MEETING AGENDA

I. Interim President David Descutner
   ❖ Topic 1: Thank You. Descutner thanked Senators who were ending and beginning new terms for their service. Faculty Senators are important to discussions and discourse across a variety of topics on campus. Senators add value to the operations of the University. Descutner also noted that his time serving on Faculty Senate meant a great deal to him in his career. He encouraged Senators to encourage their colleagues to get involved.
   ❖ Topic 2: Duane Nellis Visit. Descutner shared information about a recent campus visit by OHIO’s incoming President Duane Nellis. Nellis sends his regards to all faculty. During his campus visit, Nellis met with Deans and some distinguished professors; he intends to continue to meet with
individuals groups throughout the summer. Descutner shared that Nellis is enthusiastic about learning more about OHIO and encourages everyone to be honest in sharing opinions.

- **Topic 3: Distinguished Visitors.** Descutner said that his tenure as Interim President has been immensely rewarding. He has had several opportunities to meet several distinguished visitors to OHIO’s campus. Examples included Dr. Arkady Ostrovsky, who provided the keynote address for OHIO’s 2017 Baker Peace Conference, Vanda Shiva, and Wesley Lowrey.

- **Topic 4: Promotion and Tenure Review.** Descutner stated that he has recently reviewed 55 Promotion and Tenure packets. These packets provide examples of the accomplishments of OHIO faculty including exceptional teaching, impactful scholarship & creative works, and outstanding service records. Achievements spanned across applications for both Group 1 and Group 2 faculty. Descutner also noted that he has been able to speak with faculty who recently completed a Faculty Fellowship Leave; these faculty expressed enthusiasm for what they accomplished and how they can add value to the OHIO community.

- **Topic 5: Engagement Opportunities.** Descutner encouraged all faculty to attend upcoming events including the Spring Literary Festival, the International Film Festival, and the Student Research and Creative Activity Expo.

**Questions and Discussions**
- A senator asked for an update about the content of the brochure (discussed at the previous Faculty Senate meeting) that was intended to provide the guidelines for protest. Specifically, did the recent court rulings change the contents of the brochure? Descutner stated that the rulings did not change the brochure. The Joint Police Advisory Council and Center for Student Legal Services tried to work together to create the contents of brochure. However, the two groups could not reach an agreement about the contents. As such, there will be two brochures created – one from each group.

**II. John Day, Associate Provost for Academic Budget & Planning—Budget Process Update**

- **Topic: Budget Process Update.** Day provided an update about the University’s budget process. The presentation included information about the pre-RCM budget process, the budget process under RCM, and an approximate timeline for the budget process.
  - Please refer to Appendix A for a copy of the presentation information.

**Questions and Discussions**
- A senator asked how this budget process makes OHIO more efficient. Day said that the process is more work and ongoing throughout the year, so it is not more efficient in that sense. However, the process does help units prioritize their budget, account for spending, and understand trade-offs. Deans are also more involved in this process and have more information to make decisions.
- With reference to asking units to prepare budget cut proposals, a senator asked if units’ efficiency is considered when reviewing budget cut proposals. Day said that all responsibility centers – both academic and administration – participate in the exercise asking them to identify potential cuts. Budget cut proposals are then reviewed centrally. Central administration assesses the efficiency of units; units who are efficient and central to the University are less likely to have budget cuts.
- A senator asked why financial aid is increasing if tuition flat. Day explained that this is a function of the OHIO Guarantee. This will continue for the next two years.
- A senator asked for a brief explanation of the Century Bond. Day explained that the Century Bond is a debt instrument that allows the University to pay back the principle in 100 years.
• A senator asked for clarification about the 1.3% note associated with the Ohio Guarantee (as a Revenue Source). What does this mean? Day explained that the note refers to the fact that tuition for the next cohort will increase by 1.3% from the previous cohort.

• A senator asked about the previous four iterations of the RCM. Is this iteration the most constrained? Day said that there is always a gap between revenue and expenses. In previous budgets, there has been allocations associated with the Century Bond and the Faculty Compensation Plan. However, due to changes such as an increase in healthcare costs and the State’s adjustment to SSI, this is more constrained than previous years. Some of these are likely to continue in years to come.

• A senator asked about the total budget. Day said it was approximately $700M depending upon what is included/excluded.

