Ohio University Faculty Senate  
Monday, April 19, 2010  
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.  
Minutes, Approved May 17, 2010

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:10 p.m.

In attendance:

*College of Arts and Sciences:* K. Brown, C. Coski, J. Gilliom, S. Gradin, S. Hays, B. Heckman for J. Lein, D. Ingram, P. Jung, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, S. Patterson  
*College of Business:* L. Hoshower, T. Stock  
*College of Education:* T. Franklin, T. Leinbaugh  
*College of Engineering:* C. Bartone, J. Dill, H. Pasic  
*College of Fine Arts:* D. McDiarmid, M. Phillips, A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas  
*Group II:* H. Burstein, M. Sisson  
*College of Health and Human Services:* D. Bolon, M. Li  
*College of Osteopathic Medicine:* P. Coschigano, T. Heckman, J. Wolf  
*Regional Campus—Chillicothe:* R. Knight, A. Rumble  
*Regional Campus—Eastern:* J. Casebolt  
*Regional Campus—Lancaster:* P. Munhall  
*Regional Campus—Southern:* M. Crawford for E. McCown  
*Regional Campus—Zanesville:* J. Benson, M. Nern  
*Scripps College of Communication:* E. Graham for J. Bernt, G. Newton, J. Slade, S. Titsworth  
*Excused:* T. Anderson, C. Elster, C. Kalenkoski, W. Roosenburg, J. Giesey  
*Absent:* D. Bell, R. Boyd, A. Gupta for R. Frost, J. Thomas

Overview of the Meeting:

I. EVP&P Pam Benoit  
II. Roll Call and Approval of the March 15, 2010 Minutes  
III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin  
   • Updates and Announcements  
   • Presentation on AAUP Faculty Salary Data  
   • Ohio Faculty Council Report—Hugh Bloemer  
   • Nominating Committee for Faculty Senate Officers  
   • **Upcoming Senate Meeting:** May 17, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235
IV. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly  
   • Resolution Credit Hours for Minors & Certificates on Semesters—First Reading  
   • Resolution on Retakable Courses—First Reading  
V. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano  
   • Resolution on Addressing Interdisciplinary Concerns in P&T Guidelines—First Reading
VI. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin  
   • Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School—First Reading
VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth  
   • Resolution on Shared Governance in Intercollegiate Athletics—First Reading  
   • Resolution on Sustainability of Intercollegiate Athletics—First Reading
I. Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit

EVPP Benoit briefly addressed three issues: 1) faculty salaries; 2) the budget process for next year; and 3) the EVPP instructional capacity pool.

The annual AAUP salary survey has been released and circulated, and shows that OU faculty salaries have declined with respect to other state schools; this is a concern because we need competitive salaries and compensation to recruit and retain excellent faculty. Benoit said she understood that the faculty compensation initiative was put on hold last year to focus resources on enrollment and other areas that generate revenue. She also noted that the data is complicated; for example, the salary data does not account separately for retirement, attrition, raises for promotion and tenure, and the like. The full report was recently released, and the data will continue to be analyzed.

Benoit discussed the budget process with Mike Angelini (Interim Senior VP for Finance and Administration) to identify what worked this year and what needs to be improved. Benoit would like to keep the following features of this year's process: the level of transparency, the iterative nature of the process, face-to-face meetings with planning unit heads, clear public deadlines, collecting feedback from constituents via the web site and forums, and maintaining an activity-based approach. Aspects to be improved include: gathering more information about the details of budgets at the planning unit level; defining criteria more clearly; beginning the budget process earlier; working more with planning unit heads; and creating a comprehensive multi-year plan for the budget.

Finally, Benoit announced that she would move ahead with allocating the instructional funds held in the Provost's office (derived from reducing the raise pool to 1%). After meeting with one more Dean, information about the use of these funds will be available later in the week. Benoit then asked for questions.

