Meeting called to order by Beth Quitslund (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:10PM

In attendance

- **College of Business**: K. Hartman, T. Luce, Z. Sarikas
- **College of Fine Arts**: C. Buchanan, K. Geist, A. Hibbitt, D. Thomas
- **College of Health Sciences and Professions**: F-C. Jeng, A. Sergeev, B. Sindelar
- **Group II**: D. Duvert, C. Schwirian
- **Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine**: S. Inman, S. Williams
- **Patton College of Education**: K. Machtmes, P. Mather [sub for G. Brooks], A. Szolosi [sub for S. Helfrich]
- **Regional Campus – Chillicothe**: B. Trube
- **Regional Campus – Eastern**: K. Spiker
- **Regional Campus – Lancaster**: L. Trautman
- **Regional Campus – Southern**: O. Carter
- **Regional Campus – Zanesville**: A. White
- **Russ College of Engineering**: C. Bartone, J. Cotton, G. Suer
- **Scripps College of Communication**: B. Bates, B. Reader
- **Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs**: A. Ruhil

**Excused**: G. Brooks (FFL), S. Doty, S. Helfrich, N. Manring, J. Taylor

**Absent**: A. Babrow, L. Black, D. Masel, S. Walkowski

---

**MEETING AGENDA**

I. Board of Trustees Chair Sandra Anderson and Vice Chair David Wolford

II. Campus Climate Task Force Report—Valerie Young and Colleen Bendl

III. Roll Call and Approval of the September 14, 2015 Minutes

IV. Chair’s Report—Beth Quitslund
   - **OHIO Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency**—Betty Sindelar
   - Updates and Announcements
   - Upcoming Senate Meeting: November 2, 2015

V. Finance & Facilities Committee—Joe McLaughlin
VI. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Kevin Mattson
   • Resolution on Approval of Group II Promotion Criteria—Second Reading

VII. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt
   • [Revised] Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding the Role of
   Group III Faculty—First Reading

VIII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ben Bates

IX. New Business

X. Adjournment

I. Board of Trustees Chair Sandra Anderson and Vice Chair David Wolfart

   Topic 1: Introduction by Faculty Senate Chair. Faculty Senate Chair Beth Quitslund welcomed
   Board of Trustees members to the Faculty Senate meeting and thanked all Trustees for their service.
   To introduce the speaker(s), Quitslund first described the role of the Board and Trustees and then
   introduced two Trustees (Chair Sandra Anderson and Vice Chair David Wolfart) as guest speakers
   for the meeting. The introduction provided by Quitslund is provided below.

   o The Board of Trustees is the governing body of Ohio University, with strategic governance
   and accountability as its primary concerns. The Board's Statement of Expectations states that
   the Board “is responsible for ensuring that the university offers students an educational
   experience of the highest quality and produces research that provides economic and cultural
   benefits to the citizens of Ohio….The Board should recognize the important role that the
   principle of shared governance plays in institutions of higher education. It should seek input
   from faculty, staff and students and whenever possible incorporate their views into its
   decisions.”

   The Board of Trustees includes nine voting trustees, appointed by the Governor to serve nine-
   year, staggered terms. Trustees serve in the capacity of volunteer positions. The Board also
   includes two non-voting student trustees as well as two faculty representatives. The Vice
   Chair of Faculty Senate (David Thomas) sits on the Academics Committee and the Chair of
   Finance & Facilities (Joe McLaughlin) sits on the Resources Committee. The Senate Chair
   usually attends Board meetings and talks informally with Trustees. The Senate Chair also
   gives a formal presentation to the Board once a year; Quitslund will be providing this
   presentation in January 2016.

