Meeting called to order by Joe McLaughlin (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:10PM

In attendance
Tenure / Tenure-Track Faculty
- College of Business: K. Hartman, A. Rosado Feger, R. Thacker
- College of Fine Arts: C. Buchanan, K. Geist, R. Braun [substitute for A. Hibbitt], D. Thomas
- College of Health Sciences and Professions: R. Brannan, A. Sergeev
- Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine: S. Williams, J. Wolf
- Patton College of Education: G. Brooks, S. Helfrich, K. Machtmes
- Regional Campus – Chillicothe: Allison White
- Regional Campus – Eastern:
- Regional Campus – Lancaster:
- Regional Campus – Southern: O. Carter
- Regional Campus – Zanesville: J. Taylor, Amy White
- Scripps College of Communication: A. Babrow, B. Bates, A. Chadwick, F. Lewis
- Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: A. Ruhil

Career Teaching and Clinical
- College of Arts and Sciences: C. Schwirian
- College of Business: T. Barnett
- College of Health Sciences and Professions: M. Clevidence
- Clinical: J. Balbo
- Regional Higher Education: T. Pritchard

Excused: S. Carson, D. Duvert, F-C. Jeng, S. Inman, K. Spiker

Absent:
MEETING AGENDA

I. President Roderick McDavis
II. Jason Pina, Vice President for Student Affairs
III. Enrollment Update – Craig Cornell, Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management
IV. Provost’s Office Update – Howard Dewald, Associate Provost for Faculty & Academic Planning
V. Roll Call and Approval of the May 2, 2016 Minutes
VI. Chair’s Report – Joe McLaughlin
   o Updates and Announcements
   o Report on Presidential Search
   o Policy Review – Annual Evaluation of Department Chairs & School Directors
   o Upcoming Senate Meeting: October 10, 2016
VII. Executive Committee—Joe McLaughlin
   a. Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Naming of the Roger Ailes Newsroom—First Reading
   b. Resolution on the Appointment of a Task Force to Review University Naming Practices—First Reading
VIII. Finance & Facilities Committee – Susan Williams
IX. Professional Relations Committee – Sherrie Gradin
X. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee – Charles Buchanan
XI. Promotion & Tenure Committee – Ben Bates
XII. New Business
XIII. Adjournment

MEETING PRESENTATIONS

I. Jason Pina, Vice President for Student Affairs
   ▶ Topic 1: Introduction. Vice President for Student Affairs Jason Pina provided the faculty with a brief introduction about himself including his professional background and roles at previous institutions. Prior to joining the Office of Student Affairs a few months ago, Pina was in the Office of Student Affairs at a public institution in Massachusetts, Bridgewater State University, in a similar role. Previously, he was also the Dean of Students at a university in Rhode Island. Pina noted that he often is asked why he moved to Athens and OHIO. In response, he provides three reasons. First, OHIO is a more complex institution than his previous institutions; the Division of Student Affairs provides an opportunity for development. Second, his colleagues at OHIO are highly skilled; he has known some of them and their work for several years. This position allows him the opportunity to work with them on interesting and important issues. Third, both OHIO and Athens were attractive to his family; OHIO provided his family an opportunity to be part of a welcoming community.
   ▶ Topic 2: Goals. Pina also explained three goals for Student Affairs. The first goal is to review existing structures within Student Affairs. This will involve understanding and articulating reasons and rationale for existing structure. The second goal is to explore personnel and associated resources. This will involve reviewing the skills and resources available to provide services as well as identifying opportunities for professional growth. The third goal is to make decisions for the future: the 2050 academic year. This will involve exploring how decisions made today will impact the future and generations yet to come.

Questions and Discussions
   • Senator Hicks asked about the kind of decisions Pina will be faced with in the near future. Pina mentioned (1) residence halls and needs for maintenance, improvement, and development and (2) the first two-year review of the revised Student Code of Conduct.
• Pina welcomed input and conversation. He would like to speak with others to learn his job better as well as wants to explore the community.

II. Enrollment Update – Craig Cornell, Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management

- Topic: Enrollment Update. Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management Craig Cornell provided the faculty with an update about OHIO’s current enrollment as well as enrollment initiatives for the upcoming years. Specifically, Cornell provided information about new student enrollment, overall enrollment, retention rates, anticipated milestones, and enrollment initiatives for Fall 2017. Appendix A provides a full copy of the presentation.

Questions and Discussions

- Senator Bates asked about the decline in international student enrollment and mentioned recent personnel changes in admission positions for international students. The senator asked about the specific, concrete activities that OHIO is doing for the purpose of increasing enrollment for this population. Cornell noted that he had just returned from a trip overseas in which he was working with a strategy company and mentioned that OHIO has been reviewing internal operations. Cornell further noted that OHIO hired another company this summer to help us understand the needs and differences across various countries. For example, China has a firewall that limits some types of media distribution channels. OHIO has also been trying to build relationships with agencies that will help. With respect to internal initiatives, OHIO has been attempting to identify process difficulties such as any issues with the application process as well as programs/services such as the Ohio Program of Intensive English (OPIE).

