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To: All Faculty Members

From: Lilburn Hoehn, Chairer of the Agenda Committee

Subject: WINTER QUARTER GENERAL FACULTY MEETING, Tuesday, February 17, 1981, 3:30 - 5:00, Medical School Auditorium

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes of the Fall Quarter Faculty Meeting, November 18, 1981.

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

IV. Old Business:
   A. Action on request from General Education Sub-Committee for an extension until the Spring Quarter Faculty Meeting for presentation of its report.

V. New Business:
      (See Attachments)

VI. Special Reports:
   A. General Education Sub-Committee.

VII. Adjournment.
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GENERAL FACULTY MEETING
WINTER QUARTER
February 17, 1981

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

II. The minutes of the Fall Quarter General Faculty Meeting were approved as written. Amendments to the agenda were made as follows:

A. Under Item V, Old Business, add: B. Approval of change in 1980-81 Academic Calendar in regard to the Memorial Day holiday observance.

B. Under Item VI, Special Reports, add: B. Report from the Budget Review Committee.

III. Reports

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

1. Student Affairs Committee is continuing work on the charter for the Appeals Board. It is hoped the document will come before Academic Council in March or April.

2. The Calendar/Elections Committee is conducting a survey among faculty and students regarding semester versus quarter system.

3. The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance hopes to have a report at the May General Faculty Meeting.

4. The Faculty Affairs Committee continues work on the Retrenchment Policy. A version of this policy was approved at the January Academic Council Meeting and was then presented to the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee, which provided recommendations to the Committee. Study of the policy continues. Faculty Affairs is also studying the possibility of a cap on tenure and is reviewing the Promotion and Tenure Document to determine if there is a need for revision. The Faculty Affairs Committee has been working on the Disability Policy and has a revised version ready to go before the University administration.

5. The Board of Trustees, at its last meeting, approved a resolution which authorized the President to institute a voluntary early retirement program, effective as early as July 1, 1981, and to continue for five years, at which time it will be reviewed. Mr. G. Kirk and various faculty will continue to work on details of this program.

B. Report of President Kegerreis:

1. Wright State University is the shortest of space of the twelve state universities. This problem has previously been solved by the passing of a Capital Improvement Bill by the state legislature which authorizes the selling of state bonds to finance construction
of approved facilities. Such a bill was presented, debated, and defeated and expired on December 31, 1980. A new Capital Improvement Bill is being formulated and may be introduced soon with an approximate $300 million which would include one major Wright State University facility, which would be an expansion.

2. The official investigation of the State of Ohio by the Office of Civil Rights of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department of the federal government should produce a report by the next General Faculty meeting. This investigation was conducted to determine if the State of Ohio had developed a higher education system which purposely discriminated against minorities.

3. The University Task Force has been working on the very first comprehensive, long-range planning effort of the University. Next month, the Task Force will tackle the guidelines for program directors and participants and will soon be able to produce for colleges and schools some tentative guidelines for the formulation of plans at that level. Each faculty member should be familiar with this effort and should participate in formulating the outcome. If this effort is as effective as hoped, it will lead directly to a resource allocation system which, in turn, will influence how the University shapes its future. This is taking place at the same time as the Ohio Board of Regents is formulating its every-six-year mission statement for higher education for the State of Ohio. The last mission statement from the Board of Regents added a significant new dimension to the assignment given to Wright State University: to develop in western Ohio a Health Education district, complete with degree programs.

4. The School of Nursing has had a reaffirmation of approval of its programs by the State of Ohio Board of Nursing Education, as well as having its accreditation at the undergraduate and graduate levels officially reaffirmed by the National League of Nursing.

5. The Social Work program in the College of Liberal Arts has been awarded continuing accreditation.

6. The Department of Preventive Medicine in the School of Medicine has been honored for its outstanding quality by the National Committee of the American Medical Association.

