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Date: April 23, 1982
To: University Faculty
From: Donald F. Pabst, Chair of the Agenda Committee and Faculty Vice-President
Subject: SPRING QUARTER GENERAL FACULTY MEETING - Tuesday, May 11, 1982, 3:30 to 5:30 p.m., Medical School Auditorium (120 Medical Sciences Building)

Agenda:
I. Call to Order
II. Approval of the minutes of the Winter Quarter Faculty Meeting, February 16, 1982
III. Reports:
  A. Faculty Vice-President - Donald Pabst
  B. Chair of the Calendar/Elections Committee on their recommendation concerning the University calendar system - Barbara Murphy
  C. Faculty Retirement Committee report on the Early Retirement Policy - Andrew Spiegel
IV. Election of the Faculty Vice-President (Candidates):
   Julia George, Nursing
   James Jacob, Political Science
   Harvey Siegel, Medicine in Society/Sociology
V. Reports (continued):
   D. President - Robert Kegerreis
   E. Provost - John Beljan
VI. Old Business - Lawrence Cross motion in support of a proposal to end the nuclear arms race (See page 6, item D., in the minutes of the February 16, 1982 General Faculty Meeting.
VII. New Business:
   A. Approval of the list of graduating students (copy available in the Office of the Registrar)
   B. Revisions to the Academic Calendars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1983-84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Academic Year</td>
<td>Mon, Sept 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Day of Classes</td>
<td>Thurs, Sept 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement and End of Academic Year</td>
<td>Sat, June 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Addition of a December Commencement - An on-campus commencement ceremony at the end of exam week in December be instituted by the administration at the earliest possible date (December 4, 1982)
D. Amendments to the University Faculty Constitution and Bylaws:
   1. Non-voting members of the University Budget Review Committee be changed to: President, Provost, and Vice-President for Administration
   2. Add voting members to the University Budget Review Committee from the School of Medicine and the School of Professional Psychology

VIII. Adjournment
I. The Spring Quarter General Faculty Meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by the Vice-President Elect of the University Faculty, Charles Hartmann, in the absence of Donald F. Pabst, Vice-President of the University Faculty.

II. A. Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the Winter Quarter General Faculty Meeting as written. Motion was made and seconded to amend the minutes as follows (underlined sections represent changes):

V.E. Mr. Emil Kmetec commented on an interpretation of the governance bylaws as given earlier by Mr. Pabst. Mr. Kmetec stated that the UBRC does make recommendations to the administration according to the bylaws. However, the Academic Council committees are subject to the Council, so it takes precedence of priority over what any of the committees do. Mr. Kmetec expressed concern that only process and very little substance was reported by UBRC and that budgetary policy questions were not thoroughly discussed at the Academic Council meetings before a vote was taken to recommend. Mr. Pabst stated that standing committees do report at each Council meeting and reports are open to discussion. Some items move completely through the governance process, depending on the issues, to the Academic Council. Mr. Pabst noted that the Constitution and bylaws are not specific on the routing of items. Mr. Kmetec remarked that routing is inherent in our governance documents.

Motion to amend the minutes as stated was approved. Motion to approve the minutes as amended passed by voice vote.

B. Approval was given to change the agenda of this meeting to indicate the following order:

III. Reports:
A. Faculty Vice-President
B. Chair of the Calendar/Elections Committee
IV. Election of the Faculty Vice-President
V. Reports (continued)
C. Chair of the University Budget Review Committee
D. Faculty Retirement Committee
E. President
F. Old Business
G. New Business

III. Reports:
A. Faculty Vice-President. Mr. G. Hartmann gave the following report in the absence of Mr. Pabst:

1. Mr. Pabst wishes to thank those who served as committee chairers and to recognize those individuals who served as chairers of standing committees: Mr. J. Petrofesky, Student Affairs; Mr. J. Kane, Curriculum; Mr. J. Jacob, Faculty Affairs; Ms. C. King, Library; and Mr. L. Hoehn, Budget Review. Recognition was also given to the work of two special ad hoc committees: Faculty Governance, chaired by Mr. W. Rickett; and Retirement, chaired by Mr. A. Spiegel.

2. Steering Committee will meet May 19 to begin selection of members and chairers of the 1982-83 committees. Faculty members have been requested to indicate willingness to serve on committees by a form distributed through campus mail by Mr. Hartmann. Steering Committee will appoint committees subject to ratification of the Academic Council at the June meeting.

