Ohio University Faculty Senate  
Monday, February 1, 2016  
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 135, 7:10pm  
Meeting Summary

MEETING AGENDA

I. EVPP Pam Benoit  
II. Bryan Benchoff, VP for Advancement and CEO of the Ohio University Foundation  
III. Roll Call and Approval of the December 7, 2015 Minutes  
IV. Chair’s Report—Beth Quitslund  
   • Nominating Committee: Beth Quitslund, Linda Rice  
   • Updates and Announcements  
   • Upcoming Senate Meeting: March 7, 2016  
V. Professional Relations Committee—Susan Williams  
   • Resolution to Increase the Numbers of Faculty Senators representing Group II and Clinical Faculty—Second Reading  
   • Resolution to Clarify the Wording on the Early Retirement Policy—Second Reading  
   • Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding Appointment of Chairs—Second Reading  
   • Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding Departmental Approval of Chairs—First Reading  
   • Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding Information Presented in Faculty Appointments—First Reading  
VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ben Bates  
   • Sense of the Senate Resolution to Revise “Relocating Student” Language in the Undergraduate Catalog—First Reading  
VII. Finance & Facilities Committee—Joe McLaughlin  
VIII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Kevin Mattson  
IX. New Business  
X. Adjournment

I. EVPP Pam Benoit

- **Topic 1: State Capital Budgeting Request.** Benoit explained that OHIO has completed the capital budget request, which included a variety of projects focused on critical academic space. Examples for the Athens campus include $10M for Clippinger Laboratories, $6.6 for Ellis Hall, and $3.8M for Siegfried Hall. Requests for space on the regional campuses included four academic spaces. There were number of requests for smaller projects and deferred maintenance including roofs, building exteriors, utility systems, parking lots, walkways, etc. The total request was for $31.3M, which represents a 16% increase over the previous request. Vice President for Finance and Administration Steve Golding added that the request will likely be reviewed during March / April and decisions will likely be addressed in May.

- **Topic 2: OHIO Program Report.** Section 3345.35 of the Ohio Revised Code states that the board of trustees at each state institution of higher education must “evaluate all courses and programs the
institution offers based on enrollment and student performance in each course or program. For courses with low enrollment, as defined by the chancellor of higher education, the board of trustees shall evaluate the benefits of collaboration with other institutions of higher education, based on geographic region, to deliver the course” by January 1, 2016 with reports due to Chancellor 30 days after the evaluation. Final guidelines were provided to state institutions on November 23, 2015. The compressed timeline made this a difficult process. During the last Board of Trustees meeting, the report was filed to the Board of Trustees and was approved to move forward. The Ohio Chancellor provided guidelines for the narrative required, which included definitions of low enrollment courses, summaries about how low enrollment courses were identified, what actions were to be taken, and a list of courses targeted for institutional collaboration. The Ohio Chancellor also provided advice for low enrollment programs.

- **Low Enrollment Programs.** Based upon the guidelines provided by the state of Ohio, some institutions opted to use a single metric – number of degrees granted – to identify low enrollment programs. Although this is a straightforward approach, OHIO made the decision that this was not appropriate for OHIO. Benoit explained that programs may contribute to institutions in different ways and the single metric failed to recognize the function and importance of programs. Instead, Benoit and Deans decided to use three metrics for a more comprehensive evaluation of Athens campus programs: number of degrees granted, credit hours produced by faculty FTE compared to external, discipline-specific data, and educational cost per student FTE compared to external, discipline-specific data. For any program identified as low enrollment for all three dimensions, then OHIO would classify it as a low enrollment program. Using the three metrics, none of the OHIO programs were classified as low enrollment programs. However, there were a number of programs that were identified as potentially-low enrollment using two of the three measures. For each of these programs, there was a discussion with the Deans to explain the programs. There were a variety of reasons given, such as the program was new or the program had unusual circumstances as compared to the external data. Because comparable, discipline-specific external data was not available, only number of degrees granted was feasible as a metric for Regional campuses. Based upon this analysis, some programs were discussed with Deans; explanations were provided. All of this information was provided to the Board of Trustees.