   Representatives from the Board of Trustees have also met with the Faculty Senate as a whole
   annually during the last several years. Quitslund noted that the Board has, in recent years,
   been genuinely committed to hearing faculty perspectives. Furthermore, Quitslund stated that
   the meeting guests were looking forward to listening as well as speaking.

   o Chair Sandra (Sandy) Anderson. Anderson is a 1973 graduate of Ohio University. She has
   served on the Board of Trustees of Ohio University since 2007, and she also served as chair
   just a couple of years ago. She retired as Associate Vice President and Deputy General
   Counsel at The Ohio State University Office of Legal Affairs. From 1977 to 2010, Sandy
   practiced law with the Columbus law firm, Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP, focusing
   on civil litigation. She has served on the faculty of the National Institute for Trial Advocacy
   and as an adjunct professor at OSU’s Moritz College of Law.
Vice-Chair David (Dave) Wolfort. Wolfort received his bachelor’s degree from Ohio University in 1974. Now Vice-Chair of the Board for the second consecutive year, he has served on the Board of Trustees since 2008. He also served on the steering committee for the recently-concluded Ohio University capital campaign. He has been chief operating officer of Olympic Steel since 1995 and president of the company since January 2001. David is a regional board member of the Northern Ohio Anti-Defamation League and is currently a trustee of the Musical Arts Association (The Cleveland Orchestra).

Topic 2: Introduction from Trustees. Anderson and Wolfort thanked Faculty Senate for the opportunity to speak and provided introductions.

Introduction from Chair Sandra Anderson. Anderson first explained that both Trustees are proud alumni with a number of family ties to OHIO and remarked that both Trustees are honored to serve. Anderson also offered a description about the Board of Trustees. Trustees are appointed by the Governor for nine-year appointments as volunteers. The Board has five meetings per year including one retreat; they meet from Wednesday night through Friday afternoon. The Board includes two standing committees – Academics and Resources – as well as advisory and ad hoc committees. Typically, the standing committees meet on Thursdays during the meeting; the schedule also includes times for the full Board to meet together for major decisions. Prior to the meeting, the Board receives a large (electronic) binder of information referred to as the Board Book in order to prepare for the meeting. This information provides background for the work of the Board meeting. One of the meetings takes place on the Regional campuses. Most recently, the Board visited the new Dublin campus. In addition, the Board is invited to attend a variety of events, programs, and celebrations across the campus including graduation, grand openings, galas, etc.

Introduction from Vice-Chair David Wolfort. Wolfort added remarks to Anderson’s introduction by explaining the Trustees deep-felt interest in the success and progress of the University. As volunteers, Trustees serve from a love and commitment to OHIO; they are interested in the protection, growth, and development of the institution even though this can sometimes be a difficult task given situations such as recessions and changes in state funding. Wolfort further noted that OHIO has had a number of large and small successes including (but not limited to) the results of the recent capital and the new dormitories. Wolfort also thanked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for inviting them to attend the meeting.

Topic 3: Submitted Questions. Prior to the meeting, Quitslund requested questions from the faculty for the Board of Trustees. Members of the Board of Trustee were provided questions in advance in both summarized and original form. For the meeting, Quitslund organized questions into similar groups and created questions from the questions submitted by faculty.

Question: Faculty, Personnel, and Compensation. The Trustees review the University Dash Board at the August meeting each year, and see trends like percentage of Group I faculty. What expectations does the Board have for those numbers? When would the Board become concerned with hiring?

Answer: Anderson. Anderson noted that the Board is provided a number of reports about progress and trends including enrollment, retention, graduation rates, and faculty. As such, the Board is aware from the reports that there was a time in which there were some cost-cutting efforts due to financial circumstances. We watch these numbers over time as well as compare these numbers to our peer universities. The Board’s focus is on quality of programs; faculty are the heart of quality of programs that serve students and other stakeholders. The Board has also had a focus on improving the compensation of the faculty in which the Board has given a charge to
move compensation to third in the state of Ohio. As such, even before the Ohio state budget was set in June, the Board made it clear to the Administration that they still wanted to move compensation forward in line with the plans. As such, the Board has been diligent about the compensation strategy yet changes will take time. Anderson also noted that Athens tenure-track full-time faculty accounted for 72.5% of faculty in 2014-15, which is above the national average (33% in 2009).

- **Answer: Wolfort.** Wolfort noted that it is good logic to compensate faculty appropriately in order to remain competitive. Compensating faculty is important for continuous improvement of programs, student recruitment, and development across the University. Wolfort emphasized that the Board has made a commitment to continue progress in compensation.

