

**Ohio University Faculty Senate**  
**Monday, January 23, 2012**  
**Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.**  
**SUMMARY**

Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin called the meeting to order at 7:10.

**I. President McDavis and EVPP Benoit**

- **President McDavis** addressed three topics: the University's capital improvement plan, the changes in the Enterprise University proposals at the state level, and OHIO's recent international outreach.
  1. The capital plan: At its November meeting, the Board of Trustees approved a capital improvement plan for the University, with an overall investment of \$2.57 billion projected over the next twenty years, with funding from a wide variety of sources. The first six years of the plan calls for \$977.5 million in capital improvements, of which \$567.5 will be funded through issuing debt. The goal of the plan is to maintain and improve academic and residential facilities, with the aim of reducing a deferred maintenance burden which otherwise threatens the basic functionality of the University's physical plant. While we still hope for about \$22 million from the State in this biennium (on par with previous cycles), it is still uncertain and in no way sufficient to the University's current needs. The President indicated that 70% of core academic buildings on OHIO campuses will be affected by the plan, which was developed largely through VP for Finance Steve Golding's staff with the help of deans, vice presidents, the Facilities Planning Council, and professional advice from the Sightlines consulting group. (The complete plan will be available on the Faculty Senate website by Feb. 1: <http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/>). The University's 2011 financial statements can be seen through the Finance office's website: <http://www.ohio.edu/finance/controller/reports.cfm>.
  2. Enterprise Universities, evaporation of: The President reported that discussions in Columbus about Enterprise Universities have turned away from the idea of a voluntary program that would exchange direct State Share of Instruction dollars for scholarship money and toward mandate relief for all state universities. The mandates currently on the table include several different kinds of regulation. A number of proposals would expedite the business of Board of Trustees or allow them some closed sessions. Proposed changes to the rules for capital improvement and construction would exempt universities from State procurement requirements, increase the bid limit for Requests for Proposals, eliminate escrow/retainage rules, and eliminate the Ohio Arts Council's oversight of the Percent for Art projects. At the university level, a wide variety of different rules could be altered, including eliminating enrollment limits, allowing universities to officially partner with other state institutions of higher education, and allow schools to set different tuition rates for space and facilities reasons. Finally, proposals for state-level mandate relief would allow some health and safety code exemptions equivalent to private workplaces, remove university employees from the purview of the State Personnel Board of Review, and exempt universities from Chapter 124 (employment regulations for classified employees).
  3. International relations update: In early December, anOHIO delegation traveled to Malaysia and Hong Kong in order to connect with academic partner institutions, cultivate supporters, and engage alumni. In addition to meetings with dignitaries and educational partners, the delegation attended to alumni chapter events and received a gift of \$750,000 from the Yayasan Sime Darby Foundation for the Southeast Asian Studies Tun Abdul Razak Chair.

- **Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit** provided brief updates on several topics.
  1. The Parental Leave Task Force is at work and expected to present recommendations in February.
  2. At their most recent meeting, the Trustees received recommendations from the 1804 Task Force on General Education (not yet been posted for campus-wide review). This followed up on the earlier report of the General Education Assessment Working Group: (<http://www.ohio.edu/institres/assessments/genedassess2010.pdf>).
  3. Last week, her office collaborated with the Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee to provide a workshop for chairs and directors on annual evaluation letters. Another P&T workshop is planned for spring, and topic suggestions are welcome.