• A senator asked how much money would be saved by rolling back RCM and doing it the previous way. He argues that he has not seen the benefits as claimed. Is there talk about going back to the way it was done previously? Day noted that it is difficult to term the saving from RCM but there has not been a discussion about not doing RCM. RCM allows units to have more information and incentivizes units to develop potential revenue sources and to make choices about spending allocations. Units claim that they prefer the knowledge offered through the RCM budget process.

• A senator asked if this information is for Athens campus only. Day said that the information reflects Athens campus only. RHE budget is different than Athens campus for a variety reasons (e.g., not offering the OHIO Guarantee).

III. Greg Robertson, AVP for Architecture, Design, and Construction—Summer Construction Projects Update

❖ Topic: Summer Construction Projects Update. Robertson provided an update about the University’s planned summer construction projects. The presentation included an explanation about the goals of the presentation; information about construction projects in the West Green, South Central, North Central, Southeast, and Northeast.

• Please refer to Appendix B for a copy of the presentation.

Questions and Discussions

• Senator Balbo asked if the information is available online. Senior Associate Vice President for Finance & Administration Joe Lalley noted that some information is available through the OHIO Board of Trustees website. The presentation provided would also be made available in the Faculty Senate meeting summary and Faculty Senate meeting minutes.

IV. Roll Call and Approval of the March 13, 2017 Minutes

❖ Roll call (K. Hartman)

❖ Minutes were approved by a voice vote.

V. Chair’s Report (Joe McLaughlin)

❖ Topic 1: Updates and Announcements

• Visits to Regional Higher Education (RHE) campuses. McLaughlin shared that he has recently visited some RHE campuses and intends to visit more soon. During the visits, a couple topics have been mentioned that are related to Faculty Senate. First, faculty have asked Faculty Senate to consider the possibility of using technology to live broadcast Faculty Senate meetings. This would allow RHE Senators and faculty to attend and participate remotely. McLaughlin is
investigating this possibility. Second, there have been discussions about enrollments and financials on RHE campuses – especially with respect to issues such as state funding for College Credit Plus programs. McLaughlin noted that there may be a presentation about RHE to the entire Faculty Senate at the next meeting and explained that it is important for all faculty to beware of the challenges and changes facing RHE.

○ *Office of Community Standards.* McLaughlin and Charles Buchanan have been meeting representatives from the Office of Community Standards. The Office does a review of the Student Code of Conduct every other year. The primary change this year will be to a process referred to as “Interim Presidential Suspension.” This is a suspension for students who are at risk to themselves or others because of some action by the student. Currently, this has required a signature from the president. Moving forward, the Office will be able to do this within the Office. McLaughlin stated that he will have something within the next week or so where faculty can provide comment.

○ *Joint Police Advisory Council (JPAC).* JPAC is a group that includes representatives from the Athens police, OHIO police, community members, and OHIO faculty. Faculty Senate needs to appoint a new JPAC representative because the current representative’s term is ending; Senator Carey Snyder is the current representative. McLaughlin asked Senators interested to contact him.

❖ **Topic 2: Status of Resolutions**

○ McLaughlin shared the status of Senate approved resolutions. Specifically, McLaughlin discussed the status of the faculty-initiated petition submitted to the Faculty Senate on January 9, 2017. The Senate voted on four parts and voted to endorse three items from the petition:

1. **Add “immigration status” as a protected category under the harassment policy explicitly to recognize the vulnerabilities and struggles of undocumented/DACA-documented students, faculty, and staff at Ohio University;**
2. **Reaffirm the university’s commitment to abide by our policies of non-harassment, non-discrimination, and privacy; and**
3. **Ensure that the identities of undocumented members of our community continue to be protected in accordance with our stated policies and legal responsibilities.**

