

**Ohio University Faculty Senate**  
**Monday, November 10, 2014**  
**Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10pm**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Meeting called to order by Beth Quitslund (Faculty Senate Chair) at 7:14pm

In attendance

- *College of Arts and Sciences*: E. Ammarell, N. Bernstein, H. Castillo, C. Elster, S. Hays, G. Holcomb, N. Manring, K. Mattson, R. Palmer, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, C. Snyder, D. Tees, K. Uhalde, S. Wyatt
- *College of Business*: K. Hartman, T. Luce, Z. Sarikas
- *College of Fine Arts*: C. Buchanan, K. Geist, D. Thomas
- *College of Health Sciences and Professions*: B. Sindelar, J. White [for A. Sergeev]
- *Group II*: R. Althaus, D. Duvert
- *Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine*: S. Inman, S. Walkowski
- *Patton College of Education*: K. Machtmes, B. Martin [for G. Brooks]
- *Regional Campus – Chillicothe*: B. Trube
- *Regional Campus – Eastern*: J. Casebolt
- *Regional Campus – Lancaster*: G. Shonia [for S. Doty], L. Trautman
- *Regional Campus – Southern*: D. Marinski
- *Regional Campus – Zanesville*: A. White
- *Russ College of Engineering*: J. Cotton, B. Stuart
- *Scripps College of Communication*: A. Babrow, B. Reader
- *Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs*: A. Ruhil

Excused: T. Basta, B. Bates, G. Brooks, S. Doty, G. Kessler, A. Sergeev, G. Suer, S. Williams

Absent: C. Bartone, D. Carr, A. Hibbitt, J. Taylor

---

**MEETING AGENDA**

- I. President Roderick McDavis
- II. Student Code of Conduct Update: Martha Compton
- III. Human Resources Benefits Update: Greg Fialko and Colleen Bendl
- IV. Roll Call and Approval of the October 13, 2014 Minutes
- V. Chair's Report
  - Updates and Announcements
  - Advising Update: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Elizabeth Sayrs
  - Upcoming Senate Meeting: Monday, December 8, Walter Hall 235
- VI. Executive Committee (Beth Quitslund)
  - With EPSA: Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Proposed Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletes—Second Reading

- VII. Professional Relations Committee (Sarah Wyatt)
    - Second Resolution to Provide Consistent Language in Sections II.C and II.D of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to Faculty Rank and Status and Appointments—Second Reading
    - Resolution to Clarify Procedure for Group II Annual Evaluations—Second Reading
    - Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Need to Need to Establish a University-Wide Group II Teaching Award—Second Reading
    - Resolution to Revise the Language of the Faculty Handbook to be Consistent with the Current Practices Regarding Group IV Faculty—First Reading
  - VIII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ruth Palmer)
    - Resolution to support the definitions of plagiarism and cheating in the new Student Code of Conduct—First Reading
  - IX. Finance & Facilities Committee (Ben Stuart)
  - X. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)
  - XI. New Business
  - XII. Adjournment
- 

### **I. President McDavis**

- ❖ Topic 1: Trip to Japan. President McDavis, EVPP Benoit, and other OHIO delegates recently travelled to Japan for a celebration of the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Chubu University, who is one of OHIO's three strategic international partners. On behalf of the Chubu University faculty and students, McDavis extended warm regards to the OHIO faculty, staff, and students. During the past week, the OHIO delegation engaged in a number of activities during the trip including an alumni event in Tokyo at the beginning of the trip and a smaller, two-day round-table discussion that included brainstorming ideas for more cooperation between the two universities. McDavis expects a more formalized strategic plan for partnership goals/activities to developed and shared in the near future. The expectation is that the strategic plan will provide more opportunities for faculty, staff, and students.
- ❖ Topic 2: SSI Funding Formula. In September 2012, Governor Kasich called on higher education leaders to collaborate to develop a new state share of instruction (S.S.I.) funding formula that rewards completion. The governor and legislature adopted the higher education community's recommendations, and the new S.S.I. funding formula became law. The formula is an outcome-based formula; it specifically provides a portion of funding to institutions based graduation rates. Currently, the formula also provides credit for schools that are successful in graduating non-traditional and at-risk student populations. The formula has been implemented for a year; the first year demonstrated the real impact of the formula on funding for universities across the state. Specifically, the allocation of funding across the universities changed yet the total dollars provided by the state remained the same. For those who did well in terms of graduation rates and other metrics, funding increased; there was some loss of funding for others. OHIO performed very well in terms of all metrics. The formula is now being revisited, especially for credit related at-risk students. The Presidents will meet on November 12 to discuss possible changes to the formula. As of the Faculty Senate meeting, there are no changes to the formula.
- ❖ Topic 3: Ridges Master Plan Committee. The Ridges Advisory Committee was established last spring and included faculty, staff, and community members. The purpose of the Advisory committee has been to discuss ideas and visions for the future of The Ridges. Subsequently, OHIO established a Ridges Master Plan Committee with three sub-committees. Together, these teams seek to deliver financially responsible solutions for The Ridges that enhance connectivity, protect worthy structures,

