

**Five-Year Academic Action Plan
Committee Report
November 26, 2007**

On September 12, 2007 the Five-Year Academic Action Plan Committee was charged by President McDavis to “seek input on the strengths of the Academic Action Plan”. The committee determined the best way to achieve this was by using the following three major strategies.

1. Open Forums – There were four open forums on the Athens campus that had increasing attendance at each forum with fifty-five faculty, students and staff attending the final event. The chair of the committee facilitated three open forums, and a committee member, facilitated the other. One of the forums included the regional campuses by video conferencing.

The forum consisted of a brief introduction of the origins of the plan, the timeline and the purpose of the forum and the charge to the committee. Stakeholder heads attended as possible to help answer unit specific questions. Following the introduction participants were encouraged to state their comments and questions about the plan. Those questions were addressed when possible and the comments were noted. A summary transcription was kept for each forum and all are posted on the website.

2. Web discussion group – A web site was established and its availability was made known to the university community through Outlook. The primary purposes were two-fold, 1) to communicate narrative, and more specific budget information from stakeholders and 2) create a forum for web discussion.

A discussion board was a main feature of the web site, but was ineffective in gathering much input. All information gathered through the process of vetting the plan can be found in various documents on the website.

3. Constituent meetings – The various university senates were represented on the committee and were charged with organizing and encouraging input from their constituents. They were asked to provide a summary of those discussions to the committee. The summary reports are included in the appendix and they are posted on the website.

The feedback gathered by the committee, regardless of the method, fell into a few broad categories. A small number of comments and questions were stated repeatedly. Those categories and comments are as follows:

1. **Where will the money to fund the initiatives come from?** – This question was asked at every open forum, every senate meeting and when we met with the chairs and directors. This was an open-ended question for which a definitive answer could not be provided. It was suggested by some that the funds would come from new enrollment and reallocation. This was generally not an answer that provided enough detail for the questioner or for others. It also led to the second broad theme discussed below in point #2.

This first question, for which no one was able to provide specific answers, created the most discussion, raised the most anxiety about the plan, and cast the most doubt about the potential success of the plan. While many comments expressed general agreement that the goals, objectives, strategies and outcomes of the plan were noble and worthy but without a sense of the source of funding few were willing to fully endorse the plan. The proportion of the funding going to each area, the priority of one strategy over another and the timing of the implementation also surfaced frequently.

2. How can we prioritize if we don't know where the funds are coming from to fund the plan?

This question closely followed the first question. There was an unwillingness to speak to the relative strengths of the strategies without first determining what, or how much would be given up. It was stated repeatedly that next steps would require information about both sides of the budgetary equation. The sentiment expressed was one that made it clear that, 1) an incomplete picture was being vetted and 2) that the missing part of the picture held the most important information.

Just under the surface the implied message was a concern that the authors of the plan might move forward without clearly committing to a process to determine the source of the funding. The other implied, and sometimes stated message was the question of how this exact mix of strategies and outcomes was arrived at, and why some questionable items were added to the plan.

3. Athletics

At every opportunity someone, or some group, raised questions about how, and why athletics was included in this academic plan. It was noted that the Athletics Department was already successful, or successful enough, with their graduate success rate and that further investment was not necessary. The other prevalent question was why athletes were selected for special academic investment and why they were not served by existing, or proposed academic services.

4. Inappropriate creation, process and timeline for an academic plan.

There was significant questioning of the Board of Trustees' request for this plan and the insufficient time given for a thoughtful vetting. The question that surfaced most often asked why the Board requested the plan be developed in the summer, when faculty were unavailable for input. Other comments and questions centered on how the proportionality of the funding between academic and academic support units was determined and where investment numbers came from.

5. Most all other questions and comments reflected the unique concerns of each participating group.

The first four questions and comments dominated the discussion. The remainder of the feedback drew on constituent perspectives. Faculty requested changes that reflected on their needs and roles while students, classified staff, and administrative staff did likewise. Generally, organized constituent groups offered the more specific amendments to the plan

Recommendations

- Create a detailed financial plan that determines the source of the investment funds.
- Respond and revise the plan based on the input from this report, the senate reports, and resolutions.
- Retain the Five Year Academic Action plan committee and consider adopting the following process and timeline:
 - FYAAP committee report sent to Provost on November 15.
 - Provost reviews reports and writes recommendations that are submitted to the President before November 28th. Recommendations are to be distributed to the academic community.
 - President brings those recommendations to the Deans and Executive Staff. President, Provost, Deans and Executive staff redraft the plan by the first week in January.
 - Redrafted plan is submitted to a joint committee made up of the FYAAPC and the Vision Ohio Executive Steering Committee. They review and make additional recommendations as necessary by the end of January.

Appendix to the Five-Year Academic Action Plan
Committee Report

Faculty Senate Report on Faculty Feedback to the Draft of the Five-Year Academic Action Plan submitted to the OU Board of Trustees in summer 2007

This report is in response to the request for feedback from faculty to the 5YAAP draft document. The Faculty Senate requested input from all faculty at Ohio University. As feedback came in, resolutions were drafted that reflected the thoughts expressed in those communications. The Senate held two extraordinary meetings (October 29 and November 5) to process the resolutions thus created. Eleven resolutions were passed after a second reading on the November 5 meeting. Of these resolutions, support for ten was unanimous, and support for the other was virtually unanimous with only one vote against, indicating the unity of the faculty on all these issues. Through the process, feedback from the faculty at large in support of the resolutions was remarkable.

While the eleven resolutions are very direct and give a clear indication about the principles that faculty support, a few words seem necessary to put things in perspective and bring three core ideas to the surface.

- It should be noted that a significant part of the faculty feels that this process was not handled properly. Considering that many units, including all academic colleges, drafted strategic plans as part of the Vision Ohio process, faculty find it appalling that those strategic plans were not taken into account as the 5YAAP draft was created. By focusing on the strategic plans of a few non-academic units as the main menu where objectives to support were to be chosen from, many people feel that the first draft should be entirely disposed of and the process should be started again focusing on academic priorities. This principle resonates through many of the resolutions of November 5. In particular, it is the backbone of Resolution 11, that the University's Five-Year Academic Action Plan, when presented to the Board of Trustees, include the resources required to accomplish the goals identified in the strategic plans of the Colleges, and those of the Schools and Departments of which they are composed.
- Another major consideration that permeates the discussion is a feeling that many of the objectives which are seemingly laudable are addressed in such an indirect way that they are not supportable as presented. For example, "strengthening undergraduate education" is identified with seemingly easier to measure goals such as "improving retention and graduation rates." One would certainly hope that there is a correlation between the given objective and the measurable goals but that is not necessarily the case. By confusing the laudable objectives with the measurable goals then the 5YAAP draft suggests investments in all types of peripheral expenditures instead of focusing on academic investments such as increasing faculty size that are the most likely to strengthen undergraduate education.
- A last but certainly not least concern, expressed by virtually all faculty members who replied and in particular as a consensus of the Chairs and Directors, is the uncertainty about where the funds will be coming from to support any of the initiatives highlighted in the final version of the 5YAAP. Without a clear process to evaluate those things we are to stop doing and comparing them to those that we would like to do, this plan and the process that brought it about completely lack credibility. This is the idea behind Resolution 1.

In an ideal world, the faculty of Ohio University would like to see the 5YAAP draft thrown out and the process restarted from scratch as it needs to be completely refocused. However, in an attempt to be realistic and to be prepared and careful so that our feedback is not neglected, we came up with a mechanism to gauge support for the objectives stated in the draft of the 5YAAP and other alternative objectives. To this end, the senate conducted a “sticker poll.” We handed ten stickers and a list of the goals and objectives from the Five Year Academic Action Plan to each senator attending the extraordinary meeting of November 5, 2007. The list included space for alternative write-in objectives. Each senator was to place one or two stickers, but no more than two, in support of each of their top priorities from the thirty two objectives or their alternatives. After some discussion, three write-in goals were included: hiring more group I faculty, funding strategic plans for colleges (as per Resolution 11), and funding faculty participation in any adopted strategies (as per Resolution 10.) Discussion of write-ins prior to voting was so that people could support objectives using common terminology. In spite of that, upon counting votes we discovered other items that were added but had not been announced to everyone. Such items only received one or two votes each and, as it would be expected, that support came from the persons who introduced them.

The eleven resolutions passed by the senate and the outcome of the sticker poll are attached to this document and are meant to be integral parts of the report.

Resolutions As Passed – Nov. 5, 2007 Faculty Senate Extraordinary Meeting

Resolution One: Comprehensive Plan

Whereas the draft of the university's Five Year Academic Action Plan identifies \$37.2 million dollars in new investments over five years (\$12.3 million in base investments); and

Whereas no plan exists that identifies from where the money for these investments will come; and

Whereas it is inconceivable that this plan can be funded without significant reallocations, which means that the university will have to end or curtail current activities; and

Whereas previous annual reallocations have been steady, significant, and minimally strategic; and

Whereas it is impossible to assess priorities for new initiatives in a void, that is, without a commensurate list of activities that will be eliminated or reduced;

Be it resolved that the university create a balanced strategic plan that will propose explicit areas of reduction and elimination, alongside proposed areas of investment. Such a plan will allow faculty, staff, and students to weigh the value of new initiatives against that of plans that reduce or eliminate current activities; and

Be it further resolved that this comprehensive Academic Plan, one that respects the University's academic mission and includes both strategic investments as well as targeted reductions and reallocations, be fully discussed and reviewed by all of the senates, as well as the University Curriculum Council, Graduate Council, and other relevant university standing committees, within a time frame that allows for adequate deliberation.

