

**Ohio University Faculty Senate
Minutes for Monday, March 9, 2009.
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.**

Sergio López-Permuth called the meeting to order at 7:11 PM.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: D. Bell, K. Brown, S. Gradin, P. Jung, J. Lein, S. López-Permuth, G. Matlack, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, W. Roosenburg, A. Smith, J. Webster

College of Business: W. Gist, L. Hoshower, T. Stock

College of Education: V. Conley, T. Leinbaugh

College of Engineering: C. Bartone, J. Gieseey, D. Matolak,

College of Fine Arts: A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, L. Steele, D. Thomas

Group II: A. Hall, C. Naccarato,

College of Health and Human Services: D. Bolon, S. Marinellie, J. Thomas,

College of Osteopathic Medicine: P. Coschigano

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: S. Brogan

Regional Campus—Eastern: T. Flynn

Regional Campus—Lancaster: P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Southern:

Regional Campus—Zanesville: K. Collins

Scripps College of Communication: J. Bernt, N. Pecora, J. Slade, S. Titsworth

Excused: T. Anderson, G. Buckley, T. Heckman, E. McGown, R. Wetzel

Absent: J. Benson, S. Hatty, J. McKean, H. Pasic, D. Torres

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl
 - II. Roll Call and Approval of February 2 and 9, 2009 Minutes
 - III. Chair's report—Sergio López-Permuth
 - IV. Finance and Facilities Committee Report—Joe McLaughlin
 - V. Professional Relations Committee Report—Sherrie Gradin
 - VI. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee Report—Scott Titsworth
 - VII. Promotion and Tenure Committee Report—Pete Coschigano
 - VIII. New Business
 - IX. Adjournment
-

Minutes of the meeting

I. Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl

- **Krendl** announced that her report went up online over the lunch hour. **Krendl** summarized budget contingency plans. She emphasized that there would not be across the board cuts; rather budget cuts would be strategic. She noted that the average reduction budget rate for an academic unit was 3.5%. The budget reduction rates for major support offices were 9.6% for Finance and Administration, 9.5% for Information Technology, 9.1% for the Executive Vice President and Provost, 8.5% for Advancement, and 6.5% for the President. She stated that these cuts excluded scholarships and faculty salaries. Each unit determined the best ways of meeting the targets.
- **Krendl** stated that she met on February 12 with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Sherrie Gradin to address concerns that had arisen in the Professional Relations Committee concerning the Deans' Evaluations. She stated that a compromise had been reached. This compromise involves putting the Deans' Evaluation forms online and processing them through the Office of Institutional Research.
- **Krendl** then provided recruitment updates. She noted that this is a particularly challenging year for recruitment due to a decline in the state's population. Even so, OU has surpassed the number of applications we had last year, which was a record year. She emphasized the importance of yield activities and that the university will need help from the faculty.
- **Krendl** concluded her report with some good news: OU's College of Business ranked in the top 50 undergraduate business programs according to *Business Week*. She also announced *U.S. News and World Report* ranked OU as having the 56th highest yield rate in the nation.

Questions for Krendl

- **Ken Brown** asked about the amount of cut for academic units. **Krendl** replied that it was an average of 3.5%. **Brown** asked **Krendl** about the dollar amount of the cuts to academic units, which he noted was the only dollar amount omitted from her written report, and she answered that she did not have that information. **Brown** then asked how many Group I lines were being given up by academic units in the budget cut. **Krendl** replied that she did not have that information.
- **Joe Bernt** asked about the Athletic Department's rumored budget deficit. **Krendl** replied that Bernt was correct: the Athletic Department is running a \$1.6M deficit. She stated that a number of strategies are being discussed to fix this problem. **Bernt** asked what those strategies were. **Krendl** replied that she could not answer that question, but that this issue is being discussed by the Budget Planning Council.
- **Berhard Debatin** stated that OU is subsidizing the Athletic Department this year. He asked whether there has been a discussion of whether we can afford it? **Krendl** replied that she does not have an answer for that question. **Debatin** stated

- that there is a commitment on focusing on the academic mission, what is essential and not essential; this is a high subsidy of approximately \$14.6 M that we're paying to a relatively non-essential unit. He asked if there is a discussion about this. **Krendl** asked where he got that number. **Debatin** stated that this is what athletics takes from the university: \$6 to 7M from the operating fee and \$6 to 7M in fee waivers. He reiterated that the department is running a deficit this year and receiving general fee support. He stated that there is not a single athletic program that is self-supporting and that the majority of Division 1 programs receive some kind of institutional support. **Willem Roosenburg** asked whether this includes scholarships. **Krendl** replied that it does. **Leon Hoshower** stated that the number of employees has grown in recent years. He asked whether there shouldn't be fewer employees.
- **Chuck Naccarato** asked whether Krendl had attended the University System of Ohio meetings and was part of their recent discussions. **Krendl** replied that she had attended the provosts' meetings. **Naccarato** stated that the idea is for students to get the best possible education in the state of Ohio and that we should provide that for them. He stated that it's somewhat disturbing that if you got a Ph.D. you'd only have 4 chances out of 6 of finding a full time job. He noted that non-tenure track and part time faculty are skyrocketing. **Krendl** asked what the connection between that and the USO is. **Naccarato** stated that the USO talks about achieving educational excellence, but these people will be hard pressed to find a full time job. **Krendl** replied that the academy is not the only destination for graduates. There are also industry opportunities. She suggested that, until she looked at statistics about what percentage is actually entering the academy, she doesn't know how to answer this question. She stated that we can only give students the best opportunities. She stated that this is an on-going problem that is particularly acute right now. **Naccarato** stated that it seems like you have a group of people discussing outcomes, but did somebody say, "Who's going to staff the system?" He stated that they're going to need a lot of professors. **Krendl** stated that some 300,000 new students, mostly part time, who are adult, working students are likely to enter the system, but they will likely enroll at the urban campuses and community colleges. Those institutions will carry a heavier workload and will have to make choices between accessibility and affordability.
 - **Annette Graham** then read the following statement from the faculty and staff of The School of Human and Consumer Sciences:

I have a statement to read on behalf of my colleagues in the School of Human and Consumer Sciences that I would like to follow with specific questions for Provost Krendl.

The School of Human and Consumer Sciences at Ohio University has a long and distinguished history of high educational standards, service to the community, and alumni support. Since being established in 1911 as the Domestic Science Department, the School has evolved over time to emerge as an educational leader in Ohio and nation-wide. Our programs focus on family dynamics, consumer issues, human development and human environments. Our faculty members are

specialists in these areas—and our academic programs prepare graduates to seek careers in a variety of related fields from retail fashion buyer to first-grade teacher.

Improving the quality of life and the human condition through teaching, research and practice. That's the mission of Ohio University's School of Human and Consumer Sciences, which stresses hands-on learning in varied programs that include child and family studies; food, nutrition and hospitality; interior architecture; and retail merchandising. Each discipline focuses on the consumption of goods and services across the human life span. Each course of study seeks to improve the quality of human development by addressing the needs of individuals and families throughout the life span, including the impact of family roles and dynamics, and the formation and maintenance of human relationships. Common to all areas of specialized areas is the preparation of students for positions in their chosen areas of specialization. Shared by all specializations are courses that facilitate physical, intellectual, psychological, and social life span development.

A colleague received from Dean Gary Neiman, the following language by email in response to an inquiry about rumors concerning re-organization of academic programs at Ohio University.