- Senator Hicks asked how OHIO compares to other universities in the state of Ohio. Cornell noted that it depends on the university and metrics used for comparisons. OHIO has had consistent growth over time, but we are unlikely to have the highest growth for this year.

- Senator Cotton asked about enrollment and growth plans for the future. Cornell stated that OHIO is in the process for building a new five-year enrollment plan in 2016. Cornell noted that OHIO is not looking to grow on the Athens campus currently but is looking for growth in other areas such as online learning, Dublin, and other potential areas for development.

- Senator Geist asked if OHIO asks international students currently enrolled about their difficulties such as issues associated with applying, being accepted, etc. The senator noted that current students talk with other students, which can be a great recruitment tool for OHIO. Cornell explained that OHIO does talk with current students such as those in OPIE to understand opinions and the information that is shared. Cornell also noted that there is some difficulty with incorrect information; OHIO attempts to correct that information as best as we can.

III. President Roderick McDavis

- Topic 1: Meeting with Governor’s Staff. President McDavis provided the faculty with an update about a recent meeting with the state of Ohio Governor’s staff. Pam Benoit, Joe Shields, Brian Clark, Eric Burchard, and President McDavis met with Governor Kasich’s Chief of Staff Wayne Struble, the Governor’s Policy Director Beth Hansen, and other staff members in Columbus, OH on Thursday, September 8. The OHIO group provided the Governor’s staff with a brief update about OHIO’s collaboration with Ohio State on the OHIO Innovation Fund. Benoit provided a three-year history of the Innovation Strategy including how it was started and where it is today. Shields provided a summary of the Innovation Strategy’s implementation. Professor Clark shared his involvement by explaining the importance of having access to significant funding ($1M); this funding incentivizes faculty to pursue new, innovative directions in their areas. McDavis also noted that OHIO faculty members have been recently notified about upcoming funding possibilities; he encouraged faculty to
explore this opportunity. McDavis noted that the Innovation Strategy was instrumental in helping Professor Clark’s team advance their idea; the team has invested significant time and energy toward understanding commercialization potential through their participation in the State of Ohio’s I-Corps program for faculty innovators. The Governor’s staff was pleased with the report. They commented favorably on the program’s incentives to encourage faculty to connect with others across campus in new ways and would like to see more project-based innovation programs across all universities in the state of Ohio. The OHIO team indicated a willingness to speak with other universities.

Topic 2: Roger Ailes Newsroom. McDavis provided an update about the Roger Ailes Newsroom. The official statement given at the meeting is provided below:

“In recent weeks our campus community has been disrupted by the indirect impact of the Roger Ailes controversy. I have listened to the various viewpoints and perspectives of our faculty, staff, students and alumni. I have consulted with the dean of the college and other senior leadership. The distraction from the teaching and academic mission of the Scripps College of Communication has weighed heavily on my mind as I deliberated over the sustained effect on our university community should we continue to have our newsroom named for Mr. Ailes.

Given the allegations against Mr. Ailes and the circumstances surrounding his departure from Fox News, I have decided that the most appropriate action is to return Mr. Ailes’ gift and to remove his name from the WOUB newsroom. I have directed Facilities to begin the process of physically removing his name.

Some people may criticize me for taking a long time to make a decision, but out of fairness to all, I wanted to be deliberative. I believe this to be an appropriate decision that is in alignment with our principled beliefs as a university community.”

During this address to the faculty, McDavis also recognized E.W. Scripps College of Communication Dean Scott Titsworth for his time and effort. McDavis noted Titsworth’s personal involvement in providing the President’s Office and Provost’s Office with recommendations. McDavis also remarked that Titsworth has been a strong advocate for the faculty and students of the E.W. Scripps College of Communication. McDavis commended Titsworth for his leadership in this matter.

Questions and Discussions

- **Associate Professor Mary Rogus** thanked President McDavis for this decision. As a professor in the College of Communications, the professor expressed that it was difficult to teach in this space because of what the name represents.
- **Senator Balbo** thanked the President for his sternly worded letter to students who had inappropriate signs hung outside off-campus residences during first-year student move-in.
- **Senator Perkins** thanked president McDavis for the courageous decision to remove Roger Ailes name from the newsroom. As a point of clarification, the senator asked if the decision would also involve changing the names of the Roger Ailes scholarship. **McDavis** noted that there have already been discussions about this and what to do moving forward. Because this scholarship has already been awarded, this may take a little more time to address. Ultimately, the goal will be to protect our students.
- **Senator Buchanan** asked about the progress of the state of Ohio’s conceal-and-carry bill. **McDavis** explained there has been no progress to move this bill forward at the state level. The bill still exists; it has passed the Ohio’s House but has not been taken up by Ohio’s Senate, which is now out-of-session. The unknown now is whether the bill will be taken up by the senate when they return to session. If this passed, OHIO would collect feedback from faculty, students, staff, and others and would provide that feedback to OHIO’s Board of Trustees.
• **Senator Gradin** asked about requirements for OHIO to provide remediation courses as part of the credit-plus program. **McDavis** noted that there are no updates about this and explained that the state legislature ended its session without passing any new bill.

