

Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, February 9, 2009
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.

Sergio López-Permouth called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: T. Anderson, K. Brown, G. Buckley, S. Gradin, P. Jung, K. Sullivan for J. Lein, S. López-Permouth, G. Matlack, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, W. Roosenburg, A. Smith, J. Webster

College of Business: L. Hoshower, T. Stock

College of Education: V. Conley, T. Leinbaugh

College of Engineering: C. Bartone, J. Gieseey, H. Pasic

College of Fine Arts: A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas, R. Wetzel

Group II: A. Hall, M. Lucas for C. Naccarato

College of Health and Human Services: D. Bolon, S. Marinellie, J. Thomas

College of Osteopathic Medicine: P. Coschigano, T. Heckman

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: J. McKean

Regional Campus—Eastern: T. Flynn

Regional Campus—Lancaster:

Regional Campus—Southern: M. Crawford for E. McGown

Regional Campus—Zanesville: F. LLoschiavo for J. Benson, K. Collins

Scripps College of Communication: J. Bernt, N. Pecora, S. Titsworth

Excused: J. Benson, S. Brogan, J. Lein, E. McGown, D. Matolak, P. Munhall, C. Naccarato, J. Slade, D. Torres

Absent: D. Bell, W. Gist, S. Hatty, L. Steele,

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl
- II. Vice President for Finance and Administration Bill Decatur
- III. Vice President of Ohio University Student Senate Sally Neidhard
- IV. Roll Call and Approval of November 10, 2008 Minutes
- V. Chair's report—Sergio López-Permouth
- VI. Finance and Facilities Committee Report—Joe McLaughlin
- VII. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee Report—Scott Titsworth
- VIII. Promotion and Tenure Committee Report—Pete Coschigano
- IX. Professional Relations Committee Report—Sherrie Gradin
- X. Resolution to Defend the Faculty Handbook—Ken Brown
- XI. New Business
- XII. Adjournment

Minutes of the meeting

I. Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl

- **Krendl** announced that three resolutions on academic integrity, the grade appeal process, and the process of investigation from the Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee had been signed and returned.
- **Krendl** stated that her report was placed on the web earlier that day. It contains some good news. In particular, regional campus enrollments are up over 1,000 students since this time last year. She stated that OU has had a very successful year and that these enrollments are great news for us. Krendl stated that retention looks good across the board and that graduate enrollment is also up.
- **Krendl** stated that the recruitment news is also good to this point. She stated that, given where we are in the economic environment and the decline in the senior class, everything is going to count on yield. She stated that we have a strong applicant pool and that with some 13,075 applications there are fewer than last year, which was an all time record. Even so, this is the second highest number of applications ever. She announced that the quality of the freshman class is up this year. ACT scores, SAT scores, etc. are all up. Multicultural applications are up. International applications are up, and transfer applications are up 42%. Krendl stated that the Office of Admissions is establishing a wait list to help us meet our freshman class goals. She noted that other institutions do this routinely. The students on this list meet minimum criteria but something in their record causes us to waitlist them; their final admission will depend on the yield process. She stated that we need faculty help in yield activities.
- **Krendl** announced that Dean's Evaluations will be going online this year. She stated that the Professional Relations Committee is vetting it. This change was recommended by the chairs of the committees last year. She noted that this process will maintain confidentiality and will save time in handling sensitive information.
- **Krendl** stated that the Vision Ohio website has been updated.
- There were no questions about these issues. **Krendl** reported that the turnout for pizza before the meeting had been good. She then asked David Juedes and Jeff Connor to report on the Centers of Excellent Report.
 - **Juedes** noted that this report is the result of a long process that started by the deans, who gave the committee the charge to look at and review all of the graduate programs on campus. The committee developed a set of self study guidelines over the first year, and in October we had all of the 87 programs submit self studies. The committee reviewed them over the fall quarter and winter break. The committee rated them and came to some conclusions about the strengths of the programs at OU.
 - **Connor** stated that throughout the designing of the template and the review process the committee was faced with the apples vs. oranges question, the issue that each program is unique and special. To meet this challenge, the committee included a lot of user defined tables and narratives and used that

information from the self-studies. The committee kept the process open and had a long question and answer period. The committee posted answers to questions on the web and tried to be as unbiased as possible. The committee took care during deliberations that interested parties left the room and didn't vote during the discussion of their programs. He stated that the first reading done by the members of the committee that were not from the college of the program being reviewed. This made the process as unbiased as possible. The process was that after the self studies, initially faculty and student sections were rated by two committee members, who turned in initial ratings, averages of which are in the appendix of the report. The committee recognized that each program was distinct and that there was no universal rating that one could use. He explained that when the entire committee met, six people had been through each self-study. The committee looked at the studies, tables, narrations, etc. looking at the program itself in a disaggregated way. The committee then we averaged the student and faculty ratings. After that, a free discussion of the program occurred. In the actual final, pre-appeal categorization reflected the group discussion of the report. Connor then asked for questions from senators.

