

**Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, November 5, 2018
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 235, 7:10pm
Meeting Minutes DRAFT**

In attendance

College of Arts and Sciences: G. Buckley, D. Clowe, H. Edwards, S. Gradin, M. Gurien, K. Hicks, P. Jung, N. Manring, J. McLaughlin, L. McMills, R. Muhammad, R. Palmer, N. Sandal, S. Wyatt
College of Business: J. Andzulis (sub. for A. Pueschel), J. Hiler, D. Ridpath
College of Fine Arts: M. Franz, K. Geist, V. Marchenkov, H. Siebrits
College of Health Sciences and Professions: R. Brannan, M. Clevidence, A. Sergeev, B. Sindelar
Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine: B. Franz, J. Wolf
Patton College of Education: L. Harrison, C. Hartman, S. Helfrich, C. Lowery
Regional Campus – Chillicothe: A. White
Regional Campus – Eastern: P. McMurray-Schwarz
Regional Campus – Lancaster: S. Doty
Regional Campus – Southern: Y. Shao-Lucas
Regional Campus – Zanesville: S. House, J. Taylor
Russ College of Engineering: J. Cotton, D. Schwerha
Scripps College of Communication: B. Bates, A. Chadwick, B. Debatin
Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs: D. Kauneckis
Athens At Large: G. Michaud, D. Nickles, T. Pritchard
Clinical: A. Healy

Excused: C. Crawford, B. Debatin, A. Rosado-Feger, J. Taylor

Absent: E. Stinaff, C. Stork, J. White

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Agenda for Monday, November 5, 2018
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10-9:00pm

- I. M. Duane Nellis, President & Chaden Djalali, Executive VP & Provost
- II. Faculty Compensation Task Force Report—John Day, Associate Provost for Academic Budget & Planning (See Appendix A)
- III. Roll Call and Approval of the October 8, 2018 Minutes
- IV. Chair’s Report—Joe McLaughlin
 - a. Updates & Announcements
 - b. Upcoming Senate Meeting: **December 10, 2018, 7:10pm, Walter Hall 235**
- V. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Betty Sindelar
- VI. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Sherrie Gradin
 - a. Resolution to Clarify Eligibility to Serve on Loss of Tenure Hearing Committees—Second Reading & Vote (See Appendix B)
- VII. Finance & Facilities Committee—Susan Williams
- VIII. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt
- IX. New Business
- X. Adjournment

I. M. Duane Nellis, President & Chaden Djalali, Executive VP & Provost

President Nellis provides updates and announcements on several issues:

1. He reminded everyone of the opportunity to nominate anyone for an honorary degree. The deadline to nominate someone is February 22, 2019.
2. The new VP for Communications and Marketing search will be launched very soon. Dean of the College of Business Hugh Sherman and Vice-President Gigi Secuban are co-chairs of the search committee. Late February or early March campus visits are expected.
3. RHE Task Force will be released in the one to two days. There will be an opportunity to comment.
4. The President expressed a desire to elevate our sustainability plan. Hubs of faculty leadership are being formed November 13 is the deadline for applying to serve one of the hubs (sustainability planning group centering on a particular theme).
5. Last year we started the training for sexual assault awareness and prevention. The old file (online training program) has been modified to make it more trackable and less cumbersome. 93% of faculty and staff have completed the training.

Provost Djalali provided updates on the five searches and noted that additional updates and details will be posted to the Provost's website regularly: <https://www.ohio.edu/provost>

- 1) The search for the Dean of Libraries is under way and the interviews will take place this month (November).
- 2) The search for the Dean of the Russ College of Engineering is moving forward and interviews will take place in February and/or March.
- 3) The search for the Director Ohio University Press is under way and is being co-chaired by Joe McLaughlin and LJ Edmonds.
- 4) The search for the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences is finalizing the committee composition and will launch soon.
- 5) Group II representation will be present on all the search committees.
- 6) The search for a Dean for Honors Tutorial College will follow the CAS search; the Provost is in the process of selecting a search firm for this search.

Questions, comments and feedback:

A senator raised concerns about another administrative position being reconfigured to a Vice-Presidential level given the potential cost.