• President McDavis remarked that OHIO is continuing to work to build OHIO’s enrollment of international students and remarked that enrollments are part of a larger conversation nationwide. McDavis noted that OHIO welcomes its international students and values their contributions to our community.

• In closing, President McDavis welcomed all faculty members back to campus for the 2016-17 academic year.

### IV. Provost’s Office Update – Howard Dewald, Associate Provost for Faculty & Academic Planning

**Topic 1: Faculty Recognition.** Associate Provost for Faculty & Academic Planning Howard Dewald announced recent faculty teaching and research awards.

- **Provost’s Award for Excellence in Teaching.** This is awarded to full-time, career teaching faculty. The three finalists were Jeffrey Anderson (Business), Pamela Kaylor (OHIO-Chillicothe), and Matthew Stallard (Arts & Sciences). The winner was Klaus Himmeldirk (Arts & Sciences - Chemistry & Bio-Chemistry).

- **Presidential Research Scholar.** This is awarded to full-time, tenure / tenure-track faculty. The five winners were Michele Fiala (Fine Arts), Nancy Stevens (Medicine), James Thomas (Health Sciences & Professions), Arthur Werger (Fine Arts), and Sarah Wyatt (Arts & Sciences).

- **Presidential Teacher Award.** This is awarded to full-time, tenure / tenure-track faculty. The four finalists were Lauren McMills (Arts & Sciences), Marina Peterson (Fine Arts), Linda Rice (Arts & Sciences), and Stephen Scanlan (Arts & Sciences). The winner was Roger Braun (Fine Arts – Music).

**Topic 2: Transfer Students.** Dewald discussed the Credit Level Examination Program (CLEP). There are 35 CLEP exams for which OHIO provides credit. The state asked universities to adopt a single number for all examinations in which the universities would provide credit. The universities within the state pushed back by stating that each examination must be reviewed to determine what the passing score should be. As such, the state is currently exploring what would be a passing score for each of the examinations that the state should adopt for the entire state. The process includes faculty panels to review the exams and to determine an acceptable score that the state should adopt. Dewald asks OHIO faculty to consider serving if asked. In addition, Dewald noted that there are a number of initiatives related to transfer with the TAG program for language courses.

**Topic 3: Interstate Passport.** Dewald discussed OHIO’s general education requirement initiatives and task force. Dewald discussed an initiative that started in universities in the Western United States that has been working its way through to other states – including OHIO. The program is called the [Interstate Passport](#). As a faculty-led initiative, it uses learning outcomes as the foundation for transferring general education credits. Please refer to **Appendix B** for details.

**Questions and Discussions**

• **Senator Carter** asked if the Interstate Passport would be similar to passing a board examination for credentialing in a field. Dewald remarked that it is somewhat similar in intent. A student demonstrates achievement of outcomes based upon competencies in particular areas or skills. In order to demonstrate that they have an appropriate level of mastery, students would be required to demonstrate proficiencies for the corresponding learning goals.
• Senator Cotton asked if there had been discussions about or thought given to how general education requirements would be communicated to transfer students or students in high school. Dewald stated that he did not know what had been discussed or thought about in Ohio nor did he know what has been done in other states. Dewald indicated that this was a good question; he intended to look into the issue.

• Senator Schoen asked how the competencies are measured. Dewald stated that the faculty developed a set of competencies with written assessments of those competencies. The intent would be that, if Ohio was a passport state, the university would provide credit for the classes mapped onto the competencies.

V. Roll Call and Approval of the May 2, 2016 Minutes

❖ Roll call (K. Hartman)

❖ White moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Gradin. Minutes were approved by a voice vote.

VI. Chair’s Report (Joe McLaughlin)

❖ Topic 1: Updates and Announcements

  o McLaughlin provided the faculty with context for the decision to remove the name of Roger Ailes from the WOUB Newsroom. McLaughlin was contacted prior to the meeting by senators who asked if the Faculty Senate intended to take up the issue. McLaughlin explained that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee brought two resolutions to the meeting; one is now unnecessary. (Please refer to Appendix C for a copy of this resolution.) McLaughlin echoed comments about the courage demonstrated in the discussions to remove the name of Roger Ailes from the WOUB Newsroom. Specifically, McLaughlin noted that the term courage directly applies to the Graduate Student Senate for taking on this issue (refer to resolution); he thanked them for their leadership. McLaughlin also shared that the Undergraduate Student Senate expected to take up this issue at their next meeting. McLaughlin noted that this was an example of a good exercise in shared governance across the University. Prior to the meeting (last week), McLaughlin spoke to the President and Provost; they had a significant and thoughtful conversation about the issue.