- **Geoff Buckley** asked permission to show a couple of tables on the overhead screen. He stated that the confusion that we get is if you did an aggregate or composite, things jump around quite a bit from the rankings. He stated that all of these things on the table don't seem to count towards the ratings. **Connor** stated that column 4 isn't included in the first pass, because it wasn't appropriate for a lot of programs. **Juedes** stated that the most appropriate thing to do is to have the deans look at them so that based on service to the university they can determine what they can do to support a program. **Buckley** replied that one of the things that doesn't seem to contribute is interdisciplinarity, which is not rewarded in this process. He suggested that, if you drop section 4, it's confusing on what the final ratings are based on. He asked what went into the process. **Juedes** responded that the initial ratings were a starting point for the discussion; the committee then looked at the self studies carefully. He stated that initially 4 people looked at one program; those people had read the entire self study. Then the committee had a discussion about each of the programs. In some cases, he said, the committee decided that the ratings were not right. Consequently, he stated there is not a one-to-one correlation: it was a starting point for discussion, but the final rating was not based solely on the initial rating. **Buckley** pointed out that there is not an explanation in the report of how the committee did this. **Juedes** stated that the committee could add that information. **Buckley** stated that a lot of people did not understand the weighting; consequently, it's a big issue. He asked whether departments need to start thinking about not doing interdisciplinary work. **Connor** replied that, when the committee looked at the whole report, interdisciplinary was included. He stated that in the initial pass it wasn't included but the larger discussion looked at the ratings and then the final categorization came out of a vote of all the members.

Buckley stated that the dean pointed out that some departments had different teaching loads; this report is very product oriented and seems to have ignored a teaching and service component that's not as sexy as other components. **Juedes** stated that certain cases were very hard for us to get a handle on, especially the interdisciplinary programs.

- **Joe McLaughlin** stated that everyone respects the work of the committee, but the nature of the task is something that is impossible. He stated that there are lots of us planning on an appeal, but this report doesn't really give us a lot of information to make this appeal. **Connor** replied that, due to the nature of the report and that there weren't individual comments on programs, it would be very difficult to appeal. He suggested looking at appendix E, looking at individual columns, and seeing if there is an area where the department has fallen lower than you think it should be. He stated that those are the areas you want to address in your appeal. He stated that he would go ahead and look at the self-study with a critical eye, see where it's not strong enough, where data that was incomplete or there were empty tables. He stated that the committee did the best it could, but if something wasn't there we had to do the best we could. He suggested that departments go ahead and look at other programs in your category and where you want to be and see how their reports looked. He stated that the process was very informative about what's going on across campus. He said that he wouldn't have guessed how productive some programs have been. He also suggested that chairs call Ben, David, or him for more information. He stated that they can give a sense of where weaknesses might lie. He suggested looking at people on the same level and where you want to go. He recommended looking at the numbers, but not as a composite.
- **Quitslund** stated that this was primarily comparative across the university, not national programs, which seems like a large apples to little grapes comparison. She asked how you know what a normal standard for highly productive scholars is. **Connor** replied that the committee depended on the program and the description of scholarly activity and funding information.
- **Pete Coschigano** stated that the committee looked at faculty scholarly and creative activities. He noted that one program said we expect one book every five years and gave us a benchmark, which allowed us to compare to the benchmark. Other programs said other things in relation to benchmarks.
- **Buckley** stated that he was glad he wasn't on the committee and trying to figure things out. He stated that student Scholarly and Creative Activity is something his department wasn't keeping track of. He stated that the department has it; it just didn't keep track of it. He stated that some categories are so broad that there's room for embellishment. He pointed to grants and history, for example, and asked whether that means grants they bring in? **Juedes** recommended looking at the self-studies.
- **Tim Anderson** asked whether programs should have set low standards. This process seems rife with opportunity for embellishment. He wondered where the numbers come from. **Juedes** replied the we had collective

intelligence on the committee with well respected colleagues. He suggested that, if you're not satisfied with what the task force said, look at the self-studies of other programs. He stated that it was tough for the task force to come to these conclusions.

- **Tracy Leinbaugh** stated that, when you say look at other self studies, it's a problem to compare professional programs to other programs. There's a huge discrepancy here. **Juedes** stated that there was a huge discussion on the committee about this and whether it was fair. He stated that the committee tried to be as fair as possible. **Connor** stated that in terms of professional programs scholarly activities wouldn't be the same. Another senator stated that it seemed that scholarship and student placement was evaluated the same for all kinds of programs. **Connor** stated that programs were rated in this context and that there was a clear separation of the kinds of programs. He stated that the committee looked at what professional programs were doing and recognized that they're all different. The committee looked at how the mission of each program was defined, how the program asked us to review its data. **Juedes** stated that there was a distribution throughout the various categories. He noted that not all professional programs were high or low. He recommended that faculty look at those programs' self studies; at least 1 was ranked as "very good." **Leinbaugh** replied, "Only one?" **Juedes** replied that's the one that stood out in his mind but that it's hard to remember where they all came out. He reiterated that there was a distribution and that the committee tried to be fair. He reminded senators that this is not *the* answer; it's a good first step towards an evaluation.
- **Peter Jung** asked where we go now and what the process is.
- **Krendl** replied that this is the first time we've been through this kind of study. She stated that she looked at other institutions on how to do this. We've never gathered institution-wide data on our graduate programs. We will now go through the appeals process. Self-studies are on the web, so everyone can look at other examples and see if there are some comparisons. She reminded senators that Jeff Connor, David Juedes, and Ben Ogles did not vote; they facilitated the process, so programs can turn to them for advice on the appeal. She stated that this is one of the building blocks on how we get to a conversation about centers of excellence. She stated that by end of June we must identify centers of excellence. This is a first attempt at how to define this and to figure out how we identify the service they provide, interdisciplinarity, etc. She stated that we're learning from this process and that it's one piece of the puzzle as we identify the centers of excellence at OU. She explained that the board votes on the final decision, but in consultation with the chancellor. Next up is undergraduate programs and interdisciplinary centers of excellence. She stated that we a long way to go yet.
- **Krendl** thanked the committee for their work. She stated that they've done a terrific job compiling information and that we'll get better as we do it. She indicated that we may repeat the process about every five years.

