

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Agenda for Monday, February 22, 2010
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
[Summary]

Note: The meeting scheduled for 2/15/10 was postponed to 2/22/10 due to inclement weather.

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:10 p.m.

I. Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit

EVPP Benoit began by introducing Mike Angelini (Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration). She announced the appointment of Dianne Bouvier as the new university Ombudsman, effective March 1st, and thanked the members of the search committee for their work. Benoit also congratulated Peter Jung on his Distinguished Professor award and lecture.

Benoit continued with an enrollment update: while applications and final admits are down slightly compared to last year (12,664 applications, 754 fewer than last year; 659 final admits compared to 731 last year), the ACT scores and GPA of the application pool has increased (from an average 23.49 ACT last year to 23.77; and from an average 3.29 GPA last year to a 3.32 GPA). The ACT scores of the final admits are also higher (24.13 at this time last year, 24.20 this year), while the average GPA of 3.42 remains the same. Graduate application are up 241 from last year, and final admits are up 48 from last year.

Benoit then discussed the draft budget recommendations released February 15. She emphasized that these recommendations were made public early in the process so that the entire campus could provide feedback. The draft recommendations were extremely difficult to construct. Priority was given to activities that support enrollment objectives, protect graduation/retention rates, generate student credit hours, preserve the quality of the student experience, and advance research and creative activity; these criteria are also reflected in the Resolution on Budget Priorities passed by Faculty Senate and signed by Benoit. The draft recommendations need further refinement, more data can be gathered, a better understanding of the consequences of cuts can be gained, and new ideas brought forward. The process is experimental and "messy," but the goal is to make the process as bottom-up, as transparent and open, as multi-year, and as strategic as possible. Benoit reminded the faculty senate of the upcoming budget forums:

Budget Forum for Faculty: Tuesday, February 23, 4:00 - 5:30 p.m., Bentley 227

Budget Forum for Staff (Classified & Administrative): Wednesday, February 24, 12:00 - 1:30 p.m., Walter 235

General Budget Forum: Thursday, February 25, 4:00 - 6:00 p.m., Bentley 236

Budget Forum for Students: Thursday, February 25, 6:30 - 7:30 p.m., Baker Center 503

Q: From the beginning of the process, we have been told we cannot continue to do across-the-board budget cuts as in the past. But in actual fact what has happened are the same old uniform cuts. How did the decision get made to change the process and principles and to spread the pain around, and when was that decision made? It does not look like we have restructured the budget, or that there won't be anything we're doing now that we won't be doing next year.

Benoit: I would disagree. I think we have maintained the principles articulated at the beginning. We asked units for strategic cuts using the criteria we set up at the beginning of the process, and looked at every proposed cut to see how it aligned with those criteria, regardless of the unit involved. It is important to realize that we need to look at activities, not units, and see how activities contribute to the mission of the University. Across campus, some things look very different; units are merging, and we are thinking differently about how we manage campus recreation and the OU Press. It is not a matter of whether we have eliminated a unit, but whether we can change how a unit thinks about doing business with respect to the priorities within the unit.

Q: It is correct to assume that things in the difficult column will come up as probable cuts next year?

Benoit: I would say they are possible rather than probable cuts, because some cuts were not included on the list this year because they take longer to implement (e.g. reorganizations). We have told the units that this is a multi-year process, and we need to plan for it now.

Q. I'm pleased that the largest percentage cuts come from President and Provost offices. But in Arts and Science, cuts are coming from teaching, particularly adjunct teaching. How do you reconcile the goal of increasing enrollment – bringing in more students at the same level of quality – while at the same time reducing the teaching lines of people who teach larger numbers of students? Large sections are usually introductory, and usually taught by adjuncts, and they're being let go. Upper level courses (taught by Group I faculty) have to be small. If the goal is to increase enrollment and maintain quality, we need more teaching lines, not fewer.

Benoit: The aim is not to increase enrollment across the board, but in targeted areas. We have to think about where we want to increase enrollments ("smart growth"). Also, as we reduce instructional capacity (which will have to happen because of the budget cuts), we have asked units to reduce capacity where it will have the least impact. Also, it is a fallacy to assume that quality is always related to class size. We need to think about where we can increase class size, and where we can't. We need to look at other models for teaching upper-level electives: can we alternate courses, or teach the courses in a different way? We are not at the point of laying off tenure track faculty; we are trying to protect that which is core to us. In order to do that, we have to think about how to do things differently.

A senator commented that we are at the point of effectively cutting Group I faculty, because we are not filling empty Group I lines. Benoit offered to send some data about the number of group I faculty.

