

Vice President
Academic Affairs

RECEIVED
NOV 6 1980
ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT

MINUTES
ACADEMIC SENATE
November 5, 1980

ATTENDANCE (See attached roster)

CALL TO ORDER

After establishing that a quorum was present, Dr. Jean Kelty called the meeting to order at 4:07.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes for the meetings of May 21, 1980 and June 4, 1980 were approved as circulated.

REPORT FROM THE CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

Charter and Bylaws had no formal report. Gratia Murphy has been elected chairman of the committee; anyone having business for Charter and Bylaws should refer it to her.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dr. Kelty reported. This past spring, the Senate Executive Committee requested input into the selection of the Academic Vice President. The SEC, therefore, met with all final candidates and made their recommendations to the Search Committee.

The Senate Executive Committee, on July 9, 1980, expressed its concerns about the appointment of the Athletic Director because of its apparent violation of past practice in selecting Athletic Directors, because of the possible violation of existing Affirmative Action procedures, and because of the potential negative impact this appointment may have on the academic sector of this university.

On July 1, 1980, the SEC sent the following correspondence to Dr. Yozwiak, Chairman of the Planning Committee: "The Senate Executive Committee has met with faculty members of the Planning Committee, and they have expressed concern that the Committee has been examining the academic master plan independently of the long range plan for the total university community. We realize that the Planning Committee's charge is to deal primarily with academic planning matters, but we urge a more holistic approach to the over-all university master plan, especially with respect to budget priorities. Therefore, we strongly urge that the Committee be

supplied with information on all fiscal units of the university in order that the Planning Committee can establish more enlightened priorities. In this way, the fullest attention can be paid to the first priority, which we feel the academic sector is due. The primary purpose of the university is academic, and all resources of the university should be considered as supporting the academic program."

The SEC has made the following appointments to committees to fill vacancies: Richard Ulrich to Academic Affairs; Alfred Owen to Computer Committee; Diane Smolen to Continuing Education; William Swan to Curriculum; Lawrence Cummings to Educational Media; Homer B. Warren to Student Grievance.

REPORT OF THE ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE -- none

REPORTS OF OTHER SENATE COMMITTEES

Academic Events

No action on the Academic Events report was called for; Dr. Kelty asked that questions be addressed to Dr. Beelen. No questions followed.

Academic Affairs

Dr. Khawaja reported. With reference to the proposal of the School of Business Administration, he drew the attention of the Senate to page 5 of the Senate agenda for this meeting, which consists of a memo to the members of the Academic Senate regarding the purpose of the proposal and the background of Academic Affairs' action on this proposal. He pointed out that Academic Affairs had had months of discussion with CAST, the School of Business Administration, and Business Education and Technology. It was agreed by Deans Paraska and Dodge that they intended to meet curricular needs of students (see page 7 of that agenda). The committee was under the impression that all parties were satisfied, so unanimously approved the proposal for senate consideration. Dr. Khawaja moved that the senate approve the proposal from the School of Business Administration: seconded. Dr. Kelty called for discussion. At this time Mary Sebestyn moved that the senate postpone consideration of approval of the School of Business Administration proposal: seconded. Dr. Kelty called for discussion on the motion to postpone.

Ms. Peterson spoke on behalf of the Business Education and Technology faculty. She stated that BET faculty are not against the proposal as it is, just overwhelmed by the tasks to be completed by the deadline, and she pointed out that BET requires answers to the questions it has posed in its memo to the senate (see attached memo).

Dr. Largent wished to hear from the Business School; Dr. Smolen spoke for the Business School, regretting further delay in the accomplishment of something that they have been trying to accomplish for a long time. He acknowledged that he had not had time to absorb

the implications of the questions posed in the BET memo, especially noting the reference in item 1 to a memo from Dr. Coffelt dated October 16, 1980, to which he did not have access. Nevertheless, he urged voting on the proposal at this time rather than postponing consideration; he assured BET that this proposal involved no malice on the part of SBA, only a need to move the school into an accredited status.

Dr. Guzell from Management addressed the concerns of BET regarding the deadline: he stated that it was his impression that BET would not be solely responsible for implementation of new courses; SBA would be working with them.

Dr. Roberts posed several questions, beginning with what he felt was the fundamental question: could someone explain why the School of Business Administration wished accreditation by AACSB and what the standards were?

Dr. Smolen responded. He expressed the object of the accreditation in one word: quality. The School of Business Administration perceives that the rules and guidelines as proposed by the AACSB will greatly enhance its program in terms of articulation (that is, students taking courses in a logical sequence); from another point of view, the placement of Business School graduates would be enhanced, since businesses seek candidates from among those schools acknowledged as the best schools, those accredited by AACSB. Furthermore, graduation from an AACSB accredited school would also improve the chances of a student who wished to pursue graduate education in business.

Dr. Roberts then enquired whether there was a proposal to transfer faculty from one college to another inherent in the motion before the senate.

