Speaker.
 - December 8th Winter Appreciation 11 AM – 1 PM Baker Ballroom

Vice Provost Hartman 7:10 PM

- Thanked President Sherman for announcements and promised updates on four topics:
 - Dean Search updates were shared for:
 - Patton College – Candidates were on campus in October. Provost met with search committee co chairs to hear recommendations and is now doing extensive on and off list reference checks. Provost thanks Co-Chairs Danielle Dani and Donald Skinner, and all committee members for their time and efforts.
 - College of Health Sciences and Professions – Candidates were on campus in October. Provost has met with the search committee Co chairs for that search to hear their recommendations. The Provost is now doing extensive on and off reference list checks. Provost thanks, Dr. Char Miller and Dean Scott Titsworth and all of the members for the committee for their time and efforts.
 - Vice President for research and creative activity, or the Dean of Graduate College. The search has been launched. Plan is for final candidates to be invited for campus interviews in February. The Provost thanks, co -chairs doctor Sarah Wyatt and Dean Neil Romanosky, and the entire committee for their time.
 - Russ College of Engineering. The search has been launched. The plan is for final candidates to be invited for campus interviews in February. Provost thanks, Dr. Issam Khouri and Dean Jackie Rees Ulmer and the entire committee for their time.
 - College of Arts and Sciences. The plan is to launch the search in November of 2022 and to hold campus interviews in March or April 2023.
 - Chalk and markers in central classrooms: in response to Student Senate and faculty mentioning a shortage of dry erase markers and blackboard chalk in central classrooms to the Provost, the Vice Provost of Faculty Development has been tasked with setting up a system to deliver and replenish supplies every ten days. If you see shortages or notice other things missing, email Dr. Katie Hartman. [hartmank@ohio.edu]
 - University Professor – Provost thanks Faculty Senate for the resolution and has signed it opening eligibility for four University Professor awards to instructional clinical and tenure track faculty. Website was updated. Call for nominations shared via Ohio News, Ohio Employee News, emails to Chairs & Directors Council, and email to students from Student Affairs. Nominations due November 14th.
 - Voting Reminder: We encourage you to encourage students to vote in general but you may not do so or encourage students with for things of value. The university supports

regular voter registration on campus. However providing anything of value in exchange for a student's vote is a violation of Ohio's election laws per Ohio Attorney General Opinion 96-033. As such, extra credit may not be awarded for voting under any circumstances. We in support the intent of the recent resolutions from the shared governance bodies to make sure voting is more accessible to students. However, since an excused absence for voting may be considered of something of value, an individual class absence cannot be excused for the specific purposes of voting excused absences that are part of the instructors absence policy in the syllabus may continue as long as the excused absence is not explicitly tied to voting and absences for other reasons are similarly excused. For example, if you have a certain number of absences that you allow without explanation or documentation, students can use such an absence on Election Day or any other day.

- If you have any questions, Vice Provost Hartman pledged to share with the appropriate person.

Questions 7:20 PM:

Question online from Senator Steele: The Provost mentioned that a faculty compensation committee is being formed. Can you give us an update on how the committee is being formed, whether it's an open call or nomination process, what the charge will be and if Athens and RHE compensation will both be addressed in the group?

Answer Vice Provost Hartman: Thank you very much for the question. So I think that this was going to be brought up later this evening by either Sarah Wyatt or one of the committee members, but I will tell you what I know now. So there is plans to conduct a faculty compensation study and put together a committee. We are currently working on the charge for what that committee or Task force would look like. As you know, that there was a similar study done in 2017, a similar studies done in 2005. We're also looking for data. At this point we have, I believe that we have been discussing the idea of an open call that will come out in the next couple of months for people to self-nominate. What is included in the study. I do not have that answer yet, but we will probably have those answers shortly as we put together the task force charge.

Question from Senator Crawford: A general question about Presidential and Dean searches – whether there is evidence on how the search firms we employ pay off [how they're beneficial to the University]. Do we have data on the value of using a search firm versus not? Can you remind the Senate why the University sees the payment of a search firm to be worth the money?

Answer President Sherman: That's a good question we've talked about a lot. That's the practice in higher education. Search firms have deep records of candidates across the country who might have interest. When we've done searches without a firm we can tell the difference in the breadth of candidates. They seem to have more contacts. Second, we are a sunshine state so search firms have the ability to keep the records of who applies more confidential until the point that we have the announcement of the finalists. This [sunshine law] is very damaging to a state like Ohio because they [the applicants/candidates] don't want their institution to know that they're applying. So, we agree with the question and your point. It's easy to sometimes get frustrated in this market today when there's so much turnover in higher education, to wonder sometimes whether they're after our best interest, right? That's just a personal concern that I have because you know, because they have so many other opportunities and so forth. You want them to put forth the best candidates and try to capture the interest of the best candidates for us. I'm not always sure that that happens, but at this point in time, we're still relying on the on the search firms for the majority of our searches.