- **Low Enrollment Courses.** Benoit first explained that the process only included courses traditionally defined as standard courses and excluded non-standard courses such as independent studies, dissertation hours, etc. More than 5000 courses on the Athens campus were evaluated; more than 2500 on the regional campuses were evaluated. With respect to evaluation criteria, the state provided guidelines about how to determine appropriate course enrollment sizes such as quality, centrality to mission, costs, potential for restructuring, potential for institutional collaboration, etc. In addition, the State also said that each institution should set course thresholds across the University and defined the requirement of minimum enrollment as exceeding 20% of the course thresholds. The OHIO administration had several discussions about threshold levels given the number of factors to consider. Ultimately, OHIO set the minimum course enrollment thresholds for the Athens campus to be as follows (with the State minimum noted in parentheses): 8(10) students for 1000/2000 level courses, 6(7) students 3000/4000 level courses, and 4(5) for graduate-level courses. For the Regional campuses, this was set at 6(7). As expected, few courses fell below the threshold. For the 265 courses offered through the Athens campus that fell below the threshold, explanations were provided to the Board of Trustees and the State. Possible decisions for each course were as follows: no action taken, eliminate course, reduce the number of sections, change modality, target this is a course to collaborate with other institutions, or other action. Benoit further remarked that some courses should be taught at less than the minimum threshold (e.g., Kayaking). However, Benoit noted that there were 63 courses
offered on the Athens campus in which OHIO could have reduced number of sections offered. Finally, the evaluation identified courses in which there were collaboration opportunities. Benoit noted that many of the courses marked as possibilities for collaboration were infrequently taught language courses. The report has been completed and provided to the State. Moving forward, the State requires this to be done every five years; the OHIO Board of Trustees has requested this to be done annually. Benoit also noted that the Deans have already been monitoring course enrollment closely. As a final comment, Benoit explained that other universities in Ohio have developed their own process.

Topic 3: OHIO for Ohio Strategy. This strategy reflects the reality that OHIO is serving the entire state through our main campus, five regional campuses, two extension campuses, a research park outside of Dayton, and a variety of centers. OHIO plans to use physical locations to build bridges with external agencies, companies, government organizations, and communities. In the long-term, OHIO envisions developing the network of sites as mixed-use campuses. The sites may provide any number of combinations including research laboratories, classroom space, residential living, and other amenities that reflect the unique context as well as needs of its stakeholders and community. As such, this strategy encompasses OHIO’s goal to collaborate with the communities in which OHIO has a physical presence to build upon the strengths of OHIO. Furthermore, this strategy reflects OHIO’s mission to serve a wide variety of communities within the greater state of Ohio.

Questions and Discussions

- A guest faculty member asked about setting up course collaborations with faculty at other universities. Specifically, she explained the difficulties she faced in the past when attempting to engage in this type of opportunity. Benoit responded by stating that she did not know about the specific difficulties mentioned. Benoit further remarked that the State has made collaboration a priority such that State may have new systems that may make collaboration easier now. Benoit also acknowledged that some difficulties in the past may reflect internal and external barriers. As such, Benoit recommended that it might be a good time to establish a new collaboration.

- A senator asked if information presented today was available electronically via the web. Benoit noted that materials about enrollment are available on the Board of Trustees website from the most recent meeting (January 22, 2016). Information about the OHIO for Ohio strategy is also available on the Board of Trustees website from the August 27, 2015 meeting.

II. Bryan Benchoff, VP for Advancement and CEO of the Ohio University Foundation

Vice President for Advancement and CEO of the Ohio University of Foundation Bryan Benchoff provided a presentation to Faculty Senate about the following topics.

Topic 1: About the Foundation. Benchoff described the history of the Ohio University Foundation, the roles and responsibilities of the Trustees (philanthropic, fiduciary, ambassadorial, and advisory), the Trustee committees, the endowment’s market value, and scholarship funding.

Topic 2: Promises Live Campaign Summary. Benchoff described the final results and an analysis of OHIO’s Promise Lives Campaign. Specific details and numbers can be found in the Appendix.

Topic 3: Division of Advancement. Benchoff discussed aspirational goals for the future ($50M annually and $1B endowment market value) as well as how to structure fundraising strategies for the future. A copy of the slides can be found in the Appendix.

Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked if the number of Trustees serving on the Ohio University Foundation is fixed. Benchoff explained that the number is not fixed; the Foundation has flexibility. The Ohio
University Foundation currently has 38 Trustees. OHIO is fairly typical; the range nationally is often between 25 – 50 members.

• A senator remarked that a positive step moving forward would be to increase communications between the Ohio University Foundation and the OHIO faculty through the Faculty Senate. He also remarked that there are sometimes disconnections between the Foundation and campus operations.

• A senator asked about the donor-centric funding model and how University needs and institutional strategies are communicated to donors during fundraising engagements. Benchoff remarked that there are some fundraising efforts that span the University including scholarships, faculty support, and existing programs. New projects and needs are identified by University administration. Furthermore, the Deans often set their own priorities for fundraising needs. Benchoff also stated that the Foundation and the Office of Advancement do not make decisions about OHIO’s strategic priorities. Instead, the Office of Advancement receives information about specific strategies and fundraising needs from the University administration.

• A senator mentioned a statement made by Gordon Gee about six years ago that described a policy at Ohio State University dollar matching between donations to athletics and donations to academics. Benchoff noted that the percentage donated to OHIO athletics was $27M, which represents approximately 4% of total campaign contributions. As such, OHIO is doing much better than a dollar-for-dollar threshold. Benchoff further remarked that the Office of Advancement would be unlikely to approach or solicit potential donations in such a way.

• A senator asked for clarification about the calculation of the aspirational fundraising goals (i.e., Advancement 2025). Benchoff remarked that the goal focused on just gifts and not investment returns on the endowment because the endowment is separate.

• A senator echoed a previous comment about increasing the communications between Foundation and the faculty. He also mentioned that the Ohio University Foundation outperformed a number of other universities during previous market problems. Benchoff credited the Trustees’ – and specifically the investment committee’s – expertise in finance, financial management, and financial planning.

• A media representative from the Athens News asked if the Ohio University Foundation meetings are open to the public and, if so, how to find out about future meetings. Benchoff stated that several of the Board of Trustee meetings are open to the public while there are a couple meetings that are not. The Ohio University Foundation’s next meeting will be held on February 12, 2016.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the December 7, 2015 Minutes

❖ Roll call (Hartman)

❖ The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

IV. Chair’s Report (Beth Quitslund)

❖ Topic 1: Signed Resolutions. Provost Benoit has signed two resolutions: Resolution on Group II Promotion Criteria Approval and Resolution on the Role of Group III faculty.

❖ Topic 1: Nominating Committee: Beth Quitslund, Linda Rice

According to the Faculty Senate bylaws, all sixth year senators comprise the nominating committee. This year, the committee is comprised of Linda Rice and Beth Quitslund. Nominations for Faculty Senate officers should be shared with Chair Beth Quitslund and/or Senator Linda Rice before the March 7, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting, where the slates will be announced. Self-nominations are encouraged. If you are considering running for an officer position, please do talk with any of the current officers about what the positions entail.
Topic 2: Updates and Announcements

○ Board of Trustees

The Board voted to increase the tuition/fee rate for the incoming cohort of students by 1.7% (average inflation over the last 5 years; the OHIO Guarantee legislation permits us to set tuition for each cohort at the state cap [0%] + the running 5-year inflation average.)

They also passed all the program reviews, although there was considerable discussion in the Academics Committee about how closely the Trustees were supposed to scrutinize the review reports and the recommendations of the UCC in response. The Trustees have asked for statements from the deans to accompany program reviews, stating what action steps if any they are taking in response to the recommendations contained in the reports.

Chair Beth Quitslund gave the annual Faculty Senate update. The presentation focused on (1) faculty contributions to and perspectives on affordability, efficiency, and innovation and (2) shared governance. In the first section, Quitslund discussed initiatives around a) textbook costs, b) streamlining the curricular process, c) the Academic Innovation Accelerator proposal submitted for the Innovation Strategy, and d) faculty views on athletics costs. In section (d) of the presentation, Quitslund asked the Trustees to consider supporting HR 2731 (the legislation that has replaced HR 275) and about the challenge to sustainability posed by the total level of national, state, and OHIO athletics subsidy. Quitslund also emphasized that, although faculty frequently raise ICA costs with the Faculty Senate, OHIO faculty does have diverse views on the balance between ICA costs and benefits.

