

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, December 8, 2014
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10pm
Meeting Minutes

Meeting called to order by Beth Quitslund (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:12pm

In attendance

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

Excused: E. Ammarell, B. Bates, D. Carr, S. Carson, C. Elster, A. Hibbitt, G. Kessler, K. Mattson, A. Sergeev, K. Uhalde

Absent: S. Doty, J. White [for A. Sergeev], S. Walkowski

MEETING AGENDA

- I. President Roderick McDavis and Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit
- II. Tobacco Free Campus Update: Judy Piercy
- III. Email Upgrade Update: David Alexander
- IV. Roll Call and Approval of the November 10, 2014 Minutes
- V. Chair's Report
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, January 12, Walter Hall 235
- VI. Professional Relations Committee (Sarah Wyatt)
 - Resolution to Revise the Language of the Faculty Handbook to be Consistent with the Current Practices Regarding Group IV Faculty—Second Reading

- Resolution to Include Dates for Notice of Non-Reappointment for Group II Faculty—First Reading
- VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ruth Palmer)
- Resolution to Support the Definitions of Plagiarism and Cheating in the new Student Code of Conduct—Second Reading
- VIII. Finance & Facilities Committee (Ben Stuart)
- Resolution on Shared Governance in Faculty Compensation—First Reading
 - Resolution on Guidelines for the Year 2 Faculty Compensation Implementation Plan—First Reading
- IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Bill Reader)
- X. New Business
- XI. Adjournment
-

I. President McDavis

- ❖ Topic: SSI Funding Formula. As of the Faculty Senate meeting, the Presidents had not yet made decisions about changes to the funding formula. After faculty senate meeting in November, there was an extensive meeting of all fourteen Presidents to discuss what to change and what not to change. The discussion included considerations about the policies that should drive decisions, the formula in general, specific variations to the formula, and options for changing the formula. They did not make a decision that day. Instead, the body the Executive Committee was asked to continue the conversation and return to the December meeting with a Resolution for consideration. Although McDavis is not a member of the Executive Committee, McDavis was asked for input in this continuing conversation. To date, McDavis has participated in three meetings with the Executive Committee during the past few weeks. On December 9, 2014, the Executive Committee will share ideas with the group. It is expected that the ideas will include some of the proposed changes; the changes will focus on the issues for which the group is in agreement. To make changes, there needs to be a consensus among the group. If there is agreement with some of the recommendations that are expected to be proposed on December 9, 2014, then McDavis suggests this would be a good thing for OHIO. For the issues in which there is not agreement, the group will be using the next five months (i.e. May 2015) for further discussion. Any agreement on December 9, 2014 would take the formula through the first year. Additional changes including how to fund at-risk students would be discussed for the subsequent years. McDavis shared that he was cautiously optimistic about the future and stated that it has been a good month with beneficial conversations. If there is agreement, McDavis stated that he will share the decisions with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Questions and Discussions

- Senator **Hays** asked how the potential changes to SSI will be more beneficial for OHIO than it currently is. McDavis noted that it may not be more beneficial for OHIO without consideration of the at-risk discussion. The benefit for OHIO is that the group will take the time to get the policy right rather than simply focusing on distribution of funds. McDavis argues that getting the policy and funding correct is the more important than the distribution of funds because the distribution needs to be based upon something that makes sense and is in the best interest of the public. At this point, the group simply needs more time to get the policy right and potentially needs to have additional discussion after data has been collected. Benoit added that the primary benefit to OHIO is also that we will not lose as much as we expected.

- Senator **A. White** asked how the issues related to funding for the at-risk students impacts the regional campuses. McDavis responded by explaining that the discussion has included issues related to funding for at-risk students that will impact the regional campuses. For example, if a student starts his/her education at a community college or at a regional campus or at a university, should the credit be equal or different depending upon where they start? If so, why? Those are the kinds of questions that are currently in discussion.

