

**Ohio University Faculty Senate
Agenda for Monday, May 14, 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, C. Elster, J. Gilliom†, S. Hays, D. Ingram†, L. Lybarger*, J. McLaughlin†, G. Negash, R. Palmer, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, A. Rouzie, H. Sherrow*, K. Sullivan*, K. Uhalde*, S. Wyatt

College of Business: B. Roach, T. Stock

College of Fine Arts: C. Buchanan*, D. McDiarmid, M. Phillips†, A. Reilly†, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas*

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

Group II: R. Althaus*, D. Duvert*

Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine: P. Coshigano for H. Akbar, J. Wolf

Patton College of Education and Human Services: D. Carr*, A. Paulins†, V. Vanderveer

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

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt

Regional Campus—Lancaster: G. Shioni for S. Doty

Regional Campus—Southern: D. Marinski

Regional Campus—Zanesville: J. Farley, A. White*

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

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

Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: none present

Excused: H. Akbar, R. Boyd, S. Doty, G. Brooks*, K. Brown†, T. Franklin, V. Marchenkov, M. Tomc

Absent: B. Branham, L. Hoshower†, M. Nern†, S. Patterson, A. Ruhil, M. Sisson†, G. Van Patten†

*starting term in AY 2012-13

†ending term at end of AY 2011-12

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. Executive Vice President & Provost Benoit
- IA. Vice President for Finance & Facilities Steve Golding
- II. Roll Call
- III. Chair's Report
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Elections Report and Introduction of New Senators
 - Election of Faculty Senate Officers for 2012-13
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: June 4, 2012, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235
- IV. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt

- Resolution to Establish Multi-Year Contracts for Clinical Medicine Faculty—
Second Reading & Vote
 - V. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly
 - Resolution to Change Catalog Language on Experiential Learning on the
Semester Calendar—Second Reading & Vote
 - VI. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom
 - VII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade
 - VIII. New Business
 - IX. Adjournment
-

I. Executive Vice President & Provost Benoit

- Parental Leave Policy update: the Task Force has received public feedback and is working on revisions in line with those responses.
- Raise distribution guidelines have been given to planning units. The total raise pool for faculty is 2.5%, to be awarded based on merit. Colleges were allowed to set aside up to .75% to be distributed according to the dean's discretion in helping with equity or other particular circumstances.
- Ohio University Salary and Compensation Study: Compiled by Assoc. Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment **Mike Williford**, comparative compensation data for OHIO faculty is available on the Institutional Research site: www.ohio.edu/instres/faculty/OUSalaryStudy.pdf. The Provost summarized some findings from the Executive Summary, including average salary and total compensation by rank. Among Ohio public universities, OHIO's average salaries for each of the three faculty ranks are the 7th highest, and 3rd highest when combined; in terms of total compensation, full professors rank 6th, associate professors 5th, and assistant professors 4th, with all ranks together at 2nd. Benefits make up over 33% of total compensation, a higher proportion than the state average. Raises at OHIO have been higher than the state average over most of the last seven years, and last year's average raise was 3.7%. From AY 2010-11 to 2011-12, 92% of Group I faculty continued at OHIO.

Questions and Discussion:

In response to a question from **Robert Knight**, the Provost noted that regional salaries were not included in the average figures, although, according to Williford, OHIO did report on all six campuses for statewide comparisons. **Judith Lee** asked for clarification about whether the .75% dean's pool is taken from, not in addition to, the total pool of 2.5% (it is).

Much of the discussion focused on the relative value of salary and total compensation both for reporting purposes and in utility to faculty. **Judith Lee** and **Sarah Wyatt** argued that salary was a truer comparison, in part because not all faculty use the benefits provided (and some use few of them). Benoit disagreed, noting that total compensation was a more complete picture and also, anecdotally, that some job candidates are happy to consider a lower salary with much better benefits. To Wyatt's objection that each piece of the benefits package (e.g., parental leave) affects a small subset of the faculty, the Provost contended that a good package offers benefits important to most employees, even if not all use all parts of it.

