## Ohio University Faculty Senate Monday, September 10, 2012 Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m. Minutes

Faculty Senate Chair Elizabeth Sayrs called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

#### In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: C. Elster, R. Boyd, S. Hays, K. Hicks, G. Holcomb, P. Jones, L.

Lybarger, G. Negash, R. Palmer, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, A. Rouzie, H. Sherrow, K. Uhalde

College of Business: J.M. Geringer, K. Hartman, T. Stock

College of Fine Arts: C. Buchanan, V. Marchenkov, D. McDiarmid, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas

College of Health Sciences and Professions: T. Basta, D. Bolon, D. Ries

Group II: RA Althaus, D. Duvert

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

Patton College of Education: G. Brooks, D. Carr, B. Vanderveer

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: N. Kiersey, B. Trube

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt Regional Campus—Lancaster: S. Doty Regional Campus—Southern: D. Marinski Regional Campus—Zanesville: A. White Russ College of Engineering: B. Stuart

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

Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: A. Ruhil

Excused: none

**Absent:** B. Branham, J. Farley, R. Pasic, S. Patterson

#### **Overview of the Meeting:**

- I. President McDavis and Executive Vice President & Provost Benoit
- **II.** Roll Call and Approval of the June 4th, 2012 Minutes
- III. Chair's Report
  - Update on Filling Senate Seats
  - Report on Meetings with the Board of Trustees
  - Updates on Senate Committees and University Standing Committees
  - Ohio Faculty Council Representatives
  - Announcements
  - Sense of the Senate Resolution on Parity in Presidential and Faculty Compensation—Executive Committee, for First Reading
- IV. Professional Relations Committee—Ben Bates
  - Resolution to Establish a Clinical Faculty Track to Include the College of Health Sciences and Professions—Second Reading

- V. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ruth Palmer
- VI. Finance & Facilities Committee—Judith Lee
- VII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Adjournment

## I. President McDavis and Executive Vice President & Provost Benoit

- **President McDavis** provided updates on important developments at the state level and summarized the new Total Compensation Initiative.
  - Ocomplete College Ohio Task Force: This body was appointed last spring by Chancellor Petro to increase completion of college degrees; the goal is to increase the number of Ohioans with at least an Associate's degree beyond the current 36%. President McDavis is a member of this task force, which includes representation from both 2-and 4-year colleges as well as others. Their report is due out in November. Although proposals are incomplete, under discussion are the following: working with and through high schools; replacing the high school completion exam with a college readiness assessment; making high school work count for college; articulation and credit transfer accommodations; and making sure that specialty and certificate training builds toward a degree. For more information, see <a href="https://www.ohiohighered.org/completion">https://www.ohiohighered.org/completion</a>.
  - O State Budget Update: Work on the new biennial budget will probably start in earnest in January. Increases in state funding to offset recent cuts are unlikely; all state agencies have been asked to submit budget requests reflecting both flat funding and a 10% reduction by October 1. Universities will work with the IUC to protect the current level of funding and continued investment, in the belief that higher education is part of the solution to state revenue concerns rather than part of the problem. Ohio is, fortunately, running slightly ahead of projections in current revenues.
  - O Pension Reform: Five public employee pension bills are in their final stages; McDavis predicted votes in both the House and Senate imminently [N.B.: all votes were concluded by the end of 9/12 and the bill signed 9/26]. Bills had the support of all major stakeholders, and McDavis characterized the only significant opposition as coming from one conservative think tank. The IUC and advocacy from higher education blocked some significantly harmful changes, such as a mandatory shift from defined benefit to defined contribution plans.
  - O Total Compensation Initiative: Announced at the faculty/staff convocation and the Board of Trustees meeting the previous week, this initiative acknowledges that attracting and retaining the best employees is the key to a transformational educational institution. The faculty compensation plan in VisionOHIO was not fully implemented due to budget pressures created by the economic downturn. The University will be working over the next months to figure out how best to address compensation, including a review of current compensation. The President said that it was important to vet the idea with the Board, and that he had gotten positive feedback.

