Ohio University Administrative Senate
Minutes of August 22, 2002
Baker Center 334

Next Meeting: September 26, 2002, 11:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Elizabeth Baker Room, Baker Center

Present: Dorothy Anderson, Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Sherry Barnes, Maggi Channell, Terry Conry, Jean Cunningham, Karen Dahn, Sherry Downs, Doug Franklin, Julio Friere, Jim Gilmore, Doug Grammer, Wendy Merb-Brown, Chris Morris, John Ray, Deanna Russell, Christine Sheets, Ralph Six, Rusty Smith, Gretchen Stephens, Andrew Stuart, Dale Tampke

Excused: Tina Abdella, Blis Hanousek DeVault, Patty Griffith, Sharon Huge, Judith Johnson, Kim Lawson, Barbara Montgomery, Chris Reghetti-Feyler, Cheryl Riley, Jean Witkowski

Absent: R. Douglas Pettit

Guests: Kim Greenfest, Jim Kemper, George Mauzy, Gary North

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

Approval of June Minutes: Andrew Stuart moved to approve the minutes of June 20, 2002. Gretchen Stephens seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Dorothy Anderson introduced guests George Mauzy from University Marketing and Communications and Kim Greenfest and Jim Kemper from Human Resources.

Special Guest: Jim Kemper, Assistant Vice President for Administration for Human Resources

Chair’s Report: Dorothy Anderson
• Welcomed Doug Franklin back to Senate.
• Announced that Deanna Russell has been asked to represent District 4 and Dale Tampke has been asked to represent District 14 this year and requested a motion to ratify these appoints. Maggi Channell moved that these appointments be ratified and Karen Dahn seconded the motion and the appointments were unanimously approved.
• Informed Senate that orientation for the new and re-elected senators went very well.
• Reminded Senators to register their vehicles with Parking Services.
• Distributed Graystone Group Advertising brochures.
Announced that 9/11 events were being planning and asked that Senators watch the OU website and local media for details.

Reminded Senators that Advance is scheduled for Thursday, September 26, 2002, from 11 a.m.-4 p.m., Elizabeth Baker Room, Baker Center; that President Glidden will speak at 11 a.m. about the vision and challenges for the future, including the budget for the next 2-3 years, administrators’ role in vision and challenges, logo/word mark, review “institutional growth”, including building plans; that Gary North will speak after lunch and provide a transition from the President’s remarks to our planning process; that Becky Bushey-Miller will facilitate the planning session.

Encouraged Senators to contact their constituents for ideas for Advance planning.

**Vice Chair’s Report:** Jean Witkowski—Not present—No report

**Secretary’s Report:** Wendy Merb-Brown—No report.

**Treasurer’s Report:** Chris Morris distributed a written report (attached); he requested that committee chairs submit internal billings for university related expenses using the Administrative Senate account number. Chris also asked that p-cards be used whenever and wherever possible to reduce the paperwork and improve efficiency. Copies of all receipts go to Chris.

**Old Business:**

**Second Revision of By-laws and Constitution-FIRST READING:** Dorothy Anderson thanked Sharon Huge and committee for their work, as well as Jean Witkowski, Chris Morris, Wendy Merb-Brown and Maggi Channell for their help in putting together the executive committee changes. She then reviewed all the changes to the Constitution and By-laws. Gretchen Stephens moved that the rules to have this document considered for acceptance as a final document be suspended. Maggi Channell seconded the motion; a vote was taken and the rules were suspended unanimously. John Ray then moved that the changes to Administrative Senate’s Constitution and By-Laws be accepted. Sherry Barnes seconded the motion. There being no discussion, a vote was taken, and the changes were unanimously accepted. Dorothy announced that the changes to the Constitution and By-Laws would now be submitted to the President and Board of Trustees for their approval.

**Vice President for Administration Report:** Gary North

Reported that everything is in relatively good condition for the start of the academic year; that economically the revenue picture from the State does not look good; that the budget was based on 3.5% revenue growth which has not occurred; that he would not be surprised to see some substantial adjustment in the budget after the election; that there are only two or three agencies that can be cut, higher education being one; that the Board of Trustees will be meeting in early September and not again until early December.

*John Ray asked how the $4 million shortfall might impact higher education?* Dr. North explained that the legislature kind of passed by higher education the first time; that other agencies took as much as 15% cut already and are now working without support staff and secretaries; that they have no other choice with the mandate to keep a balanced budget; that the dilemma is that revenue growth was projected and a budget put together to get passed the election with the hope that there might be an upturn in the economy.
A question was asked about the possibility of layoffs at OU? Dr. North responded that no decisions have been made on changes of any kind, reductions or layoffs, at this point; that the University wants to manage by freeing open slots, make adjustments, moving experience people who might be laid off into other openings; that they are working hard to come up with solutions and keep people informed; that President Glidden thinks we need to generate revenue to accommodate some kind of a raise next year and that will be a challenge to do that on top of reductions; that legislators do not see funding higher education as being a popular issue with the voters.

A question was asked about how Administrative Senate can help? Dr. North suggested that perhaps constituent organizations, like Administrative Senate, could create a forum and talk about how they could communicate collective concern about support or lack of support for higher education.

Dorothy mentioned that the new Provost, Stephen Kopp, is scheduled to attend the October Senate meeting.

**New Business:** None

**Announcements:** Dale Tampke announced that the City of Athens has engaged a consultant to put together a comprehensive plan for the city; that he has been involved with trying to increase public participation in that effort; that one of the groups targeted is university administrators; and that the fall roundtables or brown bag sessions might be an opportunity to attract people who might have an interest in participating in an hour long focus group type endeavor.

Gary North encouraged Senators to become familiar with the Academic Quality Improvement Program AQIP. Dale Tampke explained that it is an attempt by the North Central Accrediting Agency to get away from input oriented evaluation of institutions and toward outcome orientation and that there is a document for review on Provost's web site.

**Adjournment:** John Ray moved to adjourn and Gretchen Stephens seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Merb-Brown
Secretary
## 2002-2003 Administrative Senate Budget

### General Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budgeted Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190</td>
<td>Exec Committee Salaries</td>
<td>$ 9,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Overtime-Clerical &amp; Website Support</td>
<td>$ 1,500.00</td>
<td>Staff Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$ 3,209.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>General Supplies</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100</td>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$ 250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4610</td>
<td>Business Meetings</td>
<td>$ 1,538.00</td>
<td>Refreshments for Meetings/Lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>Elections/Outstanding Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310</td>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>$ 200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5710</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$ 109.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7660</td>
<td>Employee Awards</td>
<td>$ 3,500.00</td>
<td>Non-Cash Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7990</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>$ 7,292.00</td>
<td>Awards-Retirement/Outstanding Admin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                           **$31,098.00**

PLEASE NOTE: Total Carry Forward From 2001-2002 has not been reported
Ohio University Administrative Senate Advance
Elizabeth Baker Room
Minutes of September 26, 2002

Next Meeting: October 17, 2002, 12:00 noon – 1:30 p.m.
Baker Center 334

Present: Dorothy Anderson, Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Maggi Channell, Terry Conry, Jean Cunningham, Karen Dahn, Blis Hanousek DeVault, Sherry Downs, Doug Franklin, Jim Gilmore, Doug Grammer, Patty Griffith, Sharon Huge, Judith Johnson, Wendy Merb-Brown, Chris Morris, Chris Reghetti-Feyler, Deanna Russell, Christine Sheets, Rusty Smith, Andrew Stuart, Dale Tampke, Jean Witkowski

Excused: Tina Abdella, Julio Friere, Barbara Montgomery, Gretchen Stephens

Absent: Sherry Barnes, Kim Lawson, R. Douglas Pettit, John Ray, Cheryl Riley, Ralph Six

Guests: Robert Glidden, Becky Bushey-Miller, Gary North

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

Approval of August Minutes: Andrew Stuart moved to approve the minutes of August 22, 2002. Karen Dahn seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

The session began with Dr. Glidden, president of Ohio University, who talked about the following:

- The importance of Senates at the University.
- The State of the University address. Glidden highlighted some of the main points that he was going to present that week.
- The budget situation at the University. Ohio University is not as bad as other institutions in that we are well-prepared to deal with additional cuts that may be made at the state level.
- Campus growth.
- The campus climate with regards to diversity.
- The University’s visual identity with the new “logo” or mark
- Partner’s Benefits -- “stay tuned.”

The meeting recessed for lunch at 12:30 p.m. and resumed at 1:30 p.m. with Dr. North talking about:

- Teaching and learning being what the University is about and the role of administrators in supporting that purpose
The new Provost’s commitment to student engagement and undergraduate education; his different way of looking at the institution--his orientation to numbers and data. The Provost expects to function as chief budget officer; he understands the totality of institution.

The challenges for the coming year being student engagement/involvement; AQIP; general education; AFSME negotiations; budget; finding ways to generate dollars for salary increases; getting Administrative Compensation Project off the ground.

Becky Bushey-Miller, from University Professional Development, facilitated small group exercises to determine and list the priorities Senators would like to accomplish for 2002-03. The lists were explained, clarified and condensed and each Senator voted on his/her top priorities. The results of this process are summarized below. After the top six priorities (see below) were identified, Senators were asked to answer a series of questions to help evaluate how implementation of these goals would take place.

GROUP I
- Compensation of administrators is maintained or increased – 10 votes
- Professional Development opportunities are broadened – 4 votes
- Communication with constituents and upper administration is clear (accountability) – 3 votes
- Senate representation is increased and diversified – 2 votes
- Refine the Outstanding Administrator process – 2 votes
- Quality of life/work issues; Senate credibility/impact/voice—duplicate—removed from chart
- Committee(s) had/have clear direction or focus—duplicate—removed from chart

GROUP II
- On-line voting to encourage administrator participation – 6 votes
- Re-evaluate the role/purpose of Senate standing committees (excluding Elections) – 5 votes
- Compensation issues c) more equitable distribution of raise dollars through both set dollars and percentage – 2 votes
- Compensation issues b) education benefits at Hocking College for spouses – 1 vote
- Increase interest among administrators seeking election for Senate and committee membership – 1 vote
- Parking issue revisited/settled – 1 vote
- Compensation issues a) sick leave credit (PERS) – duplicate—removed from chart
- Better communication with constituent – duplicate—removed from chart

GROUP III
- Develop one activity for each element of University mission – 8 votes
- Enrich sick leave benefits – 6 votes
  a) Service credit at retirement for sick leave balance
  b) Sick leave pool for cases of special need
- Senate ensure all administrators are informed and educated on benefits – 0 votes
- Administrative Training and Professional Development – duplicate—removed from chart
- Senate Involvement and Communication – duplicate—removed from chart
TOP PRIORITIES (according to voting):
• Compensation of administrators is maintained or increased – 10 votes and  
• Enrich sick leave benefits – 6 votes—combined to include whole package  
  a) Service credit at retirement for sick leave balance  
  b) Sick leave pool for cases of special need  
• Develop one activity for each element of University mission – 8 votes  
• On-line voting to encourage administrator participation – 6 votes  
• Re-evaluate the role/purpose of Senate standing committees (excluding Elections) – 5 votes  
• Professional Development opportunities are broadened – 4 votes

Announcements:  None

Adjournment:  Advance concluded at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Merb-Brown
Secretary
Ohio University Administrative Senate
Minutes of October 17, 2002
Baker Center 334

Next Meeting: November 21, 2002, 12 noon – 1:30 p.m.
Baker Center 334

Present: Dorothy Anderson, Maggi Channell, Terry Conry, Jean Cunningham, Karen Dahn, Sherry Downs, Doug Franklin, Jim Gilmore, Doug Grammer, Patty Griffith, Sharon Huge, Judith Johnson, Wendy Merb-Brown, Chris Reghetti Feyler, Cheryl Riley, Deanna Russell, Christine Sheets, Rusty Smith, Andrew Stuart, Dale Tampke, Jean Witkowski

Excused: Kim Lawson, Barbara Montgomery, Chris Morris

Absent: Tina Abdella, Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Sherry Barnes, Blis Hanousek DeVault, Julio Friere, R. Douglas Pettit, John Ray, Ralph Six, Gretchen Stephens

Guests: Becky Bushey-Miller, Bob Hynes, John Kotowski, George Mauzy, Carol May, Gary North

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

Approval of September Minutes: Christine Sheets moved to approve the minutes of September 26, 2002 with the following correction: change Composition to Compensation in second bullet on page 2. Andrew Stuart seconded the motion and the corrected minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report: Dorothy Anderson

- Reported that the President’s retreat was time well spent; that they did not get as far along in the process as they expected and will be meeting in small groups within the next few weeks to continue work on action plans.
- Announced that a very nice thank you note was received from Scott Shepherd’s mother.
- Reported that the RFP for the Comp Plan Project has gone out; that the deadline for submissions is October 29; that Bob Hynes is currently working on the project and will be at here at the end of today’s meeting to say a few words about the process.
- Announced that a meeting has been scheduled with Jim Kemper to get an update on the College of Medicine situation.
- Announced that the major agenda item today will be to finalize the work on priorities for the year that emerged from the Advance session last month.
- Reported that the Constitution/By-laws revisions have been approved by President Gidden and will be on the agenda for the February Board of Trustees meeting.
• Reported that UPAC had its first meeting yesterday and discussed the following: modeling concepts for next year; increasing out-of-state enrollment; managing additional cuts this year; what enrollment yield for next year is needed to optimize subsidy dollars; enrollment being 195 students short of projection due to underestimated graduation rate.