and support the strategic mission of Ohio University. The Plan committee is tasked with providing recommendations to Advisory Committee, who will then provide recommendations to the President. To date, we have collected community input, hired a consulting firm to help think of ideas, and have done benchmarking of similar projects as examples. As a result, McDavis believes that many good ideas have been generated including (but not limited to) suggestions for University use, public-private partnerships, and private investments. As the next steps, the committees will need to put together a list of specific recommendations with realistic costs and other funding considerations. Although OHIO's priority for expenditures is for academic buildings on campus, there is potential for joint efforts with shared funding responsibilities. McDavis praised the committees for all the hard work and noted that there is great potential for the Ridges. McDavis also acknowledged that understanding potential costs is still being considered.

### Questions and Discussions

- **Shonia** asked McDavis about the impact that the state's formula for funding has for OHIO's regional campuses. Specifically, how will a revisit of the formula impact regional campuses? McDavis stated that they are considering how the formula (and the possible revised formula) impacts the regional campuses and argues that it is an important issue to consider. McDavis stated that universities with "feeder" regional campuses have benefited more from the current funding formula as compared to universities with other types of regional campus models. The OHIO model is not designed as a purely feeder. Instead, OHIO has a variety of academics on the regional campuses. McDavis also noted that, in the state of Ohio, there are only a few models similar to OHIO. In fact, two universities (OHIO and Kent State) have more than half of the regional campuses in the state. Although OHIO regional campuses are part of the entire OHIO system, McDavis believes that regional campuses serve a slightly different mission than the Athens campus and that may not have been fully considered within the current funding formula.
- **D. Thomas** stated that the funding formula has changed a number of times over the years and asked whether or not funding formula will remain the same for some period of time. McDavis responded by explaining that each governor has a different perspective on the funding formula for higher education. Governor Kasich, who was recently reelected, has been focused on positive outcomes such as graduation rates, which is different than focusing on headcount. In the past, institutions received funding based upon headcount. As such, universities are now focusing on positive outcomes such as graduation rates rather than focusing on increasing headcount. Yet, it is unknown what will happen five or six years from now. McDavis also stated that one problem is that the amount of money has not changed. As such, the current formula only distributes the same total dollars to institutions differently than in the past. OHIO is in a good position with respect to allocations based upon outcomes rather than headcount. Unlike OHIO, institutions that haven't been focused on outcomes are getting less of the total dollars. Therefore, the revisit to the funding formula will involve these considerations. McDavis supports the outcome-based funding formula because the purpose of institutions should be to educate students so that they graduate (without compromising integrity and quality). This focus is reflected in how well OHIO does in terms of positive outcomes. The current funding formula broke new ground across all states; Ohio is the only state to have 50% of the funding based upon graduation rates.
- **Ammarrell** asked if there is room in the funding formula to account for students who transfers from one institution to another. McDavis responded by stating that this is how the funding formula current works. For example, if a student from Columbus State graduates from Columbus State and then transfers to OHIO, then Columbus State and OHIO get credit for the students first two years. However, the question now is should OHIO get credit for the first two years? This question is specifically relevant to OHIO's R.N.-B.S.N. program. Another question is credit for admitting at-risk students.