Leon Hoshower said that he had heard that first-year room deposits were down 6%. Benoit responded that as of yesterday, room deposits are actually up. Hugh Bloemer asked whether Benoit was aware that there was a Board of Trustees resolution to move faculty salaries to the top quartile of the state. After clarifying that this was a Board of Trustees resolution (not the Vision Ohio priority), Benoit said she was not aware of that and would look into it. Steve Hays noted that it would be helpful if the administration could explain the broad pressures we are facing (e.g. debt servicing, utilities, etc), especially trends in these expenses. Benoit: That is a good comment; it is hard because things are changing so quickly that historical trends are not as helpful as they once were, but we can try to tell you the assumptions we have. Joe McLaughlin added that what could be most helpful to us would be how much large expenses (e.g. utilities, health care) have changed as a percentage of the budget over time. Benoit said that information about revenue trends would be helpful as well. Rudy Pasic requested that we also look at salaries over a longer span of time (e.g. ten years) to see the trends more clearly.

Joe Slade: You said we have to start the budget process earlier, which is a good idea. But in my college, the Dean announced the cuts early, and I did not feel like the forums made an impact; there was a sense that the cuts were already decided before the forums. This coming year, the rumors are that we will face draconian cuts, so to give some semblance of real discussion, a lot will have to be laid on the table, including why athletics is so important. Benoit: I take issue with one thing you said: there were changes between the first draft set of proposed
cuts and second set of cuts. For example, over $400,000 in cuts from IT were added after first set of cuts; we also asked planning units whether adjustments needed to be made after first set of cuts. I take your point that the discussions within Colleges might have to increase, and will follow up with the Deans about this. **Duane McDiarmid** requested that Benoit talk with the Deans about incorporating more transparency into the budget process; the level of transparency at the ground level varied substantially among Colleges. **Benoit** responded that she will take responsibility for that, and will continue to talk with Deans about this as the budget process moves forward. **Doug Bolon** added that some Colleges had an outstanding, transparent process.

**John Benson:** The proposed raise pool is 1% across the board plus a $750,000 merit-based pool dependent on Athens enrollment goals. Who sets those enrollment goals, and what is the trend? **Benoit:** Those enrollment goals are set by the Budget Planning Council (BPC); in the case of the merit pool the issue is whether our enrollment will generate the necessary revenue. BPC has started talking about developing guidelines for what to do if, for example, our enrollment generates $500,000 for the merit pool, but not $750,000. **McLaughlin** asked about regional campuses, and **Benson** asked whether regional campus enrollments will affect raises at the Athens campus, or vice versa. **Benoit** responded that regional campus raises would be based on regional enrollment. **Casebolt** noted that what we have seen so far implies otherwise; **Benoit** responded that that is because we have not looked far enough ahead yet.

**II. Roll Call and Approval of the March 15, 2010 Minutes**

A quorum was present. The minutes of the March 15, 2010 meeting were approved by voice vote.

**III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin**

- **Ohio Faculty Council Report**—Hugh Bloemer

  Hugh Bloemer attended the Ohio Faculty Council meeting on behalf of the Ohio University Faculty Senate on 4/4/2010. Topics discussed included: 1) House Bill 472, which proposes that all state-supported institutions use the same textbook for introductory classes. The Ohio Faculty Council strongly opposes this; and 2) The growth of administrative positions in state-supported universities while academic positions are shrinking. Chancellor Fingerhut joined the meeting to discuss Issue 1 (the Third Frontier program). He is concerned that it may not pass, and asked for help promoting the program. Fingerhut also said that the upcoming budget will be very difficult; he will do everything he can to keep education at the forefront, and emphasized that higher education needs to be looked at as a resource and not as an expense. Each campus also gave a report. Bloemer also asked those attending about faculty parking fees; they reported that Miami pays $60.00/year, BGSU pays no fees, and other non-urban campuses were not represented.

  **Hays** asked whether anyone pushed the Chancellor to think about how the University System of Ohio can help contain large costs (e.g. a state insurance pool). If we are told that we need to prune middling Ph.D. programs, why not do the same thing with athletics programs, which cost state-supported universities a lot of money? **Bloomer:** The issue has been raised, but universities have had a difficult time working out the statewide health care system; this should be possible.