Vice Chair’s Report: Jean Witkowski asked committee chairs for reports:

Compensation: Terry Conry reported that the committee’s first meeting is scheduled for November 14th and monthly thereafter. The following issues will be reviewed: service credit for unused sick leave balance at retirement, salary and benefits information changes/recommendations, and the administrative pay plan.

Professional Development: Wendy Merb-Brown reported that the committee supported a brown bag discussion, which Dale Tampke facilitated and 20 people attended, with the City of Athens’ committee working on the comprehensive plan for 2020.

Personnel Policies Committee: Sharon Huge reported for Cheryl Riley that the committee will review the policy collapsing professional development for classified and administrative staff. It will also look at how it interfaces with the university-wide personnel policy committee.

Outstanding Administrator: Jim Gilmore reported that the committee consists of nine members and will meet for the first time this Thursday.

Service Awards: Karen Dahn reported that Sue Boyd will meet with the committee to share information from last year and that a date will be set soon.

Elections: Doug Franklin —No report.

Secretary’s Report: Wendy Merb-Brown—No report.

Treasurer’s Report: Chris Morris—Not present—No report.

Vice President for Administration Report: Gary North reported that President Glidden is slightly more optimistic about the information out of Columbus; that revenues are not going down as quickly as expected; that the Governor has indicated continued support for higher education, however, he may recommend re-imposing tuition caps.

Old Business: None

New Business: None

Becky Bushey-Miller, University Professional Development, continuation of establishing Senate priorities for 2002-03: Dorothy Anderson turned the remainder of the meeting over to Becky Bushey-Miller who facilitated the finalization of priority planning for 2002-03. She reviewed the six priorities (handout attached) established at
the Administrative Senate Advance on September 26, 2002 and presented the following revision of priorities based on discussions that occurred during the Advance:

**Revisions:**
Bullet 2 became a *Guiding Principal: Keep University mission statement in mind when acting* and the following became priorities:
- Compensation of administrators is maintained or increased (10 votes) and enrich sick leave benefits (6 votes)
- On-line voting to encourage administrator participation (6 votes)
- Re-evaluate the role/purpose of Senate standing committees (excluding elections) (5 votes)
- Professional development opportunities broadened (4 votes).

Senators were divided into four groups and asked to review in depth one of the four remaining priorities, using a fishbone mapping exercise and the following worksheets: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOTH), Improving Existing Strategies, and Action Planning. Summaries of small group reports are attached.

**Bob Hynes:** Bob Hynes spoke briefly about his role in assisting Human Resources with the development of the Administrative Pay Plan and asked Senators to contact him with their questions and concerns at 597-1597 or hynes@ohio.edu.

**Announcements:** Dale Tampke asked for volunteers to help with Halloween.

**Adjournment:** Patricia Griffith moved to adjourn and Jean Witkowski seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Merb-Brown
Secretary
Ohio University Administrative Senate
Minutes of November 21, 2002
Baker Center 334

Next Meeting: January 16, 2003, 12 noon – 1:30 p.m.
Baker Center 334

Present: Tina Abdella, Dorothy Anderson, Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Jean Cunningham, Karen Dahn, Sherry Downs, Doug Franklin, Jim Gilmore, Doug Grammer, Patty Griffith, Judith Johnson, Kim Lawson, Wendy Merb-Brown, Barbara Montgomery, Chris Morris, Chris Reghetti Feyler, Cheryl Riley, Deanna Russell, Christine Sheets, Rusty Smith, Andrew Stuart, Jean Witkowski

Excused: Maggi Channell, Terry Conry, Gretchen Stephens, Dale Tampke

Absent: Sherry Barnes, Blis Hanousek DeVault, Julio Friere, Sharon Huge, R. Douglas Pettit, John Ray, Ralph Six

Guests: Hub Burton, Bob Hynes, Jim Kemper, George Mauzy

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.

Approval of October Minutes: Patty Griffith moved that the minutes of October 17, 2002 be approved with the Service Awards report corrected to read as follows: “Karen Dahn reported that Sue Boyd will meet with the committee to share information from last year and that a date will be set soon.” Barbara Montgomery seconded the motion and the corrected minutes were approved unanimously.

Special Guest: Hub Burton, Associate Vice President, University Advancement, University Communication and Marketing: Hub Burton presented the Ohio University Graphic Identity Standards Manual for review and discussion. He explained that the manual contained the visual identity the university wants to present to a variety of different audiences. He stated that these standards were driven by the need to distinguish Ohio University from other institutions within the state; to undo some of the clutter created by the institution; to examine who the university is from a graphic and visual standpoint; to identify the institutional mark and to provide a graphic identity that allows the university to focus on putting forth a single signature. He further stated that the manual deals with questions that will come up and that the Office of Communications and Marketing will work with anyone who has a particular challenge that comes from instituting the mark. He concluded by saying that the approval process (listed in back of manual) is designed to find the maximum opportunity for the University to gain standardization on the mark.
Questions:
Doug Franklin asked how and where the Bobcat could be used to promote internal programs in his area and expressed concern that fun/enjoyment cannot be sold with a building. Burton responded that the Office of Communication and Marketing would be willing to work with him on the image he wants to portray.
Barbara Montgomery asked about the nursing pin given to students upon graduation. Burton requested that a sample or rendering of the pin be provided for review.
Christine Sheets stated that her department needs a look that students will easily recognize. Burton responded that mastheads, banners and logos can be used to portray what departments want and still include the identity.
Chris Morris asked about distinguishing between the internal and external markets. Burton responded that Ohio University has been unable as an institution to create a standard for either internal or external use; that so many pieces cross the line between internal and external; and that parts of the system will need to be adjusted during the process.

Chair’s Report:  Dorothy Anderson

Announced that Wendy Merb-Brown will report on the Administrative Comp Plan under Secretary’s Report.

Reported that she has been working with Linda Lonsinger and John Sanders to develop a proposal in the event of administrative layoffs; that they are looking at many alternatives; that one idea is to establish a network of administrators to listen and provide job hunting, interview and technical skills

Announced that the membership committee of the Emeritus Organization contacted her about informing administrators that retirees may be eligible to be nominated for emeritus status; that the official policy applies to both faculty and administrators; and that she will meet with Alan Geiger to discuss the procedure for forwarding nominations to the Board of Trustees.

Encouraged Senators to give serious thought to giving back by making a donation to United Appeal.

Announced that Gretchen Stephens resigned due to workload and that a temporary replacement is being sought to be in place by the January meeting.

Reported that Management Development Program is continuing; that chairs of Administrative, Classified, and Faculty Senates and presidents of Student Senate and Graduate Student Senate made a presentation to the group yesterday; that the group expressed a very strong desire for a mentoring program for administrators; that a program for classified staff will begin soon and asked for volunteers willing to develop the draft of such a program for administrators.
Reported that work from the President's Retreat continues; that she is part of the group considering mission 4: *Maximize the learning opportunities afforded by a residential campus environment*; Terry Hogan leads the group; draft action plans will be present to President Glidden; and the entire group will reconvene in early January to attempt to finalize the action plans.

Reported that UPAC had its second meeting; Darrell Winefordner reported that there is a strong feeling there will be no mid-year cuts but the budget for the next fiscal year and perhaps the next biennium may be very tight.

**Vice Chair’s Report:** Jean Witkowski asked committee chairs for reports:

**Professional Development:** Wendy Merb-Brown reported that the committee met on November 1 to brainstorm about broadening professional development for new administrators; that they plan to assess what the professional developments needs on campus are in terms of individual administrators, as well as what other offices are providing; that an assessment tool is being developed with University Professional Development; and that they will continue to be a resource and offer opportunities to constituents by co-sponsoring programs.

**Personnel Policies Committee:** Cheryl Riley reported that she attended the first meeting of the University’s Policy & Procedure Review Committee at which the purpose of the committee was described as one of shepherding new and revised policies through the new approval process, identifying areas where no policies exist but probably should, and identifying policies already in existence that need revision. She requested that her committee be informed of any policies being considered for review so they can consult the University’s committee. She announced that they meet on the second Thursday of every month.

**Compensation:** Terry Conry—No report.

**Outstanding Administrator:** Jim Gilmore reported that the committee met for the second time, set a time frame, reviewed the policy and will make recommendations. They will meet again in December to review the nomination form.

**Service Awards:** Karen Dahn—No report.

**Elections:** Doug Franklin reported that the committee met with Doug Mann on October 24 to discuss online elections and determined that a system is already available; that they need to set up a meeting with John Dean to see about tying into it; that they are also talking to Dale Tampke about an alternative system; that Student Senate also attended the meeting and were very excited about the prospects; that two types of elections will be run (on-line and hard copy); that the time frame is nominations out by May 16, with elections the last week in May; that it looks like there may be 16 open seats for the election.

**Faculty Senate:** Chris Morris reported that the past two meetings focused mainly on the following financial issues: the latest AAUP salary study placing Ohio University sixth among the Ohio schools in pay for faculty members, down from 1997 when it ranked
third; Youngstown State receiving significant raises this past year while OU appears to be standing still; a review of the 2001-02 budget and the current 2002-03 budget indicating that both academic and administrative units received similar 4.5 percent increases; that in the past, graduate student tuition fee waivers were grouped with administrative areas and this year they are grouped with the academic units and some faculty are beginning to feel that the raises in the administrative areas are a little bit higher than academics. The following academic issues were also discussed: the new general education requirements and tier three offerings; the annual problem of students being unable to get into the tier three classes they need to graduate; the difficulty of getting tier three classes approved contributing to the problem; the hope that the new general education requirements will help alleviate this problem. In addition, the following issues were discussed: logo and signature; enrollment numbers being up 270 students (grad and undergrad combined) for Athens campus; and that the Board of Regents Chancellor is optimistic that higher education will not suffer further cuts in this biennium.

Secretary’s Report: Wendy Merb-Brown reported on the Administrative Compensation Project and informed Senate that the IT and Classified Staff Comp Project Review has just been completed; that they are concerned about communicating clearly with other administrators on campus about what is going on; that many people are involved in process (UHR, Administrative Senate, Compensation Committee and purchasing); that information will be posting on the web site; that subcommittees will be formed to provide sessions for knowledge sharing and to assess and review the current climate for administrators; that bids are currently being reviewed and a decision about the vendor (to compare our information with that of other institutions) should be made by January 2003. Dorothy Anderson commented that in an effort to make the process wide open and transparent, Deborah Daniels, Classified Senate, and Ann Paulins, Faculty Senate, have been appointed as liaisons.

Treasurer’s Report: Chris Morris distributed a written report (attached).

He reported that the Kent State University committee, interested in forming an Administrative Senate group, did not get support for the concept from administration and will have a place in an all university senate on campus. He further reported that research is being done to see if there are other groups like Administrative Senate in the state and what issues they confront on a regular basis. So far, four similar organization have been identified: an administrative staff council at Bowling Green, an all university senate with a break out group for administrators at Ohio State; an administrative assembly at Shawnee State; and a professional staff association (similar to a union) at Toledo. These groups are being contacted about the possibility of meeting with their leadership to discuss important issues on their campuses and/or get together as a group and exercise a power of one approach within the State of Ohio.

Vice President for Administration Report: Jim Kemper reported for Dr. North on the following issues:
Clinic Privatization Project: that Human Resources has been closely involved; that 126 positions could potentially be eliminated; that the privatization would be the best financial decision; that the report should be to President by next week; that an EAP Resources subcommittee is looking at putting together a transition plan for layoffs (training, severance packages, stress management); that a communication committee, coordinated by Jenny Jordan, is being formed to provide up-to-the-minute updates on what is happening via web site, fact sheets, newsletter, etc.; that Deanna Russell has agreed to be on the committee; that 17 of the 126 positions are administrative; that President Glidden wants employees to be taken care of at all costs.

Merit Plan for Classified Staff: that raises for July 1, 2003 will be determined the same as in the past (there will still be across the board increases based on a percentage of base pay) and responsibilities for the Performance Management System will be stepped up so that by July 1, 2004 the payout can include the possibility for a merit component for classified staff; that they are working closely with Classified Senate on defining and designing that precisely.

2003-04 Budget: At IUC/HR meeting it was reported that an agreement was negotiated between the two-year and four-year sector around the state (public institutions) that would assure performing institutions a one percent increase in the next one or maybe two biennium’s.

Old Business: None

New Business: Doug Franklin asked who was working on the issue of sick leave pool and commented that he spoke with a state representative who informed him that sick leave pools are not against any state law. Jim Kemper responded that legislation was enacted two or three year ago that allowed for the donation of sick leave. OU has developed a plan but there has been no agreement on implementation.

Karen Dahn discussed concerns about the way that the new mark has been imposed without any opportunity for feedback, except after the fact, and thought that it would be relevant for Administrative Senate to express that concern. Dorothy Anderson asked her to draft something for the next meeting.

Bob Hynes commented that is the Job Information Questionnaire process is fundamental to the compensation project and is the foundation upon which jobs will be evaluated. It must be taken very seriously.

Announcements: Jim Kemper encouraged Senators to visit the new Human Resources and Training Center.

