

**Ohio University Faculty Senate
Minutes for Monday, April 13, 2009.
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.**

Sergio López-Permouth called the meeting to order at 7:12 PM.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: K. Brown, G. Buckley, S. Gradin, P. Jung, J. Lein, S. López-Permouth, G. Matlack, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, W. Roosenburg, D. Torres, J. Webster

College of Business: L. Hoshower, G. Coombs for T. Stock

College of Education: V. Conley, T. Leinbaugh

College of Engineering: C. Bartone, J. Gieseey, D. Matolak, H. Pasic

College of Fine Arts: A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, L. Steele, D. Thomas, R. Wetzel

Group II: C. Naccarato

College of Health and Human Services: D. Bolon, S. Marinellie

College of Osteopathic Medicine: P. Coschigano, T. Heckman

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: J. McKean

Regional Campus—Eastern: T. Flynn

Regional Campus—Lancaster: P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Southern:

Regional Campus—Zanesville: K. Collins

Scripps College of Communication: J. Bernt, N. Pecora, J. Slade, S. Titsworth

Excused: T. Anderson, D. Bell, S. Brogan E. McGown, A. Smith, T. Stock,

Absent: J. Benson, W. Gist, A. Hall, S. Hatty, J. Thomas

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl
 - II. Roll Call and Approval of March 9, 2009 Minutes
 - III. Chair's report—Sergio López-Permouth
 - IV. Professional Relations Committee Report—Sherrie Gradin
 - V. Finance and Facilities Committee Report—Joe McLaughlin
 - VI. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee Report—Scott Titsworth
 - VII. Promotion and Tenure Committee Report—Pete Coschigano
 - VIII. New Business
 - IX. Adjournment
-

I. Provost's Report—Kathy Krendl

- **Krendl** stated that her report was posted on her web site earlier in the day. She reported on the deans' evaluations and noted that the response rate was lower than had hoped for, only 13% to 50%, depending on the college. She stated that the parameters were explained at the outset and respondents had a two-week period to complete the survey. There was no reminder from Institutional Research as there would have been with an outside vendor, though some evaluation committee chairs did send out a reminder. The survey went out March 10. **Krendl** stated that her office would continue to work toward an acceptable online instrument for next year with the Professional Relations Committee. Sherrie Gradin noted that PRC is starting to work on that now and called on senators to email her and members of the PRC if they have suggestions for improvement.
- **Krendl** asked Tom Carpenter, the co-chair of the Quarters to Semesters Transition Team (Q2STT) to report on the committee's work. She acknowledged all of the members of the committee: Carpenter, David Descutner, Sergio Lopez, David Thomas, Jeremy Webster, Tracy Leinbaugh, Jeff Giesey, Connie Esmond-Kiger, Pam Sealover, Patrick Munhall, Brice Bible, Tom Scanlan, Brenda Noftz, George Cheripko, Pete Wickman, Michael Adeyanju, Bailey Miles, Sharon Smith, Bill Willan, and Shelley Conrath.
- **Tom Carpenter** reported on two main points. First, he stated that the report of the Q2STT is now available on the Provost's website. He noted that one of the committee's efforts has been to make everything available to the university community as it went forward. To accomplish this, Janice Roche took notes and posted them on the web. Second, **Carpenter** stated that the committee is now turning over its work to Jeff Giesey and Gary Neiman, who will lead the implementation team. He reminded senators that there were three basic charges for the Q2STT. One was to develop a coordinated approach that schools and departments will take for transitioning their programs and majors. The committee started with a document of principles for the conversion. The transition team spent the first quarter modifying this document. The team also realized that there were elements there that should go through the senate's Educational Policies and Student Affairs Committee. EPSA's chair, Jeff Giesey, joined the transition team at the point. **Carpenter** noted that the senate is voting on some of those issues tonight. The transition team was also charged with developing a comprehensive advising program. The team agreed that every student has to have the opportunity to have a one- to-one meeting with an advisor. **Carpenter** stated that the third charge was to establish a calendar. The team concluded that there would be two 15-week instructional periods each year and two 6-week summer sessions. The team's recommendations have been passed on to the deans, but it did not decide whether the winter break should be 3 or 4 weeks. **Carpenter** stated that this decision was now for the deans to make. **Beth Quitslund** expressed her appreciation for the work of the transition team. She then asked about the 15-week semesters. She was concerned that OU may be the only institution making this conversion that would be going to 15-week terms. **Carpenter** replied that this was probably not the case. He noted that the University of Cincinnati announced

that they would have 3 14-week terms and that prior to that Wright State had talked about having 14-week instructional periods. In the latter case, they proposed adding 5 minutes to each class, which, according to Carpenter, is “absurd.” He noted that OSU agreed on April 3rd to go to semesters and that they don’t have the specifics yet. Quitslund stated that the faculty had voted for a minimum of 65 class days and a maximum of 70. Carpenter replied that Miami would likely go with 15 weeks. He stated that the big issue is, if you have two 14-week terms, you’re losing 2 weeks of instruction.

- **Krendl** then discussed the issue of academic restructuring. She reminded senators that she had appointed a regional campus task force last year that was facilitated by Dean Evans. She stated that all of the regional deans served as facilitators and that most of their recommendations involved communication and integration with the Athens campus. She stated that one recommendation was around establishing a regional college. She continued that in the fall she visited each of the regional campuses, at which time there was further conversation about establishing a regional college. She stated that the other major component of establishing an academic health center has been discussed for a while. She noted that the trend in recent years on campuses with colleges of medicine and college of health and human sciences is to combine them into academic health center. She stated that all of this came to the fore last winter when the president established working groups for improving efficiencies and costs. She stated that the academic restructuring group was composed of all deans. She stated that initially a handful of the deans were in this group and then all the deans joined. They prepared the white paper that has been circulated. She pointed out that these are not new ideas. This conversation began with efficiency, reducing costs, and preparing the university for the future. It is also about improving academic excellence and enhancing areas where we see major opportunities. The deans put forward the blue print that’s been shared around campus and she has just started meeting with faculty in the last few weeks. **Krendl** stated that smaller groups of faculty have met with various deans, specifically the deans of colleges where they’re going. She stated that she wanted to clarify how we came to this movement: the conversations had been going on for quite some time. She stated that outreach, university college, and the regional campuses have shared missions. The academic health center raises a number of opportunities, such as a 4-year nursing program. She stated that she wanted to make sure everyone is clear and that there are no misunderstandings.
- **Krendl** then reported on average faculty salaries and OU’s ranking for in-state comparisons. She reported that OU has moved up in the rankings. The ranking for professors’ salaries moved from sixth to third in the past year. She reported that associate professors’ salaries moved up into second place, right after OSU. The ranking for assistant professors remained at number 5, but is closing in on a couple of other schools. **Krendl** noted that when we look at all ranks, OU moved up to third. OSU is number one, and Miami is number two. **Krendl** stated that she does not yet have the national data. She stated that these numbers give us some sense of the progress we’re making especially at the full and associate professor

ranks. She said that more information will be forthcoming when she receives the national comparisons.