President Nellis acknowledged the concern and said that the reconfiguration (VP title) would not increase the cost in terms of salary.

A senator asked if the number of faculty was likely to be reduced.

The President and Provost stated that there were no immediate plans for the reduction in the number of faculty.

A senator asked about enrollments and “head counts,” asking whether the strategy was to increase overall enrollments or not.

President Nellis responded that increasing enrollments was a factor and that John Day would be providing more details.

A senator asked, what could faculty do? Under RCM there was a false promise the impact of increasing enrollments and expanding or creating new programs to meet financial needs.

President Nellis acknowledged that faculty played a significant role in attracting and retaining students through new programs, advising and other practices to bring up enrollments.

II. Faculty Compensation Task Force Report—John Day, Associate Provost for Academic Budget & Planning

Day gave a Powerpoint presentation and facilitated a discussion on questions and issues arising from the task force’s findings. **(See Appendix A)**

Questions, comments and feedback:

A senator asked if regional campus faculty salaries were factored into the analysis.

Day responded that they were not but the idea moving forward would be to invest with similar percentages (increases) across all faculty.

Chair McLaughlin noted that one year of no raises wiped out three years of incremental raises.

There was discussion about the reliability of the self-reported numbers in the compensation studies used by the task force.

Day made several points throughout the presentation, including issues with data and methodology. Day noted that moving forward more data might be needed from the Colleges. In terms of the National Peer Analysis (see slides with particular attention to the National Peer Analysis slide in Appendix A, page 17 of this file). Faculty are encouraged to send feedback on the task force's findings presented here to John Day or Joe McLaughlin.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the October 8, 2018 Minutes

Motion to approve was made, seconded, and approved with one abstention and no nays.

IV. Chair's Report—Joe McLaughlin

Updates & Announcements

With regards to the upcoming RHE report, Chair McLaughlin reported that its effect on the Faculty Handbook will have to be considered. Comments should be forwarded to the Chair.

Secondly, the call for faculty coordinators for the sustainability has gone out. If there are interested faculty, they should sign up by the November 13 deadline.

Upcoming Senate Meeting: **December 10, 2018, 7:10pm, Walter Hall 235**

Board of Trustee members Scholl and Coleman will visit that meeting. Senators are encouraged to forward questions for the Board members to the Chair of Faculty Senate, Joe McLaughlin

V. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Betty Sindelar

No report.

VI. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Sherrie Gradin

Resolution to Clarify Eligibility to Serve on Loss of Tenure Hearing Committees—Second Reading & Vote (**See Appendix B**)

There were no questions or comments. A motion to approve was made, seconded, passed unanimously.

VII. Finance & Facilities Committee—Susan Williams

Senator Williams reported that a small raise pool is expected; health care benefits are expected to remain relatively unchanged. Senators are encouraged to send her comments regarding the “new” exceptions to the exceptions to the Bobcat Buy procedures.

VIII. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt

No report

IX. New Business

No new business

X. Adjournment

Appendix A

Task Force on Faculty Compensation

Faculty Senate
November 5, 2018

Task Force Charge

- Review the results of the recently completed faculty compensation plan
- Create an updated plan that considers all aspects of the previous plan:
 - Review and potentially update the peer set approach used for establishing the goals of the plan
 - Review and potentially update the actual goal relative to the peer set
 - Review and potentially update the methodology used to project salary inflation and determine any investments needed
 - Review and potentially update the implementation of the plan including the timeframe and how the plan addresses not only Athens tenure-track faculty but also non-tenure-track faculty and regional campus tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty

Structure of the Previous Plan

- Goal linked to faculty salary compared to the other four-year public universities in Ohio.
- Limiting the peer set to only the other universities in Ohio necessitated averaging salaries across disciplines given the variations in disciplines existing across the state.
- This resulted in a single average salary across all colleges/disciplines for each rank
- The goal was to reach the third highest average salary at each rank over a period of three years

Structure of the Previous Plan

- First step was to calculate the three-year average salary increase for each rank for Ohio University and faculty at the Ohio Peers.
- For OHIO faculty, this average annual increase was 2.8% for Professors, 3.2% for Associate Professors, and 4.0% for Assistant Professors.
- These numbers are different from the annual raise pool percentage because the total salary also increases for promotions, equity adjustments, and the differential between faculty leaving and new faculty being hired.
- Amount of investment needed took the three-year average salary increase for the other institutions at higher positions than ours and determined the additional amount needed to put into iour salaries above the amount it was normally putting in as listed above.