- **Updates and Announcements**
We are in the middle of Faculty Senate elections: please encourage your colleagues to submit their votes, even if it is only for alternates. Next month will have new senators with us and we will elect new executive officers.

• Nominating Committee for Faculty Senate Officers
  The nominating committee consists of Tim Anderson, Tracy Leinbaugh, and Pete Coschigano. Coschigano reported that Joe McLaughlin, David Thomas, and Elizabeth Sayrs have agreed to run for re-election. In addition, nominations are welcome for any of the offices. Those who self-nominate will be assumed to be willing to serve; if other candidates are nominated, we will first ask whether the nominee is willing to run. Senators may also nominate from the floor. Short speeches will be presented on behalf of candidates in May. We will send out a slate about a week ahead of time of those who have been nominated in advance.

• Chair's report:
  The Executive Committee met with the outgoing Chair of the Board of Trustees Robert Kidder and incoming Chair Marnette Perry. This was a very constructive meeting. We shared the AAUP salary data with them, and they reiterated that faculty compensation is a priority for them; they will look at the data and ask for a new faculty compensation plan (or OU could commit to following through with the current compensation plan). We also pointed out that athletics has been allocated $2 million in new base funding in the last two years; this was not brought up during other Board events. We hope to arrange for Perry to come to the Faculty Senate meeting in June.
  Two tenure appeals went to hearings this year. In both cases, the president sided with the recommendations of the committees. McLaughlin commended the ten colleagues and two chairs who served on those committees.

• Presentation on AAUP Faculty Salary Data
  Salary data from the recently-released AAUP salary survey was circulated (as complied by Joseph Bernt for the local AAUP chapter's white paper on faculty salaries). The data show that faculty salaries at OU have fallen with respect to our peers in Ohio: from 3rd to 7th at the rank of full professor; from 2nd to 6th at associate professor; and from 5th to 7th at assistant professor. In addition, OU is ranked 10th or 11th in salaries compared to its designated presidential peers. We will find the Board of Trustee's faculty compensation resolution and give it to EVPP Benoit. The current Board may not be aware of this resolution.
  Brown noted that the data tell something important: all of the schools in the state have the same fiscal problems, and it is possible to face these problems and still provide reasonable increases in compensation. Other campuses have maintained compensation for two reasons: 1) Unionized campuses have negotiated contractual agreements for raises, or; 2) Non-unionized campuses (e.g. Ohio State) have followed through with making faculty compensation a priority. At OU, neither of these applies. Vision Ohio's high priority on faculty compensation is obviously a platitude, not real. If we get a 1% raise (and possibly nothing else if we do not meet enrollment goals), these figures will look even worse next spring. There's no future for faculty at Ohio University; administration is not worried about faculty leaving, because there are lots of younger faculty available. That's how much the university values us.
  Robert Knight commented that salary compression is a serious issue. McLaughlin raised concern about next year's budget; with a $15 million (minimum) budget cut next year it will difficult to improve the salary situation. David Thomas added that changes in the Governor's office could make even larger budget cuts possible. Duane McDiarmid reiterated
that percentage-based increases exacerbate the gap between higher- and lower-paid employees; this hits colleges with lower pay scales especially hard.

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: May 17, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

IV. **Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly**

- **Resolution to Approve Credit Hours for minors and certificates under semesters—First Reading**

  This resolution proposes that under semesters, the minimum credits hours for minors be 18-24 credits (currently 24-35 under quarters); for undergraduate certificates, a minimum of 18 credits (currently 24 under quarters); and for graduate certificates, 14-20 credits (currently 20-30 under quarters).

  Senators raised concerns that the conversion factor seems to be 3/4 rather than 2/3, due to rounding up. One senator pointed out that a minimum of six courses for a minor is more than 50% of the credits required for a major, and that 15 credits would make more sense. Other senators suggested making the requirements divisible by 3 credits (the typical credit per course under semesters). EPSA will look at this again.

- **Resolution on Retakable Courses—First Reading**

  Reilly began by explaining that retakeable courses are those that can be retaken to replace a previous grade in the course. Different departments have different policies – some courses cannot be retaken at all, while some that can be retaken 99 times. The new student information system, PeopleSoft, would require modifications (at considerable expense) to be able to continue this system. This resolution proposes a uniform university-wide retakeable policy of two retakes (three total attempts at a course) in order to start discussion about whether there is an acceptable number of retakes for all departments across campus.