Ms. Peterson responded to this question by reading from the memo sent to Dr. Rand by Dr. Coffelt on October 16, 1980: "AACSB accreditation continues to be an important objective, but it is imperative to point out that projected new resources during the next biennium do not reflect sufficient funds to add any additional new positions to the university faculty, professional staff or classified civil service. Should the realignment of courses increase the staffing needs to CAST, such staffing needs must be accommodated by the movement of positions from the School of Business, by the re-ordering of resources within CAST, by the internal shifting of resources by the academic vice president, or reassignment of vacant positions by the university budget committee. In the event this is not feasible, I presume the only other alternatives are program enrollment caps (an alternative none of us relishes) or elimination of a program."

Dr. Crum pointed out that some of the questions attached to the BET memo were very far-reaching in their implications for other programs. He felt that if the administration would not address those questions, the senate could not pass the motion to approve

SBA's proposal, and he endorsed postponement.

Dr. Kelty noted that, technically, the senate should be considering only the motion to postpone, but that greater latitude in discussion was being allowed to establish a background upon which to make that decision.

Dr. Gillis spoke to assure the faculty that the administration was sensitive to faculty concerns in this issue. He knew of no plans to move faculty around within the university; his intent is to meet the needs of the students, but not to disrupt the faculty. He felt that the accreditation of the School of Business would be very important to attract students in the years ahead, and repeated that the administration would indeed be sensitive to the concerns of the faculty in all of the areas which had been mentioned.

A student from Business Education and Technology noted that removal of some 700-level courses from that curriculum would be a mistake, lowering the quality of the program; he observed that the proposed program could not be placed in effect until Fall, 1981 and that therefore one additional meeting to allow careful consideration of the implications of the proposal would not hurt.

Dr. Baldino observed that some of the questions raised may be irrelevant to the School of Business Administration's proposal; Dr. Smolen agreed.

Ms. Peterson referred to Dr. Russo, who noted that part of the concern expressed related to the position of BET in relation to the rest of the university. The department is already down two positions. There has actually been a minimal involvement on the part of BET in working out the SBA proposal. Russo asked about problems that would be involved in implementation of the proposal, especially class size and equality of faculty (would imported faculty make more money than established members of the department). He asked whether feasibility studies had been done, and observed that nothing concrete had been discussed. The concerns of BET are well based, he concluded.

Dr. Brothers felt that it was unclear what effect postponement would have; would anything be done during that time?

Dr. Campbell said that during postponement they would continue to work on the problems.

A question was raised regarding how many courses BET students now take at the Business School; Ms. Peterson indicated 30-40 courses. Was alternative course work for BET students being worked on? Yes, Dean Dodge was working on transition.

Dr. Roth said that he had been working for months with Mrs. Phillips on transition; Dr. Baldino noted that Mrs. Phillips' name did not appear on page 4 of the BET memo.

A member of Academic Affairs expressed concern about the statement on page 2 beginning "We became aware of the actual SBA proposal and Dean Dodge's qualifying statement when the Senate agenda was circulated." He requested that Dr. Khawaja review the actions of Academic Affairs, which has been working with the proposal since May, and has already discussed many of the questions raised in the BET memo.

Dr. Khawaja acknowledged this, noting that they had not discussed quite the same problems, looking at it from the point of view of the impact of the proposal on the availability of courses to the students. They felt that the agreement that Dean Dodge and Dean Paraska arrived at was satisfactory to the committee and would be satisfactory to the schools.

Ms. Peterson made the observation that the Senate needed to be realistic. If BET did come up with 30-40 courses, there would be no guarantee of faculty to teach those courses; this, in turn, would affect the students.

A question was raised regarding courses: when courses are re-established, would 700 level courses then become 600 level courses? Dr. Smolen indicated that this was so: it is part of the articulation process to insure that only the business courses be offered at the junior level and that the so-called tool courses be offered to freshman and sophomore students.

Would it be true then that no student from CAST could take 700-level courses in Business Ed? Dr. Smolen indicated that that was correct. At present, BET has some freshman students taking junior-level courses, some sophomores taking senior-level courses in the School of Business Administration. That is part of the problem they are attempting to solve. However, a junior-level engineering student with the prerequisites could take SBA junior-level courses with no problem.

Dr. Roberts wished that he had had the memorandum before this meeting. He referred to the eight questions in the memorandum, indicating that it seemed to him that they were covered by the collective bargaining agreement; he asked Vice President Alderman if this was true.

Dr. Alderman said that the concerns looked familiar, and he suggested that those questions might be misdirected to the Senate and premature.

A student from BET pointed out Business Law 715, indicating that he intended to take that course.

A question was raised about the effect of the proposal on articulation; the number of prerequisites would become too large to allow anyone not enrolled in the School of Business Administration to take upper-division courses.

The question was called. Motion to postpone consideration: For--35; Against--22. Motion passed.

Dr. Baldino asked whether it would not be proper to be certain that the Senate have a meeting in December; Dr. Kelty indicated that the Senate is obliged to have 2 meetings per quarter, so there would definitely be a December meeting. She advised all concerned members of the Senate to send materials relevant to the discussion of this issue to the secretary so that they could be attached to either the minutes of this meeting or the agenda for the December 3 meeting.

