

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

Faculty Senate Chair Elizabeth Sayrs called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: E. Ammarell, N. Bernstein for R. Palmer, C. Elster, S. Hays, G. Holcomb, P. Jones, G. Negash, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, H. Sherrow, C. Snyder for K. Hicks, K. Uhalde

College of Business: 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. Ries

Group II: RA Althaus, D. Duvert

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

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

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

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt

Regional Campus—Lancaster: S. Doty

Regional Campus—Southern: D. Marinski

Regional Campus—Zanesville: A. White

Russ College of Engineering: H. Pasic

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

Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: A. Ruhil

Excused: J.M. Geringer, K. Hartman, K. Hicks, N. Kiersey, R. Palmer

Absent: D. Bolon, R. Boyd, B. Branham, D. Carr, J. Farley, L. Lybarger, S. Patterson, A. Rouzie, B. Stuart

Overview of the Meeting:

- I.** Executive Vice President & Provost Pam Benoit
- II.** Associate Provost for Academic Budget and Planning John Day
- III.** Roll Call and Approval of the November 5th, 2012 Minutes
- IV.** Chair's Report
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: January 14th, Walter Hall 235
- V.** Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade
- VI.** Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ruth Palmer
- VII.** Finance & Facilities Committee—Judith Lee
- VIII.** Professional Relations Committee—Ben Bates
 - Sense of the Senate Resolution on Group II Evaluation—Second Reading and Vote

- Resolution on the Establishment of a Professional Name and Possibility for Promotion for Group II—First Reading
- IX.** New Business
- X.** Adjournment

I. Executive Vice President & Provost Pam Benoit

- Ohio Higher Education Funding Commission Report: The Commission made its report before Thanksgiving. Seven steps are recommended in the first year, including basing 50% of funding on degree completion (in contrast to the current 20%), to take base funding on three-year averages rather than the current two, and to reward the recruitment of out-of-state students.
- Faculty Compensation Task Force Update: The complete committee is as follows: the EVPP as chair; Dean Hugh Sherman (Business); Assoc. Dean John Gilliom (Arts & Sciences); Gary Chleboun (Rehabilitation & Communication Sciences); Steve Ross (Film); Loren Lybarger (Classics & World Religions/Senate F&F); Mona Robinson (Counseling & Higher Ed); Kelly Johnson (Biological Sciences); Nicholas Kiersey (Chillicothe/Senate F&F); and Mark Barsamian (Group II). The charge of the task force is to identify benchmarks for faculty compensation, break out the components of current OU compensation, and compare them to the benchmarks. The Task Force’s charge comprehends both Groups I and II as well as all campuses.
- Dean Searches: These are progressing. Three finalists have been identified for both the Fine Arts and Communications searches.

Questions and Discussion:

Bernhard Debatin expressed his unit’s concern that basing such a large amount of the formula on degree completion would increase both degree and grade inflation, and also that poorer students who progressed slowly because of the need to work would be deemphasized. The Provost insisted both that producing quality degrees is our responsibility and that we need to help students complete them. Faculty must monitor grade inflation, she argued, but that does not mean it is not possible to improve student success at the same time, without harming the OU brand’s reputation for quality. With regard to at-risk students, the formula also includes measures to incentivize helping them; the task is to remove barriers to completing those degrees so that they can get out into the work force and earn a living.

In response to **Joe Slade**’s question about timing, the Provost said that the Compensation Task Force initial report is due by spring break, and referred to the agreement with the State Department of Education agreement. When **Judith Lee** asked her to clarify this agreement for senators, Benoit explained that the DOE is requiring OU to reanalyze our classification system for classified staff; this has not been done for decades, and inconsistency and redundant titles are an issue.

II. Associate Provost for Academic Budget and Planning John Day

Day offered a long presentation on the rationale for and current state of OU’s RCM model. The full set of slides, plus some preliminary FAQs, are available on the Faculty Senate website: <http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/>. What follows is a compressed overview and report on discussion.

- Big picture principles and status: The point of RCM is to make clear the relationship between revenues and costs, not to mandate attention to the bottom line rather than to academic quality. Ideally, what the model does do is to balance accuracy (where revenues actually come from), simplicity (to maintain the clarity of the model), and fairness while guarding against perverse incentives. The model thus far has been developed primarily on principles, rather than on outcome numbers. It has been refined over several iterations, and the version for this year's parallel budget exercise will be completed soon.
- Revenue: Revenue to academic units accrues from a combination of tuition, non-resident fees (for out-of-state students), and SSI (for in-state students). The SSI formula will, of course, change soon. The portion for student credit hours is weighted according to a taxonomy intended to reflect the cost of instruction at different levels in different disciplines. The RCM model employs these weightings for tuition and non-resident fees as well as SSI distribution, even though the same tuition is charged for all classes and majors. Instructional fees for WSCH are allocated at the rate of 85% to the instructional unit and 15% to the student's major unit, in order to strike a balance between the costs associated with recruiting and serving majors and the costs associated with teaching.