○ Provost Benoit signed the second and third item but did not sign first. The Provost’s [written response](https://www.ohio.edu/global/resources/eo.cfm) was as follows: “While I can empathize with the motivation generating the request to add immigration status as a protected category, I am not able to sign this Resolution (item #2). After consultation, I have concluded that adding immigration status as a special protected category creates confusion because there is no recognized civil rights status under federal or state law. In contrast, national origin is a recognized protected status. Discrimination or harassment based on a person’s real or perceived nationality or citizenship is prohibited by law and University policy. Item #2 requests a reaffirmation of the university’s commitment to abide by current university policies. Although any policy is subject to change I can affirm a commitment to the following policies: 40.001 Equal Employment and Educational Opportunity; 3.004 Sexual Misconduct, Relationship Violence, and Stalking; 3.003 Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance; and 12.020 Student Records. We will continue to protect personal information for all of our students and employees in accordance with university policy and legal responsibilities. We can provide resources and assistance to undocumented and international students, faculty, and staff. The website Updates on Immigration Executive Orders and OHIO Actions can be found at [https://www.ohio.edu/global/resources/eo.cfm](https://www.ohio.edu/global/resources/eo.cfm) and multiple meetings have been held to answer questions and provide assistance to those directly impacted.”

○ McLaughlin intends to have a conversation with the faculty initially involved with bringing the petition about possible next steps.

❖ **Topic 3: Faculty Senate Election Results**
McLaughlin welcomed all newly elected and re-elected Senators, who were as follows:

- Arts & Sciences – Group 1: Geoff Buckley, Robin Muhammad, Ruth Palmer, Willem Roosenburg, Nukhet Sandal, Eric Stinaff, Julie White, and Sarah Wyatt
- Arts & Sciences – Group 1: Heather Edwards
- College of Fine Arts – Group 1: Kamile Geist and Helene Siebrits
- Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine – Group 1: Berkeley Franz and Susan Williams
- Patton College of Education – Group 1: Laura Harrison
- Patton College of Education – Group 2: Cindy Hartman
- Scripps College of Communication – Group 1: Bernhard Debatin and Trevor Roycroft
- Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs – Group 1: Derek Kauneckis
- Eastern Campus – Group 1: Paula McMurray-Schwarz
- Regional Higher Education At Large – Group 2: Debra Nickles

McLaughlin thanked faculty elected as Alternates and all faculty who participated in this year’s elections. The electronic balloting increased participation as compared to the paper balloting system used two years previously. McLaughlin also noted that there are some unfilled seats; he will be speaking with those units in the next several weeks.

Please refer to Appendix C for the Faculty Handbook language about the election process.

Topic 4: Ohio Faculty Council Report – Beth Quitslund

Quitslund explained that the Ohio Faculty Council (OFC) is the officially recognized body of faculty representatives from all public institutions across the state. Each institution appointments two representatives; one is always the institution’s Faculty Senate Chair while the other is elected. Quitslund is one of the two representatives from OHIO. Quitslund explained that OFC has been primarily addressed the following issues in the past few months:

- **DACA:** In January, OFC approved a resolution supporting beneficiaries of DACA ([https://www.ohiofacultycouncil.org/sites/ohiofacultycouncil.wright.edu/files/page/attachments/OFC_DACA-resolution_Jan2017.pdf](https://www.ohiofacultycouncil.org/sites/ohiofacultycouncil.wright.edu/files/page/attachments/OFC_DACA-resolution_Jan2017.pdf)). They closely followed the language of a resolution from Ohio Faculty Senate, which represents the community colleges, so both faculty groups are consistent.

- **College Credit Plus:** The OFC has had ongoing discussions about College Credit Plus. In January, OFC talked with the faculty representatives to the College Credit Plus Advisory Committee. Interestingly, the two women did not know that they were officially representing faculty as required by the regulatory framework that set up the advisory committee. The representative from a 2-year institution was a faculty member while the representative from a 4-year institution is primarily an administrator who teaches a few classes. They had some relatively encouraging data about the grades awarded in different contexts to College Credit Plus students, though there is some indication of grades being slightly higher in classes taught by high school teachers in the high school setting. OFC asked them to ask the committee for longitudinal studies to evaluate and enhance the program. OFC members remain very concerned about the costs of College Credit Plus to institutions. For example, the requirement that universities absorb very large fees (e.g., aviation) as well as pay for any testing necessary to establish college readiness. For example, if a student has not taken the ACT, the institution must pay for it – sometimes allowing an unlimited number of times for it to be taken. There is also anecdotal data about private colleges not accepting credit for some courses and continuing worry about the small percentage of students who fail College Credit Plus courses.