  Senators raised several concerns. Some departments limit retakes to one, especially in large required classes. Bumping this up to two retakes could cause capacity problems. But if the retake limit were set lower, those departments with a high retake policy would have to pink slip large amounts of students into classes. Further research will be done to see whether a uniform retake policy is possible, or whether modifications of PeopleSoft will be necessary. Some senators expressed concern that PeopleSoft was driving educational policy; others said that this is affording us the opportunity to re-evaluate those policies and decide whether we are committed to them for pedagogical reasons.

V. **Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano**

  Coschigano reported that the Provost has signed the **Resolution on Correcting Inconsistencies in P&T Appeals, passed 2/12/2010.**

  - **Resolution on Addressing Interdisciplinary Concerns in P&T Guidelines—First Reading**

    Coschigano explained that the Interdisciplinary Council drafted this resolution by adapting part of a resolution passed last year by Faculty Senate but not signed by the Provost.
The Interdisciplinary Council then brought the resolution to the P&T committee to discuss and present to Faculty Senate. Coschigano then introduced Jerry Miller, Chair of the Interdisciplinary Council. Miller explained that surveys four years ago of certificate and interdisciplinary programs found that one of the major problems was how interdisciplinary activities were recognized and valued in the P&T process. This resolution introduces handbook language that asks departments/schools to ensure that their P&T guidelines clarify how and to what extent interdisciplinary activities will be assigned, evaluated, and included in annual faculty evaluations, and in promotion and tenure decisions.

VI. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

Gradin reported that response rates for Dean evaluations were up except for the College of Osteopathic Medicine, where it was down 10%.

• Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School—First Reading

The Voinovich Center has become a School, but they do not belong to a College. Right now faculty in this school are technically left out of the handbook in some areas; they have no faculty senate representation, no professional ethics committee, and this year an ad hoc procedure was developed to handle a P&T case. There are approximately 7-8 tenure-line faculty in the Voinovich School. This resolution proposes to remedy the lack of representation on Faculty Senate by designating one senator position for the Voinovich School. This would mean that someone would lose a senator unless we increase the overall number of senators.

Senators expressed concern that this would result in disproportionate representation for the Voinovich School; in the current Faculty Senate, there is one senator for every 19 Group I faculty members, while the Voinovich School would have one senator for 7-8 faculty members. This is a particular concern as the number of centers on campus continues to grow and may need Faculty Senate representation in the future. Gradin responded that the committee had thought about alternatives, including representing the Voinovich Center through Arts and Sciences, but they are very different. Other possibilities raised were an at-large senator that could also represent future centers, or a more encompassing system where the 1:19 ratio is maintained, and the excess in each area would be represented by an at-large candidate. Another senator noted that there was already a problem with disproportionate representation in that two senators represent hundreds of Group II faculty. Another senator noted that while centers are not technically covered in the Handbook, any programs or certificates offered through those centers would have to be approved through the normal channels. Gradin will bring this back to the committee for further discussion, and welcomes input.

VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth

• Resolution on Shared Governance in Intercollegiate Athletics—First Reading

This resolution is based on a draft resolution template from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), the UC Berkeley Faculty Senate, and The Drake Group. The template has been adapted for OU to work within the existing Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC), which is a standing committee. The resolution also addresses issues related to the academic and financial oversight of ICA.
Senators expressed support for this resolution. Some suggestions included adding a faculty member to IAC rather than eliminating a non-faculty committee member, and clarifying that the commitment to maintaining an FBS (formerly Division 1-A) intercollegiate athletics program is an administrative commitment, not an institutional commitment.

• A Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Sustainability of Intercollegiate Athletics—First Reading

Titsworth began by presenting a graph of ICA subsidies across conferences (see below). The MAC overall subsidizes 68.1% of athletic budgets from university operating budgets. The MAC taxes its student much more than other conferences because of the lack of television revenues, bowl tie-ins, etc.