Dr. Kelty called on Dr. Largent, the Representative to the Chancellor's Advisory Committee. Dr. Largent reported the following items of interest: (1) At the meeting of October 23, the chancellor provided some statistics that showed that there was a 4.5% increase in the "headcount" of state institutions in Ohio. The chancellor expected about a 5% increase in FTE throughout the state; (2) There is a cash-flow problem in the state of Ohio which will result in the December payments to the universities being deferred, perhaps as much as 60 days; (3) The chancellor has indicated to the advisory committee that he will do whatever he can to protect the funding for higher education from budget cuts; statistics projecting funding for higher education are below the actual headcount and FTE count--there are some institutions that are going to lose revenue because they are "over-enrolled"; (4) A "Subsidy Formula Revision Overview" was passed out to members of the advisory committee. It will be attached to the minutes of this Senate meeting so that members of the Senate can see how the funding for higher education in the state of Ohio is going to be attended in the next biennium; (5) Copies of the minutes for September 17 and October 23 will also be appended to the minutes of this Senate meeting; (6) A document has been passed out among the Senate members; this document refers to the possibility of an "inter-university fee waiver reciprocity system," which means that faculty might be able to take advantage of the "instructional fee waiver system" that we have at YSU in other state universities as well. The chancellor has requested that advisory committee members find out what their constituencies think of this possibility. The document passed out is simply for the purpose of asking opinion.

Dr. Largent observed that there were many difficulties attendant upon the institution of a fee waiver reciprocity system, not the least of which would be how to handle the differences in fee waiver between state institutions; nevertheless, he requested that members of the Senate indicate a preference that he could report back to the advisory committee. Dr. Smith asked whether this form would be sent to all faculty or only to the Senate. Dr. Largent responded that his instructions were to get response from his constituency, which is the Senate.

Dr. Sutton moved to submit the questionnaire to all faculty and staff.

Opposition to the motion observed that the Senate represents the faculty, and furthermore it was obvious that everyone would indicate positive response to the idea anyway.

The question was called. Motion to submit questionnaire to faculty and staff: motion fails.

Dr. Largent requested an immediate response to the questionnaire; it was suggested that the Senate simply indicate response by a show of hands. Meanwhile, a question was raised about the faculty being able to take advantage of this reciprocity (the document said dependents). Dr. Largent said that it was not intended to exclude faculty. There was a show of hands with a unanimous positive vote.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion was made to adjourn; the motion was seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO Members of the University SenateDATE 11/4/80FROM Business Education and Technology Department
FacultySUBJECT School of Business Administration Proposal

We do not oppose the SBA proposal. It is acknowledged that there are potential benefits for the University, the School of Business Administration, and the Business Education and Technology Department resulting from this proposal. However, the Business Education and Technology Department faculty members named below request that the University Senate refuse to approve the School of Business proposal until certain questions regarding curricula have been addressed and certain assurances are made to the members of this department concerning new faculty positions that will be necessary because of the added courses.

We the faculty of the Business Education and Technology Department object to certain practices that have been carried out in the course of making decisions in this matter. We are concerned that we have not been consulted about decisions that directly affect our department. The document the Senate is being asked to approve may seem to be a relatively minor revision in program that does not have much impact on the rest of the University Community; however, the decision to move forward with the SBA program proposal, attached to the Senate agenda, will indeed have an impact on the Business Education and Technology faculty and perhaps many other faculty members of the University Community.

Moving all courses presently taken by two-year Business Technology and Business Education and Technology students to the Business Education and Technology Department will necessitate revisions in every curriculum in the Department with complete restructuring required for four of the Business Technology majors. Between 30 and 40 new courses need to be developed and be approved by the University Curriculum process.

As stated above, it is not unlikely that other areas of the University Community will be affected; however, the greatest impact will be on the Business Education and Technology Department. We have been instructed to have curriculum revisions for all Business Education and Technology and Business Technology programs completed, and all course proposals written on a time line that will get the necessary forms to the University Curriculum Committee by January 5 so that all changes can be incorporated in the 1981-82 bulletin,

9

Members of the University Senate
November 4, 1980
Page 2

and the Fall schedule should reflect all new programs in place. Those of you who have been involved in curriculum revisions in the past can appreciate the unrealistic goal that has been set for us by the administration.

Historically, we first became aware of anticipated changes when the Business Education and Technology Chairman, Virginia K. Phillips, announced at a Spring 1980 Departmental faculty meeting that we would defer consideration of revisions in the Business Technology curricula until the Fall quarter when, hopefully, the impact of the SBA proposal, then being deliberated by the Academic Affairs Committee, might be more clearly understood. Our next information regarding the impact on us was on October 15 when the Chairman announced at a departmental meeting that Robert Campbell had agreed to coordinate the Department efforts to meet the Administration request for restructuring. We became aware of the actual SBA proposal and Dean Dodge's qualifying statement when the Senate agenda was circulated--a copy of President Coffelt's reply to the Acting Academic Vice President Rand's memo was read at a faculty meeting on Wednesday, October 29, 1980.