II. Vice President for Finance and Administration—Bill Decatur

- **Decatur** stated that he wanted to update the senate on the budget. He stated that the university is preparing the tentative budget for next year for presentation to the Budget Planning Council on Friday. His office is also planning the budget summits for next week; all three are open to everyone. The intent of these summits is to address the budget challenges in a great deal of detail. Each will have question and answer sessions on the challenges we face. Decatur stated that he hopes to someday talk about new money to spend on our priorities, but he will present the outlook for the current fiscal year based on the governor's budget. He distributed pages from the governor's executive budget that provide line item listing of the budget so that he can present what the governor's budget means for OU. He also will address the next steps in the budget process.
- **Decatur** stated that for the fiscal year 2009 the university put together a contingency plan that planned for a loss of revenue and a loss of state funding. To date, however, state funding has remained harmless. Unfortunately, revenues in December were down some \$25M from revised projections and January's news is depressing. The Office of Budget Management report says that sales and income taxes are down. If things continue to deteriorate, Decatur noted, we should expect state budget cuts. He pointed out that the governor has committed the entire rainy day fund to the next budget. OU has fared well so far, since the State Share of Instruction has remained the same.
- **Decatur** then explained some of the line items in the governor's proposed executive budget. In sum, many programs across the state have been eliminated or reduced. Increases in the state funding are currently predicated on federal stimulus funds being distributed to the state. If these funds aren't forthcoming, then the governor's budget will start over from scratch. The current state budget for the next biennium includes stimulus funds, rainy day funds, and other cash bring downs; the legislature is currently debating whether this is wise. The good news, according to Decatur, is that education is a top priority for the governor, but there are still a lot of potential holes for this budget. Even if federal funds do become available for the state, it doesn't mean we're home free. OU is looking at \$13M to \$16M shortfall under the governor's budget. Tuition is held to zero next year in the governor's budget, and there will be a small increase the next year. If the stimulus doesn't come through, we are back at looking at the dire scenarios we've been working on: well over \$20M shortfall in our budget.
- **Decatur** then summarized what the university is currently doing to plan for the budget. He stated that efforts underway are coming together in the next couple of weeks. First, deans and vice presidents put together recommendations focusing on administrative cost restructuring and cost effectiveness. He stated that announcements about this should come soon. This should generate more than \$5M in short term and less than \$10M in long term savings. Second, the university is looking at total compensation and has put a whole array of options on the table. He stated that the administration is trying to protect the core academic enterprise, but the university has to start making decisions. He stated that it's very clear that even in the best case scenario the university will still see a

\$10M short fall. Accordingly, the university has have to have costs reduced by July 1 and is moving ahead with some strategies for reductions. He stated that there still could be a second phase of reductions from the state. He reported to senators that the entire document, from the executive budget to other plans, changes for primary and secondary education and the University System of Ohio is available on the Ohio Office of Budget Management website. He invited everyone to attend budget summits next week.

- **David Ingram** asked where we are in creating a new formula for distributing the money that's out there in state funds, the State Share of Instruction. **Decatur** replied that he was on that committee and chaired that group, which worked in a short period of time to develop an outcomes based formula as opposed to input based formula, which would focus on FTE and credit hours. The new outcomes based formula will be phased in over several years and is based on course completions. 35% will be based on successful graduation. He reminded senators that 2 to 4 years ago the state revised the State Share of Instruction and produced new taxonomy on the cost structure with emphasis on STEM programs, math, and medicine. That structure was suspended. Since then, enrollment shifts occurred, leading to the new formula, the new taxonomy, and the enrollment shifts happening all at once. The state was afraid of significant ramifications of money reallocations. Decatur stated that different formulas will be used for universities and two-year colleges and that most of the growth in Ohio is in the two-year section. He stated that the more outcome based approach should provide greater stability in funding. He reported that OU will lose about 1% of state funding during the first year due to our lack of STEM areas but we will fare better once the graduation rates are phased into the formula.
- **Ken Brown** asked what "course completion" in the funding formula meant. **Decatur** replied that it meant that being there on the 15th day of the term will not drive funding but who completes the course. **Brown** stated that his former employer did that and it was a disaster.
- **Rudy Pasic** asked about activities to increase the university's income. He stated that we never discuss any means or activities that we could possibly have at the university to perform better. **Krendl** replied that her presentation about enrollment on the regional campuses and the targeted growth from 8,000 to 10,000 students on the regional campuses in the next 5 years is partly about increasing revenue. She stated that the Athens campus has introduced strategic programs, including new cohort programs, programs in online academic programs, memoranda of understanding with some 2-year programs, which allow their students to create transfer agreements with OU in which they spend 2 years there and 2 years here. She stated that the Athens campus is not looking to grow the undergraduate population but is looking at other alternatives; we're not just cutting the budget but also trying to generate new revenue. She stated that academics has to be in the lead position in these efforts.

III. Vice President of Ohio University Student Senate—Sally Neidhard

- **Neidhard** spoke to senators about the upcoming election for a new student trustee. She explained the selection process. Students apply for the position. Applications are reviewed by a committee of the Student Senate. There are then in-person interviews with candidates. Five names are then sent to the governor's office. She reminded senators that there are 2 student trustees, that they are non-voting, and that they rotate out every year. She asked senators to nominate students. She reported that, if she can email a student and say that they've been nominated by a professor, it goes a lot further to get them to apply. She asked senators to send her an email giving her their name. She also asked senators that, if a student asks for a letter of recommendation, to help them with that. February 27 is the due date for applications. Her email address is sn109505@ohio.edu and is also on student senate site. She expressed her appreciation for senators' help with this.
 - **Geoff Buckley** asked what kind of time commitment this position requires. **Neidhard** replied that it is significant. These students serve on a board committee, which meets in addition to the regular board meetings, which require 2 full days of meetings. In addition, the week leading up to those meetings is pretty heavy. These students also serve on student legal services committees and other university committees. Consequently, it is a big time commitment, but it's a good way for students to learn a lot.
 - **Buckley** asked if the applicants had to be sophomores. **Neidhard** replied that any student who would be at OU for two more years, including graduate students, is eligible.
 - **Willem Roosenburg** asked if there was a scholarship requirement. **Neidhard** replied that there is.
 - **Joe Bernt** asked if the selection committee is a student committee. **Neidhard** replied that it is.