Resolution Two: Reaffirm Our Mission Particularly to the Region

Whereas the Vision Ohio Five Year Academic Action Plan does not appear to address the mission of Ohio University to the region:

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that we must strive to continually improve access and excellence in higher education in our region,

Further, we must strive to employ technology and other instructional strategies to enhance program offerings by regional campuses in a manner that embraces high academic standards and enables students to complete their degrees at Ohio University.

Resolution Three: Academics and Academic Support

Whereas the university now budgets less than half of the Athens General Fund to Academic Areas*; and

Whereas a significant portion of the new investments outlined in the draft of the Five Year Academic Plan will be in Academic Support areas (Information Technology, University Advancement, Student Affairs, and Intercollegiate Athletics); and

Whereas most of the funding for the Five Year Academic Plan will likely be generated through a reallocation process;

Be it resolved that the total cost of new investments in the Academic Support areas should not exceed the total monies reallocated from Academic Support areas;

Be it further resolved that the University identify goals that would result in a positive increase in resources, measured as a percentage of the Athens General Fund, for Academic units. The academic leadership should identify metrics to ensure this occurs.

*Note: Academic Areas will be defined as the Academic Colleges and the Library.

Resolution Four: Interdisciplinary Programs and Activities

Whereas interdisciplinary initiatives and programs are essential for the future of Ohio University and Vision Ohio;

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that investments should not be limited to new initiatives and new appointments but should also foster interdisciplinary programs by making sure that existing interdisciplinary programs have adequate resources and by reforming institutional mechanisms to support interdisciplinary research and teaching.

The Faculty Senate affirms that interdisciplinary study is central to the mission of Ohio University and should be funded and supported accordingly.

Resolution Five: Hire More Faculty

Whereas Faculty Senate passed a resolution in May 2006 that called for the following:

" **Let it be resolved** that VISION OHIO be revised to formally incorporate the following written goals:

- Establish a comprehensive Group I faculty hiring program to bring Group 1 instruction on the Athens campus to the AAUP guideline and Ohio University policy of 85%.
 - Increase Group I faculty by 20-30 per year to accomplish this goal in 10 years.

- Track percent Group I faculty instruction (Athens Campus Group I WSCH / All Athens Campus WSCH) as a metric of the success of the “Quality, Diversity, and Prominence for Faculty, Staff, and Students” goals of VISION OHIO.

These goals should be added to Vision Ohio as the first or second item under “Quality, Diversity, and Prominence for Faculty, Staff, and Students” in each section of VISION OHIO”; and

Whereas Provost Krendl reported to Senate in Fall 2006 that this was an important goal, but she wanted to determine first how much an increase in faculty compensation--a higher priority--was going to cost;

Whereas a Faculty Compensation Task Force was formed in academic year 2006-2007 and issued a report calling for an additional \$1.2 million investment in faculty compensation for each of the next five budget years; and

Whereas this amount is part of the FY08 budget and is included in the five-year financial planning being undertaken by Budget Planning Council; and

Whereas one could justifiably conclude that the university has now determined the cost of improving faculty compensation; and

Whereas most of the academic objectives articulated in the Draft Five Year Academic Action Plan can most effectively be accomplished through the commitment of more faculty time; and

Whereas there is at present no explicit goal to hire significant numbers of additional faculty in the draft of the Plan

Be it resolved that the Draft Five Year Academic Plan include recommendations for the hiring of new faculty in line with the resolution passed by Senate in May 2006.

Resolution Six: A Quality Learning Environment for All

Whereas enhancing service and accessibility to quality learning environment should be our highest priority for all students, not just intercollegiate athletes, and

Whereas university resources and facilities should benefit all students and not just a few of them, and

Whereas goals or strategies consisting of hiring coaches or winning sporting trophies are not compatible with an academic strategic plan, and

Whereas the success rate of Ohio University student athletes ranks favorably compared with that of its peers in the Mid-American Conference and compares favorably with that of the Ohio University student body,

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that there should not be funds in the Five Year Academic

Plan earmarked exclusively for improving the academic success of Intercollegiate Athletes; any such funds and the services they support must be made available to all students.

Resolution Seven: Marketing and Communications

Whereas it is welcome that Marketing and Communications has begun to actively assist with the recruitment of students as evidenced by the Promise campaign;

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that investments in Marketing and Communications be benchmarked in order to measure improvements in the quality of recruited students and the educational experience of students at Ohio University.

Resolution Eight: University Advancement

Whereas it is an excellent objective to improve University Advancement efforts at Ohio University;

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that these efforts should have clear benchmarks and accountability, and should not be funded by the General Fund.

Resolution Nine: Student Information System

Whereas a fully-supported, integrated Student Information System (SIS) is critical to the academic enterprise;

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that the new SIS should not be in competition for funds identified in the 5-year Academic Plan.

Resolution Ten: Faculty Time is a Resource

Whereas many of the initiatives in the Draft Five-Year Academic Plan will require greater commitments of time on the part of faculty; and

Whereas faculty time is a resource that costs the university money, but such time has not been budgeted in the plan; and

Whereas this greater investment in time will have to be accomplished either through hiring more faculty or reducing activities (teaching, research, and service) on which faculty currently spend their time; and

Whereas such increases in faculty workload most often come at the expense of research;

Be it resolved that the plan be revised to reflect and value the opportunity costs of faculty time. Any objective in the Five-Year Plan that implies an increased expectation, or reallocation, of faculty effort must be matched with specifically identified budgeted resources.

Resolution Eleven: Sense of the Senate Resolution Regarding Inclusion of Resources Identified in Strategic Plans of Academic Units in the Five-Year Academic Action Plan

Whereas the University's Five-Year Academic Action Plan purports to be an academic plan, and

Whereas the academic units are central to achieving the goals of any academic plan, and

Whereas Colleges, through their Schools and Departments, developed strategic plans detailing their goals and objectives within the framework of Vision Ohio, and

Whereas the current draft of the University's Five-Year Academic Action Plan does not mention specifically the Colleges' plans, nor include resources directed specifically toward their achievement;

Be it resolved that the University's Five-Year Academic Action Plan, when presented to the Board of Trustees, include the resources required to accomplish the goals identified in the strategic plans of the Colleges, and the Schools and Departments of which they are composed.

REPORT ON THE STICKER POLL

Gauging faculty support for objectives in the 5YAAP draft and for alternative write-in objectives.

It should be pointed out that faculty support for those objectives from the 5YAAP draft that did receive votes is to be interpreted under the light of the eleven resolutions passed. For example, one of the senators voting for V.5.(Increase Annual Philanthropic Support from \$15M to \$30M) annotated the ballot to emphasize that development staff must earn their own salaries and not be supported by the General Fund.

Worthy of mention is also the fact that supporting an objective does not necessarily mean supporting the goals attached to that objective by the 5YAAP draft. For example, there is ample support among faculty for the resolution passed by Graduate Student senate putting other forms of support for graduate students such as reduced fees and insurance benefits over the stated 5YAAP draft goal of creating a graduate college. Support of objective II.1 is consequently an example of the principle stated in this paragraph.

What follows is a summary of the outcomes of the sticker poll:

- The most popular objective was a write-in: Hiring More Group I faculty, with 58 Votes.
- Increasing Faculty Compensation (objective VI.3) was the second most popular objective; it obtained 48 votes.
- The third item was enhancing support for Graduate and Professional Students (Objective II.1). It received 34 Votes.
- Another write-in, funding Resolution 11 received 30 Votes.
- The next four objectives are virtually tied. Two of them received 23 votes each and the other two received 24 votes each. These objectives are
 - I.1 Improving the Retention Rate, Engagement, and Graduation Rate of Undergraduate Students,
 - I.3. Enhancing Interdisciplinary Programs
 - III.1 Improving Faculty, Staff, and Student Quality and Diversity, and
 - V.8 Reducing Support Expenditures Relative to Academic Expenditures.
- The objectives receiving between 10 and 13 votes each are:
 - V.1. 1. Provide a Dependable and Secure Network and Systems Infrastructure
 - VI.4. Increase Internal and External Research Funding including OUCOM
 - Write-in: Fund Faculty Time Investments (as per Resolution 10)
- Objectives receiving 5-9 votes each:
 - I.2. Implement General Education Assessment
 - II.2. Increase Diversity of Faculty and Staff
 - IV.1 Enhance Positive Student Engagement in Campus and Community Life
 - IV.3 Enhance Residential Students' Out-of-Class Experience
 - IV.6. Instill Among Students a Sense of Personal and Civic Responsibility
 - V.4. Utilize Technology to Enhance the Academic Mission of Instruction, Research, and Service
 - V.5. Increase Annual Philanthropic Support from \$15M to \$30M
 - V.7. Improve Balance Sheet Strength
 - VI.1. Invest in Targeted Undergraduate Programs
 - VI. 2. Increase Strategic Investment in Targeted Graduate and Professional Programs
- Objectives receiving 1-4 votes each:

IV.2. Improve the Health and Safety of Students
IV.4 Foster Leadership Development of Students
IV.5 Enhance the Integration of Student Affairs and Academic Units
V.3. Create and Maintain a Customer-Focused IT Service
V.9. Lower Risk and Financial Liability Exposure
VI.5. Strengthen Student Recruitment Marketing
VI.6. Implement Paid Media Strategies to Build the Brand in Core Markets
VI. 9. Make Better Use of Earned Media Coverage as a Brand-Building Tool
Write-in: Increase Fund Intramural and Faculty Creative Activities
Write-in: Restore Funds to Academic Units that have endured budget cuts for the last eight years, at least to those departments that still exist.
Write-in: Increased University-wide compensation for Group II faculty-more proportional to the WSCH that they teach.
Write-in: Fund Resolution 2

- The following objectives from the 5YAAP draft received no votes:

III.3. Increase Diversity of Graduate Students
IV.7. Lift our Athletic Programs to New Heights of Excellence
V.2. Ensure Effective Information Technology Security Practices
V.6. Campaign Preparation and Silent Phase Kick-Off
VI.7. Use Alumni Volunteers to Help Tell the OHIO Story
VI.8. Make Better Use of the Web as a Brand-Building Tool

Final Report of the Ohio University Graduate Student Senate on the 5 Year Academic Action Plan

“Pandemonium did not reign, it poured” – John Hendrick Bangs

The fall quarter agenda of the Ohio University Graduate Student Senate has been dominated by discussions, resolutions, and advocacy focused on the Five Year Academic Action Plan. Our efforts to address the plan began with an item for discussion at our third meeting of the quarter. During the two weeks following that initial discussion, members of the GSS attended the open forums to ask questions regarding the origin of the funding priorities in the 5YAAP. We were directed to the various documents related to Vision OHIO. After investigation, it appeared that there was not a clear linkage between the 5YAAP and Vision Ohio, specifically the Graduate Priorities Implementation Report. This caused many GSS members to draft a resolution requesting that the funding allocated in the 5YAAP be increased and prioritized in line with the Graduate Priorities Implementation Report (GPIR). Once the resolution was passed, the Graduate Senate initiated a Call/Email-in campaign in support of our proposals. On our last meeting of the quarter, November 5, we invited the major stakeholders to further discuss the 5YAAP with graduate students. What follows is a summary of the feedback we received during all of our discussions, some of which refers to the entire 5YAAP, and some of which refers specifically to the graduate sections of the plan.