Curriculum concerns occur when one considers the potential impact on Business Education and Technology faculty and possibly university faculty. These concerns should cause every faculty member and student representative to the Senate to vote for a postponement of a consideration of this proposal until satisfactory answers to a number of specific questions have been given B.E.T. faculty members by the Administration. We have asked that the Administration provide these answers as quickly as possible so that a seemingly impossible curriculum redesign project will not be unnecessarily delayed and the B.E.T. faculty can move forward on the monumental task and advise and counsel students effectively and honestly.

Specific questions and concerns that have been raised with the Administration include:

1. Will faculty be transferred to B.E.T. through a Retrenchment Process or on a Voluntary basis? ("insufficient funds to add additional new position" -- President Coffelt's memorandum dated October 16, 1980)
2. If the transfer is voluntary, will those transferring be held to the same criteria mandated to individuals who requested inter-department transfers in the past; that is, will the transferring faculty member lose tenure, and be treated contractually as if he/she were a new recruit to the YSU faculty.

Members of the University Senate
November 4, 1980
Page 3

- 3. Assuming the answer to Number 2 is NO:
 - (A) How can past actions be justified?
 - (B) Will equity in salaries be given present B.E.T. faculty (we have in the past been precluded from offering salaries necessary to attract qualified people because the President insisted on equity with present salaries).
 - (C) Which service will count if future retrenchment becomes necessary in the B.E.T. Department--University or Department service.
- 4. If the answer to Number 2 is YES, and a new policy regarding voluntary transfer is implemented by the Administration, will it set a precedent for future transfer requests.
- 5. Will positions already budgeted in the B.E.T. Department being filled this year on a temporary basis be permitted to be advertised as they were last year, or will the Administration force us to change the job description from a Business Education to a Business Technology orientation and perhaps eliminate the Business Education Teacher Educator position.
- 6. Will "elimination of a program" referred to in President Coffelt's letter be a B.E.T. program or some other university program?
- 7. Will transferred faculty be required to meet the same criteria for tenure as present B.E.T. faculty members; that is, possession of a terminal degree?
- 8. Is the Administration willing to guarantee that no B.E.T. faculty members presently without tenure will be displaced to facilitate implementation of the SBA proposal.

We respectfully ask your careful consideration to approve our motion to postpone the SBA Proposal until these questions are answered. Any department in the University could face a similar situation in the future if the Academic Senate does not deal with the academic questions raised by the SBA Proposal.

Mary Sevestgep
D. J. Hill
Mary Ann Picante
Alvin Vitano
Henry J. Fatto
Phyllis Walton
John B. Russo
Richard F. Rogness
Shirley Campbell
Cynthia L. Peterson

This is a copy of concerns and questions sent to Dean Paraska from B.E.T. faculty.

Questions Regarding the SBA Proposal

1. How does the Administration plan to transfer faculty?
 - A. A retrenchment process
 - B. A voluntary process

2. If retrenchment or voluntary transfer of faculty occurs in the School of Business because of the proposed changes, what plan will be used to determine which faculty will remain in the School of Business?
 - A. SBA Department needs
 - B. Length of University service

3. If retrenchment necessitates the transfer of some School of Business faculty members to the Business Education and Technology Department, who will decide which faculty members will be transferred?
 - A. Administrative officers
 - B. Departments in the School of Business
 - C. Business Education and Technology Department

4. If retrenchment or voluntary transfer of faculty members occurs, which promotion and tenure criteria will be used for their future evaluation?
 - A. School of Business
 - B. College of Applied Science and Technology

5. Will transferred faculty have to meet the same requirement for tenure as Business Education and Technology faculty members hired in the last eight years, i.e., possession of a terminal degree?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No

6. If a voluntary transfer process is used, will those transferring be held to the same criteria mandated to individuals who requested inter school transfers in the past; that is, will the transferring faculty member lose tenure and be given new faculty status in the Business Education and Technology Department?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No

2.

7. Will salary equity be established between present Business Education and Technology transferred faculty?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
8. Will the Administration guarantee that present Business Education and Technology faculty members without tenure will not be displaced to facilitate implementation of the SBA proposal?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
9. If School of Business faculty members join the Business Education and Technology Department faculty, who will have priority for the available faculty positions, should enrollment decline in the future?
- A. Faculty with the most years of University service, regardless of their professional backgrounds
 - B. Faculty members most qualified to fill the positions
 - C. Faculty with the most years of Business Education and Technology Department service
10. Will the two budgeted positions in the Business Education and Technology Department being filled this year on a temporary basis be advertised with the same job description this year?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
11. If the job description in Question 10 is changed, who will authorize the change?
- A. Business Education and Technology Faculty
 - B. The Administration
12. Which program(s) (referred to in President Coffelt's letter) will be eliminated?
- A. Business Technology programs
 - B. Business Education and Technology programs
 - C. Other University programs

- 13. What criteria will be used to determine program elimination?
 - A. Student Enrollment
 - B. Faculty Availability
 - C. Cost justification
 - D. Other

- 14. Will the Business Education and Technology Department be given permission to advertise the needed positions during the Winter quarter 1981?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No



14.