“There have been rather significant discussions about academic reorganization that involves programs in CHHS and other programs and colleges. There have been many rumors “on the street” of varying degrees of reality. I prefer not to comment on rumors. The deans and vps are working on a philosophy outlining the rationale for and major components of reorganization and are close to closure on that. I expect any reorganization to be one that is sound academically and bodes well for the future of programs involved. Once presented, many of the implementation details would be left to the chairs/directors and Faculty (in concert with the deans) to work out in the coming months. I would expect a public presentation on this topic in very early spring quarter.

Stay tuned.”

The faculty of the School of Human and Consumer Sciences are concerned about the lack of faculty involvement in the decision making process in the plan to reorganize the academic units of the university.

How effective can a university-wide academic re-alignment be without input from the faculty who best understand the missions, learning goals, curricula, and the students enrolled in the given programs?

Our dean has declined to meet with school faculty and in the absence of communication rumors and fears take over. We believe the demise of the school will have a negative impact on students. We cannot fathom why the deans and

vice presidents at Ohio University would attempt to make substantial changes in the academic makeup of the university without input and comment from the faculty.

At this point in time our four questions are:

What priorities were used to develop the philosophy outlining the rationale for and major components of the reorganization?

Krendl replied that she would do her best to answer. She stated that when budget scenarios became obvious that reductions were likely working groups were established. The goal of one such group was to look at the possibility of academic restructuring. The sense was that there might be something that would improve opportunities for programs and reduce administrative costs and improve efficiency. She noted that one goal was not putting students at risk. From that group came the idea of the creation of new integrated units. The deans started talking about putting together a conceptual model that outlined some possibilities. The deans just received a conceptual outline and met this afternoon to talk about it. They will produce a framework and then there will be an opportunity for faculty input. She stated that she talked with Gary Neiman this afternoon. He will meet with school directors as soon as possible. She stated that she understands that CHHS feels at risk because of Neiman's retirement.

Graham continued with question 2: Is this action being taken to save money?

Krendl replied that estimates are that it will save between \$500,000 and \$750,000. **Graham** noted that this seems small compared to athletics, for example. **Krendl** replied that, if it's not going to improve quality and reduce costs, then it's not something to pursue.

Graham then asked a third question: Is this action being done to improve student learning? **Krendl** replied that such outcome measures as student success, graduation rates, retention rates, etc. will be kept in mind.

Graham concluded by saying that one concern in Human and Consumer Sciences is about their collaborative work. She reminded **Krendl** of the importance of faculty consultation. **Krendl** assured her that faculty will be consulted.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the February 2 and 9, 2009 Minutes

The minutes of the February 2 and 9, 2009 meetings were unanimously approved on a voice vote.

III. Chair's Report – Sergio López-Permouth

- **López** asked Hugh Bloemer to report on the most recent Ohio Faculty Council meeting.

- **Bloemer** stated that the most recent Ohio Faculty Council meeting was held in Columbus on February 13, 2009. Chancellor Fingerhut and the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) requested the OFC to comment on the “Second Educational Conditions Report” on universities’ infrastructure and technology. Specifically the OFC was asked to address the following three questions:
 1. Have the proper questions been asked in the report?
 2. Are the data on infrastructure and technology valid?
 3. What should be emphasized?

- **Bloemer** stated that the following suggestions were made to the chair of the OFC (John Cuppoletti) in response to the questions:
 - a. While electronic learning can do some things, many buildings on all the Ohio public universities need updating and repair before they would be ready to facilitate this task.
 - b. All universities should be linked electronically.
 - c. There should be user input regarding the design of electronically delivered education (not simply top down by some consulting outfit).

- **Bloemer** reported that the suggested conclusions emphasized the following:
 - a. The campuses need to make sure that the appropriate hardware and software is in place before they begin to participate.
 - b. Adequate support personnel must be in place to ensure that the system will work.
 - c. Participating personnel must be sure to have a well developed knowledge of theories of electronic pedagogy.

- **Bloemer** reported that the OFC then discussed the OFC ad hoc committee representations on state wide higher education committees. OFC discussed whether or how OFC should be involved in Ohio Board of Regents committees, especially if they included representation from other higher education constituents: Inter-University Council, students, community colleges, etc. The question was asked if any such committees would have any powers since the Chancellor now has many of the powers over academic programs that once belonged to the OBOR. The advantage of participating in such a large body would be the fact that it would create a mechanism in which all the stake holders have a place to hear each other and offer advice to the chancellor. The other side of the coin would be that such a body would probably be less likely to become a source of advice for the chancellor but rather a vehicle for dissemination of information from the chancellor’s office. The concern here is that it would simply be a top down operation. **Bloemer** stated that he shared that concern in the whole process. He stated that another major concern is the fact that such a large joint body would diminish the influence and voice of the OFC and university faculty as a whole. He

- stated that OFC needs to make sure that publish universities' academic issues remain in the hands of the university faculty.
- **Bloemer** then reported that the members of the OFC then discussed a resolution to support and endorse the "Employment Nondiscrimination Acts" also known as House Bill 502 and Senate Bill 305, which is currently under consideration in the 128th session of the Ohio General Assembly. The actual language of the bipartisan bill can be found on the web at ohio.gov. The members of the OFC voted in favor of the resolution 10 to 0 with one abstention due to unclarified membership status. This vote has been forwarded to the appropriate offices in the house and senate.
 - **Bloemer** reported that there was a discussion regarding the length of semesters since several universities are either shifting or considering shifting from the quarter system to semesters. It appears that several universities have discussed the length of the semesters and have opted for 14 week semesters plus one week for finals. The rationale for the campuses is that it is very difficult to find a 75 day semester, and that the 14 week summer session fits best into their coop programs. **Bloemer** stated that he expressed his displeasure over a 14 week semester because he believes that we should give our students more, not less. He said that this perhaps reflects his dinosaur philosophy about higher education.
 - **Bloemer** stated that the last item of business was the campus reports. The reports included the usual searches for new deans, provosts, and presidents. The big item was budget cuts and subsequent impacts. Budget cuts proposals ranged from 5% to 15% with the University of Cincinnati's Arts and Sciences budget taking a hit of 19%. He jokingly reported to OFC that OU anticipated an increase of 5% in our budget. A hiring freeze for the current year and for next year seems to be the norm across state institutions. He stated that the picture is bleak across the state – all the more reason for all constituencies involved in public education to work together for the common good of a university education. **Leon Hoshower** asked about the length of classes in a 14 week semester and whether time was added to classes. **Bloemer** replied that OFC had not discussed that. **David Descutner** stated that typically 5 minutes are added to each class, but that's not the same as a week of class. **Bloemer** replied that the chancellor has been informed of this and will probably determine the norm across the state. **Joe Bernt** asked whether representatives from Ohio State talked about going to semesters. **Bloemer** replied that OSU's faculty are voting on it. **Bernt** asked, "The faculty are voting?" **Bloemer** replied, "Yes."
 - **López** reminded senators that he had sent out a copy of the survey to evaluate the president via email. Most senators said it looked ok. He received a couple of suggestions for improvement. He noted that, while letter grades are compatible with our culture as professors, responses were that it might be better to use what's normally used, similar to dean's categories. He read them the senators. He stated that he thought they say the same thing, so he will adopt it for the survey. He stated that he will contact the president to ask for a report to the faculty on aspects of his performance that we're not aware of. He expects the president will inform us of them. He stated that there is a question about timing and whether we should do the evaluation at the end of the year or wait until fall to do it. He stated that his understanding was the May resolution called for once a year, which implies a

