

**Ohio University Faculty Senate**  
**Monday, October 17, 2011**  
**Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.**  
**Minutes**

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

In attendance:

**College of Arts and Sciences:** K. Brown, C. Elster, J. Gilliom, S. Hays, D. Ingram, J. McLaughlin, G. Negash, R. Palmer, S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, A. Rouzie, G. Van Patten, S. Wyatt

**College of Business:** T. Stock

**College of Fine Arts:** V. Marchenkov, D. McDiarmid, A. Reilly, E. Sayrs

**College of Health Sciences and Professions:** M. Adeyanju, D. Bolon

**College of Osteopathic Medicine:** S. Inman for Akbar, M. Tomc, J. Wolf

**Group II:** R. Althaus for LaPierre, M. Sisson

**Patton College of Education and Human Services:** T. Franklin, A. Paulins, B. Vanderveer

**Regional Campus—Chillicothe:** N. Kiersey, R. Knight

**Regional Campus—Eastern:** J. Casebolt

**Regional Campus—Lancaster:** S. Doty

**Regional Campus—Southern:** D. Marinski

**Regional Campus—Zanesville:** J. Farley, M. Nern

**Russ College of Engineering:** J. Dill, J. Giesey, R. Pasic

**Scripps College of Communication:** B. Bates, B. Debatin, J. Lee, G. Newton, J. Slade

**Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs:** A. Ruhil

**Excused:** H. Akbar, L. LaPierre, A. Rouzie, T. Stock

**Absent:** T. Anderson, R. Boyd, B. Branham, L. Hoshower, R. Knight, L. Rice, B. Roach

---

**Overview of the Meeting:**

- I. President McDavis and Executive Vice President & Provost Pam Benoit
  - II. Vice President for Finance Steve Golding
  - III. Roll Call and Approval of the September 19, 2011 Minutes
  - IV. Chair's Report
    - Ohio Faculty Council Alternate
    - Update on College Professional Ethics Committees
    - Deans' Evaluation Committees
    - Announcements
    - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: October 17, 2011, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
  - V. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom
  - VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly
    - Resolution to Establish Junior Composition Equivalency (JE) Courses (Second Reading & Vote)
  - VII. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt
  - VIII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade
  - IX. New Business
  - X. Adjournment
-

## I. **President McDavis and EVPP Benoit**

- The President gave updates on three topics:
  - Enterprise Universities (EUs): The Chancellor's office has made two significant changes to the original proposal. In the original plan, EUs would give back 10% of their State Share of Instruction (SSI), which the state would hold in an account to be used for merit scholarships to the EU, with criteria for merit that would identify "preeminent scholars." The first change is that in the current proposal, the an EU would set aside in a locally-controlled account an amount equal to 10% of SSI, but the funds need not come directly from the SSI or the operating budget; rather, universities could raise the money in other ways. Current scholarship programs would have to be maintained at current levels. The second change is that not all the scholarships would have to be strictly based on merit; some proportion could be granted at least partly on the basis of need. The Legislative Service Commission is working on a bill to be introduced in November, but committee hearings are not expected before January 2012.
  - Capital bill: After a period of no news about a bill for capital funding, some conversations have begun at the state Office of Budget Management about a capital bill for 2012. The funds are likely to be significantly less than in the past, and it is being referred to as a "maintenance" capital bill (rather than one large enough for new construction). Most of Ohio University's capital costs are maintenance, though the university was hoping for state money to help renovate the new Scripps building (the former Baker Center).
  - International travel and connections: The President described his trip, with other OU faculty and administrators, to Ghana in November of 2010. That trip resulted in the establishment of an official chapter of the OHIO Alumni Association there, as well as strengthening academic ties to African University College of Communications. This past summer, the Scripps College of Communications signed a formal Memorandum of Understanding with AUCC which would facilitate student and faculty exchanges and professional development for AAUC faculty. (See <http://www.ohio.edu/compass/stories/10-11/8/oumc-aucc-agreement-2011.cfm> and <http://www.aucc.edu.gh/news/AUCCOhio.html>.) Another trip to Ghana is being planned for 2012. This academic year, the President intends to visit Malaysia and Hong Kong in order to continue and expand relationships with universities in those places.
- Provost Benoit also discussed three issues:
  - The faculty/staff buyout and current headcount of Group I faculty: The EVPP reminded the Senate that some units met their budget reduction targets in part through retirements. Results of the buyout to date are on the attached spreadsheet.
  - The Parental Leave Task Force has been formed. It will be chaired by Betty Sindelar; the other members are Andrew Escobedo, Suzanne Dietzel, Eleni Zulia, Linda Lonsinger, Brian Bridges, Donna Goss, Kathleen Sullivan, Laura Larson, Joseph Bianco, and Jody Lamb.