Ohio Board of Regents
Revised Budgeting System
for Instructional Subsidies

- A. Retain the existing sixteen expenditure models and determine total state subsidy support by applying to the expenditure base for the system, 1) enrollment forecasts of the next biennium, 2) inflators which reflect anticipated price increases, 3) a proposed sharing of the resulting expenditures between state subsidies and student fees, and 4) a partial buffering of support against enrollment decline. This process actually determines total state support for the system and is substantially unchanged from past practice.
- B. Distribute resulting state support among institutions on the basis of revised formulas which have five principal features:
1. Direct Instructional Costs (50% of budget)
Where growth occurs, provide full units of increased support. Where decline occurs, protect from enrollment decline the basic support of existing academic courses of institutions, while allowing the student volume-related support of multiple sections of courses to decline following a two-year buffering period.
 2. Support Costs (30% of budget)
Where growth occurs, provide full units of increased support. Where decline occurs, protect one-half of support from an enrollment base, while allowing the other one-half to decline following a one-year buffering period.
 3. Selected Student Services (4% of budget)
Distribute all support on a head-count rather than a full-time equivalent enrollment basis.
Where growth occurs, provide full units of increased support. Where decline occurs, protect one-half of support from enrollment decline, while allowing the other half to decline following a one-year buffering period.
 4. Library Acquisitions Costs (3% of budget)
Remove entirely from an enrollment base, and distribute according to the various academic programs of institutions which give rise to library needs.
 5. Plant Costs (13% of budget)
Remove entirely from an enrollment base, and distribute according to the various types of plant spaces actually operated by institutions, recognizing also varying intensities of plant use.



15.
Edward J. Lurgens

SUBSIDY FORMULA REVISION OVERVIEW
CHANCELLOR'S FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 23, 1980

I. Introduction

- A. Enrollment decline in substantial measure is virtually certain over the next 15 years.
- B. Decline will occur differentially within the system, with some campuses strong and others falling even more than the average of decline. Demographic patterns in various Ohio counties make this clear.
- C. State policy, while concerned with steadily declining campuses, will likely resist the abandonment of campuses.
- D. Hence, institutions must deal directly with the cost implications of decline, and many campuses must expect to become smaller.
- E. Autonomous governance of institutions can likely survive this prolonged period only if a process of orderly change is developed.

II. Board of Regents' Stance

- A. The Board stands firmly in support of sustaining successful autonomous governance for individual institutions.
- B. The Board feels strongly that only through a program of positive, but largely institutionally-determined choices among existing programs and activities can stability occur in a prolonged period of enrollment decline.
- C. The Board is convinced that the state must insist upon specific institutional responses to changed circumstances as a guarantee of orderly adjustment within the system of institutions.

III. Major Objectives of Revised Formula System

- A. Sufficient stability of support for major components of relatively fixed costs must be achieved to allow time for thoughtful and systematic adjustments to enrollment decline.
- B. The major types of institutional change required to adjust such relatively fixed costs to enrollment decline over the longer term must be identified and be expected to occur.

III. Major Objectives of Revised Formula System (Continued)

- C. Costs which are clearly related to enrollment levels should be identified and expected to change as enrollments may rise or fall.

- D. Major areas of changing service (remedial education, research and public service, quality improvement, lifelong learning, student services related to serving large concentrations of part-time students) must be identified and support needs assessed.

SUBSIDY FORMULA REVISION

Instruction Component (Approximately 51% of Total Expense)

Condition: By Institution, By Model

A. If Growth

- FTEX Rate (By Model)
- Full payment for growth

B. If Decline

Fixed and Variable Proportions Applied

Fixed (Concept of Protection for First Section of Course is Utilized)

1. Analysis of the proportion of total course credits represented by the first section systemwide:

<u>Level of Instruction</u>	<u>First Section</u>	<u>All Other Sections</u>
General Studies	25%	75%
Technical	60%	40%
Baccalaureate	60%	40%
Masters	75%	25%
Doctoral	75%	25%

2. Allowance provided for evening program (duplicate sections)

Weight applied based on proportion of first section instruction duplicated after 5 p.m.

3. Small Campus Inflexibility

Research revealed high proportion of first section instruction at campuses below 1,000 FTE.

(See Attached)

Table A-1

DIRECT INSTRUCTION: Basic Programmatic Instruction (Fixed Cost Component)
First Section, Day/Evening, and Small Campus Factors

GENERAL STUDIES

<u>Condition</u>	<u>First Section*</u>		<u>Day/Eve**</u>		<u>Small Campus Adj.**</u> (Over 1000)		<u>Basic Prog. Ratio</u>
A	.25	x	1.00	x	1.0	=	.25
B	.25	x	1.15	x	1.0	=	.29
C	.25	x	1.30	x	1.0	=	.33
D	.25	x	1.45	x	1.0	=	.36
(Under 1000)							
E	.25	x	1.00	x	2.0	=	.50
F	.25	x	1.15	x	2.0	=	.57
G	.25	x	1.30	x	2.0	=	.65
H	.25	x	1.45	x	2.0	=	.72

TECHNICAL AND BACCALAUREATE

<u>Condition</u>	<u>First Section*</u>		<u>Day/Eve**</u>		<u>Small Campus Adj.**</u> (Over 1000)		<u>Basic Prog. Ratio</u>
A	.60	x	1.00	x	1.0	=	.60
B	.60	x	1.10	x	1.0	=	.66
C	.60	x	1.20	x	1.0	=	.72
(Under 1000)							
D	.60	x	1.00	x	1.2	=	.72
E	.60	x	1.10	x	1.2	=	.79
F	.60	x	1.20	x	1.2	=	.86

