

**Ohio University Faculty Senate
Agenda for Monday, December 9, 2019
Room 245, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10-9:00pm
Meeting Minutes**

Present:

I. Dave Scholl, & Janelle Coleman: Ohio University Board of Trustees

II. Roll Call and Approval of the November 4, 2019 Minutes

III. Chair's Report—Robin Muhammad

a. Updates & Announcements

b. Upcoming Senate Meeting: February 3, 2020

IV. Discussion: The Strategic Framework and College-Level Realignment Exercises

V. Reimagining General Education presentation: Katie Hartman

VI. Executive Committee: Sarah Helfrich

**Resolution to Reimagine and Revise General Education – First Reading
Resolution to Establish the UCC General Education committee – Second
Reading & Vote**

V. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt

**Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Faculty without Home Departments – Second
Reading & Vote**

VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Betty Sindelar

VII. Promotion & Tenure Committee— Jackie Wolf

VIII. Finance & Facilities Committee—Susan Williams

IX. New Business

X. Adjournment

Called to order 7:10 pm.

Board of Trustees Visit

Board of Trustees members Dave Scholl, Chair and Janelle Coleman, Vice Chair introduced themselves and described their connection to Ohio University.

Dr. Scholl thanked the faculty members who have worked with him throughout his time on the Board. He noted the various backgrounds of the trustees on the board and their commitment to doing what's best for the institution, noting that their background is generally not in higher education.

Mrs. Janelle Coleman described her dedication and attachment to the University and her goal that students today can have the same great experience that she had as an OU student. Mrs. Coleman will be taking over the role of Chair of the Board of Trustees.

Chair Mohammad had posed some questions to the Trustees in advance, such that they can be prepared to discuss answers during the meeting. Faculty members also brought their questions.

Senator: For several months, the message from Administration repeated calls to increase revenue and cut expenses. However, there has been no mention of accounting for administrative expenses. Cuts have been made to units across the institution. Faculty have been asked to increase their teaching loads, but there does not appear to be a corresponding call to increasing the workloads for administrators. Examples of cuts include: math department, maintenance on Dance building, libraries. Administrative offices grow, but academic services are reduced. Academic units bring in the tuition revenue, yet they are the ones cut. Are those in executive positions also being asked to take on more work? What is the return on investment on high-salary executive roles? In a time of tight budgets, we should be cutting luxuries before necessities.

A faculty member stated he is concerned, angry and upset. He would like to ask a favor of the Trustees, when they visit with President Nellis please ask three questions. First, when it comes to workloads, why revisit a 1994 policy and only mention one part (item D). Item E says workload is typically 12 hrs, but Deans were told to increase that to 15-21. The second question: If increasing teaching load is to increase efficiency, why do faculty need to teach more classes if we have fewer students on campus? Finally, why is administration using the argument of a "demographic cliff" when other state institutions (BGSU, OSU) have not seen enrollment decreases?

A faculty member asked Trustees to please act on behalf of the University. Deans have been asked to create plans that will damage the institution. Fear at his department are that their department will either be eliminated or the faculty farmed out to serve other units. Please challenge the administration to find ways to balance budget without cutting faculty and damaging academic mission. Make cuts where excess is, not where the core mission is.

A faculty member agreed with prior faculty members, but noted that new administration who have arrived recently are not responsible...prior administrations created this financial crisis. Do trustees know who's been laid off? Do you know how this has happened? There is no transparency, questions elicit different stories from different administrators. Administration should look out for their people. Where are the defenders of the faculty?

SCHOLL response: trying to be thoughtful about responses and stated that he respected comments and views. Regarding the workload policy...his understanding is that it is under board purview, but based on state law? Under impression it was mandated by state policy. That was his impression but he pledged to ask and check.

Regarding salaries for admins...3-4 yrs ago had to look at the salaries because there was no defined process for determining salaries. Salary basis is market-based, based on legal requirements. Faculty pay scales may not have a market-based compensation component. Public institutions need to be market based.

Regarding the demographic cliff...as a trustee, he tries to stay informed about regional and national scene. The perspective at national trustee conference is that the cliff is perhaps not here yet but it is on its way, 18-20% drop in 10 years, 2 years ago. Are trustees acting quickly enough to avoid financial jeopardy? How do we address the enrollment decline? The trustees heard about the market share loss...in a sales context, negative numbers for sales revenues mean perhaps something is wrong in a different direction than what you think. Trustees see enrollment shortfall of \$30M by 2022. The trustees decided 12-18 months ago, that they want the President to focus on 5yr strategy, \$65M on reimagining. Bottom line, this institution needed to reanalyze how it functioned. College Credit+ is a factor, it does impact teaching load, some majors are seeing less enrollment. He doesn't know how the institution can be healthy with low enrollments, when students pay 78% of bill. They spent one yr of strategic planning with the President, with the impression that conversations about this process were held across whole community. Shared governance is a big deal. They want the engagement of the academy.