Extensive discussion centered on the revenue allocation part of the model. **Eugene Ammarell** was curious about why the SSI taxonomy gives the relative weights that it does, and **Amy White** asked about how weighting works for regional units with many disciplines. Day responded that RHE does a simple version of RCM now, and it will decide independently whether to alter that model. Prompted by **Ruth Ann** Althaus, Day said that graduate programs without waivers (such as online programs) will be able to keep revenues; we are hoping, he added, that all programs will be able to decide on their level and number of waivers based on their own budgets, rather than through central permission as now happens. When **Rudy Pasic** asked how this model maintains quality in the teaching, Day said that it doesn't; the model merely shows where the money comes from, and academic quality requires other kinds of decisions.

Most comments, however, centered on the 85-15 split of WSCH. (The ratio applies to the WSCH of each student in each class; for a student taking a class in her own college, 100% of the associated tuition goes to the college.) **Debatin** deplored the ratio's effect on programs with many core requirements outside the college, characterizing their situation as perpetual impoverished supplicants. He also pointed out that the decision to allocate tuition by WSCH is itself a choice among ways of measuring teaching responsibility. Day noted that deans decided on this ratio after long discussion, and that the main effect would be to take a bite out of the teaching revenue for A&S, which provides most "service" courses to other colleges' majors. When Debatin and **Lee** wondered about what ratios had been modeled and how much effect the ratio had, Day said that several alternatives had in fact been modeled, and that the effects naturally differed for different colleges. No consistent formula, however, would produce the same balance between units that they have now. **Ben Bates**, **Charlotte Elster**, and Debatin each asked for a more concrete explanation of why that particular ratio had seemed most fair both to the deans and to the outside consulting group, Huron. Day's answer was that, taken all in all, it seemed fairest to the college that would be giving up the most in any ratio allocating some WSCH to majors, A&S. The Provost asserted that in fact A&S would need that much of the tuition revenue from courses it teaches in order to provide effective general education; the deans tried to weigh the good of the university, not any

particular college. Responding to concern from **Debatin**, the Provost said that curricular poaching will be controlled by UCC, as it is now. Day remarked that OU is fortunate to have a strong UCC in place already, something that many schools transitioning to RCM have to build.

- Costs: For the sake of simplicity, many indirect costs will be allocated proportionally, rather than according actual use (e.g., IT costs won't depend on how often a unit calls the service desk, and the library costs won't depend on actual student use). Some cost allocators are designed to motivate units to engage in efficient behaviors (building financial reserves, including F&A in grant applications). Units will be charged for the operational costs of usable space that they control, including offices, labs, studios, and classrooms for which they have priority scheduling. (Classroom upgrades will be paid for centrally to encourage units to share nicely.)

Bates asked where the indirect cost portion of a grant would go, and Day said that it would go to the college as revenue; the costs for the VP for Research would come from colleges, not from individual grants. Senators expressed concern about classroom costs in particular. **Ammarell** worried that colleges would give up priority scheduling for rooms that individual departments need in order to save money. Day pointed out that, in the past, units have had exclusive rights to rooms, and that there will be more rooms available if all unused ones go into a central pool. He also indicated that units really ought to maintain priority scheduling of crucial space. **Duane McDiarmid**, noting that dedicated lab and studio space couldn't be shed from unit budgets, opined that large lecture format instruction would therefore be even more cost-effective for units. In response, Day indicated that the WSCH formula was meant to compensate for those differential costs by discipline, and that units would need the classrooms they needed in order to teach their classes. Similarly, units should maintain priority scheduling on rooms located centrally for their faculty to avoid the costs associated with faculty scurrying around campus to teach.

- Governance, adjustments, and implementation: The oversight depends on some existing committees and others that will be created. The timeline allows for rebalancing unit budgets over time; the assumption is that we are out of balance now, and rebalancing is itself a strategic decision, not a necessary consequence of the model.