Adjournment: Andrew Stuart moved to adjourn and Christine Sheets seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Wendy Merb-Brown
Secretary
Administrative Senate  
Treasurer’s Report

Current as of 21 November 2002

**Account Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$42,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures YTD</td>
<td>$( 5,971.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Balance</td>
<td>$36,078.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Account Activity October 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190 Officer Contracts</td>
<td>$(792.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 PT Students</td>
<td>$(197.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Benefits</td>
<td>$(299.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 Travel/Living</td>
<td>$(58.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(1,347.61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OU Foundation Account**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>$875.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Balance</td>
<td>$875.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio University Administrative Senate
Minutes of January 16, 2003
Baker Center 334

Next Meeting:  February 20, 2003, 12 noon – 1:30 p.m.
Baker Center 334


Excused:  Tina Abdella, Terry Conry

Absent:  Blis Hanousek DeVault, Kim Lawson, R. Douglas Pettit

Guests:  Erin Guyer, Bob Hynes, Stephen Kopp, George Mauzy, Rich Neuman

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:06 p.m.

Approval of November Minutes:  Andrew Stuart moved that the minutes of November 21, 2002 be approved. Barbara Montgomery seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Chair’s Report:  Dorothy Anderson

● Announced that Maggi Channell agreed to take Gretchen Stephen’s District 1 seat and Brenda Noftz will fill Maggi’s at-large seat for the remainder of this year; and that the at-large seat will be filled for a three-year term in the spring election cycle.

● Asked Jean Witkowski to give the following report on the new Senate meeting space:  Jean Witkowski reported that she met with Pam Callahan and representatives of the other governance bodies to go over plans for space in the new building; that the Governance Room, with a capacity of about 100, will be available for meetings and be equipped with state of the art technology, but will not be linked to regional campuses at the current time; that two conference rooms, with capacity of about 24, may also be available for use; that no office space has been allocated for the various Senates but some type of lockable storage is being considered; that the large rotunda space could possibly be used by more than just the Board of Trustees (e.g. Senate’s Service and Outstanding Administrator Awards ceremonies).

● Thanked Wendy Merb-Brown for sending out the new Administrative Senate handbooks.

● Reported that Senate Exec met with President Glidden in December and discussed the following items:
  ● The possibility of mid-year salary increase for faculty in an attempt to get them back to a higher placement in the state-wide rankings.
  ● Dr. Glidden’s support for raising awareness among retirees and supervisors of the Emeritus Status for Administrators’ Policy.  She also requested that the Service Awards committee advise supervisors that retirees are eligible to be nominated for emeritus status and refer them to the policy.
  ● The Board of Trustees met to develop a business plan for the university and agreed on three major priorities (the first two short-term and the third long- term): (1) to be more explicit in identifying OU’s strengths; (2) to develop strategies for increasing diversity–geographically (e.g., increase out-of-state enrollment); and (3) to organize for learning.
  ● Clinic Privatization
Senate’s Exec is serving on the Administrative Comp Project team and learning many details about the work involved in this project from the consultants.

The President’s retreat group reconvened on January 6 to continue working on implementing the mission statement.

The steering committee of AQIP and a sub-group are developing a plan for making learning space (residences, classrooms, etc.) more conducive to learning and student engagement.

Jim Kemper volunteered to have Senate serve as a “client” for his winter quarter class developing a mentoring program for administrators. Wendy Merb-Brown, Becky Bushy-Miller, and Joan Wall will be working with the class.

Approval of Administrative Senate’s Constitution/By-laws is on the agenda for the February Board of Trustees meeting.

Introduction of Guests: Erin Guyer introduced herself as a member of the Human Resources team that will be working on the mentoring program. Rich Neuman introduced himself as a representative of the Administrative Compensation Committee.

Vice Chair’s Report: Jean Witkowski called on committee chairs for reports:

Professional Development: Wendy Merb-Brown reported that the committee will meet on the fourth Thursday of each month; that they are working on a survey of professional development needs, issues and concerns; that the main focus of the year will be finding out what the opportunities are for staff members in the various areas; that they will be working in conjunction with the mentoring group.

Compensation: John Ray presented the following Draft of Compensation Committee Recommendations for Salary and Benefits:

The Administrative Senate clearly recognizes how difficult it is to improve the salary and benefits package in the current budget climate. We also recognize how important it is to maintain compensation to meet the increasing cost of living and particularly to reward outstanding performance.

Health Care
This year we continue the transition toward an employee contribution of 10% of heath-care premiums by FY 2004-05. We recommend no increase in cost and no reduction in benefits to the current health care package. We further recommend adjustments to preventive care that reduce long-term costs.

Salary
We recommend a 4.5% salary pool for administrators, with 2.2% allocated to a base adjustment for all employees who are performing at acceptable levels and 2% to be allocated based on merit. The final .3% should be distributed to planning units to address gender and market equity issues.

External factors that help put administrative salary decisions into perspective include:

- A 2.2% cost-of-living increase is the “bottom line” to keep employees even with the past year. Source: Consumer Price Index for 2002 – Bureau of Labor Statistics, November 2002 Report.
- 4.7% was the average wage increase for administrators in higher education in 2001-02 and an increase of 2.5 to 3.5% is predicted for 2002-03, assuming a CPI of 1.1% and an unemployment rate of 5.6%. This continues a trend of administrative salary increases that exceed the CPI by more than 2%. Source: College and University Personnel Association annual wage survey reported in CUPA News Volume 2, issue 4.

Internal factors affecting the administrative pay increase include:

- The need for a merit pool to insure that we can continue OU’s tradition of running an efficient operation with relatively lean administrative staff.
- The need for an equity pool so planning units can address existing internal inequities as well as inequities with market to insure fair and competitive treatment for administrators.

He then presented information on Krista Antle’s research on the annual sick leave conversion program. He reported that PERS allows some employers to include annual sick leave and vacation conversion programs as earnable salary. Earnable salary is what PERS uses to calculate retirement contributions and benefits. An annual sick leave conversion plan would allow employees to annually (in December) cash in a portion of their sick time for pay, which would be additional taxable income that would be subject to retirement deductions. The program would be beneficial to employees in two ways: 1) it would boost employee’s annual income and could be viewed as a year-end bonus and 2) for those closer to retirement this additional pay could have a long-term positive impact to their retirement benefit because PERS uses an average of an individual’s last three years of income in calculating their retirement benefit, the higher this average, the higher the benefit.
For those in a defined contribution retirement plan, such as the alternative retirement plan, benefits are based on employee and employer contributions, plus earnings on those contributions, and the higher the contribution, the higher the possibility for a higher benefit. As a PERS employer, Ohio University would be required to draft an annual sick leave conversion plan and submit it to PERS for approval. As the employer, Ohio University would determine eligibility for the program, such as the required years of service, required bank of sick leave an employee would have to have on hand, and the percentage of time would that be paid. The maximum amount that PERS allows to be paid in this type of plan is the amount earned but not used in that calendar year. Her completed research will include the cost to the university and analysis of how the plan would work.

Jean Witkowski requested that the committee submit the results of the sick leave conversion plan to the Executive Committee before bringing it to Senate for a first reading.

A question was asked about whether STRS was being reviewed as well.

Ray responded that this is what PERS allows and that he did not know about STRS.

Doug Franklin asked if the committee has looked into the sick leave pool proposal.

Ray responded that it is still on the table; that the committee has not moved forward on it because a sub-committee is reviewing it in order to meet the objections that came up when it was last presented.

Sharon Huge stated that Jim Kemper indicated that planning units might be able to adopt a sick leave pool policy for their units and it might be worth checking back with him.

Doug Franklin suggested that the committee check with the University of Texas that has had a system in place for the last 15 years.

Barbara Montgomery requested that the STRS component also be looked at since some administrators are still under STRS.

John Ray also reported on converting sick leave time to retirement time and stated that PERS informed the committee that it is fraudulent to do this because you cannot earn retirement time credit for time not worked; that legislative action permits it for early retirement; that continued efforts in this area will also require legislative action; and that it is a long range project for the committee to work on.

Rich Neuman reported that he is on a subcommittee developing a needs assessment survey for the Administrative Pay Plan. The needs assessment should be circulated to the executive committee next month and may be distributed to all administrators shortly thereafter.

Personnel Policies Committee: Cheryl Riley stated that the committee was asked to review policy 40.036, which has to do with how upgrades and promotions are handled by the University. She wanted to know if the committee should be entertaining this in light of the work being done on the new Administrative Comp Plan. Dorothy Anderson responded it will be managed as part of the overall comp project. Riley also asked for suggestions of policies that need to be looked at during the remainder of the year.

Elections: Doug Franklin reported that CNS is developing an on-line election program for Senate and he should have some results to report at the next meeting.

Service Awards: Karen Dahn reported that she and Maggi Channel met with Sue Boyd to discuss the difficulties in gathering data about who is retiring when; that they have set up committee meetings on the third Tuesday of each month this quarter to try to decide who will put together the program; that the date for the Service Awards and Outstanding Administrator Award Ceremony is May 20, 2003 at 2:00 p.m.; that they are open to any ideas.

Outstanding Administrator: Jim Gilmore reported that the committee met in December and will meet again next week; that they have been reviewing and updating the forms and sent out the ballot for the Outstanding Administrator. Christine Sheets mentioned that the last time the Outstanding Administrator plaque in Chubb Hall was updated was 1996-97. Dorothy informed her that a flyer and card with Mike Doyle’s contact information (he’s the person from whom the plaque and updates are purchased) was in the mail to Jim Gilmore.

Faculty Senate: Chris Morris reported that there was a lot of focus on the general education requirement.

Secretary’s Report: Wendy Merb-Brown informed Senators that extra copies of the handbook are available and asked them to e-mail her with their requests.
Treasurer’s Report: Chris Morris distributed a written report (attached) and asked that November be changed to December in Account Activity.

Vice President for Administration Report: Dale Tampke asked Senate if there were any questions for Dr. North. None were put forth.

Old Business: None

New Business: Dorothy Anderson asked for a motion to consider the draft proposal of the Administrative Senate Compensation Committee Recommendations for Salary and Benefits presented by John Ray as the official first reading. John Ray moved that it be so considered and Rusty Smith seconded. This proposal will be presented for a second reading and vote at the February meeting and all comments should be forwarded to Terry Conry.

Special Guest: Dr. Stephen Kopp, Provost
Dr. Kopp began by explaining that the debate at the Faculty Senate meeting centered on whether courses required for the general education requirement should be designed to be instructor specific or course specific. The final outcome of the discussion was that a course was a course; and if it was designated as meeting whatever component of the general education requirement, all sections of that course will be considered as meeting the requirement.

Provost Kopp responded to the following questions submitted to him by Senate:
1. What role do you see for Administrative Senate? How will you work with us?
   Kopp responded that traditionally both Classified and Administrative Senates have worked closely with the Vice President for Administration who communicates information to the Provost; that he is open to any routes that will promote better communication and would be willing to attend periodic meetings; that the whole Senate concept, except for Faculty Senate, is new to him, but he thinks it is an effective communication tool and an organizational framework that promotes discussion and the sharing of ideas on both levels.

2. What processes are you using to evaluate how things have been handled in the past? What determines whether changes to prior processes and procedures are warranted?
   Kopp responded that he asks a lot of questions to find out why things are being done the way they are; that he uses best practice concepts and tends to be data driven; that he would like to align all planning processes (goal setting, resources, capital planning); that there should be a five-year vision for where the university is going.

3. How would you open up the planning process so the entire community can get a clearer picture of the long-range goals for OU?
   Kopp responded that the planning process seems to be pretty open as it is and announced that there will be a campus-wide meeting scheduled for February 23rd about what it means to organize the university for learning.

4. We are concerned about the ever-increasing size of the first-year class, especially when resources, both physical and human, are already overtaxed. How will this continuing trend impact Ohio University’s unique character and culture?
   Kopp responded that enrollment has been static over the past few years; that if the university continues to stay where it is at, with the recent changes in funding, it stands to lose state appropriations by a zero growth situation; that one way to buffer the implications of static enrollment is to take more out-of-state students; that the university should be a melting pot with people from many places with different perspectives that enrich the overall university community; and that he has recommended the development of an enrollment management plan for both graduate and undergraduate students.

5. What changes do you foresee/recommend in the Pre-college Program—for this coming year and long term?
   Kopp responded that the Pre-college Program needs to be looked at extensively from a number of different perspectives; that there are issues relating to Pre-college, such as enrollment patterns, instructional space, cost of instruction, demand for additional courses, and improving course availability; that an analysis of where the highest course demands are and what is being done to address those demands has been requested; that an analysis of the academic performance of first year students indicated that students perform at about the same level regardless of when they take English composition, except for students who do not take this course in the first year; that for those students the attrition rate is significantly higher and overall academic performance is significantly lower; that he would like to survey students for their preferred choice of courses and then structure course offerings to align as closely as possible with the demand and with where the university knows students should be enrolling in the first year to optimize success; that a common readings project for every incoming freshman is under consideration.
Dorothy Anderson questioned Dr. Kopp about a plan to let selected first year students take courses this summer without going through Pre-college.

Dr. Kopp responded that there is a possibility of a trial program where Pre-college registration will occur in April for students who are “early admits” to the university; that this group is one of the strongest applicant pools and it is hoped that their knowing their schedules in advance might entice them to attend the university, improving the overall profile of the first year class.