- **Reader** asked about students who become at-risk after getting to OHIO and questioned whether or not the University does too much in terms of intrusive advising. [Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Elizabeth **Sayrs** stated that she would be discussing this issue later and asked if the question could be posed at that time.] McDavis responded that one of the points of discussion is how to define at-risk. For example, is it upon admission or later during the course of students' academic careers? This discussion is some of the issues that the Presidents are currently trying to address. McDavis remarked that he believes that the funding formula should not be modified until there is a more clear definition of at-risk students.
- **A.White** stated that one concern is that regional campuses do not earn credit under the funding model if a student does not graduate from the regional campus or if student transfers to another university. McDavis agreed that this is a major consideration within the funding model and that this has been discussed. Much of this debate is about this specific issue (i.e., regional campuses do not get credit in the funding model). McDavis also stated that students who may not graduate for a variety of reasons including (but not limited to) retraining for a new occupation, knowledge acquisition without a degree, and/or skill development still benefit from the educational experience.
- **Shonia** asked if there is a possibility for doing something internally (i.e., giving credit to regional campuses for graduation from OHIO) even if it is not changed in the state funding formula. McDavis responded by stating that one of the problems is that there is a lack of funding across the entire state system. In his opinion, the total dollars provided by the state for all institutions across the state needs to be increased.
- **Inman** asked whether or not the medical schools included in the graduation rate. McDavis stated that medical students are not included in the formula; there is a separate formula for funding medical schools as a separate category. The funding formula being discussed only includes undergraduate and graduate students.

### **I. Executive Vice President and Provost Benoit (presented by Associate Provost for Faculty & Academic Planning Howard Dewald)**

- ❖ **Topic 1: Campus Climate Task Force.** Members of the task force have been identified and have met once to discuss the charge and directions. The purpose of the task force is to use the quantitative data to make recommendations. The goal will be to make OHIO a transformative environment not only for students but also for faculty and staff. The task force is being co-chaired by Colleen Bendl and Valerie Young. Other members include faculty from the main campus, faculty from regional campuses, representatives from Senates, and a variety of others.
- ❖ **Topic 2: Enrollment.** The lead [article](#) in Compass was about enrollment. There are a number of highlights and records in terms of enrollment numbers:
  - Approximately 39,000 total students enrolled at Ohio University; 1% increase from last year
  - First-year class  $\approx$  4,379 students; increase of 135 students (3.1%) from fall 2013
    - In-state students  $\approx$  3,789, increase of 160 (4.4%) from fall 2013
    - Multicultural students  $\approx$  609, increase of 46 (8.2%) from fall 2013
    - Students from Appalachian counties  $\approx$  744, increase of 67 (9.9%) from fall 2013
    - First-generation students  $\approx$  1,065, increase of 172 (19.3%) from fall 2013
  - Retention from first-year to second-year has also had a significant 1% increase.
  - Graduate student, medical student, and e-learning are also all increased
  - In terms of comparison to other universities in the state of Ohio, enrollment increased in the state of Ohio by 0.18% for all public institutions. By comparison, OHIO increased by 1.7%.

We ranked third in terms of percentage (after the University of Cincinnati and Miami of Ohio). In terms of numbers, Cincinnati, OHIO, and Wright State were similar.

- ❖ Topic 3: Group I faculty. Faculty numbers have been released for Human Resources. The number of Group I faculty have increased slightly (approximately 3). The numbers of Group II and Group IV have also increased. Specific numbers will be presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

#### Questions and Discussions

- **Casebolt** asked whether or not the Campus Climate task force has been given the qualitative data from the Campus Climate Survey. **Quitslund** stated that the task force did not have the qualitative data when the task force was charged at the end of October. Chief Human Resource Officer **Colleen Bendl** stated that the qualitative data has been provided since the first meeting of the Campus Climate task force.