- **Question: Faculty, Personnel, and Compensation** [Follow-Up]. Does the Board ask for or receive an accounting of the change in number of administrative positions from year-to-year? Does it have regular updates about changes in administrative compensation, either in comparison to faculty compensation or on its own?

- **Answer: Anderson.** Yes – the Board receives information in the budget book and in discussions with the Provost about changes in administrative positions and compensation. The budget book provides head-count and compensation information about administrative positions. However, Anderson also noted there is some ambiguity in the accounting because not all positions are strictly faculty or administration; some serve in multiple capacities. In the most recent budget book, the head-count for administrative positions account for 42% of personnel while faculty account for 24%. Yet, the compensation is reversed. By salary, administration accounts for 34% of the personnel budget and faculty compensation accounts for 41% of personnel budget. Anderson further remarked that it is important to remember that we need enough administrators and faculty to achieve the mission of the University.

- **Question: Facilities.** A number of faculty members expressed concerns over what seems like accelerating deterioration of some core academic buildings. A major concern is how the academic units can pay for what needs to be done. Given that the Central Bank is not intended for very large capital projects, how do you anticipate that building replacements will be funded? Can we expect the historical practice of the State of Ohio to continue, i.e. that it will provide part of its funding for the university by paying for such infrastructure? Or should we plan for tuition to cover the amortized cost of new and refurbished buildings?

- **Answer: Wolfort.** Wolfort remarked that “there is no such thing as a free option.” Many of the buildings have not been updated in the past several years yet buildings need maintenance. As such, this is an on-going problem for a number of institutions. The goal is to continue to improve buildings as possible. The Century Bond and Central Bank is an important step in the right direction and should enable a number of improvements to be made. Wolfort argued that the University capitalized on a moment in time that is unlikely to happen again by securing a very low interest rate, establishing the sinking fund, and the ability to accumulate interest. What this means that OHIO has $250M to reinvest in the institution to reduce deferred maintenance or other needs as necessary. However, the University also has to use the money with care.

- **Answer: Anderson.** Anderson noted that the Board is aware of recent incidents in academic buildings and elsewhere. She has been called for when there were major
issues. The Board has been planning to address them using the Capital Improvement Plan. The Century Bond is part of the long-term strategy to address deferred maintenance issues. Anderson also noted that priorities change due to unexpected events. Century Bond is among several resources used to address the problem. Anderson also encouraged faculty to take a role to help the Board try to reprioritize needs. Furthermore, the Board has visited several buildings across the Athens campus and on Regional campuses. Anderson offered assurances that the Board is aware of the big problems and has plans to address them.

- **Question: Budgeting and the Regional Mission.** Many faculty feel that budgets have become significantly more opaque since the whole university moved to a version of RCM, and the associated issues have impacts on programmatic planning and development as well as faculty morale. I have heard from faculty across the institution about this, but when I put out the call for topics for this evening, the largest number of comments or questions on budgeting came from the regional campuses. The Board does not really have a role in the “rules” of our internal budgeting model, but I know it is very concerned to maintain OHIO’s access mission through the regional campuses. Can you speak at all to how the Board does or might affect the resources that are available to Regional Higher Education?

  - **Answer: Anderson.** Anderson responded by providing information about RCM and about the importance of the Regional campuses. First, RCM has been in effect for approximately two years. Board heard recommendations about RCM from outside consultants and leaders from other universities. As a data-driven Board, this information was important to making decisions. One of the goals of RCM is to empower Deans to have some more control of costs and revenue. However, budgeting is a challenge in general. Second, one of the challenges for the Regional campuses is that the state-share-of-instruction (SSI) has changed. This impacts the formula for how regional campuses across the state are funded. Another challenge for the Regional campuses is shifting economics; enrollments are being impacted by economic changes. The Board is aware of several budget challenges faced by OHIO’s Regional campuses. Anderson notes that OHIO Regional campuses are important to the accessibility mission, so efforts need to be made to identify ways to better support Regional campuses.