6. What are we doing to address the current budget crunch?

Kopp responded that he is asking a lot of questions and trying to get some idea where there might be some room for cuts.

7. Historically, the university has provided equal raise pools for faculty and administrators. Please give us your thoughts.

Kopp responded that the rationale for the mid-term salary adjustment for faculty was that we continue to fall behind; that staff is working on a systematic analysis of Group I faculty salaries trying to identify where the problems are; that they are trying to make comparisons at the unit/department level; that he is not interested in deviating from past practice unless there is a compelling reason.

8. Tough economic times dictate tough decisions. How will you determine programmatic cuts if these are necessary?

Kopp responded that there is a long-range planning and budgetary prioritization process; that it is coupled to a determination of research priorities—what research programs have the potential to achieve national prominence or with the addition of resources, could become a Tier I or II doctoral program; that they will also look at the areas and activities we are currently engaged in where the costs outweigh the benefits.

9. Responsibility Centered Management—what is it and why does it interest you?

Kopp responded that RCM is based on a concept that centers that generate the revenue become the responsibility centers that determine the distribution of funds across the university in terms of services; that it is an accountability model; that it aligns incentives with decision making; that the danger of RCM is the competition that can develop; that the time frame would be 3-5 years; that we need to make decisions based on the long-term best interest of the university; that we need to know what the full costing of those decisions are.

10. What questions do you have for us?

Judith Johnson asked whether students taken under Senate Bill 140 displace our freshmen students in classes.

Kopp responded that he did not have an answer and would check on it.

John Ray asked about the impact of the Governor’s request that the commission to look at non-duplication of priorities for higher education.

Kopp responded that a certain level of duplication is healthy and is part of the state’s responsibility for an educated work force for not only the state but also the nation; that how much duplication is excess is hard to address; that he does not think there is enough information.

Chris Morris asked how enrollment management issues fit in philosophically with student engagement and a low instructor to student ratio.

Kopp responded that he was referring to are artificial caps; that the issue is should we be teaching classes of 150-200 students; that he hopes to get a funding proposal to examine this issue; that the state funding formula provides the lowest level of funding for first year students taking humanities courses and the highest level is for senior level courses; that the model is backward if you want to engage first year students and develop their learning skills.

A question was asked if tuition would be decreased to attract out-of-state students?

Kopp responded that they will discount tuition in order to attract out-of-state students; that every time the state has a call back of state funding the university loses per student funding for in-state-students; that out-of-state students are more stable base for funding; that it is a balance as to what is the right percentage of out-of-state students to complement our in-state students; that the university has fallen under 10% for out-of-state enrollment.

Announcements: None

Adjournment: John Ray moved to adjourn and Judith Johnson seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Merb-Brown
Secretary
Administrative Senate
Treasurer’s Report

Current as of 16 January 2003

Account Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$42,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures YTD</td>
<td>$(10,400.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Balance</td>
<td>$31,649.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Account Activity December 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190</td>
<td>Officer Contracts</td>
<td>$(938.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$(242.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3940</td>
<td>Photo Supply</td>
<td>$(12.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$(485.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310</td>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>$(1,039.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(2,716.56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OU Foundation Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>$875.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Balance</td>
<td>$875.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio University Administrative Senate
Minutes of February 20, 2003
Baker Center 334

Next Meeting: March 20, 2003, 12 noon – 1:30 p.m.
Baker Center 334

Present: Tina Abdella, Dorothy Anderson, Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Sherry Barnes, Terry Conry, Jean Cunningham, Julio Friere, Jim Gilmore, Doug Grammer, Sharon Huge, Judith Johnson, Wendy Merb-Brown, Barbara Montgomery, Chris Morris, Brenda Noftz, John Ray, Chris Reghetti Feyler, Cheryl Riley, Deanna Russell, Christine Sheets, Ralph Six, Rusty Smith, Dale Tampke, Jean Witkowski

Excused: Maggi Channell, Karen Dahn, Doug Franklin, Patty Griffith, Kim Lawson, Andrew Stuart

Absent: Blis Hanousek DeVault, Sherry Downs, R. Douglas Pettit

Guests: Jim Kemper, George Mauzy, Gary North

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

Approval of January Minutes: Jean Witkowski moved that the minutes of January 16, 2003 be approved. Chris Reghetti Feyler seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Report on Athens City Comprehensive Plan: Dale Tampke distributed the Public Input Summary of the January 14, 2003-Scenario Workshop of the Athens Comprehensive Plan. He reported that the purpose of the workshop was to provide residents (165 people attended) with the opportunity to comment on planning issues and the major themes identified during the city’s planning process and to provide an opportunity for participants to contribute to the prioritization issues. The report summarized the voting results and priority rankings of the following themes: Housing/Neighborhoods; Economic/Downtown Development; Environment and Open Space; Urban Design/Landscaping/Gateways/Signage; Urban Forestry (participant suggested); Public Facilities/Services; Transportation; Historical/Cultural Resources/City Image; and Collaboration/Coordination/Accountability/Implementation.

Chair’s Report: Dorothy Anderson reported that

● The Board of Trustees approved the Constitution and By-Laws revision last Friday at their meeting in Ironton and that there was also a long discussion on the state budget situation.

● The Administrative Comp Project has been postponed; that Senate Exec, and other administrators serving on the proposal committee, determined that the financial and human resources allocated to the project were inadequate and that they were uncertain about the end result of the project; that these concerns were discussed with Kim Greenfest, Robert Hynes, Jim Kemper and Gary North and it was concluded that postponement of the project was the best option; that Senate Exec is committed to a complete and careful review of administrator compensation, which would include a process to describe all administrative positions, identify the market value of each position, and make adjustments in pay structures that are reflective of the findings; that electronic distribution of a needs assessment to all administrators is being considered; that with all the human resource-related challenges facing the university (clinic privatization, a merit pay system for classified
staff, and the uncertain future of state funding) the timing was not right for this project; that they will continue to keep Senate informed.

● The steering committee of AQIP will meet after today’s Senate meeting and each of the project groups will have recommendations to share; that anyone interested in the instructional/residential programs that were developed should e-mail her.

● The mentoring program team from Jim Kemper’s class distributed a questionnaire to all administrators hired in the last 18 months; that clients (Dorothy Anderson, Wendy Merb-Brown, Becky Bushey-Miller, Joan Wall) will hear a full report from the class on March 13 and will share their recommendations with Senate at the next meeting.

● Questions
Tina Abdella asked how long the postponement was expected to last.
*Anderson responded that she did not know but that she may have an answer within the next few weeks.*

**Vice Chair’s Report:** Jean Witkowski called on committee chairs for reports:

**Compensation:** Terry Conry reported that John Ray is trying to schedule a meeting with Gary North to get advice on how to proceed on the credit for unused sick leave from PERS; that he received the history of the sick leave pool from Human Resources and sent it to all members of the committee for review.

**Professional Development:** Wendy Merb-Brown reported that the committee is reviewing, evaluating and making recommendations on professional development; that they are currently compiling a survey for administrators that will contain simple questions about participation in professional development, whether the opportunities are within the university or external; that it should be coming out within the next couple months.

**Personnel Policies Committee:** Cheryl Riley -- no report.

**Elections:** Jim Gilmore reported that the pilot program will be on-line in March.

**Service Awards:** Brenda Noftz reported that the committee was unable to meet this week due to snow; that they are on task with what needs to be done; that the names of people with five to 30 years of service have been forwarded for verification; that they are getting quotes; that the ceremony will take place at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 20, 2003, Ballroom, Baker Center.

**Outstanding Administrator:** Christine Sheets reported that the last meeting was January 23, 2003; that the deadline for nominations was 1/31/03; that 52 administrators were nominated; that the committee is checking eligibility; that the forms are out to those nominated.

**Faculty Senate:** Chris Morris reported that President Glidden talked about some of the challenges with the budget, the soft hiring freeze and how it would impact faculty this year, and announced that the mid-year faculty salary increase was no longer a priority this year.

**Secretary’s Report:** Wendy Merb-Brown apologized for the delay in sending the meeting reminder due to the snow.

**Treasurer’s Report:** Chris Morris distributed a written report (attached) and requested that committee chairs or their designees submit copies of expenditures/invoices to him at 140 Ping Center.

**Vice President for Administration Report:** Gary North reported that budget discussions are ongoing; that the Ohio Senate followed the lead of House and did not take any initiative on a tax increase; that there is a slight hope that something might emerge from the conference committee that would provide additional revenue but it is not likely; that the Governor has indicated that he intends to impose cuts on K-12 and higher education; that higher education's share would be roughly $39 million and OU’s share of that would be about $2.7 million; that another $3 million can be added for plant operation and maintenance, utility, health care costs; that if the effort to provide a two percent salary
increase continues, the University is looking at $7 million plus that will have to be made up; that putting a hard freeze on open positions is about the only way to generate dollars to deal with this problem; that the university is looking at a difficult time in the short run and possibly as much as two or three years.

Questions:
Chris Morris asked about whether the hiring freeze would be just for this fiscal year. North responded that he expects it to be long term and indefinite and would not put any limit on when it might terminate because that would depend on the state of the economy, when things might turn around, or if the legislature took action. Dorothy Anderson asked how bad it would have to be before there would be a freeze on faculty positions. North responded that we are not far from one; that the overall budget is about 80% personnel and people are the only place to cut if a 5% reduction was instituted; that the new faculty initiative is pretty much off the board; that mid-term adjustments to upper level professors have been suspended; that there are implications and impacts in the academic units even though the freeze has not been applied directly to them. Wendy Merb-Brown asked for what a soft freeze means. North responded that Jim Kemper will discuss that in his presentation. Chris Morris asked if a mid-year tuition increase is being considered. North responded that it is under consideration but no decision has been made.

North then discussed the history of the draft budget planning document that replaces UPAC with UBAC by explaining the reallocation tax imposed by Provost Brehm, the defining of the institution’s mission and goals by himself and Jack Bantle, and Gary Schumacher’s conclusion that longer term budget planning (three-year cycle) was important. He stated that membership in the new plan is more proportional and balanced; that there was strong opposition from Faculty Senate toward the document because of lack of shared governance participation; that UPAC and other constituent groups are reviewing it. Dorothy Anderson responded that she can provide copies of the document to anyone who would like them and that it is also available on the Provost’s web site.

North asked the opinion of Senate about a parking plan put together by Sherwood Wilson and his staff as an alternative to pay for parking. The plan would set up a parking auxiliary that would reserve part of the spaces in each lot as follows: exclusive reserved spaces, metered spaces, and free parking/open assignments. He stated that increasing parking fines, using registration and fine revenue, and the revenue generated from rentals and meters, would provide for lot maintenance, enforcement and administration of the parking program.

Questions:
John Ray asked how many spaces would be in the reserved category. North responded that 20% of the spaces would be exclusive reserved, 20% would be meters, and the balance would be free or open parking. Chris Morris asked about enforcement. Sherry Barnes responded that enforcement will be increased with the plan.

Old Business: Dorothy Anderson distributed the revised (see highlighted areas) version of the Compensation Committee’s Recommendations for Salary and Benefits for discussion and review.

The Administrative Senate clearly recognizes how difficult it is to improve the salary and benefits package in the current budget climate. We also recognize how important it is to maintain compensation to meet the increasing cost of living and particularly to reward outstanding performance.

Health Care
This year we continue the transition toward an employee contribution of 10% of healthcare premiums by FY 2004-05. We recommend no increase in cost and no reduction in benefits to the current health care package. We further recommend adjustments to preventive care that reduce long-term costs.

Salary
We recommend a 4.5% salary pool for administrators, with 2.2% allocated to a base adjustment for all employees who are performing at acceptable levels and 2% to be allocated based on merit. The final .3% should be distributed to planning units to address gender and market equity issues.

External factors that help put administrative salary decisions into perspective include:

- A 2.2% cost-of-living increase is the "bottom line" to keep employees even with the past year. Source: Consumer Price Index for 2002 – Bureau of Labor Statistics, November 2002 Report.
- 4.7% was the average wage increase for administrators in higher education in 2001-02 and an increase of 2.5 to 3.5% is predicted for 2002-03, assuming a CPI of 1.1% and an unemployment rate of 5.6%. This continues a trend of administrative salary increases that exceed the CPI by more than 2%. Source: College and University Personnel Association annual wage survey reported in CUPA News Volume 2, issue 4.

Internal factors affecting the administrative pay increase include:

- The need for a merit pool to insure that we can continue OU’s tradition of running an efficient operation with relatively lean administrative staff.
- The need for an equity pool so planning units can address existing internal inequities as well as inequities with market to insure fair and competitive treatment for administrators.

Questions:
Jean Witkowski asked for clarification of the 2.2% cost of living based on CPI and the CPI of 1.1% in the next bullet. Terry Conry responded that it is the trended or expected differential between the CPI and the actual pay raises.
Witkowski also asked if there would be guidelines associated with the .3% distributed to planning units to address the gender and market equity issues.
Conry responded that each planning unit will be responsible for fixing the problems if given the resources and that the .3% would be in a separate pool set aside for that purpose.