Concerns over Entire Plan

I. Concerns over the source of funds

- The most common concern related to the entire 5YAAP is related to the ambiguity regarding the source of funds to support the plan. While the plan specifies the amount of base reallocations required to fund each of its initiatives, the fact that there is no indication of where the realignments will come from causes much concern and anxiety. Given the cost of the initiatives, roughly Thirty-seven million dollars, this should come as little surprise given the amount of reallocations and realignments made in the past year as well as the cuts to the various academic departments during a time of fiscal uncertainty.

II. Concerns over the process of drafting the plan

- Given the importance of the 5YAAP to the future of Ohio University, it is extremely troubling how confused and disjointed the process has been to this point. The short timeline has been a concern that has been raised at multiple points during the process. To put it simply, the Board of Trustees set a timetable for approval of this document that seemingly all major constituencies feel is artificially accelerated, including our own administration. The most troubling aspect of this, and a concern that was raised at the November 5 GSS meeting, is that no one has seemed willing to take the initiative and tell the Board that a longer timeline would produce a better plan. One graduate student in attendance at the November 5 meeting expressed his difficulties in even getting other graduate students to invest in the public debate surrounding the plan. He attributes this to the impression left with many of the

graduate students who attended the open forum on Nov. 1. Many were so disillusioned by having their questions go unanswered (mainly because any individual who could answer their questions was not in attendance) that they saw little reason to spend more time trying to voice their opinion. This should cause concern for all involved in drafting this plan. To say that this process has been chaotic would be an understatement. The fact that many of the hard decisions regarding this plan will once again be made over a break magnifies all of the problems listed above.

Issues Related to Graduate Priorities

I. Enhance Graduate and Professional Education and Research

- On October 22, 2007, the Graduate Student Senate passed resolution 0708-05 (Attached to the end of this report) that called for returning the priorities of the 5YAAP to be more in line with the GPIR. Among the priorities requested in the resolutions are:
 1. A decrease in the general fee
 2. An enhancement to stipends
 3. A 75% subsidization of health insurance
 4. An increase in the number of assistantships, as well as the size and amount of named fellowships
 5. An increase to the GSS grant fund

All of these initiatives were outlined in the GPIR and did not appear in the 5YAAP. This produced concern, as it appeared that, quite possibly, Ohio University was backing out of some of its commitments to graduate students. Members of both GSS and the greater graduate student community were concerned about the proportionality of funding going towards enhancing graduate education and research. Only roughly \$390,000 is allocated to this section, which represents roughly 3% of the total realignment. To be fair, it has been made clear by members of the administration that proportionality was not the driving force behind the creation of the 5YAAP, however, whether the low proportion going towards graduate education was intentional or not is immaterial. The simple fact that the proportion is only 3% creates a perception among graduate students that graduate education is not as highly valued as other initiatives in the 5YAAP.

- After passage of the resolution, the GSS initiated a Call/Email-in campaign to the offices of Deans McWeeny and Ogles, as well as Provost Kathy Krendl. The large turnout of graduate students during this event was indicative of the support for aligning our priorities with those enumerated above as they relate to graduate student funding and compensation.
- There is also concern over the vagueness of the outcomes regarding section II of the 5YAAP. Given the small amount of funding already going to section II, vagueness over where it will be allocated causes much anxiety.
- Through our deliberations at our Nov. 5 meeting, it became apparent that the Ohio University administration would like for GSS to come up with a prioritized list for

the proposals enumerated in our resolution. Though it is still early to provide a comprehensive and final list, there are some guidelines to consider based on feedback we have received:

- a. There is a lot of concern related to the “hidden costs” of pursuing graduate education at Ohio University. Our high general fee, as well as health insurance costs (particularly for international students who are required to enroll in the Ohio University insurance plan) is a significant disincentive to recruiting top level graduate students. There were some anecdotes presented about prospective graduate students not entering a program once the amount of fees they would have to pay became apparent because they could get better offers from other schools.
- b. There was also concern regarding increasing graduate enrollment without significantly increasing the amount of fully-funded assistantships available for graduate students. There was a sense that increasing our graduate student selectivity and profile would be much easier if we could offer more opportunities for funding for graduate students.
- c. When it comes to providing sections of the academic plan that graduate students feel could be removed in favor of our proposals, the discussions are still ongoing, but some trends have emerged:
 1. There was a sense that the Athletic section of the plan was not warranted at this time. This is probably the biggest concern outside of the Graduate Education section of the plan that I have seen. The sense is that in terms of priority, promoting graduate education is more important than trying to enhance athletics.
 2. There are sections under the Enriching Environment section (particularly those that relate to Student Affairs) that cause concern. It has been mentioned that the sections of the plan related to enriching our environment tend to focus on undergraduate concerns only (dealing with alcohol, etc.) and have little bearing on the lives of graduate students. Furthermore, though initiatives like increasing the LeaderShape program could have benefit, the tight fiscal environment requires us to prioritize and graduate education should be a higher priority than some of these initiatives. The fact that Student Affairs has not placed information on the Academic Plan website to explain its section of the plan was also addressed.

All of these issues were addressed in the open forums related to the 5YAAP, as well as in our meetings and during discussions of our resolution. One can only hope that the Board of Trustees realizes how many questions remain about the Academic Plan and allow more input to be received before the final plan is implemented.

October 22, 2007

(President's approval upon Senate passage)

**A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH
PRIORITIES OF VISION OHIO**

1. *Whereas:* Ohio University has dedicated itself to becoming a premier graduate and research institution and
2. *Whereas,* this desire has been clearly stated and developed in Vision Ohio; Ohio University's strategic plan and
3. *Whereas;* the Ohio University Graduate Student Senate has, and continues to, support the graduate goals outlined in Vision Ohio and
4. *Whereas;* Ohio University is currently developing a Five Year Academic Action Plan and,
5. *Whereas;* the Five Year Academic Action Plan stems from the goals and directives highlighted in Vision Ohio and,
6. *Whereas;* during the 2005-2006 academic year The Graduate Priorities Implementation Team issued a report detailing the priority initiatives for graduate education and research and,
7. *Whereas;* the Graduate Priorities Implementation Report included a list of the following initiatives:
 1. A reduction in the graduate student general fee.
 2. That the average level of stipends for Ohio University graduate students be increased.
 3. That the number of named fellowships for Ohio University graduate students be increased from a total of five to a total of ten, and that their value increase from \$13,000 to \$20,000.
 4. Increase the total number of Graduate Assistantships by fifty (50) over five years.
 5. That health insurance costs for Ohio University Assistants be subsidized by twenty-five percent and that such subsidization increase incrementally to seventy-five percent over three years (a 25% subsidy in year one, 50% in year two, with a 75% subsidy by year three).
 6. That the Graduate Student Senate Travel and Original Work Grant Fund be increased to \$150,000 annually.
8. *Whereas;* the Graduate Priorities Implementation Report directed that each of the previous initiatives commence during the 2007-2008 academic year and,
9. *Whereas;* as of October 2007 implementation of these initiatives has not begun and,
10. *Whereas;* none of the aforementioned initiatives are explicitly stated in the Ohio University Five Year Academic Action Plan therefore be it,
11. *Resolved* that goal number two in the Five Year Academic Action Plan be amended through the addition of the following outcomes:
 1. That the Graduate Student general fee be reduced through a buy-down of the general

fee in the amount of \$900,000 over the next 3 years, with a \$300,000 annual reallocation in each of those years.

2. Increase funding for stipends by \$1.2 million over the next 5 years in addition to the standard raise pool, with a reallocation of \$240,000 in each of the next five fiscal years.

3. Increase the number of graduate assistantships by a total of 50 over five years, adding 10 assistantships (at \$25,000 per position) in FYs 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, with a total reallocation of \$1.25 million or \$250,000 per year.

4. Incrementally increase the number of named fellowships from 5 to 10 and increase their amount from \$13,000 to \$20,000 annually, with the addition of one (1) fellowship and \$1,400 in FYs 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013.

5. Begin subsidizing graduate assistant health insurance by 25% in FY 2008-2009, 50% in FY 2009-2010, with a 75% subsidy in FYs 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013, with a total reallocation of \$726,000 over the next five fiscal years.

6. Increase the GSS grant fund to \$150,000 annually, with the current funding of \$50,000 per year raised by a \$20,000 reallocation in each of the next five fiscal years.