- Promotion and Tenure events: Dr. David Perlmutter, author of *Promotion and Tenure Confidential* and a columnist on P&T for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, visited the Athens campus on Sept. 20 to provide a series of presentations on promotion and tenure. The Provost would like to plan another campus-wide P&T event in winter, possibly a panel discussion; faculty are encouraged to share their ideas with the P&T Committee.

Questions for President McDavis mainly centered on Enterprise Universities. He confirmed **John Gilliom**'s sense that he seems more positive about the idea than last month, and noted that the Chancellor's office seems to be listening to feedback from the state's universities. He and the EVPP also made clear that increasing scholarships is a major goal for OU and the highest priority for the remainder of the capital campaign. The President also mentioned the possibility of beginning a legacy scholarship program for the children of OU alumni. Asked by **Ann Paulins** about Inter-University Council (IUC) responses to the EU proposal, McDavis noted that while mandate relief would be welcome to IUC members, there is concern about what has to be given up in return, and that the decision will rest with each individual institution. **Steve Hays** pointed out that 10% of the Athens campus's SSI would be \$9 million, which might be more than we could use for the kind of students targeted for merit scholarships. The President emphasized that the new version of the proposal would allow OU to use different criteria for the scholarships, including need. Discussion clarified that while which mandates in particular EUs might be able to shed is still unknown, the ones *not* currently on the table include outcomes assessment and the tuition cap. When Hays commented that dictating where SSI would go sounded like the camel's nose under the tent of micromanaging by the Chancellor's office, McDavis responded that the motive behind the EU idea had been to move away from the centralization that the USO brought and toward more institutional autonomy; the scholarship piece was a later addition. In response to **David Ingram**'s observation that \$9 million per year income would require about \$245 million in additional endowment, the President noted that we might be able to develop other revenue streams. Further discussion in response to a query from **Duane McDiarmid** reiterated that the "mandates" are unspecified, but that some might be the result of lobbying rather than regulatory safeguards. For example, the last budget removed the requirement for multiple-prime contracting in construction, which Vice President Steve Golding asserted would save at least 2-5%, and up to 10% in some circumstances. That mandate had primarily benefited construction firms, rather than any public state interests.

**Joe Slade** noted that up through 2007, faculty reappointment letters specified that the faculty member was "subject to the rights and privileges of the Faculty Handbook," but that since then any reference to the Handbook had not appeared in reappointment letters. McDavis promised to look into it.

Questions for the Provost took up two topics. **Ken Brown** expressed concern about a national search for the new Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, Planning, and Policy position (reconfiguring what had been Marty Tuck's job) on the grounds that it requires a thorough knowledge of the Faculty Handbook and understanding of the University's culture. The EVPP said that those things can be learned, and that internal candidates are invited to apply. When **Judith Lee** opined that a salary higher than that of a faculty member plus

summer was excessive for an administrative position, Benoit countered that one sometimes has to pay to get the best person.

**Bernhard Debatin** expressed a sense of unease about workload on semesters, and wanted to know how it would be determined. He cited University Procedure 18.009, which specifies the percentage of workload that should be devoted to teaching, depending on the degree program (B.A., M.A., Ph.D.). The Provost objected that calculating courses as a percentage of a 12-hour/semester load was not a complex enough model of workload, given the myriad and variable kinds of responsibilities that faculty members have as teachers, advisors, researchers, etc. She also cautioned that producing too few credit hours would harm students, and also, under RCM, reduce the resources of the unit. When Debatin asked if there was a 20% floor for all of the components of workload, or whether one might be less than 20%, Benoit recommended flexibility for short-term arrangements, but expressed doubt that a department could sustain itself over the long term with faculty members giving less than 20% of their workload to any one area.