Wyatt further noted that, with so many benefits only helping faculty with families, the “total compensation” effectively masked two different pay scales, and Lee suggested that total compensation was put forward because it made OHIO look better than raw salary data did. Benoit disagreed, but also said that she was not happy with the current salary level, and suggested two possible courses of action. First, perhaps new hires should be brought in at more competitive salaries, despite issues of compression and potential unhappiness from current employees, because the long-term result would be a better salary profile. Second, she pointed out that it was worth having a conversation about the balance between salary and benefits, given the high proportion currently invested in the benefit package. When Lee wondered why OHIO salary averages are so much lower than other institutions in the state (e.g., 10% below Wright State), **Bernhard Debatin** noted that the schools with higher salaries tended to be those with unions. Benoit pointed out that higher union-negotiated salaries involve a trade-off in the number of tenure-track positions and actions like furloughs during periods of budget austerity. Asked by **Joe Slade** how she was working to increase faculty salary, Benoit instanced her advocacy in the Budget Planning Council for the 2.5% raise pool against the original proposal of 2%, and noted that the University had not shifted the projected 5.5% increase in health care costs to employees.

The conversation also considered whether the money spent on employee benefits “belongs” to individual employees. When **Duane McDiarmid** asked if nationalized health care would result in the University shifting the whole health benefit budget into salaries, the Provost declined to consider extraordinary improbabilities. **Steve Hays** differentiated between benefits as something earned by employees and as a set of costs to the University. If benefits are income, he said, then it would make sense for a faculty member who could go on Medicare to do so and collect her University allotment of health benefits as cash. VP for Finance **Steve Golding** jumped in to explain that health care is not divisible on the same terms as income. Premiums are predicated on total cost, divided by the number of employees, some of whom will actually incur much larger expenses than others. Actual total compensation for an individual thus depends on use. He agreed that employees old enough to qualify for Medicare are likely to have higher medical costs, but noted that faculty are a relatively expensive group to insure overall because they tend to be sophisticated medical consumers. **John Gilliom** added that Golding’s office has initiated preliminary conversations with Senate leaders and the Benefits Advisory Council about reimagining and differentiating benefit packages. **Doug Bolon** asked if this meant a cafeteria plan, but the Provost said that proposal was unlikely because the groups need to remain big enough to spread risk. Multiple plans also raise the unpleasant possibility that overwhelmed new employees might make high-stakes choices without perfectly understanding the risks involved. **Charlotte Elster** opined that the health care program should create more incentives for healthful choices, noting programs in Germany that refund premiums if no health services are used.

Regarding the raise pool distribution, the Provost indicated in response to a question from **Albert Rouzie** that the deans preferred to use merit criteria rather than assigning a portion across the board. When Rouzie said that faculty might prefer that some part of the pool be distributed equitably, given that many who do fine work do not have unusually high merit evaluation numbers, Benoit replied that there was no restriction on the percentage of faculty eligible for raises, and that departmental protocols would determine how most of the money was divided. (A written rationale is required for raises below .5% and above 7%.) **Amy White** argued that a raise should be, by definition, greater than the rate of inflation, and

that merit rewards should happen only after COLAs for all faculty. The Senate also briefly struggled to explain to itself why a 2.5% raise pool did not mean that the average raise would be 2.5%. **Jackie Wolf** asked whether administrators also have a 2.5% raise pool; they do, with individual raises determined by planning unit heads.

Hays also asked the Provost about enrollment figures. We are slightly behind targets in housing deposits received, but there are many promising improvements over last year: more out-of-state students, higher quality in both G.P.A. and test scores, and larger diversity numbers. She thanked faculty who had participated in yield efforts. **Slade** asked whether students would have more trouble paying on the semester calendar (because each term is half a year's cost, rather than a third), but the Provost pointed out that monthly payment plans will continue to be available, and that students can take out emergency loans if they run into trouble.