Questions for Krendl

- **Joe Bernt** asked about the rate of return on the dean's evaluations. He asked how this year's returns compare to last year's. **Mike Williford** replied that some colleges were higher but that the response rate was somewhat lower overall this year. **Krendl** added that one goal was to improve response rate. **Sherrie Gradin** asked about reminders sent to faculty. **Krendl** replied that some committee chairs sent reminder. She added that we could require it in the future.
- **Bernt** stated that a faculty member who has several grants found out that the university or some agency that the university is using for travel was adding \$11 fees against plane ticket reservations. When this was questioned and the faculty member announced that s/he wouldn't pay it in the future, s/he received the following email:

Your point about using Concur and our travel agency is not subject to debate. If you expect to travel on University business and be reimbursed to your expense, you must use the Concur system, our Travel Agent and the University Purchasing Card when possible. I hope you understand that your threat to violate University policy is consider to be an act of insubordination. If you choose to knowingly violate the policy, I will shut down your Purchasing card and report the violation to Human Resources.

*Sincerely,
Frank
Frank M. Corris
Chief Procurement Officer*

Bernt stated that this language from Corris is inappropriate. He asked whether this is something that should be brought to the knowledge of federal grant agencies. **Krendl** replied that she would be happy to ask Vice President of Finance and Administration Bill Decatur about it.

- **Bernt** stated that another colleague asked him to ask about the Graduate Centers for Excellence process: in this age of transparency will Cutler release all of the original ratings as well as the ratings that were appealed and the results? **Krendl** replied that she does not have them. She stated that she assumes the members of the committee have them. She stated that there has been no discussion about what to do with those numbers. **Bernt** asked whether they exist. **Pete Coschigano** stated that what he would ask is what exactly are the original ratings? He explained that what the committee did was assign individual committee members parts of the self-studies. These members than assigned preliminary ratings and then brought them to the 13-hour meeting where the full committee discussed every program. During that

meeting, the committee determined a rating for the program, which was communicated to deans, where programs did appeals. He stated that the committee then modified ratings, which were then communicated. He stated that the committee spent 4 hours dealing with those appeals. Programs have until April 20 to review the final results and to include dissenting opinions, which will be part of the final report. He stated that the reports that were generated were the ones that went to the deans and the units. **Bernt** asked whether the university is going to release the information from individual committee members. **Coschigano** replied that those numbers weren't collected. **Krendl** stated that it was a consensus process. **Coschigano** stated that he turned in a sheet that became a table that Jeff Connor talked about here in the senate. Connor told senators that there was more to the process than the preliminary numbers. He stated that the committee doesn't have anything more than that. **Krendl** suggested that Bernt's colleague talk to Ben Ogles.

- **McLaughlin** stated that, regardless of how people are purchasing, Concur is not going well. He stated that it is impeding people's ability to travel and to do research and that it is affecting academics, which needs to be addressed. He stated that he's heard about this from lots of people. **McLaughlin** stated that Decatur should get out and talk to people. **Geoff Buckley** stated that there is an extreme example in the Department of Geography, members of which traveled just as the P-Cards expired. He stated that he couldn't make heads or tails of the tutorial and still has reimbursements and travel needs, including reservations. **James Lein** asked if this is a one year program. **Krendl** replied that American Express is the temporary part. **Lein** stated that the university should tailor the concur system to address academics. He said that there needs to be a greater ability to adapt to reality. He stated that we are losing money because we can't book on some vendors that are more competitive. **Krendl** replied that she will steer this back to Bill Decatur. **Gary Coombs** stated that we can't use American Express abroad. **Krendl** replied that this issue came up immediately and that she will talk to Bill Decatur about the process. She stated that it wasn't the intention to make it more difficult.
- **Ken Brown** asked about the total figure of academic cuts. He also wanted to know the number of Group 1 faculty cuts. **Krendl** replied that she could get the figure, but that there were zero Group 1 lines cut. **Brown** replied that he has seen something very different in his college. **Krendl** stated that no dean put a Group 1 line up for the budget cut. **Coombs** asked whether that includes searches that were stopped. **Brown** stated that he means lines that were given up. **Krendl** replied that there were vacancies that were not filled, but she did not know how many were actually abolished. **Brown** responded, "Right."

II. Roll Call and Approval of the March 9, 2009 Minutes

A motion to accept the minutes from the March 9, 2009 meeting was made by Joe Slade. Norma Pecora seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by a voice vote with one abstention.

III. Chair's Report – Sergio López-Permouth

- **Norma Pecora** reported on behalf of the Nominating Committee. She thanked the other members of the committee, Tom Flynn and Willem Roenburg. She stated that Jeremy Webster has agreed to stand for secretary and that David Thomas has agreed to run again as vice chair. Since López will be leaving, we will have to elect a new chair. There are two candidates: Ken Brown and Joe McLaughlin. The election will take place at the next meeting. Each candidate will need two friends to talk about them. **Bernt** asked whether the floor will be open for nominations. **Pecora** replied that, yes, nominations can be made at the next meeting.
- **López** stated that he attended the previous Ohio Faculty Council meeting, which was held the previous Friday. He stated that the chancellor stopped by to share some news that he considered good news. He reported that some legislation is moving along about construction reform – our laws on construction are outdated and don't fit universities in particular because of the way a lot of university construction is funded. The current system has not been very flexible. He wanted senators to be aware of it. He stated that he should receive more information and that he will forward it to the faculty. The second item the Chancellor discussed was the way financial aid is distributed. The legislature is trying to revise the scheme in light of having less funds and is trying to prevent problems with the prior scheme. Currently, money could be given to students from private and public institutions alike; the legislature wants to create a parallel program for private institutions in order to free up money for public institutions. He stated that it looks like they're taking away money from 2-year colleges and giving it to 4-year institutions, but that's not what they're doing. They are distributing the money so that it is distributed more fairly among students in the same socio-economic background. The goal is for students to choose schools based on academic interests rather than money. Again, more information will be forthcoming. **López** stated that another conversation that took place at the OFC meeting was the new State Share of Instruction formula that is being developed, which is not based on the number of students who enroll but on the number of students who succeed. He stated that people had concerns about pressure to pass students; the consensus was that we have had similar pressures in the past and we have handled them. Consequently, OFC members were not too concerned about this. He stated that OFC should make some kind of statement and send to all faculty senates about standing on our principles and values.
- **Brown** made a comment about SSI based on students' performance. He stated that it's insane to say that we're only going to give you funds to teach the students who will pass and not to students who take up time and space and will not pass. He reiterated that it is "insane and perverse." He stated that the university will not be compensated at all for these students. He asked, "How should I spend my time?" He stated that there are all kinds of problems with that. **Krendl** replied that completion is just one dimension of the new formula but the thrust is to move from headcount to one about outcomes. She stated