  - **Answer: Wolfort.** Wolfort noted that changes in the state formula to SSI require OHIO to adapt to changes and further emphasized the importance of Regional campuses to serving populations in their areas. The Board is committed to identifying ways to adjust and continue to invest in the Regional campuses.

Questions and Discussions [from the floor]

- Senator Schoen congratulated everyone on the results of the capital campaign and asked how the Board works with others to determine how the capital campaign money is prioritized to OHIO’s needs.

  - As the Vice Chair of the capital campaign, Wolfort acknowledged the hard work and efforts of the President to secure funding for endowments. The message was successfully delivered to donors. In addition, a number of transformative donations were provided. Anderson remarked that the President and the team explain the strategic priorities and university’s mission during donor calls. However, in addition to explaining this information, callers also determine passions and interests of the donor in order to match that to the strategic priorities. Passions could be scholarships, programs, and/or facilities. Anderson offered herself as an example of someone who has been called and has given a donation based upon her passions.
As a graduate of the Scripps College of Communication, Anderson donated money to name a conference room in Schoonover Hall. President McDavis added by explaining that there were two components of the campaign: from the University and from the Colleges. The University set priorities and the Deans set priorities. Several college-specific donations were instrumental in the final results. Quitslund remarked that donations are typically earmarked at the time of gift. Wolford added that the University needs to have the funds and to invest the funds appropriately. Anderson further noted that there are a limited number of sources of revenue. As such, the capital campaign helps to address shortages in other sources of revenue.

- Anderson concluded by thanking Faculty Senators and all faculty for their service and commitment to the University.

II. Campus Climate Task Force Report—Valerie Young and Colleen Bendl

- **Topic: Campus Climate Task Force Presentation.** Dr. Valerie Young provided a presentation with a review and updates from the Campus Climate Task Force. The presentation included background information, survey results, task force member names, recommendations, and next steps. Complete survey results are available at [http://www.ohio.edu/instres/climate/index.html](http://www.ohio.edu/instres/climate/index.html). A copy of the presentation is available in Appendix A.

**Questions and Discussions**

- Senator Bates noted the results indicate that senior leadership respondents were more satisfied in almost all areas as compared to every other group of respondents. Young responded by noting that the results may be a consequence of communications. Specifically, senior leadership is more actively involved with direct and consistent communication and messages. As such, one of the recommendations is that there needs to be more opportunity for direct, authentic communications from senior leadership to other groups. However, Young also noted that communication also has to be the responsibility of the faculty to pay attention to communications and seek information. Young shared a story that she has personal experience with not paying attention to some communications. Furthermore, Young noted that some of the negative results are specific to a particular problem while others may be more systemic.

- Senator McLaughlin asked if the focus should be on communication or if the focus should be dealing more directly with shared governance. Young responded by explaining that there is a difference between communication and messaging. Specifically, communication refers to being honest about sharing information—both sending and receiving—rather than superficial messaging.

- Senator McLaughlin noted that the recommendations for senior leadership included a number of continue recommendations rather than change recommendations. Young explained that there are a number of things being done currently yet doing something does not always mean that it is being done effectively. For example, there were several suggestions about things that should be done (e.g., the President or Provost should…) that are actually already being done. As such, the suggestions indicate that many do not know about what is already happening; this implies that some current efforts may not effectively achieve specific goals.

- Senator Reader remarked that the University is growing and becoming more centralized and, with that growth, individuals tend to become more abstract. Young responded by noting that this sentiment was apparent in the survey results. However, Young also noted that there are some concerns with too much decentralization as well as some concerns with too much centralization. For example, individuals are being asked to perform tasks or produce results with less central support. As such, concerns depend upon the content and context of the question.
• Vice Chair Thomas asked if there were budgets for the action committees. Young indicated that the Provost made a commitment for modest budget support to support actions. However, Young also indicated that direct compensation for committee members is unlikely.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the September 14, 2015 Minutes

❖ Roll call (Hartman)
❖ Bates moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Sindelar. The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

IV. Chair’s Report (Beth Quitslund)

❖ Topic 1: Updates and Announcements
  o 25th Anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Quitslund e-mailed an attachment that provided list of activities this month in celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Quitslund noted that there were a number of activities and encouraged faculty to review the list and to get engaged.
  o Faculty Senate Communications Survey. Quitslund encouraged faculty senators to complete the online survey regarding communications to and from the Faculty Senate. A link to this survey was shared in a recent e-mail sent to all faculty. In addition, Quitslund asked senators to encourage constituents to respond.