Regarding financial reserves, the balance sheet and strength of these reserves, the university is currently in position of strength. Looking forward to the next five years of enrollment numbers declining, digital transformation, general education reform, enrollment shifts...we need to change education delivery. Others have made shift. Fiduciary responsibility...university needs to consider what changes to make to impact fundamental dynamics.

Strategic initiatives, structural and enterprise wide are needed to make our position stronger. Edison: Vision without execution is hallucination. In his opinion, this institution needs to identify how we move forward strategically, marketing and branding the university for innovation and leveraging the legacy of 225 years to reclaim market share, expand to adult learning, transfer students, etc.

General Education reform is a great example of success along these lines, with innovative changes proposed by the faculty. He's hopeful that more initiatives will follow from the One OHIO and Strategic Framework processes.

He is hopeful that this current plan is a good plan to pursue and will give good results.

COLEMAN response: She pledges to get answers to the questions from the faculty. She believes that organizations that stay the same, fall behind. We don't want the university to fall behind so we need to make changes, which is what the board and President Nellis are trying to do. She needs and values faculty input and thinks that together we can get there. However, pressure factors like enrollments, budget, deficits, and dipping into reserves is not sustainable. How does OU position itself to be here and be relevant in future?

Regarding the communication issues. There needs to be clear and transparent communication about what, when, and how things are happening. She will be talking to President Nellis about this, and the board will be talking about it in January at the Board of Trustees meeting. We want to get change done for students, faculty, and community. She noted she has now spent more time as board member than student and sees how each person is committed and passionate about OU. We all care: students, faculty, communities. We want to harness the passion to ensure we are thoughtful and intentional but continue moving forward to where we need to go. Her philosophy is to always assume positive intent. We all want the best for the university now and in the future.

Chair Muhammad thanked Chair Scholl and Vice Chair Coleman for coming to the meeting, for listening, and for their work on behalf of the university. Faculty Senate will continue to provide a conduit for information.

Question from student: We share the faculty's concerns, and a student movement is organized around this issue. Many are as shocked, terrified and outraged as the faculty members. He described a student who left Wright State due to that institution's mismanagement: OU is his refuge, and he is now dismayed at the situation here.

Scholl: Wright State has financial issues beyond what we would ever want OU to face. We want to coalesce around strategy to build for future. Come to OU and flourish. But decisions have to be made, with commitment to shared governance on these topics.

Roll call taken by Secretary Rosado Feger

Motion to approve November 4 minutes

Doty/Matlock Pass

Minutes approved

Chairs report

- The resolution to create Accelerated Grad Pathways was approved and signed by the Provost, many thanks to Beth Quitslund and her team and EPSA who worked on this process.
- We should continue to have discussions about the strategic framework, we need broader conversation about what's taking place, and thinking about what we want to do as a Faculty Senate body.
- January 2020 meeting canceled unless there are extraordinary circumstances.
- Ohio Faculty Council monitoring two areas: legislation dealing with freedom of speech on college campuses and legislation dealing with term-paper-mills.

Strategic initiatives: these are the primary concerns that rise up:

College level varies; our experience of the process varies a bit depending on where we are, college, campus, sometimes discipline.

Workload discussions: workload vs teaching load, want to allow discussion to bubble up to share across colleges. More than about fears but conducive to student success, faculty retention

Implementation timeline: the strategic framework has many layers, pace creating a response...some feel it is rushed, with no input in time frame much less content.

What other issues need to be raised? What trustee issues were not addressed sufficiently?

A Senator: She came to OU 23 yrs ago, on the advice that it was public liberal arts college with amazing professional schools. Everything read about next generation students suggests they still need liberal arts education. The current language about innovation seems to be about displacing that. People are now expected to have not different jobs, but on average 3 different careers, and a university education should not be seen as a training program. We offer excellent 4-year university education. She was recently listening to President Drake of OSU celebrate a Rhodes scholar, Henry Wu. We should be talking about the function of the university. OSU grew in part by advertising that students can spend two years at the OSU branches in small classes, but we say small classes are a burden. We need to change our message, but it is difficult to trust leadership because faculty has not been included in the conversation. We want to be a part of reimagining. Faculty are competent scholars of the education and social context, shutting out does harm to university.