Further be it,

12. Resolved: That the total cost for such initiatives be based on the monetary amounts enumerated in the Graduate Priorities implementation team report, at a total of \$4,294,000 over 5 years.

Further be it,

13. Resolved That a copy of this resolution and a letter of explanation be sent to, but not limited to: Dr. Roderick McDavis; President of Ohio University, The Board of Trustees, All drafters of the Five Year Academic Action Plan, All members of the Five Year Academic Action Plan Task Force.

Sponsors:	Stephen Oechsle Commissioner for Graduate Student Life	Steve Siff Department Representative for Journalism
	Drew Pusateri Senator for the College of Education	Karen Greiner Department Representative for Communication Studies
	Alyssa Thomas Senator for the College of Arts and Sciences	Pete Wickman Department Representative for History
	Dominic Barbato President of Graduate Student Senate	Merrian Brooks Senator for the College of Osteopathic Medicine
	Nihar Shah Senator for the College of Engineering	Brittany Buxton Vice President for Committee and Legislative Affairs
	Eric Zimak Vice President for Finance and Administration	Cherish Odom Vice President for Communications

Graduate Student Senate Priorities and Recommendations:

As per the request of the Provost, the Graduate Student Senate has prioritized their recommendations detailed in GSS resolution 0708-05. All GSS members were asked to prioritize the recommendations in our resolution as well as list which sections of the 5YAAP we feel are most important. What follows are the priorities of the Ohio University Graduate Student Senate.

Priorities of Res. 0708-05:

The GSS was asked to prioritize the recommendations listed in the resolution passed at our October 22nd meeting. The list is separated into two tiers, with one exception. It is important to note that the separation between the tiers is very small and that there were supportive comments made regarding all recommendations contained in resolution 0708-05.

Tier I: Decrease the General Fee and Begin Healthcare Subsidization:

These two recommendations were prioritized the highest by all participating GSS members. The reasons for support varied greatly but focused on two central themes. First, it was felt that the “hidden costs” associated with graduate education at Ohio University were a substantial disincentive in our recruitment of quality graduate students. Our general fee is one of the largest in the state and it was felt that a top priority should be to decrease that cost. The cost of health insurance was also seen as a top priority in order to keep costs down for students who need to purchase healthcare coverage from Ohio University. The second reason given for supporting these priorities was because they affect the conditions for both students on assistantship and those without funding. This is particularly true when it comes to the general fee.

In the Middle: Increase Stipend Levels:

This recommendation has been placed between Tiers I and II because it received more support than those listed in Tier II, but not as much as Tier I. Support for increases in stipends tended to come from GSS members in programs with lower stipend levels, but still received much support from many respondents regardless of program or department. It should be important to note that the Graduate Priorities Implementation Team recommended a study be conducted comparing our stipend levels to other institutions. This has not yet occurred and should be conducted as soon as possible.

Tier II: Increase the Number of Assistantships Offered, and the GSS Grant Fund:

These two recommendations were prioritized very highly by a large number of respondents, but not to the extent of the two listed under Tier I. Support for increasing the number of assistantships available tended to come from those whose departments did not offer much in the way of funding. It should be noted, that the issue has been raised in both open forums and GSS meetings that an increase in graduate enrollment in the next 5 years, could necessitate an increase in the amount of funded position available. Increasing the GSS grant fund received support from senators in departments with heavy research components. It is also important to note that this is yet another recommendation that could benefit all graduate students, not simply those with funding.

The final recommendation in Resolution 0708-05, Increasing the Size and Monetary Amount of Named Fellowships, was not voted upon, pending an investigation by the Provost's office as to whether these could receive increased funding from an endowment or if they required the use of general fund dollars. The GSS would be willing to assist the Provost's office with this issue.

Priorities within the Plan:

The top priority of GSS members has been section II of the 5YAAP: Enhance Graduate and Professional Education and Research. The reasons for this should be apparent, given the resolutions we have passed.

The next highest priorities were Increasing Strategic Investment in Targeted Graduate Programs and Fortifying our Infrastructure. It should be noted however, that neither of these recommendations received nearly as much support as our top priority.

GSS members also recommended sections of the proposed 5YAAP they felt should be either removed or given less funding. These were difficult decisions and there has been much debate, but the following is as close to consensus as we have come:

1. There was virtually no support for keeping the sections dealing with Athletics in the plan.
2. There have also been concerns that some of the initiatives under section IV of the plan, dealing mostly with Student Affairs, cater primarily to undergraduate students. It was felt that many of them were worthwhile endeavors, but that our current budgetary situation made some sections unfeasible at this time. This is particularly true of the initiatives to add another section of Leadershape and increase the compensation of Resident Assistants. Given that we already have a strong Leadershape program that serves a large amount of students, this section of the 5YAAP could potentially be a luxury we can not afford. Residence Life has received increased funding from Auxiliaries this year to help fund Resident Assistants so it was felt that there could be a cut in the amount of funding going towards that initiative. It should be noted that it was never recommended that we completely remove Resident Assistants compensation from the plan, only that the amount of money going towards it be significantly decreased in the final document.

These are the final priorities of the Graduate Student Senate regarding the 5YAAP.

A Report on the 5 Year Academic Action Plan by the Ohio University Student Senate

During the last month the Ohio University Student Senate has undertaken the review and analysis of the Vision Ohio Five Year Academic Action Plan. To carefully evaluate the aforementioned document, the Senate carefully divided the sections amongst the appropriate commissions in our general body and scrutinized the parts with a set of given criteria. The most important of these guidelines being the potential impact on the student body from budgetary, social and academic standpoints. To better grasp the possible outcomes, the Student Senate specifically looked at three key areas of assessment: Strengthen Undergraduate Education, Enrich Environment and the financial implications of the plan. The following is a breakdown of those key area portions.

Strengthen Undergraduate Education:

- The overall outcome of the Five Year Academic Action Plan should not result in a net increase in funding for “support” areas. In other words, reallocations to these portions should not exceed the dollar amount taken from them. All adjustments should remain internal; for example, money should not be reallocated from the College of Business to fund the proposed \$775,000 increase in Athletics.
- The “strategies” and “outcomes” sections of this segment should be made to reflect the Five Year Plans of the individual academic departments and colleges.
- Senators seemed to echo the position of Faculty Senate in regards to creating a “quality learning environment” for all students, not just student athletes.
- There needs to be more clarity in what it means to “improve academic advising”. Senate expressed a great deal of interest into how advising will be improved on campus, and the document provides little guidance for the implementation of this strategy.
- It would behoove this particular section to add a parameter expanding UC115 classes to improve Peer Advising within each class. This could perhaps fall under the purview of Objective number 1.

Enrich Environment:

- Most Senators supported the idea of establishing programs like “Bobcat Passport” to eventually increase student engagement throughout the university. However, sentiment also reflected issues with such initiatives, such as there being a lack of promotion by the Ohio University administration and a lack of understanding the programs on the part of students. It was suggested that increasing the awareness and purpose of these programs is a necessity to their success.
 - Along these same lines, appropriate funding must be forthcoming to student activities included in “Bobcat Passport” to provide adequate resources for such initiatives. Therefore, a line item strategy for increased Student Activities Commission funding is a must.¹
- The Senate encouraged funding for out of class initiatives such as the Lasagna Project, to better foster Student/Faculty relations.

¹ See Senate Resolution 07/08-18

- The document must specify whether or not its recommendations for the “Improvement of Health and Safety of Students” will be modified after the final Keeling and Associates recommendation are released. This report will directly influence changes within the health and safety departments on campus and the way they affect students.
 - It is important to stress that increased participation within research based alcohol interventions (such as Prime for Life) be voluntary.
- This document acts as a perfect opportunity to address the issue concerning the funding of Arts for Ohio. The Senate agreed that there should be inclusion of said program within the 5 year Academic Plan in this particular segment.
 - It was stressed by our body that “Arts for Ohio” is an essential element to “enriching the environment” and to obtaining a true liberal arts education at Ohio University.
- The Student Senate favored an increase to funding for the Leadershape Institute and believed a second annual session would positively impact our constituency.
- The Senate also supported the notion of increased resident assistant compensation.
- Greater clarification is needed to explain how the Athletics Department will achieve their outcomes and why this funding is necessary.
 - For example, under the objective “Lift Our Athletic Programs to New Heights of Excellence”, the phrase “Dreams and Aspirations” is incredibly vague when describing potential strategies.
- Although goal three specifically addresses diversity to an extent, there needs to be clarification on what the University means when they use the word “diversity.” To the administration, is diversity qualified by race, out-of-state residence, etc.?
- Most Senators would like to see inclusion of a parameter focused on an increase in scholarship funds. This would not only enrich the student environment at Ohio University, but also would add to the competitive educational atmosphere and significantly aid our recruiting efforts.

Financial Concerns:

- The most troublesome issue with this document stems from its lack of accountability when handling its 37 million dollar budget. The Student Senate felt strongly that the estimated investments for each strategy seemed unbelievably arbitrary. Given that there are distinct and substantial strategies and outcomes stemming from each objective, there needs to be a more defined breakdown of monies allotted to each objective.
 - The Senate feared that future, unjustified cuts in other departments and programs may result in attempts to provide for the given reallocations; the current evaluation process of the 5 Year Academic Action Plan must not act as insulation for potential decisions.
- There needs to be a monetary consideration for increasing scholarship funds. This does not necessarily have to come from an increase in the original 37 million, but could be pulled from other sources.

To reiterate, Senate feels as if the 5 Year Academic Plan is focusing our university on the correct overall goals. Issues such as retention rates, the out of class experience and student leadership are admirable and serve a need for this institution. But, these goals and what is precipitated from them, are also broad, undefined and opaque. In addition, the Senate strongly voiced its concern with the apparent arbitrariness of the fiscal component of the plan.