## II. Vice President Steve Golding

At the invitation of the Finance & Facilities Committee, VP Golding presented an overview of the goals in and progress toward RCM implementation (the “Ohio Improvement Project”) as Ohio University’s primary budgeting strategy. (The complete PowerPoint is attached as an appendix to the end of the minutes.) He emphasized the flexibility that RCM presents colleges in the allocation of their resources and its creation of incentives to increase the resources generated. Implementation of RCM, however, must incorporate appropriate strategic objectives. A committee (which includes F&F chair John Gilliom) is currently in the search process for a consultant to assist OU in figuring out what tools we need to develop. There were four respondents to the position announcement; the two that seemed to have appropriate expertise will be interviewed on campus.

Discussion: **Brown** debated VP Golding’s characterization of RCM as a “revenue-generating tool,” arguing that the faculty generates revenue. Golding replied that the issue may be semantic, but that universities that have implemented RCM have grown their revenue base exponentially, in part because RCM provides incentives. When **Slade** objected that RCM seems to promote intra-university competition and corporate-style fixation on income, Golding pointed out that RCM was developed at the University of Pennsylvania in early 1970s at behest of its faculty, hoping to give more decision-making about resources to deans and instructors. RCM does, he conceded, pose challenges: for example, cross-disciplinary teaching will be discouraged unless you build in incentives for it, as Cornell and other schools have done. The ability to decide what you value and then incentivize it, Golding argued, makes it a more flexible tool than traditional central budgeting. Subsidizing some colleges out of other units’ revenues will be necessary, but, like the cost of administrative support, more transparent.

**Charlotte Elster** asked if the RCM models being run would have prevented past expensive failures (e.g., Concur), while **Hays** pointed out differences in opinion among units on some previous investments (e.g. Blackboard). Golding said that the models were still under development, and would require open conversation. Golding was also asked by **Greg Van Patten** about what would assure that the central administration and support units provided high quality, competitive services in return for the taxes paid by academic units. Golding replied that deans will need to decide what level of service they were willing to pay

for. In some cases, units may have different requirements, and pay differentially. **Hays** also noted that whatever the benefits of RCM, there is a great deal of generalized cynicism about what parts of the budget will actually be transparent. VP Golding replied that the whole budget needs to be available for scrutiny. While not everyone will agree on all of the allocation, everyone should be able to see what the trade-offs are. This is particularly true of OU because it tries to be bigger than it is, with ambitious research and facilities. Hays commented that students are currently often unaware of how the money they pay to the institution is spent, especially the on the fees side. When asked when we can see the simulations, Golding said they would be available in the fall and early part of winter.

**James Casebolt** reminded the Senate that the regional campuses have been on RCM for fourteen years, and that although there have been bumps, they have adapted. Golding agreed, and noted that the regionals have been growing during that time, and that all colleges have their own economic cycles.

McLaughlin asked that any unanswered questions go to **John Gilliom** ([Gilliom@ohio.edu](mailto:Gilliom@ohio.edu)) with a cc to McLaughlin ([McLaughj@ohio.edu](mailto:McLaughj@ohio.edu)).

### III. Roll Call and Approval of the September 19, 2011 Minutes

The minutes were approved by voice vote.