B. Calendar/Elections Committee. Ms. B. Murphy, Chairer, made available to attendees of this meeting copies of the Calendar/Elections Committee recommendation regarding the early semester study. Ms. Murphy stated that as a follow-up of the survey conducted by the 1980-81 Calendar/Elections Committee which indicated an interest on the part of faculty to change the calendar from quarter to semester, Steering Committee charged the present Calendar/Elections Committee with the task of further studying this issue and preparing a recommendation based on input from resource persons, faculty, and students. The work of the committee focused on the impact of change on the various disciplines within the University, the impact on registration, scheduling, space, attrition, articulation, and enrollment patterns. All data collected are on file in the Registrar's Office. Various academic units were asked to look at the feasibility of a calendar change and specifically address issues, such as, impact on course inventory, educational advantages and disadvantages, extent of curricular revision, teaching loads, etc. A survey was also done of the regional colleges that have recently converted to a semester calendar and have done such a study. It was understood that a proposal for change would have to clearly indicate evidence of a solid majority of faculty in support of calendar change. The results indicate that no consensus exists at Wright State which supports the early semester calendar. Without a clear majority committed to change, the Calendar/Elections Committee recommended to Steering Committee that Wright State University remain on the quarter system at this time.

IV. Election of the Faculty Vice-President. The candidates were introduced: Julia George, Nursing; James Jacob, Political Science; and Harvey Siegal, Medicine in Society/Sociology. Discussion concerned eligibility requirements of nominees regarding tenure status. Mr. Hartmann reported that the Vice-President Elect may assume that position in the fall, at which time he/she must be tenured. There were no nominations from the floor. One ballot vote was taken and James Jacob was elected by majority vote.

V. Reports (continued):
C. Chair of the University Budget Review Committee. Mr. L. Hoehn, Chairer of UBRC, gave the following report:

1. UBRC has recommended to the University administration that the average salary increase for faculty and unclassified staff for the 1982-83 academic year be 6% and that the University absorb the additional cost of fringe benefits, approximately equivalent to a 3% salary increase. The UBRC also approved the following recommendations:

a. The salary increment for promotion be increased from $200 to $300 for promotion from instructor to assistant professor, $400 to $600 for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, $600 to $900 for promotion from associate professor to professor.

b. An increase of $50 per credit hour in the overload teaching rate.

c. Travel pay be at the same rate as allowed by the Internal Revenue Service for tax deductions.
In making these recommendations, UBRC recognized the current financial problems of the state of Ohio and that an 8% increase in salary would be dependent upon: 1) movement for and approval of new taxes in Ohio, 2) a willingness on the part of administration to make budget reductions in other areas and a willingness on part of faculty to accept those reductions, 3) and a student fee increase which has already been approved. UBRC recommended the 8% salary increase because faculty losses to inflation over the past five years have been approximately 12% up to September 1981, maintenance of a reasonable standard of living is needed to retain good faculty, and UBRC is convinced faculty salary increases must be one of the very highest priorities in the University budget. UBRC is continuing to gather data from other universities in order to make adequate comparisons.

2. As a result of the budget crunch, Mr. Beljan requested UBRC to prepare a Statement on Faculty Productivity (Attachment A to these minutes). UBRC felt that increases in faculty teaching loads was a condition which should come after many other attempts to adjust the budget had been exhausted. Ten ad hoc budget groups are examining various parts of the budget.

Discussion followed Mr. Hoehn's report as to the definition of "productivity." Mr. Hoehn responded that "productivity" was defined, for this purpose, as being equivalent with an increase in teaching load, nothing else.

D. Faculty Retirement Committee. Mr. A. Spiegel, Chairer, reported that the original committee, chaired by Mr. A. Klein, presented a plan to administration that did not contain an annuity provision and did recommend guaranteed teaching. The University plan, which was finally adopted, contained an annuity provision and no guaranteed teaching. The Steering Committee last summer was concerned for both procedural and substantive reasons, resulting in the present committee. This present committee analyzed the University plan for cost and effectiveness and found it to be deficient in the following ways:

1. It did not define the target group.
2. It had no eligibility requirement, other than for STRS.
3. It contained no limitation on the school's liability.
4. Under certain circumstances, it could become inordinately expensive, thereby penalizing 9-month faculty members who had not retired.