Results of the Plan

Base Year

Professor			Associate			Assistant		
OSU	139,239	1	OSU	4,148	1	OSU	84,761	1
UA	11,236	2	UT	3,658	2	MU	4,998	2
UC	11,026	3	UA	3,057	3	UT	3,280	3
KSU	109,915	4	MU	2,136	4	KSU	1,275	4
WSU	108,986	5	KSU	2,012	5	UA	70,931	5
MU	106,724	6	WSU	1,990	6	CSU	70,815	6
UT	106,525	7	OU	79,303	7	OU	70,367	7
OU	105,522	8	UC	78,736	8	WSU	66,882	8
CSU	100,069	9	CSU	74,984	9	UC	63,841	9
BGSU	99,252	10	YSU	73,468	10	BGSU	63,012	10
YSU	90,685	11	BGSU	5,918	11	YSU	60,843	11
SSU	72,485	12	SSU	1,933	12	SSU	52,597	12
ToJ3rd	5,504		ToJ3rd	754		ToJ3rd	2,913	

2014-15 Actual

Year%	Investment	Professor			Associate			Assistant		
Professor	672,910	OSU	142,200	1	OSU	6,100	1	OSU	85,200	1
Associate	486,983	UC	116,400	2	MU	5,600	2	MU	81,900	2
Assistant	122,989	UA	112,500	3	KSU	4,400	3	KSU	73,700	3
		1,282,882	KSU	111,600	4	WSU	4,200	4	UT	73,100
		MU	111,400	5	UT	3,700	5	OU	72,100	5
		WSU	110,700	6	UA	3,400	6	WSU	72,100	6
		OU	109,700	7	OU	2,300	7	CSU	71,400	7
		UT	106,400	8	UC	0,600	8	UA	70,300	8
		BGSU	102,800	9	BGSU	8,000	9	UC	69,400	9
		CSU	101,100	10	CSU	74,900	10	BGSU	66,600	10
		YSU	89,500	11	YSU	72,800	11	YSU	61,200	11
		SSU	73,100	12	SSU	3,500	12	SSU	53,600	12
		ToJ3rd	2,800		ToJ3rd	1,100		ToJ3rd	1,600	

Results of the Plan

Base%ear

Professor			Associate			Assistant		
OSU))))))139,239	1	OSU)))4,148	1	OSU))))))84,761	1
UA))))))111,236	2	UT)))3,658	2	MU))))))74,998	2
UC))))))111,026	3	UA)))3,057	3	UT))))))73,280	3
KSU))))))109,915	4	MU)))2,136	4	KSU))))))71,275	4
WSU))))))108,986	5	KSU)))2,012	5	UA))))))70,931	5
MU))))))106,724	6	WSU)))1,990	6	CSU))))))70,815	6
UT))))))106,525	7	OU)))9,303	7	OU))))))70,367	7
OU))))))105,522	8	UC)))8,736	8	WSU))))))66,882	8
CSU))))))100,069	9	CSU)))7,984	9	UC))))))63,841	9
BGSU))))))99,252	10	YSU)))7,468	10	BGSU))))))63,012	10
YSU))))))90,685	11	BGSU)))5,918	11	YSU))))))60,843	11
SSU))))))72,485	12	SSU)))1,933	12	SSU))))))52,597	12
To}3rd))))))5,504		To}3rd)))8,754		To}3rd))))))2,913	