### **Questions and Discussion:**

Most of the discussion focused on the capital improvement plan and its relationship to the University's financial health. Senators sought reassurance that OHIO was not going to be hopelessly mired in debt (the dominant analogy was "Greece"), and confused about massive proposed spending in the aftermath of years of cutting the institution's budget. Responses to these concerns came from the President, the EVPP, and **VP for Finance Steve Golding**. All three emphasized how unsustainable it is for the University to continue to defer maintenance. In 2003-4, our deferred maintenance costs per aggregate square foot were \$64; they are currently \$78, and by 2020 would reach \$100 if policy did not change. At that point, according to Sightlines, facilities risk being unrecoverable. The Trustees understand the gravity of the problems with the physical plant, which include serious safety concerns as well as reduced functionality for research and teaching. On the question of how risky debt might be, Golding noted that although the budget has been relentlessly cut over the last 14-15 years, the University has taken on relatively little debt and thus has a better debt ratio (as defined under S.B. 6) than it had four years ago. Furthermore, the work will be approved and completed in increments (beginning with a 6-year-plan), and debt will be similarly paid off along the way. This approach is designed to allow for adjustments in the plan if assumptions about the University's finances turn out not to be accurate. In response to a suggestion that it might be wiser to slash enrollment and close unworkable buildings, the President replied that doing so would still mean the need to repair the remaining buildings, with a much-reduced revenue stream (in addition to shrinking personnel).

A short conversation took place about other international areas. A senator noted that the Russ College had large numbers of alumni in Saudi Arabia. President McDavis said that OHIO is indeed looking at expanding both academic relationships and fundraising efforts in the Middle East, and that Saudi Arabia is a country being considered.

The final questions centered on the idea of state "mandate relief." When a senator noted that some of the proposals represented evasions of other goods (e.g., 1% of construction monies for the arts), the President emphasized that he was simply reporting the way that legislative discussions were moving. He did agree that the University would have to have a process to decide which of the eventually offered forms of relief it would choose to accept. Asked about whether this was in any way tied to reductions in SSI, the President said that it was not. The EVPP also noted, however, that *if* the reduction in regulation did end up saving universities money, the State might eventually find in that a rationale to reduce direct State funds.

## **I.A. VP for Finance Steve Golding and Director of Procurement Services Laura Nowicki**

- Bobcat BUY

In response to the State's encouragement of IUC schools collaborating to reduce procurement costs, and with funding from a Lumina Foundation "Making Opportunity Affordable" grant, OHIO and six other IUC schools have invested in SciQuest eprocurement software. The system is intended to make procurement more efficient through a streamlined all-electronic process and to assist in identifying ways that using common vendors can yield better negotiated costs. All realized savings remain with the unit or college; this cost-reduction was among the non-personnel savings opportunities identified by the Trustees for meeting straitened budgets. The expectation is that PCards will remain active for some employees for some time, and will be replaced with another mechanism (as yet undeveloped) for emergency purchasing. The travel system may eventually be affected as well. [Nowicki's presentation to the Senate was a shortened version of the first hour of Bobcat BUY training, and the slides are attached to the end of the summary.]

### **Questions and Discussion:**

Senators expressed concerns about the ability to continue purchasing highly-specialized research supplies from specialist vendors, as well as the ability to choose product configurations or take advantage of sales or reduced prices. Nowicki agreed that some research needs might need to go through very particular vendors, and that the system might provide deans with recommendations for cheaper ways to make some purchases. There were also worries about the apparent complexity of the system, Concur being mentioned as an analogue. Other senators wondered about grants written for equipment from particular manufacturers and how those would flow through the Bobcat BUY system (or not). Nowicki responded that the system also works for non-catalogue items, and that lag time would in many cases be reduced because orders are issued the same day that the purchase is initiated. Some comments were directed at the need for some way of buying materials from niche suppliers quickly, without cumbersome paperwork ahead of time (e.g., musical instrument parts). Golding emphasized the financial risk that PCards represent to the institution and the Trustees' concern about them. Joe McLaughlin asked that any questions that had not been answered be sent to him, John Gilliom, Steve Golding, or Laura Nowicki.

## **II. Roll Call and Approval of the November 14, 2011 Minutes**

The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

## **III. Chair's Report—Joe McLaughlin**

- Updates and Announcements:

McLaughlin reported that his attention had recently been devoted to the capital improvement plan, faculty concerns about Bobcat BUY, and the unusually high number of P&T cases. He suggested that Assoc. VP for Finance Mike Angelini meet with the Finance & Facilities Committee, which could bring information it found relevant back to the Senate as a whole.