that course completion is one part; graduation rates, internships, and other characteristics also counted. She stated that there will be more funding for STEM-based programs, but course completion is one dimension. **Coombs** replied that an F is an assessment. He suggested that maybe it should be based on grades reported, since then you're doing your job. He continued that Ken's right: it's insane. **Krendl** replied that it's more multi-dimensional than that, that the new formula is trying to help students succeed. **Williford** added that the standard will be successful completion. He stated that we're finding a lot of students who withdraw right now. He stated that's more the problem than the students who stay and fail. **Brown** stated that we're also funding students who register and don't come to class. **McLaughlin** stated that we also have mechanisms to track students who fail and withdraw; we know those numbers. **López** stated that he remembers that when he first joined the American Math Society there was a pamphlet that said calculus was a pump and not a filter. He stated that we have to make people aware that we are there not just to filter the bad students out but also to make an effort to help the weaker students make it. He stated that OU has been successful with learning communities; that is the positive way to look at this. He said that there are things that we can do to enhance the performance of students. He continued that as an institution we can do something to improve retention and success. **Brown** stated that if attendance in class were mandatory maybe we could do something, but 20% of his freshmen chemistry students do nothing. He asked, "What can I do to help them pass the course?" He continued that on any given day attendance in his class may be 50%.

- **López** presented the Resolution to Amend Faculty Handbook Language Related to the Search for the Composition of Search Committees for Executive Academic Officers for second reading and a vote. He stated that the Executive Committee had made the changes that were suggested on the floor during the last meeting. No other changes had been made. **Marty Tuck** pointed out that the "Vice Provost for Regional Higher" doesn't exist. **Tom Flynn** asked what that position is now called. **Tuck** replied that Dan Evans is the executive dean for regional higher education. **Flynn** stated that we could change it to executive dean for regional higher education. **Krendl** noted that after the restructuring it would change again and that the new title is yet to be decided. **Bernt** stated that he thought it would be possible to have a more generic reference such as an executive for regional higher education. **Krendl** pointed out that there could be title changes that would require this to be updated when it happens. **López** stated that sometimes the senate doesn't change it right away, and then 15 years later asks why something is the way it is. **Flynn** stated that it would be the responsibility of the regional faculty senators to make sure that the change takes place. **Coschigano** asked if we could make it executive deans. **Doug Bolon** asked if this is something where we need to talk about head hunter firms. He asked if there is a search firm involved for deans. He stated that the search committee seems to be less involved when there is a headhunting search firm involved, since the headhunter provides a subset of candidates that they're pushing, which is

costly and isn't always necessary. He stated that it is more work for the committee if there is no search firm, but the committee is more involved in selecting the best candidates. **Krendl** stated that once in 5 years we used it for a dean, which means we used it in 1 out of 7 dean searches. **Tuck** stated that a headhunter doesn't diminish the role of the committee, since the committee still reviews the candidates. **Bolon** replied that the identification of candidates part is key. **Tuck** replied that we still run an ad. **Bolon** stated that he has been on two search committees. On one the search firm was used, and the firm gave the committee ten candidates. **Tuck** stated that they preselected the candidates. **López** asked whether we should we have something to say about this now or keep it in mind and revise this later. **Bolon** stated that the search at the dean's level is his main concern and that, if Kathy says that's not the common practice, then it's fine. **Joe Slade** suggested adding a sentence that a committee can always overrule a search firm. **Bernt** stated that is should be clearer that the search firm is serving the interests of the search committee and not the other way around. He stated that a pattern that has developed in the last 15 years is to go with search firms. He stated that now head hunters have taken over almost all of those searches. He said that this takes away control from the committee, the public, and the faculty as well. **Conley** stated that this seems like a search committee training issue. She stated that the committee is certainly empowered to say things to the search firm. She said that we need to make sure that people on the search committee understand their role in the search in relation to the firm. She suggested that training be available so that everyone understands this. **Bernt** stated that the search firm is subservient to the committee and that the resolution should make the relationship clear. **McLaughlin** expressed his agreement with **Bernt**'s idea. He stated that the issue is that ultimately search committees are advisory to the person making the appointment and now we have a search firm that is advising him or her. Consequently, committees have become less important and the firm's voice has become more important. He agreed that we should state that the firm is advisory to the committee, which is advisory to the person making the appointment. **Pecora** suggested revised language for the resolution on this matter. **López** agreed to the revised language, combined with suggestions from **Bernt**, and added it to the resolution. (See revised resolution below.) **Flynn** asked whether the resolution could be interpreted to include deans as faculty members. **López** replied that it could not, since the handbook is clear on who has faculty status: deans don't.

- **Roosenburg** moved that the senate vote on the resolution. **Bernt** seconded the motion. The resolution passed on an unanimous voice vote.
- **López** announced that we have acquired an account with Survey Monkey and have entered the questionnaire. He has run a couple of experiments to see how it works. He encountered a few technical difficulties. He asked anyone who has used it before to send him an email. He predicted that the presidential evaluation should be ready in about a week or so.

IV. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

- **Gradin** announced that the committee has not had luck finding an outside company that matches our criteria for the deans' evaluation process. She stated that when she talked to Marty Tuck, there weren't any major snafus with the evaluation run through Institutional Research this year. She stated that people who did it liked the online nature of it, since it was quick and easy. She stated that PRC wants to stick with online as the way to go, but there is no outside company that does what we want to do. She expressed appreciation to Mike Williford for putting the evaluation together. She stated that she was not surprised that the response numbers went down, since that seems to be something that happens, especially when you do it for the first time. She also stated that she was glad that some chairs put out a reminder email. She suggested that we think about writing that into the process for the future.
- **Gradin** stated that there have been several senator and non-senators who suggested that we might want to not allow directors and chairs to serve on deans evaluation committees as this might pose conflicts of interest. For example, chairs and directors report directly to deans and might therefore have a different stake in the evaluation process, since they could be easily removed by the dean. This is especially problematic since the deans tend to know, especially in the smaller colleges, who wrote what. Those of us in the College of Arts & Sciences have not seen some of the conflicts that some of our colleagues from smaller colleges report, such as deans knowing who had responded and tracking down a chair and going after them in some way. She stated that in opposition to the idea of removing chairs and directors from the evaluation committee was the idea that it was not a very good idea to restrict chairs' roles as faculty members: they are faculty. She met with chairs and directors and they are now behind the current resolution and see it as a reasonable compromise. It allows a chair or director to wisely make that decision. The committee deleted nothing but added what is in bold. She read the bold section. She stated that the committee got some feedback on that line from regional campus people who were glad to see it. They felt that they haven't been able to say no. She stated that PRC has not talked about this yet, but she got an email today from someone who suggested that faculty from different colleges should evaluate the dean. In other words, the A&S dean would have no A&S faculty on the evaluation committee. **Bernt** asked, "Doesn't a conflict of interest either exist or not exist?" **Gradin** replied that she would say that the chairs and directors group, PRC, and members of the Executive Committee did not say that there is no conflict of interest. The question is how best to handle that conflict of interest while not completely restrict the rights of chairs and directors. **Bernt** suggested that they can be a little pregnant. **Gradin** agreed that they could, but not with twins. **Bartone** asked if this could apply only to chairs and directors. He stated that a conflict of interest could exist with anyone who might end up on the committee. **Gradin** stated that the committee could add language addressing that issue. **Bartone** stated that there was nothing wrong with the statement about chairs

