

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Monday, November 16, 2009
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
[Summary]

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:09 p.m.

I. Executive Vice-President & Provost Pam Benoit

EVPP Benoit began her remarks by thanking faculty for their patience throughout her first quarter here. She then thanked faculty for their help in addressing H1N1 on campus; and commended the faculty for their role in many accomplishments that the OU community celebrated this quarter, ranging from the awarding of the Nobel Prize to an alumnus to a record number of Fulbright applications.

Benoit referred to her November report for an update on both the budget process and the *ad hoc* major code and program review committee. She then discussed the forthcoming strategic enrollment management report. The Board of Trustees requested a strategic enrollment report that evaluates the potential for growth at the Athens campus and at regional campuses while maintaining student success. The report recognizes that the level of instructional and student support must be increased for this to occur. The final report will be posted around December 14th.

Benoit then asked for questions.

Q: A recent Athens News article reported that auxiliaries (such as housing and dining services) are going to be taxed to pay for the \$21 million structural deficit (which includes the deficit in athletics); will the academic side be taxed as well? Is it standard practice to tax for structural deficits? What is the source of the structural deficit?

Benoit: We all are paying for the structural deficit right now. A “tax” is one of the standard ways to address a structural deficit. The deficit has arisen over several years, and stems from investment losses, airport costs, and athletics (about a third of the structural deficit).

Q: Your report says that you will accept the recommendation of the *ad hoc* major code and program review committee to follow the Faculty Handbook process for eliminating programs. Other than educational reasons, would it be necessary to declare financial exigency for programs to be eliminated?

Benoit: Yes, the elimination of a program would have to be justified by educational reasons, and we would have to follow the procedure outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Q: How would the strategic enrollment plan (to increase enrollment) impact the quality of student services, instruction, and the student experience, especially given the predicted budget cuts?

Benoit: Some of the goal of cuts is to make strategic reinvestments where necessary – not just cuts.

Q: We talk a lot about cuts; what is the plan for enhancing revenues?

Benoit: We are asking each of the planning units to think not only of cuts, but also about how to increase revenue across multiple years. (It takes more than a year for some cuts or revenue enhancements to make a difference.) Some examples include more outreach for fundraising and the new nursing program.

Q: What about cuts on the non-academic side, such as eliminating non-academic units? What is the process for that? Will non-academic areas be eliminated? Do we spend too much on administration compared to our peers?

Benoit: Every unit, academic and non-academic, is being asked to plan for 5% and 10% cuts (although the cuts themselves will be differential, not an across-the-board 10% cut). Everything is on the table for all planning units. This is not just about ways to cut programs; there are lots of ways to make cuts, not just in programs. With respect to our administrative costs, this is complicated to answer because of the different ways that spending can be categorized, but based on IPEDS data the amount we spend on administration is comparable to our peer institutions.

In addition, senators asked for clarification of the family and medical leave policy, especially for married couples or domestic partners who are both employed by OU. The EVPP will report back on this.

II. Roll Call and Approval of the October 19th, 2009 Minutes

A quorum was present. The minutes were approved as amended by voice vote.

III. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

- The results of the Presidential appraisal have been disseminated; participation was 32.7%, approximately 50% higher than the last time an appraisal was done.
- The *ad hoc* major code and program review committee recommendation was to follow the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook if programs were to be eliminated.
- Resolution on Core Goals (Executive Committee)—Second Reading and Vote
The resolution was amended to include continuing faculty as well as tenure-track faculty, and approved by voice vote.
- Jeff Giesey, co-director of Q2S, demonstrated the process for entering courses being converted from quarters to semesters into the OCEAN system.
- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: January 11, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

IV. Finance and Facilities (FFC)—Scott Titsworth

- Resolution on Budget Priorities—First Reading

Titsworth explained that FFC based the resolution on the percentage of OU funds (Athens campus) spent on academics as presented in OU's Budget Book, but recently received more data from IPEDS. The two data sets do not necessarily align: for example, the Budget Book shows about 38% for academic expenditures, while the IPEDS data shows 50% for instruction and research. This occurs for several reasons: 1) The Budget Book outlines projected expenses, while IPEDS data reports actual expenditures; 2) Expenses are categorized differently in each source, so there is no clear one-to-one correspondence between categories; 3) The IPEDS data excludes some expenditures (such as scholarships) that are included in the Budget Book, so even if the categories aligned, the percentages of money spent on a given category could not be directly compared. FFC will spend time before the next meeting sorting out this data so we can get a clearer picture of how budget priorities may have changed over time.

Senate discussion emphasized the need to be able to compare actual expenditures from year to year rather than projected expenses; how to get this information disseminated more effectively to faculty and the Board; and how to compare our data to other institutions' data.

Titsworth emphasized that FFC is working toward language in the resolution that will affirm academics as the top priority and that everyone in the institution can support, including the administration, especially because critical decisions will be made in the next 3-5 months. FFC will meet again, at least once with John Day, to continue work on this, as well as begin to look at regional campus budgets.

V. Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly

- Resolution on Minimum Graduate Hours on Semesters—Second Reading and Vote

Passed by voice vote.

Reilly reported that EPSA has been asked to look at drop/add dates and withdraw dates, as well as hours for minors and certificate programs under semesters. EPSA is also following up on any adjustments necessary to PeopleSoft (the new SIS). The student honor code issue reported on last month is still pending.

Senators asked about the status of the academic calendar under semesters. David Descutner replied that the basic calendar of 15-week semesters with a 4-week break has been decided; there are a couple of different scenarios that outline how that could be implemented, which he will make available.

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

Coschigano reported that P&T has completed work on two appeals. They are now working on a resolution to make a technical correction to an inconsistency in the Faculty Handbook. They will also return to the resolution that was not signed by the EVPP, focusing on sections related to interdisciplinary work.

VII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Steve Patterson

Patterson reported that PRC has finished the last grievance case. In winter quarter Sherrie Gradin will return as chair of the committee. McLaughlin thanked Patterson for his work this quarter while Gradin was on leave.

VIII. New Business

Steve Hays proposed that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee appoint an *ad hoc* committee to examine intercollegiate athletics (ICA), specifically to look at how much money is actually being spent, to collect published research about ICA, to develop ideas about how to communicate this information, and to report this information to the Faculty Senate as a whole at the January meeting.

McLaughlin and the Executive Committee agreed, noting that it was important for faculty to have good information about this topic. Senators wishing to volunteer to serve on this *ad hoc* committee should email [McLaughlin](#).

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:18.