- deadline before May to complete the evaluation. He asked if anyone had feedback on this. Several senators nodded affirmatively. **Ken Brown** stated that he saw no reason to wait until fall. **López** stated that one argument for delay is that the president just stated his new set of goals based on the external evaluation. According to this argument, a brand new set of goals requires some time before evaluation, but part of the survey asks about the appropriateness of the goals, so the survey would evaluate that too. **Tom Flynn** stated that there is no reason to wait and that it makes more sense to conduct the survey at the end of the year. **Norma Pecora** stated that even if the survey was conducted in the in fall it wouldn't give the president enough time to carry out those goals. She stated that she thought it was better to do the survey sooner rather than later. **López** stated that the plan is that between now and the next meeting, he will figure out survey monkey and work on conducting the survey.
- **López** stated that according to the Faculty Handbook, the March meeting is when the senate puts together a nominating committee for the May elections of a chair, vice chair, and secretary. This committee is charged with announcing in the April meeting nominations for at least one candidate for each officer slot. The handbook calls for this committee to consist of retiring senators who have finished a second elected term. There is only one: López. He therefore looked for other retiring senators, but you never know if someone is really retiring. Three people have said yes to serving on this committee: Tom Flynn, Willem Roosenburg, and Norma Pecora. **López** asked Pecora to chair the committee, and she said yes. He stated that anyone who wants to run should let these senators know.
 - **López** presented a resolution from the Executive Committee on Provost Searches. This resolution adds language to the Faculty Handbook to address the degree of ambiguity how to search for a provost. He projected the resolution on the screen and read it aloud. This resolution clarifies Section VII.E and would cover searching for a provost, some vice presidents, and deans. Ken Brown asked about including associate provosts. **Kathy Krendl** stated that including “such as” means that we would be giving some examples. **Chris Bartone** asked whether this would include associate deans. **López** stated that there is specific language for associate deans in another section. **López** stated that he would accept Ken's suggestion and add some vice provosts, but that we also want to be flexible as titles change. **Joe McLaughlin** stated that this resolution uses faculty rank and faculty status. He asked if there is a place in the handbook that defines these terms. **López** replied that yes there is. **Tom Flynn** offered a suggestion for the language: that the chairperson of the search committee and a majority of the members of the search committee will have faculty status. **López** stated that this change was OK with him. He stated that the resolution mutated because one of the comments he received was that maybe instead of changing one paragraph the entire section needed rewriting. He stated that the current handbook language starts with search committees in general and moves to deans and then to the president then to general searches and then to deans alone, which is where the ambiguity arises. He stated that instead of preserving the confusion he wanted to take the same language and reorder everything. He put up an example of the

rewritten version, in which he pulled out the common factor to the front. Now the beginning statements are about search committees in general. The resolution then moves to the specific kinds of searches. **Jeff Giese** asked if we needed to pull out the exception for the president. **López** stated that this is already taken care of in the revision. He stated that he would email this to everyone and ask for feedback before the next meeting.

IV. Finance and Facilities (FFC)--Joe McLaughlin

- **McLaughlin** stated that will take senators through some of the things F&F has been working on in recent weeks. He started with a discussion of Vision Ohio and its commitment to faculty. He stated that the core of that commitment is faculty compensation. He then presented the following PowerPoint presentation:

Vision OHIO

“Recruit and retain exceptional faculty and staff to create and sustain preeminent programs of learning, engagement, research, creative activity, and scholarship...”

- Compare salary and compensation with peer institutions and meet the goal of raising our percentile rank among peers by 15 points by 2010”

Faculty Compensation Initiative

- In order to fulfill the Vision OHIO goal, the University planned to add \$1.2 million in base funding for faculty compensation
- Approximately \$1 million in salaries and \$.2 million in Benefits
- Begins in 2007-08 or FY08

Reality
OHIO

Year 1 (2007-08)

- \$1.2 million added to base funding
- \$1.5 million cost shift on health care benefits
 - Approximately \$1 million on premiums & \$.5 million on out-of-pocket expenses
 - Faculty share is 40% or **\$.6 million**
- Net gain from FCI: \$.6 million

Year 2 (2008-09)

- \$1.2 million added
- President accepts BPC recommendation to put raises, including \$1.2 million, on hold
- Trustees overrule President
- Net gain from FCI: \$1.2 million

Year 3 (2009-10) Proposed

- No 3% raise pool
- No \$1.2 million
- \$2 million cost shift on health care
- 40% or **\$.8 million** is faculty share of cost shift
- Proposal puts FCI on hold indefinitely and wipes out 2/3 of Year 2 gains

Faculty Compensation Initiative Summary

- 2007-2008 \$.8 million
- 2008-2009 \$1.2 million
- 2009-2010 (\$.8 million)
- Years 1-3 \$1.2 million total
- Years 4- ??????

“Priorities” not found in Vision OHIO

	03-04	08-09	Increase
President	\$256,420	\$380,000	48%
Football Coach	\$153,000	\$330,000	116%
Director, ICA	\$134,000	\$225,000	68%
Director, HR	\$ 95,703	\$165,000	72%
Avg. Dean*	\$149,369	\$199,542	34%
 Avg. Group I Faculty	 \$ 63,383	 \$ 78,158	 23%

*CAS, ENT, HHS, COM, FAR, BUS, HHS

Some New Positions Since 03- 04

- Chief Information Officer \$216,300
- Director, Shared Services \$159,776
- Sr. Assoc. VP, Fin. & Admin. \$179,813
- Vice Prov., Enrollment Mngt. \$135,500
- Assoc. Prov., Strategic In. \$120,000
- Executive Dean, Regional Cam. \$146,849

Full-Time Top Administrators *

	2003-04	2008-09	Increase
# of Top Admin.	52	77	48.7%
Total Salaries	\$6,302,536	\$10,467,937	66.1%

* Defined as president, provost, vice-presidents, vice-provosts, deans and those full-time administrators with titles including the following descriptors: "executive director," "assistant to," "assistant vice-president," "associate vice-president," "assistant vice provost," or "associate provost"

Full-Time ICA Employees

	03 04	08 09	Increase
# ICA Employees	56	65	16.1%
Total Salaries	\$2,911,691	\$4,056,255	39.3%

- **McLaughlin** stated the Faculty Compensation Initiative is not dead and may come back but no one is sure when or what it would take to get back on schedule. He stated that this initiative is hard to tackle at least in part due to the growth of administrative spending and structure. He stated that it is very clear that the real crux is not administrative staff in general; the problem is at the top. He stated that

- this structure is constantly shifting. He listed administrative salaries in a spreadsheet so that current levels could be compared with the past. F&F chose 2003-2004 because it was five years ago, was the last year before President McDavis arrived, and it was the last year when we had a number of deans in this position. This spreadsheet also lists new positions since 2003-2004, but it is not an exhaustive list.
- **McLaughlin** stated that the university is currently facing about a \$10M gap. With the Budget Planning Council's recommendation the bottom line of that gap would ultimately be reduced. In this plan, \$3M shifts would plug \$3M in Athens campus budget, but the impact is actually about two-thirds of that since the proposal includes not just the \$3M in cost savings and shifts but also includes enhancements in the current healthcare benefits. McLaughlin read these enhancements from the table entitled "Summary of Health Benefits Discussion of February 27, 2009." He stated that the total savings is about \$2M and has a \$1.3M budget impact on the Athens campus. He stated that the health benefits budget for this year and next year assumes a total increase of about \$863,000; \$561,000 is part of the Athens budget. He stated that what this \$3M called for by the Budget Planning Council gets is actually \$1.3M from a budgetary perspective.
 - **McLaughlin** then presented F&F Resolution 1. He stated that in presenting this resolution F&F is carrying out the senate's responsibility to vote on the recommended changes to health care by bringing this proposal to senate for approval. He stated that typically when a resolution is brought from a committee, there is an understanding that the committee endorses that resolution. This is not the case this time. He stated that we have to do this and that there is an obligation for discussion and a vote, but it is not something F&F is endorsing or recommending against.
 - **Chuck Naccarato** asked how many brackets there are in figuring healthcare contributions. **McLaughlin** replied that there are 9 brackets. **Naccarato** asked what the cut off is for the highest bracket. **McLaughlin** stated that \$86,000 is the top cut off. He said that, according to the plan, these people would pay \$500 more in premiums next year. **Naccarato** replied that this is the bottom paying for the top.
 - **Ken Brown** asked how the 25% maximum got in the resolution. **McLaughlin** replied that we also need to revise the handbook, because the current limit is 10%. He stated that there has been a great deal of confusion about that 10% and whether it is everything we pay or just premiums. He stated that 4 years ago the president said he was not going to change healthcare, which was taken to mean premiums. **McLaughlin** stated that we need to change that because the \$3M takes us up to 12.5%. He stated that he realizes that we need to clarify whether its just premiums or everything. F&F decided that it was intended to mean everything. We've been under 10% on premiums, but around 18% or 19% when you calculate the total expenses. We would be well above 20% and pushing up against 25% under the new plan. He explained that what F&F has done is put in the 25%, which includes everything. **Brown** asked whether it will accommodate the total of what we anticipate but not greatly increase it. **McLaughlin** replied that it gives us a little wiggle room, but not a lot.