John Ray moved that the revised version of the Recommendations for Salary and Benefits be approved. Barbara Montgomery seconded the motion, a vote was taken, and the motion was approved with one negative vote.

New Business: None

Special Guest: Jim Kemper, Asst. V.P. for Administration for Human Resources
Topic: Update on COM personnel issues

Jim Kemper distributed a draft document dated 2/3/03 entitled Employee Decision Tree (UOMC) and stated that the university is doing everything possible to avoid displacement; that there are some options in the document not dictated by policy or code but are proposed as an effort to alleviate or eliminate displacement; that the document is on the web site, linked from the Human Resources homepage dealing with the UOMC situation; that the decision tree describes what will happen if a displacement or a job abolition that results in a lay off occurs; that the reason for privatization is the medical center is losing about $4.7 million per year; that it is anticipated that the new corporation will start interviewing and making job offers by mid-March but the effective date would not be until July 1; that 126 people and jobs are affected; that roughly 15-17 of those are administrators and the balance are classified with two in AFSME; that the numbers are down to below 90; that the organization is operating with increased temporaries; that the goal is to remove staff without harming patient care; that this affects only Athens, Coolville and Nelsonville, not the core sites or regional campuses because they are considered by code as separate lay off jurisdictions.

Kemper then described the worst case scenario for a job displacement or bumping process which would occur as follows according to Lay Off Policy #40.046: the dean would give Human Resources a thirty day notice of the job(s) to be abolished; Human Resources would have 16 days to avoid the displacement and find job(s) for the employee(s) within the university; vacant positions will be identified and Human Resources will try to make a match happen; if nothing can be found, the
employee(s) would get the 14 day official notice required by law and the retention point list would be posted in a conspicuous spot; the employee(s) then have five days to let Human Resources know in writing if they will exercise their displacement rights; Human Resources will review the retention point list for all classified staff and an employee with the same classification with the fewest retention points will be identified and that person would be displaced; if that is not possible, Human Resources would go to the next lower classification series to look for a vacancy and the same scenario would occur; if that did not work, Human Resources would go back to the employee(s) previous certifications held within the last five years; if a vacancy still is not found, Human Resources would perform the same procedure with part-time regular positions, and finally provisional and term positions. He stated that this process is mandated by Ohio Revised Code; reiterated that bumping is the worst case scenario; and gave the example that 47 bumps would result in 170 moves across the university; that in addition to displacement, employee(s) could also go directly to unemployment, go directly to Extended Employment Group (EEG), go directly to severance; or choose to do nothing.

Questions:
Barbara Montgomey asked if this process is only for UOMC employees or for the entire University.
Kemper responded that the abolishment of jobs is only at UOMC, but the bumping process potentially affects every classified staff member at the university and that administrators have rights to everything on the decision tree except bumping.
A question was asked about the web page and the retention point list.
Kemper responded that the web page went live last week with a “snapshot” of where people currently are in the retention point calculation by range.
Christine Sheets asked how planning units will be notified.
Kemper responded that Human Resources will be sending a general list to planning units; that they are bringing in someone from the Ohio Department of Employment Services to critique a mock presentation; that a program has been built in ORACLE to run retention points.
John Ray asked if there are vacancies to place administrators in since the university is in a hiring freeze.
Kemper responded that each of the eleven UOMC administrators will be getting their notice on April 1 that their job is being abolished by July 1; that they will be able to bid on any open classified position at the university-wide level; that they will be made aware of any vacant administrative position before it does public; that it is then up to the individual and department to make the match; that there will be no forced transfers.
Barbara Montgomery asked why displacement will not impact the regional campuses.
Kemper responded that the hiring freeze will effect the regional campuses and the core sites; that displacement will not because they are considered separate lay off jurisdictions; that the 50 mile radius rule permitted by law states that anything within 50 miles the Athens campus is one lay off jurisdiction; that there is a second provision in the code that states that all branch campuses of state colleges and universities are considered a separate lay off jurisdiction; and that the code cannot be violated.
Sharon Huge asked if UOMC employees would get preference for classified position available at regional campuses.
Kemper responded that job displacement and the hiring freeze are two different issues; that the hiring freeze was designed not because of the UOMC situation; that Human Resources has decided to use it as an opportunity to alleviate/eliminate displacement; that originally transfers were going to be forced; that now Human Resources will only make both parties aware that a vacancy has been approved, that an individual is available, and ask that special consideration be given to the individual.

Kemper reminded Senate that he Debbie Evans, Tammy Hawk, Peggy Jameson, John Sanders and he are available to come to planning units to explain the process.

Announcements: None

Adjournment: John Ray moved to adjourn and Judith Johnson seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Merb-Brown
Secretary
Administrative Senate
Treasurer’s Report

Current as of 20 February 2003

Account Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$42,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures YTD</td>
<td>($15,533.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Balance</td>
<td>$26,516.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Account Activity January 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190 Officer Contracts</td>
<td>($1,118.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510 PT-Overtime</td>
<td>($214.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Benefits</td>
<td>($350.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 Travel/Living***</td>
<td>($1,841.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300 Printing</td>
<td>($1,039.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310 Photo Copy</td>
<td>($41.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($5,133.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***This was a portion of the Outstanding Administrator Award for 1998 Honoree Margaret Sheskey

OU Foundation Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>$875.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure YTD</td>
<td>($88.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Balance</td>
<td>$786.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundation Account Activity January 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4619 Entertainment</td>
<td>($36.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000 Misc Expense</td>
<td>($51.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($88.98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio University Administrative Senate  
Minutes of March 20, 2003  
Baker Center 334

Next Meeting: April 17, 2003, 12 noon – 1:30 p.m.  
Baker Center 334

Present: Dorothy Anderson, Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Sherry Barnes, Maggi Channell, Terry Conry, Jean Cunningham, Karen Dahn, Sherry Downs, Doug Franklin, Jim Gilmore, Doug Grammer, Patty Griffith, Sharon Huge, Judith Johnson, Wendy Merb-Brown, Chris Morris, Mary Patacca, John Ray, Chris Reghetti Feyler, Christine Sheets, Andrew Stuart, Dale Tampke, Jean Witkowski

Excused: Kim Lawson, Barbara Montgomery, Brenda Noftz, Cheryl Riley, Ralph Six

Absent: Blis Hanousek DeVault, Julio Friere, R. Douglas Pettit, Deanna Russell, Rusty Smith

Guests: Jim Kemper, Patricia Debruin, George Mauzy, Bruce Nottke

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Approval of February Minutes: Maggi Channell moved that the minutes of February 20, 2003 be approved. Jean Witkowski seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report: Dorothy Anderson reported that

● Mary Patacca will replace Tina Abdella for the remainder of the year and that Tina has taken a position as director of internal auditing with the Columbus schools.

● Jim Kemper proposed a “Project Postponement Action Plan”; that Senate Exec will meet with him on April 16 and will have more to report at the April meeting; that he is recommending Senate postpone the project for not less than one year and perhaps three to five years, and in the meantime, Debbie Evans will manage a project that will “update/modernize the administrative pay structure” (Policy 40.036); that after the meeting there will be more details of the plan and what is expected of Senate.

● Wendy Merb-Brown will report on Jim Kemper’s class project team’s recommendations for the administrator mentoring program and stated that the group did a very good job developing a plan that was simple and easily implemented.

● She invited President Glidden to any remaining meetings for the year and that his calendar will not allow a visit; that general meetings of all Senates will be scheduled when more is known about the seriousness of the budget crisis.

● She attended an explanation of the Classified Merit Pay Plan a few days ago and encouraged Senators to sign up for a session if they are interested.

● Due to some large claims, there will be a substantial deficit in the medical benefits account this year; that based on current levels, the cost of providing benefits will double in five years; that in order to reduce the need for layoffs, the benefits advisory committee has been charged with looking for ways to increase revenue and decrease costs of benefits; that any ideas should be mailed to her or Greg Fialko.
A strategic budgeting plan and energy conservation measures were issues discussed at yesterday’s UPAC meeting; that senior executives agree that workforce lay-offs and displacement must be a last resort and should be minimized as much as possible; that various options for workforce reduction are under consideration and a subcommittee of UPAC has been appointed to study them.

She distributed copies of the Ken Hicks article in the *ANews*, which cites a 51% increase in the number of administrators hired at OU; that Exec is putting together a group to attempt to sort, analyze and clarify this data; that it will be a short two to three week project to determine who is being counted. She asked anyone interested in participating to contact her.

UPAC was asked to recommend communication strategies for these serious economic times and recommended Presidential visits to all Senates and direct communication to all employees.

**Vice Chair’s Report:** Jean Witkowski called on committee chairs for reports:

**Compensation:** Terry Conry reported that work has gone from three major committees to one; that the salary and benefits recommendation has been approved by Senate and forwarded to the senior executive officers; that there has been discussion about whether the committee should reconvene if the budget drastically changes; that the postponement of the Administrative and Professional Pay Plan review has completed that project; that John Ray’s sub-committee is continuing to work on the two sick leave issues—having sick leave counted for service credit at retirement and the donation of sick leave to those in critical need. John Ray reported that he has appointments to gather additional information and that he is also looking into the issue of sheltering sick leave and vacation payout from taxes at retirement.

**Professional Development:** Wendy Merb-Brown reported that the committee is still working on a survey to determine the professional development needs on campus; that the group of nine students from Jim Kemper’s class came up with a mentoring proposal they feel would work very simply on campus; that they proposed that new administrative employees have a volunteer mentor assigned to them for the first three months of their employment at Ohio University; that the mentor should be from their own department, division or planning unit; that there would be a training session for the mentors. She then asked for feedback from Senate.

Sharon Huge asked if this proposal was only for the main campus. *Merb-Brown responded that the research focused on the main campus but that the program could be adapted if it works out.*

Jean Cunningham asked how the mentors would be assigned. *Merb-Brown responded that a list of potential mentors would be compiled; that as employees were hired, University Professional Development or Administrative Senate Professional Development Committee, working with Human Resources, would logistically matched them with mentors.*

Doug Grammer suggested that the request for mentoring could be included in the Profession Development survey.

Karen Dahn asked what the parameters for mentorship were. *Merb-Brown responded that there would be a community and campus connection; that contact information would be given about different areas; that the person being mentored would be asked what their particular needs might be.*

Judith Johnson informed her that the Ohio University Women’s Club already has a nice package that they distribute.

Merb-Brown asked Senate if it thought that people would respond to an e-mail or if a personal invitation would be better. *General response was that an e-mail would be fine.*

Johnson responded that the e-mail should include a set time limit for when the project would begin and end so people knew the time commitment.
Personnel Policies Committee: Sharon Huge – No report.

Elections: Doug Franklin reported that the pilot is ready to go and that the committee is on the timeline.

Service Awards: Karen Dahn reported that the committee is on task; that even with years of services entered in the ORACLE system, it does not mean anything matches; that they have made a conscience decision to go with a less expensive event but expect it will be very nice.

Outstanding Administrator: Christine Sheets reported that they had 52 nominations; that 90% of nominees returned the questionnaire and are interested in being considered; that they are working on updating the plaque; that they will meet in April to finalizes the names.

Faculty Senate: Chris Morris reported that he was out of town and did not attend the Faculty Senate meeting but that he spoke with some faculty members and was informed that two resolutions were passed concerning salary increases for faculty.

Secretary’s Report: Wendy Merb-Brown – No report.

Treasurer’s Report: Chris Morris distributed a written report (attached) and informed Senate that there are approximately $14,000.00 in unclaimed Outstanding Administrator awards; that these funds have been designated as miscellaneous carryover in the past; that he is talking with the Vice President for Finance to find a way to build the funds into the Administrative Senate budget as encumbered carry forward in future years.

Vice President for Administration Report: Jim Kemper reported for Gary North on
(1) the hiring freeze. It's expected that the freeze will continue indefinitely. The freeze will be used to reduce costs. At its first meeting, 15 requests were considered and 6 were approved. At the second meeting, 6 requests were considered and 3 were approved. Approval/non-approval is based on "centrality to mission" of the position and the projected impact if the position is NOT filled. Several positions are exempt from the freeze: group III administrators; positions funded by grants or auxiliaries that serve students; temporary positions working on special projects. Temporary positions that are replacing vacancies are NOT exempt.
(2) the budget. In addition to the information that was contained in Friday's email from President Glidden, Jim indicated that the senior executive officers sincerely want input from all employees on ways to address budget challenges.
(3) UOMC privatization. The senior executive officers have confirmed their intention to fund both the EEG and severance packages that are options for staff whose UOMC positions are eliminated.
Jim also stated that it was his feeling that a wage increase is a high priority for President Glidden.

Old Business: None

New Business: Christine Sheets asked Senate to consider taking part in the O’Bleness Fund Drive in future years.
**Announcements:** Dale Tampke asked Senators to consider the value of having O’Bleness and what it contributes to the university and community and informed them that the focus for this year is cardiac care. He then passed out pledge envelopes and asked them to consider making a donation to the O’Bleness Fund Drive.