Senator. Part of communication issue we are speaking about, they think they communicate by bringing out a PowerPoint presentation and post-its and presenting the same statements but they do not answer questions. If admin's pay is set by market rate then we may need to eliminate some of those positions. It's not enough to bring a presentation and collect comments, there needs to be substantive meaningful input in order to actually implement shared governance.

A faculty member: we do not have shared governance, in such governance, faculty would have veto power over budget. We have conversations with administrations, who get paid market rates. Appreciates VC Coleman's statement about assuming positive intent. We are all here because we love OHIO.

Different positions provide different perspectives on issues. Faculty knows what works and what won't, and we need all of these perspectives to have true shared governance. Otherwise we may end up with a school that will not feel like OU, and that is not what anybody wants.

A senator: Had three questions from regional faculty. (1) What steps are there to ensure that \$65M is spent on real benefit to the future of the university vs expensive consulting fees? (2) Could we move to Div 2 athletics to save money? Is this a BoT issue? We would like an answer on the implications and mechanisms for this. (3) The faculty handbooks establishes a staff reduction process protects tenure system. President Nellis said it would not be strategic to reduce only instructional staff...what does this mean for tenured faculty?

A faculty member...building what was said about real shared governance and taking power back. Faculty "input" is not enough. When shared governance not in effect the institution can suffer grievous effect, for example, the implementation of RCM. The effect of RCM was to grow the Administration. AAUP submitted an independent analysis on the budget, no substantive engagement on that report. Document has been avoided. Can faculty be avoided and not taken seriously? He sees a demoralized faculty, facing layoffs (even tenured) and implications for workload plus layoffs. What does it mean to engaged, empowered faculty?

A senator: Building on what a colleague just said, if you don't know where you're going, any road will take you there. We do not seem to know where we are going. Where will we be in 5 yrs?

Chair Mohammad: we want to address workload and teaching load...strategically. We need to think concretely about what we mean about class size, workload, instructional faculty, tenured faculty. What are the key points that we need to press on and focus on? We can itemize the weaknesses of shared governance, but can we ID very specific areas and push progress on those?

An instructional faculty member. (1) As President of a non-profit, during strategic planning the board sits down with staff and have extensive conversations, not just swarm in for a half an hour. Appreciate the board members' time, but we need more comprehensive engagement. We need sustained engagement between faculty and Board of Trustees. It would not be out of line to request meeting including endangered faculty. (2) Have concerns about the way the situation is being framed. We are told we need to make up \$30M in lost enrollment, but \$20M in academic cuts and \$65M in strategic investments. What she sees in the strategic plan is a "digital-first" university, in a world where market space that is largely saturated. With notable exceptions (business, nursing) we have not been able to market online programs. We should ask what do we do well, which is a well-rounded undergraduate education. Don't need lots of technology, what we need for good active learning is a good set of questions and students who are engaged. Invest not in the bells and whistles, but rather instead invest in faculty, including instructional faculty. (3) When we consider issues of workload, no one has been noting or asking, what do we give up when we increase faculty workloads? Otherwise we play into the trope of the lazy professor. Research faculty...what do you give up? Research? What does that mean for reputation? Mentoring grad

students? Tenure-track with higher burdens...what does it mean? Instructional faculty is often already at 20-30% service. There is not a lot of extra capacity. Some people teach 100, or 250-person classes. What constitutes a “class”? All classes are not created equal. If you go back to the 1994 policy report by the Regents, which was written by people with faculty titles, it says that the workload could not really be quantified.

Chair Muhammad: Moving forward, Faculty Senate can continue press these points. Trustees hearing what you have to say...recently there’s been some “reimagining of the reimagining”. We have used our voices and collegiality, sending a consistent message about anger, anxiety, frustration baked into our lived experience. We want to be constructive about our concerns but we don’t have the kind of traction that we’d find reassuring.

However, we do right now have to move to other agenda items. Please send information and comments to Chair, we will compile. Compiling feedback about Nellis letter. Appreciate attention and attendance. Please continue to engage with senators and other groups, we need everyone’s energy to make real changes.

Reimagining General Education; K. Hartman

See attached presentation and Resolution.

General Education reform is the product of an extended process of faculty input and consultation. A vote on the models is expected in February.

Tonight, will be walking through the proposed model for General Education: BRICKS. Focus is on common goals, which are embedded into the model. The presentation illustrated the model, with the following changes from before:

- Reduction in total credit hours, by reducing the Capstone requirement to 2 credit hours, and eliminating a “required” Learning Community, because not all students participate.
- OTM-approved hours are reduced from 30 to 27
- Intercultural dialogues, in foundations, replaced with Intercultural explorations. Oral communications now moved to “Bridges”.
- Categories renamed to emphasize distinction.
- Changed third Arch from Any-OTM to OTM-Math/Statistics/Logic or OTM Arts & Sciences.
- Reduced Capstone to allow faculty to innovate and match up with Bridges.