In the second part of the presentation, Quitslund described how the initiatives Quitslund described in the first part of the presentation were good examples of shared governance, and how listening to perspectives from faculty that might differ from other participants in shared governance was a crucial part of the process. Quitslund also asked the Board of Trustees to participate in the discussion of shared governance that will be presented in the follow-up to the Campus Climate survey. Finally, Quitslund described the changing roles of non-tenure-track faculty, including our resolution today on Senate expansion.

○ Dean Evaluation: The Dean evaluation process looks set to start sometime next week. The committees will meet to receive their charge this Friday afternoon.

○ Student Senate Alumni Annual Advocacy Event: Quitslund forwarded senators an invitation from the Student Senate Alumni Society for a discussion about the cost of higher education on the evening of February 19. Featured panelists will include Chancellor John Carey and Senate President Keith Faber. Senator Faber is the author of the 5% cost reduction Senate Challenge. Please contact Quitslund if you need the registration information again.

V. Professional Relations Committee (Susan Williams)

○ Resolution to Increase the Numbers of Faculty Senators representing Group II and Clinical Faculty—Second Reading

The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to increase the numbers of Faculty Senators representing Group II and Clinical Faculty.

By 2018, ten Senators shall be elected by the non-tenure track faculty members (Group II and Clinical Faculty) of the degree-granting colleges with deans or academic units with a dean’s equivalent of the
Athens campus and Group II faculty of each of the regional campuses. Representation shall be in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each Athens Campus College with at least 20 eligible Group II faculty members will elect one or more senators to represent that college. All colleges on the Athens campus with fewer than 20 Group II shall be combined to elect at-large senator(s) from those colleges to serve on Faculty senate; all Group II faculty on regional campuses shall combine to elect at-large Group II senators from regional campuses to represent those faculties. Clinical faculty from HCOM and CHSP shall combine to elect at least one at-large senator from among their ranks to represent those faculty.

The allocations and election of Group II and Clinical Faculty senators will reflect the proportion of Group II and Clinical faculty at the annual faculty census prior to elections. Assuming the current allocation, seats will be added in the following way:

- In 2016, the number of Group II faculty senators shall be increased with four additional Group II senators (one at-large Group II Senator from regional campuses, one from HHS, and one from COB and one at-large Clinical Faculty member from HCOM and CHSP).
- In 2017, three additional senators shall be elected (one from A&S, one from Education, and one at large senator from regionals).
- In 2018, one additional senator shall be elected (an at-large senator from other colleges on the Athens campus that have fewer than 20 Group II faculty), for a total of ten non-tenure track Senators who are Group II or Clinical faculty elected by the Group II and Clinical faculty of Ohio University.
- If any new senators for Group II or the Clinical faculty seats unexpectedly vacate their seats before 2018, these will also be elected during the next regular election.

✓ Resolution was approved by vote voice of two-thirds majority.

**Questions and Discussions**

- A senator asked if there is an annual faculty census process. Quitslund responded by explaining that the current process is the Senate Chair’s review of data from Institutional Research.
- A senator mentioned that the Regional campuses have very few senators. The addition of the Group II senators as allocated may not fully represent all of the campuses. If Group I and Group II representatives have divergent views, then the voice of the tenure-track faculty may not be adequately represented – especially if a Regional campus only has one Group I senator.
- A senator stated that each Regional campus has at least one senator from each campus. The Resolution does not remove those senators; instead, it adds two more Regional senators.
- A senator asked for clarification about how the implementation would work given that the two Group II senators currently are faculty members from the College of Arts & Sciences. Quitslund noted that the implementation will have to reflect the numbers in each college.
- A guest asked if this Resolution raises the entire number. Quitslund replied that it did; it would not reallocate current Group I representation.
- Quitslund noted that this Resolution only passes with a two-thirds majority (or more), OHIO faculty, and approval of the Board of Trustees. By precedent from the last time the Constitution was changed, the faculty is defined as Group I and Group II faculty.

