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Date: October 31, 1980
To: All Faculty Members
From: Lilburn Hoehn, Chairman of the Agenda Committee

Subject: FALL QUARTER FACULTY MEETING, Tuesday, November 18, 1980, 3:30 – 5:00, Medical School Auditorium

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes of the Spring Quarter Faculty Meeting, May 20, 1980

III. Reports:
   A. Report of Steering Committee
   B. Report of President Kegerreis

IV. Old Business (none)

V. New Business (none)

VI. Special Reports:
   A. United Way
   B. General Education Sub-Committee
   C. Budget Review Committee
   D. Question and Answer Session with the President

VII. Adjournment
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The Fall Quarter General Faculty Meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by the Vice President of the University Faculty, Mr. Lilburn Hoehn.

The minutes of the Spring Quarter General Faculty Meeting were approved as written.

Committee reports:

A. Steering Committee: Mr. Lilburn Hoehn, Chairman, gave the following report:

1. The Faculty Retrenchment Policy will be considered under Old Business at the December Academic Council Meeting.

2. The Faculty Affairs Committee will issue a report on the Grade Appeals portion of the Charter for the Appeals Board and hopefully will be before Council by January.

3. At the December meeting of the Academic Council, the Curriculum Committee will report on the Fourth Hour Meeting Time for the Liberal Arts courses.

4. Mr. Hoehn noted that the President's Cabinet is presently studying the Early Retirement Plan and hopes to have more data in a few months.

5. The Steering Committee has also given approval to the Calendar/Elections Committee to study the pros and cons of the quarter versus the semester system.

6. Adv. Committee on Faculty Governance held three open hearings during Fall and hopes to have a report at the February Council meeting.

7. The General Education Subcommittee has met regularly and the chair will report later at today's meeting.

8. At the December Academic Council meeting, the calendars for the academic years 1981-82 and 1982-83 will be presented for approval.

B. Report of the President: President Regehr noted that he had six items which he wished to present to the faculty:

1. There are four University Administrative Review Committees now meeting. The two committees reviewing the Deans of Science and Engineering and Liberal Arts are nearly finished with their deliberations and final reports will be sent to the Vice President of Academic Affairs shortly. The Administrative Review Committee for Vice President of Student Affairs is near completion of the first part of its study. The Presidential Review Committee is broken down into five subcommittees and they hope to complete their study by February or March. Following the four Review Committee reports, a conference will be held which will involve the four Review Committees together with the original University Administrative Review Committee which followed the report of the Reorganization Committee two and one half years ago.

2. The Capital Appropriations Bill contains two appropriation requests which were submitted through the Ohio Board of Regents to the Legislature of the State of Ohio: (1) Operating Budget for the Biennium, and (2) Capital Expenditures, which includes renovation of buildings. Up to this point (nearly two years since the University formulated its request), no progress has been made concerning appropriations for renovation or new buildings. The House and Senate could not reach an agreement on the bill so a conference committee was appointed to effect a compromise to produce a final bill. An impasse occurred in the committee and no progress was made. The conference committee may take one last look at a possible compromise on the Capital Appropriations Bill. If no such bill emerges by the first of the year, the bill will be dead and the new Legislature will presumably take up a whole new bill.

3. Last year a committee was formed to study and recommend measures to resolve controversy surrounding the School of Nursing. The School of Nursing has hired eighteen (18) new faculty members and a new Dean. This complemented the eight (8) continuing faculty members. Earlier this month, the School of Nursing began reporting administratively to the Vice President for Health Affairs.

4. The Advisory Search Committee for a Vice President for Academic Affairs, under the chairmanship of Roger Eddings, has a list of finalists and its next plan is to have campus visitation for the finalists. Recommendations will then be made to the President.

5. The University Planning Task Force is near the end of Phase I. The Task Force has produced a new mission statement for the University and has approved a set of planning premises and will consider a draft of instructions for planning by the academic program managers for their critical participation in the process of developing a plan for the entire University. The subcommittees of the Task Force will address other specific components of the planning process including a consideration of: (1) Buildings and Campus Development, (2) Continuing and Lifelong Education, (3) Retention, (4) Public Relations, (5) Recruitment, and (6) Academic Reorganization. At a later date, a specific invitation will be sent to the University community for suggestions for justification for changes in the academic organization of Wright State University. Eight full-fledged proposals were received including some dramatic recommendations for reorganization. These proposals will be given serious consideration.

6. The budget that was approved for the academic year 1980-81 did not accurately reflect the effect of inflation. In July the State notified the University that there would be a 3 percent reduction in subsidy, which was an approximate loss of $675,000 in revenue. At that time,
It was noted that if the present trend of tax receipts continued, the University could expect another reduction in January 1981. The University took the following steps to cover the loss of revenue: (1) Raise student fees for Fall Quarter 1980, (2) Partial freeze in filling staff and faculty vacancies, (3) Reduction of capital expenditure and reduction in inflationary allowances that the University did have in the budget, and (4) Other internal actions taken to cut costs.