Therefore, the Ohio University Student Senate implores the 5 Year Academic Action Plan committee to breakdown this document for further explanation. Although the haste of the plan's current time table is understood, for the sake of definition and the eventual direction of Ohio University, the committee must delay this process to better clarify the not only the source of these reallocations but also their destinations and then synthesize the constituent feedback given in a reasonable amount of time.

A RESOLUTION FOR THE INCLUSION OF STUDENT ACTIVITIES COMMISSION IN
THE FIVE YEAR ACADEMIC ACTION PLAN

1. *Whereas:* Student organizations funded by the Student Activities Commission coordinate and implement student programs that enrich the educational, cultural and social environment on campus, and
2. *Whereas:* numerous organizations also conduct “late-night programming” in order to offer an educational, cultural or social alternative to high-risk behavior on weekend nights, and
3. *Whereas:* three student programming boards, Black Student Cultural Programming Board, International Student Union and University Program Council, are university organizations built into the mission of various departments housed under Student Affairs, the Office of the Provost and the Office of Diversity, and
4. *Whereas:* the Student Activities Commission (SAC), a branch of the Ohio University Student Senate, is charged with the allocation of funds to student organizations and student programming boards, and
5. *Whereas:* The Student Activities Commission will allocate \$441,269 to student organizations and programming boards for the 2007-2008 school year, and
6. *Whereas:* The Student Activities Commission allocates money to programs that enrich the educational, cultural and social environment on campus, and
7. *Whereas:* the “Five-year Academic Action Plan” seeks to address academic support areas including residence life and NCAA athletics, and
8. *Whereas:* the document stands currently, the “Five-year Academic Action Plan” does not have a mention of Ohio University’s 340-plus student organizations and programming boards, and
9. *Whereas:* the document lacks a mention of Student Activities Commission’s role as the primary funding source for programs conducted by organizations and programming boards, therefore be it
10. *Resolved:* that the Ohio University Student Senate believes that student organizations and student programming boards are an intricate part of an Ohio University’s all-around educational mission, and further be it
11. *Resolved:* that the Senate advocates for the inclusion of Student Activities Commission, student
12. programming boards and student organizations in the “Five-year Academic Action Plan” as these groups serve as academic support to students, and further be it
13. *Resolved:* that the Senate strongly encourages the authors of the “Five-year Academic Action Plan” to add another strategy under goal IV objective 1 that says, “increase the wherewithal of the Student Activities Commission to enhance student programming across campus.”, and further be it
14. *Resolved:* That copies of this resolution be sent, to but not limited to: Dr. Roderick McDavis, President of Ohio University; Dr. Kathy Krendl, Executive Vice President and Provost of Ohio University; Dr. Kent Smith, Vice President for Student Affairs; Mr. William Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Dr. Sergio Lopez-Permouth, Chair of Faculty Senate; Ms. Brenda Noftz, Chair of Administrative Senate; Mr. Dominic Barbato, Chair of Graduate Student Senate; Mr. George Cheripko, Chair of Classified Senate; Dr. Charles McWeeny, Dean of the College of Fine Arts and Chair of the 5 Year Academic Action Plan Committee; all other member of the 5 Year Academic Action Plan Committee;

Mr. C. Daniel DeLawder, Chairman of the Board of Trustees; members of the Student Activities Commission

Sponsors: Mr. Will Wemer

Treasurer

Mr. Sean Morris

Commissioner for the Student Activities Commission

Mr. Chauncey Jackson

Senator for the South Green

Vice Commissioner for the Student Activities Commission

Sen. Res. 0708-19

Of all the things I've lost, I miss my mind the most. ~ Mark Twain

A RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSED 5-YEAR ACADEMIC ACTION PLAN

1. *Whereas:* The 5-Year Academic Action Plan has been open for review and comment by the constituent groups of Ohio University, and
2. *Whereas:* This plan seeks to reallocate over \$30 million in order to achieve certain goals and objectives highlighted in VISION Ohio and needed to position Ohio University within the University System of Ohio, and
3. *Whereas:* No document enumerating precisely how this money is to be reallocated currently exists, and
4. *Whereas:* The 5-Year Academic Action Plan has been created in haste, with little time budgeted for review and incorporation of constituent feedback by the Committee, therefore be it
5. *Resolved:* That the Ohio University Student Senate submits the feedback outlined in Appendix A to the 5-Year Academic Action Plan Committee, and further be it
6. *Resolved:* That Student Senate strongly urges Executive Vice President and Provost Krendl to consider delaying the progress of this document until more detailed information has been released regarding the reallocation of these funds and sufficient time has been allowed for the 5 Year Academic Action Plan Committee to properly synthesize constituent feedback, and further be it
7. *Resolved:* That copies of the resolution be sent to, but not limited to: Dr. Roderick McDavis, President of Ohio University; Dr. Kathy Krendl, Executive Vice President and Provost of Ohio University; Dr. Kent Smith, Vice President for Student Affairs; Mr. William Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Dr. Sergio Lopez-Permouth, Chair of Faculty Senate; Ms. Brenda Noftz, Chair of Administrative Senate; Mr. Dominic Barbato, Chair of Graduate Student Senate; Mr. George Cheripko, Chair of Classified Senate; Dr. Charles McWeeny, Dean of the College of Fine Arts and Chair of the 5 Year Academic Action Plan Committee; all other member of the 5 Year Academic Action Plan Committee; Mr. C. Daniel DeLawder, Chairman of the Board of Trustees;

Sponsors: Mr. Chris Diehl
Commissioner for Academic Affairs

Administrative Senate Response to the Five-Year Academic Action Plan

Administrative Senate sought perspectives and feedback regarding the proposed Five Year Academic Plan through an e-mail solicitation that yielded fewer responses than expected. Additional feedback was solicited through contacts to administrators in various planning units and various positions throughout the university. Many administrators expressed their confusion with this prioritizing process as it related to Vision Ohio, perceiving the 5 Year Plan to be duplicative of the Vision Ohio process.

The consensus of opinions expressed were that the items identified in the 5 Year Plan create the opportunity for individual units to advance their initiatives (such as Advancement, Athletics, Communication, etc.) but may not as easily connect to the larger institutional goals consistent with Vision Ohio or be most illuminating of Ohio University's contribution to the University System of Ohio. Much time and discussion occurred in identifying institutional processes to realize the provisions of Vision Ohio while the 5 Year Plan and corresponding 5 Year Financial plan permitted much less time for discussion. Depending on which planning unit the administrators were related to, specific proposed plans in the 5 Year Plan were endorsed. For example, those who have a relationship to Advancement and Alumni affairs thought the university would most benefit by selecting the development proposals as top priorities for funding and support. Others who were related to Athletics believed that support of those proposals would advance the university's mission more fully. Because our constituents are part of each of the planning units with proposals in the 5 Year Plan, we are unable to endorse any one set of proposals over the others.

We would however, suggest prioritizing the individual initiatives in an order related to the previously identified three principal goals of Vision Ohio –1) undergraduate education, 2) graduate education and 3) faculty, staff and student quality and diversity. The advantage to using the framework of these topics would be that achievement of anyone of the three would require planning units and individual departments to work towards joint goal success, requiring collaboration among units and employee groups rather than creating or reinforcing silos of effort and funding. Enhancement of the undergraduate education may include portions of the Student Affairs proposal, the Advancement proposal as well as the IT proposal. Enhancing faculty, staff and student quality and diversity may include portions of the Communications plan, the Advancement plan, Athletics and the IT proposal. We believe the continuous promotion of these priorities would enhance the university's position relative to the University System of Ohio and what Ohio University focuses on more effectively than promotion of individual unit objectives.

Additionally, Administrative Senate strongly encourages the inclusion of those provisions that support the academic plan through administrative functions and services. Ohio University will not be able to support the three goals without supporting structures and systems of IT, human and financial resources that provide and enhance the academic functions. The support structures and systems must be a part of any planning process, working towards the same institutional goals as the academic functions. Framing the priorities towards the three principal goals of Vision Ohio will provide the opportunity for a more concerted effort towards that achievement.

Should you have questions about our recommendations or input, please do not hesitate to call. Thanks for the opportunity to participate.

Date: November 2, 2007

To: Dean McWeeny, Chair of the Five Year Academic Action Plan Committee

From: George Cheripko Chair of Classified Senate

Classified Senate applauds the effort of putting forth a five year plan for Ohio University. We do feel that this is a good start, but we do have concerns with it. Classified Senate hopes that this is only a start and the plan will be adjustable in the future as things change.

We feel that the plan was put together rather quickly. There was a rush to meet the deadline of the Chancellor and we feel this may hinder the project. Classified Senate does not feel that there was adequate time to look at the strategic plans put forth by the various departments across campus during the Vision OHIO planning. We hope that there will be some sort of oversight to make sure the top priorities in this plan match up well with Vision OHIO planning. A review of the plan soon would be a good step.

Classified Senate has great concern of where the money is coming from to pay for this plan. Since we do not have any extra money, we assume that something will have to be "given up". Before we can fully support any plan, we need to know what the trade offs will be. There will be tough decisions to make on what to eliminate in order to fund these new initiatives. It will help to see everything on the table. The plan is rather ambiguous and we would like to receive more detail.

Another area of concern for Classified Senate is the lack of money being directed to staffing. With new project and programs, there will be a need for staff to direct, oversee and administer them. Most of our staff (especially in academic units) are already overworked and could not take on much more. Some staff may also need additional training depending on the duties assigned to them.

Classified Senate would like to see a more detailed plan done. We are highly concerned about the trade offs that are needed to make this happen. It would be easy to support a new initiative without knowing what would be eliminated. We would like to see the staffing concerns addressed in this plan also.

Addendum:

Added November 21, 2007

Classified Senate would like to add an addition to our report for the Five Year Academic Action Plan. During discussions over the last week, we saw a need to have several things added to our report.

