

DRAFT

Minutes of the Meeting held January 11, 2008

Present: Ray, Gelman (CSU); Casper (KSU); Wright (OU); Billman (OSU); Bernhard (BGSU); Ahuja (YSU); Fenwick, Sterns (UA)

Vice Chair Ahuja called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm.

The minutes of the December 14, 2007 meeting were approved unanimously conditional on Chancellor Fingerhut having the opportunity to read over his remarks for possible corrections.

The meeting began with an informal discussion of questions regarding the University System. (1) Would the system have mechanisms for statewide “faculty development”- coordination of faculty at the different universities, faculty exchanges, “curriculum consistencies”? (2) How can the USO provide an “organizational” infrastructure to improve Ohio’s economy? (3) Would the development of USO follow up on the discussions and recommendations coming out of the Northeast Ohio Universities Commission, and if so which ones? Would USO push consolidation of activities, administrative services, and academic programs among the NEO universities?

New Business

Chancellor Fingerhut addressed the OFC.

Q: Were there updates on the USO since the December 14 draft.

A: Yes. The Chancellor handed out the latest draft of the USO proposal (dated 1/10/08). The Chancellor advised that the proposal was continually being “tweaked”. Metrics in the document were being constantly changed, such as those on minority enrollment and graduation. There were now two educational attainment “dashboards”: one for those 18-24 of age, and one for those 25-34. There were also changes in which states were being used as benchmarks. They had decided to adopt the state benchmarks used by the Ohio Department of Development.

Page 2

The Chancellor then discussed the next steps in the USO proposal process. (1) They

would ask each university to develop a document how the university would contribute to the goals of the USO. The document would probably be due sometime in the summer of '08. (2) Funding would then be aligned with the goals and contributions of each university. This would be due to the Chancellor by August '08.

Q: Regarding access measures, how would goal differentiation by university be made consistent with the goal of developing a fully integrated articulation and transfer system?

A: This would be done in blocks. Two year degrees would be counted as two years toward the BA (within limits).

Chancellor Fingerhut noted that in writing the USO report he was following the example of a 1962 report written by John Millet, the first Chancellor of OBOR.

Q: How would faculty be treated as part of a university system rather than as faculty of separate institutions?

A: The traditional element of the USO plan was that if the state brings in more students to universities, faculty will educate them. The Chancellor and others working on the USO proposal were not interested in telling faculty what or how to teach. The USO would contain recommendations about affordability of higher education. The Chancellor stated that he had a high level of confidence in the faculty. The Chancellor sees faculty as the guarantors of quality.

OFC then thanked Chancellor Fingerhut for his time and comments.

There was a brief follow up discussion among OFC members regarding how different funding formulas for different universities would work and how USO would follow up on the recommendations of the NEOU commission. Was there already movement to a consolidated computer science program among NEO universities, or statewide?

Campus Reports

OSU

In a student paper interview President Gee had mentioned that OSU was going to move to semesters, but there was no set time table. He also expressed the desire to have freshmen and sophomores live on campus. This would require an increase of about 10,000 existing dorm spaces.

OU

OU was also getting pressure to move to semesters, especially if OSU does so.

KSU

KSU was developing an academic plan, the “Twenty-First Century Plan” that would examine the philosophy behind the requirements for a liberal arts education and look at the first year experience. Two separate committees will develop the two parts of the plan. The Faculty Senate was looking at the university’s faculty ethics policy and a policy to extend the probationary period for untenured faculty. Contract negotiations between KSU and AAUP will begin at the end of the spring semester.

CSU

The CSU BOT had met and declared that it was imperative that CSU define itself within 60 to 90 days. There is a new Taskforce for Engagement, which grew out of the university’s Strategic Planning Committee, which might be linked to the USO plan. The My Time pay system was still causing problems, especially among CSU staff.

UA

“Zippy” won the Capital One college mascot of the year contest. The university was about to launch a new “Landscape for Innovation” initiative. The NCA was visiting UA in late April to look specifically at governance issues in the wake the 2003 vote by faculty to have AAUP serve as their collective bargaining unit and signing of the collective bargaining contract.

BGSU

BGSU had a \$3.5m budget shortfall in the fall, but the shortfall had dealt with. BGSU was looking into salary disparities between BGSU and other universities. The Senate was looking at faculty misconduct policy and looking into issues regarding non-tenure track faculty, such the voting rights in department meeting and in the senate. There was then a brief discuss of how other universities represented in OFC handled these issues.

YSU

Negotiations with two unions were ongoing. Negotiations with the faculty union were farther along than the negotiations with the staff unions. A search was on for a new Provost. NCA was visiting YSU in the spring for it 10 year full reaccreditation.

Next Meeting

February 8, 2008, with Speaker Husted as guest.

The OFC meeting was adjourned at 2:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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