I. Executive Vice President and Provost Benoit

- ❖ Topic 1: Enrollment. Benoit provided information related to student enrollment. As of the day of the faculty senate meeting, there were 14,708 applications, which is approximately 70% of the total expected and approximately 69 more applications than OHIO had at this time last year. Admissions staff members are currently reviewing applications. The number of applications changes day-to-day.
 - *Open House Events.* Attendance at the Open House events has been very good. For example, we reached capacity for the two Ohio Discovery days, which prompted the addition of a third event. As compared to last year, attendance for the first two events was up this year by 15%. The third event (added due to demand) is almost at capacity. Benoit thanked faculty members who participated and noted that attendees rated interaction with faculty very high. OHIO is also seeing higher volumes of high school juniors during these visits. Unfortunately, the increase in interest has also resulted in some people being unable to attend due to capacity limitations. OHIO believes that it is important not to turn families away because we lose on the recruitment cycles. As such, if faculty members have ideas related to recruitment, we would welcome input and ideas.
 - *Merit-based Scholarships.* OHIO sent out the first round of merit-based scholarships last week. OHIO awarded more than 10,000 awards for more than 4,000 students. In total, funding exceeded \$18 million in scholarships.
- ❖ Topic 2: College of Fine Arts and Department of Film. Faculty may have heard that there has been some discussion about moving the department from the College of Fine Arts to the Scripps College of Communication as well as some discussion about developing a closer relationship between the film program and the media arts program. Benoit was invited to have a conversation with faculty from Fine Arts and noted that she had a very good discussion with faculty early in the day. Critical issues of discussions were programmatic and curriculum issues rather than financial issues. Benoit noted that there was a good discussion with faculty including (but not limited to) how to move forward, the extent to which collaboration between the programs could be positive, and whether or not programs should be merged. As a member of the Department of Film, Benoit asked Professor David **Thomas** to add his insights. Thomas stated that the Provost provided clarification about what was really being discussed and provided information that helped ease faculty concerns. Benoit also noted that Associate Provost for Academic Budget and Planning John Day attended the meeting in order to answer questions related to budgeting and finance.

Questions and Discussions

- Senator **Rice** asked about the source of funding for the scholarship money. The Provost noted that there are a variety of different sources including (but not limited to) funding from OHIO sources, matching scholarship program, and federal sources.

II. Tobacco Free Campus Update: Judy Piercy

- ❖ Topic 1: Timeline of Implementation. Piercy provided an explanation of the policy timeline. In July 2012, the Ohio Board of Regents passed a resolution calling for colleges and universities to consider becoming tobacco free. In 2012-13, the Ad Hoc Tobacco-Free Task Force was formed and

recommended that OHIO move towards tobacco free with the establishment of an implementation team to provide a strategy. In 2013-14, the Tobacco Free Implementation Task Force developed policy and implementation plan; it also received Board of Trustees approval. On August 1 2014, the campus-wide tobacco free initiative began. In 2014-15, education, communication, and logistics were implemented. The goal is to be tobacco free beginning in August 2015.