IV. Roll Call and Approval of the January 12, 2009 Minutes

- **Beth Quitslund** moved approval of the minutes of the January 12, 2009 meeting. This was seconded by Scott Titsworth. The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

V. Chair's Report – Sergio López-Permouth

- **López** announced that the next senate meeting would be on March 9, 2009 at 7:10 p.m. in Walter Hall 235.
- **López** announced that two items on the agenda will be transposed. He also announced that he has received a lot of supportive email from faculty throughout the university expressing support for the Faculty Senate's standing on the issues recently discussed, especially the search for a new Executive Vice President and Provost. He reminded senators that soon spring will be here and we will be calling for nominations for senate elections. He stated that it has been difficult finding

people to run for senate; some colleges have no alternates this year. He asked senators to tell their colleagues they should run for senate. He stated that having a deep pool will put us in better shape for next year.

- **López** stated that the idea for budget summits came from the constituent senates. The Executive Committee suggested it be done. While the picture is always changing, we have limited time to make decisions. These summits are the only way to have meaningful participation and to provide information as quickly as possible. He stated that there will be 3 summits and encouraged senators to go and hear what the information is and to ask questions. He stated that the different members of BPC have committed to be there at one time or another.
- Becky Watts informed senators that the three summits will take place from 2-4 on Wednesday, February 18 in Baker 240/242, 7-8 on Wednesday in Walter 235, and Thursday at 11:30 in Baker 240.

VI. Finance and Facilities (FFC)--Joe McLaughlin

- **McLaughlin** stated that he intended to yield most of his time to Greg Fialko so that he can present information from the Benefits Advisory Committee. He also encouraged senators to attend the budget summits.
- **McLaughlin** reminded senators that the Faculty Handbook says changes in the benefit plan must be submitted to Faculty Senate. Anthem needs any changes to the plan by March 15. Since March 9 is the only other senate meeting before then, Fialko will present this information tonight and final recommendations will be brought to the next senate meeting. He stated that lots of things are on the table and that big decisions have to be made about compensation. As part of the larger budget decisions, the benefits package is also under consideration. He asked senators to keep in mind that this a piece of the puzzle. Senators can provide reactions or thoughts over the next month to the Finance and Facilities Committee and to **McLaughlin**.
- **Greg Fialko** delivered the following PowerPoint presentation.

Faculty Senate Presentation:
Health Benefits Committee
Recommendations for Budget
Planning Council

February 9, 2009

Health Benefits Committee Charge

- Provide Budget Planning Council with recommendations to decrease University benefits expenditures by:
 - \$1 million
 - \$3 million
 - \$5 million

Benefits FY09 Budget

- Overall Budget \$36.5 Million
- Faculty; Admin; Class. \$31.5 Million
- Employee Premiums \$3.1 Million
- Premium Percent 9.85%

Comparative Data - Premium

- **National Higher Education Survey: 18% Single; 30% Family**
- Ohio 9.85%
- Akron 15%
- BG 9%-12%
- Cincinnati: Union 5%-8% --- Non Union 8%-15%
- Kent State 9%
- Miami 2% - 13% (salary based. \$60K+ 9%-13%)
- Ohio State 15%
- Toledo 22% for most popular plan (3% - 22% range)
- Wright State 7% - 10%

IUC Data from 2007. National Higher Education Survey from Mercer Consulting 2005

Comparative Data – Cost Sharing

	<u>Ohio</u>	<u>National*</u>	<u>IUC**</u>
Copay	\$15	\$17	\$15
Deductible	\$0	\$417 / \$888	\$173 / \$435
Co-Insurance Limit	\$750 / \$1,500	\$1,862 / \$4,105	\$1,295 / \$2,923
Drug Copays:			
Retail	\$10-\$20-\$30	\$9-\$20-\$38	\$8-\$18-\$30
Mail Order	\$15-\$30-\$45	\$17-\$35-\$66	\$16-\$29-\$49

*National Higher Education Survey (Mercer Consulting 2005)

** PPO or equivalent plans

Plan Change Options

• Premiums	1% Increase	\$300K
• Deductible	Every \$100/\$200	\$400K
• Co-Insurance Limit	Every \$100/\$200	\$55K
• Copay – Office Visits	Every \$5	\$220K
• Mandatory Generic		\$400K
• Mandatory Mail Order		\$400K
• Spouse Surcharge	\$50 /month	\$100K
• Smoking Surcharge		\$180K
• OU Spouse Enrollment/Premium		\$60K
• Eliminate Benefits (Vision, Dental)		\$900K
• Etc.		

