

FACULTY COUNCIL REPORT OF ACTIVITIES, 2004-2005

INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Council is comprised of 70 faculty members of the University Senate. According to the bylaws of the Faculty Council, the duties and responsibilities of the Faculty Council include:

1. Initiation of proposals to the University regarding academic and educational policies and submission of proposals to the Senate or to Senate committees for action.
2. Ensuring that there is adequate faculty discussion of proposed modifications of academic and educational policies or mission prior to consideration by the University Senate.
3. Providing a considered faculty perspective on matters related to academic and educational policies.
4. Selection of faculty members for appointment to committees and councils of the University Senate.

The basic structure of the Faculty Council includes an Executive Committee comprised of the faculty members of the Steering Committee, the Vice Chair/Chair-Elect and Chair of Faculty Council. The Chair of the Faculty Council is the chair of the Faculty Cabinet that includes the chairs of all organizing and standing committees of the Senate. This group discusses Senate committee issues of interest and advises the Faculty Council Chair. The Faculty Cabinet meets twice monthly and this academic year met twelve times. The President and Provost attended one meeting of the Faculty Cabinet each quarter. The Faculty Council meets monthly. This academic year the Faculty Council held nine meetings.

In order to exchange ideas and maintain and enhance open communication, a Senate faculty leadership group consisting of the Secretary of the Senate (Susan Fisher), Chair of the Steering Committee (David Horn), the Chair of Faculty Council (Jack Rall) and Chair-elect of Faculty Council (T.K. Daniel) met monthly with the Provost (nine times) and quarterly with the President (four times). Also there will be a year-end meeting of the leadership group (including the new Chair of Steering and new Chair-elect of Faculty Council) and the President and Provost together to discuss the activities of the past year and future issues.

The general approach of the Faculty Council this year has been to attempt to work cooperatively with the President and Provost to promote and strengthen shared governance in the University. The Faculty Council has attempted to consider issues early in the deliberative process wherever possible in order to ensure thorough faculty involvement in the decision-making processes.

BUSINESS CONDUCTED AT FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS

The agendas of the nine Faculty Council meetings are listed in Appendix A. The nature of the business at these meetings included: informational items, items emanating from Senate committees, Faculty Council projects, issues originating from the President or Provost and discussions with the President and Provost.

FACULTY COUNCIL INITIATIVES, EVENTS AND OTHER ISSUES

New Senator Orientation

The new Senator orientation was organized by the Faculty Council Chair and held on September 30, 2004 (see agenda in Appendix B). The goal was to introduce new faculty, student

and administer Senators and alternates to the Senate process and to highlight some important issues pending during the up-coming year. More than 80 Senators attended the orientation.

Faculty Career Enhancement Committee

The OSU Academic Plan states that in order to build a world-class faculty the university should "...Implement a faculty recruitment, retention, and development plan..." The Faculty Council suggested to the President and Provost that a Faculty Career Enhancement Committee be formed to address faculty development. They agreed that this major initiative should be "faculty-driven and administration supported". The committee has been meeting regularly this past academic year under the leadership of Christian Zacher and is due to report late this Spring Quarter. In brief, the aim of the committee is to recommend actions and procedures that will enhance the professional lives of the faculty throughout their university careers and in all aspects of their academic work -- teaching, research/creative work, service, and outreach and engagement activities. Recommendations are intended to encourage the University to support career enhancement through appropriate incentives and to view this support as an investment that will ultimately return dividends as a higher level of academic excellence. Follow-through on the recommendations of this report will be crucial to its success.

Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics and Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics

Last year the OSU Faculty Council joined the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), a national organization of 48 NCAA division I universities with the goal to strengthen the faculty voice in intercollegiate athletics. That organization developed a draft document addressing Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics. The draft was circulated to the member universities for comment and suggestions. The OSU Faculty Council addressed this issue through the Athletic Council of the Senate Chaired by Joe Barr and an *ad hoc* committee chaired by the NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative John Bruno. After extensive deliberation, the Faculty Council unanimously supported a revised version of the document (see the COIA website). On March 11, 2005, the following message was sent to COIA stating the OSU Faculty Council position:

"The Ohio State University Faculty Council has unanimously approved the document on Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics sponsored by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. Over the past months, a working group composed of the Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA and representatives from the Faculty Council, Athletic Council, staff, students, and administration has reviewed the document. Also the entire Athletic Council, the President, the Provost and the Vice-Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies have reviewed the document. At the national level, Ohio State has been actively involved in the discussions and amending of the document. We will support the tenets of this document consistent with the best interests of our student athletes and the principles of The Ohio State University."

