

**Ohio University Faculty Senate**  
**Monday, September 20, 2010**  
**Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.**  
**Minutes, approved 10/18/10**

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:10 p.m.

In attendance:

**College of Arts and Sciences:** E. Ammarell, K. Brown, J. Gilliom, S. Gradin, S. Hays, K. Hicks, D. Ingram, J. Lein, J. McLaughlin, S. Patterson for C. Kalenkoski, D. Phillips for R. Palmer, B. Quitslund, A. Rouzie for C. Elster, B. Schoen for W. Roosenburg. S. Wyatt

**College of Business:** L. Hoshower, B. Roach, T. Stock

**College of Fine Arts:** M. Phillips, A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas

**College of Health Sciences and Professions:** M. Adeyanju, D. Bolon

**College of Osteopathic Medicine:** A. Huzoor, J. Wolf

**Group II:** H. Burstein

**Patton College of Education and Human Services:** T. Franklin, A. Paulins

**Regional Campus—Chillicothe:** R. Knight

**Regional Campus—Eastern:** J. Casebolt

**Regional Campus—Lancaster:** P. Munhall

**Regional Campus—Southern:** D. Marinski

**Regional Campus—Zanesville:** J. Farley for J. Benson, M. Nern

**Russ College of Engineering:** B. Branham, J. Dill, J. Giesey, H. Pasic

**Scripps College of Communication:** B. Debatin, J. Lee, J. Slade, S. Titsworth,

**Excused:** T. Heckman

**Absent:** L. Rice, D. McDiarmid, M. Sisson, J. Thomas, N. Kiersey, G. Newton

---

**Overview of the Meeting:**

- I. EVP&P Pam Benoit
- II. Roll Call and Approval of the May 17, 2010 & June 7, 2010 Minutes
- III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
  - Updates on Resolutions
  - Miscellaneous Updates
    - Committee Assignments
    - Environmental Scan
    - Budget Planning Council
    - Annual Presentation to Board of Trustees
  - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: October 18, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
- IV. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
- V. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade
- VI. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
  - Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School—for first reading
- VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—John Gilliom
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Adjournment

---

## I. Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit

After welcoming back the Faculty Senate, EVPP Benoit discussed three issues: 1) preliminary enrollment figures; 2) the process for distributing the additional \$750,000 raise pool; and 3) the environmental scan draft report.

**Enrollment Update:** Preliminary enrollment numbers are as follows (final numbers will be available later in the fall):

Freshman applications (Athens)	-6%
Freshman admits (Athens)	-2%
Average ACT (Athens)	24 (+.2)
Average GPA (Athens)	3.38 (+.02)
Graduate applications	+10%
Graduate enrollments	+4.2%

Total enrollment is approximately 34,000, up 6%. The new Athens campus freshman enrollment of 3985, though down from the record high last year, met the planned enrollment target. Transfers are down, and the retention rate is down by about ½%. Regional campuses grew by 3%. The largest growth was in distance learning, which increased 400% over the last two years, largely due to the online RN to BSN program.

Additional information is available from [Compass](#), and more detailed information is available from [Institutional Research](#).

**Additional Raise Pool:** Benoit outlined the process for the additional \$750,000 group I raise pool allocated at the end of August. John Day formulated the allocation to colleges, and Benoit asked Deans to distribute the raise pool to those who have made a measurable difference. Some Deans have begun meeting with chairs/directors, and raises will begin in the November 1<sup>st</sup> paycheck. (Raises will be retroactive to the beginning of the school year.)