Further discussion

Foundations: ground-level, “core” requirements. Written Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, Intercultural Explorations. Written Communication and Quantitative Reasoning, OTM approved. Advanced Writing and Intercultural Explorations, some will be OTM, some will not.

Pillars: support the breadth of knowledge across major domains of knowledge and the arts. Non-specialist courses, all will require OTM approval.

Arches: span disciplinary perspectives. Focus on single topic from different perspectives. Minimum 9 credit hours, but expecting/hoping they will be more than that. This a place where students can dig into an exploration of a subject that is not necessarily their major. These include at least 3 OTM categories, anything additional can be from any area of the University.

Bridges: slightly reconceptualized from before, they have evolved from connecting students and communities into connecting disciplines to the Common Goals. These will not have to be OTM approved, can be built into major courses. At least 25% of the course activity and assessment be focused on competencies.

Capstone: culminating experience that allows integration of prior knowledge. Can have Capstones connected to Arches or other elements.

Where have we been and where are we? September October and November had presentations and feedback sessions. Today we will be presenting this model and first reading of resolution, we will vote in spring, the new requirements would go into effect in Fall of 2021.

Question: When it says “the Arts” does it include Fine Arts?

Answer: There are elements similar to Tier II “Fine Arts” category but it is not exclusive to Fine Arts.

Question: Are the Arches required to go through UCC?

Answer: yes, though that process has not been worked out yet. The hope is that the Arches can encourage conversations across campus and true multidisciplinary combinations. OCEAN processes are still being worked out. Faculty are responsible for developing and approving these Arches. The courses have to be OTM-approved, in the required categories. The goal is to create a framework with flexibility where Arches can be added/retired/modified and the basic structure remains.

Question: what about programs that are very regimented and have no free electives?

Answer: will need to look at.

Question: is there a requirement from the state level that we have this structure?

Answer: No, but it is an innovative approach.

Question: Can a student create their own combinations for an Arch? How do we recognize students who want to put together a creative combination?

Answer: As faculty members, we provide the design certificates and curriculum now. This could be considered later.

Question: Different institution spent 10 yrs redoing Gen Ed, and it resulted in requiring increased faculty. Can we make this work in an atmosphere where our workloads are already being increased?

Answer: Concerns are understood, and we do know we need resources. We expect that a lot of current Gen Ed courses will be adapted for new framework. Some new courses will have to be developed.

Faculty expressed concern about adding requirements to current student programs and overloading programs. The committee emphasized that there are a lot of current courses that can be incorporated into the new framework and expand the conversation for students.

Resolution to Establish the UCC General Education committee

Motion: Doty/Wyatt

Motion Passes with 1 abstention

Resolution for First Reading: **Resolution to Reimagine and Revise General Education**

Question: How do we combine the realignment envisioned in One OHIO and the Gen Ed reimagining with regard to the regional campuses?

Answer: the hope by doing both at the same time is that the new alignment doesn't get locked into place and then have to readjust to the new Gen Ed. Regional campuses will be a part of the development and implementation.

Question: What input is being included from the regional campuses?

Answer: There are members on the Advisory committee from the regional campuses. Student input has been sought and incorporated. Feedback is always welcome.

Professional Relations Committee: (Wyatt)

SOS Resolution on Faculty Members without Dept. Homes

Faculty not hired into a department have no processes for promotion or evaluation. They are in organizational limbo.

Motion: Doty/Mueller?

Motion passes

Sindelar: spent the last month discussing General Education, majority vote is in support

P&T committee: No report

Finance and Facilities: (Williams)

Thank all faculty, students, etc. who came out tonight. We have a lot of questions remaining, and we are stronger as a group, please keep participating. Thrilled about conversation about liberal education and the importance of liberal education. Undergrad should leave the university feeling like they can do anything. Liberal arts is empowering. Important for students to hear and receive this education.

New business: None

Chair Muhammad thanked everyone for attending. Faculty Senate is a strong voice across campus. Not just because of holding meetings, but bringing information to all areas of the university and strengthening shared governance. Our university will be stronger because of all our efforts.

Still compiling feedback on Nov 25 President Nellis email. There is sincere interest in improving communication, please send your feedback to Chair.

And, have a very good break

MTA Ridpath End 8:51pm