## **II. Student Code of Conduct Update: Martha Compton**

- ❖ Topic 1: Background Information. Compton provided background about the Office of Community Standards. The Office of Community Standards was formally called the Office of Judiciaries. There are currently nine people in the Office plus another 25 associated with Residential Housing. The Office reviewed 2,402 cases last year. Last year, the Office suspended 65 fewer students than the previous year. This reflects a shift in the focus of the Office to work in the grey area to figure out the reasons of the problem and how to support students better.
- ❖ Topic 2: Code of Conduct Revision. When Compton was hired, the revision process was already underway. In spring 2013, the Undergraduate Student Senate passed a resolution to change the Code of Conduct. Prior to this change, the Code hasn't been fundamentally changed since approximately 1971. The goals of the revision are to make it easier to understand from a student's perspective and to update the language. For example, there is no current language directly associated with intoxication. Instead, the current language discusses bodily harm to self. This is not clearly understood by students. Another revision is language regarding free speech. For example, the revision intends to change the language such that there is not a violations associated with speech unless the speech meets or exceeds a threshold associated with harassment. In addition, there are proposed revisions to the use of Code A and Code B violations. Currently Code B violations mean that the maximum punishment is probation while Code A violations carry the potential for suspension from the University. Although less than 50 students were suspended, more than 1000 student received letters last year that they could be suspended because the violation fell into a Code A category. For many who received a notification of possible suspension, this was never a real possibility. As such, the revision intends to refine this for students such that sanctions are specific and appropriate for specific situations and circumstances. The group that is largely responsible for reviewing the Code as part of the charge provided by President McDavis is the Reviewing Standards Committee and includes undergraduate student, graduate student, and faculty representatives.
- ❖ Topic 3: Academic Misconduct. The revision also includes modifications to sanctioning guidelines as well as students' rights and responsibilities. Finally, the revision is looking to modify language for academic misconduct (see Resolution from EPSA) including definitions and explanations. With regards to academic misconduct, there was an increase in reported academic misconduct last year. There is a new online form for reporting academic misconduct including an opportunity to report academic conduct for simply reporting purposes.

#### Questions and Discussions

- **Ammarell** asked how much participation is there by the Student Senates in the review process. Specifically, are the Student Senates represented on the Committee? Compton answered in the

affirmative. The Committee includes representatives from Undergraduate Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate. Compton also mentioned that both the Undergraduate and Graduate Student Senates have recently passed Resolutions condemning the removal of Category B violations. The Senates want guarantees that students will not be suspended. Compton argued that keeping a guarantee that students who have certain violations will not be eligible for suspension is not realistic. For example, students who have repeated offenses should have the possibility for suspension. Revisions offer more flexibility for providing appropriate sanctions given different situations.

- **Reader** expressed concern with the current language regarding freedom of speech. Compton stated that there is an effort to revise the language in order to protect free speech yet sanctioning speech that meets a legal level of harassment and/or discrimination.

### III. Human Resources Benefits Update: Greg Fialko and Colleen Bendl

- ❖ Benefits Director Greg Fialko provided a presentation with updates about the Benefits Advisory Council. (*Please refer to Appendix A for a copy of the PowerPoint slides.*) Fialko discussed the Council's charge, composition, and guiding principles. A discussion regarding efforts to avoid the ACA Cadillac plan tax including a description, timing, and potential impact was provided. Fialko explained the process for developing recommendations to avoid the tax including benchmarking efforts, surveying faculty and staff, reviewing plan design changes, and providing initial recommendations. Other topics of note for the Council include monitoring dependent coverage, assessing faculty and staff benefits eligibility, and offering additional benefits. The next steps include holding open forums, recommending appropriate reserve levels, recommending changes (and timing of) avoiding the ACA Cadillac Plan Tax, recommending redeployment of cost savings to other benefits, reviewing/recommending increasing the number of health plan options for faculty and staff, and reviewing all benefit policies including policy conflicts, eligibility, future cost considerations, etc.

#### Questions and Discussions

- **Tees** asked about what happens to the limits in future years. Fialko stated that the limit is indexed and tied to changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Fialko also stated that, unfortunately, medical inflation has been typically twice the rate of inflation of CPI. As such, avoiding the tax will be more difficult in future years.
- **Casebolt** mentioned that not all employees are on the same plan. Fialko noted that there are 27 people on the Eastern campus that are on an HMO (i.e., a different plan). In addition, there are two different plans on the Athens campus including a faculty/staff PPO plan and AFSCME union plan.
- **Castillo** stated that the increase of costs from 6% to 8% appears to be due to medical inflation and questioned whether or not OHIO should do direct negotiation with suppliers. Fialko responded by explaining that Anthem does some negotiation on our behalf. However, because half of the benefit dollars are spent out of town, this makes negotiation more difficult.
- **Ammarell** asked about what happens to graduate students if graduate students become ill. Fialko noted that graduate students are not under the purview of this Council at this time. Instead, graduate students would be under the purview of the VP of Student Affairs.
- **Tees** asked if there was any way to collaborate with other Universities to get a better deal (i.e., group purchases). Fialko noted that OHIO does make group purchases for things that make sense such as life insurance, disability insurance, prescription drugs, etc. However, the problem with making health insurance group purchases is that location matters. More specifically, Athens is different than Columbus or Cleveland.