- o <u>Appreciation for Q2S Effort:</u> McDavis also thanked the faculty and staff who made a relatively smooth transition to semesters possible.
- **EVPP Benoit** gave updates on four topics.
  - Enrollment: All numbers are preliminary and as of 9/7. At that point, total Athens headcout was 21,514, with undergraduate headcount at 16,981 (down about 350 from last year). Athens credit hours are also lower by about 1,700 undergrad FTE. These reductions are a fairly direct consequence of Q2S: about 17% more Bachelor's degrees were granted last year than previously, and the average hours enrolled/student is 14.5—i.e., too low. On the brighter side, there are 3,893 freshmen (+10 from last year) and transfers are at 580 (+40 from last year). Quality measures for incoming students improved significantly, with an average ACT of 24 (+.4 from last year) and average 3.4 GPA (+.07 from last year). Graduate, OUH-COM, and eLearning headcounts are also higher, as are regional campuses (by >150). Freshman retention was 79%, down 1% from last year. International enrollment is up, in part among domestic international students—a result of more aggressive out-of-state recruitment. Many universities that made the conversion are seeing a decrease in headcount and enrollment; we are seeing a lower headcount, but not less enrollment overall. The EVPP thanked Mike Williford for pulling together these numbers.
  - Faculty Hiring: The best number to date is 130 new faculty, but that number is not very good because it is self-reported orientation numbers from schools and departments (so probably undercounted). There are 37 new Athens Group I faculty, and 5 on regional campuses. The Group II count so far is 46 in Athens and 3 in RHE; Group IV stands at 26 in Athens and one regional hire, with 12 other new non-TA instructors at various campuses.
  - <u>RCM Progress:</u> Over the summer, work included working through data in the model to correct errors. The deans also held a retreat to refine cost allocators. The next significant discussions will be at the college level this fall.
  - The \$100 Million Strategic Plan: These are one-time-only funds culled from a variety of sources—most of them artifacts of conservative budgeting. OU budgets for only 98% of SSI and tuition, in case of unexpected enrollment shocks, which usually results in carry-forward; similarly, unused enrollment subsidies and unbudgeted investment income can begin to build up. Discussions on this set of planned investments over the next seven years began last year, partly with priorities from deans, which included the desire for endowed professorships and scholarships. Budget meetings also provoked questions about where, after years of cuts, seed money could best be used for advancing the University's mission. Because it is all one-time money, it cannot be used for base funding (like salary increases).

The plan allocates \$24.7 million in matching funds toward endowed professorships, and \$25.4 in matching funds for scholarships. (The idea is that donors or college revenue would match the University's investment.) Another \$8.6 million will go to new, innovative academic programs, incentivizing programs that will be self-sustaining. These would begin with 75% of the funding from seed money, and 25% from the college, and then receive declining central support for a few years. Programming for student success should receive \$7 million. Academic and administrative infrastructure will receive \$10.8 million in support (for example, training may be needed to bring the right skills to the right places for RCM). Lastly,

\$13.6 million is budgeted for community initiatives that will help recruit and retain students and faculty (e.g., infant care). 1

## **Questions and Discussion:**

**Joe Slade** asked the Provost about the rate of <u>hiring after the buyouts</u> from the previous two years: are we on schedule to replace Group I faculty at the projected level? She responded that she couldn't know until the end of this year, and noted that the intent was to hire back 65% of those who left at an average of 75% of the previous salary.

Most of the discussion centered on the \$100 million investment pool. Asked by **Steve Hays** how one-time money translated to seven years of investment, Benoit explained that recurring expenses (e.g., for a new program) would be budgeted as declining amounts each for one year. When Hays asked the President why, given iffy enrollment, a volatile state funding situation, and massive new capital debt, OU is in a position to talk about large investments, McDavis pointed to eight years of balanced budgets and conservative budgeting around projected revenue. We have become frugal, he said, and our reserves are solid for an institution of our size; the Trustees thus have the sense that our financial position is actually pretty good, despite recent cuts. **John Day** commented that the University is projecting a \$13 million reserve at the end of this year. The 2% of income from enrollment not budgeted each year comes to about \$4 million annually, and combined revenue streams are about \$11 million per year. The Provost added that the \$100 million depends on carry-forward each year, and that if things go awry we can and will pull back; the reason for not budgeting all projected revenue is simply to prevent disaster (as would have happened with investment income in 2008). Barring unexpected bad news, however, we can reinvest the funds in the academic enterprise. **Amy** White asked whether the plan included the regional campuses, and Benoit said that the \$100 million in question was generated on the Athens campus but that any similar excess reserves on the regionals should be used in a similar way.