7. Wright State University is still the only university in the State of Ohio to do a "pick-up" of the faculty's contribution to the State Teachers Retirement System. The principal defect in the system is the fact that the pick-up the University makes cannot be applied to the final years of employment as the base for calculating actual retirement payments. This contribution should be added to the salary before calculations are made for retirement payments. A bill was introduced for such calculation in the last session of the legislature by the Ohio Educational Association and others, as well as Wright State. The bill passed both houses of the legislature but was vetoed by the Governor. The University is continuing the pick-up and is planning to formulate and introduce a bill which addresses the reasons for the Governor's veto, and will attempt to attract sponsors and lobbying assistance.
8. The Frederick A. White Ambulatory Care Center is partially occupied and should be fully occupied by April with dedication in Fall. The Rike Hall building is near completion with plans for move of faculty and deans' offices and staff, along with some media people, to be made in July. The College of Business and Administration should be in full operation in Rike Hall by Fall.

9. As of this time, the University is still uncertain whether Wright State University will be the host school for the regional tournament for Division II basketball.

10. There have been four administrative reviews: two deans, one vice president, and the president. The reviews of the deans have been completed; the vice-presidential review is virtually complete; and the committee for the review of the president is still at work.

11. The general operating budget for the University has been a main item of concern. The University is currently operating at 93 percent of the subsidy level at which it began on July 1, 1980. This fiscal year, the University is receiving 7 percent less from the state than it had expected; and some of its subsidy payments have been delayed which causes additional costs because the University must substitute funds for those which have not been received on time. Expenditure reductions have been necessary to balance the budget. The balance of appropriations and expenditures will be reassessed for the new year. The University's major source of revenue is subsidy from the State of Ohio, and the other principal source of income is student fees. A sizeable fee increase will undoubtedly be necessary, probably beginning in the Summer Quarter. The President then introduced Mr. George Kirk who gave a slide presentation on the state of the budget using the following information to demonstrate the nature and extent of the problem. The actual numbers that will be used to prepare a budget will vary somewhat because decisions have not been made regarding the amount of fee increase nor has a plan been adopted to make reductions in activities or services. Mr. Kirk reported that revenue on July 1, 1980 for the education and general University budget (excluding WOBC, Medical School, and Professional Psychology) prior to reductions was $21,700,000. After reductions, as of today, the University's subsidy is $20,247,000. This is an approximate $1.4 million reduction in subsidy this year. In 1981-82, the projection of the subsidy is $21,340,000. What is proposed at this point is a restoration of what has been cut but is still a shortfall of approximately $360,000. This represents a shortfall of 1 1/2 percent of what the University began with before this year's reductions. This would mean the University is being restored to 98.5 percent of its beginning subsidy July 1, 1980. With no change in fee structure, the projected revenue from fees would be $12,300,000. Other sources of income could be changed by as much as $200,000 for next year. Projected revenue for next year is $40,840,000 as a beginning, working figure. Concerning expenditures, the anticipated increases for continuing services amount to $1,500,000. Adding continuing services, that is a total expenditure of $42,212,000, meaning a $1.4 million shortfall at the beginning. No decision has been made on the amount of fee increase; however, if for example, a projected revenue from fee increases were given as $1,000,000.
(a 12 percent increase in student fees). The University's budget would be estimated expenditures for $42,212,00, and estimated revenue for $40,840,000. It was noted that figures are in actual dollars, and not in real dollars which would take into account inflation.

C. Mr. L. Hoehn reported that the Presidential Review Committee conducted a survey regarding the President. The questionnaire was sent to all faculty, 10 percent of the students, and approximately 100 nonuniversity persons, legislators, other university presidents, etc. There has been a 90 percent return from the last named group. Results will be tabulated.

IV. Old Business:

A. Mr. Stephen Renas, Chairman of the General Education Sub-Committee reported that significant progress has been made but the Committee does not yet have a proposal to submit. Mr. Renas moved that the General Education Sub-Committee be given an extension until Spring Quarter General Faculty Meeting for presentation of its final report and recommendation. Motion was seconded and approved.