\$1 Million Recommendation

	Current Benefit	Plan Change	Plan Change Impact
Mandatory Generic	not in place	Implement	\$400,000
Mandatory Mail Order	not in place	Implement	\$400,000
Spouse Surcharge (\$50 Month)	not in place	Implement	\$100,000
Premium based on Highest Paid OU Spouse	not in place	Implement	\$60,000
		Total	\$960,000

\$3 Million Recommendation

	Current Benefit	Plan Change	Plan Change Impact
Premiums	9.85%	12.15%	\$900,000
Deductible	None	\$200 / \$400	\$800,000
Co-Insurance Limit	\$750 / \$1,500	\$1,000/\$2,000	\$137,500
Office Visit Copay	\$15	\$20	\$220,000
Mandatory Generic	not in place	implement	\$400,000
Mandatory Mail Order	not in place	implement	\$400,000
Spouse Surcharge (\$50 Month)	not in place	implement	\$100,000
Premium based on Highest Paid OU Spouse	not in place	implement	\$60,000
		Changes Total	\$3,017,500

\$5 Million Recommendation

	Current Benefit	Plan Change	Plan Change Impact
Premiums	9.85%	16%	\$2,131,000
Deductible	None	\$300 / \$600	\$1,200,000
Co-Insurance Limit	\$750 / \$1,500	\$1,500 / \$3,000	\$495,000
Office Visit Copay	\$15	\$20	\$220,000
Mandatory Generic	not in place	implement	\$400,000
Mandatory Mail Order	not in place	implement	\$400,000
Spouse Surcharge (\$50 Month)	not in place	implement	\$100,000
Premium based on Highest Paid OU Spouse	not in place	implement	\$60,000
		Total Impact	\$5,006,987

All Recommendations

	Current	\$1 Million	\$3 Million	\$5 Million
Premiums	9.85%	No change	12.15%	16%
Deductible	None	No change	\$200 / \$400	\$300 / \$600
Co-Insurance Limit	\$750 / \$1,500	No change	\$1,000/\$2,000	\$1,500 / \$3,000
Office Visit Copay	\$15	No change	\$20	\$20
Mandatory Generic	not in place	implement	implement	implement
Mandatory Mail Order	not in place	implement	implement	implement
Spouse Surcharge (\$50 Month)	not in place	implement	implement	implement
Premium based on Highest Paid OU Spouse	not in place	implement	implement	implement

Premium Comparison

	Current 9.85%	12.15%	16%
Single Monthly	\$30 - \$54	\$38 - \$68	\$49 - \$88
Annual	\$360 - \$648	\$456 - \$816	\$588 - \$1,056
Single + 1 Monthly	\$61 - \$108	\$76 - \$135	\$99 - \$177
Annual	\$732 - \$1,296	\$912 - \$1,620	\$1,188 - \$2,124
Family Monthly	\$91 - \$162	\$113 - \$202	\$149 - \$265
Annual	\$1,092 - \$1,944	\$1,356 - \$2,424	\$1,788 - \$3,180

Deductible and Co-Insurance

- **Deductible:** Amount the employee must pay before the health plan begins paying claims.
- **Exempted from Deductible and Co-Insurance:**
 - Office Visits (currently \$15 copay)
 - Prescription Drugs (various copays)
 - Preventive Care exams, vaccinations, procedures, etc. (\$15 copays; 100% coverage)
 - Physical Therapy Visits (currently \$15 copay)
 - Osteopathic Manipulation (currently \$15 copay)
 - Speech Therapy (currently \$15 copay)
 - Occupational Therapy (currently \$15 copay)
 - Chiropractic Therapy (currently \$15 copay)
 - Maternity (currently \$15 copay)
 - Mental health – outpatient therapy visits
 - Hearing benefits (specific benefit and limits)
 - TMJ benefits (specific benefit and limits)
- **Subject to Deductible and Co-Insurance**
 - Everything not listed above
 - Surgery; Inpatient Care; Outpatient Care; Labs; X-Ray; Diagnostic testing; etc.

Recommended Improvements

	Current Benefit	Plan Change	Impact or Note
Healthy Ohio	NA	Implement	Approved by Vision Ohio
Dental Annual Maximum	\$750 per person	\$1,500 per person	+\$300,000
Dental Employee Premium	No premium for employee	\$5 monthly premium for employee	Can offset cost of annual max increase by \$75,000
Vision – Improve Fac. And Admin Benefit	\$25 per exam. \$55 to \$75 for glasses and frames	Provide same benefit as Classified Staff	+\$225,000
Domestic Partner Eligibility	Same Sex Only	Include Opposite Sex	Minimal – Equity Impact
Increase Child Eligibility with \$50 Monthly Surcharge	To age 19 or 23 if a full time student	To age 25 if a full time student	Increase risk (max exposure \$250,000)
Medical Lifetime Maximum	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000	University increased risk

Additional Recommended Changes

	Current Benefit	Plan Change	Impact or Note
Mental Health Benefits	First 5 visits paid 100%; remaining visits paid 70%	First 5 visits paid 100%; \$15 copay thereafter	Equity / Enhancement Minimal impact
Emergency Room Visits	no deductible; 90%	\$50 Copay Per Visit	Minimal – Encourage use of family physician
Survivor Health Care Benefit	6 months at university expense	Up to 5 years at university expense	\$9,600 or applicable standard rate
Adoption Benefits	None	\$5,000 provided for associated fees	\$30,000

Recommendation	Impact or Note
Consider placing Dental, Vision, Life Insurance out for bid	Pursue efficiencies and/or improved benefit. Research tie in with IUC institutions.