College Patterns of Administration

There is currently no University rule requiring College Patterns of Administration (POA). Two years ago the Faculty Council perceived the need for such a rule and initiated a process that has led to a collaborative effort among the Faculty Council, deans and the Office of Academic

Affairs. A draft rule has been generated and is being vetted with the Faculty Council and various Senate committees.

Evaluation of Dean's Performance

The Goal of this Faculty Council initiative is to inform both the dean and the faculty by providing constructive feedback on performance to the dean from the unit faculty. An *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Council that included Lynne Olson, Dennis McKay and Jared Gardner generated a draft survey that was distributed to faculty Senators and deans for comment. The revised survey will be distributed to college faculty this Spring Quarter. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix C.

Increased Interaction with the Board of Trustees

The Faculty Council Chair and Chair of Steering are invited to attend the meetings of the Board of Trustees. Also each Autumn the Secretary of the Senate, the Chair of Steering and the Chair of Faculty Council are invited to have lunch with the Board of Trustees. These have been worthwhile interactions with the Board. Nonetheless it was felt that greater interaction with the Board would be desirable. Thus two years ago the Senate faculty leadership group met with the Secretary of the Board of Trustees in an effort to find ways to increase faculty interaction with the Board. As a result of that meeting, the Chair of Steering and Chair of Faculty Council now make an annual presentation to the Board at a Spring Board meeting. This year Christian Zacher joined the group to explain the workings of the Faculty Career Enhancement Committee. This interaction was very positive but there is still a need for more, informal interaction with the Board (see below).

Involvement in the OSU Leadership Retreat

The priorities for the University in the up coming year are discussed and formalized at the annual OSU Leadership Retreat. Previously only the Secretary of the Senate was invited to attend the retreat. Last year the Faculty Council suggested that there was a need to have greater faculty participation in the Leadership Retreat. The President agreed and the Secretary of the Senate, Chair of Steering and Chair of Faculty Council attended the Leadership Retreat on July 19 – 21, 2004 and the follow-up meeting on October 11, 2004. Attendance at this meeting greatly enhances communication between the University leadership and the faculty.

Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC): Faculty Senate Leaders Meeting

The Secretary of the Senate and Chair of Faculty Council attended the annual CIC Faculty Senate Leaders meeting at the University of Illinois on November 12-13, 2004. This meeting provides a forum that is very worthwhile for interaction among the Senate leaders of the various CIC institutions. Notes from that meeting are included in Appendix D.

Discussion of Senate Bill 24: "Academic Bill of Rights" on television

The Chair of Faculty Council was invited to appear on the "The State of Ohio" hosted by Karen Kasler which airs weekly on PBS stations around Ohio to discuss the "Academic Bill of Rights" with the sponsor of bill, Senator Larry Mumper. The fifteen segment was taped on April 19, 2005. Points made by the Faculty Council Chair are summarized briefly in Appendix E.

State of Ohio Faculty Council

The OSU Faculty Council has been represented at the State Faculty Council meetings this past year by John Current.

Evaluation of Secretary of Faculty position

Last year the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council recommended that the Secretary of the Faculty position be re-evaluated and recommendations be made regarding the future of the position. A committee was formed that included Christian Zacher (chair), the Secretary of the Senate, the Chair of Steering and the Chair of Faculty Council. The President is currently considering the recommendations of the committee.

Graduation

The Chair of Faculty Council and Chair of Steering represent the faculty at the OSU graduations.

Outreach and Engagement Grant Review

During the past two years, the Chair of Faculty Council has represented the Faculty Council on the OSU Outreach and Engagement Grant Review committee.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Scheduling

There have been some difficulties this past year because of a “quirk” in the Spring Senate and Faculty Council schedules. Even though three Senate meetings were scheduled in the Spring quarter, only two Faculty Council meetings occurred in time for issues to be placed on the Senate agenda. The third Spring Faculty Council meeting is a year-end party. Next year the schedule should be arranged so that business can be conducted at the year-end Faculty Council meeting, if necessary, in time for items to be placed on the last Senate meeting agenda.