**Draft Environmental Scan:** The draft environmental scan (<http://ouenvironscan.wordpress.com/2010/09/21/draft-environmental-scan-report/>) has been released for initial feedback.<sup>1</sup> The environmental scan team was charged with developing an environmental scan to share for review and input. They met over summer, posting their work on a blog (<http://ouenvironscan.wordpress.com/>). The process the committee followed is described on page 3 of the document. The environmental scan will play a pivotal role in determining planning unit budgets over the next six years. Planning unit heads have met with John Day and EVPP Benoit to start analyzing resources; based on these discussions and the environmental scan, draft budget recommendations will come out earlier this year than last year, by end of

---

<sup>1</sup> The committee consists of Pam Benoit (Chair), Executive Vice President and Provost; Terry Conry, Associate Vice President, Finance and Administration; Ralph DiCaprio, Professor & Chair, Biological Sciences; Rich Greenlee, Dean, Eastern Campus; Christine Knisely, Athens community member and retired College of Osteopathic Medicine staff member; Randy Leite, Interim Dean, College of Health Sciences and Professions; Joe McLaughlin, Chair, Faculty Senate & Associate Professor, English; Kent Smith, Vice President, Student Affairs; and Scott Titsworth, Associate Professor & Chair, Communication Studies. *Ex Officio*: David Descutner, Executive Vice Provost and Ann Fidler, Executive Associate Provost.

November; responses to the draft will be due back in January; final recommendations will go to the President by March.

Benoit emphasized that we still have to winnow what we do, and focus on where we get our greatest return on our resources. She is cautious and concerned, but argued that this should not undermine our passion for what we do here, or our accomplishments. She argued that we need to make good on the promises that we make to society, to make others understand their potential and to be more fully equipped to exercise the better angels of their nature. If we lose sight of this, it is for reasons that have nothing to do with bad budgets. While she cannot say that all is well, Benoit stated that the only thing that can defeat us is defeatism.

Benoit then introduced Stephen Golding, the new VP for Finance and Administration. Benoit emphasized that Steve has only been here since September 1<sup>st</sup>, and may not have answers to all questions at this point. Golding recounted that in his first few days, the Board of Trustees called on his office to create a six-year planning document so they can understand how to integrate the academic plan, the student life plan, the capital planning docs, etc., into a template that will allow for greater transparency in terms of where resources come from, and how those resources are used. His office has already made some preliminary recommendations for this. Otherwise Golding is trying to understand our governance structure, and meeting with various groups and with units that report to him. He encourages faculty to get in touch by email ([golding@ohio.edu](mailto:golding@ohio.edu)) or in person.

Understanding that Golding was new and would not have definitive answers at this point, Faculty Senators raised several issues for Golding to look into in the future. **David Ingram** asked Golding to look into facilities management's ability to efficiently support teaching and research; this has become a problem to the point where experiments are being interrupted, extra grant money has to be spent for basic maintenance, and students' graduations are being delayed. **Steve Hays** noted that former Interim VP for Finance and Administration Angelini had expressed surprise last year that there were not formal processes for evaluating large spending decisions like return on investment for large software purchases (e.g. Concur), and asked whether formal processes would continue to be developed. **Ken Brown** added that the decision to use Blackboard 9 needed similar evaluation. **Teresa Franklin** said that she is on a committee that is looking at implementing systems statewide, and that some of the new software that OU is moving to may not be compatible with other systems being used across the state, which will make shared services more difficult. Golding responded that he is committed to instituting review procedures that include end users (faculty, staff, and students), and that Angelini is working with a group to address some of the most egregious problems with Concur.

Golding then gave a brief update on the status of plans for renovating residence halls. The Board of Trustees asked for a comprehensive plan for all residence halls before any renovations are planned. Phase 1—the consultant's report outlining the possible ways to finance and structure major dorm renovations—is finished. Phase 2 will examine fundamental questions about where are we going with residence halls, how that fits with the environmental scans, academic planning, etc., and try to pull together a comprehensive view of the capital needs, programmatic directions, and resources available for the university's mission. Golding stated that there are some more fundamental conversations that need to take place. **Joe Slade** asked whether we were leaning toward a particular model for renovating the residence halls. Benoit responded that we are not leaning any way yet; we're still figuring out which questions we need to ask, and what kind of data we need to collect before we make a decision. Golding added that there is a return-on-investment (ROI) calculus we need to do first. For example, if the student experience is

central here, do the residence halls provide that? Or is it our programs? How can we phase this in so the university can keep doing what it needs to do? **Ken Hicks** noted that in addition to residence halls, there are a lot of infrastructure issues on campus that need to be addressed, and it is critical to minimize and communicate effectively about disruptions (e.g. when water or electricity is shut off without notice in the middle of an experiment).