Additional Recommendations: Healthy Ohio

- **Healthy Ohio**
 - Health Risk Appraisal (HRA) \$162,000
 - Assumes 30% participation
 - Wellworks Membership Incentive \$27,000
 - For members who utilize Wellworks 100 times per year
 - Disease Management Programs \$110,000
 - Preventive Care Updates \$100,000
 - Follow Anthem standards, which are more flexible and cover more vaccines and procedures.
- **Annual Total** \$399,000
- **February 13 Deadline to offer HRA in FY2009**

Employee Paid Benefits Enhancements and/or Additions

- Pursue the following
 - Supplemental Life Insurance
 - Increase benefit allowed to \$500,00
 - Dependent Life Insurance
 - Increase benefit allowed to \$50,000
 - Short Term Disability
 - Long Term Care
 - Legal Services

Questions for Greg Fialko

- **Tom Flynn** asked how the \$1M, \$3M, and \$5M options match up with the budget scenarios departments are currently considering. **Fialko** replied that this was not yet determined. **Flynn** asked when this decision had to be made. **Fialko** replied that the deadline was March 15. **Flynn** asked what additional information was likely to come to light between now and the 15th. **Fialko** replied that we should have a refined sense of the budget. **Flynn** asked when the deadline for the state budget is. **Fialko** replied that the final budget should be available by the end of June or July. **Flynn** asked how much of a gamble the university was taking with the budget. **Krendl** stated that we'll know about the stimulus before June or July.
- **Fialko** stated that all users are contributing to the benefits changes, since everyone pays premiums. **Ken Brown** stated that these changes are fairly devastating. He estimated that it means close to \$1400 per employee on average plus a 0% raise pool. **Fialko** replied that his committee's charge was to find a way to adjust by \$1M, \$3M, and \$5M, but they were aware of the affects. He stated that these changes bring our costs closer to the norm at other institutions.
- **Chris Bartone** asked who faculty should contact between now and the next senate meeting. **McLaughlin** replied that faculty should contact him, Sergio, David Thomas, and Ann Tickameyer, who are all members of the Budget Planning Council.
- **Doug Bolon** asked whether the committee had considered a major redesign, such as moving to a consumer-based system, and HMO, etc. **Fialko** stated that such options are limited by the fact that there is no local HMO. There is the option of a dental PPO, but none of the dentists in the area are members of the PPO, since they don't want to renegotiate new fees.
- **Toby Stock** asked about cafeteria style plans. **Fialko** stated that this might be the long-term approach adopted at some point in the future.
- **Willem Roosenburg** asked about the income brackets for determining premiums. **Joe McLaughlin** reiterated the brackets. **Roosenburg** asked whether the committee had considered changing the bracket system. **Fialko** stated that the committee has discussed it but chose not to bring it forward at this time, since the brackets were only created a couple of years ago. Furthermore, there are so few people in the highest bracket that it doesn't impact the final targets.
- **Stock** asked about flexible spending accounts and whether they could be abused by faculty who leave before fully investing. **Fialko** stated that about 700 employees current use such accounts. He acknowledged that the scenario suggested by Stock is possible, but he doesn't think it currently happens.
- **McLaughlin** reminded senators that whatever the Budget Planning Council recommends will be brought to the senate next month. He again encouraged senators to attend the budget summits.

VII. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Scott Titsworth

- **Titsworth** reported that EPSA has a meeting at the beginning of the month. In this meeting they heard about a program to consolidate midterm grade checks and

- saw no down side to it. He also reported that EPSA discussed an online form to let advisors know about at risk students.
- **Titsworth** reported on the committee’s work on quarters to semesters. The committee discussed general education and has agreed to change the English 151 credit hours to 3.0. The committee is currently gathering feedback about general education from quarters to semesters coordinators and will have a resolution on this. This resolution will be an omnibus resolution at the next meeting that will detail general education semesters.
 - **Titsworth** reported that EPSA has one more meeting to deal with non-Q2S issues, such as reaction to the early student alert system, the issue of repeating courses when you’ve already taken subsequent courses in a sequence, AP credit, issues about electronically distribute syllabi. He noted that the handbook currently says that the syllabus is to be distributed but does not specify how. The committee wants to develop best practice standards for units.
 - There were no questions for Titsworth.

VIII. Promotion and Tenure (P&T)—Peter Coschigano

- **Coschigano** reported on the individual college P&T workshops. He thanked members of the committee for attending the workshops.
- **Coschigano** stated that the committee is looking at revising the appeals language in the handbook to streamline and clarify some elements.
- **Coschigano** updated the senate on two appeals: one appeal hearing is scheduled for this week; another one will be formally appointed this week.
- There were no questions for Coschigano.

IX. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

- **Gradin** referred back to the Provost’s comments about putting the deans’ evaluation process online. She reported that PRC had a discussion on March 10 about the dean’s evaluations. She stated that there were mixed responses from us on several things, including the online survey, whether Group 2 faculty could serve on the committee, how often it would be done, etc. She reported that this process is already underway this year. She stated that Marty Tuck showed her the online survey that will be used this spring. She also has from Tuck a copy of a memo from Dennis Irwin, who chaired a committee of the evaluation committees last year. She stated that PRC intends to look at the process and to recommend changes. She reminded senators that the senate had recommended going to online survey, which has been done.
- **Joe Bernt** asked about the current handbook language about the deans’ evaluation process. He stated that he hadn’t read it for a couple of years. He asked, “Does it allow for changing to an online process?” **Tuck** stated that the handbook says a survey should be done and that it should leave room for open-ended comments. **Bernt** asked how committees are established. **Gradin** replied that they are partly nominated through Faculty Senate. **Tuck** stated that half the committee is