Then Titsworth presented a graph showing OU’s position within the MAC: OU subsidizes athletics by 75.01%, which ranks third highest in the MAC (see below).
Finally, Titsworth presented a graph showing university subsidies of ICA compared to our presidential peer institutions (see below). OU provides the highest subsidy among our presidential peers – more than 3x as much as the next nearest institution, Washington State. (Some of the presidential peer institutions are not in the FBS and therefore not included.)
In addition, Titsworth noted that data reported in an Inside Higher Ed article ("Sports Subsidies Soar," 1/19/2010) showed that, in comparison to other FBS universities, Ohio University’s Department of Intercollegiate Athletics receives the 4th highest subsidy in the nation from the university's operating budget.

Senators clarified that the data show that OU’s ICA raises only 25% of its budget, with approximately 75% coming from the university's operating funds; in contrast, Mizzou actually makes money. Senators also asked for data about the absolute amount of money spent in the MAC, and a breakdown by sport; the committee will include this data if it is available.

Titsworth said that the data were the impetus behind this resolution: in college athletics, where this disparity is occurring, we need to start thinking differently before it erodes the academic mission. The resolution asks for recognition that ICA funding is a serious issue, and calls for the initiation of a national dialog to address the problem.

Several senators suggested taking a leadership role within the MAC and the USO as well, recommending that we add a more pointed suggestion calling upon President McDavis to take the lead and initiate a conversation within our conference about these issues, and that we bring this to the attention of the Chancellor, because it involves a lot of lost money to the state system across institutions.

VIII. New Business
None.

IX. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 9:19.

---

Resolution to Approve Credit Hours for Minors and Certificates Under Semesters
Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee
First Reading, April 19, 2010

Whereas, undergraduate minors under the quarter system are fixed at a minimum of 24 and a maximum of 35 credit hours, and

Whereas undergraduate certificates under the quarter system are fixed at minimum of 24 credit hours with no maximum, and

Whereas graduate certificates under quarters are fixed at a minimum of 20 credit hours and a maximum of 30,

Be It Resolved, that minors and certificates be fixed at the following levels of semester credit hours beginning with the University conversion to semesters in the fall of 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Certificates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificates</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution on Retakeable Courses  
Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee  
First Reading, April 19, 2010

Preamble: Ohio University has allowed any undergraduate course to be retaken for the purpose of improving the student grade; the number of retakes allowed is controlled by the department or school at the time the course is submitted for approval. Furthermore this number varies from course to course across the University,

Whereas the new Student Information System (PeopleSoft) cannot deal with retakeable classes--when the number of allowable retakes varies across campus--without expensive modification;

Be It Resolved that the number of times that a student may be allowed to retake a class for the purpose of improving a grade be restricted to a maximum of two in addition to the first attempt. Colleges, departments or schools will establish policies for additional retakes if and when appropriate.

Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines  
Addressing Interdisciplinary Activities for  
Faculty with a Singular Home Department/School  
Promotion and Tenure Committee/Interdisciplinary Council  
First Reading, April 19, 2010

Introductory Notes:
• It is recognized that this proposal, intended to support faculty interests during annual review and promotion & tenure processes, may generate other questions dealing with organizational structure and funding.
• The members of the Interdisciplinary Council, a Standing Committee of Ohio University, argue that addressing P & T guidelines for faculty with a singular home department/school is a first step in improving the organization structure on which ID programs/faculty rely.
• Questions and challenges related to the organizational structure/policy of dual/shared faculty appointments are not addressed in this proposal.
• It is not the intent of this proposal to require interdisciplinary endeavors of faculty, but to ensure that when faculty engage in interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service that their efforts are recognized and included in annual review and P & T decisions.

Whereas
We must perfect organizational structures at Ohio University to support interdisciplinary endeavors. Interdisciplinarity emerges from and relies on the foundational strengths of our individual disciplines which, in turn, enable faculty and students to explore the most pressing
questions of today. Through an organized effort to identify, support and reward such endeavors, including interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service, Ohio University will be better positioned to provide academic experiences for our students, attract and retain nationally recognized faculty, and become more competitive in securing external funding.