**Bernhard Debatin** asked Golding which issue will receive his primary attention, especially from his perspective as an outsider. Golding responded that implementing RCM (responsibility centered management/budgeting) is his highest priority. The fundamental question is what is the sustainable business model that lets you continue to do what you want to do (teaching, research, service). How do we tailor a model to reflect what's happening in Ohio, and the changing relationship between state government and higher education? Golding argued that this is really a large philosophical issue, and we need to engage the entire academy to make sure that we get it right.

Benoit then asked for questions. **Hays** asked Benoit to clarify the structure and role of the environmental scans, adding that if an environmental scan is to identify major trends relevant to OU, sometimes trends are things you want to get on board with, and sometimes trends are things we want to stand against. Benoit agreed: OU needs to pay attention to its identity and values, and identify which trends resonate with who we are. **Debatin** asked whether this process was yet another strategic plan on paper that would not end up having actual consequences, and whether there were binding decision-making structures included. Benoit responded that this is a focusing of VisionOhio, and that by focusing on six strategic priorities, it is more likely to have a real impact. Given the realities of the upcoming budgets, the plan has to prepare for this. Benoit said that they are even trying to further define the two academic strategic priorities to make their implementation more possible. It is binding in the sense that the budget will be tied to these priorities (although not everything in the budget will fit under one of these six priorities).

**Allyn Reilly** returned to Blackboard 9 problems, and asked whether there were steps being made now to fix this and make it more user-friendly, and how the decision to move to Blackboard 9 was reached (versus other commercial platforms or open source software). Benoit responded that she has asked Deans to collect a list of the problems from their department chairs so they can try to sort out systematic and support problems from the problems that always arise when an upgrade is made. **Senators Debatin, Mark Phillips, Judith Lee, James Casebolt, and Helaine Burstein** all reported concerns or problems surrounding Blackboard 9. **Hays, Bryan Branham, Brown, Franklin, Pasic, and Patterson** all raised concerns about the interaction between faculty and IT, particularly the lack of meaningful consultation when decisions about academic technology are made. McLaughlin noted that the Faculty Technology Advisory committee might be able to provide some more information as well, although IT administrators do not always attend these meetings. Benoit responded that she will be looking into these issues and will report back on the decision-making process for moving to Blackboard 9 at the next meeting. **Debatin** noted his surprise that some in IT are characterizing Blackboard 9 problems primarily as "training" issues on the part of faculty, rather than acknowledging legitimate problems with the program itself.

**Ingram** asked Benoit to report at a future meeting on how the new state SSI formula is projected to work for OU. Benoit responded that John Day would be able to provide that information at the next meeting.

## II. Roll Call and Approval of the May 17, 2010 & June 7, 2010 Minutes

A quorum was present. A motion to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2010 meeting passed by voice vote (moved by Franklin, seconded by Patterson).

The minutes of the June 7, 2010 meeting were amended to reflect the following: The "Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School" would have required an amendment of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, and therefore a motion to approve the resolution required a 2/3 vote of membership of the Faculty Senate (not 2/3 of the Senators present and voting), or 34 votes. The motion received only 33 votes, so the motion was defeated. The minutes were amended to reflect this.

A motion to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2010 meeting as amended passed by voice vote (moved by Patterson, seconded by Reilly).

## III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

- Updates on Resolutions

Many resolutions passed at the May and June meetings; EVPP Benoit has signed eight of them. She did not sign either of the ICA resolutions. In both cases the Provost has written a response; we also received a letter from the President in which he lays out what he is doing with respect to ICA within the MAC conference. The resolutions and the EVPP's responses are available on our web site (<http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/>).

McLaughlin will follow up on a recommendation from Benoit to pursue changes in the structure of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) both through that committee and through the Committee on Committees. Ming Li will talk with IAC about this, and then will report to the Committee on Committees.

McLaughlin announced that the Offices of Legal Affairs and Institutional Equity will present a legal update from 9:00 a.m. to noon on Thursday, October 7, in Baker 242; and from 1:30-4:30 p.m., Wednesday, October 20, also in Baker 242. This is now open to faculty senators, and especially recommended for those on PRC. Senators should RSVP to Judy Tabler at 3-2626 or [tablerj1@ohio.edu](mailto:tablerj1@ohio.edu).