MASTERS

<u>Condition</u>	<u>First Section*</u>		<u>Day/Eve**</u>		<u>Small Campus Adj.**</u>		<u>Basic Prog. Ratio</u>
A	.75	x	1.00	x	1.0	=	.75
B	.75	x	1.10	x	1.0	=	.83

DOCTORAL

<u>Condition</u>	<u>First Section*</u>		<u>Day/Eve**</u>		<u>Small Campus Adj.**</u>		<u>Basic Prog. Ratio</u>
A	.75	x	1.00	x	1.0	=	.75

*General, by level of instruction

**Institution Specific

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

Minutes of the Meeting of September 17, 1980.

Vice Chairman Gump called the meeting to order with the following members present: J. Carson, J. Coady, L. Frenkel, S. Givens, R. Gump, T. Hensley, J. Kweder, E. Largent, L. Laushey, J. McComb, R. Niedzielski, J. Rakowsky, J. Ross, G. St. Pierre, T. Teyler, S. VanderArk, and J. Woodworth.

MORNING SESSION

Minutes The Minutes of the meeting of June 2, 1980 were approved as circulated.

Announce- The Chair explained that the absence of Chairman Boyer was owing to a death
ments in his family. He also introduced those who were new members of the group or were attending their first meeting. These were Lawrence Frenkel from MCO and George St. Pierre, OSU, who was returning after a years lapse. Jim Ross of MCO was bade farewell by FAC.

Use of Janet McComb suggested that FAC minutes should continue to be sent to the
FAC representatives of those two year schools whose terms on FAC had expired. She
Minutes felt that it would be a valuable continuing connection with FAC/OBOR for those institutions. The wider issue of whether all schools not currently represented on FAC should receive minutes was also raised. The issue was resolved as follows:

1. The Secretary would send minutes to the former members if they indicated a desire to have them.
2. A committee composed of the FAC members from BG, MCO, and UT will study the long range issue of minutes distribution to all schools, and make a recommendation to FAC at the next meeting.

Agenda The agenda for the Afternoon Session was established by FAC.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Intro- The members of FAC all introduced themselves to CM. Chair Gump then congrat-
ductions ulated CM on his recent three year reappointment as Chancellor. He thanked FAC and indicated that he appreciated the confidence indicated by OBOR in so acting. He asserted that there was much to do during the coming term which he hoped that he had the talent to accomplish.

Current The current state of the economy makes certain that more budget cuts will be
Budget made. CM said that he would argue to cut less from higher education than from
Outlook some other areas. The basis for this, he held, was that higher education is a recession industry which has a socially and economically useful function to play. Additionally, due to the under-funding that has occurred, higher ed. has already suffered a greater budget cut than many other state agencies. He pointed out to FAC that whatever cuts do come they will place a real constraint on each school, since their budgets will already be at least 85% spent or legally committed.

Capital CM predicted that the legislature would resume action on the capital improvements
Budget budget sometime after the elections. He hoped that OBOR would be able to attain a balance of support between the need for utilities and renovation projects and new building. He expressed OBORs continuing concern over the level of debt services.

Biennial Budget

CM spent some time looking at the proposed OBOR Biennial Budget for 1981-1983. Projections indicate that enrollments for the period will hold or grow some. However, OBOR decided to attempt to roll forward the subsidy support in general rather than enrollment based support. The conviction was that the principle of subsidy support over enrollment driven support would pay in the long run. CM informed FAC that OBOR had also looked at the idea of creating a tiered fee structure, but had ruled it out as politically unwise and administratively difficult to handle.

CM ran through a number of the items in the proposed budget. (Attached to the official minutes) He pointed out that the request called for a 15% increase the first year (9% for inflation and 6% for pickup), and 11% the second year (9% for inflation and 2% pickup). A few of the items that he emphasized were:

1. There is a 25% increase in the OIG in order to increase accessibility for all.
2. The supplement for Central State is necessary for it to maintain quality programs with the limited subsidy and fee income available.
3. The proposed Eminent Scholar Program is aimed at making it possible for schools to attract eminent scholars as an enrichment process. The program calls for a 50/50 financial sharing between the state and a school.
4. The impact of debt service on the budget can be clearly seen from the yearly increases

New Subsidy Models

CM agreed that the new subsidy models had received mixed reviews. The models do change some old patterns and therefore seem to benefit some more than others. He asserted, however, that the total result was more equitable and did not change actual support appreciably for any institution. An example of this, he suggested, was the first course offering support in any program. This, he held, hurt no one, but did help programs with lower student enrollments.

CM asserted that a key to the whole program was the mandatory review process. He assured FAC that OBOR wanted the review to be primarily internal. However, at some point or in some cases, outside review (such as North Central) could be used. He said that the goal of the new approach is "not to use a meat axe, but to squeeze" programs.