First, Classified Senate would like to have funding for our Career Development Program (CDP). This would be very beneficial to the classified staff here on campus. This program could provide invaluable training for our staff in these changing times. Our hope is that certificate programs will be added that will have a direct impact on our employees and this university. Along with certificates the addition of Ohio University classes would be very welcome to provide a variety of options to classified employees for training and advancement.

Second, Classified Senate would like to see funding to do a full compensation study for classified employees. We realize that we would need to wait for the Director of Compensation to be hired, but would like to see the start of this process. Our own compression study showed a large number of classified employees were low on our pay range. Along with the study we would like to see a one time adjustment on top of our annual raise, not a reduction from other employees. We would like the same respect that other constituent groups have received. We would be willing to talk about a multi-year adjustment if needed.

Third, Classified Senate would like to see the "Overmax" eliminated for longer-term employees who have reached the top level of their pay range. These long-term employees are very valuable and should not be punished for staying in a job they love. This is a very loyal group of older employees who should be rewarded.

Fourth, classified Senate would like to see more Wellness initiatives with our health insurance. Preventive health care is a high priority with us as a way to eventually save money and have a more productive campus.

Thanks for your time,
George L Cheripko IV

Vision Ohio Five Year Implementation Plan
Open Forum
October 10, 2007

Question: On page 5, it lists the objectives to enhance the integration of student affairs and academic units and instill among students a sense of personal and civic responsibility and proposes the budget at no cost. This is what is currently taking place already and for these things to happen on a larger scale, if that is what is being introduced, would require additional funding. What is the strategy or concept of what is happening now with no increase in budget, versus what can be done with or w/o monetary investments?

Response: While no monetary budget is listed, it may be something they are thinking of handling with a one-time only budget increase. This plan is for an increase in the units base budgets, not just one-time increase.

Question: Is the Board of Trustees providing a realistic time-line to discuss these types of investments? It seems this is a very short turn-a-round time to discuss in any great length what is being proposed.

Response: Unsure. This could be driven by several factors. An example would be this may be driven by what the Trustees need (their time-line) to submit to the State of Ohio for the university to be in compliance with the State's regulations for higher education.

Question: On page 2, #II, Enhance Graduate and Professional Education and Research. How was this information gathered (to determine the two percent need of graduate applications, etc) and what is needed to spend on them to achieve the goal? With \$1.535M budgeted for this line item, is it for graduate (GA's, research, creative activity, etc.) students or is it mainly being spent on hiring more administrators?

Response: Unsure. Additional Response: For clarification, the question is at what point does someone pick what needs to be done and what is the cost of it. What gives the priority to where we should start first.

Question: On page 2, academics as a whole is receiving \$1,535M and on page 5, athletics is receiving \$777,000. Why is so much funding going to athletics, a small body of students, versus the regular academic or top notch students? Considering what athletics already has in place from prior awards, this seems an excessive amount for a small body versus the university body as a whole. What is this funding to be used for in athletics?

Response: The Athletic Department is proud of the academic success of an 83% graduation success rate. Last year it was at 82%. They would like to hire additional academic advisors for a more successful/increase in the graduation rate. Mainly it is for the personal & professional development of the students so they are better able to succeed after they graduate. This is what the athletic students have been asking for.

Response to Response: The same goals stated from the athletic department for students could be

made from all the academic units. From paper, it seemed to be driven by increasing the graduation rate by only one or two point in the percentage. However, the point is still the same in that there is a small investment in the overall academic units as a whole versus the large amount of support/investment for only a few.

Question: The five-year financial investment plan being proposed is inadequate for interdisciplinary activities. The Interdisciplinary Implementation Team submitted a report to the provost that calls for a number of urgent measures. The first is the establishment of an Interdisciplinary Council and Provost Krendl agreed to its creation as a first step.(FYI, I am attaching a copy of the report.) Faculty Senate failed to act on its agreement to establish the Council as a standing committee and appoint its members. The new Executive Committee is acting on this at present and the Council should start operating soon, probably this quarter.

However, establishing the ID Council and appointing its members was only the first step. After that, the Council is supposed to look at the key recommendations of the proposal and advise the provost on how to implement them. And those recommendations will cost significantly more than what has been allocated. The key investments needed include:

(1) A .25 to .5 FTE clerical staff position to provide administrative support for the Council. This, obviously, is a minor investment.

(2) Create a central pool that will provide the necessary funds for appropriate buy-outs of faculty members appointed to leadership positions in interdisciplinary programs. This is probably the biggest barrier to interdisciplinarity at present and is a problem that has repeatedly been identified by various groups that have worked on issues of interdisciplinarity for several years now. Every provost since at least Sharon Brehm has dealt with this issue and appointed study groups, advisory panels and the like but so far no action has been taken. The present practice, that dates from at least the 1970s, and probably the 1960s, is to offer the directors of ID programs a small stipend and to pay their home departments or schools a buyout -- two courses being typical. Course buy-outs are seldom more than \$5,000 per course, and sometimes less. Most ID director positions are at least .33 FTE, half time being more typical, and substantially more for large programs like African Studies. Still, the home department usually gets compensated for no more than the two-course buy-out, or about \$10,000, to release a senior faculty member from teaching, service and other duties frequently exceeding 50% of the faculty member's time. This is a model that some academic units agreed to accept for years, although some departments did not. But this is no longer the case. The logic of the new university budgeting model and the general dynamics of change in academia make the old model untenable. As we look to the future, ID programs will probably not survive unless the funding model changes. The Interdisciplinary Implementation Team understood that criteria will be needed to determine which interdisciplinary programs and positions are truly needed and must be centrally funded. But it is clear that a good

number of such positions will have to be funded. If "funding an ID leadership position" will mean reimbursing the home department or school for 50% of a faculty member's salary and benefits (so that they can use those funds to replace at least the lost teaching capacity, for example with Group II appointments), the average cost per leadership position times a minimum number of appointments of this nature would require an investment of several hundred thousand dollars.

(3) The Interdisciplinary Implementation Team report, consistent with recommendations from similar groups in the past, also calls for the establishment of "tagged positions" and "dual" or "joint" appointments. A task of the new Interdisciplinary Council will be to work with the provost and the deans in determining how this will be done, how many positions will be tagged or listed as dual or joint appointments, and how this will be funded. But, clearly, this will also require a substantial investment that will clearly exceed the amount allocated in the proposed five-year financial investment plan.

(4) The report also recommends an investment in research and creative activity funds. This is not as clearly defined in the report (although the report makes a reference to \$350,000 as an amount being proposed) and will be a task for the new ID Council to work on. But it does seem that the Council will probably confirm the need for some investment in this area.

A number of interdisciplinary programs have had the same faculty members as directors for a long time, including some of the larger ones. They will probably have to be replaced in the near future. Unless the funding problem is solved, it will be increasingly more difficult for academic departments to accept a \$10,000 buyout to compensate for the loss of 50% or more of a faculty member's time (and typically a senior and highly productive professor) so that she or he can assume a leadership role in an ID program outside the department or school, and sometimes even outside the college. A particular case in point is the Center for International Studies and its 5 program directors.

Question: This question is directed to Athletics. Given the fiscal environment on campus, athletics was given a very large budget increase this year over last year. Can you please explain the large increase and why even more is being requested. How does this effect the students fee they already pay for athletics - increased or remain the same. All students are concerned about the high cost of fees already.

Response: The budget procedures are calculated different now than they used to be. The \$1.2M addition to his budget this year was for various reasons. There was a transfer of budget from facilities for space allocation; there was a 3% classified pay increase; and there was a health insurance increase. Although our budget did not get a cut like other units, it did not really increase either.

Response to Response: You eliminated 4 programs, so there should have been savings there as well. Is the \$775,000 still needed or could you use the savings to help offset this amount.

Response: The eliminated programs saved us money, however, it has already been placed in other areas of need within the department.

Vision Ohio Five Year Implementation Plan
Open Forum
October 16, 2007

Question: Where are the academic unit plans, which seem to be missing. Feels the academic units needs to be detailed or listed more clearly. Do they have what they need in place to do the Vision Ohio goals set forth in this document. Example of this question would be “are you taking from the foundation to make the landscape look good? Goals for the academic units were nicely listed in the Vision Ohio document. It is important to see how this document affects the academics.

Response: Question is: needs to better reflect the academic units priorities, i.e., faculty being better able to embrace it. Also would like to make sure all the constituents are parallel with regards to faculty, students AND staff, i.e, diverse faculty should be inclusive of diverse staff and diverse student body.

Response/Response: Some of the allocations are being funded using the current budget, some are from past cuts, etc. No details were specifically given, so you are stating you would like to see where the funding in this list comes from in more detail.

Response/Concern: This does not seem realistic - to increase diverse faculty at no cost. In current searches, we are already striving to increase our diverse/minority faculty. We can't compete with other institutions on this because we cannot offer the salary to attract them. Re-alignments/cuts in the budget have been the norm for several years, so additional funding **would** be required/needed. It's just not realistic to state otherwise.

Question/Concern: The goals in Vision Ohio for Graduate Students does not seem to be addressed/supported in this document financially. This includes lowering the student fees, health and wellness, arts and humanities, development, etc. This document needs to be inclusive of these things which were stated in Vision Ohio as goals for recruitment and retention of graduate students, but seems to be omitted in this current fiscal plan which is being submitted. Would like to see this issue addressed in this document.

Question/Concern: In relation to the fist discussion, we need to be aware of where we want to be in 5 years, look at the bench mark for a determination. Do we need/want to re-evaluate the numbers in this document? What happens along the way if this plan is not working. Do we continue this plan as submitted or do we pull funding and reinvest in other/new areas?

Question: This document does not address the new student information system that is greatly needed. When is this going to be addressed?