- **Affordability Issues and Quality:** The OFC has been asking for quality metrics on our now mandatory Affordability and Efficiency reports. OFC has sent a set of recommendations to the ODHE last month that asked for the following to be included in those reports: (1) ratio of
full-time to part-time faculty (and if the institution has not established an optimum ration, should explain why not); (2) course completion and graduation rates (calculated separately for students in different incoming ACT ranges and for non-traditional/continuing education students); (3) fraction of graduates going to graduate/professional school (and what mechanism is in place or being developed to track this information); and (4) fraction of graduates with experiential learning of some kind as part of their degree program.

- **The Budget and the Legislature**: The Chair of the House Finance Subcommittee on Higher Education attended the OFC February meeting to hear concerns from faculty about H.B. 49. There was not enough time to voice all concerns. A group of OFC members then testified before the Subcommittee on March 21. OFC Chair Dan Krane (from Wright State) gave an overview of the OFC position, and an additional four faculty—the faculty chairs from OSU, Wright State, and Cleveland State, and Quitslund—talked about perspectives from our own institutions and filled in more detailed testimony on several issues. The official written version of that testimony can be found under the March 21 hearing on the Subcommittee webpage (http://www.ohiohouse.gov/committee/finance-subcommittee-on-higher-education). We addressed the following issued: 1) SSI funding; 2) OCOG funding and distribution; 3) the proposal to formally recognize Western Governors’ as a state institution; 4) College Credit Plus; 5) baccalaureate degrees at 2-year institutions; and 6) the textbook proposal.

**Questions and Discussions**

- A senator asked Quitslund to how receptive the House Finance Subcommittee on Higher Education was to the testimony from the faculty. Quitslund said that they were not un receptive. The subcommittee includes some members who appeared to be very informed about higher education topics and some members who asked clarification questions for. The members seemed divided on some issues such as the OCOG funding and in agreement about other issues such as SSI funding.

- **Topic 5: Policy Review – Dates of Service for Senators & Officers**
  - McLaughlin reviewed the dates of service for senators and officers. The discussion included start of terms, overlapping terms, and beginning / end term for officers.
  - Please refer to Appendix C and D for the Faculty Handbook language about the Rules of Elections and Faculty Senate Officers.

- **Topic 6: Election of Officers for 2017-18 – Ben Bates**
  - As a senator finishing his sixth year, Bates served as the nominating committee for the Faculty Senate Officers. Nominations for Officers included Joe McLaughlin for Chair, David Thomas for Vice Chair, and Robin Muhammed for Secretary. (There were no additional nominations from the floor.)
    - A senator spoke about the qualifications of nominee Robin Muhammed. The senator explained that she has known Muhammed professionally through Muhammed’s role as a Department Chair, as a member of the Senate’s Professional Relations Committee, and as an outside faculty member serving on a hiring committee for the English department. In all of her roles, Muhammed has been dedicated, organized, and thoughtful. She attends all meetings, asks thoughtful questions, and helps to complete work.
    - A senator spoke about the qualifications of nominee Robin Muhammed. The senator remarked that Muhammed is fair-minded and clear in purpose. She has the ability to review many documents quickly, identify key information, and focus on problems. She is a great colleague who will add value to the Senate.
✓ Senators nominated for Faculty Senate Officers – McLaughlin, Thomas, and Muhammed – were elected by a voice vote.

❖ Topic 7: Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, May 1, 2017, 7:10PM, Walter Hall 235

VI. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Ben Bates)
❖ No presentation

VII. Professional Relations Committee (Sherrie Gradin)
❖ No presentation

VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Charles Buchanan)
❖ Resolution on Academic Participation and Changes to “F” and “W” Grades—First Reading
   o Resolution is offered by the EPSA to endorse amending Ohio University Policy 12.040 Grade to include (a) F grade confirmation, (b) new WN grade to indicate the student withdrew and never attended or participated in class, and (c) last known date of participation for withdraw (WP/WF) grades.
   o Please refer to Appendix E for the full-text of the resolution.
✓ Resolution was approved by a voice vote.
❖ Topic: Updates. Buchanan shared that EPSA is currently working on a variety of other topics. For example, EPSA is discussing a Resolution about graduate faculty status with OHIO’s Graduate Faculty Council. There may be a Resolution forthcoming for the next meeting.