### IV. Chair's Report

- Ohio Faculty Council Alternate  
**Nick Kiersey** has volunteered to fill this position. Joe moved to elect him by affirmation; the motion passed by a voice vote.
- Update on College Professional Ethics Committees  
McLaughlin thanked senators for their involvement in the process of creating these committees, and their membership will be posted on the Faculty Senate website as they are finalized.
- Deans' Evaluation Committees  
There are fewer than usual because interim deans, those in their first year, and those who have announced that they will be stepping down are not evaluated. Senators from colleges that will be doing deans' evaluations have been contacted for committee recommendations.
- Announcements
  - Because this is the penultimate year of the President's contract, the Board will do a comprehensive evaluation, assisted by the same consultant they used last time. The Executive Committee will meet with him on Tuesday, October 24.
  - **Willem Roosenburg** is asking for feedback about a proposal to save costs by shutting down the Athens campus from Christmas to New Year. Any comments on this proposal should go directly to him ([roosenbu@ohio.edu](mailto:roosenbu@ohio.edu)).
  - The Joint Police Advisory Council, a cooperative venture between the city and OU needs a faculty senator as a member.
- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: November 14, 2011, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

**V. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom**

The Committee is working on rewriting the Handbook language about health benefits. Its priorities are to

- reframe language to cover basic elements of health care coverage while simplifying policy details in the Handbook itself;
- reframe the current 10% language to reflect the current 15% premium contribution and enact a ceiling on overall employee contributions to the plan;
- recognize the history and changed status of health insurance as a part of total compensation;
- and formalize annual oversight by the full Senate with a mandatory fall semester review of program performance and the budget status of all accounts linked to health care. (Such a presentation is currently given to BPC.)

It was suggested from the floor that any surpluses in money set aside for health care be invested back into employee health—as, for example, in the WellWorks/HealthyOHIO programs.

**VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly**

- **Resolution to Establish Junior-Composition Equivalency (JE) Courses—Second Reading & Vote**

Reilly emphasized that the resolution is motivated by the scarcity of J-courses that are expected to be available under semesters, but also that Junior Composition was originally intended to be distributed throughout the curriculum. EPSA also proposed two small amendments: a change of wording in the first sentence of the “Be It Resolved” paragraph (from “a category of composition courses at the junior undergraduate level” to “a category of undergraduate composition courses”) and a change in C.4 of “remedial” to “basic.” A friendly amendment changed B.8.d. from “revise and submit” to “revise and re-submit.”

Discussion: A senator, noting the difficulty of keeping other majors out of the J-course offered by his department, wondered if JE-courses would be amenable to a set-aside. Reilly responded that it seemed likely, though UCC would have the final say. Discussion also clarified that “10–15 pages of original work” meant that revision should not be a part of the page count. Most discussion centered on whether 10–15 pages was adequate to substitute for a dedicated composition course. Reilly noted that some disciplines had indicated that 15 pages was too much, and others pointed out that while that number of pages is not significantly less than current J-course standards, students must take two JE-courses to meet the Tier I requirement.

**Joe Slade** called the question, and the resolution passed by a voice vote.

**VII. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt**

The Committee had nothing specific to report. It is still working on the issues of multiyear contracts for the OU Heritage COM and for Group II faculty in the rest of the university

**VIII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade**

The Committee has met once, and will shortly meet again. Thus far this year, it has passed a request for probationary extension, ruled on one tenure appeal; and worked out a conflict of interest situation. Several appeals of denial of tenure are imminent.

## **IX. New Business**

The conversation returned to RCM. **McLaughlin** promised to follow up on Lee's request at the end of Steve Golding's presentation to make the RCM modeling available before it is finalized. **Teresa Franklin** advised all faculty to pay careful attention to messages from the Provost and VP Golding about RCM, because it will have a major impact. She pointed to the K-12 system as a model for a similar budgeting system (called "school-based budgeting"). **Brown** and **McDiarmid** also raised questions about how taxes on academic units would be set, and what negotiating power the units would have if the services did not meet their expectations. **Debatin** also observed that assumptions about how to calculate the units' revenue had not had wide discussion, but should be, because they depend on how various kinds of teaching are valued. **Paulins** noted that we should also be willing to scrutinize the disadvantages of the way we budget now, especially given its inflexibility when enrollment surges in particular parts of the institution.

Finally, **Slade** noted vis à vis Enterprise Universities that one of the "mandates" constraining public institutions is that, unlike private ones, they cannot raise revenues in ways that directly compete with community-based businesses. We should be especially careful about this given the nature of the Athens-OU community.

## **X. Adjournment**

Motion by **Ingram**; seconded by **Franklin**. The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.