  o McLaughlin provided the faculty with updates since the last meeting about a variety of topics. First, the Board of Trustees approved the construction of the Perry and Sandy Sook Academic Center during the June 2016 meeting. McLaughlin spoke to the Board of Trustees on behalf of the faculty and emphasized that this project pointed to the broader topic of University fundraising and strategic priorities. McLaughlin framed the discussion within the context of shared governance and cited specific examples in which this could be improved. Second, McLaughlin shared that he had a number of brown bag lunches or coffee meetings with faculty senators as well as spoke with RHE faculty during this summer. Although he was able to have meetings with groups that represented various college and school constituencies, he was not able to meet with everyone; he plans to make time to speak with others in the near future. McLaughlin indicated that the meetings generated ideas about important topics as well as underscored what the Faculty Senate as a whole should be addressing for the upcoming year. Third, McLaughlin thanked senators and other colleagues for identifying representatives to serve on University Standing Committees. With the exception of one college, memberships for all of the Professional Ethics Committees have been staffed. This is the best we have done at this point in the academic year.

  o McLaughlin shared updates about the Dean Evaluation process. There has been some concern expressed about dean reappointments for individuals who have not had a recent comprehensive evaluation. As such, there may be a need to clarify language in the Faculty Handbook. One of the issues is that the timings for the reappointments and the comprehensive evaluations are not
typically in sync. Another issue is that the language may not appropriately reflect the needs of deans in non-typical roles (i.e., divisions without direct faculty) such as deans for Honors Tutorial and Graduate College.

- McLaughlin noted that he plans to attend the 2016 AAUP Shared Governance conference later in September in Washington, DC. Conference topics include Title IX, faculty role in presidential searches, and faculty role in budgeting. He will report back to the faculty senate later.

- McLaughlin reminded faculty that representatives from the Board of Trustees will be presenting during the October Faculty Senate meeting. McLaughlin will provide more information before the meeting.

**Topic 2: Report on Presidential Search**

- McLaughlin shared updates about the Presidential Search. The Board of Trustees assembled a 21-person search committee. Committee membership includes five trustees, three faculty members, four deans, and others. McLaughlin is serving on the search committee in his capacity as Faculty Senate Chair. The University consulted with Faculty Senate leadership prior to creating the committee in order to identify the constituencies who should be represented and names of possible candidates to serve. This input was used to select members of the committee. Although there are only three faculty members, McLaughlin noted that two of the Deans previously held elected roles on the Faculty Senate. The Board of Trustees has also hired a search firm to identify important attributes and create an institutional profile for the position. Faculty Senators spoke with the search firm. Input from faculty is being encouraged via e-mail at trustees@ohio.edu. McLaughlin encouraged faculty to provide input.

**Topic 3: Policy Review – Annual Evaluation of Department Chairs & School Directors**

- McLaughlin explained that he intends to review a policy each meeting if time permits. For this meeting, McLaughlin selected the Annual Evaluation of Department Chairs. He has been asked about this particular policy frequently in recent months. The language from the Faculty Handbook is provided below.

**VII. D. Appointment and Evaluation of Department Chairs and School Directors**

When a vacancy exists, the college dean will be responsible for initiating action through the department to secure a new chair or director. The dean and the faculty shall jointly establish selection criteria and review the qualifications of all candidates. Department chairpersons and directors of schools shall be selected by the dean with the advice and approval of the regular Group I faculty of the department or school, or if the department wishes, an elected committee thereof. Initial appointments of chairs and directors require the approval of the Provost.

1. Chairs’ and directors’ appointments will be continued on a year-to-year basis. At the time of initial appointment, it may be agreed by the dean and the department or school faculty that the appointment will not exceed a given number of years. Before reappointment, it is the dean's responsibility to review the effectiveness of a chair or director by consultation with the Group I faculty of the department. The appointment may be terminated by the chair or director, by the dean after consultation with the faculty, or by written request to the dean of two-thirds of the Group I faculty of the department or school.

2. There will be an annual evaluation of all department chairs. For the purposes of this policy, departments, schools, and regional campus divisions are equivalent units, and the roles of department chair, school director, and regional campus coordinator are
also equivalent. The promotion and tenure committee (excluding the department
chair) or equivalent departmental committee shall be responsible for carrying out the
evaluation. A report of the results of this evaluation shall be furnished to the chair
and the dean.

3. When it is known that a chair or director is to be away from the University for more
than a few days or whenever a temporary vacancy exists, arrangements are made by
the dean for the appointment of an acting chair or director.

   o McLaughlin explained that the policy notes that faculty should be evaluating all department
   chairs annually. Through the P&T committee (or equivalent), faculty are responsible for
   evaluating department chairs. As such, all colleges should have processes for evaluating
department chairs. If faculty members want to coordinate with the Office of the Dean, this is
acceptable and reasonable. However, evaluations of chairs are the right and responsibility of
the faculty.

Topic 4: Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, October 10, 2016

Questions and Discussions

• A senator asked if faculty representation had decreased as compared to previous Presidential
searches. McLaughlin explained that he did not know off-hand but expected that the number of
faculty is fewer this time as compared to previous committees.