I.A. ComDoc Update: Vice President for Finance Steve Golding

VP Golding reported that after the March Senate meeting, he asked the academic deans if he should pull the plug on the ComDoc contract, and they indicated they weren't ready to do that. Currently his office is meeting with deans and planning unit heads, with work on implementation plans in seven colleges and the regional campuses in addition to the President's and Provost's offices. Arts & Sciences is currently on hold, although many departments have expressed interest in at least partial implementation. Not all colleges and departments have reached conclusions about their involvement. In particular, work is still needed on the issue of non-networkable printers and how to replace those for economies of scale.

When **Wolf** asked if the deans were unanimous about proceeding with ComDoc, Golding said that no individual dean said that the proposal should be stopped, though some were "circumspect about it from the standpoint of communication." OU-HCOM Dean **Jack Brose** noted that he had not been consulted so far, and Golding reiterated that some deans were still in conversation.

Senators also expressed confusion about the nature of the agreement with ComDoc. **Tim Anderson** remarked that things sounded more flexible than they had in March, and asked how he should describe the contract to colleagues. Golding replied that there had always been options; we currently have a letter of intent to pursue savings to the University, with the total finalized after a full scan of needs. To **Lee's** objection that he had said at the March meeting that there was a signed five-year contract, Golding explained that the letter of intent provides for the survey of University needs, and that the contract will be the aggregate of what the survey determines is appropriate. Some colleges have implemented agreements and already received new equipment without cost; the total savings depends on the extent of University buy-in. All savings will be retained in the units. **Anderson** reported that he had heard that units would have to decide by July; Golding replied that, while July had been a target for decisions, some units will still be in conversation at that point. **Beth Quitslund** and **David Ingram** noted that more buy-in would only achieve savings if ComDoc were less expensive than the systems being replaced, although Golding maintained that the originally projected savings would require fairly full implementation. Asked by Quitslund if less buy-in would mean that the price per page might go above \$.025, Golding said it would not. **Gilliom** added that some departments are currently paying much more than ComDoc's price/page, while some were paying much less.

Several issues raised at the March meeting were revisited, with **Debatin** wondering about responses to the Senate's privacy concerns, the departments that had experienced increased printing with ComDoc implemented, abuse of publically-situated machines, and apparent restrictions on the use of special funds. Golding replied that his office had followed up every individual situation discussed: one department overprinting had a software glitch that had been fixed; another had agreed that excessive printing had to be addressed as a cultural issue in the department. He appreciated that third-party funding might be reason for flexibility in the ComDoc agreement, though it might be advantageous not to spend the limited money for administration in federal grants on printing equipment. **Debatin** asked for particular clarification on the use of HTC stipends for printers, and extended conversation did not result in clear resolution. **Steve Hays** apologized for comments he had made in March that had been misconstrued, and Quitslund expressed appreciation for the flexibility that the VP's office had shown in dealing with her department when it was demonstrated that ComDoc would be more expensive than their current printing protocols.

II. Roll Call [and Approval of the April 16, 2012 Minutes]

Through an oversight, the April minutes were not distributed for review; they will be approved in June.

III. Chair's Report

- **Updates and Announcements**

All resolutions passed last month were promptly signed by the Provost. Response to the Resolution on University-Wide Purchasing and Printing Contracts is overdue.

The referendum on calendar changes to the Senate Constitution passed unanimously with 142 votes. It will be forwarded for approval to the Board of Trustees.

- **Elections Report and Introduction of New Senators**

Arts and Sciences—Roy Boyd, Charlotte Elster, Steve Hays, Loren Lybarger, Ruth Palmer, Hogan Sherrow, Kathleen Sullivan, Kevin Uhalde; Fine Arts—Charles Buchanan, David Thomas; Health Sciences and Professions—Tania Basta; Group II—Ruth Ann Althaus, Dominique Duvert; HCOM—Jackie Wolf; Patton College of Education—Gordon Brooks, David Carr; Southern—Deborah Marinski; Zanesville—Amy White; Engineering—Ben Stuart.