**Adjournment:** Jean Witkowski moved to adjourn and Wendy Merb-Brown seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Merb-Brown
Secretary
Administrative Senate
Treasurer’s Report

Current as of 20 March 2003

**Account Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$42,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures YTD</td>
<td>$(16,921.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Balance</td>
<td>$25,128.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Account Activity February 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190 Officer Contracts</td>
<td>$ (750.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510 PT-Overtime</td>
<td>$ (358.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Benefits</td>
<td>$ (262.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5710 Postage</td>
<td>$ (16.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ (1,387.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OU Foundation Account**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>$875.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure YTD</td>
<td>$(88.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Balance</td>
<td>$786.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foundation Account Activity January 2003**

- none
Ohio University Administrative Senate
Minutes of April 17, 2003
Baker Center 334

Next Meeting: May 15, 2003, 12 noon – 1:30 p.m.
Baker Center 334


Excused: Sherry Downs, Sharon Huge, Barbara Montgomery

Absent: Sherry Barnes, Julio Friere, R. Douglas Pettit

Guests: Caryn Asleson, Elizabeth Graham, George Mauzy, Gary North, Sherwood Wilson, Katherine Ziff

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Approval of March Minutes: John Ray moved that the minutes of March 20, 2003 be approved. Judith Johnson seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Elizabeth Graham and Katherine Ziff – What’s new in the Ombuds office? Elizabeth Graham, Ombuds and Katherine Ziff, Assistant Ombuds, introduced themselves; distributed brochures on the Ombuds Office and The Mediation Option for Ohio University Employees; and stated that people come to their office with all different kinds of issues and concerns.

Dorothy Anderson asked what groups of people are served by the office?

They responded that they deal with every member of the university community—students, faculty, classified staff, administrators, parents, alumni, and even have a virtual audience.

Jean Wikowski asked when the office gets involved in sexual harassment issues versus institutional equity or an intake representative?

They responded that they are another venue to go to in addition to institutional equity and that they have had intake training.

Judith Johnson stated that she thought that in the past the Ombuds Office was headed by a faculty member.

Graham responded that she is a faculty member in the School of Interpersonal Communication.

Chair’s Report: Dorothy Anderson reported that

● Tomorrow is the deadline to sign up to help with Commencement; that people are needed for 8:00 a.m.-noon, Friday, June 13 and 8:00 a.m.-noon and 1:00-4:30 p.m., Saturday, June 14; that lunch is provided for those who work both shifts on Saturday; that a training session will be held at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, June 5, at the Convocation Center; that if you can help, contact Gretchen Stephens at stephens@ohio.edu.

● Terry Conry will report on the recent activities/discussions of Benefits Advisory Committee; that their report is due the Provost by the end of the month and asked if there is an interest in a separate meeting with Greg Fialko to discuss the changes before they are presented to the Provost.

● Several subgroups have been formed to gather information and make recommendations to the full UPAC; that the IT group is looking at centralizing IT functions, a university technology fee, and the
student-computing environment; that the benefits group is looking at employee fee waivers and health insurance; that the reorganization group is looking at "redundancies" which may need to be addressed in order to work more efficiently and save money.

● A bridge plan for the Administrative Compensation Plan Study will be undertaken beginning in the next 6 weeks; that a consultant will be engaged, probably Scott Cook from Mercer, to advise UHR on bridging the gap between now and the larger project and to address the primary concerns of the current pay plan; that the project manager will be Debbie Evans; that Administrative Senate will be asked to become involved with the bridge project, once the consultant has been engaged and there is a response from him on how reasonable the plan and expectations are; that the Executive Committee will meet soon to discuss the plan and she would welcome Senators’ thoughts/concerns. She stated that the major components of the bridge project will most likely be updating/modernizing the pay structure (compare mid-points to market on 20+ benchmark jobs to be sure the mid-points are still relevant; updating the A & P Compensation policy 40.036; developing a long-range plan for addressing the A & P Plan; comparing the IT administrator pay plan policy and the general administrator pay plan policy to look for conflicts, complements, redundancies, etc.; assessing the JIQ design for general administrator's job evaluation process (compare to PDQ); assessing the current Performance Management System's compatibility to deliver pay for A & P Pay Plan; and asking the question, "Given OU’s total compensation package, do we have a strategic competitive advantage?"

Vice Chair’s Report: Jean Witkowski called on committee chairs for reports:


Personnel Policies Committee: Cheryl Riley reported that Policy 41.129 was submitted to the University Policy & Procedure Review Committee and to Administrative Senate’s Personnel Policy Committee for review; that the committee’s revisions have been returned to University Professional Development who are in the process of considering the recommendations; that the committee hopes to have the revised policy back by its May 8 meeting and she asked if the committee should send the policy back to the University Policy & Procedure Committee or bring it back to full Administrative Senate for review. The response was that it should come back to Senate and Riley requested that it be placed on the May agenda. She then reported that the committee looked at Policy 18.031, regarding emeritus status for administrators, which was initially issued on 9/22/95 and stated that the feedback received to date was that the policy is clear but that the issues surrounding the policy are due to contact. Dorothy Anderson asked if any had any comments.

Karen Dahn responded that no concerns have been presented.

Elections: Doug Franklin reported that CNS has built the site and it is ready to go, except for a problem in identifying who is an administrator; that the letter is written and they are on the timeline.

Service Awards: Karen Dahn reported that their entire meeting dealt with the issue of who is an administrator on campus; that they are working to reconcile who should be on the service awards program; that the ceremony will be at 3:00 p.m., May 20, 2003.

Outstanding Administrator: Jim Gilmore reported that the committee has met several times over the last couple weeks and have narrowed the nominees down to seven people; that they hope to have the awardees selected by next Thursday.

Compensation: Terry Conry reported on the Benefits Advisory Committee report and stated that benefits are the largest line in the university budget (over $30 million); that this amount is expected to double in five years; that Greg Fialko has done a very comprehensive survey comparing OU versus other state universities in terms of who gets what at what cost; that plan design and cost shifting are the two options being looked at to manage costs; that using urgent care versus the emergency room is being encouraged; that moving to 10% co-pay of premiums, increasing out of pocket costs through higher deductibles, and/or higher final out of pocket are also being considered; that the graduated scale, where those who have higher salaries pay a proportionately higher charge for service, is being retained; that they are looking at shifting to a $5 or $10 charge for generic drugs and a percentage for brand name drugs (similar to PERS and STRS); that he feels that all proposals brought forward by the Benefits Office are reasonable given the situation. Conry then talked about a Section 105 Account, which is a new provision in the tax code that allows an employer to fund something like the current spending accounts for the purpose of tax sheltering health care costs. He stated that the employer put a specified amount in the account and the employees are responsible for the management of how the money is spent; that it can be carried forward if there is an unspent balance; that the employer has to design and implement the plan but then everyone has to be in it; that there is no choice; that it is getting careful study; and that Senators may e-mail him for more information.
John Ray asked what you would give up if you went into this plan. Conry responded that the amount you put in the account would be graduated by income; that those making more would get less in this type of account; that coupled with increased premiums and deductibles, a net savings should result; that Medical Mutual of Ohio is analyzing it and may come back and say that it does not make sense because deductibles are still so low; that utilization is the number one factor driving our health care costs, followed by new technology, malpractice and large case claims; that we are a society that expects and gets quality health care at a moment’s notice.

John Ray distributed the Executive Summary “Accumulated Leave Plan” document and reported that the program would not cost the university anything; that it would allow a retiring persons to shelter their vacation and sick leave pay from taxes; that it would apply to everyone if implemented; that the pay all goes into a specified company (e.g. ING) in an account at retirement; that if it could be drawn out immediately and the taxes paid or the return of the money could be delayed for taxes purposes; that it would earn interest in a market account; that the money could be transferred to another company at a later date; that the information has been distributed to Human Resources, Finance, Budget and Legal Affairs for review.

It was asked if there was a maximum amount that could be deposited?
Ray responded $84,000.
Maggi Channell asked if it would change the 30 day maximum?
Ray responded that it would not.

Ad Hoc Committee: Doug Franklin distributed a database and graphs and reported on Senate’s charge to review the sources of data that would either refute or support Ken Hicks’ claim in an ANews article, dated March 13, 2003, of a significant growth in administrators at the University. He stated that the data used was most likely taken from the Ohio University web site and that Hicks was probably looking at general funded administrators versus faculty growth; that he collected all the easy data (from OH, Board of Regents web sites) and that none of it agrees, not even the data on the OU web site; that he looked at a 30 year study which shows faculty, administrator, classified, graduate assistants and teaching assistants; that if you combine classified and administrators and combine faculty, graduate assistant and teaching assistants, you find a 2% differential between support and direct academic instruction; that if you break down the date from institutional research over the last five years, you see a 15.98% growth in academic administrators, a 13.26% increase in non-academic administrators, a 18.67% in professional and technical administrators, a 5% growth in faculty, with graduate assistants and classified pretty much staying the same; that he thinks this is where Hicks got his information; that if you take the general funded administrators, which include academic administrators, non-academic administrators, professional and technical administrators, you come up with 836 current administrators; that in reviewing standards in higher education he noted an increase in administrator support in higher education; that the increase of activities in student affairs, diversity and facilities on campus create a growth in academic and non-academic administration.

Jean Witkowski asked if this is a national trend.
Franklin responded that it is and that he is trying to compile information to find where the growth areas are; that he sees an increase in non-academic programming, public service, and auxiliary and the size of auxiliary at this university.
Santanu Bandyopadhyay asked if the Board of Regents data for Ohio University can be accessed and compared.
Franklin responded that he has the data but has not had a chance to run it; that he has data for all similar sized institutions, as well as OSU; that he has contacted three national organizations to find out if there is a national standard or benchmark between the ratio of administrators or support to faculty and has not received any information to date.
Jean Witkowski asked about the 2% differential referred to earlier.
Franklin responded that if administrators and classified employees are combined and faculty, graduate assistants and teaching assistants are combined, you will find only a 2% differential between support and direct academic instruction; that you also see a significant decrease in classified employees and a significant increase in administrators and that the data supports that classified employees are being turned into administrators.
John Ray stated that part of the increase is explained by new functions that the university is participating in.

Secretary’s Report: Wendy Merb-Brown – No report.

Treasurer’s Report: Chris Morris distributed a written report (attached).

Vice President for Administration Report: Gary North reported that most of his time since the last meeting has been spent talking about budgets; that President Glidden has made presentations at the Board of Trustees meeting and the various forums; that they are working the plan to get the buy out officially recognized filed with PERS; that the procedures and sign up information should be out in the next week or so; that sign up for the bonus would be in May and June; that from July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004, the new year buy out will be offered.
Dorothy Anderson asked what is happening at the clinic?
North responded that it has been announced publicly that there will be a transition and that the private operation will become effective July 1; that not a lot of information has been released about how they plan to staff it and what the implications of that may be.
Anderson stated that she has heard that administrators whose positions abolished have been notified and asked if he knew how many people.
North responded that they have and that he did not know the number but he did not think it was large.

Old Business: None

New Business: None

Sherwood Wilson – New Parking Concept: Sherwood Wilson distributed and reviewed the New Parking Concept Proposal and stated that it is an alternative parking proposal that would be a win-win; that it would generate enough revenue to make Parking independent from the general fund; that it was presented to President Glidden about six weeks ago and then to the Executive Officers and now to the various governance groups on campus for feedback. He talked about the current parking structure and about Parking Services being moved from Security to Transportation and finished by asking for Senate’s support for the proposal in the form of a resolution.

Announcements: Caryn Asleson, assistant dean of the College of Arts & Sciences was introduced as a guest.

Adjournment: John Ray moved to adjourn and Andrew Stuart seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Merb-Brown
Secretary
Current as of 17 April 2003

**Account Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$42,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures YTD</td>
<td>$(17,895.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Balance</td>
<td>$24,154.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Account Activity March 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190</td>
<td>Officer Contracts</td>
<td>$(750.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>PT-Overtime</td>
<td>$(173.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$(259.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4610</td>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>$(59.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>Travel CREDIT</td>
<td>$(267.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(974.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OU Foundation Account**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>$875.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure YTD</td>
<td>$(88.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Balance</td>
<td>$786.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foundation Account Activity January 2003**

none
Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Approval of April Minutes: Chris Morris moved that the minutes of April 17, 2003 be approved. Andrew Stuart seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Special Guest: Greg Fialko, Director, Benefits, University Human Resources presented the proposed health benefit changes and reported that there is a national health care crisis; that increases in health care costs are a trend seen over the last several years and expected to continued for three to four more years; that medical claims are projected to go up 14% to 17% per year; that the current health care budget for Ohio University is $30 million and expected to increased an additional $20 to $25 million in the next four to five years; that the University can not afford to pay all of the increase so the executive officers are asking employees to pay for part of it; that even with these changes the University will still pay about $20 million; that changing insurance companies was not considered because the contract with Medical Mutual was just renewed two years ago and they are still considered the best company in the state; that the Benefits Review Committee looked at the following areas for changes: employee contributions, re-instituting a deductible, what the co-insurance limit should be; prescription drug co-pay and emergency room co-pay.

Employee contributions will increase from 8.3% to 10% of the total cost of premiums beginning in January 2004 and keep it at 10% for future years; the employees’ average annual increase for be $120/single, $240/dual, and $360/family.

An annual deductible will be added, to be determined by salary (see example below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Single Deductible</th>
<th>Family Deductible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$30,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$40,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$50,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$60,000</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$70,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$80,000</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000-$90,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 and over</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$1650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dorothy Anderson asked if preventive care was included in the deductible?