Questions and Discussions
• A senator asked for clarification about the WP / WF grade. Is this the date of last participation or the date at which they withdrew? Buchanan stated that it is the last date of participation and that the faculty determines the last date of participation.

IX. Finance & Facilities Committee (Susan Williams)
❖ No presentation

X. New Business
❖ Topic: Faculty Senate Orientation. McLaughlin shared that the Faculty Senate may offer a Faculty Senate Orientation for new Senators early in Fall 2018.

Questions and Discussions
• None

XI. Adjournment
❖ The meeting was adjourned at 8:55PM.
Appendix A

Budget Process Updates

Pre-RCM Budget Process

Under the prior incremental budgeting system
- Central administration would match projected revenues for the coming year to projected expenses
- Inflationary costs (health care, salaries, etc.) would be determined along with changes to budgets
- Planning units (colleges and administrative units) would be given a budget total in February/March
- Budgeting was basically a one-time event each year
- The trade-offs and choices were done centrally and therefore were not discussed broadly and did not involve many people.

Budget Process under RCM

The RCM process is much more decentralized and complex
- Projections of revenues and expenses must now be done using agreed upon inflationary assumptions with the responsibility centers (colleges, regional campuses, medical school and auxiliaries) making their own projections of revenues and expenses
- This introduces variability in approaches across units as each has different budget pressures, revenue opportunities and cost structures
- A more complex consolidation process is needed since you have more than 25 different responsibility centers projecting budgets
- The process requires that choices and tradeoffs be discussed both centrally and across all units leading to evolving scenarios that make it difficult to determine exactly what the final budget will be until late in the year after multiple iterations through the budget.
- The budgeting process now spans the entire year and basically has become on continuous process.

Budget Process under RCM

In the beginning of the year, assumptions and projections have less certainty and more variability as units start off with conservative revenue projections and build in all potential expenditures.

This invariably leads to having insufficient new revenues to do everything everybody wants to do which results in a gap between available revenues and expenses.

An iterative process of discussions with colleges, refinement of assumptions as more certainty emerges and adjustment of budget scenarios is then used to bring the gap to zero and create a balanced budget by the end of the year.

In addition to projecting budgets for the next year, responsibility centers are also asked to make projections three years into the future since our ability to react to changes is constrained and multiple years are needed to adjust
Rough Timeline

**Early Fall**
Initial central assumptions are created (tuition rates, enrollments, State SSI, health care inflation, salary increases, increased debt for deferred maintenance and planned capital projects, etc.)

**Mid Fall** – First Iteration and meetings with each responsibility center
Units are asked to project their budget for the next year using
- The effect of central assumptions on their budget
  - New undergraduate revenues
  - Health Care cost inflation
  - Salary inflation
  - Central cost changes (debt service, utilities, health care and salary inflation in central units)
- Their own assumptions for revenues they control
  - Graduate tuition
  - Course/tech fees
  - External sales – non-credit programs, clinics, etc
  - Revenue programs like Online, OPIE and Study Away
- Their own assumptions expenses (results of hiring, retirements, program growth, effects of central assumptions on central costs, etc.)

Administrative Units project budgets based on central assumptions – primarily Health Care & Salary
Consolidation of all unit budgets is done to determine how well total assumed revenues match total assumed expenses – typically generates a scenarios with a gap of $10M-$30M since revenue assumptions tend to be conservative and everyone builds in all potential expenses

**Rough Timeline**

**January** – Board of Trustees vote on Tuition Rates – affects tuition assumption

**February** every other year – Governor proposes biennial State Budget – affects SSI and tuition assumptions

**February** - Central planning assumptions are updated based on the above and other changes to try to bring expenses more in line with revenue

**February/March** – Second Iteration and meetings with each college (last one was held last week)
Units are asked to
- Project the budget for the next year using updated central assumptions and updated unit projections for revenue and expenses
- Depending on the various pressures on budget resources that year, Colleges and Administrative Units:
  - Make requests for investments
  - Provide scenarios for potential adjustments to the budget (added revenues or reduced expenses) along with information about the risk and impact of those ideas

In the FY18 budget cycle we are in a constrained resource environment so units were asked to discuss ideas to shrink the budget gap grouped into three tiers
- Tier 1 – ideas that could be implemented with minimal impact to activity
- Tier 2 – ideas that could be implemented that have some impact but in not in core academic activity
• Tier 3 – ideas that could be implemented but would have an impact on academic activity