✓ Resolution to Clarify the Wording on the Early Retirement Policy——Second Reading

The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to revisions Faculty Handbook language about workload in Early Retirement. Broadly, revisions allow faculty in early retirement to (1) have
workloads that may include a mix of teaching and equivalent duties as needed by the department and desired by the faculty and (2) be reviewed annually. Specifically, the updated language is as follows:

1. **Workload**: During early retirement, the faculty member will be permitted to work the equivalent of one third of the department’s annual teaching load which could include a mix of teaching and/or equivalent duties as would benefit the department and as desired by the faculty member. What constitutes one-third teaching load should be flexible enough to support departmental needs in teaching, research and service. A faculty member could satisfy the workload requirement through a variety of mechanisms: by teaching courses equivalent to 1/3 the regular departmental teaching load or by performing a mix of teaching, research and/or service as would be an equivalent time commitment. For faculty on 10-, 11-, or 12-month contracts, workload will be prorated to a 9 month workload. Those faculty with evidence of on-going research productivity at the time of retirement may be able to include research/scholarship/mentoring of graduate students in their workload agreements if it is of benefit to the department. Additionally, a significant service component may be included as part of the workload if needed by the department. The distribution of those duties will be determined through collaboration between the faculty member and his/her academic department chair and after consideration of the needs of the department. Additionally, consideration must be given to the pay and tax implications of having early-retirees teach on multiple semesters (or neither semester) in a single calendar year even though the semesters are in different academic years. For colleges that include summer session as a normal part of a faculty member’s annual contract, the faculty member may, after consulting with his/her department chair, choose to fulfill his/her obligation during summer. If the regular departmental teaching load is not divisible by 3, then a multi-year arrangement can be made.

2. **Compensation**: The standard arrangement will be that the faculty member teaches the equivalent of one-third of the specified departmental teaching load for one third of the annual base salary. The salary amount will be determined according to the following pattern: initially, to determine the salary for the year after retirement, the faculty member’s base salary preceding retirement (adjusted according to the departmental raise pool) will be used. Faculty on 10-, 11-, or 12-month contracts will have their salaries prorated to nine-month contracts. In following years, the salary will be adjusted by the average percentage increase afforded the Group I faculty as a whole. An adjustment based upon a similar procedure will be made annually. Any special financial arrangements for a faculty member teaching under this policy must be approved by the Provost.

3. **Annual Review**: Early-retired faculty will have their teaching, service and research reviewed annually, covering duties specified in their agreement and in accordance with departmental procedures.
   ✓ Resolution was approved by vote voice.

**Questions and Discussions**

• None

❖ Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding Appointment of Chairs—Second Reading

The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to provide change Faculty Handbook language regarding the appointment of department chairs. Specifically, revised language notes that non-tenured faculty (pre-tenure Group I, Group II, or Clinical) should not be appointed to chair a department except under compelling circumstances as agreed upon by faculty. The resolution further explains conditions for making assignments in appropriate circumstances.

✓ Resolution was approved by vote voice.
Questions and Discussions

• A senator remarked that the change to use the word compelling is an appropriate change given that faculty will determine what is compelling.

• A senator asked if the Faculty Senate Professional Relations Committee (PRC) would be designated as the arbiter. Quitslund noted that PRC would not act as arbiter; it only arbitrates on matters specifically noted in the Faculty Handbook.

• A senator renewed an objection to the line “Clinical and Group II faculty are hired primarily to mentor or teach students and because of their role at the university and non-tenure status may not be appropriate choices” as unnecessary editorializing.

Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding Departmental Approval of Chairs—First Reading

The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to provide change Faculty Handbook language regarding the approval of department chairpersons, division chairpersons, and directors of schools. Specifically, revised language is as follows:

…Department chairpersons, division chairpersons, and directors of schools shall be selected by the dean with the advice and approval of the faculty (including regular Group I and full-time – at or above 0.80 FTE – Group II and Clinical faculty) of the department, division, or school. Initial appointments of chairs and directors require the approval of the Provost.

Questions and Discussions

• A senator made a suggestion to revise the resolution such that “the faculty” referred to later in the resolution should reflect the definition of faculty presented earlier in the resolution.

• A guest asked how this resolution defines faculty and if this resolution differences from the other resolution about chair appointments. Quitslund explained that the section of the Faculty Handbook addressed in this resolution (i.e., Departmental Approval of Chairs) precedes the section of the Faculty Handbook addressed in the other resolution (i.e., Appointment of Chairs). As such, changes noted in this resolution would define faculty for both resolutions.