- **Hays** asked about the reserve level. Specifically, he mentioned that excess reserve has been used for other functions in the past and asked if this has happened recently. Fialko stated that the employers' portion in excess was re-appropriated for another purpose couple of years ago. **Hays** argued that that this money is negotiated in good faith by the faculty (i.e., faculty take less salary assuming need for benefits). When money is appropriated to other uses, this undermines the good faith of the faculty.
- **Shonia** asked about self-insurance. Are numbers available? How much does the employee premium cover? Fialko remarked that OHIO is self-insured. These numbers are available for budget vs. spent. Employee premiums pay 15%; University pays 85%. This split excludes out-of-pocket expenses such as co-pays, etc.
- **Castillo** asked about whether or not there have been discussion regarding multiple plan options. Specifically, the problems associated with avoiding options in which healthy participants enroll in budget plans while unhealthy or older participants enroll in more expensive plans. Fialko remarked that this usually does happen with multiple plans and noted that this has been discussed within the Council. It could potentially cause serious problems. This will be an important consideration as discussions continue.
- **Quitslund** remarked that the survey results did suggest interest in multiple plans including a budget plan with higher deductibles even though the demographics of the University do not necessarily suggest that this would be the case. **Elster** remarked that one argument suggests that it shouldn't matter whether funding is part of one's salary or available as a deductible. However, if it is part of your salary, then this income is taxed (when it is not if part of a premium). Fialko noted that the Council needs to consider a number of possible options including (but not limited to) flexible spending accounts.
- **Shonia** asked if there is an estimate of the average costs per person for OHIO. Fialko answered in the affirmative and noted that the faculty/staff plan is \$7,230 for single plan and \$21,960 for a family plan. The union plan is \$8,140 for a single plan and \$24,444 for family plan. Assuming an 8% increase, some of the plans will exceed thresholds for the Cadillac Plan in three years (start of 2018).
- **Castillo** asked, if we consider the option that is more unfavorable to faculty where the out-of-pocket expense is increased, how long does this postpone the "Cadillac plan" tax? Fialko noted that we do not know because we do not know what the future may hold. However, the committee is trying to approach it such that we avoid the tax for at least three years, starting in 2018.

#### IV. Roll Call and Approval of the October 13, 2014 Minutes

- ❖ Roll call (**Hartman**)
- ❖ **Casebolt** moved to approve the minutes, seconded by **Wyatt**. The minutes were approved by a voice vote (with one abstention).

#### V. Chair's Report (Beth Quitslund)

- ❖ Topic 1: Updates and Announcements. Quitslund announced that there were no additional updates and announcements not already discussed previously.
- ❖ Topic 2: Advising Update: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Elizabeth Sayrs. Sayrs provided an update about an effort to increase advising. Funding for the increase in advising had been previously provided; efforts toward implementation are underway now. The funding provides for an increase in high-quality advising during students' first-year and particularly for at-risk students. The new program provides for an additional 7 advisors to be embedded in each college. Their focus is on a particular kind of advising: intrusive advising. The goal is to reach students before they fail (i.e., early intervention) because helping students becomes much more difficult after they fail. The

program uses a voluntary survey, which currently has approximately a 90% participation rate. The survey includes a number of self-report measures about students and has been used in various pilot versions for the past four years. Based upon the survey results, the advisors – professional and faculty – reach out to students who appear to have trouble or who might run into trouble. This academic year is the first year that all freshmen are asked to participate. In total, 4,000 freshmen will be covered by the additional 7 advisors. The program sends messaging to students and outreaches to students in need. The outreach program has demonstrated initial success and has generated unanticipated benefits. For example, students have recently organized their own student organization/group to assist first generation college students. Sayers also noted that the search process is underway to hire the 7 new advisors. Interviewing is happening now; hires should be in place by December. Sayers also notes that program is not designed to displace or replace faculty-student interaction. In surveys, faculty-student interaction rates high while advising has lower ratings. This is an attempt to boost this particular kind of advising.