Some scheduling difficulties could be eased if the Council on Academic Affairs, which meets throughout the calendar year, could bring issues to the Faculty Council throughout the year. This past year, no issues came from the Council on Academic Affairs until the fifth Faculty Council meeting of the year.

Follow-through on Faculty Career Enhancement Report

The work of the Faculty Career Enhancement Committee has been a major collaboration between the Faculty Council and University leadership. It is crucial for the advancement of the University that the recommendations of this committee be thoroughly vetted and followed through by both the Faculty Council and central administration. Also this interactive approach for pursuing opportunities and solving problems can be a model for future collaborations between the faculty and University leadership.

Interaction with the Board of Trustees

There has been an increase in formal interaction with the Board of Trustees the past two years (see above) but there is a need for further, informal, interaction with the Board. This past

year a member of the Board expressed a desire to attend a Faculty Council meeting. Attempts to arrange this interaction were not successful. The President has supported the desire on the part of the faculty for greater interaction with the Board. Increased interaction between the Board and faculty will lead to a greater understanding on the part of the Board of how the academy differs from the business world and a greater understanding on the part of faculty of how the academy can benefit from incorporating, where appropriate, business principles in its operation. What is needed now is a plan and follow-through.

Increased Interaction of President with Faculty

In discussion with the Senate faculty leadership, the President requested greater interaction with the faculty. We thought that this was a very good and important idea. We discussed various possibilities, including luncheons and/or dinners with small groups of faculty. Because of the President's busy schedule, a plan should be generated for this interaction well in advance, ideally over the Summer for the next academic year.

Faculty Council Interaction with President and Provost's Advisory Committee (PPAC)

The Senate faculty leaders met late in the Spring quarter with the President and Provost's Advisory Committee, a group of eminent OSU scholars, for the purpose of exploring possibilities of strengthening the faculty voice on issues of mutual interest. We have agreed to meet again in the Autumn.

Continuity: Past Chairs of Steering & Faculty Council Advisory Committee

It has been suggested that an advisory committee be formed of past Chairs of Steering and past Chairs of Faculty Council with the purpose of providing institutional memory and providing advice to the current Chairs of Steering and Faculty Council. This is an idea worth considering. One issue that this group might consider is the structure of the Senate from the viewpoint of strengthening the faculty voice.

Accessibility of President and Provost

The President and Provost have been very accessible to the Senate faculty leadership, the Faculty Cabinet and to the Faculty Council. This interaction has been very valuable in promoting good communication. The President has expressed the willingness to meet more frequently with the Senate faculty leadership, if desirable. The Provost has been available for consultation on very short notice. Both the President and Provost have attended Faculty Council meetings where good discussion has occurred.

"State of the University" from a Faculty Perspective

It has been suggested that the Chair of Faculty Council should make a presentation assessing the state of the University from a faculty perspective. This approach was not the preference of the current Chair of Faculty Council but is an idea that should be considered in the future.

Participation and Communication with Colleagues

The Faculty Council will only be effective if the faculty Senators participate in Faculty Council activities and share their observations with colleagues. This past year approximately 50% of the faculty Senators attended the Faculty Council meetings on a regular basis. This core group provided much valuable advice and discussion at the meetings but greater attendance is always desirable. Just as important, it is a duty of the faculty Senators to communicate the deliberations at the Faculty Council meetings to their colleagues by using the list serve provided to each faculty Senator. This year we tried to encourage this communication by sending abbreviated Faculty Council minutes to the members and asking them to forward the minutes to their colleagues on the list serves. This procedure should be continued along with discussion of other ways to improve communication of Faculty Council activities to the whole university faculty.

Flow of Issues Through the Senate Structure

Occasionally there was some confusion about the timing of discussion of issues within the Senate structure. It is recommended that all issues go first to the Steering Committee for deliberation and disposition. For example, the Steering committee may, on occasion, want to establish *ad hoc* committees to consider issues before distributing them to the various Senate committees and the Faculty Council. The important point is to maintain thorough communication among groups.