Further questions delved into the details of the plan. The President noted that the plan so far is still in outline form, and a sizeable proportion is designed to make donation more attractive by providing matching funds. **Beth Quitslund** asked how many endowed professorships the funding would provide, and the Provost explained that the number created would depend largely on how they were defined. (John Day estimated that a \$50 million total endowment would yield about \$2 million toward the annual base budget.) Quitslund followed up by asking who would define the professorships (i.e., the unit or the donor?), to which McDavis replied that it would depend where the money came from; colleges finding matching funds could define their own, but obviously those funded by donors would match the donor's intent in their destination. **Loren Lybarger** asked what guidelines protect academic freedom when private sector donations create endowed professorships. The process described by the President and Provost noted some guidelines but also individual negotiation between the donor and academic unit, and that any gift that the unit sees as incompatible with academic freedom would be rejected. The Provost referred to a specific case in which the donor was told that proposed criteria for the professorship would make the position difficult to fill, and an amenable compromise was reached. **Ken Hicks** asked whether faculty would be involved in developing proposals for the investment funding; the Provost said no, that proposals would come from deans. Faced with **Hays**'s dismay and prediction of cynicism on the part of the

Faculty Senate 9-10-12 Minutes 4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Provost's comments doid not support the recruitment of major retailers.

faculty if all decisions about that large pool of money were made centrally, the Provost maintained that RCM required deans to be able to decide priorities for their colleges.

The final topic taken up was the <u>Total Compensation Initiative</u>. Responding to requests for clarification from **Vladimir Marchenkov**, McDavis said that total compensation did indeed mean salary plus benefits, and that part of the work would be to compare each of ours to those of peer institutions. Benoit added that it is crucial to find the right balance of salary and benefits given the available resources, and that the Board of Trustees had been told that a task force would be formed shortly to look at the composition of the compensation package. Faculty will be included in this discussion.

## II. Roll Call and Approval of the June 4th, 2012 Minutes

**Joe Slade** moved to approve the minutes, seconded by **Judith Lee**. The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

## III. Chair's Report

- a. <u>Filling Senate Seats:</u> While most colleges have an adequate number of senators and alternates, a handful are still needed from the Russ College.
- b. Report on Meetings with the Board of Trustees: The Executive Committee met with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Trustees in June. Most of the conversation was about the importance of and decline in numbers of Group I faculty, as well as about faculty compensation. We reminded them that the previous Chair of the Board had said that priorities are funded, and that things that are not funded are not priorities.
- c. <u>Senate Committees and University Standing Committees:</u> Recommendations for standing committees have been made, and official rosters will be sent out from the President's Office soon. The next call will be for College Ethics Committees.
- d. <u>Ohio Faculty Council Representatives:</u> We need one, plus an alternate. Please twist your own or someone else's arm. This requires one meeting/month in Columbus.
- e. <u>Opening Up the Senate:</u> The current Executive Committee would like to make Faculty Senate debates as accessible as possible to all faculty. One aspect of realizing this goal will be to solicit questions for the President and Provost ahead of time. (A brief survey of social media usage determined that many senators are on Facebook but few are cool enough for Twitter.)
- f. Upcoming Senate Meeting: October 8, 2012, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235
- g. Sense of the Senate Resolution on Parity in Presidential and Faculty Compensation— Executive Committee, for First Reading

Sayrs showed a number of slides illustrating trends in faculty and presidential salaries over the last several years. [All slides are available at <a href="http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/">http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/</a>.] Notably, the President's salary has increased by 9.21% over the last five years, while among Group I faculty, the average Assistant salary has increased by 7.71%, Associate by 4.5%, and Full Professor by 5.66%. Over the same time period, average salary rank among Ohio 4-year public institutions has slide from 5<sup>th</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> places respectively to 7<sup>th</sup> for all faculty ranks. (The jump preceding 2008-9 came from the partial implementation of the VisionOHIO compensation initiative.) According to *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, the average salary of all faculty ranks at OU are in the 4<sup>th</sup> quartile nationally among doctoral institutions. Simultaneously, Group I faculty numbers have dropped both in

Athens and in RHE, while student enrollment has increased. Last year, President McDavis's salary was, like the faculty's, ranked 7<sup>th</sup> among Ohio 4-year public institutions (a ranking that will improve with this year's raise), while nationally his salary was already in the second quartile among presidents of public colleges. The resolution primarily asks that faculty be given raises such that the average salary of each rank increases by the same 9,21% in five years as the President's, and that the ratio between presidential and full professor salaries return to where it was last year (3.3).

