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AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

3. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 28, 1993 MINUTES

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

5. NEW BUSINESS:
   A. EXBD Recommendation Regarding Ad Hoc Administrative Review Committee (Res. 94-1)
   B. UFA Response to "Discussion Draft" of BOR's Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload Standards and Guidelines (Res. 94-2)
   C. Faculty Advising Week (Res. 94-3)

6. ON-GOING BUSINESS
   A. Committee Reports
      1. Committee on Committees
      2. Faculty Affairs Committee
      3. Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Review
   B. Reports from Faculty Representatives on US Committees
      1. Academic Affairs Committee
      2. Affirmative Action Committee
      3. Athletic & Intramural Committee
      4. Facilities Committee
      5. Fiscal Affairs Committee
      6. Personnel Development Committee
      7. Student Affairs Committee
   C. Executive Board Reports
D. Communications/Correspondence

7. ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES
UFA GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING
Tuesday, 28 October, 1993  4:00pm

There being a quorum of the membership present, the following business was conducted:

CALL TO ORDER
Prof. Kelley, President, opened the meeting with a call to order and after having been satisfied of a quorum, proceeded.

AGENDA APPROVAL
President Kelley moved for the approval of the October 28, 1993 agenda with one change: that the presentation by Dr. Veri be moved to item 4 on the agenda. The motion was approved.

MINUTES APPROVAL
President Kelley moved for the approval of the June 10, 1993 minutes. The motion was approved.

PRESENTATION BY DR. VERI AND DR. CREAMER
Dr. Veri presented his views on the current budget crisis. He explained the ways that the budget and the corresponding shortfall has been calculated. Dr. Creamer then presented a breakdown of the budget and the areas that are short of funds for the current fiscal year (see attached handouts). He explained the way that yearly funds are calculated by the OBR, citing that the main reason for lower-than-projected figures was partially due to current student demographics, especially where the Freshman class is concerned. He stated that we are facing an approximate shortfall value of $750,000. Discussions between Dr. Veri, Dr. Creamer and the faculty followed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
There was no unfinished business to report upon.

NEW BUSINESS

A. FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT
President Kelley explained the process of determining the current, proposed guidelines for administering the distribution of the faculty scholarship. He asked for a motion to approve the guidelines as presented. Prof. Buchanan-Berrigan moved for approval and second was made by Prof. Boukabasr. Discussion followed. Prof. Buchanan-Berrigan moved to amend item #3 to include wording so that only students who are not currently receiving any other form of financial aid would be eligible. Prof. Marouf seconded. Discussion followed. The question was called and the motion was defeated. President Kelley then called the question on the amendment as presented. The motion was approved.

B. UFA/US COORDINATION
President Kelley explained the rationale behind the proposed amendments that would clarify the relationship between the UFA and the US in regards to how and when the UFA might respond to US actions in certain areas of Faculty concerns. He asked for the approval of the proposed changes. Prof. Lorentz moved and Prof. Marouf seconded to accept the proposal as presented. Discussion followed. The question was called and the motion was approved.

ON-GOING BUSINESS

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS
1. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Prof. Yang discussed the appointment to the University Foundation that was decided between Prof. Marouf and Prof. Ruby, with Prof. Marouf being appointed.

2. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Prof. Hadjiyannis reported that the committee was going to meet at 5:00pm, immediately following the general UFA meeting to elect the new chair of the committee.

3. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE
Prof. Veri presented his views on the current budget crisis. He explained the ways that the budget and the corresponding shortfall has been calculated. Dr. Creamer then presented a breakdown of the budget and the areas that are short of funds for the current fiscal year (see attached handouts). He explained the way that yearly funds are calculated by the OBR, citing that the main reason for lower-than-projected figures was partially due to current student demographics, especially where the Freshman class is concerned. He stated that we are facing an approximate shortfall value of $750,000. Discussions between Dr. Veri, Dr. Creamer and the faculty followed.

4. FACILITIES COMMITTEE
Prof. Ruby reported that the committee is still in its formative stages.

5. PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
Prof. Gemmer reported that the committee is concerned with the current budgetary problems and will continue to look into the situation and report back to the body.

6. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Prof. Miner reported that the committee was ready to "test the instrument" on campus.

7. ATHLETIC AND INTRAMURAL COMMITTEE
Prof. Lawson discussed future planning and budget cut areas.

8. EXECUTIVE BOARD REPORTS
Prof. Gilmer reported that she has been serving on the OBR's committee to investigate teaching excellence measures and the merits of research versus teaching institutions. She asked that any questions or suggestions, especially concerning the three questions that she put out on E-Mail, be directed to her attention.

9. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE
Prof. Yang moved for adjournment and Prof. Hamilton seconded. The motion was approved.
RESOLUTION 94-1: EXBD Recommendation Regarding Ad Hoc Administrative Review Committee.

The UFA takes note of President Veri's November 11, 1993 return to the UFA "for additional work" of the UFA proposal "RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE" adopted at its June 10, 1993 meeting.

The UFA requests that the Ad Hoc Administrative Review Committee prepare a proposal for the memberships' consideration that incorporates a response to President Veri's expressed reasons for not approving the UFA proposal. The Ad Hoc Committee's proposal should be submitted in time for consideration at the April 1994 UFA meeting.

RESOLUTION 94-2: UFA RESPONSE TO "DISCUSSION DRAFT" OF BOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WORKLOAD STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES.

(Forthcoming via electronic mail.)

RESOLUTION 94-3: FACULTY ADVISING WEEK

The University Faculty Assembly invites faculty to identify each quarter's first week of early registration as a special time for student advising. This can be accomplished by faculty posting on their office doors sign-up sheets dividing their regular office hours into fifteen-minute slots available for advisee appointments.
MEMORANDUM

TO:        John Kelley, President
           Faculty Assembly
FROM:  Edward C. Miner, Chair
        Administrative Review Committee
DATE: May 25, 1993
SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Administrative Review Committee would like to be placed on the Faculty Assembly Agenda for the June meeting. It is the Committee's intent to recommend that the UFA forward to the President of the University our proposal for test piloting by faculty of the evaluation instrument currently being used by the University Administrative Assembly.

The Committee's recommendation is to:

1. pilot the instrument among the college Deans by a small number of faculty. The intent is to clarify and agree upon the criteria to be used for evaluation.
2. share the criteria with faculty in these areas for further input and clarification.
3. pretest the instrument by having a small number of faculty evaluate the Deans. The results will be shared only with the Provost and President, and will not be used for employment decisions during the pilot.
4. refine the instrument; and
5. send the entire evaluation to the faculty assembly for review, revision, and a vote.

cc: Clive Veri

Shawnee State University
Portsmouth, OH 45662
(614) 354-3205

November 24, 1993

Professor John Kelley
President, UFA
Shawnee State University
Portsmouth, OH 45662

Dear Professor Kelley:

I am returning to the University Faculty Assembly its recommendation to implement the report of the Ad Hoc Administrative Review Committee for the following reasons:

A. The ad hoc committee's recommendation falls far short of the charge given to it by the University Faculty Assembly at its February 20, 1992 meeting. Specifically, that charge included the following:
   1. Justify the need for evaluating academic administrators.
   2. Define the purpose of evaluating academic administrators.
   3. Identify which academic administrative positions will be evaluated.
   4. Describe the evaluation process to be followed.
   5. Recommend the form to be used and how it will be validated.
   6. Describe to whom the evaluation will be sent.
   7. Identify who shall summarize the evaluation.
   8. Recommend guidelines on how the results will be treated as a confidential personnel matter.
   9. Recommend how the results of the evaluations are to be used.

   The instrument recommended to be used is inappropriate even for the pilot test that was recommended. The instrument can only be defined as a Management by Objectives model. It is based on an exhaustive evaluation methodology by which both parties must continuously, throughout the evaluation cycle, develop new short- and long-range goals that may be targeted for completion in 1 to 5 years. In its current form, then, the instrument is less than useful for the evaluation of academic administrators by faculty.

To assist the UFA in recalling its previous actions, I attach the UFA minutes and my presentation to the faculty, both dated February 20, 1992.

Sincerely yours,

Clive C. Veri
President

mjr:93410

Attachments

cc: Academic Administrators
The University Faculty Assembly (UFA) of Shawnee State University takes this opportunity to respond to the "Discussion Draft" (1/7/94 revision) of the Report of the Regents' Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload Standards and Guidelines. The UFA acknowledges the difficulty of the Advisory Committee's task and appreciates its extensive efforts to respond to a directive from the Ohio General Assembly to improve undergraduate education in the state's public universities.

The Discussion Draft notes (pp. 6-7) that Ohio's public university faculty already "are working longer hours today than their predecessors did a few decades ago". Although the UFA agrees with this finding, we fear that the Draft's current language may be interpreted as validating the proposition that the Amended Substitute House Bill 152 required each and every university to increase by 10% its undergraduate teaching commitment.