• A senator asked if there was a deadline to send information to the Board of Trustees about
opinions for hiring. McLaughlin stated that he did not know of a deadline for input but
encouraged faculty to share sooner rather than later (i.e., next couple of weeks).

• A senator asked about evaluation of associate deans. McLaughlin said that there was no
language in the handbook about evaluating associate deans.

• A senator asked about the need to evaluate interim or new director / chairs. Specifically, if a
department opts to not evaluate, is this a violation of the policy? McLaughlin indicated that he
did not believe so. McLaughlin remarked that OHIO policy typically does not evaluate new
deans, so this would be consistent with that policy. McLaughlin further noted that there are some
issues with language such as Interim and Acting. Acting should be short duration (i.e., days or
weeks). McLaughlin further noted that if the Dean appoints an Interim for another year, then the
Dean should consult with faculty before making a reappointment or new appointment.

VII. Executive Committee (Joe McLaughlin)

   Resolution on the Appointment of a Task Force to Review University Naming—First Reading

The resolution is offered by the Executive Committee to request a task force to review the
University’s Naming of University Buildings Policy 37.010. Specifically:

   Whereas the University Policy on the Naming of University Buildings (37.010) has not been
reviewed since its approval in March 2003; and

   Whereas a variety of naming practices, such as the naming of classrooms, laboratories, and
conference rooms, are not covered under this policy;

   Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the Executive Vice President & Provost to appoint
a task force to review Policy 37.010 and to make recommendations about procedures and
practices for naming University facilities; and

   Be it further resolved that this task force include faculty representatives.

Please refer to Appendix D for a copy of the resolution.
Questions and Discussions

- A senator noted that there is now social media confirmation that the Roger Ailes name has already been removed from the wall. This senator said that this is important because it gives voice to faculty.
- A senator said that the resolution to appoint a task force to review naming practices is a good idea. The senator would want to vote on this resolution at the next meeting in order to maintain momentum.
- A senator asked if the policy was available for public review. McLaughlin noted that the policy is available online at https://www.ohio.edu/policy/37-010.html.
- A senator asked about the practices of other universities and specifically mentioned a concern about making donations more difficult. McLaughlin explained that this is likely something the task force would review. Another senator noted that some universities have a morals clause associated with naming. McLaughlin mentioned that some universities have a policy about not naming buildings or facilities after a living person, but this is likely to be problematic for a university that does not have extensive resources.
- A senator noted that there was some controversy about the Roger Ailes naming of the WOUB Newsroom at the time of the naming. A policy might have anticipated or addressed issues earlier in the process.
- McLaughlin invited further input before the second reading at the next meeting.

VIII. Finance & Facilities Committee (Susan Williams)

- **Topic 1: Dublin Campus.** Williams noted that she and McLaughlin attended a meeting in July with administrators about the Dublin Campus. Previously, faculty had expressed concerns about taking resources from other campuses, setting up Dublin to be in direct competition with RHE, and how quickly decisions were being made. The meeting addressed a number of these concerns. One point that was emphasized was that the planning is considered long-term and specific decisions about how to move forward had not been finalized. OHIO is looking for input now from a variety of stakeholders. However, communications with Dublin provide strategic directions to move the project forward. With respect to competition with RHE, OHIO’s goal is to establish Dublin as complementing RHE programs. McLaughlin and Williams recommended that OHIO should make faculty more aware that this was not an immediate action plan. Williams also noted that the planning will continue to as a mixed use facility per the strategic vision and plans of the City of Dublin.
- **Topic 2: Benefits Advisory Council.** Williams explained that there had been a first meeting of the Benefits Advisory Council, but the first meeting was mostly informational. However, there are some decisions and issues that will be addressed in forthcoming meetings. These may be mostly related to avoiding triggering the Cadillac plan. The Council will be co-chaired with Colleen Bendell and Susan Williams. Williams noted that a comparison with other universities might be helpful to showcase how OHIO compares.

Questions and Discussions

- McLaughlin noted that he and Thomas attended the Board of Trustees meeting in June; Dublin was discussed at the meeting. At this meeting, the Board of Trustees raised questions and concerns similar to those of the faculty.
- McLaughlin noted that one of the issues from the brown bag lunches with senators was concern about the benefit package. McLaughlin assured that the faculty will monitor changes and will continue to be part of conversation.
IX. Professional Relations Committee (Sherrie Gradin)

Topic: Inclusivity Task Force. Gradin reminded faculty that Diane Bouvier and Judy Piercy spoke at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate about OHIO’s Disability Strategic Plan for Inclusion and Accessibility. The task force developed committees for the upcoming year(s) about how to shift the entire campus including facilities and curriculum. Senator Machtmes is the faculty senate representative on the leadership committee. Machtmes provided an update about what this committee is doing and what to look for in this semester.

Machtmes noted that the group put together a questionnaire that will be distributed later this year. The questionnaire asks about a number of issues related to needs assessment across the university. For example, the need for a checklist or resource guide for successfully assisting persons with disabilities who might be invited to campus to speak at a lecture or in class. The questionnaire will also ask about faculty’s level of knowledge about compliance and assistance resources. This will be a Qualtrics survey that will be sent to all faculty in early spring. Results will be shared across groups, committees, and departments to assist with planning and activities.

