

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, May 6, 2013
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: E. Ammerell, N. Bernstein, C. Elster, S. Hays, L. Lybarger, R. Palmer, B. Quitslund, H. Sherrow, K. Uhalde

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

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

College of Health Sciences and Professions: D. Bolon, D. Ries, B. Sindelar

Group II: RA Althaus, D. Duvert

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

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

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

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt

Regional Campus—Lancaster: S. Doty, L. Trautman

Regional Campus—Southern: none present

Regional Campus—Zanesville: A. White

Russ College of Engineering: C. Bartone, B. Stuart

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

Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: A. Ruhil

Excused: L. Haven, D. Marinski, A. Rouzie, D. Thomas, S. Wyatt

Absent: T. Basta, R. Boyd, B. Branham, C. Buchanan, D. Carr, K. Hicks, G. Holcomb, P. Jones, G. Negash, R. Pasic, S. Patterson, B. Reader, L. Rice, A. Sergeev, G. Suer, J. Taylor

Overview of the Meeting:

- I.** President McDavis and Executive Vice President & Provost Benoit
- II.** Roll Call and Approval of the April 8, 2013 Minutes
- III.** Chair's Report
 - Updates and Announcements
 - Recognition of outgoing Senators
 - Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday September 9th
- IV.** Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade
- V.** Professional Relations Committee—Ben Bates
- VI.** Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ruth Palmer
- VII.** Finance & Facilities Committee—Judith Lee

- Sense of the Senate Resolution on Ohio University Faculty Raise Pools—Second Reading
- Sense of the Senate Resolution on Principles for the Task Force on Total Faculty Compensation—Second Reading

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

I. President McDavis and Executive Vice President & Provost Benoit

- **President McDavis** thanked faculty for their participation in commencement ceremonies and offered several updates about higher education policy at the state level.
 - Substitute H.B. 59: He reported that the Senate was debating the biennial budget bill, passed by the House last month. He expected the Senate to pass its version on 4 June; the final version must be signed by 30 June.
 - There was widespread support for the new S.S.I. formula as recommended by the Governor’s task force last year and included in the bill. To ease the transition for institutions that will see declining revenue under the new formula, the House has added \$800 million to hold all universities harmless in the first year of the budget. OU should net an additional \$2.5 million in FY14.
 - The bill contains permissive language that will allow OU (and other institutions) to proceed with a guaranteed tuition model.
 - Faculty workload language to allow Boards of Trustees to increase teaching by one course per year was removed from the substitute bill. The President predicted, however, that a similar proposal may emerge from the House again next year.
 - An amendment to Sub H.B. 59 stipulated that when a state university issues a letter testifying to a student’s residence for voter ID purposes, that student will automatically become eligible for in-state tuition rates. The cost to OU from the loss of out-of-state tuition could be \$12 million/year, and the collective cost to state institutions would be about \$370 million.
 - Probable Higher Education Task Force: The Chair of the House Finance Committee’s Subcommittee on Higher Education, Clifford Rosenberger (R), asked the Finance Committee to appoint a task force on higher education issues not resolved in the budget process for this year.
 - John Carey appointed Chancellor to the Board of Regents: McDavis lauded Carey’s governmental experience, serving as Chair of the Primary and Secondary Education Subcommittee of the Ohio House and as Chair of the Ohio Senate’s Finance Committee, as well as his long-time advocacy for our region of the state. Carey has also been Assistant to the President for Government Relations and Strategic Initiatives for Shawnee State University. His B.A. in Political Science came from OU in 1981. McDavis particularly noted Carey’s vote against S.B. 5.
- **EVVP Benoit** thanked the Senate for its work during the year, and singled out **Ben Bates and the PRC** for their labor in the service of Group II and the University. She then updated the Senate on three topics:

- Guaranteed tuition: This had been discussed with the Board of Trustees at several meetings (and with legislators in Columbus on multiple occasions). The model under development is “all in,” rolling fees paid by all students (tuition, residential, course fees, graduation) into a single annual bill that will remain the same for four years. While not a tuition decrease, it may slow increases in tuition and, in combination with improved financial aid, over time reduce student indebtedness.
- Enrollment: Applications overall were currently 19.3% above the previous year’s record breaking numbers; in-state applications and admits are both 7.7% higher than last year’s, out-of-state applications/admits are 51.2%/26.8% higher, and international applications are up 15%. Housing deposits are also running ahead of last year at this point. Final enrollments won’t be known until fall, after the “melt” (students who commit but don’t actually come) can be calculated.
- In her second trip to Japan this year, the Provost met with OU alumni (there are more than 300 living there), visiting academic partners, and talked to members of the business community.
- Raise Pool: A 2% raise pool for all benefit-eligible employees was made available. An additional mid-year 1% pool for faculty, retroactive to July, is contingent on meeting enrollment targets for new and returning students.

Questions and Discussion:

Judith Lee asked the Provost to talk about the ways that the evolving guaranteed tuition model responds to concerns that senators had previously raised. The Provost noted that they are working on ways to create exceptions and waivers to cohorts, allowing students to avoid paying higher rates if they have to take time off (e.g., for military service or significant illness). A committee will oversee requests for waivers. They are also looking at other institutions that have ways to accommodate disabilities and planning to build in policies for programs that have a longer time-to-completion. In response to a question from **Charlotte Elster**, she clarified that these cohort waivers are unrelated to other scholarship plans. **Gene Ammarell** expressed some confusion about how a fixed price would in itself decrease student debt. The Provost said that parents could plan better if they knew the total price in advance, that OU intends to improve scholarships at the same time, and that a stable tuition meant that the financial aid package (determined before the first year) would hold its relative value for all four years. The fundraising effort for scholarships leverages \$25 million dollars in one-time money to create two-for-one matching opportunities for donors in order to create a new \$75 million scholarship endowment. That endowment is not, however, contingent on the guaranteed tuition model’s implementation. Asked by **Betty Sindelar** if guaranteed tuition could be applied to graduate programs, the Provost replied in the negative: graduate programs have even more variables than our undergraduate ones. In addition, graduate tuition has not gone up for some time, so those students have not been experiencing the frustration of annual incremental increases. Finally, the Provost and President admitted that when guaranteed tuition might go into effect is under debate: he prefers fall 2014, while she claims that “realistic and practical” timing would be fall 2015.

Senators were concerned about the possibility of linking voter ID to in-state tuition status. **Steve Hays** wondered what OU would do if that were to become law, and the President indicated that the university would obey the law. When a **Lee** opined that legislators were trying to make the University look bad by taking the blame for refusing to lower students’

tuition by issuing residence letters, Hays argued that the University would *be* a bad actor if it interfered with voting rights. The President and Provost noted that the question was not whether students could vote but where. Asked by **Elizabeth Sayrs** about the likelihood of the bill passing as it stood, neither seemed to think it probable. The Provost also indicated that the University and IUC peers were working very hard to have the language removed from the Senate version of the budget bill, using primarily economic arguments: if all out-of-state students were to pay in-state tuition, a huge amount of money would evaporate from the Ohio economy. **Duane McDiarmid** wondered whether SSI would make up for the lost out-of-state tuition, and was told it would not. The President also said that, while the University gains more revenue from out-of-state tuition than the combination of in-state tuition and SSI for Ohio students, our out-of-state tuition has not increased significantly for long enough that it is a relative bargain for students whose own states have been rapidly raising in-state rates. The Provost noted that OU offers attractive out-of-state scholarships. The President remarked that the language was contained in an anonymous amendment that had not received any prior committee discussion.