Response: There is on-going discussions about the new student information system which is estimated to cost around \$20,000,000 currently. This is not addressed in this document as

they are looking at it differently. This is a technology based discussion which needs to be funded as such. It is understood that the current system will outgrow itself in the next few years, so much more dialogue is needed, determining where the funding will come from, what system is to be used, etc. But that is something that is being discussed currently and not forgotten even though it is not listed in this 5-year plan.

Response/Response: The discussion would include what it would cost to achieve these goals. This plan does not address the entire budget, which may/may not include future cuts or an increase in revenue from higher enrollment. There will be a need to better prioritize the overall budget if some things don't work, yet the need being there to cover other things that need to be addressed.

Question/Concern: When you list funding for increasing the faculty, there also needs to be an increase in startup funding. The question would be is OU wanting to grow the faculty or just wanting to grow diversity faculty? With the Provost's remarks to Faculty Senate, it was discussed growth per capita, but nothing about growing faculty. Is this just growth before quality?

Concern/Response: A lot of this involves faculty input to make this successful. The faculty's efforts or available resources, etc. are not reflected in this plan to make it happen.

Concern/Response: In "Increasing Student/Faculty Interaction Outside of the Classroom" This does not list a measurement of to how to do this with the current faculty workload of classes, services (committees, advising, chairing areas, etc), research, on top of other things the faculty are currently being expected to do -- This document adds to an already large workload currently being asked of our faculty without addressing what will need to happen to address this increase of time investment, i.e., time off from teaching? Pay adjustment?

Question/Concern: There are no funds for Interdisciplinary programs listed until 2010. These programs are already facing challenges now which need to be addressed immediately. Efforts and funding needs should be shifted to address this issue now in this current document. The problems will only multiply if this area is not addressed causing irreversible damage to some of these programs.

Question: In the Development section, it seems to be a lot of funding is being requested. Please explain in further detail why the large amount is being sought.

Response: There are several factors. Development is taking a decentralized approach. One goal is to put a development officer in each academic unit. For example, A&S, BUS, COM, etc., have a large alumni base to pull from. We are creating goals for each academic unit and have listed our targets for each month accordingly. Another goal the units are wanting is to grow endowments (chairs, faculty), scholarship growth, new facilities, etc. There is a strategic growth plan. Alumni benchmarks are looked at. Currently, we have a 13%

participation of alumni giving which is under 30 thousand who give back out of roughly 150,000 alumni. We need to work one-on-one with alumni who have been targeted can give \$1,000 or more and work with them to give their potential. To be successful, a combination of staff and volunteers is needed to make this successful. For the next campaign to be successful, a set of CLEAR goals need to be set. They are trying to strengthen the infrastructure of the Development Office to better deal with a new campaign. To explain which academic unit they are trying to build and how, there just isn't enough time. Certainly, they are working with those units who have plans and are eager to seek out their help in accomplishing them. In Facilities 10 year plan, philanthropy plays a major part of its success.

Question/Concern: There is a grave concern about on-line teaching and how that affects OU and other institutions who promote it's usage. Weighted Student Credit Hours (WSCH) does not capture what we want faculty to be doing. The roles and responsibilities of faculty like service and research are not reflected in the WSCH report.

Concern/Response: There is technology in the classroom, on-line technology and internet technology. There needs to be improved faculty indicators to be able to use these different technologies/programs. Needs to be appropriate to what the trends are and the capability to teach these technologies for a better student learning environment. This needs to be addressed/enabled by increased funding to faculty for this purpose so we can be pro-active/competitive with other institutions who offer on-line courses and/or degrees.

Question: In reinforcing success, Under VI. Enhance National Prominence (\$4.8 million) - #3 Increase Faculty Compensation and #1 Invest in Targeted Undergraduate Programs (\$500 thousand), how do you propose this when you are investing a large portion to faculty compensation and investing a very small amount in the programs? Enhancing prominence would include several factors, not necessarily just retaining current faculty which the figures show is what is being invested in.

Response: One idea would be the units would need to focus on areas that are successful and reinforce those types of successful programs. Although this may hamper programs that are not as strong, other avenues would need to be looked at to strengthen and adjust the competing programs accordingly.

Vision Ohio Five Year Implementation Plan
Open Forum
October 26, 2007

Question: Where will the money come from to pay for this plan?

Response: Parts will be from generated income (i.e., retention). Parts will be from re-allocation. Some has still not been decided.

Question/Concern: Currently, there is a large problem of a shortage of scholarships for the students at OU. There needs to be a increase in the funding to make even the current scholarships more feasible. There does not seem to be any funding listed in this plan to address this problem. Would like to see this addressed/included in this plan.

Question from Branch Campus: Is this plan designed to act as a road-map (model) for regional campuses to follow as well?

Response: Yes.

Question: This plan does not specifically say where the money is going. How will the funding be distributed?

Response: While the plan outlines a few specific details as to what some areas are to receive, it is not a specific document. There is not a complete detailed list as yet.

Question: On Page 1, Objectives 1, Strategies a, “Expand availability of learning communities including regional campuses. The money proposed, \$2.871M over five years, looks great. How does the regional campuses get a piece of this?

Response: Unsure. This document is just a working draft at this point. Further discussions will be needed to make that determination.

Question: Is there a prioritization among the different pools of funding? If you don’t achieve the goals set forth, will there still be funding given? Will be know what the prioritizations are?

Response: This document does not provide that information. It should be re-stated that the work this committee is currently undertaking, is only a small part of what needs to happen to begin the process of addressing the issues set forth in this document. Further discussions/meetings will be needed as this Implementation Plan is defined and put into place.

Question: On page 3, Goals IV, Objectives 2, “Improve the Health and Safety of Students”. Is this topic related to the regional campuses as well? It should be if it isn’t inclusive.

Response/Response: This document is a budget for the Athens campus, not the regional campus. The regional campuses budget and the Athens campus budget are separate and are looked at differently.

Question/Concern: On page 2, Goal III, Objective 3, Increase Diversity of Graduate Students. The current strategy (a) only lists recruiting from Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The strategy should be inclusive of Women's Colleges/Institutions, Hispanic Students, Tribal Students, etc. The strategy needs to be re-written so it is inclusive in the final document.

Question: Will the current committee continue it's work on this plan (seeking input on prioritizing the needs, defining the budget sources, etc.), seeing it through the final implementation process?

Response: The committees' charge is to gather input (about the proposed plan) from all areas across the University, compile the results - addressing all concerns that are being stated - into a report, and then submit this report to the Provost by November 15.

Question: What is the role of the Administrative Staff in this plan? How does it support them and what is expected of them?

Response (Athletics): There are three major goals/strategies for Athletics: increasing graduation success rates, competing for championships, and provide more personal and professional development opportunities for our athletes. Recruiting and retaining successful coaches and staffing are essential to accomplishing these goals.

Response (Communication & Marketing): The department proposes four major initiatives which are listed on their website. Mainly our role is to support high quality education and to have higher visibility. Initiatives include: strengthen student recruitment marketing, continue with the academic marketing campaign, co-lead a project with the Office of Information Technology to do a web site assessment of the needs of the units, and to focus on building better visibility in regional and national news media. Each of these initiatives invest in our faculty/staff.

Question: How does the Classified Staff fit in? How do they play a role in this endeavor?

Response: To increase retention. Classified and administrative staff all play a major role in the retention of our students.

Question: What is the make-up of the committee?

Response: 3 Vice Presidents, the chairs of Classified Senate, Administrative Senate, Faculty Senate, Graduate Student Senate and Undergraduate Student Senate, 3 Dean's, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the Executive Dean of Regional Campuses.

Question: What is the current graduation rate of the athletic students?

Response: 82%. This ranking is from our peers in the Mid-American Conference. This currently puts us in 5th place, out of a possible 12.

Question: How does that rate compare with Ohio University as a whole?

Response: That would have variable outcomes. If you look at the Federal Graduation rate, it is currently 2% below the general graduation rate.

Response to Response: The University needs to put this funding where it is needed versus what someone's goals might be for their particular program. All academic units could state the same goals, but only one unit is being invested in. We just need to place funding where it is needed, not just wanted.

Question: How does this support the branch campuses with regards to Athletics?

Response: This funding would affect 16 varsity programs on the Athens campus only. It was not meant to address issues on the branch campuses.

Question: Is this process/plan, one that is strengthening the regional campuses with the Athens campus?

Response: This process has not strengthened the relationship. Feels this is not relative to them and doesn't feel they are being separated from Athens.

Response/Regional Response: They are looking over the plan but they do not know how they would go about accessing some of the funding pockets. The regional campuses would like to have a seat at the table when these discussions are taking place.

Response/Response: Planning process should not be separate. They need to be better identified. How are the regional campuses going to fit in with the Athens campus if they are always treated differently? If the same issues being addressed on this campus is not being addressed on theirs? Even if the budgets are looked at differently, they should be included in this planning document and in the planning discussions. Perhaps we can include the regional campuses in the next open forum as well.

Vision Ohio Five Year Implementation Plan
Open Forum
November 1, 2007

Comment: Graduate Student Senate is presenting to Chair/Dean Chuck McWeeny, 155 signed letters of support for the resolution passed by Graduate Senate in favor of improving our financial and health care conditions at Ohio University. These include decreasing the cost of the General Fee; subsidize health care costs; increase size and number of stipends and named fellowships; and increase the GSS grant fund.

Question to Graduate Student Senate: What would be the top graduate priority (from list being submitted)?

Reply: Decreasing the cost of the general fee and/or subsidizing health care. Graduate Assistantships as well. If the university increases the enrollment for graduate students, that would spread what support is currently available even thinner. There should be more support dollars available with the current enrollment and then build on this funding should enrollment be increased.