Fee Waiver Reciprocity

FAC asked CM what he thought of the idea of inter-university fee waivers. He replied that it was a good idea, but would have to be initiated and negotiated largely at the inter-university level. He saw no problems with the legislature concerning the issue. He agreed with FAC that the exchange would probably have to be at the lowest common denominator of fee waiver benefits.

Future FAC Agendas

Laushey asked CM if there was anything that he would like FAC to work on. The reply was for help in developing "site specific program approval." In order for OBOR to control out of state course/program offerings in the state on matters of quality, it must use the same standards for in-state institutions. The need for this must be communicated to each school, he charged, and the means of informing OBOR developed.

Next Meetings

The next two meetings of FAC were established with CM. The first meeting will be on Thursday, October 23 and the second meeting on Monday, December 8. Both meetings will convene for the morning session at 10:30 a.m. and the afternoon at 1:15 p.m. The room for the meeting will be indicated in the announcement of the meeting when sent.

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart R. Givens

Stuart R. Givens
Secretary

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

Must approve til. 8 Dec.

Minutes of the Meeting of October 23, 1980.

Chairman Boyer called the meeting to order with the following members present: R. Boyer, J. Carson, G. Clark, J. Coady, P. Falkenstein, H. Flory, L. Frenkel, S. Givens, R. Gump, L. Hoehn, P. Jastram, J. Jordan, E. Largent, L. Laushey, J. McComb, C. Moseley, J. Rakowsky, G. Reagan, T. Teyler, S. VanderArk, and J. Woodworth.

MORNING SESSION

Minutes The Minutes of the meeting of September 17, 1980 were approved as circulated.

FAC Business Much of the morning session was occupied with various business matters of FAC.
The items dealt with or discussed were the following:

1. Chairman Boyer welcomed to FAC the new representatives who were attending their first meeting. These were: Glenn Clark (Columbus Technical Institute), Harriette Flory (Raymond Walters College, UC), Lilburn P. Hoehn (Wright State), James Jordan (Ohio University-Zanesville Campus), and Gerald Reagan, Alternate (Ohio State).
2. The Ad Hoc Committee created to deal with the circulation of minutes reported. It recommended that FAC Minutes be sent only to current members and any former member schools that requested it. The reasons presented were those of the mechanics of locating the correct people at each school and the cost. The recommendation was accepted by consensus.
3. To help new members understand how FAC matters were conveyed back to the campus, several individuals reported on how they did it. Among the methods used were: a written report sent to all faculty; a report made to the Faculty/University Senate which then appears in the minutes of that meeting; and the making of the FAC Minutes available at some central point.
4. Election of officers for the 1980-81 academic year was held. Dick Boyer declined to be considered for reelection. VanderArk then moved and Carson seconded that Robert Gump (Miami) be chosen as Chairman. He was unanimously elected. Also elected by acclamation were Louis Laushey (Cincinnati) as Vice Chairman and Stuart Givens (BGSU) as Secretary.
5. Laushey raised the question whether FAC should not assume a more positive stance in its relations with CM. He indicated his interest in having FAC take such a posture. Gump agreed, but pointed out that the diversity of FAC makes consensus difficult. He added that the range of differences and dissent was important, too.
6. Upon a motion by Givens, FAC with acclamation expressed its appreciation for the seven years of leadership that Richard Boyer has given the FAC.

Fee Waiver Reciprocity Frankel submitted to FAC from MCO a recommendation that the idea of fee waiver reciprocity be approved and presented to CM. Discussion followed in which FAC indicated positive reactions on various campuses, but some concerns. Among the concerns were: with tightened budgets is the timing auspicious?; can any program succeed if there is an uneven flow among the schools?; and, would the fact that some schools only waive 50% of the fees have a negative impact on 100% campuses? It was agreed to ask CM for his opinion on how to approach the issue.

Status of OFS Boyer inquired as to the current status of the Ohio Faculty Senate. The reply was that it was comatose at best, and, more likely, moribund.

Enroll-
ments

CM stated that total enrollments for higher education for 1980-81 were up a weighted mean of 4.5%. This ranged from a 3% increase on main campuses to 13% at technical colleges. He added, that while the FTE was up, the funds to finance the increases were not available. Moreover, the first year of the biennium was underfunded by \$8 million because the LBO used projections that were too low. CM reiterated the points he made in September (See Minutes) concerning the need to increase subsidy support rather than enrollment support. He augmented that view with the idea that universities are moving increasingly into the service area. The demands and opportunities for service are great, but CM cautioned that such activities must not be met by cutting into a constant support at the probable expense of the liberal arts.

Current
Budget
Situa-
tion

CM indicated that the state had a cash flow problem that would probably lead to a deferring of December payments for 30 to 60 days. The worst impact of such a cut is the loss of interest by schools on that money (e.g. \$100,000 for OSU). He stated, as he did in September, that he would attempt to prevent further out right budget cuts to higher education. Finally, he opined that the outcome of the capital improvements bill was uncertain.

Two Tiered
Fee Struc-
ture

CM stated that the idea of a two tiered fee structure for the first two years and the second two years was before OBOR. Action had been delayed for a month in order that all supporting information would be available. CM is recommending that OBOR reject the idea because of its administrative difficulty and cost. He recognized the financial problems of some of the two year institutions-- especially that of equipment needs at the technical colleges. He hoped that the new formula which is retrospective will help resolve some of the problem.

