

## **OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL**

### **Minutes of the Meeting held on September 14, 2007**

**Present:** King (YSU), Wolff (U Toledo), Cuppotetti (U Cincinnati), Muego (BGSU), Casper (KSU), Ray (CSU), Gelman (CSU), Bernard (BGSU), Bloemer (OU), Lopez (OU), Gunning (U Toledo-HSC), Perry (OSU), Fenwick (U Akron)

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

#### **New Business**

Chair Cuppoletti introduced Dr. Harry Andrist from the Ohio Board of Regents to discuss the Ohio Innovation Partnership.

Dr. Andrist began by discussing the Choose Ohio First Scholarships and Research Scholars Initiatives. The Choose Ohio First Scholarships were to be funded at \$100m; Research Scholars to be funded at \$150m. The funds for the Ohio Research Scholars Program are anticipated to be increased from \$122 million to \$150 million through an initiative led by the Chancellor that seeks legislative support to redirect \$28 million from other Regents' research support programs.

Dr. Andrist stated that the Research Scholars initiative was meant to generate "groundbreaking" research related to STEM, as related to HB 119. He also noted that the state had increased funding for Ohio universities by \$534m in the current budget.

Dr. Casper asked how the Research Scholars initiative was related to the Eminent Scholars initiative.

Dr. Andrist answered that the Research Scholars could come from outside the academy, from business or government, and did not have to have full professor status. He continued that the Research Scholars was to provide capital, operating and salary dollars to universities in return for a major institutional commitment and \$1 to \$1 matching funds.

Dr. Gelman asked whether these initiatives, along with the University System of Ohio, would change local governance structures.

Dr Andrist responded that the University System was not a California, New York, or North Carolina system in which a central BOR made system-wide decisions such as salaries, etc. Rather, in the Ohio system the BOR would be more of a "coordinating body." He continued that the system would require curriculum changes to improve

student success. This would require faculty input, especial in the STEM areas. This was tied to the Third Frontier Initiative.

Dr. Andrist continued that the Ohio System was an attempt to create “clusters of excellence,” especially in STEM research- with STEM very narrowly defined (excluding behavior sciences). The goal was to tie in to regional economic development, by the Research Scholars would be more focused on basic research than past initiatives.

Dr. Cuppoletti asked about the current planning for the Ohio System.

Dr. Andrist responded that there were 5 working groups drafting different parts of the plan. The working groups were organized around the issues of: (1) Affordability; (2) Funding the Plan; (3) Economic Growth and Higher Education; (4) Statewide Benchmarks/System Integration; and (5) Building Public Support.

Dr. Andrist continued by stating that some “ideal” outcomes of the system would include: a common calendar, common numbering system for courses, easier transfer and articulation, especially between two-year colleges and universities, and common textbooks in intro level courses.

Dr. Gelman expressed concerns about common textbooks. How would faculty do this? When would faculty be involved in these decisions?

Dr. Muego and Dr. Lopez also expressed concerns about common textbooks. Dr. Perry expressed concern about the amount of time involved in moving to a common calendar.

Dr. Andrist responded by stating that the Ohio System was driven by the history of inadequate funding for higher education in Ohio. The System was a way to manage financially rather than have every university suffer substantial cuts, even financial exigency. He cited OhioLink as an example of a university-wide system that worked: universities could share books and journals rather than each purchasing the same publications, thus saving money.

Dr. Perry pointed out that university librarians were involved from the start in developing and implementing OhioLink.

Dr. Bloemer expressed concern that the Ohio System was likely to impose more control over universities, but the state still only funded universities at one-third of their budgets.

Dr. Cuppoletti suggested looking into the Arizona system that had developed a strategy for controlling textbook costs.

Several members of OFC expressed concerns about the lack of input by faculty in developing the Ohio System.

Dr. Andrist responded that so far many of the ideas (such as common textbooks) was “brainstorming,” and that the plan was not far enough along for faculty input.

Dr. Fenwick expressed concern that by the time faculty had a chance to respond to the plan they would be reacting to a finished plan rather than having input in the development of the plan.

Dr. Lopez analogized that if you are an architect you need to ask the people whose house you are remodeling.

OFC then expressed its thanks to Dr. Andrist for taking his time to speak to the group.

### **Old Business**

Dr. Cuppoletti reported on his meeting with Chancellor Fingerhut over the summers. Based on that discussion, he reported that the state would probably combine all 2 year colleges into a system. Chancellor Fingerhut had reported that he wants faculty involvement (if needed). Dr. Cuppoletti said that he would attempt to schedule Chancellor Fingerhut for the November meeting of OFC.

### **Campus Reports**

#### ***BGSU***

There was a new provost and a new financial officer. The first faculty senate meeting focused on a master plan that would find the school’s “niche” within the University System of Ohio, as well as timelines for the plan. Because of a \$3m deficit the school had imposed a hiring freeze.

#### ***OSU***

The school had a new president (Gee) and new provost. At a dinner, some faculty brought up to President Gee problems related to growing compliance reporting requirements and concern with the growth in the numbers of staff in administrative offices. President Gee indicated that he was hearing this from multiple sources and that he believed these were problems he could help address.

#### ***KSU***

Also has a new provost. KSU was fine tuning its strategic plan. The school was also moving to Responsibility Based Budgeting, going through program review of PhD programs and moving money to STEM programs.

### ***CSU***

Focus on enrollment: credit hours up slightly from fall '06, but no change in headcount. Also adopting responsibility based budgeting. Task force had been created to look into problems in engineering school, especially its large deficit. There were concerns that task force recommendations could bypass faculty senate and be approved by board of trustees without oversight or faculty input.

### ***OU***

Also moving to responsibility based budgeting. There was a push for strategic planning. Academic deans had established a task force to look at graduate programs. Also concerned that task force would bypass faculty senate.

### ***UA***

UA reported a 4.9% increase in enrollment from fall '06. Increase was across the board: freshmen, overall undergraduate and graduate. Purchased Quaker Square (Crown Plaza Hotel plus shops and restaurants). Plan to use half of hotel rooms as dorms; rest would remain as hotel for two years per agreement with city. Various proposals were being developed for how the rest of the space would be used. Ground breaking was planned for on-campus football stadium in October. This would coincide with university capital fund drive. UA was engaged in Academic Alignment initiative to "inventory" academic assets and align with University System of Ohio. Dr. Harvey Sterns, psychology, was the new faculty senate chair.

### ***YSU***

Provost had passed away over the summer; there was interim provost. Contract negotiations were beginning between faculty union and administration. There were concerns about YSU's status in the NE Ohio Universities Collaboration Task Force. YSU had formed a STEM college. YSU was planning for NCA reaccreditation visit.

### ***UT-HSC***

Still trying to merge faculty senates. HSC had set up "incubator" money that had already funded 6 or 7 projects.

### ***UT***

Reported a 2% increase in enrollment from fall '06; 2.8% in credit hours. Budget was ok. Concerns regarding merging faculty senates (with HSC): What will powers of combined senates be? Who will have control over graduate curriculum? UT moving to responsibility based budgeting. Separate budgets for UT and HSC. Possibility that separate senates would continue.

### ***UC***

Labor negotiations: 2% salary increase for next year; 2+% for year after. Domestic partner benefits had been proposed; yet to be ratified by faculty. Clinical faculty had been removed from faculty bargaining union and encouraged to form their own separate

bargaining unit. UC had \$1.4 billion debt and \$27 million deficit.

**Minutes of May 11, 2007 meeting were reviewed, correct and approved unanimously (14-0).**

**The next meeting will be October 12, 2007, the second Friday of the month.**

**The meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

Rudy Fenwick