❖ Topic 3: Upcoming Senate Meeting. Monday, December 8, Walter Hall 235

Questions and Discussions

- A Senator asked Sayers if there was any information about how faculty could engage with advising for populations who are commuter / not residential (e.g., the regional campuses). Sayers responded by stating that the Office is working toward modifying materials and advising recommendations for non-residential populations.
- A Senator asked for clarification regarding the distinction between faculty advisors and professional advisors. Specifically, does advising follow a model such that faculty are there to help professionally as mentors whereas the professional advisors are there to help with other issues? Sayers responded in the affirmative. While faculty advisors provide a valuable mentoring service, professional advisors are available to help students with a wide variety of issues such as social concerns, holistic academic skills, transition advising (i.e., from college to college), students who are currently undecided, psychological problems, accessibility services, etc.
- A Senator asked about the approach to students who may not be ready for college. Specifically, a remark was made that not everyone who comes to college actually belongs in college. Does intrusive advising make them not feel like failures? Sayers remarked that the model of advising currently used is appreciative advising. Specifically, this model acknowledges and respects what is in the best interest of students. Through this advising, sometimes students are advised to leave or to take time off. The goal is to make sure the student decides and feels as if they have the right to do so.

**VI. Executive Committee (Beth Quitslund)**

- ❖ With EPSA: Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Proposed Academic Center for Intercollegiate Athletes—Second Reading
  - The sense of the senate resolution is offered jointly by the Executive Committee and the EPSA Committee to (1) thank donors who invest in OHIO students' success, (2) encourage the President and Advancement Office to work with academic leaders to align private giving for academic facilities with OHIO's academic needs, and (3) to encourage the University to integrate academic support, study space, and recreational facilities for student-athletes with those for other OHIO students.
  - The resolution was approved by a voice vote.

Questions and Discussions



There were a number of questions and comments regarding this Resolution. The following provides a summary of the discussion:

- There were some questions asking for additional clarification. Specifically, there were questions about the services offered within the Academic Center for ICA, the donation, funding for construction and on-going costs, exclusivity, and whether or not there were other student groups who had exclusive space/staff.
- There were some concerns about the Resolution wording such that the Resolution singles out student-athletes rather than making a statement about the integration of academic support, study space, and recreational facilities for all students groups. In addition, there was some question about whether or not this resolution will prohibit “exclusive” group spaces for all student groups on campus. In response, some argued that spaces for specific student populations were not equivalent to separate academic support for student-athletes.
- Some expressed concerns that the Resolution could be perceived as entirely negative toward student-athletes and their needs. It was remarked that student-athletes have stressful academic lives and demands for their time. In addition, the University puts specific demands on student-athletes that other groups may not have. As such, there is a need for additional support and facilities for student-athletes. In addition, remarks were made that existing facilities for academic support for the university as a whole would be unable to accommodate student-athletes specific needs (such as mandatory study groups).
- Some comments about potential negative consequences for separating academic support for student-athletes from the general student population were expressed. Although it was expressed that there are specific student-athlete needs that require exclusive spaces including (but not limited to) housing and practice facilities, it was also stated that separating academic support for student-athletes could potentially lead to providing student-athletes with a different academic experience, which has caused problems at other universities. However, it was also noted that this is not currently the situation at OHIO and that the resolution should not be interpreted as opposing ICA’s commendable desire for academic success.
- Some expressed opinions that student-athletes as a group should not be conceptualized as having identical needs; there are diverse student needs within the group. In addition, it was noted that the Academic Center for ICA is proposed for only NCAA student-athletes – not for other student athletes such as club sports or for other students in groups with similar schedules, needs, etc.
- Some questions were raised with respect to funding. Specific questions were raised about how the idea for the Center developed, how much had already been donated, whether the money was donated for the specific purpose, funding for operating expenses, and funding for staff. It was noted that there is a sub-committee of the F&F that is currently revising ICA budgets and spending. It was also noted that the fund raisers and academic advising staff for ICA are doing an excellent job.