and directors, but anyone could have a conflict. **Rudy Pasic** stated that this sentence could be changed, no member with a conflict of interest would be appointed. **Gradin** replied that the language could be changed. **López** suggested removing the language specifying chair or director. **Gradin** stated that she would rather add language about a faculty member. **Conley** suggested deleting the sentence. **Gradin** replied that, since we are not saying that chairs and directors cannot serve on deans' evaluations, we are saying if you are asked to do so, you should think about it carefully and that if there is a conflict you should do something about it. **Conley** asked whether this issue rises to the occasion that it needs to be explicitly stated. **Gradin** stated that the regional campus faculty say yes. **Conley** stated that information about the regional faculty helps. **Scott Titsworth** asked what happens if a faculty member points out someone else's conflict of interest. **Gradin** stated that, if I believe you have a conflict of interest, I come to you and ask you to determine what to do. **Titsworth** stated that there could also be a negative bias. **Bernt** stated that there is something about the relationship between a dean and chair or director that makes for a natural, always present conflict of interest. He agreed that there is certainly all kinds of bias potentially in every faculty member's view of his or her dean. He stated that you can't remove the conflict of interest since it's part of the job. **Gradin** stated that PRC did not feel that you could wipe out that conflict of interest; they are just trying to mitigate it. **McLaughlin** stated that we are trying to write policy for the university when we have very different cultures in different colleges. He stated that there are some colleges where chairs and directors require more approval from the dean, others where chairs are elected. He stated that he thought this is a good compromise, since it minimizes their impact by making them not the majority and not the chair of the committee. **Bartone** stated that we must be careful that the committee doesn't bias the report. He asked whether the summary of responses for each question is required in the report. **Gradin** stated that the committee gets back the summary of the data and the written comments. **Bartone** asked whether the committee is required to provide the raw data. **Tuck** stated that they are not required to do so but often they do. He stated that the provost gets the raw data. **Bartone** stated that the committee can have less bias if the raw data is provided. **Tuck** reminded senators that in a comprehensive evaluation there is more information collected. **Krendl** stated that in a comprehensive we are obligated to seek out more views. **Roosenburg** suggested requiring members of the evaluation committee to be tenured. He suggested that there is a tremendous conflict of interest for untenured faculty to serve on these committees. **Quitslund** noted that this also rules out Group 2 participation.

V. Finance and Facilities (FFC)--Joe McLaughlin

- **McLaughlin** started with a resolution that involves approving the latest recommendation concerning healthcare benefits. He reminded senators that we voted last month not to approve the Budget Planning Council's

recommendation. He stated that later that week the president came out with a different recommendation. The handbook requires us to approve the changes. That is the first part of the resolution. He stated that there is confusion on the part of some people on what the handbook actually says on this issue. The second part of the resolution attempts to clarify that and make it less ambiguous. **McLaughlin** read the section from the handbook: “The total contributions of all employees will be limited to 10% (or less) of the medical monthly dollar factor on an annual basis (the medical monthly dollar factor includes medical costs, prescription costs, and various administrative fees). Any changes to the employee contribution rates must be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval each year.” He stated that one of the things that’s happened over time is that misinterpretation about whether “premiums” and “total compensation rates” are interchangeable or referring to different things. He said that part of the president’s proposal is that total contributions are the same as premium payments. Employees would only contribute 10% of total health costs. **McLaughlin** referred to the former resolution from January 2005 and read part of the resolution. He stated that the previous resolution would have locked us in at that 17% rate. It also called on the university to use outside consultants. With that resolution, if contributions exceeded 17%, the administration would come back to the faculty. At the next meeting, the president announced that we would use outside consultants, give back surpluses, and not change benefits for the next couple of years. This discussion died out as a result. **McLaughlin** stated that F&F is trying to get that conversation open again and to clarify what we mean. He read the language in the new resolution (see below). He stated that we are now at 9.85% . He said that the president did not recommend any premium increases. He stated that we are actually at 23% of total contributions according to Greg Fialko. This resolution would approve the president’s recommendation which would take us to 21 or 22%. The F&F committee was fearful that the language was still open to some misinterpretation and therefore created this formula that spells out what we’re saying about total employee contributions. Thus, the first part is on the president’s recommendation and the second part is what we believe would need to be done to the handbook if those changes go into effect. He stated that, if this resolution were to fail, we still believe the handbook needs to be clarified. **Ken Brown** asked about McLaughlin’s use of the phrase “the president’s recommendations.” He stated that he was confused about this language, since the decision had to be communicated to Anthem on March 15. **McLaughlin** replied that it was. **Brown** then objected to putting a stamp of approval on what is a violation of the handbook. **McLaughlin** replied that the handbook says we have to approve changes. **Brown** responded that this is not a recommendation but something that has already been done. He asked why the senate would approve a change that is a violation of the handbook. **McLaughlin** explained that the committee thought the change that was made could be undone and that we could go back to where we were before. He further stated that the handbook says the senate needs to approve any changes. Thus, we need to vote on whether or not to approve that. **Brown**

suggested that we change the language in the handbook to say that changes need to be approved by senate before the decision is made. **Jeff Giese** stated that it already says that. **Brown** asked why do this then. **Giese** replied that it's because people aren't doing what it says. **Gary Coombs** suggested we change to "approved by the senate" instead of "presented to the senate." **Brown** agreed. **Geoff Buckley** stated that the senate needs to think carefully about the precedent this resolution sets. **McLaughlin** queried whether he meant approving something after the changes have been made. **Buckley** asked whether down the road this sets a precedent for next time. He said that he was nervous about the precedent that we set. **Bernt** stated that the more he listens to this conversation, the more he realizes that the president has acted as the decider and has submitted a package to Anthem (or his people have) and now we're trying to approve something that we really don't have control over. **McLaughlin** said that the way he was thinking about this is that, if we turn down a recommendation and another recommendation was made, we believe the handbook says we have the right to vote on this second recommendation and approve it or not. He stated that, if we don't vote on it, we're giving this right over to someone else. **Brown** stated that the president has instituted, not recommended, a package. **McLaughlin** stated that he thought that all of our discussion in the senate has been about this body having the responsibility and authority to approve changes in our benefits package. He maintained that putting the word "decision" in the resolution would cede that authority. **Brown** stated that what it says now is factually incorrect—it's already been enacted. He stated that, if we want to vote on a resolution that approves that move, we could do that, but he didn't see how we can vote on something that says something has been recommended. **Glenn Matlack** stated that he agreed with Ken: we don't have the possibility of disapproval and we're just playing catch up. He stated that the resolution needs explicit language about having to be passed by the senate before a decision is made. **Joe Slade** stated that we know the administration is going to screw us and we have the power to do something about it. **Chuck Naccarato** suggested changing the recommendation in the title to "changes to increase employee health care cost sharing." **Roosenburg** suggested adding "prior to faculty senate approval." **Coombs** said that the two parts of the resolution are at cross purposes. **Naccarato** stated that, if we vote it down, we've registered our disapproval and thus still meets the requirement of the handbook. **McLaughlin** stated that BPC made a recommendation. Faculty Senate said "no" unanimously. The president has made a decision and now the issue is does the Faculty Senate have some kind of role. He asked how a non-response would be read. **Brown** replied that it would be seen as recognition of the truth that we have no power over this. **McLaughlin** stated that some people saw what the president had done as a compromise. This body needs to go on record to say whether or not it is a compromise or if it's not acceptable. He stated that a non-vote or lack of action could be interpreted as Faculty Senate giving its approval to the compromise. **Elizabeth Sayrs** stated that it is more dangerous than approving the compromise. She stated that the president said his recommendation was