- **Brown** asked about Holzer. He stated that the figures about the \$3M do not include changes in Holzer's status; we therefore need to add in the cost to employees of \$400,000. **Quitslund** replied that this is only if everyone who currently uses Holzer continues to use Holzer. **Brown** asked whether the deductible would also increase costs. **Bernt** stated that when he looks back to the Glidden years, when the administration decided it was time to hit the employees for a chunk of the premiums, there was a deal of 10% period. He stated that this was like the nose of the camel slipping into the tent: move from 10% to 25%. That original bargain has been violated in so many different ways. He stated that he wants to speak against approving this proposal. He stated that the handbook goes on to say that any changes must be approved by the Faculty Senate each year. He stated that this is clearly a change in rates. He asked, "Why undermine the compensation of all the employees of the university to subsidize the kind of management this university has received in recent years?"
- **Joe Slade** asked if there was any good reason to support this. **McLaughlin** replied that the argument has been made that if we do not support this it will mean more layoffs. He stated that it is a choice that is being made by the people who make those decisions, but F&F has presented data in the PowerPoint presentation about other areas in which the university could make cuts and save employees.
- **Mary Rogus** asked whether anyone has factored in the increasing costs of employees using less preventative healthcare, such as mammograms, cardiac care, etc., as a result of putting Holzer outside of network. She stated that it seems \$400,000 is not a lot when you compare the costs that are inevitably going to happen when someone has to make a choice between a doctor s/he's had for 10 years or seek other care. It will triple what it used to cost, which leads to catastrophic health issues. She stated that spending less on preventive care doesn't cut health care costs; when we get memos about having multiple healthcare providers it's a joke—there are not multiple healthcare providers period. She stated that this lead to disaster and will hurt lower paid employees more.
- **Geoff Buckley** stated that the Faculty Handbook doesn't say consultation about what the benefits are, just the cost. He stated that he has some disinclination to take a salary cut this year, but he might be persuaded if it were in the best interests of the institution in total. He stated that he has trouble sorting out issues about providers in regards to this resolution. **McLaughlin** stated that we have a lot of information overload. He stated that F&F has another resolution about Holzer. He stated that he didn't want to deal with Holzer tonight, but F&F has been flooded with email. He stated that the Benefits Office has informed him that OU has to tell Anthem by March 15 if we're going to move to a two-tier health system. We have to do discuss this tonight.
- **Berhard Debatin** stated that this resolution is basically a salary cut and a regressive salary cut. It is a hidden salary cut that gives the appearance of our salaries being untouched when it creates a socially unjust way of dealing with a situation that needs to be dealt with. He stated that he thinks the Holzer issue is related to it, since it is coming at the same time in the context of creating a guilt campaign where people are pitted against each other because of layoffs: if you don't do this, please will lose their jobs. In this context the Holzer issue is

- outrageous. He stated that it would be more honest if BPC said let's have a salary cut and asked how we do it that is socially acceptable and somewhat just. He stated that our benefits are supposedly among the best in the country; the consequences of changing it will be felt for a long time. **McLaughlin** stated that we have been talking about Holzer for at least 2 year on the Health Benefits Advisory Committee. He said that a decision like this one was imminent.
- **Doug Bolon** stated that, especially if you've been talking about it for 2 years, Holzer cannot do without the university population and the university can't do without Holzer being part of the network. He asked why hasn't there been some negotiations going on and whether it has to do with turf protection issues with university medical associates. He asked if this is purely Holzer playing hardball. **McLaughlin** stated that faculty on the HBAC haven't talked openly about this because negotiations have been going on and they did not want to jeopardize those negotiations. He stated that the conversations he's heard have been that this is a multifaceted problem, one not just about the costs but also about the College of Medicine, University Medical Associates, and lots of things feeding into this. He stated that it is his understanding that there may be a legal issue preventing the university from negotiating directly with Holzer: Anthem works with Holzer on the rates. He stated that he doesn't know what pressure has been put on Anthem. The university just decided to renew with Anthem for another year.
 - **Bernt** stated that the \$400,000 excess of payment has hit the university at the same time that we're raising the rates and cutting the quality of services. At the same time OU is finding \$400,000 to fund the Healthy Ohio Initiative. He stated that he would just as soon have his access to Holzer, **McLaughlin** stated that he was a supporter of Healthy Ohio, since it focuses on preventative care that should save some money at some point. He also stated that last year Inter-Collegiate Athletics got \$1M from Holzer and that the arena is now advertising for Holzer.
 - **Brown** stated that he was surprised about this flack about Holzer. He stated that Anthem contracts reimbursement rates with all of the providers in the network and that there are high cost providers and low cost providers across the network. He asked, "Why pick on Holzer?" **McLaughlin** stated that he didn't know why. He stated that one frustrating thing is we haven't been able to sit down and look at this data. He said that he knows that every 5% of university business is \$400,000 cost to the university. It is a growing cost problem.
 - **Debatin** asked whether the senate could hear directly from Bill Decatur or Greg Fialko about when the last negotiations with Holzer were. **Bill Decatur** stated that there have been discussions for 2 years. He said that it is a complex issue and is not just about costs. He stated that Holzer received much higher reimbursement rates than everyone else in this area and in Columbus, because Anthem negotiated based on Holzer's monopoly across this part of the state. He stated that negotiations were attempted at least 1 year ago. A one-year deal was offered from Holzer. He confirmed that for every 5% increase in market share our costs go up \$400,000 and that Holzer is about 17% now. Holzer has filled an important niche and used that to grow their practice and increase their market share. He stated that we have opened negotiations with them again but can't talk about that yet. He

