

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Agenda for Monday, April 16, 2012
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
Minutes

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

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: T. Anderson, R. Boyd, K. Brown, C. Elster, J. Gilliom, S. Hays, D. Ingram, J. McLaughlin, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, A. Rouzie, G. Van Patten, S. Wyatt

College of Business: none present

College of Fine Arts: D. McDiarmid, M. Phillips, A. Reilly, E. Sayrs

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

Group II: L. LaPierre, M. Sisson

Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine: H. Akbar, M. Tomc, J. Wolf

Patton College of Education: 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, L. Haven for M. Nern

Russ College of Engineering: J. Dill, J. Giesey, H. Pasic

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

Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: none present

Excused: M. Nern, R. Palmer, B. Roach, T. Stock

Absent: B. Branham, T. Franklin, L. Hoshower, V. Marchenkov, G. Newton, S. Patterson, A. Ruhil

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. President McDavis and EVPP Benoit
- II. Roll Call and Approval of the March 12, 2012 Minutes
- III. Chair's Report
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Report on Sustainability Initiative—Steve Scanlan
 - Report of Nominating Committee
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: May 14, 2012, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235
- IV. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom
- V. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade
 - Resolution on Adjustment of Deadlines in Faculty Handbook For
 1. Non-Renewal of Probationary Faculty
 2. Promotion and Tenure
 3. Evaluation and Contracts for Continuing Faculty
 4. Time Limits for Appeals

5. Time Limits for Grievances other than Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

—Second Reading & Vote

VI. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt

- Resolution to Clarify the Role of Group II Faculty—Second Reading & Vote
- Resolution to Establish Multi-Year Contracts for Group II Faculty—Second Reading & Vote
- Resolution to Establish Multi-Year Contracts for Clinical Medicine Faculty—First Reading
- Resolution on Correction of 0.5 FTE Rule—First Reading

VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly

- Resolution to Change Catalog Language on Experiential Learning on the Semester Calendar—First Reading

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

I. President McDavis and EVPP Benoit

- **President McDavis** presented updates on three topics:

1) University Budget: At their meeting this week, the Trustees will consider a 3.5% tuition and fee increase for Athens campus undergraduate students, adding \$5.7 million to the general budget to address its current imbalance. That imbalance remains despite repeated budget cuts, largely as a result of decreasing state support. Other student charge increases include:

- Tuition increases of 5% for OU-HCOM
- Tuition/fee increases of 1.58% for regional campus students in the aggregate (smoothing out differential fees based for different campuses or class standing)
- Room rate increase of 3.5% and board rate increase of 1.5%

There is no proposal to increase non-resident surcharges, Athens graduate tuition/fees, or employee health contributions.

Proposed strategic investments of \$15.7 million include base funding for some initiatives funded initially for a year; multi-year funding for the heating plant renovations; salary raises for staff and faculty; financial aid; IT upgrades; facilities and instructional capacity improvement; student recruitment and retention; and student services and activities.

2) Partnership with OSU for commercialization and funding of high value start-ups: The OU Foundation will give \$15 million and OSU \$20 million, with the possibility of raising additional private funds. The goal is to move innovation in technology, medical research, energy solutions, and other areas from campuses to the market place in order to enhance regional economic development and promote the research agenda of the institutions.

- 3) The New Basketball Coach, Jim Christian, has been given a 5-year contract with a base salary of \$425,000 (excluding performance incentive), a reduction for him from his Texas Christian salary of \$600,000. The difference from John Groce's salary will come from ICA resources, without support from the General fee or General Fund.
- **EVPP Pam Benoit** also discussed three topics.
 - 1) The Parental Leave Task Force report is out, and forums were held on April 4 and 6; the Task Force has been asked to make revisions based on that feedback. **Additional comments directly to the Provost (provost@ohio.edu) are welcome before Monday, April 23.**
 - 2) Budget Planning Council recommendations: Following a budget forum on April 11, BPC met last Friday (4/12) and voted on its recommendations for FY 2013. This included a raise pool of 2.5%. Despite projected healthcare cost increases of 5.5% (~\$1.5 million), no shift of these costs to employees is recommended.
 - 3) Getting Enrollment: Applications and admits have been very strong, but it is now time to help students commit to OU. **Faculty are STRONGLY encouraged to participate in yield activities.** To volunteer, please contact Breanne Sisler (sisler@ohio.edu, phone 593-4123).