2014%15'Actual

Year%	Investment	Professor			Associate			Assistant		
Professor672,910	OSU))))))142,200	1	OSU)))6,100	1	OSU))))))85,200	1
Associate486,983	UC))))))116,400	2	MU)))5,600	2	MU))))))81,900	2
Assistant122,989	UA))))))112,500	3	KSU)))4,400	3	KSU))))))73,700	3
	..1,282,882	KSU))))))111,600	4	WSU)))4,200	4	UT))))))73,100	4
		MU))))))111,400	5	UT)))3,700	5	OU))))))72,100	5
		WSU))))))110,700	6	UA)))3,400	6	WSU))))))72,100	6
		OU))))))109,700	7	OU)))2,300	7	CSU))))))71,400	7
		UT))))))106,400	8	UC)))0,600	8	UA))))))70,300	8
		BGSU))))))102,800	9	BGSU)))8,000	9	UC))))))69,400	9
		CSU))))))101,100	10	CSU)))7,490	10	BGSU))))))66,600	10
		YSU))))))89,500	11	YSU)))7,280	11	YSU))))))61,200	11
		SSU))))))73,100	12	SSU)))3,500	12	SSU))))))53,600	12
		To}3rd))))))2,800		To}3rd)))2,100		To}3rd))))))1,600	

Issues Identified

- Issues with Data
 - This salary ranking was previously compiled by Wright State using data that each institution submitted at the same time they submitted information to *Academe*. That process is no longer occurring and we have been attempting to reproduce that information from the data in *Academe* by ourselves.
 - The methodology utilizes data from each institution about the annual percentage inflation in salaries reported to *Academe* to create an inflationary trend line for each institution. Both Toledo and Shawnee State are not providing that information any more.

Issues Identified

- Issues with Methodology
 - Using a single average salary for each rank results in averaging salaries across a wide variety disciplines with a wide range of salaries. Within our own data, professor salaries range from \$86,779 to \$173,825, associate professor salaries range from \$67,954 to \$162,749 and assistant professor salaries range from \$52,000 to \$147,000. What does an average mean?
 - Establishing trend lines depend on how the trend is computed (five-year average, three-year average, most recent year, etc.).
 - Average salaries are highly influenced by factors such as retirements and movement of faculty across ranks. Retirements at the professor rank or a higher distribution of more recently promoted associate professors could result a downward shift in the average even though individual salaries are not actually eroding when time-in-rank is considered.
 - While the goal is to ensure competitive compensation, the approach only looks at salaries and ignores benefits since it is difficult to ensure that the benefits included are comparable across institutions.
 - Ohio Peer rankings including compensation put us at 6th for Professors compared to 8th for salary, 5th for Associate compared to 7th and 4th for Assistant compared to 5th.

Issues Identified

- Issues with the Ohio Peer Approach
 - The market for faculty talent is national. We are not competing with just other universities in Ohio.
 - While the theory was that we were comparing schools with similar economic environments (subsidy support within Ohio and statewide tuition caps), the reality is that there is a huge variation in resources across the 13 institutions from extremely small regional institutions to a national flagship institution.
 - In addition, the mix and proportion of disciplines across the Ohio institutions is highly variable. For example, not all have engineering and the size of the business school varies, both of which tend to have faculty with higher salaries.

National Peer Analysis

- Peer comparison should look at national averages by rank and discipline.
- The match between disciplines across universities is not perfect since our departments do not line up exactly with the discipline mixes nationally.
- Even at a discipline level any set of peers will apply well to some disciplines but not others.
- Looked at two national faculty salary surveys
 - The Oklahoma study compares salaries among Carnegie Peers by discipline and rank within discipline. This study uses six-digit CIP codes that match most closely with Ohio University's academic departments
 - The CUPA- HR survey similarly collects aggregated faculty salary data broken down by rank and discipline but uses four-digit CIP codes, which requires some of our departments to be combined.
- When you compare our average salaries to national averages by discipline, we have disciplines that are above average and disciplines that are below average – competitiveness should look at both the number of disciplines that are above as well as below average.

Oklahoma Study Test

Calculated the number of faculty above and below average as well as the total dollars above or below by taking the amount times the number of faculty we had at each rank and discipline combination.