Vice Provost Hartman: And they they do have, I would argue that they do have, expertise to help us craft questions, to help us craft statements, things like that. So they have some expertise and in

addition to the hefty rolodex, right?

President Sherman: That's a good question. I appreciate that question.

Question online from Senator O'Keefe: What are some of the criteria that you're using to evaluate them? The search firm itself, not the actual search, but which firms are more effective and work best with the kind of positions that you're searching for and all of that?

Answer from President Sherman: That's a good question, too. So one or two of the firms have a specialty area. So there is a different firm who does more administrative positions versus Deans positions. So, there's a difference between those kind of firms. So, they could have a slight expertise in a certain area. So that's one cut. The second cut, the IUC [the Council of University Presidents or universities in the state], we did a broad RFP to try to negotiate a reduced fee that they would charge us. So we have about 5 search firms that have been accepted that we can go to you know without doing an RFP. Because it's already been done so. So there's about 5 firms that are judged to be relatively equivalent, so one [of the criteria] is that some of them have an expertise and are known for it. The second one (criteria that we use) is we interview each of the firms because we want to know the person who's being assigned to us is the person who is the search lead person for us. So these five firms, I would suggest are very similar. But there is a difference between the people that are assigned to be our key contact person. So I think there is a difference, right? So the person who is assigned to be our lead person for the presidential search, (I'm afraid to say her name; I think it's Sheila Mason, but I'm not positive) is a person who's been a previous president that has a high reputation in the marketplace. So that's the last factor. We interview the different key people that are going to represent their firm and then we want to have a person that we feel comfortable understands our values and what we're trying to look for...and also have previous experience that's equivalent of what we're looking for.

Secretary Andzulis: Thank you President Sherman and Vice Provost Hartman.

Roll Call and Approval of Minutes 7:24

Motion to approve by Senator Guseman. Second Senator Klein.

Chair's Report 7:25

- Task force for Faculty Compensation will be Chaired by Faculty Senate Finance and Facilities Committee Chair Aaron Wilson. We decided to do an open call for that task force so that more faculty could be involved that really wanted to address this issue as opposed to the Faculty Senate Chair just nominating a couple of people; that was intentional.
- Next Faculty Senate regular meeting is December 12th
- No questions were noted for Chair Wyatt so she segued to Committee reports.

Professional Relations Committee – Daniel Karney

- Report – major item is replacement for Section 3R [page 67 of Handbook] related to Early Retirement Program. Working with HR and Legal. Going to reimagine as a “Phased Retirement” than a new mode of working.
- Other items - setting set of objectives to focus on for new program/new policy:
 - All tenure-track, instructional and clinical faculty will be eligible.
 - Fair across different modes of defined benefit STRS program or Alternative Retirement Benefit program (or Hybrid). Policies may not be equal but this will

help them to be fair across the different modes rather than one size fits all. This would relate to time faculty required to work and what allocation would be. Some departments need more teaching; some more service (depending upon needs).

- Moving from permanent to transition period, from full employment to retirement.
- Roadblocks relate to figuring out best mechanism by which defined benefits STRS employees can get compensated under the program; issues with respect to taxes.

Question from Chair Wyatt: You mention teaching and service. What about research?

Answer from Senator Karney: Yes, all aspects of faculty responsibility could in theory in the way they are envisioning it depending upon the needs of the department. A fair trade of time for resources is the goal, and making it more flexible than the previous policy which was basically just teaching a class and getting compensated.

Question from Senator Ostermann: are you looking at what any of the neighbor schools are doing to see what else Ohio State or some of the others have already gotten figured out to the state stuff as anything capable with us?

Answer from Senator Karney: Yes, there are a lot of different programs out there. There is lots of different programs that Ohio State and Akron and across the country, we've actually looked at many of those. It's a little unclear in the current landscape which of those programs match our interpretation of the IRS code at the university level. It's difficult to just port an existing policy. Also when you go across state lines you can get inspiration, but the retirement programs in those states are very different. Referenced a University of Iowa program. Then shared that it's a little hard across state lines, but they're definitely drawing inspiration from a variety of programs to try and get a good mix of what can work best for us.

- Second Reading of Grievance Resolution: the purpose is to clarify some ambiguities in the dates in terms of how long it takes for different entities to respond to other entities, the chain of command across Chairs, Deans and Provost office [and School Directors when there are no chairs]
- Q&A RE Resolution:

Question Hallman-Thrasher: My question about this policy is what if the grievance is with the Chair Director? Does it skip over that person and go directly to the next level.