Questions and discussion.

Several comments focused on the proposed tuition increase, the balance between tuition and fees, and OU's competitiveness given its expense. **Lorie LaPierre** recounted informing students about the planned increase and hearing surprise, outrage, and thoughts about transferring. The President responded that he has been trying to communicate with students about the need to increase tuition and the reasons behind it, and noted that the 3.5% increase is in line with the cap imposed by the state. Although it is a substantial amount of money, it is required to compensate for cuts in state support and increasing costs (utilities, health care); academic units have seen their budgets repeatedly reduced. **Charlotte Elster** compared the similar total costs of attending OU and OSU, wondered if OU's quality allowed it to be competitive with no significant price difference, and also noted the higher proportion of OSU's cost to attend given to tuition (rather than the General Fee). **LaPierre** echoed the sense that too much of the student bill goes to non-academic affairs. Both McDavis and the Benoit made the point that what is covered by "fees" and what by "tuition" varies between institutions, so that comparing the balance from university to university can be misleading. Finally, **Steve Hays** noted that even if OU is competitive with other Ohio colleges, we may be collectively pricing students out of the education market. The President agreed that student debt is a national problem, but that the high cost of a degree is also a long-term investment. The University is also challenging itself to find revenue streams other than tuition and public funding in order to maintain its mission.

A question about the salary raise pool from **Ann Paulins** clarified that it is for all employees; the Provost said that she has not yet discussed with the deans how it will be distributed. Paulins asked that merit be taken into consideration, and that the inequitable distribution of the health care cost adjustment last year not be repeated with any salary increases this year.

A protracted discussion centered on RCM modeling and implementation. **Bernhard Debatin** related that his College has just learned that the proposed RCM model puts them \$2

million in the red, and wondered how the formula of 15% for headcount and 85% for Weighted Student Credit Hours was arrived at. He noted that this seemed backward if (as **Mike Williford** of Institutional Research confirmed) SSI only accounted for 25% of the budget. The Provost responded that the formula came from long discussion with the deans and our RCM consultants (the Huron Group), and rested on examination of best practices at other institutions. While not set in stone, it was the preliminary consensus. WSCH are a way of recognizing that some courses or some disciplines are more costly to deliver than others. To Debatin's objection that this is a foundational decision with enormous consequences for some colleges, the Provost said that there are many such decision points and further discussion with the campus will take place on many. **VP for Finance Steve Golding** noted that RCM necessarily has winners and losers in the allocation of revenue and that solutions should be tailored for the institution as a whole, recognizing that rebalancing may be necessary. The numbers the deans have just received are their first look at the consequences of the principles they agreed to; forums for the campus based on those numbers will be scheduled very soon. When **Duane McDiarmid** asked what exactly qualified as "best practices," Benoit said that they had paid attention to RCM institutions where program budgets grew—where we might learn which decisions would make the institution more financially sound.

Lastly, **Joe Slade** asked for clarification about the goals of the investment partnership. The President said that it was meant to help students and faculty at both universities who needed investors to help them move from discovery mode to having a real, job-creating business—the kind of investors that have helped fuel Silicon Valley and the Research Triangle. The model is Diagnostic Hybrids, which was incubated by OU and recently sold for \$130 million. The fund has hired a general partner, Dominion Ventures, to manage the fund and create a wall between the institutions and the investment decisions. When **Hays** wondered whether the goal was regional development at the expense of the Foundation or income for the University, Golding emphasized that Dominion was chosen because it has a record of bringing market rates of return, and that the fund has been created as a regional one precisely in order to allow the general partner flexibility in choosing promising investments.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the March 12, 2012 Minutes

The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

III. Chair's Report

- Report on Sustainability Initiative—**Steve Scanlan**
Scanlan provided a brief history of the Presidential Advisory Council for Sustainability Planning (PACSP), formed in 2009. While the campus sustainability plan was approved last year, OU's involvement with the American College & University Presidents' Climate Commitment (ACUPCC) also requires a Climate Action Plan for reaching the goal of climate neutrality by 2075. Sub-councils including students, faculty, staff, and community members have drafted their portions of the Plan, and the PACSP is preparing for public vetting of this draft. **Comment forms are currently open online** at www.ohio.edu/sustainability and www.ohio.edu/pacsp; they will remain available until 9 a.m. on May 21.