- appointed by senate and half through the provost's office. He said that there are typically 4 members, except for Arts and Sciences, which has 6 members.
- **Gradin** stated that she doesn't know who served on the committee of chairs of last year's evaluation committees, which is the committee that made these recommendations.
 - **McLaughlin** stated that this is already in process even though we haven't seen it. **Gradin** replied that it was. She said that PRC met on Wednesday and those of who were there didn't have any major issues with online survey. In fact, they saw some advantages. There were 5 members of the committee present. She stated that the announcement will coming to faculty via email and that faculty when also receive a reminder. **Tuck** clarified that faculty will have 2 weeks to complete the survey.
 - **David Ingram** stated that the Provost's written report mentions that data on demographic subgroups is reported only if 5 or more faculty members report being part of the subgroup. He reminded senators that the Faculty Handbook prohibits this entirely. **Tuck** asked for clarification. **Ingram** therefore read from the Faculty Handbook, which states: "This questionnaire must be entirely anonymous, with no demographic data collected and no tracking of individual responses to different questions" (VII.E.9). **Gradin** stated that there will be no tracking. **Ingram** replied that the provost's report indicated that it could be done. **Gradin** stated that she will follow up on that. She stated that the committees will also be able to add questions that they want to add, which is the same as current process.
 - **Valerie Conley** asked whether the survey collects demographic data. **Gradin** showed the survey on the screen. **Tuck** stated that there are questions at the end about tenure status and length of employment.
 - **Jeff Giese** suggested that PRC needs to look at the survey to see if it follows the Faculty Handbook.
 - **Tracy Leinbaugh** stated that any tracking really affects faculty in small colleges. **Gradin** stated that PRC will follow up on it.
 - **McLaughlin** asked whether Gradin received this information on Thursday. **Gradin** replied that what she got on Thursday was the memo and the recommendations from the committee of committee chairs. She stated that the survey was dropped off the week of the storm. **McLaughlin** asked why, if the committee was comprised of last year's committees, the memo is from Dean Irwin. **Tuck** stated that the committee was committee chairs and Dennis.
 - **McLaughlin** asked when this survey goes live. **Tuck** replied that he hopes it goes live at the end of the month. He reminded senators that the handbook just says that a survey goes out. **McLaughlin** stated that it also says not to collect demographic information. He stated that this looks like a rush job to him.
 - **Gradin** agreed that we need more information on whether these are the same questions as the previous evaluation. **Tuck** replied that it is a totally new evaluation. **Gradin** asked who made up the questions. **Tuck** replied that the Idea Center made them.
 - **Bernt** asked who owns the data that comes from the survey. He asked if it is considered public information. **Gradin** responded that it is her understanding that

when the Idea Center has it, it is more “protected” than it might have been in the past. She thought that one of the driving things of this change is you could get the results more quickly, surveys would not get lost in the mail, and committees could work faster. She stated that committees have said in the past that public requests for the information have slowed them down. **Gradin** read the committee’s recommendation from the memo.

- **Norma Pecora** stated that there is nothing wrong with an online survey. She says that we should pluck last year’s questions and put them online. Her concern is that it’s a corporation that doesn’t know us who has access to this data, not that it’s an online survey. She also stated her concerns about the other questions about tenure, etc . She said, she’s not uncomfortable with the online element.
- **Gradin** stated that the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs works with the Idea center to make up the content. **Tuck** stated that we can add questions. **López** asked whether we can you remove questions. **Tuck** replied that he wasn’t sure. **Pecora** noted that technically you should be able to add or subtract questions; the Idea Center just may not allow it.
- **Peter Jung** wanted to know what happens if someone doesn’t answer a question. **Tuck** replied that their responses should still be counted.
- **Steve Patterson** asked about continuity with the past. **Bartone** asked whether we can take last year’s questions and drop them into the survey. **Tuck** stated that we can add up to 4 questions. **Gradin** stated that they have a set of prefabricated questions they ask; we are allowed to add some local questions.
- **Tuck** stated that he thought the new survey was a better survey than last year.
- **Giesey** stated that we have to be careful what we do since the response rate is small. He stated that we must uphold principles of the handbook. **Tuck** reiterated that the handbook says a survey. **Giesey** replied that it calls for no demographic information.
- **Gradin** pointed out that, to meet the handbook’s guidelines, the final section should come out. **Tuck** replied that we’ll have to talk to the Idea Center. **Gradin** noted that if they can’t be removed the questions we’re in violation of the handbook.
- **Bolon** stated that faculty should have some input into all of the questions. He asked who the Idea Center is. **Roosenburg** asked how much they are getting paid. **Bolon** stated that faculty should be involved in setting up the questions.
- **Gradin** stated that there was a discussion with the deans and the senate talked about it here. She stated that PRC had issues and was not aware that this committee was working and bringing these recommendations.
- **Bernt** stated that this is the deans whining to the provost about people getting ahold of the information before nasty comments were eliminated. He said that it’s being used to hide this information. The committee of chairs was to benefit the whining deans and then run it by the Faculty Senate at some point. **Gradin** stated that the deans are frustrated about the low response rate. She said that the senate talked about ways to get the response rate up. She stated that she has no problem with the deans wanting a good assessment. She also stated that this doesn’t mean that what Bernt is saying is incorrect. **McLaughlin** stated that these problems are