❖ Topic 2: OHIO Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency—Betty Sindelar
  o The Task Force started this summer and paralleled what the state was doing with respect to its Affordability and Efficiency Task Force. The state’s Task Force had a report due October 1, which is available at https://www.ohiohighered.org/affordability-efficiency. OHIO convened its own Task Force; the charge can be found at https://www.ohio.edu/provost/affordability-efficiency/index.cfm. The task force was divided into sub-committees. These sub-committees created ideas that are being discussed with respect to feasibility, barriers to implementation, and other considerations. The goal will identify actions with high impact, for consideration, and currently in progress. For example, the OHIO Guarantee is something that OHIO is already doing to address affordability and efficiency. Recommendations would be implemented by other committees. Outside consultants are also offering information and ideas.

❖ Topic 3: Upcoming Senate Meeting. Monday, November 2, 2015

Questions and Discussions
• A senator asked Sindelar if there were specific recommendations being considered that members of this body (i.e., Faculty Senate) might find controversial. Sindelar remarked that it was too early to say. Sindelar also encouraged faculty to provide input.
• A senator asked if the recommendations would also apply to the Regional campuses. Sindelar noted that it is likely that a number of the recommendations could be implemented across all campuses.
• Vice President for Finance and Administration Steve Golding mentioned the requirement from the state of Ohio regarding a 5% savings within a five year target. OHIO is required to put steps together to meet that goal. The Task Force has been asked to address the state’s goal as they put together recommendations. Golding noted that discussions and recommendations are still ongoing. Currently, the committee is seeking and receiving them from multiple sources. Golding further noted that the state is not recommending that changes be made to the detriment of quality programs.
• A senator asked if the consultants addressed faculty governance processes. Golding responded that they did not within the context of this task force. Instead, Golding mentioned that consultants provided recommendations for a separate process and group.

V. Finance & Facilities Committee (Joe McLaughlin)

❖ Topic 1: Updates.
  o The Planning Council has had a number of meetings this year; this work is on-going with respect to reviewing information. There has also been a first meeting of the Benefits Advisory Council. McLaughlin reminded senators that there must be changes to avoid the “Cadillac” plan moving forward.
  o Graduate Student Senate has been in touch with F&F about graduate student compensation. Specifically, Graduate Student Senate has been in touch to share information about their concerns over stipends, fees, and health care costs. F&F is considering possible next steps.

❖ Topic 2: RCM Liaison. McLaughlin reminded the Faculty Senate about the RCM Resolution passed in April 2013. Specifically, McLaughlin discussed the RCM process and clarifications about appointing / electing additional Senators or Group I Faculty as additional RCM Faculty Liaisons. Each College and Regional campus is supposed to have at least one RCM liaison. The Dean and the faculty should work together to identify one or more people to fill this role. The faculty and the Dean should decide together if they want to identify more than one person in order to have a larger group. If more than one person is appointed / elected as an RCM Liaison, then all appointees would be considered RCM Liaisons. F&F will be in touch with the Deans to discuss the appointments. The goal is to have a meeting with F&F and all RCM Liaisons at least once a semester. F&F would then report back to Faculty Senate.

❖ Topic 3: Capital Plan. At the upcoming Trustees meeting, the Trustees will be presented with the Capital Plan. The plan includes three phrases and emphasizes deferred maintenance – specifically for Clippinger Hall, Ellis Hall, and Siegfried Hall. Information is available on the Board of Trustees website (in the October 16, 2015 Agenda) at https://www.ohio.edu/trustees/agendas/index.cfm. McLaughlin noted that Tab 4 (pages 107-109) of the agenda discusses the Senate Challenge – 5% Plan and Tab 10 (pages 237-260) of the agenda details the FY17-FY18 State Capital Request and Century Bond Projects. In addition, a copy of the Interoffice Communication to the President and Board of Trustees regarding the FY17-FY18 State Capital and Century Bond Deferred Maintenance Projects: Approval of the FY 17-FY18 State Capital Submission can be found at https://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/upload/fy17-fy18-biennial-capital-plan3.pdf.