• After remarking that s/he was the second longest serving senator in the room, a senator remarked that s/he has never felt more opposed to a resolution that this resolution. S/he argued that what we have now is a situation in which faculty members with tenure – i.e., those with academic freedom and job security – have to approve department chairs. However, there are units in which there are more Group II faculty members than tenured or tenure-track faculty members; trends seem to indicate that OHIO is moving in that direction more and more. We are moving to a situation in which people serve at the pleasure of the Deans and without protection from retaliation. Although none of the current Deans would do this, Deans in the future could hire in order to stack the deck. This resolution hands over a major privilege of tenure to non-tenure faculty. The senator expressed shocked that the Senate was even considering this and hopes that the resolution does not come back for a second reading.

• A senator expressed that s/he is proud of the work done by the Faculty Senate in the past four years to recognize Group II faculty as committed professionals whose contribution is integral to many functions of the University. The paternalism of saying that Group I faculty need to protect Group II faculty because they can be easily manipulated by Deans seems to be a faulty argument. In addition, this same logic may apply to untenured Group I faculty. To not give Group II faculty a voice in the shared governance of their departments is in opposition to the work of the Faculty Senate in the past few years. Group II faculty should be included in shared governance.
• A guest respectfully disagreed with the previous comments and argued that resolution such as this function to grease the wheels for the eradication of tenure. The speaker argued that tenure has been and continues to be vitally important to progress. Without tenure, there would not be women studies programs, LGTB programs, etc. Tenure matters; tenure matters to shared governance. Every time we do this, this is one more contribution to the eradication of tenure. In addition, the speaker suggested that this body (Faculty Senate) work towards getting tenure for Group II faculty.

• A senator agreed with concerns expressed about protection of tenure and further expressed concern about the assault on academic freedom. However, the senator argued that denying Group II faculty the right to participate in shared governance will not address that problem. In the past, Group II faculty member have been extraordinarily disenfranchised from shared governance. Now, they are just partially disenfranchised. Instead, we can help to address the continued assault on academic freedom by empowering Group II faculty members as well as by using the power of Group I faculty to defend academic freedom, intervene when problems occur, and identify manipulations of power. Group I should intervene if there are inappropriate uses of power toward all faculty.

• A senator asked about the audit mechanism for the annual evaluation of department chairs.
  o Quitslund noted that language about evaluating department chairs is already in the Faculty Handbook.

• A senator remarked that Group II should be deeply involved in the department including operations and decisions. Chairs have to work closely with all faculty members. Accordingly, Group II should be involved in the selection of chairs.

• A senator noted that this resolution changes the possibility of forming a committee to elect a change. If passed, this resolution would not allow for that possibility.

• A senator stated that Faculty Senate should be seriously exploring the possibility of providing tenure for Group II faculty members.
  o Quitslund noted that there are a number of ways in which a chair can be selected according to how one determines approval of the faculty. It may be interviews, discussions, or votes.

• A senator asked for clarification about the different ways in which faculty provide input about the selection of chairs. If there are one-on-one meetings, are the results shared? In other words, approval is a very loose term.
  o Quitslund noted that what determines approval is set by the department (or college).

• A senator noted that his/her college has an online system for evaluating chairs administered by the Dean’s office. This could be a handbook violation.

• A senator mentioned that s/he discussed this resolution with his/her chair as well as other chairs. Several expressed concern that this could be easily abused by some chairs. Chairs might feel anger toward a faculty member who did not support his/her in becoming chair. Group I faculty have more protection in these situations than Group II faculty. Are there mechanisms to address this possibility?

• A senator remarked that s/he assumes that “adults” would become chairs. S/he believes that instances of abuse and retaliation would be very infrequent.

• A senator remarked that the possibility exists for Deans and/or Chairs to manipulate the system. If there is evidence of retaliation, violations of academic freedom, or manipulations of the system, then these instances should be grieved. Group I faculty should also intervene in these situations.