- ❖ **Topic 2: Philosophy.** Piercy noted several reasons for the policy. (1) Ohio University strives to foster a healthy and productive environment for everyone on its campus. (2) Research and recommendations from the Board of Regents, The American College Health Association, and the Surgeon General encouraged us to move forward in our tobacco-free initiative. (3) A February 2013 internal survey (2,222 respondents) indicated that 65% were supportive of initiating a tobacco-free campus and 82% reported not using tobacco. (4) The tobacco-free initiative (TFI) also encourages a cleaner and greener campus while preparing our students for future tobacco-free environments
- ❖ **Topic 3: Policy.** The following provides a number issues related to the policy:
 - *Definition.* Ohio University will provide a smoke and tobacco-free environment for all members of the University community which includes employees, students, visitors, volunteers, patients, and customers. For purpose of this policy, the university is defined as facilities, property and grounds used to carry out the mission of the university. The use of tobacco or smoking products is defined as all nicotine, tobacco-derived or containing products, and plant based products including, but not limited to, cigarettes (e.g., clove, bidis, kreteks), electronic cigarettes, cigars and cigarillos, hookah smoked products, and oral tobacco (spit and spit less, smokeless, chew, snuff). An exception is all FDA approved nicotine replacement therapy (e.g., patches, gum, inhalers, and lozenges).
 - *Scope of the Policy.* The physical location of a smoke and tobacco-free campus is defined as facilities, property and grounds used to carry out the mission of the university. This will also extend to sidewalks adjacent to university buildings and grounds in keeping with the city policy of property owners' responsibility for sidewalks. Smoking and tobacco use in personal vehicles on university property will not be allowed.
 - *Exceptions.* FDA approved nicotine replacement therapy will be allowed (e.g., patches, gum, inhalers, and lozenges). In addition, tobacco use may be permitted for controlled research, educational, clinical, or religious ceremonial purposes with prior approval of the dean or director responsible for the facility
 - *Related Issues.* The Task Force decided that there will be no designated smoking areas and no use of electronic cigarettes.
- ❖ **Topic 4: Compliance.** A number of issues were discussed as related to compliance.
 - *Community-Wide Accountability.* Each member of the university community will be responsible for respectfully informing or reminding others of the smoke/ tobacco-free policy if coming upon someone smoking or using tobacco. Effective approaches for talking with individuals who smoke or use tobacco will be provided on the smoke/tobacco-free website.
 - *Employees.* It will be the responsibility of the supervisor to enforce the policy and document as they would any other policy violation. Repeated violations could be subject to disciplinary action. Supervisors are encouraged to emphasize the wellness aspects of the policy and ask if the employee is interested in any assistance adapting to the policy or interested in cessation resources. A guide for supervisors will be provided on the smoke/tobacco-free website.
 - *Students.* Students should be given the opportunity to be warned and not be subject immediately to a Student Code of Conduct charge. When talking with students, one is encouraged to emphasize the wellness aspects of the policy and ask if the student is interested in any assistance adapting to the policy or interested in cessation resources.

- *Visitors, Volunteers, Patients, and Customers.* It is recommended that visitors, volunteers, patients, and customers be reminded that OHIO is a smoke/ tobacco-free campus. Educating these groups can begin prior to their arrival on campus by the sponsoring office via their websites, mailings, advertisements, and electronic information. During the event, the sponsoring office shall make efforts to ensure compliance.
- ❖ **Topic 5: Resources.** Resources available include Support for Tobacco Users; OHIO is committed to assisting smokers and tobacco users if they choose to quit or cease while on campus. Options are currently under review. A website (www.ohio.edu/tobaccofree) will be going live starting in January 2015. The website will include policy, FAQ, resources, communication tools, downloads, and news. The marketing campaign will be “Reading for Change. Ready to Choose. Ready to Commit.” For additional questions, please write to tobaccofree@ohio.edu

Questions and Discussions

- Senator **Casebolt** ask if the new policy is an Athens only policy or for regionals as well. Piercy noted that, for now, the policy is only for Athens campus. However, there are discussions about extending to the regionals. Piercy also noted that there have been a number of discussions with the City of Athens. The City just passed an ordinance that prohibits smoking on some city properties.
- Senator **Thomas** asked whether or not someone can smoke uptown. Piercy noted that you can still smoke uptown if the location is not a sidewalk in front of a campus building.
- Senator **Tees** asked if you can smoke in the road. Piercy stated that you can smoke in the road. Piercy also noted that there is a committee called Tobacco Free 2015 that is currently working on the logistics of the policy. It is expected that the committee will have to review and revise policies as issues arise.
- Senator **Reader** argued that one-third of the people surveyed indicated that they did not support a tobacco-free campus and asked if there were representatives on the committee who believed that personal rights trumps policy. Piercy noted that there were a number of conversations about the issue of personal rights. Piercy also noted that the charge indicated that some policy needed to be implemented. It was really a matter of how.
- Senator **Reader** expressed concern about not allowing the use of electronic cigarettes. Specifically, it was stated that there were studies that suggest that e-cigarettes reduce smoking. To what degree was research done? Piercy stated that a great deal of research was done and the decision to not allow e-cigarettes was among the last decisions made. The group decided to follow the examples of best practice.
- Senator **Basta** thanked the committee for their efforts. It was argued that this is an important policy that considers public health. It was also noted that providing cessation programs should be an important component of the policy.
- Senator **Inman** asked if there are plans to have signage posted about the policy. More specifically, there are a number of residents who don't have access to OHIO information. As such, how will you communicate with residents? Piercy noted that there will be signs. The designs and signage are in process.
- Senator **Hartman** asked if this policy will apply to campus buildings located downtown. Piercy noted that this does include buildings located downtown.
- Senator **Rice** asked when the discussion moved from personal rights to the decision to implement the policy. Piercy remarked that the decision was made during the period in which there was the Implementation Task Force. As a follow-up, another question asked if there was a vote about the policy or if there was another mechanism for decision-making. **Quitslund** noted that there was not a great deal of choice based upon the directive from the Board of Regents.