Continu-
ing
Concerns

CM dealt with a number of issues that he had discussed at either the September or the June meetings. Among these were:

1. The need for site specific approval of all programs. He cited the extreme importance of improved access, but the equal need for quality.
2. The general trend within the nation for increased accountability in higher education. CM sees this leading to greater centralization. In Ohio, if higher education is willing to police itself, he felt that it might be averted.
3. The fact that by March 1981 the joint study of OBOR and the State Department of Education on what high school courses are most likely to prepare students for college will be ready. CM is optimistic about the value of the report.

Subsidy
Formula
Revision

CM distributed copies of "A Subsidy Formula Revision Overview" to FAC. He asked the members to read the statement and peruse the formula for the December meeting. He added that all of the university and two year presidents had generally endorsed the new formula.

Fee
Waiver
Reciproc-
ity

FAC sought CM's views on the idea of an inter-university fee waiver reciprocity system. He suggested a resolution from FAC which he could then pass on to the presidents for their consideration. FAC agreed to study the issue further.

Budget
Reserves

CM was asked if there was an OBOR policy on fixed percentages for a university budget reserve. He replied no, but that prudence dictated a fund somewhere in the range of 2% to 3%.

Next
Meeting

As agreed to in September, the next FAC meeting will be on Monday, December 8. The meeting will convene for the morning session at 10:30 a.m. and for the afternoon at 1:15 p.m. Both will be in the OBOR Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted,

Dear Dodge & Kauska will ^{have} meet reqs

Business Education & Technology

Mary Sebastian motioned "against" (to delay) consideration of the SBA proposal

Dr Smolan = wants the motion voted on.

Curriculum development

College of BA is wanting to be recognized by AACSB for "Quality" reasons.

Question exists as concerning the moving of teachers (professors) from department to department.

Would it be possible to have those students "caught in the middle" of the transition ~~■~~ from the present curriculum be given ~~●~~ with special permission, opportunities to take courses not allowed for students just entering the program (eg freshman). There could also be course(s) offered which fit the previous ~~■~~ curriculum (for juniors/seniors) for the transition period. New students would take the new curriculum alternatives to these.

Rainer H. Kangas

ATTENDANCE
UNIVERSITY SENATE

ARTS AND SCIENCES

Bache, Christopher*
Bee, Richard
Bishop, Edwin V.
Earnhart, Hugh
Edwardio, D.
Esterly, Larry*
Khawaja, Ikram*
Koknat, Fred*
Manton, John W.
Moore, Margaret*
Morrison, James
Poggione, James P.
Salvner, Gary*
Smith, Agnes*
Sturm, Nicholas
Veccia, Mario

RBB
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

At-Large:

Beelen, George
Blue, Frederick
Brothers, Barbara
Cohen, Irwin
D'bec, Paul
D'elstein, Thomas
Earnhart, Hugh
Kelty, Jean
Mettee, Howard
Murphy, Gratia
Roberts, Sidney
Ronda, James P.
Satre, Lowell
Sniderman, Stephen
Schroeder, Lauren
Young, Warren

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Bensinger, Dennis
Davis, Larry*
Guzell Jr., Stanley
Simmons, Jane*

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

At-Large:

Daly, James
Diederick, Terry
Kohn, Mervin
Prych, William

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Dunsing, Jack*
Feitler, Fred*
Hill, Louis

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

(SCHOOL OF EDUC)

At-Large:

Baldino, Peter
Douglass, James E.
Leck, Glorianne M.

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Botros, Peter
Driscoll, Wade
Mirth, R. A.
Slawecki, Thad.*

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

At-Large:

Jones, Richard
Munro, Phillip
Prakash, Damshub

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Babisch, Joseph
Largent, Edward*
Shale, Virginia

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

At-Large:

Byo, Donald
Lapinski, Joseph
Naberezny, Jon
Owens, Alfred

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Beaubien, Mary
Boyd, Joan
Crum, Ralph
Hedrick, Gail*
Sebestyen, Mary*
Talton-Harris, Alfreda*
Feld, Kathylynn

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

At-Large:

Barsch, William
Ciminero, Ronald
Feld, Kathylynn
Kennedy, Dorothy

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

ADMINISTRATION

Alderman, Taylor
Binning, William
Cummings, Lawrence
Dodge, Robert
McBriarty, Charles
McGraw, William
Moore, Arnold
Paraska, Nicholas
Rand, Leon
Ross, Ray
Salata, Edmund
Scriven, James
Sutton, George
Yozwiak, Bernard
Gillis, Bernad

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

STUDENT MEMBERS

Ed Salata
Wasko, Bob
Castrodate, Joe
Cooper, Perry
Card, Jeff
Hartsoe, Desiree
Horton, J.
Hudak, John
Kangas, Rainer
Yemma, John

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

At-Large:

Koury, Tony
Menaldi, Ed
Muldoon, Jane
Nakley, Ray
Rand, Deborah
Siegel, Harlan

[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]

Ed Menaldi second year of term