- Announcements

Spring Break and the Athens City Schools: There won't be a solution for next year, but we are trying to work on this for 2014. **David Descutner**, **Registrar Debra Benton**, and McLaughlin have met, and Descutner drafted a letter to Schools Superintendent Carl Martin.

Secretary to the Board of Trustees position search: The deadline for applications is April 23. Dean of the College of Business Hugh Sherman is chairing that committee, and Senate Vice Chair Elizabeth Sayrs is on it. Having a faculty member in that position has been very helpful for faculty relations with the Trustees, so McLaughlin asked senators to consider twisting competent arms.

The Sense-of-the-Senate fracking resolution received cordial letter in response from the President (now on the Senate website), and the resolution has also gone to the Trustees. On the raise pool: it would be preferable to have a conversation about the role and nature of merit earlier this year. McLaughlin urged communication with deans about faculty preferences.

The tuition increase: Students will have questions about the proximity of a tuition hike and employee raise pools. McLaughlin asked faculty to remind students that there is a link between faculty salaries and academic quality, including recruitment, retention, and morale.

Extensive conversation ensued at this point, with a variety of views represented. **LaPierre** expressed skepticism that impoverished students should or could take faculty needs into account. A guest indicated frustration at the idea that the media do connect tuition increases to faculty raises. LaPierre further argued that if OSU and OU cost the same amount, they would prefer OSU for job prospects, while **Paulins** responded that some students do indeed prefer OU. She hoped that faculty could explain to students what their tuition money supports (e.g., the beauty of the physical campus). **Nick Kiersey** noted that the problem of student debt is real, but also national in scope. **Judith Lee** observed that tuition costs are fairly directly linked to tax revenue or its absence. **LaPierre** argued that students correctly see large amounts of money going to non-academic units and thus imposing unjustified costs on them (e.g., \$15-20 million to ICA).

McLaughlin suggested that the academic side of the University suffers from its failure to construct an “apocalyptic narrative” rhetorically equivalent to the one for OU’s infrastructure (“at \$100 million in deferred maintenance, we lose the campus!”)—even though there probably is a tipping point where declining compensation, faculty numbers, and support budgets create a situation difficult to recover from. This observation was received enthusiastically.

Most recent resolutions have been signed; there has been no direct response to the one about University-wide printing and purchasing, although some productive conversations about ComDoc have taken place. McLaughlin again urged feedback on the issue to deans.

The referendum in faculty mailboxes is the result of our resolution to change the Senate calendar for semesters; McLaughlin urged senators to vote, and to encourage colleagues to vote.

We need an unusually high number of Senate nominations this year. Nominations can be submitted by printing and sending the form, filling it out electronically, or simply

emailing names, but in any case should go to Laura Tuck in the Senate office (tuckl@ohio.edu).

- Report of Nominating Committee: Elizabeth Sayrs and Beth Quitslund are willing to continue in their current offices, but no candidate for Chair has been secured. McLaughlin asked for nominations to the Committee of someone who has served on Senate at least one year.
- Upcoming Senate Meeting: May 14, 2012, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235

IV. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom

- Salary data from the Chronicle of Higher Education: <http://chronicle.com/article/faculty-salaries-data-2012/131431#id=204857>.

This data shows that all three tenure-track faculty ranks at OU are in the lowest quartile for salaries nationally [see attachment at the end of the summary]. The chart has been shared with the Trustees in preparation for this week's meeting.