presented for approval but we don't have to approve it. **McLaughlin** stated that was his hesitation to change the language. **Ken Collins** said that perhaps Ken Brown's censure resolution is another response. **Brown** agreed that the other possible response is a motion to censure. **McLaughlin** agreed but stated that what this resolution is trying to solicit is where we stand as a body. He said that he heard from people who saw what the president did and said it was unacceptable and others who said it was an attempt at compromise. He said that what F&F is trying to do here is go through some deliberative process and potentially have a vote to see where this body stands. **Bernt** stated that in reality the president wasn't putting together a compromise and wasn't even looking at the various bodies' views of how to alter healthcare benefits and the costs thereof; he was trying to institute by his decision an interpretation of the handbook language that was beneficial to the administration's interpretation of the handbook for the future. The president said nothing about premium increases and still gets as much revenue out of the pockets of employees as possible. **Bernt** called this an "ingenious" reaction to the circumstances. **Quitlund** stated that her largest concern is with the reading of the handbook language and changing the handbook language which could be interpreted as conceding what it now says. She asked whether we could deal with that with another whereas, a long one, outlining the history of negotiations with then President Glidden and then say this is what we meant to say the first time. **McLaughlin** replied that it would involve deleting the second be it resolved and defers the discussion of changing the handbook language. **Quitlund** stated that, if we vote yes, we're voting against what the handbook says. **Brown** said that, should this resolution pass, a change in the handbook would be required anyway. He stated that we should refer to the original intent of the language. **McLaughlin** stated that we could go back and work on this resolution in committee, which would mean deferring until May a vote on the decision/recommendation that was made. **Pasic** asked about the 2.4% increase and why the president institutes \$2.1M increase. **McLaughlin** said that's the question we're asking; the answer we get is that our healthcare package is more generous than the market research shows nationally and possibly in the state. This is a way to save the university money by putting us more in line with peer data, a way to save university money that it can use for other things. **Bernt** added, "Like the athletics." **Conley** asked if we have the comparable numbers to the 17% in 2005. She asked whether we have kept up with those. **McLaughlin** replied that last year was 18.44% and that this year is 18.72% . According to Greg Fialko, next year the president's plan brings us to 21.08%, but it could be between 21 and 22% based on projections. **Conley** stated that this number does map to the 23% that we have in the resolution. She stated that the second resolution would have kept this year in place.

- **McLaughlin** then presented another resolution for a first reading that involves the early retirement benefit. He stated that this resolution changes the handbook to include people who are in the Alternative Retirement Plan in the Early Retirement Incentive Plan. He reminded senators that OU does not give health benefits to faculty in State Teachers Retirement System; those benefits

come from STRS. He stated that this resolution doesn't change the health care issue for people in the ARP. He reported that a chairs and directors meeting today suggested to Human Resources that the university look for some sort of supplemental plan. **Naccarato** stated that people might misunderstand the health benefits issue: STRS makes it available to you, but you have to purchase it. **McLaughlin** stated that what he was trying to address here is that people in ARP sometimes think that the university is picking up health care for people in STRS. **Bernt** asked why faculty members choose the ARP over STRS when they arrive here. He stated that he assumed it was about portability, but wonders how they ever going to retire if they are going to portable themselves out. **McLaughlin** stated that in his case his wife did not have a job here and demographic data suggested that most people are not in the same job as when they start. He stated that it was nuts to opt for something that he couldn't take with him if he should leave OU. **Bernt** stated that there is a national effort to push people out of defined benefits programs like STRS and suggested that portability should be put up against what is lost. He thinks that STRS is too glibly overlooked when employees are presented with the ARP. **McLaughlin** replied that we've talked about the need to do a better job of educating faculty members when they come to the university. He stated that's not the moment when people should be making the decision. He suggested that perhaps F&F could run an orientation for new faculty about the pros and cons of each system. **Tuck** stated that HR is starting to do that in a separate orientation about retirement benefits packages. **McLaughlin** said that's good, but it is something faculty should be involved in. Flynn stated that this resolution seems sensible and worth doing and suggested that the senate consider suspending the rules and voting on this. **Bernt** stated that he had nothing against doing that. **McLaughlin**, however, stated that he would rather not do that because it was something F&F very quickly decided it wanted to take care of before the end of the year. Consequently, he and Marty haven't talked about it and wants to make sure everything is thought through.

VI. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—**Scott Titsworth**

- **Titsworth** stated that he had three resolutions for second reading and vote.
- **Titsworth** stated that the first resolution is about credit hours and meeting times for semester courses. He stated that the conversation on this resolution had focused on whether it would preclude colleges from doing something else. The committee spent a lot of time talking about this and left it so that as long as there's a pedagogical justification it's allowed. EPSA set a base-line standard across the university. **Quitslund** stated that she is concerned that a pedagogical reason might be like health exceptions and therefore be meaningless. She stated that one of the reasons for creating the norm is about resource use that would have consequences for other units. **Titsworth** replied that he understands the scheduling challenges and resource use issues. The committee thought that "pedagogical justifications" should primarily focus on learning objectives of a specific class. **Allyn Reilly** stated that we have to

recognize that many disciplines use models that are very different from the standard models. **Flynn** asked about regional campuses having a different schedule and wanted **Titsworth** to add language for regional campuses.

Titsworth stated that the resolution is meant only for the Athens campus.

Flynn stated that this needs to be explicit in the resolution. **Giesey** stated that EPSA looked at regional campus differences as true under this resolution and stated that he thought the senate did not a need to add that language. **Flynn** responded that the regional campuses don't exist if they're not mentioned in the resolution. **Slade** asked what curricular component neutrality means.

Titsworth said that he would come back to that in a minute. **Patrick Munhall** pointed the out the resolution's ambiguity if regional campuses are not explicitly mentioned. **Titsworth**, **Coombs**, and **Pecora** discussed the implications of not including the regional campuses in the resolution. **Giesey** suggested that we add language for the regional campuses and then read the suggested new language. **Bernt** stated that he questions whether there are commuting students on the **Athens** campus. **Flynn** stated that 100% of regional campus students are commuters. (See below for the revised resolution.)