Q. Can you elaborate on the proposed cuts listed under Graduate College/Research?

Benoit: Maintaining research/creative activity is really important, and we tried to protect that as much as possible. **Rathindra Bose** (Vice President for Research/ Dean of the Graduate College) added that the 7% proposed cut is not really 7%, because some expenses were moved to other funds (e.g. endowment).

Q: In the College of Arts & Sciences, when the 5% & 10% scenarios were submitted, you chose to cut some items from the 10% scenarios in order to protect faculty lines; did that happen across the board?

Benoit: Arts & Sciences submitted their cuts by department, so it was hard for us to make strategic cuts across the College. So we went back to those criteria, and tried to protect instructional capacity in Arts & Sciences the most. Then we met with the Dean, and asked for more information about which cuts are more strategic, and adjustments will be made. You are seeing the messy part of the budget process, because we are not done yet. We did choose some items from the 10% scenarios in other units. If the 5% cuts did not align with the criteria, we looked at the 10% cuts to see if something was less strategic there.

Q: I am concerned about the way our business process has developed in the last 5-10 years. For example, P-cards, Concur, and Oracle were supposed to make life easier, but actually it's harder. This is a concern because it is an inefficient use of our time – we have more forms, and less efficiency. In addition, we never get a cost/benefit analysis of whether or not these systems work.

Angelini: I arrived here a little under 2 years ago, and I have been amazed at how little we do get from Oracle. We're trying to figure out how to get more out of it and make things easier. I am not willing to throw in the towel on Concur, but it has been a problem. We would like to talk with people about where it went wrong, and how to improve it. We are starting to do some cost/benefit analysis with the endowment.

Several Senators expressed frustration with these systems.

Q: Who is keeping track of the budget numbers during this process: is it internal or do we have a consultant? And are there any plans to realign Colleges?

Benoit: We are running the numbers internally, primarily John Day, Rebecca Vazquez-Skillings, and Mike Angelini. Part I of restructuring is under way; some additional restructuring may be coming, but there will need to be a separate process for any further restructuring.

Q. I first want to thank you for the transparency of this process. But I also want to criticize the term "smart enrollment." The departments are already pretty smart about this. By firing adjuncts (the people who teach the most for the least amount), it will unbalance enrollments. In a few years we will see bad consequences from cutting what is actually already smart enrollment. It is going to hurt financially.

Benoit: I want to clarify what I mean by smart enrollment. In which areas do we target to bring in new students? We need to be careful, because we know we have places

where we can increase capacity, and places where we don't. We want to increase enrollments for a lower cost.

Q. Can you talk about the status of the merged office of University Outreach and Regional Campuses, and about the recommendations contained in the Report of the Task Force of the Future of Regional Campuses? I cannot tell if any actions have been taken.

Benoit: I just asked Dean Evans to highlight what he thought were the most important ideas to take out of that report, and we need to develop a set of action steps that we can implement to make some headway on these issues. In terms of University Outreach and Regional Campuses, we're looking at how to continue improving the merging of regional and outreach.

II. Jim Sand—Director, University Judiciaries

Jim Sand gave a brief presentation on the University Hearing Boards and Appeal Boards. He asked faculty to help in three ways:

- 1) Serve on a Hearing Board or Appeal Board.
- 2) Share the information with colleagues who might be interested in serving.
- 3) Help recruit students to apply to serve on the boards (students must apply and interview).

Faculty are asked to commit to one hearing every two weeks, although they are often less frequent and there is some flexibility in scheduling. A current faculty member serving on hearing boards added that it was very satisfying and interesting, and recommended participation. Faculty may contact Kelly M. Pero (593-2629, perok@ohio.edu). Students may pick up applications in the Office of Judiciaries beginning April 5, 2010, or may email judiciaries@ohio.edu.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the January 11, 2010 Minutes

A quorum was present. The minutes of January 11th, 2010 were approved by voice vote.

IV. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

- Updates and Announcements
 - McLaughlin asked senators to encourage participation in the upcoming Dean's evaluations in order to increase response rates.
 - Faculty senate nominations for next year will be requested soon; start thinking about potential nominees. We would like to strive for more diversity in the Faculty Senate.

–McLaughlin also recognized Peter Jung as Distinguished Professor. Six of the last eight Distinguished Professors are people who have served on Faculty Senate recently.

–McLaughlin and Ming Li attended the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) meeting. We will start looking at specific COIA recommendations on best practices.