- Miscellaneous Updates
  - Committee Assignments

All have received their committee assignments, and at this point you should have been contacted by your committee chairs.

- Environmental Scan

Both Scott Titsworth and McLaughlin are on the committee. The preliminary draft of the scan has been released. The timeline is tight, and they would like feedback from us in the next week. But there will be more opportunity in October, when there will be some forums on the scan. As you read the draft, identify anything that is missing, or whether anything that is identified as an important trend is less important. Any comments can be sent to McLaughlin; he will forward feedback to the Provost.

- Budget Planning Council

BPC meets weekly, and has five faculty representatives: Valerie Young, Claudia Hale; Joe McLaughlin, John Gilliom; and David Thomas. Feel free to contact any member.

- Annual Presentation to Board of Trustees

McLaughlin presented three main topics to the Board the week before classes began: 1) Faculty involvement in Q2S; 2) The AAUP salary study, where we dropped precipitously (and from anecdotal information it does not seem like our 1% + \$750,000 will help us gain back much ground); and 3) Athletics, especially in the context that of the 64 priorities of VisionOhio, only one mentioned athletics, yet it was clearly a spending priority, with \$2 million in new funding over the past few years. McLaughlin strongly encouraged the Board to read the Knigh commission's report.

Faculty senators raised three points about ICA: 1) Whether there been any discussion about the increasing health concerns related to football, especially with respect to concussions; this might raise liability issues for the institution. McLaughlin responded that there has not been any discussion of this that he knows of. 2) 1/3 of OU's structural deficit is from ICA overspending its budget. 3) ICA should be part of the environmental scan; it is a significant trend across universities that is not sustainable.

McLaughlin added that in the Knight commission survey, 80-85% of presidents would like to do something about athletics, but feel powerless due to Boards, alumni, donors, etc. He reminded faculty senators of the data that Scott Titsworth presented last year, showing that the MAC conference as a whole is subsidizing athletics at a very high level. And there is little conclusive evidence to support the idea that athletics brings in donors or students. It's a matter of having the courage to make significant changes.

- McLaughlin announced that there will be a reception with EVPP Benoit in October (date TBA).

- McLaughlin asked for an alternate to Ohio Faculty Council; if you are interested, get in touch with him in the next few weeks.

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: October 18, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

- We plan to have Marnette Perry, chair of the Board of Trustees, at this meeting.

### **III. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin**

Gradin began by outlining the committee's goals for the upcoming year.

- 1) Discuss and define what "timely manner" means in the handbook with respect to responding to professional ethics issues.
- 2) Discuss the early retirement report, and decide how to alter the handbook to accommodate the move to semesters.
- 3) Revisit the Group 2 faculty task force.
- 4) Continue to explore a Clinical faculty designation.
- 5) Address faculty fellowship leave for semesters, especially problems that have arisen with logjams.
- 6) Stay involved in policy discussions.

Gradin then reintroduced the Voinovich resolution that was defeated at the June 2010 meeting for first reading.

- Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School—for first reading

The Voinovich Center has become a School, but they do not belong to a College. Right now faculty in this school are technically left out of the handbook in some areas; they have no Faculty Senate representation, and this year an *ad hoc* procedure was developed to handle a P&T case. There are approximately 7-8 tenure-line faculty in the Voinovich School. This resolution proposes to remedy the lack of representation on Faculty Senate by designating one senator position for the Voinovich School. This would mean that someone would lose a senator unless we increase the overall number of senators.

Steve Patterson moved that the rules be suspended, and move directly to second reading and vote. Helaine Burstein seconded. The motion to suspend the rules was approved by a 2/3 majority by show of hands.