“Honest Dialogue Among Citizens” and Mutual Respect

At a recent OSU graduation, Professor Deborah Merritt challenged our recent graduates to be good citizens. She said that one of the elements of good citizenship was “honest dialogue among citizens”. One of the clearest ways to exhibit mutual respect is to promote honest dialogue among faculty and administration. To discuss issues openly and respectfully will always be a major challenge but one that must be met for the betterment of the University.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the excellent advice and support that I have received this past year from the following: a) my colleagues in the Senate faculty leadership group (Professors Fisher, Horn and Daniel), b) the Faculty Cabinet members and c) those core faculty who regularly attended the Faculty Council meetings. Also I want the President and Provost to know that I have valued my interaction with them. Whether we agreed or not, I always knew that we all were trying to work for the betterment of the University. Finally I would like to thank Ms. Dottie Gordon in the Senate office for her support and unwavering dedication to duty. She has worked tirelessly on behalf of the Senate and Faculty Council. For that, I am most grateful.

Jack A. Rall
Professor, Department of Physiology & Cell Biology
Chair, OSU Faculty Council
May 23, 2005

APPENDIX A
AGENDAS OF FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS, 2004-2005

Faculty Council Meeting
October 7, 2004
3:30 to 5:30 PM
Faculty Club

AGENDA:

Because of the Provost's schedule it will be necessary for us to start the meeting promptly at 3:30 PM.

- A. Welcome
 - B. Overview of new initiatives- Undergraduate Experience and Review of Graduate Programs:
Provost Barbara Snyder
 - C. Introductions: general comments
 - D. Updates on various initiatives:
 - 1. Faculty Career Enhancement initiative
 - 2. Senate leadership group meetings with Provost and President
 - 3. Interaction with the Board of Trustees
 - 4. University Leadership Retreat
 - E. Call for comment:
 - 1. CHEE report summary (see attachment)- Implications for OSU: David Horn
 - 2. Conflict of Commitment report (see attachment): Susan Fisher
 - 3. OSU Business Expenditure Policies: Susan Fisher
 - F. Ohio Faculty Council: Gene Mumy
 - G. Mechanics:
 - 1. Request for biographical sketches + CVs
 - 2. Listserv: keeping colleagues informed
 - H. Other business
-

Faculty Council Meeting
November 4, 2004
3:30 to 5:30 PM
Faculty Club

AGENDA:

A. Updates: Jack Rall

1. President would like to meet faculty for lunch. Bio-sketches and/or CVs useful in this regard
2. Leadership agenda to be finalized next week. President will comment on it at November 18 Senate meeting. General categories: Distinctive Educational Experiences and Opportunities; Cutting-Edge Interdisciplinary Research; Outreach and Engagement
3. President's State of University address sent out.
4. State budget is uncertain and is a concern. University plans a concerted effort to include faculty
5. Position available on Council on Libraries and Information Technology Committee of Senate (3 years)
6. Temporary parking (S. Fisher)

B. Proposal for creation of "Graduate Associate Compensation and Benefits Committee": Susan Fisher

C. Office of Research- Vision and Plans: Robert McGrath, Senior Vice President

D. Review of Secretary of Faculty position: David Horn

E. Report from the Senate Hearing Committee: T.K. Daniel

F. Report from Senate Program Committee: Allan Silverman

G. Other business

Faculty Council Meeting
December 2, 2004
4:00 5:45 PM (DIFFERENT TIME)
Faculty Club

Please review and bring attachments to the meeting.

AGENDA:

- A. Updates: Jack Rall
 - 1. Questions for Provost: January 13 Senate meeting
- B. New Student Organization Registration Guidelines and Advisor Certification: Kerry Hodak and Matt Couch
- C. Review of Secretary of Faculty position: Christian Zacher (attachment)
- D. Interim Report on Graduate Education: Dean Joan Herbers (attachment)
- E. Other business

Faculty Council Meeting
January 6, 2005
3:30 – 5:30 PM
Faculty Club

Please review and bring attachments to the meeting.

AGENDA*:

- A. Updates: Jack Rall
- B. Presentation by and dialogue with President Holbrook
- C. Interim Report from the Faculty Career Enhancement Committee: Chris Zacher
- D. Other business
 - 1. Annual Reapportionment of Faculty Senators (attachments)
 - 2. Request by Regional Deans to serve as Senators (attachment)

*OSU students from the Mount Leadership Society will be guests at our meeting.