Senator Kessler noted that OHIO is developing policy about the use of online resources – university websites, online courses, websites used within curriculum, etc. – as related to accessibility.

Questions and Discussions
• A senator asked about the progress of policy related to faculty teaching at other universities and for online courses. Two current senators were on a task force to discuss this issue. One of the other members of this task force was supposed to follow-up with a draft of a policy or suggestions for revision. Gradin said that she would look into the issue.

X. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Charles Buchanan)

Topic: Updates. Buchanan provided a brief overview of EPSA and its functions in the areas of educational policy and curriculum. Half of the EPSA committee members serve on the University Curriculum Council; the other half of the committee works on educational policy issues. Buchanan shared some of the topics to be addressed in the upcoming year: (1) implementation of university’s accessibility plan – especially with consideration of the amount of work required from faculty to address students’ needs, (2) process for stackable certificate, (3) online teaching outside of the university, and (4) recruiting faculty members to serve on the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment advisory committee. Buchanan noted that the issues mentioned are mostly reactive. However, he would like EPSA to take a more proactive approach. As such, he encouraged faculty to bring issues or ideas to him.

Questions and Discussions
• None

XI. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Ben Bates)

Topic: Updates. Bates provided a brief overview of the P&T committee by explaining that the committee manages issues of promotion and tenure appeals as well as extensions to faculty’s tenure-clock. Bates remarked that the committee has already met this year and expects at least some activity in terms of managing appeals. Bates further noted that a question has been raised about the process for retaining tenure when moving from one department to another department within the University. The discussion of this issue has already started and will continue.
Questions and Discussions
• None

XII. New Business
❖ Topic 1: Committees. McLaughlin thanked the Faculty Senate committee chairs – Susan Williams, Sherie Gradin, Charles Buchanan, and Ben Bates – for agreeing to chair the committees. These are significant responsibilities that involve extensive work. McLaughlin also reminder senators of the composition of the Executive Committee including the three elected officers – Joe McLaughlin (Chair), David Thomas (Vice-Chair), and Katie Hartman (Secretary) – and two at-large members – Amy White and Jackie Wolf.

❖ Topic 2: Senators. McLaughlin also mentioned that there were some resignations over the summer. When there were alternates, the alternates were invited to serve. Robin Muhammad and Paul Patton will serve as tenure-track / tenure senators from the College of Arts & Sciences; Tracy Pritchard will serve as an at-large, career teaching senator. In the case of the College of Business, there was not an alternate to appoint. In this case, Rebecca Thacker was appointed. McLaughlin further noted that there are no senators currently representing the Lancaster campus. The faculty governance structure on that campus is working to find us senators.

Questions and Discussions
• None

XIII. Adjournment
❖ Bates moved to adjourn, seconded by Weckman. The meeting was adjourned at 9:02PM.
Appendix A: Enrollment Update

Enrollment Update, 2016 – New Students

New Student enrollment analysis for overall and targeted student populations from the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP) as of the first day of class:

- Overall New Freshmen – 4,309, so far third highest in school history

![Graph showing enrollment trend from 2010 to 2016]

Enrollment Update, 2016 – New Students

New Student FINAL enrollment analysis for overall and targeted student populations from the SEMP as of the first day of class: To be updated

- International – 36, down 28, a lot of work being done here.
- Multicultural* – 609, down 9 from last year’s record
- Students from Appalachian Counties – 794 – 19% of class, up 63 students (9.0%) from last year, record
- Students identified as First Generation – 993- 24.5% of class, up 49 students (5%), 2nd highest since we started tracking
- Student Academic Quality – Overall essentially equal to last year’s record with:
  - ACT Composite – 24.0 (24.1 last year was a record)
  - High School GPA = 3.48 (3.46 last year), record
- New Transfer Students – 545, down 18

*This category includes students identified as: Hispanic, American Indian, Asian American, African American, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, or Two or More Races
Enrollment Update, 2016 – Overall

Overall Enrollments – We want to start to change the conversation as we transition to a more accurate unduplicated headcount number moving forward.

- 2015-16 total year unduplicated all campus headcount enrollment was 43,752
- Fall unduplicated all campus enrollment:

* Currently up 140 students overall
* Anticipate more than 37,000 unduplicated

Enrollment Update, 2016 – Overall

Retention Rate - Fall 2015 new students returning Fall 2016. 2.4 increase!!!
Enrollment Update, 2016 – Overall

Overall enrollment –

- **TOTAL Enrollment** - Up 93 (0.3%) to 36,410, Record
- **Undergraduate Athens Enrollment** – Up 250 (2%) to 18,207
  - **Undergraduate E-Campus Enrollment** – Up 31 (1%) to 5,638
- **Graduate Athens Enrollment (Including Dublin)** – Up 62 (2%) to 2,686
- **Graduate Outreach and E-Campus** – Up 187 (8%) to 2,624
- **College of Medicine Enrollment** – Up 93 (13%) to 805, definite record!
- **Regional Higher Education Enrollment** – Down 94 (1%) to 8,427