Discussion revisited many of the issues discussed in depth last spring. Senators expressed concern that this would result in disproportionate representation for the Voinovich School; in the current Faculty Senate, there is one senator for every 19 Group I faculty members, while the Voinovich School would have one senator for 7-8 faculty members. If centers proliferate, how would this change the size of Faculty Senate? Others were more concerned that all faculty have representation, that the Voinovich School was a college-like entity and therefore required to have representation according to the faculty handbook, and argued that there was a greater risk to having unrepresented faculty than there was of having centers proliferate. Gradin emphasized that the Provost has signed the resolution on the creation of centers, which gives a larger context for this resolution, and makes it less likely that this problem will arise again. PRC committee members also outlined why an at-large Faculty Senate member, or why bundling the Voinovich School with another College for representation would not constitute fair representation. This resolution also fixes the number of senators at 51, so even if more centers were created, the Faculty Senate would not automatically increase in size.

As a change to the Faculty Senate's constitution, approval requires a 2/3 vote of the membership, or 34 votes. By secret ballot, the motion passed with 35 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.

The executive committee will now work out how to submit the resolution to the entire faculty for approval; if the faculty approves the resolution, it will then go to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

#### **IV. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly**

Reilly began by welcoming new members, and noting that all EPSA members automatically serve on UCC as well as on a UCC subcommittee.

This year EPSA will focus on two main issues:

1) Advising for the Q2S transition: right now advising varies across the university, and EPSA will discuss ways to provide incentives for advising.

2) The University System of Ohio is encouraging students to take college courses that are taught at secondary schools, and OU has entered into agreements to give college credit for these courses. We do not know how many of these there are, or how they are reviewed. We will investigate this, and look into having these courses reviewed by UCC.

EPSA will also be working with David Descutner on the Standing Committee on the First-year Experience, and will explore how technical decisions are made (e.g. Blackboard 9).

**V. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade**

Slade noted that they had one case coming up (an appeal of extension of tenure clock).  
An addition, P&T will:

- 1) Monitor tenure issues arising in certain states, where legislatures are trying to do away with tenure altogether.
- 2) Address the startling statistics about the hiring and retention of women faculty; P&T may invite the incoming Director of Institutional Equity to come and speak to the senate about that.

Faculty Senators should email Slade with any suggestions.

**VI. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—John Gilliom**

Gilliom stated that there would be challenges in the areas of facilities, development, budget planning council, and the benefits advisory committee. They will be having a two-hour planning meeting to discuss how to be the most effective advocates.

McLaughlin reminded Faculty Senators that the executive committee meets with the EVPP and staff the week before monthly Faculty Senate meetings. We typically bring suggestions for issues the EVPP might address. If Senators have something they would like addressed, or someone you would like to come in and address the Senate, please let any member of the executive committee know.

**VII. New Business**

None.

**VIII. Adjournment**

Slade moved to adjourn, seconded by Burstein. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:40 p.m.

---

**Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School  
Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate  
Approved 9/20/10**

**Whereas** the Voinovich Center has now been restructured and approved as a School by the Board of Trustees;

**Whereas** faculty in the Voinovich School are entitled to representation on the Faculty Senate;  
and

**Whereas** Section VI. A. Article 1 Reads:  
**Article 1 Composition and Election**

1. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members with faculty status, with or without tenure. Forty-eight Senators shall be elected by the Group I faculty of the degree colleges of the Athens campus and Group I faculty of each of the regional campuses in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each degree-granting college or unit headed by a dean and having Group I faculty shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the Senate. Two Senators who are Group II faculty shall be elected by the Group II faculty of Ohio University. The election shall be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Election stated in the Senate Bylaws.

**Be it resolved** that the Faculty Handbook VI. A. Article 1 be changed to the following [changes in bolded italics]:

#### **Article 1 Composition and Election**

1. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members with faculty status, with or without tenure. Forty-***nine*** Senators shall be elected by the Group I faculty of degree-granting colleges ***with deans*** or academic units ***with a dean's equivalent (e.g. Voinovich School)*** of the Athens campus and Group I faculty of each of the regional campuses. **Representation shall be** in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each degree-granting college or unit headed by a dean ***or dean's equivalent*** and having Group I faculty shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the Senate. Two Senators who are Group II faculty shall be elected by the Group II faculty of Ohio University. The election shall be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Election stated in the Senate Bylaws.