- **Piercy** asked for assistance in getting the word out and for support in compliance.

III. Email Upgrade Update: David Alexander

- ❖ Topic 1: Benefits of Catmail. Alexander highlighted the benefits of Catmail including much larger quotas (50 GB), a better webmail experience, and having everyone on the same system.
- ❖ Topic 2: New Outlook Web App. The new OWA URL is catmail.ohio.edu. It includes an all new modern interface, shared calendar access in OWA. It also works well in all browsers (not just Internet Explorer).
- ❖ Topic 3: Other important changes. There are two key issues. First, deleted items will be subject to a 30-day auto purge. Second, there will be bulk mailing limits including 10,000 recipients per day and 500 max recipients per message. The limits apply to department senders.
- ❖ Topic 4: Timeline. In November / December 2014, there are OIT and Distributed IT pilots and FTAG pilots. In addition, there will be a start to scheduling departments outside of OIT. In early January, the plan is to move remaining 3,700 graduate students and to meet with departments to finalize schedule. The goal is to be done (hopefully) by April 2015.
- ❖ Topic 5: Support Resources. The following provides support resources available online:
 - [OIT Web Site](#) – Schedule & Project Updates
 - [Video overview of what to expect from the move to Catmail](#)
 - [Mobile Device Configuration Instructions and Videos](#)
 - [Online Training Resources](#)
 - [In-person Training Sessions](#) (Bobcat Depot Training)

Questions and Discussions

- Senator D. **Thomas** asked about archiving e-mails. Alexander described the ability to use .pst files. Alexander noted that everything in your account will move: e-mail, calendar, contacts, rules, etc. In other words, everything you have set-up will move with you.
- Faculty Senate Chair **Quitslund** shared her experiences. She explained that everything worked as expected and looked exactly the same. The only issue she had was with a phone. She used a short video to help solve one issue with the phone.
- Senator **Babrow** asked about the timeline for faculty. Specifically, the noted timeline does not indicate when faculty will be migrated. When will faculty be migrated? Alexander noted that faculty will not be moved until after the first two weeks of the spring semester 2015 at the earliest.

IV. Roll Call and Approval of the October 13, 2014 Minutes

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

V. Chair's Report (Beth Quitslund)

- ❖ Topic 1: Updates and Announcements
 - *Signed Resolutions.* The Provost has signed all resolutions revising the Faculty Handbook that we have passed so far this academic year.
 - *Ohio Faculty Council Report.* There were two major issues discussed during the recent meeting:

1. SB 6 ratios and other markers of financial health: Over the last five years, OHIO has performed remarkably well in comparison to other IUC institutions. The challenge for SB 6 calculations is that due to a ruling by the Government Accounting Standards Board, starting this year all unfunded pension liabilities have to be reflected on the annual balance sheet of public entities. As such, every public university (and every town, school, etc.) will be nominally in the red at the end of FY15. For the time being, the Board of Regents will be running two parallel sets of SB 6 figures for everyone, an official one including the pension liabilities and one that will actually be used to evaluate the financial stability of institutions.
 2. Board of Regents regulations regarding General Education requirements. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Paula Compton, explained how Gen Ed works from the perspective of the Chancellor's office. The rules for transferability, the categories in which Gen Ed credit must fall, and the overall number of required credit hours according to the BOR make the job of the Gen Ed Task Force a bit more complicated, but more analysis is needed to figure out how much more complicated.
- ❖ Topic 2: Upcoming Senate Meeting. The next meeting is currently scheduled for Monday, January 12, Walter Hall 235. However, we may not have a meeting in January. Notifications will be sent by the first week of January about whether or not there will be a meeting. If we do not meet in January, the next meeting will be Monday, February 9.