All Administrative units were asked to provide ideas for a reduction of up to 5% - in rank order from least to most impact to operations and services to colleges. In addition, the carry forward policy for administrative units was changed to not allocate carry forward back to those units

Constrained Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Incremental Revenue ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Guarantee 0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantee 1.3%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens Enrollment*</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17 SSI Adj</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 SSI Growth *</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Reserve</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Incremental Cost ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare (5% University growth)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Plan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Learning</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Illustration: Cost Impact of 1% Raise Pool = $2.8M*

These are only the central constraints. Each unit has additional layers of revenue opportunities and investment needs

Rough Timeline

April-May
• New consolidation across all units will be created to determine the remaining gap – currently looks like about half of what it was in the first consolidation
• Ideas for changes to assumptions, new revenues and expense control across both colleges and administrative units will be discussed with various units to see what might reasonably be used to close the gap
• Units will update proposed budgets with any changes needed to close the gap and create a balanced budget

Mid-May – Balanced budget must be submitted to the Trustees
Late June – Trustees vote on the budget
Appendix B

Exterior Construction Summers 2017-18

Intent
Provide awareness of summer construction projects that, by nature, have potential to impact surrounding activities. The following slides contain planned construction activities for the Summers of 2017 and 2018. Characteristics of these projects include for example:

- Extended roadway closures/lane restrictions
- Continuous increased campus traffic volume
- Overt activities that may pique curiosity

Disclaimer-2018 subject to change as project requests accumulate

2017 Key Dates
- Commencement: April 29, 2017
- Construction Begins: May 1, 2017
- BSO: May 5, 2017; June 1-30, 2017
- Steam Outage: May 8-19, 2017
- Construction Complete: August 15, 2017
West Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1 – Permanent Campus Boilers</td>
<td>9/1/16 – 11/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2 – Sargent Hall Masonry Repairs</td>
<td>5/1/17 – 8/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.3 – Lot 20 Retaining Wall Repair</td>
<td>Dates TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### South Central Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.4 – Peden Scoreboard and Speaker Replacement</td>
<td>5/1/17 – 8/15/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5 – South Green Drive Culvert Replacement</td>
<td>5/1/17 – 10/20/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6 – Ping Chilled Water Connection</td>
<td>5/1/17 – 6/9/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.11 – Back South Demolition Phase II (Truck Route)</td>
<td>5/2/17 – 8/11/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1 – Sook Academic Center</td>
<td>8/7/17 – 8/10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2 – University Terrace CW Piping</td>
<td>4/1/18 – 8/30/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### North Central Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.7 – College Green Exterior Repair</td>
<td>5/1/17 – 7/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8 – Cutler Retaining Wall Repair</td>
<td>7/2/17 – 8/15/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.9 – Hudson Roof, Cupola &amp; Dormers</td>
<td>6/2/17 – 8/4/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.10 – Seigfred Hall Roof and Window</td>
<td>6/17/16 – 8/15/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2 – University Terrace CW Piping</td>
<td>4/1/18 – 8/30/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3 – Ellis Hall Renovation</td>
<td>10/10/17 – 09/17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4 – Cutler High Voltage Upgrade</td>
<td>5/1/18 – 6/30/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5 – Wilson to McGuffey Brick Walkway</td>
<td>5/1/18 – 6/30/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6 – Seigfred DCW Connection</td>
<td>8/14/17 – 9/03/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southeast Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.11 – Back South Demolition Phase II and Truck Route</td>
<td>5/2/17 – 8/11/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.12 – Front Four Transformer Replacement</td>
<td>5/1/17 – 9/15/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7 – Potential Remote Chilled Water Plant (Electric Route)</td>
<td>12/15/17 – 12/17/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Northeast Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.13 – Jefferson Hall Renovation</td>
<td>5/1/16 – 8/10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.14 – North McKinley Drive Extension</td>
<td>4/10/17 – 8/15/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.15 – Various Locations – Campus Steam System Repairs 2017</td>
<td>5/1/17 – 8/25/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7 – Potential Remote Chilled Water Plant and Utility Routes</td>
<td>12/15/17 – 12/17/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8 – Jefferson Underground Utilities</td>
<td>5/1/18 – 9/1/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.9 – Various Locations – Campus Steam System Repairs 2018</td>
<td>5/1/18 – 8/15/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Rules of Election

Each member of the Faculty Senate shall be elected for a three-year term beginning May 1 and ending July 31.