If that was the intent of the General Assembly's action most of the state's public universities could, at least in theory, implement the 10% mandate by redirecting some effort from graduate programs and/or research to undergraduate education. Shawnee State is a baccalaureate institution which has excellence in undergraduate instruction as its primary mission. The faculty already devotes 100% of its classroom effort to undergraduate education. As such, a partial reallocation of faculty effort from graduate programs or research is impossible. [After the General Assembly adopted Am.Sub.H.B. 152 the University (during collective bargaining) cited its passage as further support for its proposal to increase annual faculty teaching loads from 36 quarter hours to 40 quarter hours.]

The UFA believes this was an unfortunate misreading of the legislative intent. Support for the UFA's interpretation may be found in an article in the January 26, 1994 issue of the CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (Denise K. Magner, "Association of University Professors Challenges the Belief That Professors Are Underworked."). The article notes that one of the supporters of the legislation, Senator Gene Watts, insists that the General Assembly did not intend to impose a 10% teaching increase on all institutions. Senator Watts observed that "there are some of our institutions where I think one can argue they teach too much already."

The Discussion Draft also recommends that the percentage of the faculty's workload allocated to teaching should vary according to the type of state institution. We find this an uncontroversial proposition but believe that such a percentage formula leaves a fundamental question unanswered: what is the quantitative definition of the total faculty workload? Absent such an assigned value the percentages can be used to arrive at quite different teaching loads by simply assigning different numerical values to faculty workload. In past years this would have been only a quibble but the decision of the General Assembly to exclude workload from collective bargaining makes this a real concern to many members of the UFA.

Finally, the UFA recommends that the Advisory Committee make more explicit its commitment to faculty involvement in the establishment of university, college and department-level faculty workload policies and guidelines. Such participation is implicit in the Discussion Draft's language (particularly at the departmental level) but we believe that the language could be strengthened.

Summing up, the UFA recommends that the Discussion Draft incorporate:

1.) a judgment that an annual teaching load of 36 quarter hours (12 hours per quarter) is a reasonable interpretation of the Amended Substitute House Bill 152's requirement for baccalaureate institutions.

2.) a more precise definition of total faculty workload.

3.) a clarification of faculty involvement in establishing faculty workload policy and guidelines at the department, college and university levels.

As the Advisory Committee notes, "higher education in Ohio, as well as in the nation, is experiencing a time of transformations of major proportions." The UFA appreciates the efforts of the Advisory Committee to respond to these exogenous forces. The faculty of Shawnee State University looks forward to working with the Committee in its further efforts to strengthen undergraduate education in Ohio's public universities.
RESOLUTION 94-2

The University Faculty Assembly (UFA) of Shawnee State University takes this opportunity to respond to the "Discussion Draft" (1/7/94 revision) of the Report of the Regents' Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload Standards and Guidelines. The UFA acknowledges the difficulty of the Advisory Committee's task and appreciates its extensive efforts to respond to a directive from the Ohio General Assembly to improve undergraduate education in the state's public universities.

The Discussion Draft notes (pp. 6-7) that Ohio's public university faculty already "are working longer hours today than their predecessors did a few decades ago". Although the UFA agrees with this finding, we fear that the Draft's current language may be interpreted as validating the proposition that the Amended Substitute House Bill 152 required each and every university to increase by 10% its undergraduate teaching commitment.

If that was the intent of the General Assembly's action most of the state's public universities could, at least in theory, implement the 10% mandate by redirecting some effort from graduate programs and/or research to undergraduate education. Shawnee State is a baccalaureate institution which has excellence in undergraduate instruction as its primary mission. The faculty already devotes 100% of its classroom effort to undergraduate education. As such, a partial reallocation of faculty effort from graduate programs or research is impossible. Consequently, when Shawnee State University learned of the state mandate it responded in 1993-94 by increasing faculty annual teaching loads from 36 quarter hours to 40 quarter hours, arguing that this was necessitated by the new 10% mandate.

The UFA believes this was an unfortunate misreading of the legislative intent. Support for the UFA's interpretation may be found in an article in the January 26, 1994 issue of the CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (Denise K. Magner, "Association of University Professors Challenges the Belief That Professors Are Underworked."). The article notes that one of the supporters of the legislation, Senator Gene Watts, insists that the General Assembly did not intend to impose a 10% teaching increase on all institutions. Senator Watts observed that "there are some of our institutions where I think one can argue they teach too much already."

The Discussion Draft also recommends that the percentage of the faculty's workload allocated to teaching should vary according to the type of state institution. We find this an uncontroversial proposition but believe that such a percentage formula leaves a fundamental question unanswered: what is the quantitative definition of the total faculty workload? Absent such an assigned value the percentages can be used to arrive at quite different teaching loads by simply assigning different numerical values to faculty workload. In past years this would have been only a quibble but the decision of the General Assembly to exclude workload from collective bargaining makes this a real concern to many members of the UFA.

