

Thomas Johnson  
Chairman of the Board of Trustees  
Hocking College

February 7, 2016

Dear Chairman Johnson,

The Faculty and Professional Staff of Hocking College have prepared and voted on a Resolution of No Confidence for each of the following administrators.

Dr. Betty Young, President of Hocking College

Dr. Myriah Davis, Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs of Hocking College

As a courtesy to the Hocking College Board of Trustees the Faculty and Professional Staff have elected to provide the Board of Trustees with the results of the votes prior to publication of the Resolutions of No Confidence.

Ninety-nine members or nearly 92% of the members of the full-time Faculty and Professional staff cast votes on each of the two resolutions.

#### Result for Dr. Betty Young

Option	Number of Votes	Percent of Votes
I have full confidence in Dr. Young's leadership.	1	1.01%
I have some confidence in Dr. Young's leadership.	1	1.01%
I have little confidence in Dr. Young's leadership.	5	5.05%
I have no confidence in Dr. Young's leadership.	92	92.93%

#### Result for Dr. Myriah Davis

Option	Number of Votes	Percent of Votes
I have full confidence in Dr. Davis' leadership.	1	1.01%
I have some confidence in Dr. Davis' leadership.	8	8.08%
I have little confidence in Dr. Davis' leadership.	14	14.14%
I have no confidence in Dr. Davis' leadership.	76	77.77%

In addition to the votes, hundreds of comments, concerns, opinions and observations were submitted.

#### A Sample of Comments on Dr. Betty Young

In a further attempt to cut costs, many courses are over cap; there are fewer class sections available because classes were cut, or multiple courses were combined into one section. Yet, many faculty members are teaching overload or have converted one or more of their courses to online due to the shortage of faculty and the College's inability to find qualified adjuncts to replace faculty who were dismissed by Dr. Young or who chose to resign or retire due to the toxic environment. All these factors decrease both service to the students and the likelihood of student success.

Too many decisions have been made that harm student success --from over-crowded classrooms to the inclusion of part-time instructors who have very limited teaching experience.

Dr. Young's ever increasing reliance on adjuncts may reduce costs, but it also decreases service to students because adjunct instructors are not required to hold office hours, advise students, or otherwise help students outside of class. This practice places more and more pressure on the remaining full-time faculty because those faculty members must advise, tutor, and fulfil the needs of the adjuncts' students.

Since Dr. Young was selected as president of Hocking College there has been a continuous decline in morale among staff, faculty, students, alumni and the community. In past administrations, occasional political unrest and decisions may have (for the most part) affected the employees of the college but not the students. The current leadership is making decisions that have and continue to deteriorate the quality of the education, mission and reputation on the local, state and national level. If something does not change the college will collapse and become a local commuter community college with no unique, specialized programs that the college is known and respected for. The surrounding community will suffer further when students from outside of the region and state stop attending the College; sales will decline and more and more rental units will sit vacant.

Dr. Young's decisions do not align with the mission of Hocking College, thus greatly diminishing the quality of education provided for our students. Dr. Young makes these decisions without input from faculty and staff, therefore eliminating the shared governance ethic that helps to maintain an institution's integrity. Dr. Young fails to maintain the transparency of the leadership's intentions, creating policies that eliminate trust within the organization, resulting in an extremely hostile work environment.

### A Sample of Comments on Dr. Myriah Davis

Dr. Davis has no experience outside of Hocking College and so she is forced to invent processes and methods without any knowledge of how colleges and universities typically work. Sadly, she does not solicit the advice or opinions of faculty members who have served numerous other colleges and universities. I do not know whether it is embarrassment or ego that forces her to write and implement policies without consultation of those affected by her policies. Either way, most of her policies are contrived and needlessly complicated; they greatly hamper, sometimes harm, both the teaching and learning processes.

Dr. Davis fails to recognize the needs of students in our area, and the unique niche that Hocking College serves in the community, imposing policies that appear to have no logical need for implementation. Dr. Davis denies that these policies are erroneous, despite an overwhelming majority of faculty opposing said policies.

Universities across the US have seen on average a 6% decline in enrollment over the past four years. Hocking has seen a 51% decline in relatively the same time frame. Why the disproportionate difference? The difference is Hocking's leadership since 2010/11 has been inept. It's noteworthy that the only executive level leader present throughout that decline has been Dr. Davis. And, it's ironic that with the Administration's emphasis on credentials, Dr. Davis's credentials have never been questioned. She has never held a faculty post at any institution nor taught even a course. How can she be Hocking's Chief Academic Officer?

Dr. Davis exhibits a total disregard of student needs. She accepts no input from others. She fails to communicate lines of action to faculty. She accepts no responsibility for poor outcomes, while claiming ownership of achievements for which she has no part.

She cares little about the quality of education at Hocking. Her agenda is waiting for the opportunity to become a college president, and while she waits, she provides her friends and neighbors with administrative jobs for which they are not qualified or cannot adequately perform, but protects them at all costs.

Dr. Davis portrays issues and items to the Board of Trustees in an untruthful manner. Pulling the wool over the eyes of the members of the Board of Trustees by repeatedly indicating that all is well when Hocking is going down before our very eyes.

Dr. Davis often tells the Board of Trustees that her policies were vetted with and approved by the faculty. Most times she has merely mentioned such policies in passing or has casually discussed them with a small group of faculty, telling the faculty members that the idea is being considered.

### Conclusion

We are profoundly aware of the enrollment and economic challenges faced by the College as we were among the first to note and point out that many of the methods, practices, structures, and policies that evolved at the College were economically inefficient and unsustainable under the revised state funding model. It was the Faculty and Professional Staff who went to Dr. Ron Erickson and first pointed out the need to balance academic goals and needs with economic realities.

We are not a radical group nor are we a group of complainers. We are a Faculty and Professional Staff who are exceptionally devoted to the College and the students we serve. We who suggested the need for greater efficiency in course design, faculty load structure, and other matters, have watched as the push for efficiency has become excessive. Maximum possible revenue from courses and loads now trumps concepts such as ideal teacher student ratios, classroom or lab capacity, and adequate class time and so trumps student service and student success. It has become a tyrant that likely increases attrition and reduces our course completion and graduation rates. It most certainly frustrates our students.

That maximal revenue production has come to dominate at Hocking College is not exclusively due to enrollment declines and changes in state funding, it is also driven by the addition of more and more administrative positions. Nearly every week there is an announcement introducing a new administrator.

We have tolerated administrative indifference to our contributions, education, and experience. We have stood in silent frustration as the administration minimized or marginalized virtually every one of our concerns. We have listened as we are repeatedly blamed and ridiculed for enrollment declines and other problems that are often the result of administrative actions or strategies such as course or program cuts or cancellations, waiting until the last minute to hire instructors, or offering inadequate, non-competitive salaries. We have experienced all of these things and more. What we do not wish to witness is the death of the unique and societally beneficial institution that is Hocking College.

On behalf of the Hocking College Faculty and Professional Staff,

J. B. Hart, Ph.D.

President, the Professional Bargaining Unit

The Hocking College Education Association, HCEA/OEA/NEA