Answer Senator Karney: Yes, there is a conflict of interest clause in it [2A & B].

Question Senator Hallman-Thrasher: So that's if they're all identified?

Answer Senator Karney: Yes, any or all and both.

Question/Comment Senator O'Keefe: Days means calendar days. Question withdrawn but feel free to comment.

Answer Senator Karney: Yes, 2 C defines days as calendar days.

Secretary Andzulis: Motion to Vote? Senator Klein and seconded by Senator Ostermann. Voice vote:

Numerous “Aye” votes. No “Nay” Votes. Abstentions: Senator Marchenkov and Senator Drogula (alternate).

GRIEVANCE RESOLUTION APPROVED.

Promotion and Tenure Committee – Cynthia Anderson

- Update: revising resolution from last year on Inadequate Consideration to reflect different working condition in Schools and Departments. Will bring to next meeting.
- Reviewing Handbook to identify sections that need to be corrected; please reach out if you see something that requires attention.
- RHE members of the committee will be following up with others to get a sense of satisfaction with the changes that have been made and then we will begin working with colleges and departments to help them to revise documents to reflect the new policies.
- Finally, Senator Anderson is serving on the Diversity, equity inclusion, sub subgroup working on promotion and tenure. It's a subgroup of the diversity equity inclusion Faculty Affairs Council and I'm looking at best practices for equitable promotion and tenure.
- No question were noted.

Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee – Jennie Klein

- Election Sense of the Senate Resolution was not legal because it offers an incentive. Therefore the President of the Undergraduate Student Senate is working on requesting a day off for election day. EPSA needs to resolve the number of classroom minutes issue related to Tues/Thurs and Mon/Wed/Fri classes. Chair Wyatt suggested this should be possible with enough notice so 2024 would be the goal for the student senate and EPSA will support them.
- Working on two resolutions:
 - Transfer of external D grades from out of state and private schools for credit as OU currently accepts in-state transfer D grades and has since 2005. OU is last in state to do so. Initiated by Rob Callahan. The D grade would not supersede a required grade in a program: Example [a D grade won't let you advance to the next language class].
 - Bringing children to class. This is in response to a grad student who could not drop a class after childcare fell through in the fifth week of the semester.
- Finally, also considering standalone certificates that lead to degrees. Remember TLA is working on a subcommittee and is looking for volunteers. Reach out to Katie Hartman or Beth Quitslund.
 - Correction: The group is Friday Group 2.0 led by Hartman and Eisworth and refers to Stackable Certificates. Reach out to either with Questions or to Volunteer to be involved.
- No Questions were noted.

Finance and Facilities Committee – Aaron Wilson

- F&F working on a couple of things:
 - Revisions to Faculty Handbook; the Benefits section is extremely outdated. Looking to see what other Ohio schools have as far as content in this area. The goal is to create something that is principles based and doesn't need to be

- updated each year.
- The RFP process for healthcare is coming up. The committee received an evaluation matrix after the fact so they have to go back to rewatch all of the presentation recordings to score and compare them.
- Budget planning: Too early in year; won't get numbers until Spring so it's largely educational.
 - How they allocate money for scholarships
 - How they allocate money for admissions, etc.
 - Largely these are pricing issues
- No Questions were noted.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee – Sarah Wyatt

- First up: the missing TLA Resolution from last time. The TLA committee last year did a project on conceptualizing teaching excellence at Ohio University of the overarching idea is to try and move us away from using student evaluations of teaching. As the major ingredient in the promotion and tenure process and what we have in front of you is a resolution from faculty Senate to endorse their report and authorize them to continue their work, to develop recommendations and bring them to us as a body. Resolution is put in for First Reading.

Question from Senator McDiarmid: Curious about what appears to be a cross multiple disciplines modes sort of standardization of what constitutes excellence in teaching and how disciplined differences are factored into all this, and it seems like we're all getting this always in sort of two parts and only in one part in front of us, which makes it hard to suss all that out.

Answer from Vice Chair Eisworth: I think of that as probably part of the purview of the TLA of their supposed to bring recommendations to us. So that's a pretty broad group of people. Certainly the intent is to have something that allows customizing.

Clarification request from Vice Provost Hartman

Question clarification from Senator McDiarmid: Well, I guess I'm wondering specifically how teaching excellence is adjusted for varying disciplines and modalities and goals of those various programs on such a diverse campus, for instance. And so I just, you know, I I'm always a little wary of things becoming centralized and standardized when we are broken up into communities of expertise and that's where I think the evaluation should reside.