Hays requested the rationale for distributing the raise pool based on merit as opposed to cost-of-living adjustment. In response, the Provost said that the deans were adamant that meritorious performance be rewarded. A pool has also been set aside in each college to address equity issues.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the April 8, 2013 Minutes

Approval of the minutes was moved by **James Casebolt**, seconded by **Joe Slade**. The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

III. Chair's Report

- Dates for next year's Senate meetings will be announced soon. Sayrs asked for feedback about how impossible senators find the May meeting after finals week.
- The new Senate website has been built and is in the process of being populated; it will be publically accessible soon.
- Volunteers and nominees needed: Sayrs asked senators to email Laura Tuck (tuckl@ohio.edu)
 - Senators need to rank their preferences for committee assignments. See below for brief descriptions of the four committees. EPSA, it should be noted, will be experimenting with assigning 2/3 of the Committee to regular EPSA business and 1/3 to UCC, rather than having all members do both.
 - RCM liaisons for each college are needed. Preferably these are senators, but need not sit on the F&F Committee.
 - Due to a retirement and a leave, Arts & Sciences is down below the mandated number of senators and also needs alternates. Volunteers or nominations were requested.
 - Standing Committee nominations were due Friday, 5/10. Charlotte Elster added that a senator is needed for the Parking Committee.
- The Ohio Faculty Council passed a resolution opposing the H.B. 59 workload language (no longer in the May 2013 version).
- Report on the April Board of Trustees meeting: the agenda can be found here.
 - **Judith Lee** described the four main topics of discussion in the Resources Committee:
 - Guaranteed tuition, about which the Board is enthusiastic

- A “service alignment initiative,” affecting Finance, Facilities, HR, and OIT, at a total cost of \$28.1 million (not previously discussed at BPC). The money has been authorized but not specifically allocated, with the bulk going to a new Oracle ERP system. (Senators briefly discussed training for new institutional software, and Lee noted that this has been a topic in the search for the new Senior Assoc VP for Finance and Administration.) \$3.8 million is projected for associated new personnel.
- Authorization for \$200 million in bonds for the capital plan. Clippinger and Seigfred are high on the list of buildings that may be renovated out of these funds, along with work on the dormitories.
- The Board voted on granting FFL.
- Saysrs reported that the Executive Committee and Senate representatives to the BPC had sent a letter of support for the proposed (and now passed) 1.6% tuition increase. This had been erroneously reported by *The Athens News* as a letter from the Senate as a whole (the story was quickly corrected online). She explained the unusual decision to send this letter as a result of urgency, there being no time for full Senate consultation and a resolution. The Executive Committee was convinced that the result of no tuition increase would be either zero salary raises for faculty or cuts to academic programs. She noted, too, that it is below the current rate of inflation. A senator asked if the Committee had considered sending a letter in support of the students arrested for protesting at the Trustees’ meeting, and Saysrs responded that despite healthy respect for civil disobedience the Committee had not. She did, however, attend the rally in their support afterward.
- Summer projects for Senate officers and chairs include looking at instruments for the campus climate survey, consideration of patent and intellectual property issues as they concern faculty, and work on the program review component of UCC.
- Recognition of outgoing Senators: Saysrs asked for appreciation of **Huzoor Akbar, Doug Bolon, Roy Boyd, Bryan Branham, Mike Geringer, Nick Kiersey, Loren Lybarger, Duane McDiarmid, Rudy Pasic, Dennis Ries, and Toby Stock**. She also acknowledged the work of committee chairs **Ben Bates, Judith Lee** (outgoing), **Ruth Palmer, and Joe Slade**, as well as the Executive Committee (**David Thomas, Beth Quitslund, Ben Stuart, and Jackie Wolf**).
- Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, September 9th

IV. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade

The primary business of the P&T Committee is to consider applications for probationary period extensions and to hear appeals of promotion and/or tenure denials. Its task is to assure due process to faculty members while also attending to the University’s interest in a well-qualified faculty.