Faculty Council Meeting
February 3, 2005
3:30 – 5:30 PM
Faculty Club

Please review and bring attachments to the meeting.

AGENDA:

- A. Updates: Jack Rall
- B. Proposal to form a Department of Radiation Medicine: Nina Mayr, Director Radiation Oncology (see attachment)
- C. Intercollegiate Athletics: John Bruno, Faculty Athletics Representative
 - 1. Duties of Faculty Athletics Representative
 - 2. Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics: Academic Integrity Proposal (see attachment)
 - 3. Academic State of OSU athletics
- D. Proposal for merger of John Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management: Kay Halasek, Council on Athletic Affairs

(see 4 attachments: proposal; Dean of SBS, Paul Beck; Director John Glenn Institute, Deborah Merritt; Director School of Public Policy and Management, Bert Rockman)

Faculty Council Meeting
March 3, 2005
3:30 – 5:30 PM
Faculty Club

Please review and bring attachments to the meeting.

AGENDA:

- A. OSU plans for re-accreditation review: Provost Snyder and Randy Smith (see attachment)
- B. Proposal from CAA regarding the formation of a Clinical Faculty track in the College of Engineering (see attachment): Ray Noe
- C. Academic Integrity Proposal from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics: Joe Barr and John Bruno (see 2 attachments). **Faculty Council vote required.**
- D. Update on evaluation of Deans (see attachment): Lynne Olson and Jack Rall
- E. Other business: AAUP invitation to visit with local State legislators

Faculty Council Meeting
April 7, 2005
3:30 – 5:30 PM
Faculty Club

Please review and bring attachments to the meeting.

AGENDA:

- A. University Development- Investing in Excellence: James Schroeder, Vice President for Development (see attachment)
- B. Development of university rule relating to financial fraud by faculty: Susan Fisher
- C. Update on evaluation of Deans: Lynne Olson, Dennis McKay, Jared Gardner (see attachment)
- D. Faculty role on Board of Directors of OSU Health Care Systems: Stephen Pinsky
- E. OSU plans for re-accreditation review- Special Emphasis: Jack Rall (see attachment)
- F. Other business

Faculty Council Meeting
May 5, 2005
3:30 – 5:30 PM
Faculty Club

Please review and bring attachments to the meeting.

BECAUSE OF THE FULL AGENDA THE MEETING WILL START PROMPTLY AT 3:30 PM AND RUN THE FULL 2 HOURS.

AGENDA:

- A. Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee update: Brian McHale and Pam Paxton (2 attachments)
- B. Conflict of Commitment document: Todd Guttman (attachment)
- C. Financial fraud rule: Susan Fisher and David Horn (attachment)
- D. Clinical faculty track in College of Business: Kay Halasek (attachment)
- E. Proposed rule on College Patterns of Administration: Charlie Wilson (attachment)
- F. Other business

Faculty Council Meeting/Party
May 26, 2005
3:30 – 5:30 PM
Faculty Club

Agenda

- A. Proposal to form a Department of Bioengineering: Mark Fullerton, Randy Smith (attachment)
- B. Proposed rule on financial fraud: T.K. Daniel, Susan Fisher, David Horn (attachment)
- C. Informal discussion and party: President Holbrook and Provost Snyder

APPENDIX B
NEW SENATOR ORIENTATION

New Senator Orientation Agenda
September 30, 2004
Faculty Club
8:30 – 11:30 AM

- I. Continental Breakfast: 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
- II. Remarks by guests: 9:00 AM – 9:30 AM
 - a. Board of Trustees Chair, Tami Longaberger (David Frantz)
 - b. President Karen Holbrook
 - c. Provost Barbara Snyder
- III. Comments by leaders of Senate constituencies: 9:30 AM – 10:10 AM
 - a. Undergraduate Student Government: Mr. Aftab Pureval
 - b. Council of Graduate Students: Ms. Barbara Pletz
 - c. Inter-Professional Council: Mr. Christopher Ries
 - d. Faculty Council: Professor Jack Rall
- IV. Break: 10:10 AM – 10:25 AM
- V. Senate programs and legislative process: 10:25 AM – 10:40 AM
Secretary of the Senate: Professor Susan Fisher
- VI. Preview of some 2004-2005 initiatives: 10:40 AM – 11:10 AM
 - a. Committee on Academic Affairs: Vice Provost Randy Smith
 - b. Faculty Career Enhancement: Professor Christian Zacher
- VII. General Discussion: 11:10 AM