- **Slade** asked again what curricular component neutrality means. **Giesey** stated that its comes from Q2STT constraints and principles document. He stated that, for example, courses you're taking in your major would be one component; courses outside the major might be another component. **Titsworth** noted that unless we're able to deviate from the norm it would change the neutral transition from quarters to semesters. **Slade** asked how that would affect General Education. **Titsworth** replied that any time you would deviate from the ideal pattern, it would create difficulties, including in Gen Ed. He asked **Brown** about chemistry. **Brown** stated that our students wouldn't be able to complete the major because of year-long sequences without these exceptions. **McLaughlin** stated that he's afraid that this resolution doesn't really do anything: it says there's a standard but then says that deviation can happen. He noted that it doesn't point to who will be the authority on deciding it. He stated that some unnamed authority would be able to point to a standard or deviation based on some arbitrary decision. **Slade** stated that you have to define the deviance. **McLaughlin** replied that it's not clear if that's a dean or someone else. **Giesey** noted that it's UCC who would make these decisions. **Titsworth** stated that the way **Giesey** has led discussion on this topic EPSA would set the standard and then UCC would implement the decision. **Giesey** stated that this norm would also carry weight with deans in the approval process. They would not allow a deviation from the 3-credit class without the pedagogical reasons. **McLaughlin** stated that there is a lot of room for a lot of inconsistency. **Titsworth** asked is there is a way to resolve that. **McLaughlin** said there was not. **Bernt** stated that we should allow 3- or 4- or 5-hour courses depending on the needs of the discipline. **Matlack** stated that he wasn't sure why this is a resolution before the Faculty Senate. **Titsworth** replied that we want to maintain faculty control over this process. **Matlack** stated that not all policies need to go through us. **Bernt** replied that

it's the job of faculty to control the curriculum. **David Thomas** said that it is important that the faculty remain in control of the curriculum; it is a policy, a guideline statement adjudicated in UCC. **Bernt** stated that it comes down to verbs like "enforce." He asked, "How do you enforce guidelines?" He stated that the language here says we have guidelines but for pedagogical reasons we could have a range of courses. **Giese** replied that's the reason for including UCC. **Quitslund** stated that the convenience of instructors is not allowed for deviating from the norm nor is not wanting to teach on Fridays. **Slade** stated that as someone who's taught for many years on semesters he would be a lot happier if it were specified who would be making the decision and that exceptions would be rare. He noted that when people start putting forward 5 and 6 hour classes it guarantees that students take longer to graduate since they can't mesh their schedules. He stated that it has to be controlled very carefully because of the ripple effect across colleges. **Brown** stated that he doesn't see the difference between scheduling problems and classes that need to meet certain hours. He stated that the problem of meshing schedules is going to be there regardless of what we do. He stated that we can do it now because we've been working on it for 30 years: it's a very elaborate mechanism that gets thrown to the wolves in a change like this. **Reilly** stated that his school has a whole lot of courses that vary from the norm. His school couldn't operate if there were restrictive language insisting on 3 credit hours. He said that there must be flexibility in this language. The measure was approved by a show of hands. Twenty-two senators voted for the resolution. Five voted against it. There were two abstentions.

- **Titsworth** then presented the second resolution on the minimum number of hours to graduate. He stated that EPSA wanted to propose eliminating the graduate-related portion of the resolution and keep it at the undergraduate level. **Pecora** suggested putting "Undergraduate" in the title. **Titsworth** agreed to do so. **Roosenburg** asked about students starting this year. **Titsworth** replied that their hours would be up to transition coordinators to decide. He stated that the Q2S coordinators will be devising strategies for transition students. **Roosenburg** asked whether the resolution's minimum hours wouldn't start until after transition. **Giese** stated that was right. **Titsworth** clarified that there would be graduated credit hours while we move from quarters to semesters. **Bernt** reminded senators that students can choose to graduate under a later catalog than the one they enter under. **Brown** stated that we can do that like transfer students. **Bernt** stated that people coming in under 128 hours will be choosing a 120-hour model. **Leon Hoshower**, however, stated that students couldn't really do that. **Giese** stated that in essence transition students will have an individualized study plan of what they need to do to graduate that will be negotiated and figured out with the students student by student. **Quitslund** stated that this resolution is just about students under semesters. **Titsworth** stated that we have to know the beginning point on quarters and the end point under semesters to figure out the transition between the two. **Coombs** stated that a later catalog would only apply if the

unit of the degree chose to go with a 120 minimum rather than a 128 minimum. The resolution was passed on a unanimous voice vote.

- **Titsworth** then presented the third resolution on General Education. **Roosenburg** stated that the sciences are really hard pushed without a bigger reduction in Gen Ed. **Bernt** asked that, if we're dealing with neutrality, why aren't we dealing with neutrality? **Titsworth** stated that in terms of credit hours it's not neutral but it is neutral in the kind of classes you need to take. **Munhall** stated that a colleague in an associate degree program is concerned about line 27 and whether associate degrees will have these requirements. **Titsworth** asked how it works now. **Munhall** stated that they're not the same Gen Ed requirements. Associate degree students don't take the same breadth of knowledge requirement. He offered a friendly amendment to indicate something about associate or bachelor's degrees. **Giesey** stated that this resolution is assuming bachelor's degrees. **Titsworth** made the change in lines 27-28 "seeking bachelor's degree." **Giesey** stated that the Faculty Handbook says that Faculty Senate is primarily responsible for the curriculum. He said that the option of doing what we're doing now for Gen Ed is not going to work under semesters. He stated that working on this isn't making everybody happy but he is trying to maintain a conversion and protect all of the departments. This is the best we can come up with after 5 months of discussion. **Titsworth** stated that it seems to him that we have to have some place to start from. This resolution gives us two years to look at general education and talk about it but we need something in place for units to plan for majors, etc. He reminded senators that we can change it later with greater deliberation. He said that this current plan may not be perfect, but we need something now. The resolution passed on a voice vote with two opposing votes.
- **Titsworth** then presented the last resolution, which deals with a rule in the undergrad catalog that states that students cannot repeat a course to improve a grade if they have taken a course for which that course is a prerequisite. This resolution cleans up a mismatch between some practices and the catalog. He stated that when the rule was written prerequisites were used differently. The resolution says that we should get rid of that rule, but departments can handle it on their own if they want. **Matlack** asked why not say you can't go back to improve your GPA. **Titsworth** noted that not every prerequisite is a true sequence. **Matlack** stated that prerequisites shouldn't be used for that purpose. **Titsworth** rhetorically asked whether students be able to go back and take a previous course. **Matlack** responded that he doesn't understand why the rule is there. **Reilly** pointed out a typo in line 26.

At this point in the meeting, a senator asked whether the senate still had a quorum. David Thomas read the rules on a quorum from Sturges, which states that no business can be conducted without a quorum. Thomas and Webster determined that a quorum, which consists of 26 senators, was no longer present. According to the rules, the senate was then in adjournment. The time was 10:22 PM.