Slade noted that the Committee would meet one more time on 7 May for a long-running appeal, and thanked the members for their difficult and committed service.

V. Professional Relations Committee—Ben Bates

The PRC handles the intersections between administrative and faculty structures that are not part of the immediate charge of the other committees. It hears grievances (other than

those related to P&T), but also originates policy discussions, as with this year's changes to Group II employment.

Next year's work includes reviewing and attempting to make rational the faculty Group designations.

VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Ruth Palmer

EPSA deals with all aspects of curricular policy and learning experiences at OU. It works with UCC, though next year not all EPSA members will need to also be on UCC. Those who do will serve on one of UCC's committees: either the Individual Course Committee (which reviews all new course and course change proposals) or the Programs Committee (which reviews new graduate and undergraduate programs as well as changes to existing programs. Palmer bravely reminded the Senate that Q2S—or at least its implementation—was brought to us by EPSA.

Next year's first important task is to propose an updated framework for student and faculty's intellectual property and patent rights.

VII. Finance & Facilities Committee—Judith Lee

- F&F took its agenda this year from the role that the Faculty Handbook gives to the Senate in acting “on behalf of all faculty on matters related to University planning, governance, and resource allocation.” Three subcommittees took on particular tasks: **Mike Geringer**, **Steve Hays**, and **Sandra Doty** worked with the Provost to establish a mechanism for allocating parts of the Strategic Investment Pool; **Steve Patterson**, **Charlotte Elster**, **Sandra Doty**, **Steve Hays**, and **Bernhard Debatin** wrote the resolution to create an RCM oversight for the Senate; and **Loren Lybarger**, **Sharon Inman**, **Duane McDiarmid**, and **Nicholas Kiersey** worked on faculty compensation issues.

- **Sense of the Senate Resolution on Ohio University Faculty Raise Pools—Second Reading**

This resolution addresses raise pool inadequacies and how raise pools should be distributed, especially when the pool as a whole is at or under the rate of inflation. Currently, OU salaries are losing ground relative to other Ohio public institutions. Distribution of raises defaults to merit, even when the potential merit reward is small, while distribution across colleges as a percentage of current salaries exacerbates inequalities between faculty pay in different units. Finally, current salary structures have problems with inversion and compression. Thus the resolution asks for salary increases to match academic ranking; mitigation of compression and other inequities; merit-based raises only when the pool exceeds inflation; and “banking” of merit to be taken into account when there is a more substantial raise pool available.

Discussion began with clarifications about this year's raise pool. It was established that the 2% pool will be across-the-board for classified employees and distributed by merit for faculty, though any raise below .5% or above 5% needs individual approval from the Provost. Assuming a floor of .5% and some money reserved by deans for equity, something in the neighborhood of 1% will actually be based on merit considerations. It was also noted that due to STRS changes all faculty would have an additional 1% of salary diverted to retirement, with the result that the actual floor on take-home salary difference is -.5%. Irritation surfaced about a merit process with little money to reward it.

A lengthy and animated conversation about the actual state of OU faculty salaries and their relation both to inflation and to other what other people are being paid took place. There was reference to students linking protests about tuition increases to high executive salaries, and the suggestion that institutional priorities in addition to state funding choices (e.g., the STRS changes) contributed to relatively lower faculty pay. Considerable frustration was expressed about the perception that faculty salaries in general and/or those of faculty not consistently at the top of the merit ratings are losing ground to inflation. Senators debated whether those perceptions could be supported by available data and whether it was necessary or desirable to include such data in the resolution. Eventually, senators noted that the resolution did not actually assert that salaries had fallen in real dollars, only in state ranking. In response to a question about the dollar amount separating OU's average salary from the third-best-paid institution, [AAUP data](#) was located showing differences of approximately \$6000, \$5000, and \$4000 at the professor, associate, and assistant ranks, respectively.¹