The election shall be held by secret ballot in the last week of March of each year. At least two weeks prior to the date of the election, the Senate Elections Committee shall circulate to all faculty a call for nominations of eligible faculty members for the Senate. The call shall request the faculty member (1) to list his/her own name if he/she wishes to have his/her name on the ballot, and is not disqualified by the rules of the election; (2) to list the name or names of any other eligible faculty members whom he/she wishes to place in nomination for election to the Senate, and who are not disqualified by the rules of election.

The Elections Committee will draw up a ballot listing all the names returned with the following exceptions: (1) members of the Senate whose terms are not expiring; (2) members of the Senate whose terms are expiring but who have been elected and who have served for two consecutive three-year terms (such persons are ineligible for election until one year has elapsed); and (3) members of the faculty who will not be on the campus for more than one semester of the next academic year. Provisions shall also be made on the ballot for write-in votes.

Every faculty member with faculty status is eligible to vote for members in his/her college or regional campus. The balloting shall be carried out according to the "Method of Proportional Representation." In this method, each voter's ballot is used for the candidate of his/her choice unless this candidate has too few votes for his/her election to be possible, in which case his/her ballot is transferred to his/her second choice candidate, and so forth. Almost every voter's ballot is used to elect some representative, and thus each minority faction will have its proper share of representatives.

The ballots will be tallied according to the following steps:

1. Distribute all ballots to candidates of first choice. (If a ballot does not indicate an unambiguous first choice, it is invalid and is discarded.)
2. Count the number of ballots distributed to each candidate.
3. Add these numbers to find the total ballots. Call this "B."
4. Let n be the number of candidates to be elected, and let E be the number of ballots required to elect any candidate. Compute E as follows: If B/(n+1) is not a whole number, then E is the next largest whole number. Example: B = 100, n = 2, then B/(n+1) = 50, and E = 50. If B/(n+1) is a whole number, then E = [B/(n+1)] + 1. Example: B = 100, n = 3, then B/(n+1) = 33 1/3, and E = 34.
5. If one or more candidates have at least E ballots, then declare Elected the candidate with the largest number of ballots. Call his/her number of ballots N. (In case of a tie, choose one by lot.) (If no candidate has as many as E ballots, go to Step 11.)
6. Count the elected candidate's Transferable Ballots (those with a second choice indicated). Call this number "T."
7. Compute the Value of each transferable ballot. V = (N-E) / T to two decimals. Write this value at the top of each transferable ballot. (Example: Smith has 25 ballots, of which 23 indicate a second choice; E is 20. Then V = (25-20) / 23, or 0.22 to two decimals.)
8. Distribute all transferable ballots to candidates of second choice.
9. Compute a new total (N) for each candidate by adding the values of his/her ballots. (The value of an untransferred ballot is one.)
10. If one or more of the remaining candidates have at least E ballots, repeat steps 5 through 9. In Step 7, the new value of any transferred ballot is computed by:

   \[ \text{New Value} = \text{Old Value} \times \frac{(N-E)}{T}. \]

If none of the remaining candidates has E or more ballots, then go to Step 11.

11. Declare defeated the candidate with the fewest votes. (If two candidates are tied for low, select one by lot.) Record all defeated candidates in the sequence of their defeat for the purpose of compiling a list of alternates.
12. Distribute all ballots of the defeated candidates among the remaining candidates according to the highest choice indicated on the ballot. The value of a ballot does not change in this transfer. (If a ballot indicates no further preference among the remaining candidates, it is declared exhausted and plays no further part in the election.)
13. Count the new totals for all remaining candidates. Repeat Steps 5 through 12 until n candidates have been elected, or until the number of remaining candidates is just sufficient to fill the remaining positions, at which point they are declared elected.

The election shall be carried out by the Elections Committee of the Senate, consisting of the chair, the vice chair, and the secretary of the Senate, plus the other two members serving on the Executive Committee of the Senate. The chair of the Senate or a member of the Elections Committee designated by him/her shall serve as chair of the Elections Committee.