Question: Where is the \$37 million dollars coming from to invest in this plan? The academic departments have already been reduced to the bare bones in their current budget from prior cuts in the past few years.

Reply: This has not been fully decided. Part will come from the re-allocation of the past budget cuts, part of the plan is to generate additional income, and then President McDavis having further discussions with the Provost/VP's/Deans to find the remainder needed.

Question: Regarding the enhancement of support for graduate and professional students. How did they arrive at the dollar amount listed (\$1.535M)? This is only 1/33rd cut out of the overall budget being requested. This seems like a really small amount when looked at in these terms.

Response: The answer will be better addressed at the Graduate Student Senate meeting next Monday night. The Provost and Vice Presidents have already stated they will be in attendance to answer these questions.

Question: Were promises made during the Vision Ohio process for graduate students but are not being implemented in this document? Interested in learning what commitment OU is placing on their graduate students as it seems it is not really interested when you look at what funding is actually being invested in graduate education.

Response: The reality of the budget is a matter of proportion. It's not whether we value education as it is what funding do we have to invest.

Question: This pertains to graduate fees. OU promised during the Vison Ohio discussions

to help lower these fees but does not deliver in this document.

Response: The current budget is the most transparent than it ever has been before. The State of Ohio budget has us scrambling to reassign the funding decisions made earlier. This has been a consistent problem in that the State's budget isn't decided until after our budget is in "place", which causes the university to then scramble and do reassignments to make our budget balance. There are decisions that need to be made by the President and his committee as to how the entire budget is to be spent.

Question: If things are not addressed in this 5 year plan, does that mean they will not be discussed in the next 5 years?

Response: No. Budget and circumstances are constantly a flux. There will always be discussions taking place. Priorities change, budgets/funding changes, etc. We always have to look to our values and plan accordingly as best we can.

Question: What IS the process to get a larger piece of the pie (budget)?

Response: This is part of it, voicing concerns at these forums. The Senates (Graduate, Faculty, Classified, Administrative) are all having meetings and will submit their input to the committee. The committee's report will be inclusive of everyone's needs. So everyone should attend their respective Senate meetings as well to make sure their concerns are communicated.

Question: Where do the classified people fit in this plan? There have already been prior job eliminations. Will there be layoffs to pay for this plan?

Response: This will be part of the discussions that need to take place. The weakness of this plan is that it doesn't tell where the funding will be coming from.

Question/Concern: How do the strategies link to the outcomes? There needs to be a measurement put in place that is specific. Actual costs need to be listed, being specific/detailed as to what each aspect costs. This would add to understanding the processed measures. We can all disagree as to the priorities, but there needs to be specific measurements in place for each priority listed.

Question: How do we expand our budget from the State? It seems OSU gets a lot more funding from the state than what anybody else does for the same type of programs/enrollment. Shouldn't we have someone go to Columbus and lobby them to get a larger piece of the pie?

Response: This is already happening. Terry Geiger and President McDavis are constantly working on this in Columbus.

Question: What are we doing to re-position ourselves? There needs to be a much more better job of communication happening at OU, to let everyone know what is going on in Columbus and how OU is working to resolve the issues. In not hearing what is happening,

we assume nothing is being done by OU because we haven't read or heard anything. So more communication is necessary if we are to be better informed of what OU is doing at the State level and not rushing to judgment. Which leads back to my question.

Response: It is hard to strategize when we don't know what the State is doing from one year to the next. Both President McDavis and Provost Krendl sit at the table on very important State committees and work very hard on our behalf. But when the State budget is affected for what ever reason, it will impact our budget as well.

Question: What is the Board of Regents time frame for this?

Response: The committee will need to present the summary of these discussions to the Provost by November 15. The Provost has to have her report to the President by November 30. The President has the month of December to have continued discussions and to re-write this plan as necessary by the end of January so he can deliver the final version to the Trustees at their February meeting.

Question: Why don't we have a major initiative for fundraising?

Response: There has been a large transition of staff in the Development Office due to a change in the leadership. Even through all the staffing shortages, they were still able to bring in large sums of monetary donations. The Development Office is always working on this but they do need more help.

Concern: This document completely lacks vision. This report was not hatched by educators but by administrators. This is a very bad plan that betrays a lack of vision. Example: Pg 3, Goal IV, Objective 1, Strategy a, there is only \$35 thousand budgeted for this over a period of five years which equals to just \$7 thousand a year for the entire campus to pull from. This is too small funding and is clearly looked at as having no value. Under civic responsibility, which is THE most important thing in strengthening retention, no money is associated with it. There is ~~appalling~~ bad judgment in this document. There is no vision in this plan.

Concern: Increasing diversity of Faculty & Staff at no cost is not a realistic statement. We are always trying to fill positions with people who are/have diverse backgrounds. More funding would be needed, on a regular basis, to afford the opportunity to actually reach such a goal. The no cost association attached to this plan is not realistic at all.

**Brief Summary of Comments about the *Five Year Academic Action Plan*
From the Chairs and Directors' Council**

Where do the cuts come from?

Where does the \$30,000,000 come from? Which units? Through increased revenue? Cuts? What will be sacrificed?

Related - If we are to reallocate this large amount of money, we need to know where the pain is before moving forward.

Without knowing what might be lost and where it will come from, it is difficult to judge whether the investments are worth the trouble of going through a re-allocation process.

As a general comment, the goals are hard to argue with, but that excludes any broad view of the potential costs elsewhere.

\$30 million may be too much to try and swallow since it is nearly 10% of our budget.

Lack of Details or Clarity

Much confusion about whether the total operating reallocation over 5 years is 30,000,000 or not. Need clarity about this and the presentation should perhaps show cumulative totals instead of yearly totals.

Projected increases in several of the goals are not clearly stated. For example, does an increase in diversity indicate an increase in the total number of students enrolled or a change in the mix of students from various ethnic backgrounds with no increase in enrollment. Other items expressing an annual increase are similarly confusing or unclear.

Some budget numbers seem to underestimate the real costs. For example, increasing the number of students participating in research might be achievable in the first year given the budgeted amount, but if planning to increase by 1% every year, the total number of students involved in research quickly becomes large.

If the base line were included, the achievability of goals would be easier to judge.

Narrative needed to explain the budgeted items.

Is any of this one time money?

Affect on academic units

The details of the programs that will be established to help with retention, engagement, research, etc. are not provided. If the location of those programs is outside of the academic departments, it will not be useful to already overburdened faculty.

If it is not new money then we will bleed the academic units to build up the support units.

Establishing a council and creating more joint appointments is unlikely to solve our interdisciplinary problems.

There is no mention of increasing the number of faculty lines. This should be central to any plan.

Strategy

It is not strategic to re-allocate and capitalize on open faculty lines. We are already doing both strategic and un-strategic re-allocation and do not need more.

This appears to be a reversal of the process from two years ago which was -> find cuts then decide where to make strategic investments; now we define where we want investments and locate the cuts later.

What if we don't meet enrollment targets? Is there a safety mechanism in place? Which items will not be addressed if we don't have the money?

Don't spend money you don't have. Get the enrollment first.

Shouldn't this whole plan be reconsidered including the potential influence of the University System of Ohio?

We should approach this as a wish list and begin to prioritize the items that are most essential and see how far the money will take us.

Governance

Lines of shared governance appear to be circumvented by this process.

Concern that these forums and meetings will be construed as adequate consultation for a plan that is already a "done deal".

Detailed responses from one chair:

"Investment" implies an expected return. Where there is anticipated monetary return, it should be clearly laid out. That was done in V.5. Is there an anticipated increase in revenue due to increase enrollment? Increased research?

There needs to be a distinction between 1-time expenditures and ongoing expenses. If I spend \$100K to renovate one building this year, I can spend that same \$100K in next year's budget on another building. But if I am investing \$100K annually in new faculty, then I need \$100K this year, and \$200K total next year, and \$300K total the next year . . .

I.2.c. Please take advantage of existing outcomes assessment in programs that do it for accreditation. Do not make them write yet another report.

I.3.b. What are the implications of a joint appointment? Where is the P&T home of the faculty member? Who gets credit for what under RCB? We don't need another layer of bureaucracy to do this (Interdisciplinary Council). We need a short-lived task force that identifies barriers to joint appointments and has them removed. I am unable to guess at what this \$\$\$ is to be spent on.

II.1. How much of this \$\$\$ is actually to be invested in graduate students, and how much is being wasted on another layer of bureaucracy called a Graduate School? Torpedo the graduate school and spend the money within existing structures to recruit quality students and support them with tuition scholarships and internal grant programs.

III.1. I am VERY disturbed by the outcome "Decrease the acceptance rate" I assume this is being done because we want to score higher on the USNWR selectivity scale. Why not invest in finding people we have no intention of ever admitting, help them fill out the form, and waiving the application fee? Then we can reject them and make ourselves look great! Is this even what we want? If we had applications from a full freshman class of people with 32 ACTs and no one else, would we want to reject a lot of them? The other outcomes in this section look good and positive to me.

III.2. Interesting, the idea that we can increase faculty and staff diversity at no cost. I suppose, no cost visible to the Provost. But every time you advertise in a different place to try to increase the diversity of your applicant pool

Iv.7.a. I suggest that as a strategy we forbid scheduled training between 8:00 am and 4:00 pm. Costs nothing, and increases the access that student-athletes have to coursework and degree programs.

V. The IT investment is absolutely needed. How much of this is one-time? How much is a perpetual increase?

V.7.b What does "Apply percentage of carry forward to quasi endowments" mean?

V.8. Great idea. So why is most of the spending planned here on support services?

VI.2. Do we want more students, or better students? Some good programs are already near max in terms of numbers, although we might improve the mix of students they attract. Is more the only outcome of interest?

VI.4 Can someone tell me where I could get numbers for research expenditures? LEO only gives research awards.