

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.