

Faculty Council Meeting
December 2, 2004
4:00 – 5:45 PM
Faculty Club North

Members Present: Nina A. Berman, George E. Billman, Graeme M. Boone, Karen S. Bruns, Mark A. Bullimore, A. Terrence Conlisk, John R. Current, Philip T.K. Daniel, Susan W. Fisher, Ralph Gardner, Jacqueline Gargus, Deborah Yale George, Gerald S. Greenberg, David G. Horn, Douglas A. Kniss, K. Alan Loper, Karen M. Mancl, Charles W. Massey, Jr., William M. Masters, Brian W. McEnnis, Dennis B. McKay, Jeffrey K. McKee, Gene E. Mumy, Stephen C. Myers, Berl R. Oakley, John M. Parson, Jack A. Rall, James E. Sheedy, Richard D. Slemmons, Anne M. Smith, Stephen J. Summerhill, Michael D. Trudeau, Harald Emil F. Vaessin, Dale D. Vandre, Altaf Wani, Sharon C. West and Charles E. Wilson

Guests Present: Matthew Couch, Michael Daniels and Kerry Hodak

AGENDA:

A. Updates: Jack Rall

1. Dean Herbers will address the Faculty Council at 5:00 p.m. today on the work of the Freeman Committee. Dean Freeman, Chair, of the committee is out of town.
2. At the January 13 University Senate meeting, Provost Snyder will present her address to the University. Allen Silverman, Chair of the Program Committee, requests that you have questions ready to ask the Provost at this meeting.

B. New Student Organization Registration Guidelines and Advisor Certification: Kerry Hodak, Chair, Council of Student Affairs and Matthew Couch, Assistant Director of the Ohio Union.

1. The new guidelines came about by a committee composed of faculty, staff and students. This certification is designed to help minimize liability issues for those advising students.
2. Advisors need to do the certification process once. Every three years the certification can be renewed through an online module that denotes any changes that advisors need to know.
3. This certification has been very well received and feedback has been given on how to improve the process. Attempts have been made to make this process as convenient as possible for faculty advisors.
4. One on one presentations as well as coming to departments are possible.
5. Jack Rall asked for an electronic version of handout "Student Organization Advisor Certification Sessions AY 2004-2005" so that it could be distributed to other faculty.

C. Review of Secretary of Faculty position: Christian Zacher

1. This past summer, Jack Rall, David Horn and Susan Fisher and Christian Zacher met to make recommendations about the Secretary of the Faculty position.
2. The following are tentative suggestions:

- a. Retain the Secretary of the Faculty position but modify it by dropping two of its current tasks – advocating for the faculty collectively and encouraging faculty to be involved in governance – tasks now well managed by others.
 - b. The Secretary of the Faculty would have one main duty which would be to advise individual faculty on how to manage grievance and complaints and where on campus to take those grievances and complaints.
 - c. The Secretary of the Faculty position should be given a new title.
 - d. The modified position should be piloted for a year or two. The person in this position should undergo training and keep records to track outcomes.
 - e. The position should be moved from OAA to Faculty Council and the Secretary of the Faculty should report to Faculty Council. The person fulfilling the job might be called a Faculty Council Fellow.
 - f. Applications for the position should be solicited from full professors as well as emeritus faculty.
 - g. Faculty Council would widely publicize the position so others would know about the position.
 - h. The person holding the position would create a webpage.
3. Chris Zacher asked Faculty Council members to email himself or Jack Rall with comments about the position so a final recommendation could be available in early January.
 4. Questions, comments and discussion:
 - a. Q: How many of complaints have been handled? A: One of the holders of the position said that about 40 complaints had been handled per year. If the position is in a pilot stage it could better be known if one person could handle this position or if more than one person would be needed in the position.
 - b. Q: If this person has no authority, what can this person do? A: The former holders of the position said that the faculty who came to see them were glad they had someone to share their concerns with.
 - c. Q: Do you see this role being different than an ombudsperson? A: In the past staff issues became the emphasis of the ombudsperson. The ombudsperson did more resolving of issues while this person would do more directing.
 - d. Q: One of the powers the Secretary of the Faculty had was having meetings with the President and Provost. Would this be eliminated? A: The two holders of the position did not find these contacts fruitful. That is why it is suggested that the position should be connected with Faculty Council. When the Provost was asked about the position, she replied that she did not know what the person did in the position. Nothing would be lost by taking the position from OAA and giving it to Faculty Council.
 - e. Q: Is this position unique to Ohio State? A: Susan Fisher said that there are analogs elsewhere. Cornell has a strong one. The person holding the position has an office next to the President of the University's office. The appointment process is that three names are submitted and the President of the University selects the person. The list becomes narrow because of this process.
 - f. Q: Would OAA fund this position? A: Susan Fisher replied that since the position has simply changed, we may still get support from OAA.
 - g. Q: Do the faculty still think there is a need for this position? Comment: T.K. Daniel replied that as Chair of Hearing Committee he felt that there is a definite need for the position. These resources and kinds of offices that are

available on campus would be very helpful to faculty. Faculty members are just getting into the flow when they get to CAFR. One more voice is also good in the governance position at the university.