Clarification from Vice Provost Hartman: Thank you very much for the comment and for the clarification. I appreciate that. So, Andrew Pueschel, who is the co-chair of this committee with me, our sub project team of the committee with me is also a senator and he would be happy to also jump it. But I will answer the best that I can. So in the original report that what that is being submitted we have been pretty clear in all of the parts to say that, you know, these are the six checklist descriptors and eight criteria and the weight, importance and how they're evaluated is up to the local levels, whether it be a school or whether it be a college about what is, what is important. It also could be important for people's different career trajectories so someone who is prepping a course may be very different in terms of where their career is than someone who would be a, you know, doing a continuous improvements or innovation or adaptability of course, which is the 8th criteria. So we are still moving forward with that in mind that these are broad that should be adapted and adopted at the local level. That's the next steps. But the person from your college who serving on the committee I believe is Jenny Smith, Jennifer Smith, Jenny Smith.

Question from Senator Srivastava: So at school levels or at department levels, you know, we have student evaluations of instructors, right? So I just wanted to see how this teaching excellence, you know, will influence a local practices. So in, for example, in journalism, you know, evaluations of instructors, there are 10 questions, right? They measure different things. Now, would some of these, you know, some of these criteria are there. Some of these might not be there as directly as you know, as they are here. So what would it mean? Would it mean that you know that the evaluation systems that school levels would be modified would be varied?

Answer from Vice Chair Esworth: All we're asking is that the committee, the TLA Committee look and see what kind of framework makes sense. Everyone is pretty much in agreement that the way we're giving to student evaluations is probably not the best thing, but we lack an overall framework to discuss teaching excellence and what it might mean. And like all things, I don't think it's envisioned as being prescriptive like "this is the way the university shall be. It is enconced in the faculty handbook," it's just to intend to give people tools to talk about it. But we'll see, right? I mean this I think all we're asking is for the blessing of faculty Senate for them to continue their work, to see what happens and then we can decide, you know, depending on what comes out of it.

Comment/Clarification from Senator Pueschel to Vice Provost Hartman: Please correct me if I'm wrong, but I just want to reassure everyone. The processes is that we will move forward, but we will then come back with next steps. This isn't just a one and done thing. There is a process that will come back for clarification. That's correct Katie?

Clarification from Vice Chair Esworth: I look at it as just an endorsement for the committee to continue their work. So they're not just out there doing it for fun.

Question from Senator Karney: I don't know if this is wouldn't be a potential change or addition to one of the be it resolved pieces, but potentially something to think about since we're on the 1st read. It talks about university policies and practices. Would it be appropriate in the "Be it resolved" section here to ask the TLA Committee to make recommendations on how these evaluations, and I'm assuming there's going to be work involved for faculty to Either personally or for other faculty to do observations or collect data, or do other things, and how that evaluation work is then structured into the workload policies of both the colleges, etc. So I don't know if that's relevant to specify and the policies and practices that how this relates to workload is that part of the teaching obligations of the faculty as a part of their service obligations is a part of the promotion and tenure process. I don't know if that's relevant or appropriate for this particular area, but something I wanted to bring up.

Answer from Vice Chair Esworth: I don't know. I haven't thought about thought about that part, right, so that can always be left up to the schools and colleges how they decide to implement whatever general framework comes out of this. There's never going to be in the in the faculty handbook. Some sort of prescriptive "everyone does it the same way, because we know that's not going to work."

- We will vote after the Second reading of the TLA Resolution next time.
- Second Reading of Resolution to Update Faculty Handbook from Sturgis Code of Parliamentary Procedure:
 - No questions/comments/concerns
 - Motion to vote by Sen Karney and Seconded (simultaneously) by Senator Llamas, Hallman-Thrasher and Guseman.
 - Unanimous "Aye" votes. No "Nays" or Abstentions noted.

PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY STANDARD RESOLUTION APPROVED.

Chair Wyatt:

I wanted to mention something. It was someone mentioned it earlier there here as an alternate tonight and just to be sure that everybody understands, if you're going to miss, if you're a senator and you know you're going to miss a meeting, all you have to do is write Angie Brock and tell her that you will not be there. She will find the alternate for you. So to be sure that alternates are in place and in the right colleges, she will take care of that and notify them and find someone to replace you. Does that make sense?

Question from Senator Ostermann: Since you're clarifying you, please clarify about the voting for alternates. Are they supposed to abstain? If they're just the same?

Answer from Chair Wyatt: If an alternate is here, acting as a senator as a replacement, then they vote. If not, they don't vote.

New Business - None**Motion to Adjourn:**

Senator Guseman and Seconded by Vice Chair Eisworth.

Adjourned 8:15 PM