- The Committee has not brought forward the resolution on health benefit language for second reading, although it was revised in response to feedback. The resolution puts the Benefits Advisory Committee in a pivotal role, but the VP for Finance, Provost, and President are currently reconfiguring the mission of that committee.
- Please read and comment on the report of the Parental Leave Task Force. Gilliom noted that it is highly informative about practice elsewhere, and that it offers two options for how paid leave is allocated.
- Deans appear to be the focal point for things like how merit money is divvied up. They are the people you want to work through, more than us. In John's reading, RCM universities do tend to make deans more important.
- More on the raise pool: Gilliom reiterated that deans will be at the center of decisions about how merit weighs in distribution. Gilliom also noted that the raise pool of 2.5% is below the last year's rate of inflation, making it in the aggregate a sub-COLA rather than a raise. McLaughlin noted that it is at least equal to and in many cases slightly better than other state institutions'. There was discussion of how the 2.5% was reached; one early model for a unit showed 2%, a later spreadsheet showed 1.5%, the Senate leadership on BPC objected to the decrease, but the Provost actually proposed and argued for the 2.5% figure.

V. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade

- **Resolution on Adjustment of Deadlines in Faculty Handbook For**
 - 1. Non-Renewal of Probationary Faculty**
 - 2. Promotion and Tenure**
 - 3. Evaluation and Contracts for Continuing Faculty**
 - 4. Time Limits for Appeals**
 - 5. Time Limits for Grievances other than Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure**

—Second Reading & Vote

This resolution incorporated extensive feedback. Note that the dates go into effect in a year, not immediately. (Discussion clarified the date of "2013" here as "AY 2013-14.") Some significant dates to note:

- The annual evaluation of probationary faculty will retain the date of Feb. 1.

- Departments will notify candidates of the results of P&T votes by the last day of fall semester, but dossiers will not be due to the college until the first day of the spring semester. Discussion focused on whether the end of fall would allow enough time for process, late reference letters, etc.; several noted that most semester institutions have earlier processes than OU has currently.
- College P&T denial letters are due to candidates March 1. Slade confirmed that the Dean of Arts & Sciences had (somewhat reluctantly) agreed to this date. It allows the same amount of time for the college process as the current calendar.
- Contract letters will be due to departments by July 15. The existing Handbook date of March 1 has not been remotely feasible for some time, and July 15 is the earliest date that Payroll could commit to processing letters.

The resolution passed on a voice vote.

VI. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt

• Resolution to Clarify the Role of Group II Faculty—Second Reading & Vote

This resolution states that Group II faculty may be full time, and clarifies both that any service should be related to the unit’s teaching mission and that research is not part of their expectation. Changes from last time include specifying that TRS distribution *ranges* from 100:0:0 to 80:0:20 (to give options between those) and that “quality of service” can be taken into account in salary negotiations.

The resolution passed on a voice vote.

• Resolution to Establish Multi-Year Contracts for Group II Faculty—Second Reading & Vote

This resolution recommends 5-year contracts for Group II after an initial 5 years of 1-year contracts; it is simplified from the 1-, 3-, and 5-year system proposed in the first reading. In discussion, the word “Normatively” was changed to “Normally” to describe this 2-phase system. The resolution does also allow flexibility in contract length for a) those Group II who have already been here a long time, and b) recruitment or retention of highly-qualified Group II.

Two issues dominated the long discussion. The most central was whether multi-year Group II contracts would lead to the substitution of Group II for Group I, particularly on regional campuses. A regional campus Senator noted that tenure-track faculty outside Athens sometimes have the sense that administrators and main campus faculty see them as basically similar to Group II, and while enrollment has soared on regional campuses in recent years, Group I hiring has stayed stagnant. The suggestion was also made that units reaching a given percentage of non-tenure-track faculty should automatically be compelled to convert some positions into Group I. Others argued that while abuse could not be prevented by resolution, sustained education about and advocacy for Group I positions was important, and that potential harm to Group I had to be balanced against fairness for existing long-term Group II faculty.