**Resolution to Clarify Faculty Handbook Language
Related to the Composition of Search Committees for Executive Academic Officers**

April 13, 2009

Passed by the Senate

Whereas language in the *Faculty Handbook* concerning the composition of search committees for executive academic officers is unclear and thus open to conflicting interpretation, and

Whereas this imprecise language may result in unnecessary conflict among various constituencies at Ohio University, and

Whereas such conflict may affect the success of any search for an academic executive officer at Ohio University,

Be it resolved that the language in the *Faculty Handbook* Section VII.E must be clarified by replacing

This policy provides for the appointment and evaluation of the major administrative officers of the University, including the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education, Deans, and the Director of the Center for International Studies. It outlines regularized procedures for the search, appointment, evaluation, reappointment, and termination of these officers.

Search

1. A search committee will be established by the person responsible for making the appointment to assist in the identification, evaluation, and recommendation of highly qualified candidates.
 - a. The committee should be small enough to work effectively but large enough to accomplish its task. (A reasonable range is six to fourteen.)
 - b. In case of an academic appointment, the chairperson of the committee will be a faculty member.
 - c. The committee should include representatives of the major constituencies of the position. The search committee for a dean will include faculty, students, and a dean. Half of the faculty will be elected by the Group I faculty members of the academic unit involved. The Provost will appoint the other half from the faculty of the college or unit after consultation with the department or school chairpersons.
 - d. The search committee for a President is appointed by the Board of Trustees and works under the guidance of the Board. The committee will include representatives from the major constituencies of the University.

with

This policy provides for the appointment and evaluation of the major administrative officers of the University, including the President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education, Deans, and the Director of the Center for International Studies. It outlines regularized procedures for the search, appointment, evaluation, reappointment, and termination of these officers.

Search

1. A search committee will be established by the person responsible for making the appointment to assist in the identification, evaluation, and recommendation of highly qualified candidates. The committee should include representatives of the major constituencies of the position. The search committee for a President is appointed by the Board of Trustees and works under the guidance of the Board. The committee will include representatives from the major constituencies of the University.
 - a. The committee should be small enough to work effectively but large enough to accomplish its task. (A reasonable range is six to fourteen.) The search committee will be reminded that if a search firm is used, the role of the search firm is only advisory to the committee.
 - b. In case of an appointment in which the academic executive officer to be appointed is expected to acquire faculty rank—such as in the case of Provost, Deans and some Vice Presidents and Associate Provosts— the chairperson and a majority of the members of the search committee will be faculty members, i.e. individuals who have faculty status.
 - c. The search committee for a dean will include faculty, students, and a dean.
 - d. Half of the faculty involved with a Dean search will be elected by the Group I faculty members of the academic unit involved. The Provost will appoint the other half from the faculty of the college or unit after consultation with the department or school chairpersons.
-

Resolution to Restrict Number of Department Chairs and School Directors on Dean Evaluation Committees
Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate
Draft—first reading
April 13, 2009

Whereas Department Chairs and School Directors have faculty status and are encouraged to serve in many roles as faculty within the university (including faculty senate);
Whereas serving on a Dean's Evaluation Committee as a Department Chair or School Director can create a real or a perceived conflict of interest;

Be it resolved that the following (bold text) be added to Section VII. E. 9
In the case of academic deans [2], a committee of 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. **No more than one Department Chair or School Director will serve on a committee. No Department Chair or School Director will serve as chair of a committee. Before accepting an appointment to serve on a committee, a Chair or Director must carefully consider whether a perceived or real conflict of interest exists to such an extent that it would be problematic.** Each evaluation committee shall have access to previous annual and comprehensive

evaluations of the dean being evaluated. Group I faculty in each college or area will participate in the evaluation of their dean by means of a questionnaire that contains both standard questions and questions specifically relevant to the academic unit of the dean. This questionnaire must be entirely anonymous, with no demographic data collected and no tracking of individual responses to different questions (such as respondent 12 answered X to question 1 and Y to question 2). 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.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO INCREASE
EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE COSTS**

Finance and Facilities Committee

April 13, 2009

First Reading

Whereas the University is projecting a 2.4% increase (\$863,901) in budgeted health care costs for next year (FY10), and

Whereas President McDavis has instituted a package of increased total employee contributions on health benefits prior to Faculty Senate approval, that includes cost increases for employees, for FY10 totaling \$2.1 million (see Appendix A), and

Whereas the Faculty Handbook requires that changes in employee contributions be approved by Faculty Senate,

BE IT RESOLVED that Faculty Senate approves the changes recommended by the President (Appendix A), and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Handbook (III.A), which now reads

“The University provides two health plan options for Faculty. Premium payments under this plan are partially or totally made by the University with the understanding that increases in the premium are considered as part of the annual discussion concerning faculty compensation increases. The total contributions of all employees will be limited to 10% (or less) of the medical monthly dollar factor on an annual basis (the medical monthly dollar factor includes medical costs, prescription costs, and various administrative fees). Any changes to the employee contribution rates must be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval each year,”

be revised to read as follows:

“The University provides a health benefits plan for Faculty. Premium payments under this plan are partially or totally made by the University with the understanding that increases in the premium **and employee out-of-pocket costs** are considered as part of the annual discussion concerning faculty compensation increases. **Premium payments by employees will not exceed 10% of the University’s total health care budget. Out-of-pocket costs include co-insurance, co-pays, deductibles, and any other health benefit costs that are paid by employees. Total employee contributions are defined as the sum of employee health care premiums plus employee out-of-pocket costs. Total employee contributions will be limited to 23% (or less) of the sum of the University’s total health care budget plus total employee out-of-pocket costs. The following equation expresses the preceding:**

$$A / (A + C) < \text{or} = 10\%$$

And

$$(A+B) / (A +B+C) < \text{or} = 23\%,$$

Where,

A = Employee health care premiums

B = Employee out-of-pocket costs, and

C = University’s funding of the health benefits budget.

Any changes to **total employee contributions** must be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval each year.”