## **VI. Professional Relations Committee (Sarah Wyatt)**

- ❖ Second Resolution to Provide Consistent Language in Sections II.C and II.D of the Faculty Handbook Pertaining to Faculty Rank and Status and Appointments—Second Reading
  - The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to amend language in Section II.D.1.d of the Faculty Handbook such that appointments for Group IV faculty may be made for a total of no longer than three years. Currently, the language in Section II.C.3.d states that visiting professor and other full-term appointments (Group IV) are limited to a total of three years. The resolution changes language in Section II.D.1.d to be consistent.
  - The resolution was approved by a voice vote.
- ❖ Resolution to Clarify Procedure for Group II Annual Evaluations—Second Reading

- The resolution is offered by the PR Committee to amend language in Section II.C.3.b.v of the Faculty Handbook such that the procedure for Group II annual evaluations is clarified. Currently, the language in Section II.C.3.b.v does not reference Section 2.E.1 of the Faculty Handbook, which is a section describing appropriate procedures for evaluating all faculty. The resolution adds a phrase to the current language that references the section describing procedures.
- The resolution was approved by a voice vote.
- ❖ Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Need to Establish a University-Wide Group II Teaching Award—Second Reading
  - The sense of the senate resolution is offered the PR Committee to recommend that the university develop a university-wide teaching award for Group II faculty that is similar in stature and requirements as the Presidential Teaching Award for Group I.
  - The resolution was approved by a voice vote.
- ❖ Resolution to Revise the Language of the Faculty Handbook to be Consistent with the Current Practices Regarding Group IV Faculty —First Reading
  - The resolution is offered the PR Committee to eliminate unnecessary language regarding exemptions to the Group IV term of contract. The revision to the language is designed to be consistent with current practices and needs for exemptions.

#### Questions and Discussions

- A senator asked a question regarding the first reading of the Resolution to Revise the Language of the Faculty Handbook to be Consistent with the Current Practices Regarding Group IV Faculty. Specifically, if the deletions are completed as proposed, then would the deleted language essentially remove the definition of the CORE? Wyatt agreed that the definition should remain and stated that she would modify the intended cuts so that the definition would remain included in the language.

### **VII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ruth Palmer)**

- ❖ Resolution to support the definitions of plagiarism and cheating in the new Student Code of Conduct—First Reading
  - The resolution is offered by EPSA to accept and support the proposed definitions of the types of plagiarism and cheating in the proposed revision to the Student Code of Conduct language.
- ❖ Topic 2: Student Accessibility Services. Palmer announced that EPSA is currently working with Student Accessibility Services to address questions about student accessibility accommodations and the process by which faculty will meet them. This is a work-in-progress to date.

#### Questions and Discussions

- None

### **VIII. Finance & Facilities Committee (Ben Stuart)**

- ❖ Topic 1: ICA Subcommittee. Stuart announced that F&F plans to bring an update with preliminary ideas to the Faculty Senate Meeting in December.
- ❖ Topic 2: Recommendations for Faculty Salary Implementation Year 2. Stuart announced that F&F plans to bring an update with preliminary ideas to the Faculty Senate Meeting in December. To date, the specific numbers are not yet available.

Questions and Discussions

- None

**IX. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)**

- ❖ Topic 1: Potential Resolution. P&T will be working on a new resolution regarding promotion and tenure standards yet has decided to delay progress in order to review a new appeal case.
- ❖ Topic 2: Appeal. P&T has recently received a new appeal. The committee is making progress toward reviewing this appeal.

Questions and Discussions

- None

**X. New Business**

- ❖ None







Questions and Discussions

- None

**XII. Adjournment**

- ❖ **Casebolt** moved to adjourn, seconded by **Wyatt**. The meeting was adjourned at 9:38pm.

## Appendix A: Benefits Advisory Council Update PowerPoint Presentation

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Faculty Senate Benefits Advisory Council Update</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">November 10, 2014</p> 	<p><b>Benefits Advisory Council</b></p> <p><b>Charge:</b> The Benefits Advisory Council (BAC) is charged with analyzing and making recommendations related to university benefit plan designs. The BAC will consider competitiveness, financial sustainability and fairness in their recommendations.</p> <p>Recommendations will be made to the Total Compensation Committee. Goal is for initial recommendations to be made in December, 2014.</p> 
<p><b>Benefits Advisory Council</b></p> <p><b>Guiding Principles:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate structural deficits.</li> <li>• Manage university health care cost increases</li> <li>• Suggest plan design modifications to avoid the ACA Cadillac Plan Tax and potentially redeploy any associated savings within the suite of employee benefits.</li> </ul> 	<p><b>Benefits Advisory Council</b></p> <p><b>Guiding Principles:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate Structural Deficits:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Reserves have been used to balance the annual benefits budget</li> <li>– FY15 projected to use reserves to balance the budget.</li> <li>– FY16 Budget to not include use of reserves</li> </ul> </li> </ul> 
<p><b>Benefits Advisory Council</b></p> <p><b>Guiding Principles:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage university health care cost increases             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Benefits costs are expected to increase 6% to 8% annually</li> <li>– BAC to recommend the amount of annual increases the university can fund                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: If costs are projected to increase 6%, university absorbs 5% and employees absorb 1% via plan design changes, premiums, and etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> 	<p><b>Benefits Advisory Council</b></p> <p><b>Guiding Principles:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid ACA Cadillac Plan Tax             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Suggest plan design modifications to avoid the ACA Cadillac Plan Tax, and</li> <li>– potentially redeploy any associated savings within the suite of employee benefits.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> 