- h. Q: If OAA funds the position, would they dictate who would hold the position and the kinds of issues that are handled?
- i. Q: What kinds of issues are brought to the Secretary of the Faculty? A: Many faculty don't know how things are done and where to go to get questions answered. Another part is P&T.
- j. Q: Does this person "hold hands" with unhappy people of the world or does this person try to fix the problem? A: Letting faculty know where they can go to get problems handled would be good – informational issues.
- k. Q: What if the problems were legal issues? A: Not all problems are legal issues.
- l. Comment: a faculty member was more interested in having an advocate for the faculty such as an ombudsperson. Reply: David Horn replied that this university's experience with the ombudsperson was not a successful one. The ombudsperson was responsible for problems with faculty, staff and students.
- m. Comment: Having someone help a faculty person get to the right place to solve a problem would be very helpful.
- n. Comment: One very useful thing would be to take data during the temporary year, find out what the problems are, whether we are meeting them with what we have or what changes need to be made. A: Currently we have no records and thus no samples of cases to work from.
- o. Jack Rall asked everyone to send their thoughts to Zacher.1@osu.edu. Also think about the name of the position. Chris Zacher said we want the name to be as accurate as possible. T.K. Daniel commented that the position could be called faculty ombudsperson and that the description fit the position.

D. Draft Interim Report on Graduate Education: Dean Joan Herbers (attachment)

- 1. Members of the Committee are: Rick Freeman (Chair), David Andrews, Robert Brueggemeier, Donna Evans, Joan Herbers, Susan Huntington, Alfred Sanfilippo and two staff members, Julie Carpenter-Hubin and Marie Mead.
- 2. Background. The committee was charged last September and the charge stemmed from a discussion by the deans concerning the graduate student benefit rate assigned to colleges. The Deans supported the increase in graduate student medical benefits and accepted the additional charges that would be levied against the colleges. But the Deans wanted to know where graduate education fits in the existing budget model. The answer is that that it doesn't fit very well. This is the premise from which the Freeman Committee worked and the budget issues lay out the principle concerns. These issues were voiced at a council of deans meeting. An agreement was made with the Provost that the Deans would pay for the increase in graduate student benefits but they wanted her to set up a committee to look into how graduate education is faring within the new budget model. The Provost did this.
- 3. The Freeman Committee has focused on quality of Ph.D. programs as its first task. This works out well because of the upcoming National Research Council ranking of Ph.D. programs. The Committee wanted to think of new ways to fund

graduate education at Ohio State University. Those ways must take into account quality of the program, etc. The Committee has until January to do this task.

4. The goal is to develop a set of metrics to assess the quality of the programs - the great ones, the ones in the middle and the ones that are struggling. Some of the metrics are universal but most of them are not. Some metrics will apply to programs in one discipline but not in another. The metrics are accompanied by footnotes that give all of the caveats (see attachment). University benchmark peers are not necessarily the best ones to use.
5. The Committee will identify a subset of doctoral programs to evaluate appropriate metrics. Each of the deans on the Committee has selected two programs and some other deans have volunteered some of their programs for consideration. There are twenty programs to be considered. Data that are listed in the metrics on the handout will be collected. An attempt will be made to discriminate and put the programs into the three areas listed above. The Committee wants to see if its preconceived ideas and the metrics match. If they do, the Committee will proceed with the accepted metrics and use the model to evaluate all of the university programs. This is the goal that the Committee hopes to accomplish over the next several months.
6. In addition, over the next couple of months the Committee will study proposals to reallocate resources among graduate programs with the realization that budget cuts are possible. OSU should support the programs that are strong or that should be strong. The only way to do this is to reallocate resources. The Committee is still looking for ideas.
7. Work in the next few months is two-part:
 - a. Run the model, see how good it is based on the metrics that have been identified.
 - b. Study the impact of various budgeting proposals for graduate education.
8. Questions, comments and discussion.
 - a. Q: If the preconceived notions don't fit the metrics, how will the Committee solve the problem? A: The Committee may have to throw out the model all together or may need to try something different. The Committee members think they know the answers to the problem. However, if it does not work out as expected, the Committee will need to find out what went wrong.
 - b. Comment: The German Department does not have a large group of graduate students and the metrics may not work well with this group. What will the committee do about a situation like this? A: Some programs depend on GTAs to run their instructional programs. Their criteria are not the same as programs that rely on GRA support. The Committee understands these complications. This report will not be a snapshot but rather will consider five years of data. There are some departments that have picked up steam in the last five years; some programs have faltered.
 - c. Q: Are all colleges represented in this report. A: Not all deans wanted to participate.
 - d. Comment: One concern is that the College of Engineering is considered a professional school but does not operate as the other professional schools. A: The College of Engineering was covered because of their ABET program.
 - e. Q: What was the charge to the Committee? A: There were five parts to the charge and these are listed on the last page of the handout (see attachment).