**Whereas**

Since Ohio University has not established university or college-wide policies for faculty in dual or shared appointments, it is necessary in the meantime to clarify responsibilities of faculty who have home departments but assume responsibilities in interdisciplinary teaching, research/creative activities and/or service.

**Whereas**

Reports from faculty and constituent groups “call for a better integration of research and creative activity into undergraduate and graduate academic priorities and noted that special consideration should be given to interdisciplinary efforts. . . .” ([http://www.ohio.edu/vision/upload/VisionOhioFinal_11072006_web.pdf](http://www.ohio.edu/vision/upload/VisionOhioFinal_11072006_web.pdf), page 13).

**Whereas**

Vision Ohio challenges the Ohio University community to explore methods of “how to foster more interdisciplinary partnerships in teaching, scholarship and creative activity” ([http://www.ohio.edu/vision/upload/VisionOhioFinal_11072006_web.pdf](http://www.ohio.edu/vision/upload/VisionOhioFinal_11072006_web.pdf), page 13).

**Whereas**

The formal and informal arrangements through which interdisciplinary work is currently accomplished vary widely and appropriately across the university. Examples include formal dual or joint appointments, recognized interdisciplinary responsibility in a department or program not in the home department, and emerging or relatively short-term research interests or teaching interests. All exist and present different challenges in evaluation within the P&T process. One policy cannot address all of those situations. First attention should be given to those faculty with recognized and expected interdisciplinary responsibility across department or program lines.

**Whereas**

Department/School, program directors and faculty should negotiate P & T guidelines to clearly establish procedures for departmental committees and administrators, as well as for candidates. Transparent and efficient guidelines are strongly in the best interests of the university as a whole.

**Be it resolved that**

the following be added to the Ohio University Faculty Handbook as II.E.2 of *Procedures for Tenure and Advancement in Rank and Recommendations for Salary Increase* and all subsequent numbers be increased accordingly.

1. Be it resolved that
2. To ensure proper recognition of faculty with a singular home Department/School who engage in interdisciplinary activities the home Department/School P & T Committee should insure that the Department/School P & T guidelines explicitly clarify how and to what extent interdisciplinary activities (teaching, research/creative activities and/or service) will be assigned, evaluated and included in annual faculty evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions.
Resolution on Senate Representation for the Voinovich School
Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate
First Reading, April 19, 2010

Whereas the Voinovich Center has now been restructured and approved as a School by the Board of Trustees;

Whereas faculty in the Voinovich School are entitled to representation on the Faculty Senate; and

Whereas Section VI. A. Article 1 Reads:

Article 1 Composition and Election

1. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members with faculty status, with or without tenure. Forty-eight Senators shall be elected by the Group I faculty of the degree colleges of the Athens campus and Group I faculty of each of the regional campuses in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each degree-granting college or unit headed by a dean and having Group I faculty shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the Senate. Two Senators who are Group II faculty shall be elected by the Group II faculty of Ohio University. The election shall be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Election stated in the Senate Bylaws.

Be it resolved
The Voinovich School will have one Senator on Faculty Senate. The May 2010 nominations and elections will reflect this addition;
And be it resolved that the Faculty Handbook VI. A. Article 1 be changed to the following [changes in bolded italics]:

Article 1 Composition and Election

1. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of faculty members with faculty status, with or without tenure. Forty-eight Senators shall be elected by the Group I faculty of the degree colleges of the Athens campus, the Voinovich School, and Group I faculty of each of the regional campuses in proportion to the numbers of such faculties eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate, with the following provisions: each degree-granting college or unit headed by a dean and having Group I faculty, and the Voinovich School shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the Senate. Two Senators who are Group II faculty shall be elected by the Group II faculty of Ohio University. The election shall be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Election stated in the Senate Bylaws.
A Resolution\(^1\) on Shared Governance in Intercollegiate Athletics
Finance and Facilities Committee
First Reading, April 19, 2010

Whereas, Ohio University is committed to maintaining a FBS (formerly called Division 1-A) intercollegiate athletics program;\(^2\) and,