• A senator notes that some Deans might want to change the culture of a college or department through hiring Group II faculty that may not resist changes as much as Group I faculty.
• A senator for clarification about the FTE in the documents. Is the 0.80 FTE appropriate? There are a number of differences across the University. In a worst case scenario, a unit could hire faculty at 0.79 FTE such that faculty cannot have a vote or representation.

• A senator remarked that his/her department has some long-term Group II faculty members. Recently, the department wanted to allow these faculty members to vote for chair yet felt that they could not do so based upon an understanding of the current Faculty Handbook. As such, it was suggested that there be some changes to at least allow for the possibility.

  o Senator Williams and Chair Quitslund presented alternate language for the resolution that would allow for more flexibility such that departments are allowed to decide. For example, if “approval” refers to voting, then Group II should be given the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback yet may not be permitted to participate in the actual vote. The alternate language has not been fully vetted by PRC but has been discussed by a number of people and has received feedback from PRC.

• A senator expressed skepticism about the extent to which the fear of retribution is real. If there is a real possibility of retribution, then s/he would stand to reason that we should protect faculty members from far too many things.

• A guest remarked that the alternate text reads much better. Specifically, the alternate language allows for the possibility for the group to decide based upon context and circumstance.

• A senator noted that s/he feels rather selfish about this discussion; it is about tenure as well as what tenure has and may become over time. One of the reasons that this senator values Faculty Senate is for the value of democracy and shared governance. However, these groups of faculty are two different groups with different relationships to power. As such, we should not enfranchise both groups equally.

• A senator thanked the committee, Senator Williams, Committee Chair Wyatt, and Chair Quitslund for their hard work and efforts. Senator Williams responded by stating that the committee has tried to consider this from a variety of circumstances and contexts.

❖ Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding Information Presented in Faculty Appointments—First Reading

The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to provide change Faculty Handbook language regarding new appointment contracts as well as terms of appointments for appointments, tenure, and renewal of contracts. For new appointments, a written statement of appointment should minimally specify the following:

  a. FTE, start and end dates of initial contract, salary arrangements, and other compensation agreements
  b. FTE, start and end dates of the initial contract and salary arrangements and other compensation agreements (e.g. start-up funds, moving expenses, facilities, teaching releases, etc.) as negotiated,
  c. The T:R:S distributions and expectations of employment, including responsibilities associated with the specified T:R:S distribution.
  d. Information about the need to attend both the “New Faculty Orientation” organized by the Provost’s office and “New Employee Orientation” run by Ohio University Human Resources, including date, time and location (if available at time of writing).
  e. A summary of benefits and/or a link to the benefits information contained on the Human Resources website.
  f. And for Group I, the latest date for tenure review.

Questions and Discussions
• A senator noted that the resolution should be slightly reworked to account for creative activities as well as research.

VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ben Bates)

❖ Sense of the Senate Resolution to Revise “Relocating Student” Language in the Undergraduate Catalog—First & Second Reading

The resolution is offered by the EPSA Committee to endorse amending the Ohio University Undergraduate Catalog to read:

**Relocating Student.** If you are currently attending Ohio University’s regional campuses and wish to attend the Athens campus, you are considered a prospective relocating student. Relocation is possible for any semester, though you must have earned at least 12 credit hours of coursework that is not developmental or remedial on the regional campuses with a minimum cumulative 2.0 g.p.a. to be eligible for relocation. Students who have earned fewer than 12 credit hours at a regional campus will be subject to Athens campus admission guidelines. Contact the student services office on your regional campus for additional information.

✓ Resolution was approved by vote voice.

Questions and Discussions
• A senator expressed his/her support for the resolution.
• A senator asked about the 2.0 GPA requirement. In response, representatives from the OHIO Admissions office indicated that a GPA minimum of 2.0 reflected non-probationary status. In addition, the state of Ohio mandates a GPA of 2.0 or better for transfer.
• Bates asked for a motion to suspend the voting rules such that the Faculty Senate could vote on the Resolution without a delay between the first and second reading in order to make the undergraduate catalog print deadline.
  o A senator moved to suspend the rules; this was approved by a two-thirds majority voice vote.
  o A senator stated that s/he would prefer to wait another month to receive feedback.

VII. Finance & Facilities Committee (Joe McLaughlin)

❖ Topic: Upcoming. Next month, there will likely be an update on budget planning. In addition, it is likely that there will be some changes to the Handbook language regarding employee benefits.