The second major issue was the how flexible the resolution would or should be in practice. Some felt that the statement that departments “should” offer a 5-year contract after 5 years would become a *de facto* “shall,” resulting in unintended consequences, while others worried that “should” was insufficiently strong and that longer contracts ought to be required after given period. There was also objection about the sentence

allowing for more short contracts or earlier long ones if the intent was to create usual practice. The Committee argued that they wanted to facilitate the faculty member's ability to negotiate, and that it was important to give an expectation of long-term contracts in part to create the grounds for appeal if necessary.

A number of other topics arose. On the review process, the Committee clarified that "extensive reviews" did not have to begin immediately for existing Group II. In response to concern that "extensive review" meant "nit picking for grounds to fire," the wording was changed to "cumulative review" to emphasize that it covered the full term of service. Discussion also agreed that the evaluations currently required frequently do not happen in the specified manner. On the question of whether raises might also entail promotions, Wyatt said the PRC is working on that resolution for May; it was intended for this meeting, but was held back for refinement. The Feb. 15 evaluation letter date is two weeks later than the probationary faculty date, but that discrepancy exists currently.

The resolution passed by a voice vote.

- **Resolution to Establish Multi-Year Contracts for Clinical Medicine Faculty—First Reading**

This resolution suggests three 1-year contracts, a 3-year contract, and subsequent 5-year contracts. It also offers minimum normative times at rank before promotion; the ranks were established last year, and the OU-HCOM Promotion Committee has already established their promotion criteria. It was noted that while OU-HCOM has five departments of clinical medicine, only one is named in the resolution; Wyatt said that she had been supplied the language by the College, but that PRC would address the issue for second reading.

- **Resolution on Correction of 0.5 FTE Rule—First Reading**

This is a correction of a resolution passed in February, which for the second reading only left out the phrase "on part-time appointments." As a result, the resolution applies to faculty for whom it was not intended.

A motion by **Doug Bolon**, seconded by **Gilliom**, to suspend the rules passed by a voice vote; the resolution passed by a voice vote.

VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly

- **Resolution to Change Catalog Language on Experiential Learning on the Semester Calendar—First Reading**

This resolution is an item originally in the omnibus catalog-update resolution passed in March. As it was only placed there for the second reading and thus attracted confusion, it was removed. It is not intended to create debate on the merits or detractions of experiential learning, only to change the catalog for semesters in a credit neutral way (rounding down from 16 hours to 15, in order to be a multiple of 3).

- Surveillance cameras in dormitories: EPSA has been in correspondence with the OU Chief of Police over the implementation of an existing policy for surveillance cameras in "publically accessible areas or areas available for communal use." Residence Life and Chief Powers have interpreted "public spaces" as those where there are "no enhanced expectations of privacy," and include in that category some areas within the dormitories,

rather than simply the external periphery or entrances. Given that the cameras will not necessarily be monitored and that the dormitories are locked facilities, EPSA is concerned that the trade-off will involve giving up a good deal of privacy in return for little actual protection of students. It has thus conveyed its concerns to Chief Powers, who has passed them on to VP Golding; the decision making process is still underway. The relevant committee of the Student Senate did not voice objections.

Opinion was varied. Some Senators thought that the Faculty Senate should speak up, perhaps in a resolution, against invasions of student privacy, citing the slippery slope of using surveillance recordings for secondary purposes, the views of students not in the Student Senate, and the chilling atmosphere for free speech where everything is recorded; the fact that instruction takes place in some of the common rooms was also noted. Others There were questions about whether such surveillance deterred or simply moved criminal acts, and about whether, given the overall lower rates of crime on campuses than in surrounding areas, hysteria was at work. Other Senators were torn between the importance of privacy and additional security, especially given that assaults against women in particular often occur in what is thought of as protected space at the hands of acquaintances. Unmonitored film can be pulled quickly to track a potentially dangerous assailant. The value of security to parents was also raised.

Further comments are welcomed by the Committee; write Reilly at reillya@ohio.edu.

VIII. New Business

There was none.

IX. Adjournment

Gilliom moved to adjourn, and **Slade** seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:11 p.m.