Enrollment Update, 2016 – Milestones

The following **Anticipated** milestones can be attributed to the Fall 2016 enrollments at Ohio University:

**New Student Milestones:**

- Third highest freshman class in OHIO history
- Highest (record?) Arts and Sciences enrollment since 1995 = 1,007
- Record Appalachian counties resident enrollments = 794
- Record African-American enrollments = 244
- Record Asian-American enrollments = 47
- Record High School GPA average for freshman class = 3.48

**Overall Enrollment Milestones:**

- Record Athens student enrollments = +250
- Record Overall Graduate student enrollments = +187
- Record Medical student enrollments = +93
- Record overall unduplicated headcount enrollments = +93 = 36,410!
Enrollment Initiatives - 2017+

To continue to advance our enrollment planning, following are a few high level highlights of efforts we will be undergoing this next year:

- **SEMP2** – Following the great success with our inaugural SEMP, 2010-2016, the next SEMP Advisory Committee has been established and is in the process of setting parameters and goals.

- **Common App** – OHIO will be a Common Application school for the Fall 2017 class.

- **The OHIO Guarantee** – Our first cohort under the Guarantee (Fall 2015) has advanced to the second year and did not see an increase in their costs! The 2016 class is our second cohort of students beginning the OHIO Guarantee.

- **International Student Enrollments** - Revamping our overall approach to international recruitment.
TRANSFER

Today's students are increasingly mobile ... but the transfer process gets in their way ...

33% of all students transfer before graduation.¹

14.6% of 2014 bachelor degree recipients started studies in another state.²

Transfer students who earn a B.A. take 1.2 years longer.³

Although 80% of community college students desire a bachelor's degree, only 1 in 10 actually complete within 6 years.⁴

Only 58% of transfer students are able to bring all or almost all of their credits with them.⁵

... and too many simply give up!

Passport Knowledge and Skill Areas

- Oral Communication
- Written Communication
- Quantitative Literacy
- Natural Sciences
- Human Cultures
- Creative Expression
- Human Society and the Individual
- Critical Thinking
- Teamwork and Value Systems
Goal:

While safeguarding quality, simplify the transfer process to save students time and money and increase their chances of completing a credential.

Students who earn a Passport at one participating institution and transfer to another have their learning achievement recognized for meeting all lower-division general education requirements.

- **Faculty-led.** Each institution’s faculty decides what courses and/or learning experiences are in its Passport Block.
- **Collaboratively developed.** Faculty from two- and four-year institutions in multiple states developed the Passport Learning Outcomes and Proficiency Criteria.
- **Data-driven.** Designed by registrars and researchers from multiple institutions, the student tracking service provides Passport sending institutions with reports on the academic progress of their former students.
- **Rigorous.** Multiple avenues of quality assurance built into the Passport ensure a focus on continuous improvement.
Benefits for:

▶ Students.
  • An early milestone on the way to a credential to encourage persistence.
  • Advance knowledge that lower-division general education learning will be recognized upon transfer.
  • Faster time to degree, which will lower cost, reduce debt, and decrease foregone earnings from unduplicated learning.

▶ Faculty.
  • Opportunity to construct the institution’s Passport Block: a list of courses/learning experiences that prepare its students to achieve quality learning outcomes.
  • Flexibility to make curricular changes in its Passport Block without triggering equivalency reviews.
  • Opportunity to collaborate with colleagues on interstate faculty teams.

▶ Institutions.
  • Opportunity to align lower-division general education learning outcomes with a national network of institutions.
  • Fewer unnecessary or duplicated courses means greater student motivation to complete and faster time to degree, improving completion agenda performance metrics.

(continued)
The Interstate Passport Initiative provides a new learning-outcomes-based framework for transfer with the goal of improving graduation rates, shortening time to degree, and saving students' money. The new framework focuses on lower-division general education, the common denominator among most institutions—concentrating on it as a whole, not on individual courses—and allows for a cross-border "match" of outcomes-integrated general education for block transfer. Students who earn a Passport at one participating institution and transfer to another will have their learning achievement recognized; they will not be required to repeat courses or other learning opportunities at the receiving institution to meet lower-division general education requirements.

The idea and design for this grass-roots initiative was conceived in 2010 by chief academic leaders in the West as a solution for transfer students, who too often lose credits, have to repeat courses, and spend additional money to complete their degrees. With approximately 33 percent of today's students transferring—and nearly 27 percent of them crossing state lines according to a study by the National Student Clearinghouse—the Passport promises a new way to streamline transfer students' pathways to graduation.

Passport Learning Outcomes and Proficiency Criteria for Transfer
Since 2011, faculty from both two- and four-year institutions in multiple states have worked collaboratively to develop the Passport Learning Outcomes (what a student should know and be able to do) and attendant proficiency criteria (ways students demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes) in lower-division general education. Referencing the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the Passport framework comprises nine knowledge and skill areas: oral communication, written communication, quantitative literacy, natural sciences, human cultures, critical thinking, creative expression, human society and the individual, teamwork and value systems.