- said that if we got a reasonable rate, we might be able to reach agreement with them.
- **Flynn** stated that the Faculty Handbook states that any increase has to be approved by the senate. **Bernt** read the section in the handbook aloud. **Flynn** asked what approval means. He asked what happens if we don't approve it. **Brown** replied that any change would then be a violation of the handbook. **Flynn** asked whether the handbook is really a contract. **Brown** replied that it is. **McLaughlin** stated that it is up to the president whether he'll abide by the handbook. **Flynn** stated that he liked F&F's suggestion that other areas of cost savings be looked at. **McLaughlin** stated that F&F is suggesting that there are other areas that the university could look at to avoid layoffs. **Flynn** asked how that works out realistically. He stated that he would like not to see any more layoffs and asked how we achieve that. He asked what the next step in the process is. **McLaughlin** replied that the next step would be a BPC recommendation, then a faculty senate vote. He stated that if this resolution is not approved but the president made the changes anyway, there would be changes that are not Faculty Senate approved. He reminded senators that someone has to tell Greg Fialko whether to call Anthem and change the benefits. **Flynn** asked if the faculty on the BPC voted for this recommendation. **McLaughlin** stated that he voted against it.
 - **Hoshower** asked if we could vote on the resolution. **Willem Roosenburg** stated that we can suspend the rules. **Bill Decatur** stated that there will be layoffs. He said that how we achieve those savings would have to be determined, but there are all kinds of reductions. **Flynn** asked if McLaughlin was correct that the cuts in healthcare really saved \$1.3M. **Decatur** answered, "Yes." **Flynn** asked if there would be layoffs of faculty as well as classified staff. **Krendl** replied that it is likely that there would be some faculty layoffs. **McLaughlin** stated that he was not suggesting that there is a way to avoid layoffs. **Chris Bartone** noted that it is up to administrations to make decisions about layoffs and not the faculty's responsibility to lay off people. He stated that's what the administration is for: to make those decisions, which should include the athletic department, administrative salaries and positions, etc. **Krendl** noted that the Athletics Department is funded by the general fee, not the general fund.
 - **Flynn** asked whether there was money left over in healthcare this year. **McLaughlin** replied that there was – it is in a reserve dedicated to healthcare expenses. He stated that to his knowledge that has stayed in the managerial reserve. **Flynn** asked whether these savings will go into the general fund. **McLaughlin** stated that we will save more money than is needed for higher healthcare costs. **Brown** stated that it is just a cost transfer. **Flynn** stated that it will assist the budget of the university.
 - **Bernt** stated that he seconded **Roosenburg's** notion to suspend the rules. **David Thomas** ruled that the second stops the discussion. While he looked up the rules, senators continued to discuss the issue.
 - **Brown** noted that OU employees who are members of the unions are not seeing any changes in their healthcare costs or access to physicians next year. **Bernt** stated that, along the same lines as union employees, our president has a contract too. He stated that his policy is such that it pays 100% of everything—he can go

- wherever he wants to go, it will be paid. He indicated that this demonstrates the value of contracts. He said that this resolution needs to be defeated because we need to enforce the handbook and the contract that it is supposed to be.
- A voice vote to suspend the rules was held and passed unanimously. A voice vote on the resolution was then held. The senate was unanimous in rejecting the resolution. There were no votes in favor of the resolution and no abstentions.
 - **McLaughlin** then presented the second resolution. He stated that he wanted to bundle the next two resolutions together for a moment. These resolutions are not just to defend the handbook but also to demonstrate that the faculty want to try to help the university deal with its budget problems. He stated that the second resolution is the resolution we didn't get to vote on in February. He read through the resolution. He stated that the resolution still calls for the rollback but then commits to declining the rollback if the university keeps the rates at this year's rates. It affirms that we are upset about the violation of the handbook, calls for a remedy, and then forgives that remedy if the university agrees to hold the current rates that exist this year for next year.
 - **Bartone** asked whether the \$1.5M includes 2 years. **McLaughlin** stated that what the university did two years ago was to do a cost shift to employees. \$1M was a premium and \$500,000 was out of pocket expenses. This resolution forgives the \$3M that has been taken from employees without Faculty Senate approval over the last two years, if we keep rates at their current rates. This would approve \$1.5M in cost shifts that we didn't get the opportunity to vote on two years ago. It would approve the status quo. **Bartone** asked whether it was really \$3M. **McLaughlin** replied that it is a \$1.5M base cost shift.
 - **Elizabeth Sayrs** asked, if we vote for this, does it mean we can't vote for the next one? **McLaughlin** stated that it doesn't preclude it for 2 reasons: it is a later resolution and would supplant this one and he doesn't see a conflict since the \$860,000 savings we approve and endorse would not be a cost shift. **Sayrs** asked whether it says increase. **McLaughlin** stated that with the mandatory generic drug and mail order provisions it does not raise costs. He stated that the spouse issue is a fairness issue. **Sayrs** replied that it will increase cost for some employees.
 - **López** conducted a voice vote. The resolution passed unanimously.
 - **McLaughlin** then summarized the third resolution. He noted that \$860,000 is magically the budget increase for next year. This resolution gives the university the money it needs for the increased health care budget next year. It states that Holzer should "continue to be treated like all other in-network providers." The Holzer issue could continue to be studied, but for now it would stay the same as it is.
 - **Flynn** stated that the first part is to come up with funding for the deficit in the healthcare budget and works until you get to Holzer. He asked whether it would resolve the deficit even with Holzer in the system or would it create a greater deficit. He suggested putting Holzer into another resolution. **Joe Slade** stated that he thought Tom was right: this could subvert the whole thing. He stated that he was a little disturbed to have all of that on there and stated that the last line isn't useful.

- **Bernt** stated that \$400,000 as cost coverage for people going to Holzer is in the budget already, so that's not the issue. Secondly, we just gave the university \$1.5M base money that wasn't previously approved, so the university is ahead of the game. **Hoshower** stated that the beauty of this resolution is that we're giving them \$860,000 cost shifts and keeping Holzer. He stated that if we put them together they buy the package. **Flynn** disagreed and stated that we don't gain any leverage by putting them together.
- **Brown** asked about the generic drug program. He wanted to know if it allows normal insurance coverage of brand name drugs under certain circumstances. **McLaughlin** stated that a note from a doctor stating that the generic is not the drug for you is needed. **Brown** stated that it's a form that is submitted to Anthem and if they agree you get the coverage. **Greg Fialko** stated that this was correct: you submit it for approval. **Brown** provided an example. He stated that there is an automatic substitution: if the generic is available, a prescription will be filled with the generic unless a doctor indicates differently. He stated that this resolution takes away that discretion from the doctor and asked whether that is what we want to do. **Fialko** stated that it is encouraging people to use generic drugs or pay more. **Brown** replied that his doctor could decide that he shouldn't take a generic drug and if the company disagrees it overrules the doctor. **McLaughlin** asked whether, under current practice, the insurance company has a role here. **Brown** replied that, no, this resolution changes that to give the decision to the insurance company or face an increase in price.
- **Debatin** recommended adding a suggestion to Human Resources to engage in serious negotiations with Holzer. He said that he heard from two reliable sources that there have not been any serious negotiations since June 2007. He stated that even if it is not meant to be this it creates the impression that there is another agenda behind this. He said that there needs to be serious negotiation. **Kathy Krendl** stated that senators just heard Bill say that there are current conversations going on. **Debatin** replied that we don't know anything about that. He stated that he is happy to hear that. He said that he finds it disturbing that the decision is first put out and then in the last minute there are talks with Holzer. **Krendl** replied that there were earlier efforts. **Debatin** asked if these were between June 2007 and now. **Krendl** replied, "Yes."
- **Patterson** asked about the figure 17%. **Fialko** replied that Holzer currently accounts for 17% of our total healthcare expenses. **Patterson** asked whether it could be that regional costs are greater. **Fialko** stated that this was unlikely since Holzer isn't present at the other branch campuses. He stated that the biggest focus is here in Athens.
- **Quitslund** asked whether we could tack on "pending further consideration with negotiations" or something like that. **Scott Titsworth** asked whether the decision is made on a yearly basis. He asked if it could come up again next year. **McLaughlin** stated that the March 15 deadline allows Anthem to make changes for July 1. **Titsworth** asked whether it will happen next year as well. **McLaughlin** replied that is will. **Titsworth** stated that there is too much riding on the long term to use as a bargaining chip with Holzer. **McLaughlin** noted that the plan can be revised and reversed at any moment but Anthem needs 120 days to