This past week the University was also notified that the December subsidy check (nearly $7,200,000) from the State Treasury would not be sent to the University until February or March. This action will cost the University an additional $9,000 in revenue because the University will lose interest on short-term notes that need to be cashed and it will deny the University the possibility of making investments on other short-term notes. The State last week announced another 3 percent cut in subsidies. This means the University has lost approximately $1,400,000 in subsidy and interest.

The University expects to exert even tighter control over filling of faculty and staff vacancies, attempt to postpone where possible some planned purchases and does not plan at this time an increase in student fees.

The total loss is buffeted by: (1) Earlier actions by the University resulting in annual reductions in University budget of approximately $650,000, (2) Student fee increase which produced another $300,000, and (3) Additional fee income as a result of the enrollment increase for Fall Quarter 1980. At the same time, the University has earned higher rates on its short-term notes because of the high interest rates. These actions total approximately $1,300,000. There are no additional plans over and above the present strategies to counteract the loss of income.

Because of the poor economic health of the State of Ohio, the State Treasury has not received the income expected. The budget cuts the State has requested have been in Mental Health, administrative offices of the State, and higher education. There have been no cuts in primary and secondary education budgets or the welfare program. At this point in time, it does not appear that the State will have any sudden surge in new income. At best, the University will probably have another 3 percent cut in its budget; the worst possible thing to imagine right now is that there would be another 3 to 4 million dollar cut in State subsidies. By law, a State entity cannot operate in a deficit status. The University cannot borrow money. Because the University is a self-insurer in regard to unemployment benefits, layoffs would not produce any immediate benefits. The University has managed a $1,300,000 cut but it must look at the possibility of further cuts. The President asked the Steering Committee to either have an augmented Faculty Budget Review Committee or establish a special ad hoc committee of faculty to determine how to meet the new challenge.

IV. Old Business: None

V. New Business: None

VI. Special Reports:

A. United Way: Mr. Nicholas Piodiscalzi indicated the University collected $38,226 for the United Way, for which the University committee was very grateful. Mr. Piodiscalzi felt the success of the campaign was due to the support of President Regierreis and staff, the hard work of Joyce Young, support of the Steering Committee, and the University response. The drive is officially ended but faculty and staff may still contribute and are encouraged to do so. Mr. Piodiscalzi did point out that less than 50 percent of the employees gave to the United Way Fund and they should be encouraged to contribute in the future.

B. General Education Subcommittee: Mr. Stephen Hanes reported that the Committee has met a number of times this year. It started its deliberations with the General Education Document submitted last Spring. It is hoped there will be a proposal ready for the Winter Faculty Meeting.

C. Budget Review Committee: Mr. James Sayer indicated that there are three subcommittees consisting of faculty, staff, and students:

1. Faculty/Staff Salaries and Fringe Benefits—chaired by Mr. Donald Pabst
2. Relative Relationship Between Instructional and Non-instructional Budgets—chaired by Mr. Rubin Battino
3. Revenue & Retention—chaired by Mr. James Sayer

Mr. Sayer encouraged all thoughts and input regarding these subjects be forwarded to the appropriate committee chairman.

D. Question and Answer Session with the President:

1. Mr. Rubin Battino objected to the way the Administrative Review Committees handle the reviews. Procedures followed were not recommended by the Reorganisation Committee two years ago which set down guidelines for the Administrative Review. Mr. Battino noted that one committee never even received a copy of the Committee’s report and that none of the four committees have ever met with the past committee to question guidelines set down by the Committee.

2. Mr. Gordon Skinner asked the President what are the chances of a tax increase to relieve some of the burden that the State now has. The President noted there is a 50-50 chance of an emergency 2 percent increase in sales tax. Such an increase would forestall any drastic cuts in our subsidies for this year. A property tax increase would not benefit higher education. The best hope is that the State would recover economically.

3. Mr. Marc Law asked the status of the Summer Theatre Program. The President said he has had discussions with Mr. Abe Basset, Chairman of the Theatre Department, and Mr. Eugene Cantelupe, Dean of Liberal Arts, concerning this matter. At the present time, it appears the Summer Theatre for 1981 has been cancelled.
4. A question was raised concerning the STRS Pick-Up. The President said the resolution lies in legislative action. There is a bill in the House which is not too helpful to us; we hope for a better bill. The current bill would probably not be retroactive. Mr. Fabb said the University will continue to monitor the situation in Columbus but considering the lame duck situation, House Bill 679 may die.

5. Discussion followed concerning the percentage cut in subsidy. The 3 percent cut was on initial amount of the University appropriation and each additional 3 percent cut is on that initial amount. It does not have the effect of working retroactively in reducing the amount the University already received. The University has earned some interest on short-term investments.

6. A question was raised regarding the effect of the subsidy cut on the intramural athletic program. The President said the athletic program is not self-supporting. The University will continue to scrutinize all programs and will continue to support but to what degree is open to conjecture at this point. Most programs are contractual. If drastic cuts are necessary, then many programs may have to be shelved temporarily and a re-evaluation would be necessary.

VII. Adjournment:
A motion was made, seconded and approved. The meeting adjourned at 4:35.