- legitimate but some kind of outsourced rush job is not the way to do business. **Gradin** reiterated the dates on which she received word of the process.
- **Conley** stated that this is a step toward improving the process. She stated that there is something to be said about having an external body conducting the survey and having people feel more comfortable providing responses. She stated that if we could come to a compromise and get rid of the demographic information this would be a good process. She said that we also need to discuss whether we would get data back in a format that could be used after the fact. **Tuck** responded that we'll get a report. **McLaughlin** asked how the comments will be reported back. **Tuck** stated that they will be in the report.
 - **Giesey** asked whether the originals will be destroyed, like when Mike Williford did the evaluation. **Williford** stated that prior to last year his office transcribed the comments to preserve anonymity; last year, legal affairs and the provost's office decides to give the committees the original comments. **Gradin** stated that committee chairs said that was a problem.
 - **David Thomas** read from the Idea Center's documentation, which states that they own the data. **Pecora** stated that this is standard operating procedure.
 - **Bolon** wanted to know when faculty became so inept that we can't even construct our own questionnaire to evaluate deans. He said if anyone should be able to develop questionnaires, it should be faculty. He said this is the same thing as with the provost search—why do we need a head hunter firm to do this? He said that everything is being farmed out, and he doesn't see the need to farm these things out. **Tuck** stated that we have a hard enough time getting people to serve on the committees.
 - **Gradin** noted that one of the arguments for doing the outsourcing is that Institutional Research doesn't have the staff or the time to do this. She stated that it sounds like Marty and I need to meet and find out what we can do about getting some of those questions off there. She said they also need to check these questions against our previous evaluation questions.
 - **McLaughlin** stated that he would want PRC to sign off on it as a provisional solution for this year or maybe this is something that needs to come to the whole body. **Bernt** suggested voting on this at the next meeting, when we'll know more about the data and whether it will be returned to this institution and whether it is a public record. **Pecora** stated that she supports this.
 - **Conley** asked whose evaluation of the deans this is. **Gradin** responded that the faculty does the evaluating and gives it to the provost. She stated that during the comprehensive 5-year review it changes, but no one is up for 5-year review this year. **Tuck** clarified that the survey does not change for a 5-year review; we just cast a wider net: focus groups, etc. are up to the committees, except for the last question about renewal.
 - **Gradin** asked whether a committee could poll Group 2 faculty. **Tuck** replied that they could. **Gradin** asked if there is a deadline in the handbook. **Tuck** responded that you have to have time for the committees to write the report and for the provost to meet with the deans.

- **Bolon** stated that even though there is a contractual agreement with the Idea Center, we can always roll out the old questionnaire for one more year and give people time for developing the questionnaires.
- **David Descutner** asked whether PRC had reviewed the questions. **Gradin** responded that they had not. She said that the committee does not have objections to moving to an online survey but did not get through the questions. **Descutner** pointed out that McLaughlin wants PRC to review the survey and compare questions.
- **Bolon** noted that there are a lot of questions about the Idea Center but that we also don't want to hold up the process. **Leinbaugh** stated that faculty were left out of the loop. **Gradin** responded that there was a faculty committee, but PRC and the senate didn't know what the committee recommended. **Tuck** disagreed with Gradin's characterization of their meeting, which he said included a discussion of some of these issues. **Gradin** stated that did not give PRC enough time to consider the survey thoroughly. **Gradin** noted that PRC did not spend more time on this issue because they were told it was already happening. [Note: After the meeting, Gradin checked her calendar and discovered that she received the survey from Tuck on January 15.]
- **López** stated that it sounds like the correct thing to do is not to rush it. He stated that he had talked with Krendl and **suggested** that she contact Gradin so PRC could give a **report on** their impression on this. He said that somehow one or two weeks got lost there, partly because of the storm. He **said** that PRC discussed this at the same time that the informational meetings were happening. He said that the big issue is **if one** side decides that there's no reason for you to look at this but the other side may not feel that way. He said that we talked about communicating it to make sure that both sides are ok with it. Somehow we've not had enough time to look at this and its going to set us back maybe a month have to make sure that things are done correctly.

X. A resolution to defend the Faculty Handbook for second reading and vote – Ken Brown

- Senators called for a quorum count. Only 24 senators were present, which was not a quorum. This resolution was therefore postponed to the next meeting.

XI. New Business

- There was no new business.

XII. Adjournment

- Norma Pecora moved for adjournment. Allyn Reilly second the motion, which passed on a voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM.

Resolution to Defend the Faculty Handbook

February 9, 2009

For second reading and vote

Whereas the Ohio University Faculty Handbook is official university policy (Handbook, p. 1), and

Whereas the Faculty Senate has an obligation to current and future faculty, as well as to its predecessor faculty senates, to uphold and defend the Faculty Handbook, and

Whereas the Faculty Handbook provides (section IIIA) that any changes to employee's costs for the health care benefit must be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval, and

Whereas employee monthly contributions were raised on July 1, 2007, without consideration by the Faculty Senate, let alone the Senate's approval, and

Whereas this action is a clear violation of the Faculty Handbook:

Be it resolved that employee contributions to the health care benefit be immediately rolled back to the contributions in force during the 2006-2007 fiscal year, and

Be it further resolved that the excess contributions collected from employees since July 1, 2007, be returned via a "premium holiday."

Furthermore,

Whereas the current worldwide economic crisis has had ramifications significantly affecting the State of Ohio and, in particular, the Budget of Ohio University, and

Whereas President Roderick McDavis acknowledged and apologized for the incorrect handling of the process leading to the approval of the increases in employee monthly contributions of July 1, 2007, during his report to this Senate of January 12, 2009, and

Whereas during that meeting of the Faculty Senate, President McDavis also expressed his willingness to find an appropriate resolution to this dilemma once the overall budget situation becomes clearer, and

Whereas the employees of Ohio University have already greatly contributed to easing the budget problems of the institution with the contributions they have made which by the end of this year will have generated as much as 3 million dollars in two years, and

Whereas the Faculty Senate wishes to act in a spirit of collegiality as we all look for ways to weather this economic storm,

Be it further resolved that the roll back and reimbursements recommended here be suspended if the university agrees not to raise the employee health care costs any further for the next fiscal year.