- make any change. Changes are usually made around July 1, except for vaccinations.
- **Brown** stated that since we changed the healthcare year to align with the university fiscal year no one knows what the budget will really look like. Consequently, we're operating when we don't know for sure what the budget will do and we're taking a sucker punch on this.
 - **Bernt** stated that we have a \$7M rainy day fund sitting out there. Consequently, we're not going to blow the insurance budget. He stated that there is plenty of incentive for Holzer to deal with the university. If the university is committed to dumping Holzer, they can let Holzer know that. **McLaughlin** replied that the managerial reserve that we have is on top of two other reserves that are required by law—there are 3 different rainy day funds.
 - **Naccarato** asked whether there was any competition for another health care providers besides Anthem. **Fialko** stated that we did a claims repricing analysis that included Medical Mutual of Ohio, Anthem, and one more. Looking at a year's worth of claims, Anthem came out better, so we recommended staying with Anthem for one more year. **McLaughlin** asked if Anthem was better overall. **Fialko** replied that it was better overall and for this region. **Naccarato** provided an example in which politeness led Anthem to cover a procedure they initially refused. **Fialko** replied that faculty should call our office next time on that sort of issue. **Naccarato** also wanted to tell the university community that they should be persistent.
 - **Valerie Conley** stated that committee members all worked really hard to draft this to say what we wanted to say, but she feels uncomfortable with the third whereas since executive structure and compensation are still under study. **McLaughlin** replied that it is a daunting task to look at these issues of executive structure and compensation. It gives you pause for thinking that you can find a perfect solution to questions that are central questions.
 - **McLaughlin** moved that the senate suspend the rules and vote on this resolution. **Chris Bartone** seconded the motion. The motion to suspend the rules was passed in a unanimous voice vote. The resolution was then voted on and passed with one abstention.

V. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—**Sherrie Gradin**

- **Gradin** presented the idea for a formal process for Group 2 faculty to evaluate deans. She stated that before PRC does more work on this issue, members want to know if the senate is interested and thinks it's a good idea to pursue this further. She then read the resolution. To facilitate the discussion, Gradin projected the following informal resolution on the screen:

***Sense of the Senate Resolution:** Group 2 faculty should have a recognized process by which they evaluate Deans. Whatever that process is will be formalized in the Faculty Handbook. All processes and details relating to Grp 2 evaluation of Deans would be discussed and voted on by the Faculty Senate before inclusion in the Handbook.*

- **Naccarato** asked whether it would be distinct from Group 1 or similar. **Gradin** replied that there has been no determination and that she sees problems either way. She stated that the committee would have to discuss that further and get further information from Group 2 colleagues about each option. **Naccarato** stated that he thinks the response he's gotten about any evaluation of administrators is that the notion of separating them out puts a lot of people off. He said that he doesn't know how much Group 2 people have with deans or know what's involved in that regard, but he is generally in favor if procedures are clarified. **Bernt** stated that he is in favor of a Group 2 evaluation for deans as well as **department** chairs as long as its kept separate from Group 1 evaluations. He said that Group 1 faculty have the comfort of tenure and some stability and are also the faculty who end up on search committees with deans and who work with deans.
- **Pecora** stated that in her college they have only 2 or 3 Group 2 faculty, so it would be impossible to be fair.
- **Titsworth** stated that this raises another issue: a lot of IT staff would normally not be a part of the evaluation process, but they would be another body of people who would be important to include in an evaluation. Perhaps we could have two tiers: Group 1 and then other people who interact with the dean.
- **McLaughlin** asked whether our procedures allow us to take a straw vote. **López** asked whether it would be better for him to send an email to all faculty asking if they are interested in such a procedure. **Gradin** stated that asking them seems reasonable. **López** replied that otherwise we are making a decision for Group 2 people. **Bernt** pointed out that we represent them here. **Pecora** stated that she was not sure where the pressure is coming from and asked why we were discussing this now. **Gradin** replied that there's no pressure but there have been requests to consider this. **Krendl** stated that we do send out a form to staff, so that they have an opportunity to evaluate deans. She also stated that Group 2 on regional campuses are currently excluded from the process. **Joe Slade** stated that an email would be the best solution. **Naccarato** agreed.
- **Bernt** stated that the handbook recommends that deans evaluation are Group 1 faculty evaluations. **Gradin** replied that was put in the handbook before there were Group 2 serving in the Faculty Senate. Some point out that they serve on the Faculty Senate, they teach, they research, and they are impacted by deans' decisions. **Bernt** reiterated his point that it is essential to keep the two separate.

VI. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—**Scott Titsworth.**

- **Titsworth** announced that EPSA had voted unanimously to tell the registrar to stop telling us grades are due 24 hours after the final exam. He also noted that Quarters to Semesters work may come up later. He then yielded the floor to Jeff Giesey to present the resolutions.
- **Giesey** asked to consider the General Education resolution first. He reminded senators that this was brought to the senate for discussion last November. He noted that there were no substantive changes in General Education. There are 2

- changes from November: in tier 2 area, 3 hours in each category was changed to 2 credit hours in of each of the six areas. He explained that this was putting more and more pressure on programs with more requirements. The other change was the additional be it resolved on total number of hours dedicated to General Education.
- **Bernt** stated that in another resolution you talk about 120 hour graduation minimum. He asked what percent of the total 120 hours would this framework come to and how it compared to now. **Gieseey** stated that they are very close. The point is for Gen Ed to be about the same as now.
 - **McLaughlin** stated that he is concerned about the first be it resolved. He worries about faculty at this university valuing the major in excess of general education. He noted that some of us think that Gen Ed is just as important as the major. **Quitslund** stated that some departments are worried about the time required for Gen Ed. **McLaughlin** replied why not worry about time devoted to the major being significantly increased. **Gieseey** stated that the majority of faculty who have talked to me view it this way, but maybe the clause in question should be deleted.
 - **Quitslund** stated that it's good that we have a year of writing in our Gen Ed but there will be costs associated with it for the university and for your own departments. She stated that J-courses will be taught in your departments. **McLaughlin** stated that we're studying this and that it's very complicated. He stated that we are very skeptical that English will be able to provide 77% of seats in J-courses as it does now.
 - **Allyn Reilly** stated that this committee has paid attention so that the change will be as neutral as possible. He stated that, to answer Joe B's questions, presently Gen Ed is 16.6%; under the new plan it will be 17.5%, so it's pretty close.
 - **Gieseey** then presented the resolution on Minimum hours. He emphasized that this was the *minimum* number of hours required for graduation. Engineering, for example, will be higher.
 - **Roosenburg** asked whether there could be different hours required for B.A. and B.S. He suggested that this would be one way to compensate for the time lost under the semester system. **Tracy Leinbaugh** restated that 120 is the minimum, any program can go higher. **Roosenburg** proposed 130 for B.S. **David Thomas** asked why. **Roosenburg** replied, "Quality of education." **Gieseey** remarked that he will look at it.
 - **Gieseey** then presented the resolution on course hours and meeting times.
 - **Leinbaugh** stated that the task force talked about this a lot. She stated that programs with nontraditional students and programs that offer 3 and 4 hour courses once a week instead of spread out over the week need to know if that is a pedagogical reason. **Gieseey** stated that time of day matters – there is flexibility during off peak times. **Titsworth** stated that the resolution places limitations on how courses are scheduled and allows programs to give justifications for why they are going outside the norm – it is liberating as well as binding.
 - **Patrick Munhall** asked for an exception for the regional campuses, since a large percentage would be exceptions. Do they have to write justifications for every class? **Quitslund** stated that the reason for the resolution is to facilitate resource use on campus. **Munhall** stated that wording allowing for regional campuses