Elizabeth Sayrs asked for an update about subventions. Day replied that the word could mean about five different things: the \$100 million strategic pool is a subvention, investment is another form, subsidy to out-of-balance colleges another, and tax rates on colleges' growth can be put into a central pot for other subventions. The deans are meeting imminently on these tax rates. **Elster**, looking at the governance slides, saw too little faculty input reflected there, observing that there is not now a culture of discussion between deans and faculty. Day agreed that college discussion will be key, and that the slide represents only the central committees, while much of the decision-making will happen in the units. College discussions of the RCM model with preliminary numbers will happen in the spring.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the November 5th, 2012 Minutes

The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

IV. Chair's Report

- Report from the Board of Trustees—David Thomas and Beth Quitslund
Thomas recapped the work leading up to the inclusion of non-voting faculty representatives to the Board, with the Chair of UCC sitting on the Academics Committee and the Chair of Finance & Facilities sitting on the Resources Committee. The Board meets about five times per year, and most of each meeting is open to the public. **Quitslund** (who sat in for Judith Lee in November) outlined the information presented by the Provost and VP for Finance Steve Golding to the combined Academics and Resources Committees at the last meeting. The presentations began with data about declining state support and the university's consequent overreliance on tuition to support the academic mission, and then discussed two ways of responding to the need for new revenue and cost models. The first is the possibility of changing how tuition is charged, either by creating a variable tuition model for different students (based on costs or on demands of their academics) or by offering a guaranteed tuition rate to some or all students, good for four years. The second is the university's new space utilization policies, which will attempt to create efficiency by putting academic and student services at the center while moving administrative units and those serving the public to the margins. She also reported that the ERIP/VESP initiatives have final numbers: 295 employees took advantage of the program, at a payout cost of \$13 million for positions totaling \$19 million in salaries.

The complete agenda for the Board of Trustees' November meeting, with slides and presentation data, is available at <http://www.ohio.edu/trustees/agendas/index.cfm>.

- Dean Evaluation Committees: Sayrs asked senators from colleges with continuing deans to fill out nomination forms for evaluation committees.
- Kennedy Lecture Nominations: On behalf of the Kennedy Lecture Committee, **Gary Holcomb** asked all faculty for speaker recommendations. He also noted that programs can take advantage of Kennedy mini-lectures, which provide \$1,000 matching grants for talks. To submit a recommendation, email Committee Chair Scott Moody (moody@ohio.edu) or Holcomb (holcomb@ohio.edu).
- Upcoming Senate Meeting: January 14th, Walter Hall 235. Note that this is the first day of classes, and the Senate will need to consider whether we want to continue January meetings.
- The Faculty Handbook has been updated online; Sayrs asked senators to report any errors they might find.
- Email issues resulting in some Group II and off-campus addresses not receiving Senate messages. Sayrs asked anyone hearing of senate emails not going to someone to let her know (and forward the missing mail).
- The Complete College Ohio Task Force has reported in with recommendations (<https://www.ohiohighered.org/completion>.) The good news is that it includes no mandates other than to Have a Plan; the bad news is that it does contain some strong recommendations that we may not like.

V. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade

'Tis the season for appeals of denial of tenure. The Committee has upheld one and declined another, with letters going out this week. Slade thanked the Committee for their work, and warned that more cases are on the way.

VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Hogan Sherrow for Ruth Palmer

EPSA has spent most of the term looking into Bilateral Articulation Agreements, and the Committee is still collecting information. They seem to have begun as agreements with trade schools and are now taking in an increasing number of high schools who will teach courses counting for college credit. EPSA is concerned about General Education courses being rolled into the mix. Comments should go to Palmer (palmerr@ohio.edu), Sherrow (sherrow@ohio.edu), or any other Committee member.

VII. Finance & Facilities Committee—Judith Lee

The Committee has been spending quite a lot of time on RCM lately, with extra commitment from the RCM subcommittee (**Steve Patterson, Bernhard Debatin, Sandy Doty, Steve Hays, and Charlotte Elster**). F&F extends thanks to John Day for meeting with them for two hours last week. Questions for him should go to the Committee (leej@ohio.edu); they will send them in batches, and responses will go up in an FAQ off the Provost's page.

A resolution addressing how governance works in an RCM environment may be ready for the February meeting. At issue is how, if resource decisions are made in the colleges, Faculty Senate maintains its Handbook-defined role as the faculty's voice on resource decisions. Changes in the structure of F&F may also be necessary, with representation from all colleges.

A senator observed that the move to RCM represents an opportunity for the faculty to reassert itself, and that faculty should instruct their deans about their needs and preferences.