Questions and Discussions

- None

VI. Professional Relations Committee (Sarah Wyatt)

- ❖ Resolution to Revise the Language of the Faculty Handbook to be Consistent with the Current Practices Regarding Group IV Faculty—Second Reading
- The resolution is offered the PR Committee to eliminate unnecessary language regarding exemptions to the Group IV term of contract. The revision to the language is designed to be consistent with current practices and needs for exemptions.
 - The resolution was approved by a voice vote.
- ❖ Resolution to Include Dates for Notice of Non-Reappointment for Group II Faculty—First Reading
- The resolution is offered the PR Committee to add language to the Faculty Handbook pertaining to written notifications for non-appointment. The revision adds language such that faculty are given advance notification prior to the expiration of his/her appointment.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator stated that there has been some concern that the April 15 date for notification is too late. There have been requests to consider an earlier date such as February 1 or March 15. Wyatt stated that the date was discussed at length. April 15 was selected because this date allows the departments and/or units to know the demand for the department. The concern was that, if the date is too early, the chairs might not want to commit to employment contracts and, instead, fill employment needs with Group III faculty contracts.
- Another senator agreed that April 15 may be too late. Wyatt noted that there is some concern about how to compromise with needs of department and needs of faculty.
- Another senator supported other senators' need for an earlier date for renewal. It was suggested that giving Group II a full semester could be reasonable. Specifically, if the argument is that Group II faculty members are hired because of steady enrollment needs related to long-term

enrollment, then it seems that an earlier date should be possible. In response, Wyatt stated that the appropriate timing depends upon the department. In some departments, there is a fair amount of demand fluctuations.

- A senator asked about the discussions between the five years of service versus less than five years of service. Wyatt noted that if someone was employed for five, then there is probably steady demand/need. For less than five years, there may be more fluctuation. Wyatt also noted that there was a deliberate intention to not tie the notification to a five year contract; instead, the notification is tied to five years of service with or without the contract.
- The faculty senate chair remarked that there is a practical issue related to how different faculty groups are understood to have different terms of employment. If we assume that Group II hires are done with the expectation of indefinite service, then this is essentially suggesting that any hires in which there is not the expectation of indefinite service should be done using Group III. The problem is that Group III faculty members do not have the benefits associated with full-time employment.
- A senator stated that there is some concern about balancing the University needs and the needs of the faculty members. If effectively given short notifications, does this turn faculty members into the equivalent of migrant workers?
- A senator explained the discussion of the committee. The purpose of the April 15 deadline was to protect Group II. If the date is set earlier, then there is potential to use Group III faculty instead because there may be some possibility that some unit may not want to commit to a contract without knowledge of enrollment. Wyatt stated that the date was intended to avoid having Group II faculty in situations in which they may not have a definitive answer about contract renewal until the end of the summer.
- A senator asked if it be possible to have an earlier date plus a rider or clause that prohibited departments/units to fill the position with the Group III if a Group II faculty member was not rehired. Wyatt stated that this does not solve the problem regarding when Group II could expect to have some confirmation of employment.
- A senator suggested that it would seem that the department chair or other person responsible for hiring would give some indication earlier than the April 15 date. Wyatt agreed; this is the final deadline.
- A senator asked if there was a difference in the known demand for Group II depending upon if they are teaching senior or junior courses or freshman course. If the faculty member is teaching junior or senior courses, then enrollment should be known probably one year in advance. If they are teaching freshman, then the departments may have no idea what enrollment will be.
- A senator asked a procedural question. If someone is given notice that they will not be retained due to enrollment yet it is really due to discrimination, is there a process of appeal? Wyatt noted that there is not a process in the handbook because the contracts year-to-year contract.
- The faculty senate chair noted that the Deans will want to provide input, so there will be more conversation.