The lengthy discussion included several points of <u>clarification</u>. The enrollment count for Athens did not include eLearning, and the salary data was for Athens only, though the principle should apply to RHE faculty as well. The resolution did not specifically address the amount that Group II salaries should increase (instead calling for their pay to be "commensurably adjusted") because of the difficulty of finding and appropriately sorting Group II salary data. The point was made from the floor that Group II salaries had also been falling behind Group I. No attempt was made to ascertain the costs of the resolution; it was, rather, intended as a request for equity and an assertion of the principle that true priorities are funded. There was considerable discussion over the different index years used in subpoints 1 and 3 of the actual resolution (2008-9 vs 2010-11); Sayrs explained the discrepancy by the availability of different kinds of data for different times, partly due to a change in the way that *CHE* calculates total compensation for college presidents.

Several senators addressed the <u>Board's perceptions</u> and ways of communicating with it. The point was made that data presented to the Trustees aggregated all salary data, which (due to a large proportion of full professors) made it look as if the faculty rank in salary was higher than the President's. Sayrs also noted that the Board behaved rationally within its own framework, which includes very specific goals for McDavis that he is meeting. The resolution points out the participation of other groups in those successes.

Debate revolved around feasibility, consequences, and effects on other stakeholders. To the question of how such an adjustment would work, multiple senators recalled the "bump" given to some faculty in 2004-5 in order to deal with inequities and compression. The implications for RCM were raised as a reason that such adjustments would be less likely now. Reservations were expressed about pegging faculty salaries to the President's; first, because a lower ranking for a future President would hurt us, and second because it might look more like envy or spite than a straightforward request to move up the Ohio rankings would. Considerable discussion centered on resolution subpoint 5, asking for faculty input for the \$100 million investment pool. While some argued that it needed to be used in part to retain faculty already here, rather than only creating new endowed professorships, others contended that it was a distraction from the main point of the resolution. The Executive Committee accepted the deletion of subpoint 5 as a friendly amendment. Finally, the implications for students and their tuition bills were raised, along with the concern that parents would see such a resolution as an insult on top of the President's raise. Though there was widespread sympathy for these perspectives, discussion returned to the idea that the highest priorities were those that received existing funds, and that we are asking to be a priority.

**Jackie Wolf** moved to suspend the rules, allowing for a vote on the resolution, and the motion was seconded by **David Thomas**. The motion passed by a voice vote. The resolution passed by a voice vote.

#### IV. Professional Relations Committee—Ben Bates

# • Resolution to Establish a Clinical Faculty Track to Include the College of Health Sciences and Professions—Second Reading

This resolution amends the Clinical Track language in the Faculty Handbook created for OUH-COM to include faculty in the College of Health Sciences and Professions. Bates noted that no comments had been received since the first reading in June. <u>The resolution</u> was passed by a voice vote without discussion.

• A resolution on titles and promotions for Group II faculty will be put forward at a future meeting. Comments or suggestions should go to <a href="mailto:batesb@ohio.edu">batesb@ohio.edu</a>.

## V. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ruth Palmer

The Committee met for the first time on 9/10. It has no report to make yet. Any issues for EPSA should be sent to <a href="mailto:palmerr@ohio.edu">palmerr@ohio.edu</a>.

## VI. Finance & Facilities Committee—Judith Lee

Although the Committee has not yet met, it had extensive email discussion of the Executive Committee resolution. Three large items are on the Committee's agenda for this year: 1) RCM; 2) the \$100 million investment pool; and 3) faculty compensation. Lee further made the point that most decision-making and also significant information is routed from Cutler through the deans, and that communication with the deans therefore needed to be improved; she will see if F&F can get in on discussions earlier.

Comments or suggestions should be send to <a href="mailto:leej@ohio.edu">leej@ohio.edu</a>.

#### VII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade

A resolution on the relationship between tenure and promotion will be brought forward for a second reading in October (the first reading, which occasioned heated discussion, was in June).

The Committee has not yet met and no appeals are currently outstanding. Questions or comments should go to <a href="mailto:slade@ohio.edu">slade@ohio.edu</a>.

#### **VIII.** New Business

No new business was proposed.

## IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.