

Minutes of the Meeting held April 11, 2008

Present: Cuppoletti, (UC); Lopez, Bloemer (OU); Milburn, (Central State); McKenna, Rousmaniere (Miami); Bernhard, (BGSU); Gunning (UT); King (YSU); Sudkamp (Wright State); Ray (CSU); Fenwick (UA)

Chair Cuppoletti called the meeting to order at 12:15.

There was an informal discussion of the Master Plan and questions that the OFC could ask Chancellor Fingerhut.

The state conference of AAUP had expressed concerns with the “Senior to Sophomore” part of the plan. What were going to be the qualifications for teaching “college” classes? Would high school teachers be allowed to teach college courses?

School administrators had expressed concerns over whether their districts would have to pay for the program.

There were concerns over pressures for universities on quarter systems to change to semesters at an estimated cost of \$40 m per school.

Concerns were expressed regarding “Centers of Excellence” and who makes the decisions on which programs receive this designation and which programs would be cut or eliminated. Would the realignment of programs be through attrition and/or reallocation of existing resources?

Chair Cuppoletti reported that he had further discussion with Senator Roberts on SB 151, and that he appeared that the bill was probably dead. The cost of creating a system for “electronic textbooks” was estimated to be \$500 m for UC alone.

Dr. Cuppoletti also announced that there would a state-wide symposium on textbooks at Columbus State on April 29. Members of the OFC were invited to attend.

Other concerns were raised about the Master plan:

Would faculty be involved in translating the Master Plan into the budget?

There were pressures in graduate schools to move funding to STEM programs? What would happen to non-STEM graduate programs?

What role would faculty governance have within the system? Would governance remain at the university level (each university having its own system of governance) or would there be a state wide system of faculty governance, as with the University of California system (with a state-wide faculty senate composed of faculty representative from each school)?

What was the progress of the Plan to date? The “Choose Ohio First Scholarship Program” had awarded nine funding proposals.

Campus Reports

(Miami)

The university was reviewing its graduate programs within strategic planning. The goal was to shift money from weak to stronger program, and the effect may be especially felt by MA programs.

The university was developing a uniform workload policy to eliminate inconsistencies in unit policies regarding teaching hours, release time, etc. The document itself appeared to be ok, but there were concerns with the top-down elements in how it was developed. New norm would be 3/3 or 3/2 on the assumption that courses are 3 hours. There was no procedure for banking hours. Each department was to develop a plan for workload differentiation within the department.

(YSU)

The university was searching for a new provost. Three candidates were to visit. The university was also searching for a Dean for Fine and Performing Arts. The current dean was serving as interim dean. The Dean of the Health and Human Services College was retiring.

A new labor contract with the faculty bargaining agent had been signed. It calls for pay raises plus longevity pay for faculty hired before 2000, as well as cost of living and wellness programs for faculty.

(UA)

There were continuing uncertainty and concerns over whether department chairs in the college of Arts and Science were required to be in their offices or on campus during “normal” university operating hours.

The search for a new dean for the College of Education had not produced an acceptable candidate and would start anew in the fall.

(CSU)

The Engagement committee was developing an advertising campaign for the university and was to make recommendations for centers of excellence and other programs. One center of excellence was to focus on Health Care.

A BOT report on the Engineering college budget was due out.

(OU)

The Committee on Planning (?) was drafting a survey on academic programs. It was also developing a workload policy with different workloads for different categories of faculty.

The faculty senate and Council of Deans were trying to workout details of [WHAT?]

New Business

1:35. Chancellor Fingerhut addressed OFC and thanked it for input on the Master Plan. He also looked forward to continuing to work with OFC on the plan's further development.

The Chancellor pointed out that the Plan had been framed with attention to the major state wide audiences: the Governor, the legislature, and the public.

He stated that he would be willing to come to campuses to discuss the plan with groups such as faculty senates.

Chair Cuppoletti informed the Chancellor that he was planning on attending the Textbook Symposium at Columbus State, and that the OFC would oppose SB 151 in its present form.

Chair Cuppoletti told the Chancellor that while faculty thought the plan was good they had concerns, especially as to the process of how universities were to designate programs for Centers of Excellence. He went on to point out that while all universities routinely evaluate their academic programs they do it in different ways and with varying levels of faculty input.

Q: It seems that the Master Plan was centralized in how and who would make decision, e.g., centers for excellence. As an example the President of UT (formerly UT-HSC) was establishing five centers of excellence on his own without faculty input with funds being reallocated from weaker to stronger programs.

A: The Chancellor said that he did not agree with the "centralized" characterization of the plan. He didn't see it as proposing any changes in university governance. He pointed out that the state had always had power to appoint university BOT members- for whatever reason. In the past the OBOR had tried to force universities to eliminate weak program,

but without success.