Questions and Discussions

• A senator noted that, as the RCM liaison for his/her College, it is has been difficult to distinguish between what information is related to RCM and what information is more generally an issue with the budget process. As such, how does an expanded committee help to communicate information and/or follow-up concerns? McLaughlin noted that some have been provided explanations (correctly or incorrectly) that RCM is being applied to some decisions while RCM is not being applied in other decisions. McLaughlin suggested that an expanded group would provide value by helping the group to learn others’ (university-wide) opinions – especially because RCM is a work-in-progress. McLaughlin also remarked that a Dean who wants more faculty input tends to be a good thing.

• A senator expressed concern that a larger committee might devolve into lost responsibilities. McLaughlin further explained that the push of RCM was a decentralization of budgeting. As such, RCM liaisons help to keep faculty senate aware of all of the happenings across campus.
VI. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)

❖ Resolution on Approval of Group II Promotion Criteria—Second Reading

The resolution offered by the P&T committee modifies language in the Faculty Handbook regarding promotion criteria for Group II faculty. Specifically, the resolution would modify Section II.C.3.b.vi.d to read:

If departments, schools, divisions, colleges, and regional campuses adopt more stringent criteria for promotion than those outlined above (a-c), such criteria should emerge from a faculty committee. That committee should have Group I and Group II representation and should be in consultation with a chair or dean. Any revised or new criteria that are proposed from that committee must be approved by a majority of Group I and a majority of Group II faculty voting separately who shall vote up or down. (Criteria approved and announced prior to July 2015 shall not be subject to a new vote.) In the event of an impasse between department, school, division or the college faculty and the dean regarding promotion criteria changes, the standing Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate shall act as arbiter. Following promotion criteria revision, units are encouraged to provide a grace period in which faculty already employed at Ohio University may elect to be considered under the earlier criteria as outlined in Appendix IX.F.

✓ Resolution was approved by vote voice.

Questions and Discussions

• A senator asked for clarification regarding the separate votes of Group I and Group II faculty. Specifically, is it possible for one person override the others in the situation in which there was one Group II faculty member in a department or if there was one Group I faculty member in a department? Mattson noted that the committee spent considerable time considering possible scenarios and determined that it was not feasible to draft a Resolution in which all scenarios could be addressed. As such, it is hypothetically possible for certain scenarios yet there are follow-up processes for these types of situations.

VII. Professional Relations Committee (Sarah Wyatt)

❖ [Revised] Resolution to Revise Language in the Faculty Handbook Regarding the Role of Group III Faculty—First Reading

The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to revise language in the Faculty Handbook regarding the role of Group III faculty. Specifically, the resolution would modify section(s) to read:

In Section II.C.3.c: Group III consists of persons holding part-time appointments who are primarily considered instructional personnel, and who have such qualifications as enable them to teach satisfactorily the courses assigned them. Group III positions should be 1) temporary, part-time positions to fill an unanticipated need, 2) part-time positions to fill a gap in teaching capacity, or 3) a longer term, part-time position to provide an expertise otherwise not available to a department or regional campus. Faculty members in Group III are expected to perform those faculty activities agreed to in negotiation with their departments or regional campuses and shall enjoy the following rights and benefits:

In Section II.C.3.c.iv: If the teaching load fulfilled by one or more Group III faculty in a department or regional campus becomes more long term (more than 4 consecutive semesters, excluding summers), consistently rises above 0.5 FTE and could be filled by a full-time or nearly full-time (0.75 FTE or above) position, a department or regional campus should request a Group I or Group II position and fill it according to the hiring policy of the department or regional campus and university standards for hiring full time employees. FTE is calculated using the workload policy of the individual department or regional campus in question.
Questions and Discussions
• A senator asked about a scenario in which a number of people are working as experts for a small number of classes (i.e., low FTEs). For example, experts teaching specific musical instruments. Wyatt noted that this scenario is covered in the three reasons for Group III positions noted in the Resolution and the language in Section II.C.3.c.iv that notes could be filled by a full-time or nearly full-time position.
• A senator asked about the change of wording to should from must in Section II.C.3.c.iv. Wyatt and Quitslund explained that Provost refused to sign the original Resolution and specifically cited use of the word must in this section as one reason. As such, it was decided that it was better to have a Resolution using should rather than to have no Resolution at all.
• A senator asked about converting faculty from Group III to Group II. Wyatt explained that the processes do not allow units to convert people from Group III to Group II. Specifically, the University has policy about job postings and searches for open positions.
• A senator asked for clarification regarding the use of nearly full-time (0.75 FTE) rather than just full-time. Wyatt explained that 0.75 FTE is the criterion in which health insurance is required.
• A senator asked if the Resolution would mandate employees to convert to full-time even in situations in which employees did not want to do so. Wyatt responded by explaining that there is nothing in the Resolution that requires a conversion. As written, someone would need to initiate the process.
• Wyatt concluded by explaining the importance of the Resolution to ensure that there is no confusion about the role and function of Group III faculty. For example, employees should understand that having a Group III position is not a pathway to Group I or Group II position.

VIII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ben Bates)
❖ Nothing to report

Questions and Discussions
• None

IX. New Business
❖ None

Questions and Discussions
• None

X. Adjournment
❖ Wyatt moved to adjourn, seconded by White. The meeting was adjourned at 9:28pm.
Appendix: Campus Climate Task Force Report

Background
- Ohio University full-time employees participated in the Modern Think 2014 Great Colleges Survey in the spring of 2014
- The survey was sponsored by the collaborative efforts of the leadership of the Faculty, Classified and Administrative Senates and the Executive Vice President and Provost, Dr. Benoit
- A 54% response rate was achieved, representing 2001 out of 3674 potential participants
- The faculty response rate was 60.0% (742 out of 1237)
- Complete survey results are available at http://www.ohio.edu/instres/climate/index.html

Survey Areas Reporting Favorable Results
- Pride in the mission of Ohio University
- Positive assessment of job fit, flexibility and autonomy and support for work-life balance
- Strong sense of community within departments and positive relationships with direct supervisors
- Recognition of the challenges and pace of change at Ohio University and in higher education as a whole

Survey Areas of Concern
- Individual employees are often not effectively evaluated on, rewarded for or held accountable for their performance
- Actions of the faculty, staff and administration and of different departments often are in conflict with or insensitive to one another
- Senior Leadership, the Senates and individual employees do not consistently sense a shared understanding of the strategic direction of the university or a mutual respect for one another’s roles in implementing it

Formation of a Task Force – Members
- Colleen Bendl – Chief Human Resource Officer Co-Chair
- Valerie Young – Chair of the Department of Chemical and Bio Molecular Engineering Co-Chair
- Cynthia Anderson, Associate Professor, Sociology and Anthropology
- Inya Baiye, Director of Equity and Civil Rights Compliance
- Bonnie Behm-Geddes, Administrative Specialist, Engineering Technology and Management
- Christine Bhat, Associate Professor, Counseling and Higher Education
- Joshua Bodnar, Director of Access, Transaction, and Video Services
- Candace Boeninger, Assistant Vice Provost and Director of Undergraduate Admissions
- Dianne Bouvier, Director of Equal Opportunity and Accessibility
- Quiiping Cao, Associate Professor, Early Childhood Education
- Shari Clarke, Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion
- Howard Dewald, Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Planning
- Haley Haugen, Associate Professor, English
- Joseph Lalley, Senior Associate Vice President of Technologies & Administrative Services
- Maryann Lape, Administrative Specialist, Continuing Education - Lancaster
- Renee Mascari, Business Intelligence Analyst
- Laura Myers, Chief of Staff, Provost Office
- Elizabeth Sayrs, Dean of University College and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
- Beth Quitslund, Associate Professor, English, Chair Faculty Senate
- Jamie Patton, Assistant Dean of Students
- Gwyn Scott, Associate Vice President for Auxiliaries
Recommendation Overview