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: February 20, 2011, 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

#### IV. Executive Committee—Joe McLaughlin

- **Resolution on Revised Schedule for Faculty Senate Meetings, Elections, and Terms on the Semester Calendar—First Reading**

This resolution attempts to fit the Faculty Senate calendar to the semester academic year. In most cases dates are simply moved forward one month. A December meeting is added, and the June one eliminated. The only real change in procedure is to when newly-elected officers assume their offices. Currently this happens immediately after the vote at the May meeting (would be April on semesters); the resolution proposes handing off responsibilities on May 1, rather than half-way through an evening's business. Also, some changes must be to the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, and these require a referendum vote by the faculty at large as well as approval of the Board of Trustees.

Asked why officers shouldn't keep their portfolios until September 1, McLaughlin pointed to the large amount of Senate business over the summer; June 1 was also suggested. It was also noted that although the resolution moves officer elections, in which new senators participate, to April, new senators are still said to begin attending in May (an issue that needs resolution before the second reading).

#### V. Finance & Facilities Committee—John Gilliom

- The Committee's time was ceded to the presentation on Bobcat BUY. Gilliom noted that the information faculty are getting on the program has improved over the last weeks, and that some aspects of the program itself may have been modified in response to faculty concerns. He again urged any with unanswered questions to email him at [gilliom@ohio.edu](mailto:gilliom@ohio.edu).
- Other Committee work has centered on how faculty pay cycles and contracts will work on semesters; perhaps some simplification can take place.
- Reporting on the January Board of Trustees meeting, Gilliom noted that the capital plan for short-term crisis maintenance seems especially solid, and that while the overall plan is big, it will be acutely undertaken in smaller and more pragmatic bites.
- On the RCM front, the Huron Group [consultants] have been gathering information and holding focus groups, and there is progress on developing a basic model. There should be a lot of communication on RCM in the next couple of months.
- The Budget Planning Council is at the stage of getting forecasts for planning next year, and considering different investments and strategies for moving forward. The good news is that there may not be significant budget cutting required next year.
- The Committee continues to work on Handbook language on health benefits, although it is waiting for the Parental Leave Task Force recommendations before finalizing that because the issues seem linked.

Senators used discussion time to express further skepticism about the predicted benefits of Bobcat BUY. A list of questions included the interaction with grant accounting, the projected return on investment, the projected transaction costs, and why the seven universities involved weren't sharing catalogues. In response to general wariness about being sold "empowerment," Gilliom remarked that the current system does have unnecessary costs and it is worth seeing if the new one

works—despite everyone’s software assimilation burnout. A senator expressed frustration with being told that PCards are too risky when there is no evidence of fraud and several levels of checks on purchases, while another wanted clarity about what the safety net/alternative to Bobcat BUY would be. Gilliom said that he would like to make sure that, for the short term, it remained the PCard. The discussion concluded with an earnest hope that adults would not frequently be asked to actually say “Bobcat BUY.”

## **VI. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee—Allyn Reilly**

- **Resolution to Adjust Handbook Language for the Quarters-to-Semesters Transition—Second Reading & Vote** [co-written with the Professional Relations Committee]

This is a housekeeping resolution, without intent to change any procedures. The only differences from the first reading are corrections to some citations and the integration of some items that were previously on a separate list.

The resolution was passed by a voice vote.

## **VII. Professional Relations Committee—Sarah Wyatt**

- **Resolution on the Adjustment of the 6-quarter rule for the Semester Calendar—First Reading**

This resolution originated with an attempt to adapt the 6-quarter rule (sometimes “5-quarter rule”) for the semester calendar, but is not a simple translation. Currently, any instructor who teaches for six consecutive quarters is (in theory) automatically shifted from Group III to Group II. In actuality, Group III instructors in most units are required to “sit out” a quarter every two years to maintain their employment eligibility. This resolution proposes to do away with a limit on consecutive quarters and substitute an average % of FTE over two years.