The plan was asking each university to identify those programs that are “magnets” for talent and research. This was the opposite of the old (OBOR) approach. Nor are the centers of excellence to be only STEMM programs. There was strong support for non-STEM programs, such as the Communications College at OU. The expectation is that “each” university will have some programs of distinction, recognized nationally and internationally, and that there would be allocation of funds to these programs. How were these decisions to be made on each campus? These decisions could not be legislated by the state. The goal is “not” to interfere with university governance.

Q: At some universities the process of aligning academic programs to the plan was appearing to be worrisome and disruptive.

A: There is a need for specialization, while also maintaining overall general university academic offerings. Universities cannot reallocate to the point of depleting all non-center programs.

Q: What could the Chancellor do to support faculty governance?

A: I will be willing to speak to faculty senates and other faculty groups, and to invite ideas on governance from all faculty.

Q: How would non-STEM centers of excellence fit in the need to align the Plan to Ohio’s economic development needs?

A: While the Plan was to align with economic development needs, there was more to centers of excellence than just economic development. Other academic programs, such as those in the arts and theatre, were essential to communities’ health and well-being.

We want higher education to be able to support industries, such financial services (e.g., Key Bank and National City) and insurance (e.g., Nationwide) that have headquarters and a strong presence in Ohio. Individual faculty should continue to be impassioned about the teaching, research and service that they currently do, and collectively that will benefit Ohio’s economy.

Q: The Master Plan document will be larger than the individuals who created it. The issue will be ho to guarantee the continuation of the Chancellor’s concern for faculty governance and pursuit of knowledge.

Q: How will the Plan be translated into a budget? What will the process look like and are faculty to be involved?

A: The translation would be through a Plan for Subsidy Consultation” with ideas due by August 15. The goal for the next budget was to make progress in some areas, but the translation couldn’t be accomplished totally with one budget. There were five priorities:

1. Develop separate funding formulas for universities and community colleges, while developing bridges between the two;
2. Quality and differentiation: develop standards to aspire to for increase quality;
3. Efficient use of resources by rewarding productivity gains;
4. Incentise private fund raising; and
5. Consider all funding streams together, rather than separating subsidies for financial aid, special programs, etc.

Q: What will the quality component look like?

A: That will be a hard one. The principles will be judged in relationship to the mission, as pointed out on p. 104 of the Plan. For example, comparing expected graduation rates versus actual graduation rates. Within program areas there will be benchmarks, for example in Education colleges. However, this may not be possible across the board.

Q: Regarding the “senior to sophomore” program, who will be responsible for training the teachers and how will it be funded?

A: First, some background: Ohio is low in the percentage of high school graduates with college course credits, such as AP. We need to increase that. Additionally, it would save students some money if they could use some of these courses for college credit. The program is designed to raise the visibility that high school students can take AP and college courses. We don’t expect that there be large numbers of students who will actually take advantage of the program.

We want to fund early adopters of the program around the state. There have been about 60 proposals from high school and college partners, and so far we have funded 20. We will then look at which programs are successful. The goal is to have the state pay 100% of the seniors taking these courses in high schools and provide some percentage of the costs for students in the program taking the courses in college

Differences in funding formulas between high schools and colleges pose problems. One option is to offer college courses in high schools, primarily in partnership with community colleges. We need be concerned with the rigor of these courses since they could be used for credits in universities.

We need to protect higher education from what happened to high schools. Do high school diplomas have any rigor anymore? Otherwise, higher education will face “No Child Left Behind” type testing. Teachers in the “senior to sophomore” program should meet criteria

for teaching college as stated by the Higher Learning Commission. Teachers could be high school teachers who meet these HLC criteria.

Q: Why not have the state provide more resources to high schools to expand AP and other college prep courses and programs?

A: It is better to expand all options for high school students- including taking courses at colleges. Also, from the Chancellors point of view, we need to know what higher education can do. Neither the state nor higher education has been very effective at helping high schools. We need to be proactive. What does it mean to be “college ready”?

2:30: Chair Cuppoletti thanked the Chancellor for taking time to engage in the discussion with the OFC, and the Chancellor thanked OFC for its time and willingness to engage in the development of the Master Plan.

There followed a brief follow up discussion among OFC members.

The Plan foreshadows many possibilities. How do institutions work on collaboration?

The minutes of the March 14 minutes were approved unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded that OFC meet monthly over the summer, as needed. The motion passed unanimously. Arrangement will made to meet the second Friday of June (June 13).

The next schedules OFC meeting will be **May 9, 2008**.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudy Fenwick
Secretary, Ohio Faculty Council
Department of Sociology
The University of Akron
fenwick@uakron.edu