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

- ❖ Resolution to Support the Definitions of Plagiarism and Cheating in the new Student Code of Conduct—Second Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the EPSA Committee to accept and support the proposed definitions of the types of plagiarism and cheating in the proposed revision to the Student Code of Conduct language.
 - The resolution was approved by a voice vote.

Questions and Discussions

- None

VIII. Finance & Facilities Committee (Ben Stuart)

- ❖ Resolution on Shared Governance in Faculty Compensation—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the F&F Committee to ask the EVP&P, Deans, and Directors to consult with faculty regarding faculty compensation prior to establishing implementation guides for Years 2 and 3 of the current plan. Furthermore, the Resolution asks for Dean and Director level reporting to faculty that summarizes the factors identified in each unit and their relative priority/weighting; any data sets in addition to the average salary data that were used in the setting and/or justification of identified priorities; the progress realized via previous raise pools in addressing high priority factors; and how future raise pools will be utilized to address all identified factors.
- ❖ Resolution on Guidelines for the Year 2 Faculty Compensation Implementation Plan—First Reading
 - The resolution is offered by the F&F Committee requests that (1) a minimum of 50% of the total FY16 raise pools (i.e. the combined standard raise pool and the investment raise pool) established for each rank, as well as regional and Group II faculty, be allocated as across-the-board increases to mitigate the salary erosion experienced by the majority of faculty over the past several years, (2) these across-the-board increases be distributed as fixed dollar amounts specific to each faculty rank or group as determined by dividing the total funds allocated to each rank or group by the FTE faculty within that rank or group such that the median salary in each rank is increased, (3) the remaining raise pools at each rank be distributed evenly between addressing the equity issues identified in each unit and merit as determined by departmental peer review, and (4) faculty accomplishments over all the years when raise pools were insufficient to reward merit be included in the consideration of those merit increases.

Questions and Discussions [for Resolutions]

- With regards to the Shared Governance Resolution, a senator asked if the person(s) from whom the information is to be requested should be just the Dean and Directors or also department chairs. It was suggested that the list of person(s) from whom the information is needed might also include department chairs. Stuart noted this list of person(s) was quoted in accordance to the Provost's press release. Stuart noted that this was discussed earlier that day and that adding the department chairs as appropriate may be possible. Stuart also explained that all colleges, units, and departments were not necessarily the same in how faculty raises were implemented.
- Another senator asked if it would be an issue (helpful or hurtful) to add department chairs to the list of people from which to request. Stuart noted that it is unclear but that they are open to the conversation.
- **Stuart** shared that he had a discussion with the Provost about the two resolutions. Provost encouraged Stuart and the committee members to have a dialogue and information sharing with the Deans.
- **Stuart** also noted that there was some of issue about whether or not the Resolutions were Sense of the Senate of Resolution or a Resolution. The committee wanted to submit them as Resolutions and not Sense of the Senate Resolutions. **Quitslund** responded by referring to the language from the handbook. Specifically, Resolutions are provided to address issues associated with the faculty handbook and issues associated with addressing other University policy matters such as policies

and regulations and curriculum. However, there is a fairly robust tradition (history) of Resolutions related to finance issues. As such, offering them as Resolutions may or may not be technically appropriate (depending upon interpretation) yet is consistent with historical practices. It was also noted that there were functional differences between Sense of the Senate Resolutions and Resolutions to the extent to which the Provost is asked to sign the resolutions.