BEFORE	Discipline/Rank Below Average	25	24	15	64
	Dollars Below Average	(872,470)	(363,692)	(216,333)	(1,452,495)
	Discipline/Rank Above Average	24	29	32	85
	Dollars Above Average	747,610	878,885	396,820	2,023,315
2016-17	Discipline/Rank Below Average	17	9	9	35
	Dollars Below Average	(474,569)	(294,646)	(144,084)	(913,299)
	Discipline/Rank Above Average	31	43	36	110
	Dollars Above Average	1,159,817	1,415,985	650,468	3,226,270
Total	Before	49	53	47	149
	After	48	52	45	145

53 disciplines - some departments don't have all ranks

Oklahoma Study Test

Base Year	BEFORE	Discipline/Rank Below Average	25	24	15	64
		Dollars Below Average	(872,470)	(363,692)	(216,333)	(1,452,495)
		Discipline/Rank Above Average	24	29	32	85
		Dollars Above Average	747,610	878,885	396,820	2,023,315
2017-18 0% Raise Pool	AFTER	Discipline/Rank Below Average	24	15	16	55
		Dollars Below Average	(637,812)	(322,711)	(287,262)	(1,247,785)
		Discipline/Rank Above Average	24	37	30	91
		Dollars Above Average	973,258	1,012,049	451,806	2,437,113

Limitations of the Peer Analysis

- In many discipline/rank combinations, we will have only one or two faculty. Such small numbers will be highly influenced by time in rank and performance over time.
- Since we only have averages for comparisons as opposed to medians in these national surveys, the data is subject to influence by outliers.
- Matching our department structure to national discipline breakdowns is imperfect. A few of our discipline/rank combinations have large variations with national combinations (e.g. Applied Health Sciences and Wellness, Social and Public Health). This suggests that either our salaries in those disciplines are not competitive or that our departments may not have a comparable peer set.
- The results of such an analysis are also sensitive to the peers included. Not all universities participate in these national studies. The Oklahoma study uses peers in the same Carnegie classification but this group still has some significant variation on other dimensions.

Investment Quantification

- The peer set in terms of other institutions with which we compete for faculty is not the same for every given discipline.
- In reality departments would not all be expected to be in the same position relative to a national average. Some need to be far above national averages to compete for faculty while others are successful at or below a national average.
- With small numbers of faculty in some of our rank/discipline combinations, the dollar variation above or below an average may be appropriate given factors such as time in rank or performance over time.
- As mentioned in the review of the previous plan, average salaries are subject to many factors beyond annual raises.
 - They are more sensitive to the factors such as time in rank where a higher distribution of recently promoted faculty would result in a lower average salary but might not mean salaries are non-competitive.
 - Similarly, a higher concentration of retirements of professors within a particular department might skew the average downward but might not indicate sudden non-competitiveness of salaries for remaining faculty.

Feedback

- The task force does not feel that the expectation that we could calculate a dollar amount to invest in order to change our average salaries relative to a peer group is realistic. The perceived accuracy of such a calculation is misleading and oversimplifies the challenge of competing effectively for faculty talent.
- Use a national peer analysis as one indicator of competitiveness?
- Use a more complex college-level analysis of competitiveness (including all groups of faculty) to determine investments?
- How should we go about developing this sort of approach?

Appendix B

**Resolution on Updating the Language in the Handbook
Re: Section II.D.5.C on Loss of Tenure By Inserting the Word “Tenured”**

**Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Senate
Second Reading
November 5th, 2018**

Whereas the Faculty Handbook consistently notes the granting and denying of tenure as the responsibility of tenured faculty, e.g. Section II. E.3.a (members of departmental/division tenure and promotion committees) and Section II. F. 7 (members of formal hearing committee on denial of promotion and tenure);

Be it resolved that the word “tenure” be inserted in Section II.D.5.C as illustrated below:

Current Language

II.D.5.C The formal hearing committee shall **consist of all members** of the Faculty Senate in the third year of their current Faculty Senate term, presided over by the chair of the Faculty Senate.

Proposed Language

II.D.5.C The formal hearing committee shall **consist of all tenured members** of the Faculty Senate in the third year of their current Faculty Senate term, presided over by the chair of the Faculty Senate.

For reference: Section II. E.3.a “Tenured faculty status is required for membership on departmental/school/division promotion and/or tenure committees” (FH 34).

Section II. F. 7. “If the Standing Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate has found that a formal proceeding is warranted on the evidence presented to it, the committee will so inform the chair of the Faculty Senate. In consultation with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, the chair shall appoint five tenured faculty members, at rank or above, none of whom shall be from the grievant’s department, to constitute a hearing committee” (FH 42-41).