- f. Q: With regard to the metric of applicants accepted to those enrolling, in the Environmental Science graduate program enrollment has declined because of the international situation. The years selected will have an affect on the results. A: There are many variables and the Committee understands the complexities and these will be looked at when the results are considered.
- g. Q: Graeme Boone asked about those that liked the status quo as opposed to a change. A: None of the Committee members liked the status quo. There are different meanings of what it means to have a budget model that supports graduate education. The professional schools that can set their own tuition to whatever the market will bear do not see that there is a problem. Schools that rely heavily on GTA support versus GRA support or non-funded students have different takes on the exact problem. Whether it is the link between graduate education and undergraduate teaching or whether it is graduate education and external funding. The other fundamental divide was between the administrators in Bricker Hall and the College Deans. That is one reason why this committee was formed. Graduate education is fundamentally different than undergraduate education. The current budget model is sacrificing graduate education for undergraduate education.
- h. Comment: This is a tool. It will support our academic mission. If it does not, then why are we doing it? A: We know what the problems are but we haven't learned how to fix them. The job of the committee is to try to fix these problems.
- i. Q: Can we dial back budget restructuring? A: This would hurt many colleges.
- j. Q. If certain things are put in place with regard to the budget, what will keep these things from being used in a negative way? A: The NRC exercise is coming up. The data collected can be used locally before it goes to NRC. There is about a 70 to 80% overlap of what the Committee is asking for and what the NRC will request. This exercise should put us in a much stronger position.
- k. Comment: There has been talk about freezing or eliminating programs. Is this the expected outcome? A: Eliminating programs is not in the charge to the committee. Comment: The faculty leaders have been assured that no one will lose their job but that programs may be eliminated or frozen. A: The charge said to identify strong programs and figure out a way to support those programs with the current budget model with no new money.
- l. Q: When things are looked at like counting faculty publications, are regional campus faculty counted in this list? A: Dean Herbers asked for advice from regional campus faculty on how to deal with this issue.
- m. Q: When you are talking about faculty are you talking about graduate faculty? A: One of the metrics considered this issue.
- n. Q: Are there plans to look at other institutions to see how many graduate programs they have, especially land-grant institutions? A: The Committee was looking into this category, especially land-grant institutions.
- o. Q: What are the peer-aspiration groups mentioned in the various metrics? A: The Committee has the real benchmarks that the Board of Trustees have set and also have the aspirational peers that we want to be like. Q: Won't they vary among programs? A: We can all agree that some institutions are

definitely better than Ohio State. The Committee has not discussed this issue yet. We are a public institution and should not be comparing ourselves to private institutions.

- p. Q: Part of the purpose of the committee is to identify programs that need to be here. How is that process going to happen? A: The Committee recognizes because the institution is a land-grant university that there are some programs that cannot be eliminated. We have some programs that are unique such as Welding Engineering. The Committee is not ready to answer this question. The Committee may be able to answer this in two months. The Committee is hoping to have some recommendations on budget models and the metric model run by the end of Winter Quarter. The Committee could be wrong. Once we run the statistical model and if we are way off base we will need to go back to square one and rethink this.
- q. Comment: Graduate students are being told they cannot take courses outside of their department since state subsidy goes to another department when this occurs.
- r. Comment: One question that the Committee wants to look at is what does Ohio State University want to do well? Provost Snyder will need to take the results of the Committee's work which will state how to assess quality and will provide funding models and make her own judgment.
- s. Q: Will the testing of the metrics be completed by the end of Winter Quarter? What happens next according to the Committee's timeline? A: If the metrics perform well and correspond with results of recent external reviews as well as some of the accredited programs that have been recently reviewed and in accordance with preconceived ideas about what is strong and what is not so strong then everybody will be put in the mix. All programs will go into the model and those results will go to the Provost. Comment. Q: Will the final report be complete when everyone has been placed in the mix? A: These particular metrics were selected because they shouldn't be too terribly onerous. These are what the NRC will want to see, too. So departments should be getting these things together.
- t. Q: Will the proposed funding model take care of interdisciplinary programs? A: It better work. Q. What is the connection? Disciplinary based people who are meshed together in strange ways. A: The revenues are accrued by the departments but the expenses are born by the program. If the program drops from one year to the next in student headcount, subsidy has a marginal loss. Interdisciplinary graduate education is an orphan in our budget model and it must be fixed. Many programs rely on the interdisciplinary programs for their source of graduate students. IGSs are entirely disconnected from interdisciplinary research centers and institutes.
- u. Dean Herbers closed by stating that the committee welcomed suggestions and budgetary models that might be considered.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.