APPENDIX C
DEAN'S PERFORMANCE SURVEY
MAY, 2005

1. Overall, the Dean's performance is:
1 (exemplary) 2 3 4 5 6 7 (inadequate) DK (don't know)
2. The Dean treats faculty fairly irrespective of ethnic origin, gender, or sexual orientation.
1 (strongly agree) 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly disagree), DK (don't know)
3. The Dean is effective in promoting diversity within the college.
4. The Dean's policies and practices for distributing faculty raises are fair.
5. The Dean's policies and practices for recommending promotion and tenure are fair.
6. The Dean's policies and practices for faculty hiring are appropriate.
7. The Dean promotes a college environment that is favorable for the development of faculty as scholars regardless of academic rank or years of service to the university.
8. The Dean provides adequate opportunities for faculty to participate in the college decision-making process.
9. The Dean is receptive to input from the faculty.
10. The Dean is responsive to faculty concerns.
11. The Dean supports faculty governance within the college.
12. The Dean supports faculty governance within the university.
13. The Dean communicates the rationale for major college decisions to the faculty.
14. The Dean articulates a clear vision for the future of the college.
15. The Dean promotes cooperation within the college.
16. The Dean promotes cooperation within the university.
17. The Dean represents the college effectively outside of the university
18. The Dean represents the college effectively within the university.
19. The Dean is effective in securing resources for the college.
20. The Dean manages college resources effectively.
21. The Dean makes appropriate decisions when appointing/reappointing faculty to administrative positions within the college, such as department chair or associate/assistant dean.
22. The Dean makes appropriate decisions when appointing/reappointing non-faculty staff to administrative positions within the college.
23. The size of the Dean's administrative staff is appropriate.
24. Provide any additional feedback regarding the Dean's performance (leadership, communication, administration, issues to be addressed, strengths, weaknesses, etc.) in the box below. Note that this information is intended for the Dean only and will be restricted to the Dean and the survey administrator to the extent possible under the current Ohio Open Records Law.
25. (to be added by Dean if desired)
26. (to be added by Dean if desired)
27. (to be added by college senators if desired)
28. (to be added by college senators if desired)

Demographics:

1. In my opinion, this survey will provide meaningful information regarding the Dean's job performance.

1 (strongly agree) 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly disagree)

2. Please identify your faculty status:

Tenure Track: tenured

Tenure Track: untenured

Regular Clinical Track

Regular Research Track

Other (please specify)

3. Faculty Rank:

Professor

Associate professor

Assistance Professor

Instructor

Other (please specify)

4. How satisfied are you with your current position?

1 (very satisfied) 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very dissatisfied)

APPENDIX D
2004 ANNUAL MEETING OF CIC FACULTY SENATE LEADERS

November 12-13, 2004
University of Illinois

Friday, November 12

Session 1a: Crime Doesn't Pay

1. University of Illinois research on plagiarism
 - a. Not a uniform agreed upon definition of plagiarism.
 - b. Treatment of cheating is a matter of academic freedom
 - c. Human studies committee would have to provide consent for research study on this topic with students

Session 1b: Reign versus Rule: Should trustees be elected or appointed?

1. University of Minnesota: faculty governance gets involved in regent selection (they are elected by legislature)
 - a. Faculty chair makes 3 reports per year regents- written report in advance
 - b. 3 meetings per year with president, regents and faculty leaders
2. Penn State: 30 members on Board, elected by groups
3. Indiana University: faculty liaison to Board committees who is invited to executive sessions. Board prefers that comments come through President.
4. MSU: 5 faculty liaisons with Board. Meet for breakfasts and lunches.
5. UW: Board of regents over 26 campuses.
6. Illinois:
 - a. Interaction with board in committees- not useful because they never met
 - b. Invite 3 trustees to Senate executive committee meetings
 - c. Explain shared governance
7. Boards of Trustees have a professional organization with a publication- Look into this
8. Get more faculty members going to Board meetings
9. Generate resolutions to thank Board members when appropriate