Asked if the net result wouldn’t be the same, Wyatt explained that many regional campus instructors regularly teach one course per term, supplementing outside full-time jobs. The resolution would allow them to teach continuously, while protecting those teaching more substantial loads. According to HR, 92% of Group IIs are at 90% of FTE or above, meaning that the resolution would be unlikely to unintentionally harm them. Senators pointed out that real protection for Group IIIs would require their pay; there was also concern about contracts being written for 49% FTE. Wyatt noted that there is a credit hour-to-FTE chart for part-time employees, which might or might not effectively prevent weaselly contracts but would at least offer grounds for appeal.

In response to a question, the exemption for employees who had previously been Group I was referred to the rule preventing Group I faculty from becoming Group IIs. Wyatt also affirmed that the intention was both to prevent instructors from having to give up income for a term and to prevent units from losing crucial part-time instructors. It was also noted that converting the 6-quarter rule into a 4-quarter rule would force some instructors out of the classroom who were not previously affected—e.g., one who routinely taught two term per year and would presumably do the same on semesters. Wyatt added that more data was needed about average Group III FTE now; her informal polling suggested that most were below 50%, but that needed confirmation. **McLaughlin** added that the main goal is to prevent a situation in which instructors without benefits were working long-term at full time.

## **VIII. Promotion & Tenure Committee—Joe Slade**

The Committee helped organize the information meeting for chairs and directors as part of an effort to regularize P&T procedures across the University. The Committee has an extraordinary number

of appeals this year, partly as a result of the economy incentivizing resistance and partly because of institutional reorganizations. Some are second appeals. Asked about whether the Committee is coordinating with workshops on regional campuses, Slade responded that it is not but that it would be a good idea: irregularities in procedure are making some appeals more complex than they need to be, and may have the result of forcing tenure and promotion for faculty members who would not have received it on merit had due process been more scrupulously followed. Senators noted that some chairs and directors are nervous about legal liability for negative evaluations, and Slade emphasized that the University bore legal responsibility rather than the faculty member writing the evaluation (barring recklessness). McLaughlin reiterated that the Provost is committed to holding a P&T-related event each term on campus, and asked that suggestions be sent to Slade ([slade@ohio.edu](mailto:slade@ohio.edu)).

**IX. New Business**

There was no new business.

**X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

## Automating E-Procurement and Payment to Maximize Savings



## Partnership With IUC

- Board of Regents/State of Ohio
  - Continues to challenge us to collaborate with state-wide colleagues on initiatives in procurement
- To drive down costs associated with providing a quality higher education
- Lumina Foundation Grant and State of Ohio
- Board of Trustees
- IUC Institutions partnering with SciQuest:

Ohio University, Bowling Green State University  
Miami University, Shawnee State University, Wright State University,  
Kent State University, Youngstown State University

## What is different about BobcatBUY?

- Not our Father's Purchase Order:
  - Empowers the end user to have control over procurement – even while managing/reducing the cost of goods and services
  - Electronic Ordering
  - Electronic Requisition and Purchase Order
  - Electronic Workflow
  - Electronic Dispatch to Supplier, in many cases directly into their fulfillment system
  - Transparency into where the order is in the process for you
  - No back end customer reconciliation

## What isn't different about BobcatBUY?

- Ability to procure the goods and services you need when you need them
- Emergencies and unusual circumstances do happen – PCard or a future derivation of PCard will be in place to assist.
- Ability to create college specific roles (flexibility) based on what works best for your college
  - Shopper
  - Requestor
  - Approver

## Why BobcatBUY?

- Overall GOALS FOR Ohio University
  - Negotiate discounts for you and your unit
  - Over time, channel more spend to contracted suppliers to allow better leverage on price and terms
  - Recognize Institutional and State-Wide savings with better directed spending
  - Deliver data driven analysis to your department and college to make informed decisions in the RCM model

## What's next? What about the PCard?

- Although use of BobcatBUY will increase over time, the PCard is NOT going away any time soon.
- Modifications are being discussed that may change the PCard and Travel Programs.
- Longer term, this may include reduction in PCards as we maximize the eProcurement solution and customers are brought online.
- PCard or its future derivation will no longer be the only tool in the box.