Fialko responded that preventive care would stay as is; that it can still be done up front at no cost to the employee.

Anderson also asked if the university is stopping at $90,000?

Fialko responded that the most recent proposal goes up to $150,000.

Co-insurance is the insurance company sharing cost with the employee; it begins once the deductible was met; insurance pays 90% of the expense and the employee pays 10%; the co-insurance payment limit is being increased as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Single Co-Pay</th>
<th>Family Co-Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$30,000</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$6000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fialko gave the following example: single employees would pay $200 in medical expenses that would be applied to the deductible, then they would pay 10% of the claims under the co-pay until the $2000 limit was reached, and after that claims would be paid at 100%; that same scenario would apply to family coverage. He informed Senate that 80% of family units on campus have less than $5000 in claims per year so this change would mean an additional $500 or $600 on top of the deductible; that 88% of cases will have the exact same co-insurance as last year.

Sharon Huge asked how much money the university will save with this plan.

Fialko responded that for next fiscal year the University will save $900,000 for the general fund over a six month period and on an annual basis these changes will reduce the overall benefits budget by $3.5 million.

**Prescription drug co-pay** for generic and the brand will change as follows: generic drugs will increase from $1.00 to $10.00 and if the drug is less than $10.00, the employee pays the cost; brand-name drugs will be a percentage with a cap (30% of the cost of the drug); the University is planning to charge twice as much for the mail order for three times as much drug (e.g. the employee will get a 90 day supply and be charged for 60 day supply); a percentage was chosen over a dollar amount so they do not have to come back every year for an increase.

It was asked if there was still a $50.00 maximum on the mail order of brand-name drugs.

**Fialko responded that there is a $50 maximum on both.**

Another question was asked about how many years we would be at 30%?

**Fialko responded that there was no guarantee but the last times changes were made was 1998; that they would like to get as many people to use mail order as possible so they are instituting a requirement that after three refills of the same drug you will pay a penalty if you use a pharmacy rather than mail order.**

Judith Johnson stated that employees need to be educated to ask their physicians for an additional prescription that they can have filled at the local pharmacy in case of emergency.

John Ray asked if mail order provides the same services as a retail pharmacist in terms of keeping drug interaction records and giving print outs of co-pay.

**Fialko responded that they will only know drug interaction for the drugs that you have received from mail order.**

John Ray asked if the mail order provider can be called about concerns about allergic reactions.

**Fialko responded that they have 1-800 numbers where you can call them and be transferred to a pharmacy division and ask questions.**

An **emergency room co-pay** of $75 that would not go toward deductible or out of pocket maximum will be instituted to discourage people from using the emergency room and encourage the use of an urgent care center or family doctor.

Chris Morris asked about issues that need to be worked out about urgent care billing.

**Fialko responded that not in the Athens area but maybe in some of the regional campus areas where some hospitals call themselves urgent care centers and are not.**

Judith Johnson asked when a couple moves from dual to family.

**Fialko responded on the day the baby is born.**

Karen Dahn asked if flexible spending accounts change at all.

**Fialko responded that flexible spending accounts will not change; that they are approved by IRS for $3,000; and that they still cannot be rolled over.**

Dorothy Anderson asked if dental and vision would be affected by these changes.

**Fialko responded that no changes are planned for dental or vision.**

Jim Gilmore asked if these proposed changes were individual or all of the above.

**Fialko responded that they would be made all at once.**

Anderson asked when the changes would begin.

**Fialko responded January 2004.**

Johnson asked if consideration has been given to a penalty for people who smoke.

**Fialko responded that it has not been considered because it would be difficult to identify those who smoke and monitoring would cost more than savings; that doing health risk assessments and preventive programs might be more helpful and possible.**

Chris Morris asked about making membership to Well-Works a benefit.

**Fialko responded that it has not been seriously considered.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Generic Co-Pay</th>
<th>Brand Co-Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$40,000</td>
<td>$2100</td>
<td>$6300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$50,000</td>
<td>$2200</td>
<td>$6600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$60,000</td>
<td>$2300</td>
<td>$6900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$70,000</td>
<td>$2400</td>
<td>$7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$80,000</td>
<td>$2500</td>
<td>$7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000-$90,000</td>
<td>$2600</td>
<td>$7800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 and over</td>
<td>$2700</td>
<td>$8100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair’s Report: Dorothy Anderson reported that
● Nominations for elections are due tomorrow and asked Senators to consider running again if their term is up and to encourage and
nominate colleagues they thought would make a good contribution to Senate; that electronic voting will occur during the next month and results will be announced at the June meeting; that the executive committee for 2003-2004 will also be elected.
• UPAC’s study groups gave their final reports on the following topics: employee benefits (specifically fee waivers), IT strategies, enhancing the educational experience for students, graduate and research issues, POM, (utilities, renovations and cost containment), student access, and considerations regarding restructuring/reductions; that the Provost intends to share these reports with the Vice Presidents and they will then be available on a web site; that it is hoped that they will spark university-wide discussions; that anyone interested in seeing any of the reports, should send her an email identifying which one(s); that Senate storage space is moving from Putnam to Lindley Hall sometime in the next few weeks; that the Service Awards Ceremony is Tuesday at 3:00 p.m., in Baker Center Ballroom and all Senators are expected to attend.

Vice Chair’s Report: In the absence of Jean Witkowski, Wendy Merb-Brown called on committee chairs for reports:

Professional Development: Wendy Merb-Brown reported that the committee was meeting next Thursday to finalize the survey assessing administrators’ experiences with professional development; that they are hoping to have the survey completed by this academic year so they can have input and information to make decisions and recommendations; that they will be sending out an e-mail to all administrators in the beginning of June asking for administrators to volunteer to be mentors to new employees.

Elections: Patty Griffith reported that she met with Doug Franklin and that the committee is on target with what was done last year; that nominations are being sent to Franklin’s office; that she will meet with him again on Tuesday to review the nominations and make sure there are enough nominations to fill the vacancies; that discrepancies between the web and handbook make it difficult to track vacancies; that on-line and paper ballots will be prepared; that nominations will close June 6; that the elected senators for next year will then be presented to the executive committee for approval and everything should be finalized before the June meeting.

Service Awards: Karen Dahn reiterated that all Senators are expected to be at the Service Awards Ceremony at 3:00 p.m., on Tuesday, May 20, 2003, Baker Center Ballroom; that twelve retiring employees will be attending; that the following years of service will be recognized: 40, 35, 30, 25, 20, 15, 10, and 5.

Outstanding Administrator: Christine Sheets reported that the top three outstanding administrators have been finalized and they are Sandra Foster from the Lancaster campus, Linda Lonsinger from Human Resources, and Marvin Bowman from Telecommunications.

Compensation: Terry Conry asked John Ray to report on any new business about the sick leave credit or the tax shelter. John Ray reported that the tax shelter for sick pay is being carefully reviewed by the Richard Siemer and John Burns; that they are interested and think it is a good idea but want to clarify some issues; that the issue of converting sick leave to retirement time is a long range project that will entail working with individual units and involving all state universities and administrative senates in order to have to make it possible.

Personnel Policies Committee: Sharon Huge – No report

Secretary’s Report: Wendy Merb-Brown announced that handbooks were available for anyone who wants one.

Treasurer’s Report: Chris Morris – No report.

Faculty Senate: Chris Morris reported that there were a number of guest speakers; that Greg Fialko made the same benefits presentation; that there was talk of forming a faculty union; that President Glidden spoke and stated that he was optimistic that the State Senate budget plan would be more favorable to us and of the importance or morale, benefits, raises, and development; that Provost Kopp was less optimistic about the budget stating that the budgets were being built around the House version, which was more conservative and anticipated higher cuts; that the Board of Trustees approved a tuition increase up to a 9.5%; that the increase for fall will probably be about 6%; that academic units will receive smaller cuts than support areas; that Sherwood Wilson was on the agenda and decided to come back at the next meeting; that Ken Hicks questioned whether many of the areas that were expanded in good budget times are essential or just beneficial.

Vice President for Administration Report: Gary North was not in attendance and no report was given.

Old Business: None
**New Business:** The Professional Development Policy for Administrators #41.128 was distributed for review. Sharon Huge commented that the university-wide committee that reviews policy thought that it would be a good idea to consider combining the administrative and classified staff professional development policies; that Senate’s Personnel Policy Committee reviewed them and determined that it was not in the best interest of either group to try to combine the policies. Dorothy Anderson asked for a formal motion to consider this a first reading. Sharon Huge made the motion and Andrew Stuart presented it.

Wendy Merb-Brown asked if the highlighted areas were changes. *It was responded that they were changes in relation to questions from the committee; that there was an initial draft and the highlighted areas were changes to it; that there were two policies that were relevant to professional development and this policy is a compilation of both.*

There being no further questions or discussion, Dorothy Anderson announced that this policy would be on the June agenda under Old Business for a second reading and vote.

**New Parking Concept:** Dorothy Anderson opened the meeting for discussion about the new parking concept presented by Sherwood Wilson at the April meeting and asked Senators for their comments and concerns.

**Mary Patacca** commented that she thought it sounded like an administrative nightmare; that she would not want to administrate it; that she did not think they would be able to sell the idea that it would not restrict parking; that it did not appeal to her.

**Chris Morris** commented that he is never for eroding benefits but thinks the idea of making parking services self-sufficient is a good goal; that it is an incremental plan that is not asking every person to pay for parking, only those who wish to pay for preferential spaces; that he would be in favor of it.

**John Ray** commented that anytime you erode benefits it is a serious move; that he is concerned about including the Stimson road in the parking plan; that if benefits are eroded to help pay for the road, it should not be part of the plan; that perhaps they would not need as many paid spaces if the road was not included; that the road should come out of the capital improvement or some other method.

**Sherry Barnes** commented that all those issues about the Stimson access/river corridor are all just concepts; that the main idea is to have parking become self-sufficient and remove it from the general fund; that anything that would be implemented would have to go through a lot of committees.

**Wendy Merb-Brown** commented that she has no problem with have a self-supported area, especially with the budget issues; that she does have an issue with people who are privileged being able to buy and others who do not have the discretionary income not having the same opportunity; that she is okay with spaces with parking meters because that is an equal opportunity situation; that $200, especially with benefits increasing, is significant.

**Maggi Channell** commented that she perceives this to be punitive to anyone who has been here a significant length of time; that she does value that privilege and it says to her that the university values her as an employee; that she is uncertain that people at the lower end of the tenure scale will be given the same opportunity; that she is opposed to the whole idea the way it has been presented at this point.

**Christine Sheets** commented that from her experience working with students and bills, she wants the tow trucks off campus; that she would like them to use a boot.

**Santanu Bandyopadhyay** commented that making parking self-sufficient is a move in the right direction and asked if a shuttle service is being considered.

**Sharon Huge** commented that it might be of some value to come up with some positive alternative ideas to the proposal; that as well as expressing a general consensus that it is a worthy goal to be self-sufficient, come up with some ideas that would potentially counter and resolve some of the issues and concerns that have been brought up.

**Terry Conry** commented that these are ideas; that people are looking at the numbers, seeing how much money is being generated, and asking where it is going; that in one sense you would not want to do more than fund the operation; that you need to determine the cost to make the auxiliary self-supporting and if there is more money, roll it back; that he could not answer questions about where the money would go or whether this was the right place to get the money for the road initiative; that he would be interested in getting more specific information and understanding; that he liked the boot concept.

**Mary McPherson** commented that she represents a small minority group at the College of Medicine whose jobs take them off campus every day; that they are in and out of the office on a regular basis; that they have to load a lot of materials in and out of vehicles; that they are very concerned about being stuck in the Physical Plant parking lot and having to get in and out of the basement of Grosvenor; that they would like there to be consideration for employees who have to leave campus frequently on a daily basis to do their jobs; that they are carrying on the mission of the College of Medicine and the university off campus and need reasonable access to their offices.

**Sharon Huge** commented that Terry Conry’s ideas of identifying and defining what is self-sufficient would be an enormous goal for the university.

**Sherry Barnes** commented that she knows that seniority parking is a benefit to people now and is sure they will be upset if it is taken away; that there is only seniority parking for a limited number of people; that there has been talk about
grandfathering in those that currently hold seniority parking permits; that she is almost certain the road project will be put on hold; that these funds could possibly go to areas that would help the university as a whole, e.g. the compensation plan.  

**Mary Patacca** commented that coming up with alternatives was a good idea; that alternatives have to be balanced with any additional administrative costs that would go with the plan; that the more complicated the plan is, the more it costs to do; that it sounded administratively difficult.  

**Sherry Barnes** commented that there are four new positions in the plan.  

**John Ray** commented that the issue is that we are for them being self-sufficient and for a plan that is fair and accepted by most people on campus, but it should be self-sufficient strictly for parking and any dollars generated by the plan should go into university parking.  

**Christine Sheets** commented that she would like to have some limited spaces with meters in all the parking lots close to campus for visitors/guests.  

**Andrew Stuart** commented that the problem with metered spaces is that students will park in them.  

**Dorothy Anderson** asked what Senate would like to do.  

**Chris Morris** commented that he thought Sherwood Wilson came to Senate looking for a resolution of support; that he does not think Senate can give that wholeheartedly; that we should invite him back and express our concerns; that if he wants to take some of our suggestions, we can pass a resolution backing certain parts of the proposal but not the concept as a whole.  