B. A recent ruling by the State of Ohio states that Memorial Day must be observed on May 30 unless that date falls on Saturday or Sunday, and then the preceding Friday or the following Monday will be the day used to observe this holiday. The University calendar now has Memorial Day observance on Monday, May 25. Academic Council approved at its last meeting that this date be changed to Friday, May 29. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to change Memorial Day Holiday observance to Friday, May 29.

V. New Business:

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed 1981-82 and 1982-83 Academic Calendars. Motion passed.

VI. Special Reports:

A. Mr. Stephen Renas, Chairman of the General Education Sub-Committee, presented a progress report for the Committee. The Committee has unanimously approved a 55-hour, two-tier general education requirement. Of the 55 hours, 47 will be distributed among four areas of study: (1) Humanities and Creative Arts, (2) Social and Behavioral Sciences, (3) Natural Sciences, (4) Language and Mathematical Skills. The remaining eight (8) hours must be selected from the general education inventory which is now being prepared and could not be taken from a student's major area of study. This was unanimously approved with representation from all colleges and schools of the University. Open hearings will be held and document reworked and will be presented to the General Faculty at the Spring meeting.

B. Mr. James Sayer, Chairman of the Budget Review Committee reported that the Committee adopted a year ago as a prime consideration, an appropriate faculty compensation program. The Committee adopted a series of tentative operating guidelines, one of which stated: "The University Budget Review Committee is
committed to but not limited to supporting budgetarily instructional excellence in the allocation of University resources, including an annual commitment to salary increases that approximate the escalation in the cost of living." In November 1980, the University Planning Task Force adopted a series of planning premises, one of which noted that if the University is going to maintain its academic quality, it had to maintain its viable faculty compensation program. On February 16, the Budget Review officially adopted the following recommendations, with the overview statement, "It must be emphasized that the University Budget Review Committee forward these recommendations in the spirit of the University Budget Review Committee's two-year-old commitment. Faculty compensation must be the primary budgetary priority of Wright State University if instructional quality and programmatic integrity are to be maintained."

1. Salary and Fringe Benefit Recommendations
   a. The University Budget Review Committee recommends a 9.5 percent average salary increase for faculty and unclassified staff for 1981-82.
   b. The University Budget Review Committee recommends the definition of "semi-private room" in the Blue Cross contract be changed to a "room with two beds."

2. Funding
   a. The University Budget Review Committee recommends that the above noted salary and fringe benefit items be funded by the following 6-item combination:
      1) Student fee increases
      2) Selected services reductions
      3) Cost reductions (i.e., reduce Xerox usage, reduce usage of long distant telephone service, and reduce energy consumption)
      4) Subsidy increases over the amount received for 1980-81
      5) Other revenue increases (i.e., implementation of two suggestions already made by the University Budget Review Committee: implementation of new users' fees as recommended for the Office of Career Planning and Placement, and increased users' fees as recommended for the Physical Education Building), increased off-site instruction, increased student retention, and increased private sector support.
      6) All other necessary methods

3. The University Budget Review Committee also recommends that the central administration provide the leadership, guidelines, and specific policies to increase the productivity of all University employees. Policies which should be reviewed for faculty productivity are:
   a. Increased teaching loads
   b. Increased class or section sizes
   c. Increased advising of students
Suggestions for increasing staff productivity are:

a. Combining consonant service units  
b. Sharing of duties and responsibilities  
c. Creating such things as secretarial pools  
d. Other such higher productivity activities

Mr. J. Sayer responded to the question of how to accomplish student retention, stating that this might be accomplished by a good relationship between student and faculty (the Budget Review Committee has recommended that the faculty assume more of the advising of students) and interpersonal relationship skills.

Mr. J. Sayer stated that dollars allocated for expenditures will most likely not be changed by increased enrollment. Retention does not necessarily mean more faculty.

VII. Adjournment:

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