### Benefits Advisory Council

#### ACA Cadillac Plan Tax:

- Health Plans that exceed \$10,200 for single plans and \$27,500 for family plans will be subject to a tax of 40% of the amount in excess of those thresholds.
  - Example: If a single plan costs \$11,000, the tax = \$800 x 40% x number of individuals enrolled in a single plan.
- The university faces a projected tax of \$2.8 million in 2018 for all current plans and enrollment. (Union and non-union plans) The tax could approach \$9.6 million by 2025.
- Adjusting employee premiums does not mitigate the tax, the tax is applied against combined employee and employer premiums. Deductibles, copays, co-insurance, out of pocket maximum, and etc. mitigate the tax.



### Benefits Advisory Council

#### Managing Costs and Cadillac Plan Recommendations

- Review higher education benchmark data. (Complete)
- Survey faculty and staff to solicit feedback regarding possible approaches to avoid the Cadillac plan tax. (Complete)
  - Participation Rate: Faculty 49%; Admin 49%; Classified 66%
- Plan Design Changes: Should the university make incremental changes each year leading up to FY2018, or wait until FY2018 and make "big" changes?
- Provide initial recommendations by early December 2014



### Benefits Advisory Council

#### Higher Education Benchmark Data\*

	Ohio Univ.	Ohio St.	National Higher Ed.	National All Industry	OU AFSCME Union**
Deductible	\$200 / \$400	\$100 / \$700	\$300 / \$600	\$300 / \$1,200	\$300 / \$1,000
Out of Pocket Max	\$1,200 / \$2,400	\$1,300 / \$1,900	\$1,100 / \$1,750	\$1,400 / \$5,000	\$2,000 / \$4,000
Co-insurance	80%	80%	82%	80%	80%
Office Visit Copay	\$20	\$20	\$20	\$20	\$20
ER Copay Retail					
Generic	\$10	\$8	\$10	\$10	\$13
Brand Formulary	\$30	\$25	\$25	\$30	\$30
Non-Formulary	\$30	\$40	\$40	\$50	\$40
ER Copay Mail					
Generic	\$15	\$15	\$20	\$20	\$20
Brand Formulary	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$40	\$40
Non-Formulary	\$40	\$40	\$40	\$100	\$60

\*Source: Mercer National Employer Survey (2012)

\*\*AFSCME Union Plans Effective July 1, 2015



### Benefits Advisory Council

#### Additional Topics

- Monitoring Dependent Coverage:
  - Require proof of dependent status for new hires for benefits enrollments.
  - Conduct a Dependent Eligibility Audit to validate dependent eligibility. Will require all employees to furnish documentation proving dependent status.
- Faculty and Staff Benefits Eligibility
  - Affordable Care Act, Policy roll responses (Benefits Policy Group Policy Handbook), Part-time benefits (discrepancies between employer groups, etc)
- Offer Additional Benefits
  - Anthem Live Health Online (Telemedicine)
  - Short Term Disability
  - Enhanced Dental option
  - Enhanced Vision option
  - Other



### Benefits Advisory Council

#### Next Steps

- Benefits Open Forums
- Recommend appropriate reserve level
- Recommend changes (and timing of) necessary to avoid ACA Cadillac Plan Tax
- Recommend redeployment of cost savings to other benefits, if feasible
- Review and recommend increasing health plan options for faculty and staff
- Review all benefits policies including policy conflicts, eligibility, future cost considerations, and etc.



### Benefits Advisory Council

BAC and TCC to review impact of total compensation on university budget.