Each of the nine areas includes a consensus set of Passport Learning Outcomes (PLOs) reflecting the learning outcomes of the participating faculty's institutions or states. The Proficiency Criteria (PC) provide examples of current classroom assignments as a context within which to establish an understanding among faculty about student proficiency with the learning outcomes at the lower-division general education level and to review one's own assignments.

Passport Blocks
To participate in the Passport Network, each institution must construct its Passport Block—a list of courses and/or learning opportunities by which its students achieve the Passport Learning Outcomes. Students who do so will be awarded a Passport and notified of this achievement. For many students, this will stand as an early milestone on their way to a degree. For those who transfer, it will ensure that they do not waste time repeating learning they have already achieved at their former institution even if the courses or credits required at their new Passport institution's Block are different. Faculty also benefit by knowing that they can change the curriculum in the courses in their institution's Block without triggering an articulation review as long as the PLOs are still addressed.
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Verifying Passport Students and Tracking Their Academic Progress
Institutions participating in the Passport Network agree to report the number of Passports awarded and supply data on the academic performance of Passport and non-Passport students who transfer into their institution for two terms after they transfer as well as for students who earn the Passport at their institution for two terms after earning it. These data are sorted and analyzed by the Passport’s Central Data Repository (CDR). Each sending institution receives a report detailing how well its former students have performed at Passport receiving institutions for use in continuous improvement efforts. The CDR also reports aggregate data to the Passport Review Board for use in evaluating the overall performance of the Passport program.

The design for noting the Passport on student records and tracking academic performance was developed by registrars and institutional researchers from participating institutions. Currently, Utah State University serves as the CDR. In 2016 some of this work will transition to the National Student Clearinghouse. Passport institutions will be able to use the Passport-Verify service to determine which incoming transfer students have a Passport, ensuring that their learning is recognized. Passport Network members will also submit academic progress data to the Clearinghouse, enabling the Passport Network to be scaled across the nation.

Participating in the Passport Framework’s Development
Faculty, registrars, institutional researchers, academic advisors, and campus marketing specialists from two-year and four-year institutions in 16 states are involved in the development and testing of the Passport Framework. Some have been involved since the first phase kicked off in 2011 while others are now coming aboard to evaluate the process of applying for Passport status or to pilot the process of mapping critical assignments to the PLOs. States involved to date include: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Montana, North Dakota, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Virginia, Utah, and Wyoming.

Becoming Part of the Passport Network
In spring 2016, regionally accredited public and private not-for-profit institutions can apply to become members of the Passport Network. To be approved by the Passport Review Board, an institution’s faculty must agree that its learning outcomes are congruent with and not in conflict with the PLOs, and are acceptable as a basis of block transfer. They must also construct the institution’s Passport Block. The registrar must put in place processes to award the Passport to students who achieve it and to recognize incoming transfer students with a Passport as having fulfilled the lower-division general education requirements as well as supply data annually on the number of Passport's awarded and the academic progress data described above. Institutions sign a Memorandum of Agreement for a five-year renewable term and may pay an annual membership fee.

Funding for the Passport Initiative
The Interstate Passport initiative is being developed and rolled out in phases with funding from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Lumina Foundation, and a First in the World grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

The Interstate Passport Initiative is managed by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), one of four regional compacts established by the U.S. Congress in the 1950s to facilitate the sharing of information and expertise in the higher education community.

More Information
More information is available at www.wiche.edu/passport or contact Cathy Walker, project manager, at cwalker@wiche.edu
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Becoming an Interstate Passport Institution

- **FACULTY**
  - Review PLOs for Congruence
- **ADMINISTRATORS & INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCHERS**
  - Track Academic Progress of Passport Students
- **ADVISORS/MARKETERS**
  - Apply for Passport Status
- **Interstate Passport**
  - Award Passport
  - Inform & Advise Students About Passport
  - Construct Institution’s Passport Block
Appendix C: Resolution

Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Naming of the Roger Ailes Newsroom
Executive Committee
Faculty Senate
September 12, 2016—First Reading

Whereas faculty desire to create a safe learning environment for all students; and

Whereas Faculty Senate supports the University’s Sexual Misconduct Policy (Policy 03.004);

Be it resolved that Faculty Senate requests the immediate removal of the name Roger E. Ailes from the WOUB newsroom.
Appendix D: Resolution

Resolution on the Appointment of a Task Force to Review University Naming Practices
Executive Committee
Faculty Senate
September 12, 2016—First Reading

Whereas the University Policy on the Naming of University Buildings (37.010) has not been reviewed since its approval in March 2003; and

Whereas a variety of naming practices, such as the naming of classrooms, laboratories, and conference rooms, are not covered under this policy;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the Executive Vice President & Provost to appoint a task force to review Policy 37.010 and to make recommendations about procedures and practices for naming University facilities; and

Be it further resolved that this task force include faculty representatives.