Equally controversial were the parts of the resolution addressing compression and, especially, salary differences between colleges and disciplines. In response to a question for clarification about whether the resolution intended equity considerations to be addressed before or after cost-of-living adjustments, the "Be it resolved" sentence stating that "only after mitigations to ... inequities have been made, and after followed by a cost-of-living-adjustment" was changed, replacing "followed by" with "and after." A senator noted that if inequities were indeed substantial, then raise pools at recent levels would be entirely consumed by rectifying them. There was agreement that raising salary rank would require larger raise pools, and approval for the observation that pitting faculty against each other was counterproductive when the main problem was the low priority of faculty pay in the budgeting process. Senators further argued that equity should be addressed with other money, leaving raise pools for raises, although it was objected that such funds were unlikely to appear in the absence of angelic intervention. The much larger issue of how much disparity between pay in different disciplines is usual and/or appropriate involved a number of speakers. Some recognized that the market would necessarily create real differences, but noted that all Group I faculty participate in University's idea of what constitutes a college education; one senator recounted the demoralizing realization that he, as a full professor, made approximately the average wage of an OU assistant professor. Disciplines not highly rewarded by the market (e.g., fine arts and humanities) may contribute substantially to the value of an OU degree. In this vein, senators wanted to see raise pools distributed to both units and individual faculty members on some basis other than percentages, due to the compounding effects on inequity. Others argued that because different pay is unavoidable, we should concentrate on correcting disparities that are worse than those of peer institutions. (The Task Force on Total Compensation, it emerged, is in fact comparing OU salaries by discipline to other institutions.) A senator noted that the Trustees might find arguments based on loss of excellence more persuasive than those based on economic justice. Ultimately, a friendly amendment eliminated the first two "be it resolved" statements calling for larger raise pools and explicitly for mitigation of inequities across disciplines in order to focus the resolution more firmly on the issue of how raise pools lower than inflation should be distributed.

¹ In the interactive chart, select "Ohio" as the state and "public 4-year" as the institution set.

In the course of debate, the relationship between the two resolutions recurred several times. A senator wondered why these two resolutions, apparently very different from the three offered in April, counted for Second Readings; Lee responded that they had been reorganized and streamlined, but that there were no new ideas. Another senator suggested that the idea of mitigating inequities should be struck in this resolution altogether, as falling more naturally in the next one. This suggestion was not taken up, nor was the proposal that the resolutions should be taken back to committee for reworking into three much simpler propositions.

A motion by Ben Bates that the question be called was defeated by a show of hands. After some arithmetical confusion and a brief return to the question of what belonged in the resolution, Bates again moved to call the question, a motion which this time passed by a show of hands. The resolution passed by a show of hands.

- **Sense of the Senate Resolution on Principles for the Task Force on Total Faculty Compensation—Second Reading**

This resolution has been clarified slightly from last time. In particular, it notes the effective salary reduction resulting from STRS changes.

Most discussion focused on the idea of salary floors. Lee noted that floors ensured that average salaries would not be raised simply by paying more to a few “stars” without improving the median as well. The Task Force is reportedly discussing floors, as well. One Senator suggested that philosophical clarity would be helpful: if the Senate did not like the idea of floors, it should pass a resolution to offer the minimum possible salary for each hire. Support for the current resolution took the form of defining “value” in terms of non-disciplinary functions (credentialing, national searches, peer valuation, educational outcomes), as well as in distaste for a system that encourages faculty to search for other jobs in order to negotiate a better OU salary.

Salary discrepancies between disciplines resurfaced as a question: if underpayment in affected disciplines was corrected, need the gap between the lowest- and highest-paid groups shrink? Although there was some skepticism, the first “Be it further resolved” statement was modified to eliminate the phrase “and to offset and prevent further expansion of salary disparities among the disciplines even as salaries rise at the higher end of the scale.”

The resolution passed by a voice vote.

VIII. New Business

There was none.

IX. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:12 p.m.