VIII. Professional Relations Committee—Ben Bates

• Sense of the Senate Resolution on Group II Evaluation—Second Reading and Vote

This resolution asks schools and departments to renew their commitment to compliance with the Handbook through regular and meaningful evaluation of Group II faculty.

The resolution passed by a voice vote.

• Resolution on the Establishment of a Professional Name and Possibility for Promotion for Group II—First Reading

This is the continuation of an initiative over the last year and a half to assure fairer and more respectful conditions for Group II faculty. Resolutions last year clarified Group II faculty's role (preventing the imposition of research requirements) and creating the possibility of multi-year contracts. This one renames the category (as Career Teaching Faculty) and proposes a system of promotions. After a long discussion about the many possible titles for Group II ranks, the Committee polled Group II faculty about their preferences. Given that most currently have the courtesy title of "Assistant Professor," the overwhelming response was that promotion to any rank other than "Associate Professor" would seem like a demotion. The resolution proposes adding "Term" to the standard faculty rank titles to indicate that these faculty have time-limited contracts. It also gives a loose sense of promotion requirements, mandating that departments define promotion criteria by July 1.

Comments and questions directed toward clarification included the correction in II.C.3.b.iv.d. of a stray reference to "lecturers." The reference in the second "Be it resolved" to rank in determining salary without any reference to raises in the proposed Handbook language is the result of the impossibility of defining raise amounts (or even their guaranteed existence) in the Handbook. Bates noted that the Provost would like to have raises associated

with promotion, but we don't yet know where the funds would come from. Very rough calculation would put the cost of giving every current Group II faculty member a promotion at about \$.5 million in the base budget. It was suggested that criteria for promotion should be relatively uniform and that none currently exist; Bates pointed to the sketch in subpoint viii., but noted that each unit should have the same latitude in developing guidelines that it has for Group I P&T. It was suggested that the resolution should more clearly state that current long-time Group II faculty could go up for promotion virtually immediately, though their titles would be unchanged until they did so. New titles would apply to any Group II hires after the signing of the resolution.

The consequences of the resolution for understanding the role of Group I faculty on the regional campuses was a major topic of discussion. One regional campus was reported to be confused about this resolution in light of last month's resolution that tenure and promotion are to be linked; the implication seemed there that promotable faculty are also tenurable. This was conveyed as part of a general concern on the part of RHE Group I faculty to maintain the university's motivation to hire Group I for the regionals. There is a perceived danger that if the difference between Group I and II is defined *only* as the presence or absence of a research agenda, the university might simply dispense with Group I outside Athens. Bates maintained that it is the faculty's responsibility to argue for the value of Group I, while Sayrs noted that if RHE wants to expand its degree offerings, it would need Group I to develop, implement, monitor, and maintain those programs; UCC would not otherwise approve them. Another regional senator noted that the resolution touched a nerve with RHE Group I faculty who in many cases have larger teaching loads than Athens Group II, with the addition of service and research expectations (and perhaps also less pay). Although there were some objections that the comparison was irrelevant to the resolution, others argued that the resolution is intended to address inequity between faculty groups and the workload for RHE represents a serious inequity. This may be an opportunity to begin another conversation about the RHE work, load question, and worth doing in its own right, but is likely to cause some agitation on the regional campuses.

The other main topic of discussion was the titles themselves. "Term" was called potentially confusing because it also means a single semester; "Continuing" was suggested as a replacement, as was "Teaching" (PRC's first choice, before the Executive Committee meddled). The objection to "Teaching" was the implication that Group I are not also and primarily teachers, but senators raised the same objection to "Career Teaching Faculty" as a category name, in addition to the question of whether "career" is the right descriptor. In addition to "teaching track" and "tenure track," "tenurable/nontenurable" and "terminable/interminable" were suggested. Several senators also expressed discomfort with the "professor" part of the proposed titles. They worried that a false equivalence between Group I and II faculty was implied by the parallel ranks and titles, problematic for several because it would confuse external constituents (like parents and legislators) and thus make it easier to increase Group II staffing at the expense of tenured lines. Without even the guarantee of raises by rank, we run the risk of making a polite gesture with no substantive advantage to the recipients but real danger to the university's academic units. It was argued that students, for example, don't know what their instructors' rank is at any point, and counterargued that students can't be the measure of the resolution's impact. Other senators asserted that the longstanding injustice was more important, and that it does not behoove faculty with the benefit of tenure to react overly defensively.

The resolution will come up for second reading in February, to allow time for adequate response from the university community at large. Comments should go to batesb@ohio.edu.

IX. New Business

There was none.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.