RESOLUTION TO CLARIFY HANDBOOK LANGUAGE ON EMPLOYEE HEALTH BENEFITS CONTRIBUTIONS

Finance and Facilities Committee

April 13, 2009

First Reading

Whereas the Faculty Handbook requires changes in employee benefits contributions to be approved by Faculty Senate each year, and

Whereas the current Handbook language uses a number of terms (“premium,” “total contributions,” and “contribution rates”) that have been open to misinterpretation,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Handbook (III.A), which now reads

“The University provides two health plan options for Faculty. Premium payments under this plan are partially or totally made by the University with the understanding that

increases in the premium are considered as part of the annual discussion concerning faculty compensation increases. The total contributions of all employees will be limited to 10% (or less) of the medical monthly dollar factor on an annual basis (the medical monthly dollar factor includes medical costs, prescription costs, and various administrative fees). Any changes to the employee contribution rates must be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval each year.”

be revised to read as follows:

“The University provides a health benefits plan for Faculty. Premium payments under this plan are partially or totally made by the University with the understanding that increases in the premium **and employee out-of-pocket costs** are considered as part of the annual discussion concerning faculty compensation increases. **Premium payments by employees will not exceed 10% of the University’s total health care budget. Out-of-pocket costs include co-insurance, co-pays, deductibles, and any other health benefit costs that are paid by employees. Total employee contributions are defined as the sum of employee health care premiums plus employee out-of-pocket costs. Total employee contributions will be limited to 20% (or less) of the sum of the University’s total health care budget plus total employee out-of-pocket costs. The following equation expresses the preceding:**

$$A / (A + C) < \text{or} = 10\%$$

And

$$(A+B) / (A +B+C) < \text{or} = 20\%,$$

Where,

A = Employee health care premiums

B = Employee out-of-pocket costs, and

C = University’s funding of the health benefits budget.

Any changes to **total employee contributions** must be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval each year.”

RESOLUTION TO EXTEND EARLY RETIREMENT BENEFIT TO ALL TENURED FACULTY

Finance and Facilities Committee
April 13, 2009
First Reading

Whereas the Faculty Handbook defines eligibility for the Early Retirement benefit for Group I faculty in terms of one's eligibility "for retirement under the STRS" (Section III.R "Early Retirement Policy); and

Whereas Ohio University has had an Alternative Retirement Plan (ARP) in place for faculty for the last decade, in which approximately 30% of our faculty are now enrolled;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends extending the Early Retirement option to all Group I by amending the Faculty Handbook as follows:

Current Language (Section III.R.1)

1. General: "A tenured faculty member eligible for retirement under the STRS and wishing to continue to teach part-time may elect to do so under the early retirement policy."

Proposed Language (Section III.R.1)

1. General: "A tenured faculty member eligible for retirement under the STRS and wishing to continue to teach part time may elect to do so under the early retirement policy. **Those faculty enrolled in the Alternative Retirement Plan (ARP) will be eligible for the same Early Retirement benefit if they meet the same eligibility requirements as those enrolled in STRS.**"

Resolution Specifying the Minimum Number of Hours to Graduate after the Transition from Quarters to Semesters for Undergraduate Students

Whereas in October 2008 the Ohio University Board of Trustees in response to the suggestion from the Ohio Chancellor approve transition of the University from quarters to semesters for 2012-2013 academic year.

Whereas the current general education requirements are expressed in part in terms of quarter hours and will no longer be applicable after the transition to semesters in Fall 2012.

Whereas, as pointed out by the Academic Calendar and System Committee, under a semester system with a majority of the course being 3 semester hours, a student would need to average more than five courses per semester in order to graduate in four years if the current minimum number of hours to graduate with a bachelor's degree (192 quarter hours) is simply multiplied by 2/3 to determine new requirement (128 semester hours).

Whereas 120 semester hours in a four year bachelor's program could be satisfied by taking five 3-hour courses each semester.

Be it resolved that the minimum number of semester hours to graduate with a bachelor's degree be 120 semester hours from Fall 2012.

Be it resolved that the minimum number of semester hours to graduate with a associate's degree be 60 semester hours from Fall 2012.

Be it further resolved that the registrar develop and insert language into the appropriate catalogs that implements this resolution.

Resolution on the Number of Semester Hours per Undergraduate Course and Undergraduate Course Meeting Times for the Transition from Quarters to Semesters

Whereas, in October 2008 the Ohio University Board of Trustees, in response to the suggestion from the Ohio Chancellor, approved the transition of the University from quarters to semesters for 2012-2013 academic year; and

Whereas, most undergraduate courses at semester schools are 3 credit hours; and

Whereas, a standardized 3 hours of lecture per course would facilitate a uniform scheduling system and would allow for more efficient use of classroom space; and

Whereas, a normative course credit helps students (and their advisors) develop schedules involving a standard number of courses each term; therefore

Be it resolved that, as a norm, undergraduate lecture courses shall be 3 semester hours.

Be it further resolved that, as a norm, the three hours of lecture will be scheduled for one hour on Monday, Wednesday and Friday or one and one half hours on Tuesday and Thursday during prime course offering times on the Athens Campus.

Be it further resolved that the regional campuses will create a scheduling system addressing the credit hour obligations and the specific academic needs of their constituents.

Be it further resolved that exceptions to these norms will be allowed on the basis of pedagogical justification specific to a course or course sequence. Such justifications may include, but are not limited to, reference to disciplinary standards for such a course, or the ability for students to take subsequent courses in a timely fashion while maintaining curricular component neutrality in the transition.

Be it further resolved that the University Curriculum Council develop and enforce guidelines to implement this resolution.

Resolution on the Transition of General Education Requirements from Quarters to Semesters

Whereas, in October 2008 the Ohio University Board of Trustees, in response to the suggestion from the Ohio Chancellor, approved the transition of the University from quarters to semesters for 2012-2013 academic year; and

Whereas, the current general education requirements are expressed, in part, in terms of quarter hours and will no longer be applicable after the transition to semesters in Fall 2012; and

Whereas, in 2006, EPSA conducted a review of the General Education Requirements based on administrative issues and the practice of our peer institutions. The result of this review was the revision of the General Education Requirements instituted in Fall 2008-2009; and

Whereas, in 2007, the General Education Outcomes Committee proposed a set of outcomes for general education and a taskforce is just beginning the process of assessing student performance on those outcomes; and

Whereas the quarters to semesters transition time line calls for departments to begin the development of their new programs by Spring 2009; therefore

Be it resolved that there be no substantive changes in the general education requirements in the transition from quarters to semesters.

Be it further resolved that the general education requirements for all students seeking Bachelor degrees entering Fall 2012 and later will be:

One course approved as fulfilling the Tier I quantitative skills requirement (1M) or placement level PL3.

One approved first-year composition course (1E) and one approved advanced junior-level composition course (1J).

A total of 21 credit hours from the approved lists of courses in the following six distribution areas:

- Applied Science and Mathematics (2AS)
- Cross-Cultural Perspectives (2CP)
- Fine Arts (2FA)

- Humanities and Literature (2HL)
- Natural Sciences (2NS)
- Social Sciences (2SS)

No more than 8 of the 21 hours can be from courses from the same department/school. At least two credit hours must be taken in each of the six areas and no more than two of the required six areas may be satisfied with courses from the same department/school.

No more than two approved Tier II courses in the student's major department/school or area of concentration (for B.S.S. students) can be used toward partial fulfillment of the Tier II requirement.

Complete at least 3 hours in Tier III or Tier III-equivalent course(s).
At least 2 of the 3 hours must be taken at senior rank (90 hours).

Be it further resolved that programs offering courses intended to fulfill general education requirements under semesters, develop those courses such that the proportion of student's programs devoted to general education requirements (in terms of courses and credit hour) is not significantly changed.

Be it further resolved that the University Curriculum Council develop and enforce guidelines to implement this resolution.