- The recommendations focused on four key areas
  - University-wide Communication Structure
  - Professional Development and Department Leadership
  - Senior Leadership and Strategic Direction
  - Work Environment and Work-Life Balance

- Recommendations within these areas are broken down into three categories correlating with the timeframe for implementation and the likeliness they will positively impact the culture
  - High Potential – can be tackled in a few months
  - Ongoing – currently underway
  - Consider – may require more deliberation to better define an effective approach to assess whether the likely impact will be substantially positive

Recommendations – University Wide Internal Communication Structure

- Three roadblocks to effective university wide internal communication:
  - Communication that misses the intended audience or lacks continuity or follow up
  - Communication from senior leadership that appears inauthentic to the internal audience
  - A need for two way engagement and reciprocity

- Recommendations at a high level include the following:
  - (High Potential) Increase employee recognition and use of the university-wide internal newsletter
  - (High Potential) Rebuild the Faculty/Staff front page with an audience focus
  - (Consider) Consider how the online directory could be improved
  - (Ongoing) Units that offer internal services should continue to improve their avenues for receiving lateral communication
  - (Ongoing) Continue to support the Alert!OHIO system
  - (Consider) Investigate the effectiveness of internal communications in reaching the intended audience
  - (Ongoing) Continue to communicate for targeted and selected purposes via media other than e-mail

Recommendations – Professional Development and Department Leadership

- Three areas of focus related to how employees receive feedback on their performance and develop in their job roles:
  - Employees generally have trust in and maintain a positive relationship with their direct supervisor
  - Employees want improvements in how they are oriented and trained for current and potential roles.
  - Training and professional development of employees should improve functions that cross unit boundaries

- Recommendations at a high level include the following:
  - (High Potential) Improve the orientation process for employees new to Ohio University and for employees changing jobs within the university
  - (High Potential) Human Resources should work with units to improve annual employee evaluations so that they can inform compensation and employment decisions
  - (Continue) ongoing initiatives to ensure that pay for Ohio University employees is competitive with national benchmarks and equitable internally
o [Ongoing] Continue the HR Liaison program
o [Ongoing] Continue to identify and publicize opportunities for leadership, management, and supervisory training
o [Consider] Consider linking all training opportunities to a single Ohio University Employees’ Professional Development website

Recommendations – Senior Leadership and Strategic Direction
• Focus on the areas of shared governance, effective communications and vision for OHIO’s educational mission
• Recommendations at a high level include the following:
  o (High Potential) Senior leadership should communicate a consistent vision of how Ohio University furthers its education mission in this time of change
  o (High Potential) Undertake a review of the web presence on strategic initiatives and update the pages to reflect progress and current status
  o [High Potential] Senior leadership and the Senates should define a process to continue monitoring campus climate
  o (Ongoing) Senior leadership and the Senates should clarify the pathways for shared governance to impact decision-making
  o (Ongoing) Senior leaders should continue to find avenues to interact directly with employees

Recommendations – Work Environment and Work Life Balance
• Recommendations in this area center on benefits that are highly valued by and motivational to employees
• Recommendations at a high level include the following:
  o (Ongoing) Evaluate the impact of the Sick Leave Donation Pilot and Paid Parental Leave Pilot
  o (Ongoing) Continue to provide high quality benefits for employees and immediate family
  o (Ongoing) Continue Healthy OHIO program
  o (Consider) Consider implementing a “sabbatical” program for non-faculty to enable career development
  o (Consider) Consider a recognition program to encourage groups to undertake community service projects to foster community engagement, collaboration and team spirit

Next Steps
• Form a committee for each of the three recommendation areas
  o University Wide Internal Communications
  o Professional Development
  o Senior Leadership and Strategic Direction
• Committees empowered to
  o Drive implementation of “high potential” recommendations
  o Monitor effectiveness of “continuing” recommendations
  o Evaluate the potential of “consider” recommendations
  o Report annually to Senates and the Provost