The Elections Committee shall be charged with preparing and distributing the ballots, counting the votes, and notifying the new members elected. The Elections Committee shall also prepare a list of alternates, in order of number of votes, from each of the colleges and regional campuses. The list shall be maintained by the secretary, who shall notify the Senate of any vacancy that exists in the membership of the Senate and who shall aid the chair in appointing the highest-ranked alternate to the vacancy.

Vacancies may occur due to the death, resignation, or extended absence of a member; extended absence shall be considered to mean more than two absences from meetings without excuse during an academic year (August through April). An alternate, or interim member, shall serve until the original term is completed unless the absent member has signified a date at which he/she will be able to resume his/her duties.

In addition to the procedures governing vacancies as described in the preceding paragraph and Article 1, Section 7 of the Constitution, an absent senator may be temporarily replaced for a given meeting by one of the alternates from his/her college or regional campus from the list maintained by the secretary. The alternate shall, during the meeting at which he/she serves, have all the privileges of membership, including voting. Temporary replacement shall be accomplished in the following manner: a senator who must be absent shall notify the chair or secretary in advance of the meeting. The chair or secretary will then notify, if time permits, the first alternate. If the first alternate cannot serve, the second alternate will be notified, and so on. An alternate must report his/her presence to the secretary at the beginning of the meeting. The interim member shall be eligible for election (or re-election) as soon as his/her interim term expires, but he/she may not serve more than two elected three-year terms in succession.
2. The Election of Faculty Senate Officers

The Faculty Senate shall have three elected officers:

- a chair,
- a vice chair
- a secretary

The officers shall be elected in the order given above at the April meeting of the Senate or, alternatively, at a special meeting held prior to the Spring Commencement.

Members of the Senate who have served at least one year shall be eligible for election to office. Members-elect whose terms will begin on May 1 shall participate in the election of officers. Members who will retire from the Senate effective July 31 shall not participate in the election of officers.

A nominating committee will be formed from senators who will retire from the Senate effective July 31. All retiring senators finishing two consecutive terms will be first asked to serve on the committee. Should fewer than three of these retiring senators be willing to serve, the nominating committee will be supplemented from the ranks of other retiring senators. Composition of this nominating committee will be announced at the February Senate meeting. The nominating committee will present at least one slate of officer candidates to the Senate at the March meeting. At the April meeting, additional nominations will be entertained from the floor to supplement those of the nominating committee. The election shall be carried out by secret ballot. Election to office requires a majority of the votes cast. If no nominee has a majority of votes for a particular office, a new ballot shall be taken until a majority is achieved. The new officers shall assume office on May 1.
RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC PARTICIPATION AND CHANGES TO “F” AND “W” GRADES

Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee
Faculty Senate
Second Reading and Vote
April 3, 2017

Whereas Ohio University faculty are not required to take attendance in their classes,

Whereas federal regulations require students to participate in classes in order to be eligible for federal student aid,

Whereas students who do not participate or who stop participating are subject to a recalculation of enrollment status, which may result in a change to their federal student aid,

Whereas the FN grade, failure due to never attending or participating in the class; the FS grade, failure due to stopped attending or participating in the class; and last known date of participation, were established in 1998 to accommodate “unofficial withdrawals,”

Whereas the instructor(s) assigned to a class has full responsibility for grading, and

Whereas any passing grade assumes the student participated in the class,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate endorses amending Ohio University Policy 12.040: Grading to include the following:

• F grade confirmation: The instructor will confirm the following when an F (Failing) grade is assigned, “Student completed the course and earned the F, otherwise an FN (Failure, Never Attended) or FS (Failure, Stopped Attending) would be assigned.”

• New WN grade, Withdrawn Never Attended, to indicate the student withdrew and never attended or participated in the class. This grade does not earn credit and is not used in the GPA calculation.

• Last known date of participation for withdrawn (WP/WF) grades: The instructor will enter the P, F, or N for withdrawn grades. If a P or F is entered, the last date of participation will be entered.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that faculty are expected to make a reasonable effort through means such as dates of known attendance, submitted work, or communications to determine the last known date of participation. The registrar’s office, with faculty input, should offer guidelines of expected practice.