Q: Is there any way to get information from Colleges and Universities that have dropped out of division I? Other universities are making hard decisions; it would be helpful to get feedback from colleges/universities that have gone through this.

McLaughlin: Very few MAC schools belong to COIA; we are hoping to take a division approach and get more MAC schools involved.

Steve Hays encouraged all those interested in these issues to attend **Budget Cuts Happen, II: What about Intercollegiate Athletics?** This is sponsored by FutureOU and the Graduate Student Senate, and will take place this **Friday (2/26), 3:30-5:30 in Baker Center Ballroom A.**

Hays will present historic and comparative data on the cost of Intercollegiate Athletics at OU as the basis for discussion among faculty, students, and staff of ICA's appropriate future in view of ongoing budget constriction.

–McLaughlin also reminded faculty of the upcoming budget forums (see page 1 for dates/times).

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: March 15, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

V. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Jeff Giesey

- Resolution to Establish Drop/Add and Withdrawal Deadlines Under Semesters—Second Reading & Vote

Minor changes were made from the first reading to reflect the calendar change to a 14-week semester (with 55 minute classes), and to adjust summer terms. The resolution was passed by voice vote.

VI. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Pete Coschigano

- Resolution on Correcting Inconsistencies in the P&T Appeal Process—Second Reading & Vote

Coschigano explained that in the process of revising the appeal process in the case of denial of tenure last year, some parallel language was not incorporated in all sections of the Faculty Handbook. This resolution makes the process in all areas consistent. The resolution was passed by voice vote.

VII. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—Scott Titsworth

- Titsworth reported that the committee brought in someone to discuss the potential public/private partnership for upgrading and maintaining dorms on South Green. One concern is that the increasing level of programming related to academics that takes place in the residence halls be maintained under a public/private partnership. The committee that is overseeing the public/private partnership will form a working committee to make sure that this is not lost. With \$480 million in deferred maintenance across Athens and regional campuses (and \$140 million of this in auxiliaries), a public/private partnership seems like the best of a bad situation. The primary benefit is to transfer responsibility for deferred maintenance.

- Howard Lipman (Vice President For University Advancement) met with the committee to talk about development, and the upcoming capital campaign (about \$350 million). About 67% of development money goes toward academics; 29% goes toward scholarships; and the remaining 4% goes to athletics, capital, and unrestricted funds. Development has a consistent record of over-attaining their goals. The committee thought this was a very helpful presentation, and Titsworth will make a PowerPoint with the numbers available.

Senators expressed some concerns about the proposed public/private partnership, especially with respect to controlling dorm prices, and ceding revenue (auxiliaries is one of the few university units that operates with a profit). A visitor to Faculty Senate asked if private businesses can get loans to renovate on the promise of future revenue from the dorms, why couldn't OU do the same thing?

McLaughlin responded: 1) While our loan amount is not high compared to other institutions, we have no cash in the bank, which makes it difficult to add more loans. 2) We have almost \$500 million in deferred maintenance, much of which is in the dorms. Titsworth added that some sources of revenue for deferred maintenance, such as the capital bill, are uncertain because of the state budget.

VIII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

Gradin reported on three items:

- 1) Voinovich School: The committee is trying to sort out how the Voinovich School operates, especially with respect to Faculty Senate representation, professional ethics committees, and in conjunction with the P&T committee, issues related to promotion and tenure.

- 2) Faculty Fellowship Leaves: There is frustration in Arts & Sciences because not all University faculty fellowship leaves were used last year (39 were awarded out of

55 available), even though Arts and Sciences had some leaves turned down by the Provost's Office, creating a backlog. The committee is researching how faculty fellowship leaves are used across Colleges, why they are not being used, and so on, before presenting any resolutions.

McLaughlin pointed out that the Appendix A to the Faculty Handbook says that 5-6% of the faculty can be on leave at a time. We're trying to figure out if that quota still makes sense in 2010. A senator pointed out that if faculty members can go on leave every eighth year, 12.5% of the faculty should be on leave at any given time. Another faculty member asked what will happen this year in Arts & Sciences, and McLaughlin said that the Executive Committee has put this on the table with the Provost. One way to address this in the short term is to change how we count faculty leaves, and to apply the quota per quarter of leave rather than per person. Another senator noted that his department has a backlog as well, and that this does not just apply to Arts & Sciences.

3) The committee will be investigating the criminal background check policy and report back to Faculty Senate. They have just accessed the most recent draft of the policy. The background checks are across the board (not just for faculty); we need to determine what type of information is included (e.g. if it includes convictions only, or also arrests).

IX. New Business

None.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.