Questions and Discussions
• None

VIII. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)

❖ Topic: Appeal. Mattson indicated that an appeal is expected to be filed soon.

Questions and Discussions
• None

IX. New Business

❖ None
X. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 9:35PM.
Appendix: Advancement Update

OHIO UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION

About the Foundation
- Established in 1945 by John C. Baker
- Institutionally-related, nonprofit, tax exempt, 501(c)(3) organization
- Repository for all private gifts to Ohio University

Trustee Roles and Responsibilities
- Philanthropic
- Fiduciary
- Ambassadorial
- Advisory

Trustee Committees
- Executive Committee
- Membership Committee
- Finance Committee
  - Investment Sub-Committee
  - Grants and Funding Sub-Committee
  - Real Estate Sub-Committee
- Audit Committee
- Advancement Committee

Endowment Market Value

The Foundation has approximately 2,500 donor restricted accounts. Of that total, approximately 1,500 are endowed.
Scholarship Funding

THE PROMISE LIVES CAMPAIGN: FINAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Total Attainment = $500,127,000
99% was directed by the donor(s). (Just over $4.5M given to the university undesignated account.)

Total Attainment = 81,215 donors and 310,203 commitment
More than 33,000 donors gave more than once during the campaign.
More than 7,000 gave in at least 6 of the 8 years.
2,312 gave in EVERY year.

Attainment by Source (Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>$275,759,117.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Individuals</td>
<td>$30,811,096.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>$15,808,970.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>$153,406,147.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>$24,357,636.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attainment by Restriction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$105,227,572.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Operations</td>
<td>$174,213,802.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>$220,701,594.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount = $500,127,000
99% of amount directed by donor(s) ($4,500,000 given to university undesignated account).
### Attainment by Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College / Unit</th>
<th>Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>$18,789,548.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>$27,864,217.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>$11,282,702.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences &amp; Professions</td>
<td>$6,216,574.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>$140,271,279.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Tutorial College</td>
<td>$1,409,765.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton College of Education</td>
<td>$39,879,146.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ College of Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
<td>$122,326,483.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps College of Communication</td>
<td>$41,299,618.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>$1,460,644.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voinovich School</td>
<td>$1,015,420.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>$27,208,006.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$3,059,423.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>$11,524,918.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe Campus</td>
<td>$937,274.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Campus</td>
<td>$2,024,856.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Campus</td>
<td>$2,587,836.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Campus</td>
<td>$1,369,770.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanesville Campus</td>
<td>$702,868.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attainment by Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In the Door&quot;</td>
<td>$313,128,893.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Immediate&quot; Commitments</td>
<td>$115,306,535.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Future&quot; Commitments</td>
<td>$71,707,539.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact of Top 3 Gifts (Excluding the Top 3 Overall Gifts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Other Total</th>
<th>Top Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$16,238,973.87</td>
<td>$14,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$13,743,915.69</td>
<td>$7,678,451.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$9,489,004.98</td>
<td>$1,229,010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$15,120,945.28</td>
<td>$11,351,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$16,904,317.23</td>
<td>$9,258,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$15,349,598.88</td>
<td>$10,074,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$16,169,157.28</td>
<td>$20,597,494.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$28,045,023.43</td>
<td>$7,510,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact
- 2,371 accounts
- 872 scholarships
- 978 new accounts
- 478 new scholarships
- 29 capital projects
- 384 new endowed scholarships
DIVISION OF ADVANCEMENT

Advancement 2025
- $50 million
- $1 billion

What we know

First Time Donors of $10,000 or Greater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal</th>
<th>First Time Gifts &gt;$10k</th>
<th>Average Gift</th>
<th>Median Gift</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$139,510</td>
<td>$21,100</td>
<td>$16,183,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$101,529</td>
<td>$23,142</td>
<td>$14,315,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Predictive Model

Visits with NEW RELATIONSHIPS are predicted to yield a 5:1 return on first time gifts of gifts > $10k

Increasing NEW RELATIONSHIPS in the right MG EVI range we will increase first time gifts of > $10k
**Overarching Goal**
Build a nationally recognized, comprehensive, fully integrated & sustainable Advancement Program.