Whereas, financial and other systemic challenges facing intercollegiate athletics across the country will require collaborative and creative actions to protect institutions from skyrocketing subsidy of these programs;\(^3\) and,

Whereas, maintaining the academic integrity of the student-athlete experience is the responsibility of faculty, coaches, and administration; and,

Whereas, Ohio University has a standing committee, called the “Intercollegiate Athletics Committee,” (IAC) charged with assisting the President, Provost, Director of Athletics, and the NCAA Faculty Athletics representatives in the interpretation and implementation of athletic policies; therefore,

Be it resolved by the Ohio University Faculty Senate that Intercollegiate Athletics should have meaningful oversight from and collaboration with faculty from across the university.\(^4\)

Be it further resolved that the following changes be made to the composition and mission of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee:

Section 1: Composition. Current composition of the IAC is 16 members.\(^5\) Although the 16 members reflects the diversity of interests involved, the even split (7-7) between faculty and members representing other constituencies does not reflect the academic mission of ICA. To better reflect the connection between ICA and academics, the following steps will be undertaken:

\(^1\) This resolution is adapted, in part, from a “model resolution” issued jointly by the UC Berkeley Faculty Senate, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), and The Drake Group. Ohio University Faculty Senate is a member of COIA.

\(^2\) The document titled, “Academic Support Units,” linked off of the Provost’s website states that the university will maintain Division 1-A status to maintain potential for revenue generation by ICA and to maintain competitive advantage against Miami, Cincinnati, Ohio State, Akron, Bowling Green and Kent (all are D 1-A schools). See www.ohiou.edu/provost/Budget-Process.cfm

\(^3\) See “Sports Subsidies Soar” article in Inside Higher Education, January 19, 2010. Data reported in that article showed that Ohio University’s Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, when compared to other FBS universities, receives the 4th highest subsidy (approximately 75.02% of the ICA budget) from the University Operating Budget. In the top 21 programs for subsidy of Intercollegiate Athletics, 10 of those were Mid American Conference Schools.

\(^4\) The “Academic Support Units” document advances several arguments supporting the contention that Intercollegiate Athletics and Academics are strongly connected. Those arguments include: (1) Intercollegiate athletics “enriches the university experience...for all students in that it gives another framework for understanding excellence and witnessing the lessons of teamwork;” (2) There are “significant academic connections” between ICA, Sports Management, and Athletic Training; (3) Competitive athletics and academics both draw on “the same deep wells of human possibility;” and, (4) Both ICA and academics “contribute significantly to those intangible elements that build passion for and loyalty to an institution.”

\(^5\) The IAC is a standing committee of the University. For a complete description of the committee membership and charge, see http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/standingcomm/ICA-Committee-page.cfm
1. The chairperson of the committee shall be appointed by the President and shall be selected from the list of faculty recommended by the Committee on Committees and selected by the President.

2. There is currently no process describing selection of the two NCAA faculty representatives. During the 2010-2011 academic year the IAC shall recommend to the President a process through which those representatives should be nominated and appointed. The committee shall also recommend appropriate lengths of appointment for those representatives.

3. The number of representatives recommended by Administrative Senate and appointed by the President for 3-year terms will be reduced from 2 to 1. This change will ensure that a majority of voting members will be faculty, which is more consistent with other committees overseeing academic activities.

4. Current language specifying ex-officio, non-voting members could be perceived as sexist because the implication is that the Director of Athletics is a Male. Language should be altered to say that: “Two members of Intercollegiate Athletics administration, one female and one male, will be appointed as ex-officio, non-voting members.”

Section 2: Charge of the Committee. The charge of the committee is quite broad and is “concerned with all facets of Intercollegiate Athletics at Ohio University. Policies and procedures pertaining to athletics are under the jurisdiction of the Committee subject to approval of the President” Such activities include but are not limited to: campus relations, academic compliance, ICA governance, and student-athlete welfare. In addition to the general activities of the committee already specified, the function of the committee will be clarified to include the following:

1. The committee will review and make a recommendation on the yearly budget for Intercollegiate Athletics. The Committee will make their official recommendation to University administration for final approval.