- With regards to the second Resolution, a senator asked stipulations for how the investment pool funds was allocated when the investment pool money was created and/or supported by the University. More specifically, is combining the two raise pools (standard and investment) a violation of any stipulations associated with the investment raise pool? Stuart responded by stating that his interpretation was that it was not a violation. However, John Day might be in a better position to respond. Day stated that there are two different goals for the different pools of money and that reaching the rank of third in faculty salaries in the state is a complex process. Day also noted that it is not a violation. Stuart agreed and noted that the standard pool is not relegated to an individual rank whereas the investment pool is designated for rank.
- Another senator asked for a point of clarification. The Guidelines Resolution states that the same fixed dollar amount will be given to all professors by rank across the University. Is this a correct interpretation? Stuart answered in the affirmative and noted that the idea is that cost of living impacts all faculty members regardless of discipline.
- Faculty senate chair noted that providing a fixed dollar amount would require a different process to the distribution of funds than what we have now. Currently, the process is based upon how much of the current faculty salary pool each college/unit has while a new process (beyond the decision of the Deans) would be based upon a different allocation of funds. Stuart agreed but remarked that he has not yet done this math. This type of change would require all Deans to agree.

❖ Topic: Intercollegiate Athletics. On behalf of the sub-committee, Hays presented a preliminary overview of intercollegiate athletics. The PPT provided:

- *Description of ICA*. There are 420 student-athletes at OHIO. ICA contributes to campus life and social cohesion, connects OHIO to alumni and donors, and benefits the local community both economically and with entertainment.
- *Academic Description of ICA* includes a distribution of student-athletes among colleges including Arts & Sciences (18%), Health Sciences (18%), Business (23%), Fine Arts (1%), Communication (6%), HTC (<1%), Education (11%), University College (16%), and Engineering (6%).
- *ICA impacts many academic programs* including (but not limited to) athletic training, business administration, professional MBA, coaching education, communication, economics, exercise physiology, health, journalism, nutrition, physical education, physical therapy, recreation, sports administration (professional masters of sports administration and masters of athletic administration), sports management, sociology, and visual communications.
- *ICA impacts several non-academic programs* including (but not limited to) Marching 110, campus recreation, intramurals, and club sports.
- *Scholarships* for student-athletes cost approximately \$7 million per year including in-state cost: \$21,880, out-of-state cost: \$30,844, 125 full scholarships for head count sports, about 235 total FTE scholarships, and 319 student-athletes on full or partial scholarships (approximately 75% of all athletes).
- *ICA Spending and Sources*. ICA spends approximately \$25 million per year. ICA generates \$9.2 million, receives \$8.8 million from the general fee for personnel and operations, and

receives \$7 million per year from the general fund scholarships. As such, the cost is approximately \$15.8 million per year beyond what ICA generates in revenue.

- *Impact of RCM.* In addition to the \$15.8 million in subsidy from previous years, the 2015 budget adds indirect costs totaling \$3.7 including \$1.3 million in utilities and \$1.1 million in maintenance, custodial, and grounds. In addition, starting in 2016, there will be capital costs and depreciation costs for ICA facilities.
- *Possible External Impacts* include increasing costs due to changing NCAA rules (e.g. full cost of attendance is expected to add \$4000 per scholarship or \$940,000), the potential for increased legal liability for concussion-related injuries, and the potential for increases in the cost of insurance.
- *Further Committee Goals* include (1) soliciting input from academic, other units, and stakeholders regarding the value they place on ICA, (2) understanding ICA costs in context, (3) comparing ICA costs to other university costs, and (4) outlining rationales pro- and con-arguments.

Questions and Discussions

- Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Elizabeth **Sayrs** mentioned that the Marching 110 is academic; it is a course (not extra-curricular).
- Hays remarked the data and resources may be posted on faculty senate website in the near future.

IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Bill Reader)

- ❖ Topic 1: Appeal. The P&T committee has completed a late appeal. Mattson should be working on notifications regarding the decision.
- ❖ Topic 2: Goal for Spring Semester. One of the goals for the spring semester is to design something to encourage departments and/or units to create better P&T documents. For some departments/units, appropriate P&T documentations are not available.

Questions and Discussions

- None

X. New Business

- ❖ None

Questions and Discussions

- None

XII. Adjournment

- ❖ **Reader** moved to adjourn, seconded by **Wyatt**. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15pm.