The committee discussed these deficiencies with the Provost and presented to him a new plan which the committee considered to be better for the University and the retirees, and the committee expressed a willingness to be flexible. At this point, the University's plan was suspended. The present committee agreed to stay in existence until the administration presents a revised plan. The University is now studying a new plan. An Early Retirement Plan is very much in the best interest to the University and not a fringe benefit to the faculty. The individual faculty member gains up much when he/she foregoes the last late years of STRS in order to retire early. Mr. Spiegel presented an illustration revealing facts of the suspended plan, concluding that the 9-month faculty would be subsidizing the other employment categories with regard to early retirement. The plan this committee recommended to administration would rectify this.

E. Report of the President. President Keggeleis gave the following report:

1. Budget. Senate Bill 530, passed by the Senate, is now before the House. This bill is designed to account for approximately half of the estimated deficit this fiscal year, the other half coming from expenditure reduction - in Wright State's case, an approximately $3 million reduction in subsidy. If the bill is not passed, Wright State's reduced subsidy will climb to nearly $6 million. If the bill passes, it will then go to a conference committee, with the likelihood that the bill will not take effect until after the June primaries. Depending upon the fate of Senate Bill 530, Wright State is going to receive $3 to $6 million less in subsidy than was in the Appropriations Bill of July 1 of this fiscal year. President Keggeleis urged everyone to call or write his state representative to pass Senate Bill 530. Wright State faces an operating and general budget deficit for next year, not counting any increase in faculty and staff compensation, of approximately $1/2 million, unless Senate Bill 530 does not pass, which then would mean a $3 million deficit. Add to that a necessary increase in faculty compensation. This potential deficit will be offset by cuts in Wright State expenditures. The University does hope to generate a small operating surplus this fiscal year because the University cut-backs have been very effective, and that surplus will be carried into the next year. There is an anticipated increase in the cost of fringe benefits from 9600-9700 thousand for next year for the same benefits provided now. Premium bids are to be submitted within the next week and sent to a consultant and then evaluated. It is hoped that this increase in cost of benefits can be reduced and that savings applied to the salary size of faculty and staff compensation. If there is an enormous fringe benefits cost, its will be difficult to grant much of a salary increase.

2. Faculty-Student Ratio. Of the twelve state universities in Ohio, Wright State ranks second in the faculty-student ratio. Wright State has 7 full-time faculty for every 100 full-time students. Quality depends in part upon that ratio, but decline of support services can have as much effect on quality as adjustment of that ratio.

3. Library Support. The "stop and go" of the acquisitions budget has caused some question of the administration's intent to support the University's library program. President Keggeleis said that the University should be encouraged to support its library. Wright State ranks eleventh in the Ohio system in terms of students and tenth in terms of programs, and yet tied for seventh in the level of library expenditures. There are a number of new approaches that universities are adopting to attempt to control the costs of conventional library operations: sharing of resources and the new technology of library storage and access. This must be a joint examination by the whole University community, primarily the faculty and the faculty of the Academic Council, to recommend any change in our current expenditure ratios for our library support.

4. Joseph Chao. President Keggeleis announced the untimely death of Joseph Chao of the Economics Department.

5. Student Body Support of Higher Education. President Keggeleis expressed appreciation to the student body who went to Columbus to lobby legislators in support of higher education.
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VI.  Old Business:  Lawrence Cross motion in support of a proposal to end the nuclear arms race  
(See the General Faculty Meeting Minutes of February 16, 1982.)  Motion was put on floor for discussion.  Mr. Cross made note that this proposed resolution does not call for any 
unilateral action by our government nor weakening of our military position via-a-via the 
USSR, but does contribute our voice to a cry of concern for the imminent danger inherent 
in the continuation of the arms race.  Discussion followed with opinions expressed pro and 
con as to whether faculty members should express opinions as citizens under the guise of 
the name of faculty.  Question called.  Vote taken by secret ballot.  Results: YES: 107. 
NO: 50.  Motion passed by majority vote.

VII.  New Business:  
A.  Approval of the list of graduating students.  Motion made, seconded, and passed to 
approve the subject list as recorded in the Office of the Registrar.
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6.  STRS Pick-Up.  Three years ago the University began paying for faculty con- 
tribution to the retirement fund in lieu of a salary increase.  Wright State is 
the only system in the state to do that, with Cleveland State and Ohio State now 
considering it.  If Wright State has company with this, the appropriate 
legislation can be passed to enable easier planning of retirement.