2. The Committee will review and approve practice schedules for all sports.

3. The Committee will review and approve travel schedules for any ICA activity that will require student-athletes to miss class.

Section 3: Specific Objectives for Academics. As the committee carries out its mission, the Faculty recommends the following:

1. In order to maintain academics as the top priority for all students, those students who also participate in intercollegiate athletics will maintain a G.P.A. of 2.0 to be approved for participation.

2. The Director of Athletics, working in conjunction with the IAC, will present a yearly report to Faculty Senate on the activities of student-athletes. The report should also describe efforts undertaken to promote the physical, academic, and personal welfare of student-athletes.

3. The Committee will review and approve practice schedules for all sports. In principle practices should not be scheduled during 9:00a.m. and 3:00 p.m. because those are the times in which most courses are scheduled.

4. Advising and academic support for student athletes will be integrated with other academic support services receiving oversight from the Provost’s office.
Section 4: Specific Objectives for Finances. Given the financial complexity of ICA, the Faculty recommends:

1. The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics shall present a balanced budget each year, detailing all sources of revenue and all proposed expenditures.
2. If the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics runs a deficit at the end of a fiscal year, steps taken to cover the deficit should be approved by the President and reported to the campus community and Board of Trustees.
3. The Athletic Budget will be integrated with the Academic Budget and will follow the same processes and procedures as academic units.
4. A yearly report will be sent to Student Senate and Graduate Student Senate explaining the approximate dollar amount that each student pays in fees that are used to support Intercollegiate Athletics.

A Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Sustainability of Intercollegiate Athletics
Finance and Facilities Committee
First Reading, April 19, 2010

Whereas, data reported in an Inside Higher Education article showed that, in comparison to other FBS (formerly Division 1-A) universities, Ohio University’s Department of Intercollegiate Athletics receives the 4th highest subsidy (approximately 75.02% of the ICA budget) from the University Operating Budget. In the top 21 programs for subsidy of Intercollegiate Athletics, 10 of those were Mid American Conference Schools; and

Whereas, data released in that report shows a substantial disparity in athletic department subsidy between major athletic conferences like the Big 10, Big 12, and SEC and “mid-major” conferences like the MAC and Mountain West; and

Whereas, revenue inequities between “major” athletic conferences and “mid-major” conferences place a greater funding strain on mid-major schools, like Ohio University, because of the proportionally greater subsidy required to maintain FBS status; and

Whereas, a survey by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics revealed that less than ¼ of college presidents at Division 1-A/FBS schools believe that intercollegiate Athletics, in current form, is sustainable; and

____________________
6 See “Sports Subsidies Soar” article in Inside Higher Education, January 19, 2010. The same data revealed that all but 4 of the FBS schools receive significant subsidy from university operating budgets.


8 See the Knight Commission report titled, “Quantitative and Qualitative Research with Football Bowl Subdivision University presidents on the Costs and Financing of Intercollegiate Athletics” available at: http://www.knightcommissionmedia.org/images/President_Survey_FINAL.pdf
Whereas, a failure to address unsustainable expenditures in intercollegiate athletics will contribute to economic hardships of member schools and diminish institutions’ abilities to prioritize academics; therefore

Be it resolved by the Ohio University Faculty Senate that the current funding model for intercollegiate athletics is incompatible with the academic mission of higher education institutions.

Be it further resolved that university Presidents and appropriate state and national government officials should seek rapid and meaningful alternatives to the current “arms race” approach to intercollegiate athletics funding, with the objective of bringing institutional subsidy (including both operating budget and other revenue sources affiliated with the university) for ICA funding at all member schools to no more than 15% of the total ICA budget. Creative approaches to achieve this objective could include but should not be limited to:

- Salary caps for coaches and athletic administrators, weighted to reflect the size of the university.
- Revenue sharing between “major” and “mid-major” FBS conferences.
- The NCAA should reduce the required number of coaches, athletic scholarships or other cost-incurred requirements to maintain FBS status.
- Explore alternatives to the current organizing structure based on conference affiliations and NCAA.