

Minutes of the Meeting Held May 9, 2008

Present: Bernhard (BGSU); King (YSU); Wright, Bloemer (OU); Wolff (UT); Cuppoletti (UC); Gantt (NEOUCOM); McKee, Billman (OSU); Milburn (Central State); Casper (KSU); Gelman, Ray (CSU); Fenwick (UA)

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

Minutes of the April 11, 2008 meeting were approved with minor changes, pending the Chancellor's reading.

New Business

Chair Cuppoletti reported on the Textbook Symposium. He reported that Senator Roberts suggested amending SB 151 to require use of the same textbooks statewide for all 100-200 level university courses.

OFC members expressed concerns on the amendment and the overall bill.

There was a general discussion of the Chancellor's charge to OFC to offer input/advice on the 2008 subsidy for the University System of Ohio. Should OFC take up the Chancellor offer to provide advice, and if so, what advice should OFC offer?

Ideas for possible advice

There was discussion of whether or not to promote regional cooperation among universities, or whether such cooperation would increase regional parochialism.

There is a need to keep cost-based elements in university funding formulas.

How will the USO's metrics affect university faculty and faculty governance?

Concerns were expressed that integrating community colleges and universities would allow community colleges to get a foot in the door to offer 4 year degrees.

Page 2

There were concerns about the mandate that all Ohio students should be able to 4 year degrees within 30 miles of their homes.

What advice would OFC provide concerning “quality” metrics?

1. OFC discussed whether or not to support separating funding formulas for universities and community colleges.
2. OFC endorses transfer and articulation agreements.
3. OFC discussed whether or not to endorse additional funding in formulas for centers of excellence. Members of OFC expressed concerns that the additional dollars available for these centers appeared to be low; and that if center funding comes from the reallocation of money from existing programs substantial harm would be done to the core missions of universities.

The group also expressed concerns that having separate formulas for universities and community colleges would disadvantage universities, since they had more differentiated missions in contrast to the “evolving” system of community colleges. He also noted that university CFOs had so far failed to come up with funding formulas.

Several members of OFC saw dangers with new state initiatives that could lead to increased “administrative overhead” through the creation of new administrative positions to oversee the new initiatives.

-It was suggested that the OFC advise the Chancellor to develop a metric for reducing the growth in university administrative costs, positions and salaries by developing a ratio of administrative to faculty costs.

There were concerns that the emphasis on increasing private fund raising could divert private donation to the system from specific universities. Would private donations to specific universities/programs be matched by the State, e.g., scholarships, textbooks?

-OFC endorses the Chancellor’s support for university and faculty governance. However, the OFC sees potential dangers with the USO plan regarding instruction, faculty governance and academic freedom, especially if decisions become centralized. OFC would encourage a stronger statement of principles regarding faculty governance:

- OFC recognizes that full, institutionally appropriate, academic participation enhances university decision making.

The OFC is concerned that the USO will become a zero-sum game with respect to all new revenues.

There is concern that the plan was “tinkering at the edges.”

What will the USO look like in 10 years? Has thought been given to the probability that the goals of the plan will change as it evolves? Other than an increase in Ohioans going to and graduating from universities, what will be the vision?

Chair Cuppoletti charged Secretary Fenwick with drafting a letter to the Chancellor reflecting OFC advice on the following:

1. Endorse the Chancellor’s position in support of university and faculty governance, and enunciate a strong statement of principle on full participation enhancing university decision making.
2. Develop a metric for reducing the growth in university administrative costs, such as a ration of administrative to faculty costs.
3. Support for additional state funding for centers of excellence, but concerns that increased support could come by reallocating funds from other university academic programs to these centers.

Campus Reports

(NEOUCOM)

The school is realigning with CSU. CSU students with a BA/MD will be eligible for admission

The school was looking at clinical sites in the Cleveland area.

The school was reforming its curriculum.

(OSU)

Had completed its review and assessment of PhD programs.

There was an ongoing debate on whether or not to reorganize the college of arts and sciences. The current organization is a “confederation” of behavioral sciences, social sciences and humanities. It appeared that this was “dysfunctional” and that it could be reorganized into a single college.

(Central State)

There had been a fire in a student dorm. The cause was under investigation. No one had been injured.

Page 4

(KSU)

New deans were coming in to head the colleges of arts and science and education. KSU was still looking for a dean for the school of architecture.

Dr. Casper was retiring June 1 and taking a new job as AAUP negotiator for the KSU faculty in new contract negotiations with the KSU administration.

(CSU)

CSU was increasingly being defined as “medical” and by its medical-related programs.

A task force on Engagement and Excellence was meeting.

(UA)

The Higher Learning Commission had just completed its focused site visit on university and faculty governance. The report would be issued.

(BGSU)

The President had formed a Strategic Planning Committee and a report had been issued.

The faculty senate had approved modifications of university grievance procedures.

The President was leaving to take the presidency of Howard University.

(YSU)

The ‘early college’ had received funding from the Gates Foundation.

YSU had decided to retain the interim provost for the next 2 years.

Joan Bevan expressed thanks to the OFC for the card and flowers on her retirement.

Dr. Sunil Ahuja (OFC vice chair) has been named an American Council on Education Fellow for 2008-09. OFC offered its congratulations and good wishes.

(OU)

OU had given a new 4 year contract to the president [and provost?]

There was a proposal for a 3% across the board raises for OU employees plus an

additional 1% for faculty. The OU administration proposed freezing the raises until the state budget was known. However, the OU BOT rejected the administration's proposal and supported raises as "highest priority."

The BOT rejected the idea of formal faculty evaluations of the president and provost. However, the faculty senate planned to go ahead with the evaluations in the fall.

Page 5

(UT)

After 2 years, the UT and UT-HSC had combined their faculty senates.

The college of arts and sciences' council had voted "no confidence" in the dean.

The UT administration had signed a contract with CWA members. Negotiations with faculty had been on-going for a year. There was a possibility of going to fact finding.

(UC)

A UC task force had issued a draft document on the conversion from quarters to semesters. It would cost \$13 million. Conversion would take 4 years. The plan has not been formally approved by UC colleges.

The faculty senate had passed a resolution on "gender" speech, e.g., on -discrimination by (cross) dressing.

OFC adjourned at 2:30.

Next meeting: Friday, June 13, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

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