7.  Peking Normal University Delegation.  A delegation from Peking Normal University 
is on campus and Wright State hopes to establish a serious relationship with that 
university.

8.  Campus Scholarship Fund.  President Kegelreiss urged all to support the Campus 
Scholarship Fund.  The goal this year is $55,000.  Pledges received as of this 
time total $17,500.

9.  State Teachers Retirement System (STRS).  Congressman Bolling of Missouri has 
proposed that the Social Security System take over STRS.  President Kegelreiss 
urged everyone to write or call their congressmen and two senators to oppose such 
a move.

10.  The University is contending with the Ohio Board of Regents on a number of issues, 
such as, the expansion of Wright State's attempt to expand its post-masters 
program in the College of Education & Human Services, Wright State's limited off- 
campus programs, the new master plan for the state of Ohio for the next six years and 
revisions to the subsidy system.

President Kegelreiss said that regardless of the budgetary problems, etc., Wright 
State University is well established and well secured for launching another fine year 
next year and will always be receptive to the faculty.

Discussion followed the President's report concerning the faculty-student ratio.  It 
was questioned whether Wright State would look as good compared to other universities 
in terms of percentage deviations from the OBR Staffing Guidelines.  It was noted that 
this ratio does not include the Medical School.  Discussion also concerned the STRS 
pick-up.  President Kegelreiss said that STRS is willing to consider the composite for 
final retirement and have the pick-up added on to the salary.

VI.  Old Business:  Lawrence Cross motion in support of a proposal to end the nuclear arms race  
(See the General Faculty Meeting Minutes of February 16, 1982.)  Motion was put on floor for discussion.  Mr. Cross made note that this proposed resolution does not call for any 
unilateral action by our government nor weakening of our military position via-a-via the 
USSR, but does contribute our voice to a cry of concern for the imminent danger inherent 
in the continuation of the arms race.  Discussion followed with opinions expressed pro and 
con as to whether faculty members should express opinions as citizens under the guise of 
the name of faculty.  Question called.  Vote taken by secret ballot.  Results: YES: 107. 
NO: 50.  Motion passed by majority vote.

VII.  New Business:  
A.  Approval of the list of graduating students.  Motion made, seconded, and passed to 
approve the subject list as recorded in the Office of the Registrar.
UNIVERSITY BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE
STATEMENT ON FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY

Preface

As part of the in-depth review of the University’s financial position, the Provost has requested UBRC to review current faculty productivity with particular reference to teaching loads. The statement is predicated on the following:

1. The financial support for higher education in the State of Ohio is not likely to improve in the immediate future.

2. Enrollment projections for the decade of the eighties indicate limited growth in the number of graduate students and a continued decline in the number of undergraduate students.

3. In a period of declining resources, declining enrollment and increasing inflation, the primary objective of the University should be to protect the quality of its academic programs.

4. The quality of the academic programs is determined by the quality of teaching and scholarship.

5. Faculty should participate fully in budgetary decisions to help ensure that resources are allocated in support of quality education.

Statement

As a result of its consideration of these factors, UBRC recommends the following:

1. The academic staffing model already in place constitutes the current basis for determining appropriate faculty size for academic units. Downward adjustments in the model could be used to adjust teaching loads. Special circumstances i.e. accreditation requirements, of some academic units should be considered if adjustments are made in the staffing model.

2. Increased teaching loads will result in a decrease in the quantity and quality of scholarship and the quality of instruction. Therefore, the current emphasis on reductions in the non-academic support areas should be continued. The UBRC recommends that the University drastically reduce the budgets of indirect support activities, i.e. units which are not in direct support of academic programs. Budget reductions to units in direct support of academic programs should be at the same ratio as reductions to academic programs.

3. Prior to increases in the average teaching load of faculty, the University should consider the following:
   a. Employment of new faculty on a non-tenure track.
   b. Selective employment of high quality adjuncts and visiting professors to avoid some long-term financial commitments.
   c. Use of some faculty on a part-time basis in various administrative and/or advisory positions.
   d. Increasing the teaching loads of department chairs, directors, associate deans, and assistant deans. This would improve the current average credit hours taught by faculty.
   e. Examine the need for twelve-month and/or summer contracts for department chairs and directors.
   f. Examination of the need for the current number of faculty on twelve-month contracts.

Attachment A
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