- **Thanks for Jobs Well Done:** McLaughlin praised **Jeff Giese**y for his leadership of the Q2S team, and outgoing Presidential Chief of Staff **Becky Watts** for her work in facilitating communication between the Senate and the President's office.

- **Election of Faculty Senate Officers for 2012-13**

The Nominating Committee put forward the slate of candidates: **Elizabeth Sayrs** for Chair, **David Thomas** for Vice Chair, and **Beth Quitslund** for Secretary.

Chair: **Allyn Reilly** and **John Gilliom** spoke in favor of electing Sayrs.

Vice Chair: **Jeff Giese**y and **Beth Quitslund** spoke in favor of electing Thomas.

Secretary: **Jackie Wolf** and **Elizabeth Sayrs** spoke in favor of electing Quitslund.

Rouzie moved to suspend the rules and allow for a vote by acclamation, seconded by **Casebolt**. The motion passed by a voice vote. The officers were elected by acclamation.

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting:** June 4, 2012, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235

- **Executive Committee Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution to Commend Outgoing Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin**
The resolution passed by a voice vote.

IV. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt

- Resolution to Establish Multi-Year Contracts for Clinical Medicine Faculty—Second Reading & Vote

The resolution provides for increasing contract lengths of one, three, and five years for Clinical Medicine faculty. There were no changes from last month's version except to remove the inaccurate "Faculty Medicine" descriptor from the ranks and to insert "Heritage" where necessary in the College name. Misnumbering was amended. The resolution passed by a voice vote.

V. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly

- Resolution to Change Catalog Language on Experiential Learning on the Semester Calendar—Second Reading & Vote

This is a housekeeping resolution providing a neutral conversion of quarter to semester credits. The Committee received no comments on the first reading, and there was no discussion on the floor. The resolution passed by a voice vote.

- Update on security cameras in the residence halls:

This continued the April report to the Senate on the proposed implementation of a policy for security cameras in and around student residence halls. The Committee received no comments following that discussion. VP Golding, who is responsible for deciding on the implementation, has indicated that cameras will be installed outside residence hall entrances and inside the halls in common recreational areas.

VI. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom

- Budget Planning Council is considering strategic investments, a welcome change from considering only budget cuts.
- Enrollment is looking basically good. Although slightly under target, the disparity is very small indeed, and almost entirely in in-state students, while out-of-state and quality numbers are up.
- RCM discussions continue, with input from the consulting Huron Group; support units are talking about how to organize themselves to serve their clients in the new environment. RCM forums for the campus community were announced for Tuesday, May 22 in Bentley 124 at noon and again at 4:00.
- The Parental Leave Policy may well become a reality; Gilliom noted a shift in the Provost's rhetoric from "if" to "when" during her presentation.

Questions and Discussion: Asked how close the University is to a realistic multi-year budget strategy, Gilliom replied that planning energy is going primarily into RCM at the moment, although longer-term planning is still a priority. A senator asked about BPC's role in allocating funds from last year's faculty buyout for new Group I hires, and was told that that is the province of the Provost. Another senator wondered how much influence the Finance & Facilities Committee has on University decision-making. Gilliom explained its function as primarily witnessing and public comment, though it does weigh in on some substantial issues

(e.g., fracking). The F & F Chair sits on BPC, the Board of Trustees Finance Committee, and the Benefits Advisory Committee. **McLaughlin** added that five of the 16 voting members of BPC are faculty, including the Senate Chair and Vice Chair as well as the F & F Chair, and that their arguments had directly influenced the way that the Provost talked about the 2.5% raise pool in BPC and the way that the raise pool was presented to the Trustees.

VII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade

While there was no activity to report this month, two or three appeals are likely before the end of the quarter.

VIII. New Business

There was no new business.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.