- exception would be helpful. **Giese**y stated that he could add more language about our of peak hours, He stated that, as Beth was saying, one of the primary reasons is we're losing all of our course offering history. He gave an example of engineering classes. He wants to make the transition as trouble free as possible in renegotiating these things. We want to put students first.
- **Hos**hower stated that a number of department chairs in business were wondering if Mondays and Wednesdays afternoons could go to the hour and a half format so that Friday afternoons could be reserved for meetings. **Giese**y stated that this plan works for 100% utilization of class day vs. now where we use 80% of class room space.
 - **Ro**osenburg asked how many classes are going to be asking for 4 hour classes. He asked what percentage will be 4 credit hours. Chemistry? Biology? Foreign Language? **Giese**y stated that we want 3 credit hours as the norm. **Ro**osenburg asked why is line 19 is in the resolution. Why not make it 3 and that's it? **Giese**y replied that there are legitimate exceptions. One example is chemistry. There are not a lot around campus who need the 4 hours.
 - **Phyllis Bernt** asked if this is for undergraduate courses only. She stated that there are different number of hours for graduate classes. **Giese**y stated that grad courses are not as interdependent and would have more flexibility. **Lein**baugh asked for the resolution to specify that.
 - **Qu**itslund stated that most universities do this. **Phyllis Bernt** suggested that this be reflected in the resolution. She said that we should also recognize that we have grad classes that should be longer than 3 hours. She stated that it is important to recognize that there is diversity of levels as well and to reflect it in the resolution.
 - **Co**nley echoed that statement. She stated that the resolution needs to distinguish undergrad from graduate. **Jo**e **Bernt** noted that in some cases programs offer classes that meet 3 hours a week and earn 4 credit hours.
 - **Ti**tsworth stated that on the credit hours, we had grad statements in there but took it out because there had been no discussion. We could insert undergrad in line 14. This resolution is not trying to shape grad education. **Jo**e **Bernt** stated that **Giese**y could put undergraduate in the title of the resolution. **Giese**y said he would look at it.

VII. Promotion and Tenure (P&T)—Peter Coschigano

- **Co**schigano stated that he had a brief report. Marty Tuck has been running P&T workshops. All but one have been completed. Attendance has been down from last year, so the committee will talk about ways to make it more efficient. The committee has received a new appeal. The committee is meeting with Marty to discuss some of the issues concerning streamlining the appeal process and to begin crafting a resolution on this.
- **Mc**Laughlin pointed out that we are hiring fewer faculty members and that this might lower attendance. **Co**schigano replied that last year saw really good turnout and that some colleges hadn't done the workshops in a while, so that too helped attendance. Arts & Sciences does the workshops annually, but other colleges may not need it.

VIII. New Business

There was no new business.

IX. Adjournment

- **Pete Coschigano** moved that the meeting be adjourned. **Tracy Leinbaugh** seconded it. The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 PM.

**Resolution to Clarify Faculty Handbook Language
Related to the Composition of Search Committees for Executive Academic Officers**

March 9, 2009

For First Reading

Whereas language in the *Faculty Handbook* concerning the composition of search committees for executive academic officers is unclear and thus open to conflicting interpretation, and

Whereas this imprecise language may result in unnecessary conflict among various constituencies at Ohio University, and

Whereas such conflict may affect the success of any search for an academic executive officer at Ohio University,

Be it resolved that the language in the *Faculty Handbook* must be clarified by replacing “In case of an academic appointment, the chairperson of the committee will be a faculty member” with “In case of an appointment in which the academic executive officer to be appointed is expected to acquire faculty rank—such as in the case of Provost, Vice Presidents, Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education, Vice President for Research and Creative Activity, Associate Provost for International Affairs, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, and Deans, and other similar positions—the chairperson of the search committee will be a faculty member, i.e. an individual who has faculty status, as will be a majority of the members of the search committee.”

Summary of Health Benefits Discussion of February 27, 2009

March 6, 2009

	Total Healthcare Budget	Athens Campus Impact ²
Recommended Savings ¹	\$3,000,000	\$1,950,000
Recommended Additions to Plan ³		
Dental Annual Maximum	\$300,000	\$195,000
Vision Improvement	\$225,000	\$146,250
Adoption Benefits	\$30,000	\$19,500
Sub-Total	\$555,000	\$360,750
Other Recommended Additions		
Healthy Ohio Initiative ⁴	\$399,000	\$299,250
Total Recommended Additions to Plan	\$954,000	\$660,000
Summary of Savings (Recommended Savings - Plan Additions)	\$2,046,000	\$1,290,000

Estimated Increase to Healthcare Budget (2.4% Increase - Milliman Low Range Estimate)		
	Total Healthcare Budget	Athens Campus Impact ²
FY 2009 Health Benefits Budget	\$36,572,792	
FY 2010 Estimate	\$37,436,693	
	\$863,901	\$561,536

NOTE: The health benefits and other personnel-related expenses will be revised and finalized when additional information regarding staffing levels becomes available in the coming weeks.

Other Notes:

¹ Recommendation as presented by the Health Benefits Advisory Committee (HBAC). BPC has requested further investigation and recommendation from the HBAC regarding the addition of salary brackets for use in determining employee premium costs, which may impact recommendation.

² Approximately 65% of University staff are supported by the Athens Campus general operating budget.

³ BPC recommended support for all benefit enhancements as presented by HBAC with the exception of a new premium for dental care. This summary presents those items with estimated additional costs only.

⁴ Athens-based program. Athens campus employees supported by general operating resources equal ~75% of all Athens employees (includes COM).

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE BUDGET PLANNING COUNCIL
RECOMMENDATION ON HEALTH CARE**

Finance and Facilities Committee

March 9, 2009

First Reading

Whereas the University is projecting a 2.4% increase (\$863,901) in budgeted health care costs for next year (FY10), and

Whereas Budget Planning Council has recommended a package of cost savings on health benefits, that includes cost increases for employees, for FY10 totaling \$3 million (see Appendix A), and

Whereas the Faculty Handbook requires that changes in employee contributions be approved by Faculty Senate,

BE IT RESOLVED that Faculty Senate approves the Budget Planning Council recommended changes (Appendix A), and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Handbook (III.A), which now reads “The total contributions of all employees will be limited to 10% (or less) of the medical monthly dollar factor on an annual basis (the medical monthly dollar factor includes medical costs, prescription costs, and various administrative fees)” be revised to read as follows:

“The total contributions of all employees will be limited to **25%** (or less) of the medical monthly dollar factor on an annual basis (the medical monthly dollar factor includes medical costs, prescription costs, and various administrative fees).”

\$3 Million Recommendation

	Current Benefit	Plan Change	Plan Change Impact
Premiums	9.85%	12.15%	\$900,000
Deductible	None	\$200 / \$400	\$800,000
Co-Insurance Limit	\$750 / \$1,500	\$1,000/\$2,000	\$137,500
Office Visit Copay	\$15	\$20	\$220,000
Mandatory Generic	not in place	implement	\$400,000
Mandatory Mail Order	not in place	implement	\$400,000
Spouse Surcharge (\$50 Month)	not in place	implement	\$100,000
Premium based on Highest Paid OU Spouse	not in place	implement	\$60,000
		Changes Total	\$3,017,500

Resolution to Defend the Faculty Handbook And Approve \$1.5 Million Cost Shifts on Health Benefits Initiated in FY08

March 9, 2009

For second reading and vote

Whereas the Ohio University *Faculty Handbook* is official university policy (*Handbook*, p. 1), and

Whereas the Faculty Senate has an obligation to current and future faculty, as well as to its predecessor Faculty Senates, to uphold and defend the *Faculty Handbook*, and

Whereas employee monthly health care contributions were raised on July 1, 2007, without consideration by the Faculty Senate, let alone the Senate's approval, and

Whereas this action is a clear violation of the *Faculty Handbook*:

Be it resolved that employee contributions to the health care benefit be immediately rolled back to the level of contributions in force during the 2006-2007 fiscal year, and

Be it further resolved that the excess contributions collected from employees since July 1, 2007, be returned via a “premium holiday.”