**Maggi Channell** commented that she agrees with the idea of addressing what happens if they make money; that she would like to see something that generates revenue properly reviewed and directed.  

**Christine Sheets** commented that Sherwood Wilson should be sent Senate’s concerns in advance with a request to come back and address them in July.  

**Announcements:** Service Award Ceremony and Reception will be at 3 p.m., on Monday, May 20, 2003, Baker Center Ballroom.  

**Adjournment:** John Ray moved to adjourn and Andrew Stuart seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.  

Respectfully submitted,  

Wendy Merb-Brown  
Secretary
Ohio University Administrative Senate
Minutes of June 19, 2003
Baker Center 334

Next Meeting: July 17, 2003, 12 noon – 1:30 p.m.
Baker Center 334

Present: Dorothy Anderson, Maggi Channell, Jean Cunningham, Terry Conry, Karen Dahn, Doug Franklin, Doug Grammer, Sharon Huge, Judith Johnson, Wendy Merb-Brown, Brenda Noftz, Chris Reghetti Feyler, Deanna Russell, Dale Tampke, Jean Witkowski

Excused: Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Julio Friere, Jim Gilmore, Patty Griffith, Kim Lawson, Chris Morris, Mary Patacca, R. Douglas Pettit, Cheryl Riley, Ralph Six

Absent: Sherry Barnes, Blis Hanousek DeVault, Sherry Downs, Barbara Montgomery, John Ray, Christine Sheets, Rusty Smith, Andrew Stuart

Guests: Scott Blower, Michael Greenfest, Beth Maxon, George Mauzy, Carol May, Gary North, Charlotte Rae

Dorothy Anderson called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

Approval of May Minutes: Since there was not a quorum, the minutes of May 15, 2003 were not approved.

Chair’s Report: Dorothy Anderson reported that
  ● University Human Resources, the Benefits Advisory Committee and the senior executives are reviewing the benefit changes proposal reinstating the office visit co-pay, introducing a deductible, and increasing the co-insurance and drug co-pays limits at lower levels than in the proposal distributed and discussed by Greg Fialko at the May meeting.
  ● Sherwood Wilson was invited to the July meeting to discuss the parking concept but could not attend; that Exec plans to send him comments from the last meeting along with a cover note highlighting the following two issues: (1) any parking proposal must be self-supporting to gain Senate support and (2) the plan must clearly identify where any income generated from it would be channeled.
  ● Today’s meeting will certify the elections, introduce the roster of candidates for the Executive Committee (Exec), and ask for nominations for Exec from the floor; that there will be no vote until the July meeting; that after the elections two vacancies still exist; that Exec needs to appoint Senators for one-year terms for District 9 and for a Regional Campus seat and asked that any suggestions for representations should be forward via e-mail.
  ● Hugh Bloemer is now sitting in on senior executive officer meetings and will be sharing information with Administrative Senate’s Exec.
  ● Senate offices have moved to Lindley Hall 213, which is big enough to accommodates committee meetings and store all records; that the chair of Senate will have the key to the space.
  ● This is the last meeting for outgoing Senators, passed out certificates and thanked them for their service.
  ● Volunteer forms for university level committees are available and announced that the following committees need administrators: Cultural Activities, Greek Life, Honorary Degree, Kennedy Lecture, Parking and Vehicle Violation, and Research.

Vice Chair’s Report: Jean Witkowski called on committee chairs for the following reports:

Professional Development: Wendy Merb-Brown presented the 2002-03 Report of Activities highlighting the year’s projects and the draft of the Professional Development Survey, which will be sent to all administrators and reported that the goal is distribute the survey by e-mail or electronically through the web site; that the bulk of the year has been spent coming up with the questions to be asked; that the goal for completion of the survey is mid-fall quarter; that Deanna and she have been part of University Professional Development’s five week supervisors series pilot.
Personnel Policies Committee: Sharon Huge – No report

Compensation: Terry Conry reported that there are three projects pending -- sick leave pool, tax sheltering sick leave payout at retirement, credit for unused service leave toward service years at retirement.

Outstanding Administrator: Judith Johnson reported that all work has been completed.

Service Awards: Karen Dahn thanked all who attended the awards ceremony and the committee for all their hard work and asked when the pictures of the ceremony will be on the web site.

Elections: Doug Franklin reported that the election was successful with 211 voters for the first time, about 80 more than last year.

Faculty Senate: Jean Witkowski reported that both President Glidden and Provost Kopp attended the meeting; that Dr. Glidden gave a budget update and stated that cuts of 3.3% for academic units and 5.3% for non-academic units are being considered; that a 6% tuition increase, with a special fund of 3% that can have fees assessed for need-based aid and for other special situations or circumstances, was approved by the Board of Regents; that a campus-wide technology fee may be assessed as a part of that pool; that 103 employees took advantage of the early retirement incentive program; that Dr. Glidden agreed that the method of accounting (regarding the health care issue) needs to be a more transparent; that in the past deficits have been assumed centrally and not been passed back to the employees; that if the deficits were assumed centrally then the overages should also be assumed centrally; that a discussion on faculty salaries revealed that faculty have been treated as any other employee group on campus (i.e. the percentage of their salary increase was always the same); that a study by Rank and Discipline is providing good data; that increased increments for promotions have been determined and the information has been distributed to the units; that there is likely to be a mid-year salary equity adjustment for faculty; that the early retirement program for faculty is to be examined because it costs the institution approximately $4 million a year; Dr. Kopp expressed concern about a trend for national testing at the higher education level similar to K-12; that two resolutions pertaining to health care benefits were presented (copies distributed); that Senate suspended the rules and passed both of them; that one resolution is a request to return the $418,000 in overage to the employees who paid into the system and the other involved being more transparent in the method of accounting; that Ken Hicks presented information on the AAUP salary study indicating that Ohio University has lost ground compared to its sister institutions in the state; that salary increases have been below the Ohio average; that there are particular problems in maintaining the salary level at the professor rank; that ground has been lost when looking at increases versus consumer price index; that Sherwood Wilson attended to discuss and answer questions about the parking proposal.

Discussion -- Faculty Senate Resolution concerning benefits:
Doug Franklin stated that he was glad President Glidden pointed out that in the past overages were returned and deficits were absorbed; that he does not understand why you would not save the overages to offset future deficits.

Witkowski responded that one of the underlying themes was a matter of distrust between faculty (employees/units) and the administration, particularly in light of the comment that this money was a part of a compensation package; that the other concern centers on the manner in which the money is tracked.

Franklin stated that he would like to see a resolution that would have the institution put the books on the table and identify exactly where the funds are being allocated; that the concept of having a sugar bowl is not good for the institution and does not make any sense; that a fee should be a fee for a particular purpose, not a general fee.

Judith Johnson asked if the overage given to the departments has been taken back.

Gary North responded no and commented that the university derives revenue primarily from two key sources – subsidy and tuition; that if there is a year-end savings (overage), it falls into a general fund and is reallocated for other programmatic purposes; that the units do not necessarily carry the deficit or retain the overages on those general fund pools; that they do on their specific unit but not on benefits, scholarships or utilities; that for the last four year there have been deficits on health care; that last year was the first year
there was a surplus in the health care fund which was allocated to the year-end pool and used to take care of shortfalls resulting from over expenditures, budget misestimates or investments that did not performed as projected; that this year he will be looking at some of these issues, particularly the format of budgeting and recording.

Franklin stated that he thinks there is a problem on the fee side of the house.
North responded that perhaps there is with the general fee, in terms of the way it is aggregated; that it was done this way in order to protect it rather than expose it; that he thinks all fees should be subject to a review and approval by an independent review group.

Johnson stated that overages should not be given back to the individual employees and be kept for the health care pool, until it reach $1 billion, rather than going to a fund which is not part of the individual’s health care package.
North responded that there will be an increase in benefit costs; that he requested that $1.5 million be taken out of the $3.5 projected increase; that if the current trend line, which is at 16.7% increase, is projected out over five years, it doubles the amount of money put into benefits; that he does not think any institution can absorb that much benefits cost and stay in business; that an alternative approach to benefits needs to be looked at (e.g. a 105 or Gap account where an amount of money is expended up front in a pre-tax plan that covers certain costs and would probably be sufficient for about 80% of employee health care costs for a year, then there would be an gap of a certain amount from $3,000 to $10,000 which the individual carries before a catastrophe plan kicked in; that this type of plan is being used to cushion and move some of the costs and more of the decisions for health care back to the individual; that there will be a lot of opportunity for input over the next year or so in terms of what might emerge.

Wendy Merb-Brown asked how the $418,000 from employee contributions could be used for university shortfalls or otherwise because it was paid by employees.
North responded that if you aggregate that with the $30 million the university put in from other sources, the assumption was that whatever fell out at the end could be used as other simple pool accounts were used; that he does not know that that was ever discussed nor was it thought of as “the employees’ portion;” that it was hard to imagine that that contribution was over and above the cost incurred.

Dale Tampke stated that the issue of payment and the mix of payment changes behaviors; that this is another piece of way health care is expensive.

Secretary’s Report:  Wendy Merb-Brown – No report.

Treasurer’s Report: Chris Morris was not present but reports for May and June were distributed (attached).

Vice President for Administration Report:  Gary North congratulated Gretchen Stephens, Maggi Channell, and all who helped with commencement and reminded Senators how important it is to volunteer. He reported that the budget has changed since President Glidden’s report at Faculty Senate; that additional cuts are expected; that today’s Dispatch indicated that there will likely be an additional $80 million reduction to the higher education budget; that some changes will be made to the original agreements on tuition; that they are looking at a 3.3% cut to academic units and a 5.3% cut to service units; that the Board of Trustees is going through some organization changes and the bylaws have been changed so the chair can serve three years and will not serve according to their date of appointment; that Human Resources pulled off a remarkable feat in dealing with the transition of the COM, the buy out the freeze, without bumping Witkowski requested an update on the hiring freeze.
North responded that the university has been generous in filling positions; that at last count 60 of the over 100 frozen positions had been acted on; that a lot of people took advantage of the transfers from COM to fill positions, particularly those that were open by early retirement program and avoided having to pay replacement costs; that the bonus period ends on June 30 and that the number who have taken advantage of it far exceeds expectations.

Johnson asked if it will be offered again next year.
North responded that it will be offered through June 30, 2004 and he is not sure whether or not it will be extended.

Old Business: The second reading and vote on the Professional Development Policy for Administrators #41.128 was carried forward to the next meeting due to the lack of a quorum.
North continued by reporting that the new compensation plans proposed by Human Resources are more market driven and that the reason the faculty have problems on the salary side is that increases have been dollar increases, particularly to help younger faculty, rather than percentages increases and consequently senior faculty, who got smaller dollar amounts, did not keep up and are not being raised proportionally or at the same pace.

New Business: None

Certification of Elections: Doug Franklin reported that the Executive Committee has certified the election and the new senators are as follows: At-Large -- Scott Blower, Terrence Brown, Carol May, Wendy Merb-Brown, Christopher Morris, Charlotte Rae, Jean Witkowski; District – Deanna Russell (District 4), John Ray (District 6), Elizabeth Maxon (District 8), Brenda Noftz (District 12), Michael Greenfest (District 13), Pam Callahan (District 14); Regional –Sharon Huge (District 15).

Election of Executive Officers: Dorothy Anderson presented the following recommended slate of officers for 2003-04: Jean Witkowski, Chair; Wendy Merb-Brown, Vice Chair; Chris Morris, Treasurer; Terry Conry, Secretary; and Maggi Channell, Advisor; and then asked for nominations from the floor. No nominations were submitted.

Announcements: Dorothy Anderson announced that today will be her last meeting as chair and was then presented with a gift in appreciation for her dedication and hard work over the past two years. She also announced that she had taken the university’s offer of an early retirement at the end of August and thanked everyone for working with and supporting her over the last two years.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Merb-Brown                  Secretary
Administrative Senate
Treasurer’s Report

Current as of 15 May 2003

Account Summary

Beginning Balance $42,040.00
Expenditures YTD $ (17,399.26)
Updated Balance $ 24,640.74

Account Activity February 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190 Officer Contracts</td>
<td>$ (792.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510 PT-Overtime</td>
<td>$ (469.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890 Professional Services</td>
<td>$ (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Benefits</td>
<td>$ (306.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 Travel CREDIT</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310 Photocopy CREDIT</td>
<td>$ 2,159.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 497.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OU Foundation Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>$ 875.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure YTD</td>
<td>$ (88.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Balance</td>
<td>$ 786.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundation Account Activity April 2003

none
Administrative Senate
Treasurer’s Report

Current as of 19 June 2003

Account Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$42,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures YTD</td>
<td>(24,056.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Balance</td>
<td>$17,983.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Account Activity February 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190 Officer Contracts</td>
<td>(750.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510 PT-Overtime</td>
<td>(444.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Benefits</td>
<td>(296.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4610 Business Meetings</td>
<td>(561.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5310 Photocopy</td>
<td>(642.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5710 Postage</td>
<td>(53.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7660 Employee Awards (non-cash)</td>
<td>(3,907.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6,656.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OU Foundation Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>$875.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure YTD</td>
<td>(88.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Balance</td>
<td>$786.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundation Account Activity May 2003

none