Finally, the UFA recommends that the Advisory Committee make more explicit its commitment to faculty involvement in the establishment of university, college and department-level faculty workload policies and guidelines. Such participation is implicit in the Discussion Draft's language (particularly at the departmental level) but we believe that the language could be strengthened.

Summing up, the UFA recommends that the Discussion Draft incorporate:

1.) a judgment that an annual teaching load of 36 quarter hours (12 hours per quarter) is a reasonable interpretation of the Amended Substitute House Bill 152's requirement for baccalaureate institutions.

2.) a more precise definition of total faculty workload.

3.) a clarification of faculty involvement in establishing faculty workload policy and guidelines at the department, college and university levels.

As the Advisory Committee notes, "higher education in Ohio, as well as in the nation, is experiencing a time of transformations of major proportions." The UFA appreciates the efforts of the Advisory Committee to respond to these exogenous forces. The faculty of Shawnee State University looks forward to working with the Committee in its further efforts to strengthen undergraduate education in Ohio's public universities.
UNIVERSITY FACULTY ASSEMBLY

MEETING

Thursday, February 3, 1994
4:00 - 5:00 p.m.
ATC 134

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. AGENDA APPROVAL
3. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 28, 1993 MINUTES
4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None
5. NEW BUSINESS:
   A. EXBD Recommendation Regarding Ad Hoc Administrative Review Committee
      (Res. 94-1)
   B. UFA Response to "Discussion Draft" of BOR's Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload
      Standards and Guidelines (Res. 94-2)
   C. Faculty Advising Week (Res. 94-3)
6. ON-GOING BUSINESS
   A. Committee Reports
      1. Committee on Committees
      2. Faculty Affairs Committee
      3. Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Review
   B. Reports from Faculty Representatives on US Committees
      1. Academic Affairs Committee
      2. Affirmative Action Committee
      3. Athletic & Intramural Committee
      4. Facilities Committee
      5. Fiscal Affairs Committee
      6. Personnel Development Committee
      7. Student Affairs Committee
   C. Executive Board Reports
D. Communications/Correspondence

7. ADJOURNMENT
I am returning to the University Faculty Assembly its recommendation to implement the report of the Ad Hoc Administrative Review Committee for the following reasons:

A. The ad hoc committee's recommendation falls far short of the charge given to it by the University Faculty Assembly at its February 20, 1992 meeting. Specifically, that charge included the following:

1. Justify the need for evaluating academic administrators.
2. Define the purpose of evaluating academic administrators.
3. Identify which academic administrative positions will be evaluated.
4. Describe the evaluation process to be followed.
5. Recommend the form to be used and how it will be validated.
6. Describe to whom the evaluation will be sent.
7. Identify who shall summarize the evaluation.
8. Recommend guidelines on how the results will be treated as a confidential personnel matter.
9. Recommend how the results of the evaluations are to be used.

B. The instrument recommended to be used is inappropriate even for the pilot test that was recommended. The instrument can only be defined as a Management by Objectives model. It is based on an exhaustive evaluation methodology by which both parties must continuously, throughout the evaluation cycle, develop new short- and long-range goals that may be targeted for completion in 1 to 5 years. In its current form, then, the instrument is less than useful for the evaluation of academic administrators by faculty.

To assist the UFA in recalling its previous actions, I attach the UFA minutes and my presentation to the faculty, both dated February 20, 1992.
RESOLUTION 94-1: EXBD Recommendation Regarding Ad Hoc Administrative Review Committee.

The UFA takes note of President Veri’s November 11, 1993 return to the UFA "for additional work" of the UFA proposal "RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE" adopted at its June 10, 1993 meeting.

The UFA requests that the Ad Hoc Administrative Review Committee prepare a proposal for the memberships’ consideration that incorporates a response to President Veri’s expressed reasons for not approving the UFA proposal. The Ad Hoc Committee’s proposal should be submitted in time for consideration at the April 1994 UFA meeting.
RESOLUTION 94-2: UFA RESPONSE TO "DISCUSSION DRAFT" OF BOR’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WORKLOAD STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES.

(Forthcoming via electronic mail.)
RESOLUTION 94-3: FACULTY ADVISING WEEK

The University Faculty Assembly invites faculty to identify each quarter's first week of early registration as a special time for student advising. This can be accomplished by faculty posting on their office doors sign-up sheets dividing their regular office hours into fifteen-minute slots available for advisee appointments.