Session 1b continued: Promoting faculty involvement in shared governance

1. Speak at colleges to advocate faculty governance
2. Consult faculty for concerns
3. Develop ways to develop leadership once in the Senate

Saturday, November 13

Session 2a: Budgets, resources, impact of less state funding

1. State legislatures feel that universities can solve their own problems- they can raise money
2. Come to the legislatures with solutions- don't ask for solutions

3. Improve undergraduate programs- in order to get students to pay more
4. Land grant universities are not much different from other universities- only they have agriculture and outreach problems
5. More money comes from state if tuition is controlled
6. For every 2 dollars from the state, the university must reallocate 1 dollar (Minnesota)
7. Is higher education a state good or a private good? What we do must affect the economy in a demonstrable way.
8. Concentrate on building endowment- appointment of trustees must enhance endowment building
9. Students at the University of Illinois were asking for higher tuition.
10. Faculty should be involved in the tuition/fees planning committees: OSU?
11. Tuition freeze for 4 years (guaranteed tuition rate)- front loaded by 15% (University of Illinois). Appropriations not connected to tuition.
12. Tuition has increased more than state subsidy has decreased. Competition has driven up costs. Universities are in an “arms race” with each other.
13. High cost of textbooks- faculty should consider the price of textbooks when making decisions. Bookstores mark up textbooks a lot. Custom books are expensive.

Session 2b: Faculty Development

1. Wis: written into the code book
2. Mentoring through out ranks
3. Local culture crucial
4. “Post tenure review” (Ill)- annual for Assistant Professors, biannual for Associate Professors, every 5 years for Professors.
5. Teaching professorships
6. AAUP conducts a tenure workshop for Assistant Professors
7. AAUP- workshop on shared governance process; leadership promotion in citizenship
8. Research- grant writing workshop
9. U Minn- promotion for teaching
10. Scholarship of teaching & learning- coordinated set of programs (Ill)
11. Teaching scholars- Iowa, College of Medicine

Session 2b continued:

1. Develop a Senate Leaders Training Program through CIC (Provosts meet on December 8)
2. Enhancement of New Senator orientation
3. Retreat with central administrators (deans)- in May
4. Faculty meet with faculty over lunch

APPENDIX E
ACADEMIC BILL OF RIGHTS
NOTES FOR TELEVISION APPEARANCE

“The State of Ohio” hosted by Karen Kasler

Airs weekly on PBS stations around Ohio

“Academic Bill of Rights”

Sponsor of bill, Senator Larry Mumper

Television Appearance with Senator Mumper: April 19, 2005

I believe that the proposed legislation is unnecessary and mis-guided.

1. We all agree that:
 - a. Intellectual development of college students is of up most importance.
 - b. No student should be harassed intellectually or otherwise. I have 2 daughters and I would never have tolerated them being harassed when they were in college. Intellectually challenged, yes; harassed, no.

2. The proposed regulations are not needed because the university has rules in place to deal with and prevent harassment of students by faculty. Students who have a complaint against a faculty member have the right to file a complaint that will lead to a mandatory investigation of the situation. In fact some of the wording the proposed legislation already exist in the university rules. I would recommend that the student first speak with the Professor openly, honestly and respectfully. Most issues can best be resolved in this way. If unsatisfied, the student has the right to file a formal complaint.

3. Beyond this, the proposed regulations are in my view misguided for the following reasons:
 - a. American universities, the greatest in the world, operate under the dual principles of academic freedom and responsibility.
 - b. In the classroom this means that the professor determines what should be included, what should be left out and how the subject should be taught.
 - c. This decision is made based on the faculty member’s extensive knowledge of the subject matter.
 - d. This decision should not be regulated by an outside political body.
 - e. When I lecture I take responsibility for what I teach.
 - f. The students evaluate my lectures anonymously.
 - g. Those evaluations are part of the information utilized to evaluate my performance as a faculty member.
 - h. Thus I feel that the proposed regulations are mis-guided and would put Ohio universities at a competitive disadvantage when recruiting the best faculty.