Furthermore,

Whereas President Roderick McDavis acknowledged and apologized for the incorrect handling of the process leading to the approval of the increases in employee monthly contributions of July 1, 2007, during his report to this Senate of January 12, 2009, and

Whereas during that meeting of the Faculty Senate, President McDavis also expressed his willingness to find an appropriate resolution to this dilemma, and

Whereas the employees of Ohio University have already experienced reductions in compensation through these increased health care contributions initiated in FY08, in a spirit of collegiality,

Be it further resolved that the roll back and reimbursements recommended above be declined by the faculty if Ohio University agrees to set employee health care costs for FY10 at FY09 rates.

**Resolution to Approve \$860K in Health Benefits Cost Savings
 And Maintain Access to Quality Health Care Options
 Finance and Facilities Committee
 March 9, 2009
 First Reading**

Whereas the projected health benefits increase is \$860K for the FY10 budget (a 2.4% increase); the projected shortfall is not the \$1M, \$3M, or \$5M cost shifts studied by BPC, nor the \$3M recommended by BPC, and

Whereas Ohio University has approximately \$7M in a health care managerial reserve, and

Whereas Ohio University faculty is not willing to increase employee health care contributions to fund Ohio University general budget items, in particular an unaffordable executive structure and executive compensation at Ohio University, and

Whereas it is recognized that the general health care selection in Southeast Ohio is generally not as comprehensive as it is in large metropolitan areas,

Be it resolved that Ohio University implement the following:

- a) a mandatory generic drug program to enable a projected health care cost savings of \$400K;
- b) a mandatory mail order drug program to enable a projected health care cost savings of \$400K;

- c) a procedure to charge the premium to the highest wage earner, in a family when two or more family members are employed at Ohio University, to enable a projected health care cost savings of \$60K.

These three measures would result in \$860K in projected savings and would pay for the projected increase cost in health care costs of approximately \$860K in FY2010.

Be it further resolved that Holzer Clinic continue as a preferred provider.

Resolution on the Number of Semester Hours per Course and Course Meeting Times for the Transition from Quarters to Semesters

Whereas, most courses at semester schools are typically 3 credit hours.

Whereas, a standardized 3 hours of lecture per course would facilitate a uniform scheduling system that would allow for more efficient use of classroom space.

Whereas, a normative course credit helps students (and their advisors) develop schedules since they take a standard number of courses each term.

Be it resolved that as a rule, lecture courses shall be 3 semester hours.

Be it further resolved that the three hours of lecture will be schedule for one hour on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, or one and one-half hours on Tuesday and Thursday.

Be it further resolved that exceptions to this rule will be allowed on the basis of pedagogical justification specific to a course or course sequence. Such justifications may include, but are not limited to, reference to disciplinary standards for such a course or the ability for students to take subsequent courses in a timely fashion while maintaining curricular component neutrality in the transition.

Be it further resolved that the University Curriculum Council develop and enforce guidelines to implement this resolution.

Resolution Specifying the Minimum Number of Hours to Graduate after the Transition from Quarters to Semesters

Whereas in October 2008 the Ohio University Board of Trustees, in response to the suggestion from the Ohio Chancellor, approved the transition of the University from quarters to semesters for 2012-2013 academic year.

Whereas the current general education requirements are expressed in terms of quarter hours and will no longer be applicable after the transition to semesters in Fall 2012.

Whereas, as pointed out by the Academic Calendar and System Committee, under a semester system with a majority of the course being 3 semester hours a student would need to average more than five courses per semester in order to graduate in four years if the current minimum number of hours to graduate with a bachelor's degree (192 quarter hours) is simply multiplied by 2/3 to determine new requirement (128 semester hours).

Whereas 120 semester hours in a four year bachelor's program could be satisfied by taking five 3-hour courses each semester.

Be it resolved that the minimum number of semester hours to graduate with a bachelor's degree be 120 semester hours from Fall 2012.

Be it resolved that the minimum number of semester hours to graduate with a associate's degree be 60 semester hours from Fall 2012.

Be it further resolved that the registrar develop and insert language into the appropriate catalogs that implements this resolution.

Resolution of the Transition of General Education Requirements from Quarters to
Semesters
Draft Version 02/06/09
JJG

Whereas in October 2008 the Ohio University Board of Trustees in response to the suggestion from the Ohio Chancellor approve transition of the University from quarters to semesters for 2012-2013 academic year.

Whereas the current general education requirements are expressed in part in terms of quarter hours and will no longer be applicable after the transition to semesters in Fall 2012.

Whereas in 2006 EPSA conducted a review of the General Educations Requirements based on administrative issues and a practice of our peer institutions. The result of this review was the revision of the General Education Requirements instituted in Fall 2009.

Whereas in 2007 the General Education Outcomes Committee proposed a set of outcomes for general education and a taskforce is just beginning the process of assessing student performance on those outcomes.

Whereas the quarters to semesters transition time line calls for departments to begin the development of their new programs by Spring 2009.

Be it resolved that there be no substantive changes in the general education requirements for all in the transition from quarters to semesters.

Be it further resolved that the general education requirements for all student entering Fall 2012 and later will be:

One course approved as fulfilling the Tier I quantitative skills requirement (1M) or placement level PL3.

One approved first-year composition course (1E) and one approved advanced junior-level composition course (1J).

A total of **21** credit hours from the approved lists of courses in the following six distribution areas:

- Applied Science and Mathematics (2AS)
- Cross-Cultural Perspectives (2CP)
- Fine Arts (2FA)
- Humanities and Literature (2HL)
- Natural Sciences (2NS)
- Social Sciences (2SS)

No more than **8** of the **21** hours can be from courses from the same department/school. At least two¹ credit hours must be taken in each of the six areas and no more than two of the required six areas may be satisfied with courses from the same department/school.

No more than two approved Tier II courses in the student's major department/school or area of concentration (for B.S.S. students) can be used toward partial fulfillment of the Tier II requirement.

Complete at least **3** hours in Tier III or Tier III-equivalent course(s).
At least 2 of the **3** hours must be taken at senior rank (**90** hours).

Be it further resolved that programs offering courses intended to fulfill general education requirements under semesters, develop those courses so that the time required for students to fulfill their general education requirements is not significantly increased.²

Be it further resolved that the University Curriculum Council develop and enforce guidelines to implement this resolution.

¹ I have changed this by to the two hours that David Ingram originally suggested. For this number to pass the feasibility test there would need to a significant probability that two hour courses would be proposed and approved.

² Generally speaking courses that are 4 QH should be 3 SH (a increase of 5 hours of instruction). Courses that are 5 QH should also be 3 SH (5 hour decrease). They should not be approved as general education course if they are 4 SH (10 hour increase). The exception to this rule are(is?) courses that students are not taking individually to fulfill general education requirements. For example no student currently take PHYS 251 (5QH) and no other 2NS courses so the new physics courses could be 5 SH. General education courses that are currently 3 QH should go to 2 SH. Note that a 3QH course going to a 3 SH course would not qualify for expedited review (33% change).