

BOT 2/1/07

On behalf of the Faculty of Ohio State I want to thank Chairman Duncan and the Board for the opportunity to address what we see as major issues facing the university and the faculty, as well as bring you up to date on the activities of the Faculty Council and University Senate.

Before turning to specifics, permit us some general remarks. First and foremost, the top priority of the faculty is to help Ohio State become a world-class research university. The faculty at Ohio State has changed greatly over the last fifteen years, during which time the majority of us have been hired. Most of us produce nationally and internationally recognized research, as well as teach undergraduate and graduate students. Most of us have been trained at the top research universities in the US. We believe that there is no way that Ohio State can become world-class without emulating the practices of these best institutions whether public or private. We are keenly aware that the statistics used to measure the ‘academic quality’ of faculty, departments, colleges, and universities are all flawed, that perception usually lags reality. Nonetheless, we do have a pretty fair sense of where we stand at Ohio State. By and large, we are a good research university, probably even a very good one. OSU today is a better academic institution than it was 10 years ago. We are grateful that especially over the last few years salaries have improved, though we are not yet back to the competitive levels we enjoyed in the 1980s. We are fully cognizant and appreciative that the undergraduate population has steadily improved, most markedly this last year. And yet it is fair to say that while we think OSU has made steady, if incremental progress towards the goal of becoming world-class, we believe that right now OSU is at a crucial inflection point where we will either plateau (and then inevitably decline) or we will break through, what one dean calls the ‘killing zone—where ambitions die;’ to become an ever more self-sustaining world-class research university. The faculty appreciates just how difficult and expensive it is to become and remain a world-class research institution.

Fortunately, we believe the confluence of events that have occurred over the last year, on balance, provide the opportunity to bring about dramatic changes that will accelerate our progress towards our goal. The growing awareness of the centrality of a great university for the economic well-being of the state, following a path where great universities have been the engines of economic development for other states, makes us cautiously optimistic that the new governor and legislature will stop cutting the state's contribution to universities. With luck, perhaps they will even take steps to provide additional resources, especially for needy students who are qualified to matriculate to Ohio State and other universities. The new board structure, we believe, will allow the fifteen of you to better serve the university, to devote more energy to strategic planning for OSU, and to promote greater interaction between the board and the faculty of the university. In this regard we want to express our thanks to Chairman Duncan and his predecessor, Dan Slane, for the new practice of quarterly meetings with Faculty Leadership and the Provost. We look forward to continuing to meet with you. Finally, though we are understandably anxious about losing a President and a Provost who have worked tirelessly and successfully for a better Ohio State, we look forward to new faces and new approaches to advancing the crucial initiatives that have been set in motion by President Holbrook and Provost Snyder. Let us now turn to those initiatives.

In the eyes of the faculty, the two initiatives most crucial to our future are Competitive Compensation and Reform of the Graduate School and Graduate Programs at Ohio State. If I may speak personally for a moment, as some of you may know I joined the senate for the first time 2 and ½ years ago convinced that the most important step Ohio State could take to create a world-class research university was to Focus on the Faculty, fundamentally by increasing the number of faculty to achieve a student to faculty ratio roughly equal to that of our best peers. The size of the faculty has three direct benefits; 1) a low student-to-faculty ratio, resulting in better classroom and research experiences which in turn allow the great universities to attract the best students; 2) large numbers of excellent graduate students; today's senior graduate student is tomorrow's professor and attracting the best is important to the undergraduate experience as well as to the research profile of the university; 3) a synergistic increase in research which in turn

attracts additional outside dollars from private corporations and public agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation or the National Endowment for the Humanities. I still believe that we will have to continue to increase the size of our faculty, especially in key colleges such as engineering. Our Engineering faculty numbers approximately 267. Illinois has well over 400, Michigan well over 300, and Purdue is adding 70 new faculty. If OSU hopes to achieve the goals of the Academic Plan and place ten or twenty Departments in the top ten, additional regular tenure-track faculty will almost certainly be required. A quick glance at Harvard's expansion plans, growing the Faculty of Arts and Sciences by almost 50%, or the strategic goals of the Universities of Texas or Virginia, reveals that the race for talent will be fierce. Let us not be misunderstood: It should go without saying that we will add faculty of the highest quality, not faculty just for the sake of numbers, with due attention given to strategic departments and changing enrollment patterns.

But as ultimately important as increasing the size of the faculty will be, the Provost has persuaded us that the more immediate need is to improve the salaries of the faculty presently at Ohio State. Ohio State finds itself 38<sup>th</sup> among the AAU and at best at the mid-point in comparison to our benchmark peers. We will never become world-class if our salaries remain mediocre. The academic community is keenly aware of where universities stand with respect to salaries. With mediocre salaries we will lose out on the race to hire the best and we will not be able to keep those whom we do hire. Reputational ranking by one's peers, which is a significant part of overall rankings, will not improve until and unless we continue to make progress on salaries. We can set goals, for instance, becoming 30<sup>th</sup> among the AAU, but it will take a commitment on the part of the Deans, Provost, President and Board to make them a reality. Here we believe that the provost has it right: we urge in the strongest possible way that the university administration declare as its principal aim Annual Raises 1% over the benchmark average for at least the next 5 years. Again, let us not be misunderstood. We are not asking for across the board raises, nor are we even recommending that each college achieve the same raise pool. We believe that it is up to the Deans and Chairs to award raises according to merit in research, teaching and service, and up to the Provost to ensure that the overall raises meet the goal

of 1% over benchmark average. On the other hand, we do think that special attention needs to be given to ensuring that high-quality faculty at Ohio State be compensated equitably. The Equity Problem is not unique to Ohio State, but unless it is solved, our strongest programs will continue either to lose faculty or, almost as bad, suffer from deteriorating morale among its best and often most loyal faculty.

The second initiative is the reform of Graduate Education and Graduate Programs at Ohio State. These reforms are absolutely crucial if we are to become a world-class university. At the core of every great university are graduate programs of the highest quality, especially in the Arts and Sciences. Broadly speaking, the issues before us involve emphasizing the research environment for faculty and graduate students. This, we believe, may well pose a challenge for Ohio State, since it will be hard to explain why the undergraduate experience will improve if we emphasize faculty research and graduate education and why the short-term costs to the state will result in long-term returns for all of its citizens. But attracting and educating the best and brightest graduate students cannot help but improve the educational opportunities for all of our students, including our undergraduates. Moreover, the research done by these students will, in the long run, provide jobs and opportunities for all Ohioans. We endorse the view of the reports of Deans Freeman and Beck, and the position of the Provost, that some weak programs will have to be defunded, and that the Doctoral subsidies will have to be redistributed in a manner that enables both our better programs to flourish and the programs most strategic for the future of Ohio State to grow. We will have to find the nuts and bolts everyday resources that, Harvard, or Berkeley or Michigan or now increasingly UCLA and Texas, provide for graduate education and research: competitive multi-year fellowship offers to recruit graduate students to OSU; reduced graduate tuitions upon passage of generals; ensuring that our graduate students teach no more here than they do at the best research institutions; more colloquia, conferences, and visitors, with all their attendant costs in room, board and honoraria; more money for start-up packages in the sciences and engineering; more money for research accounts in the arts, social sciences and humanities; competitive leave policies to pursue one's research. Whether or not the money currently directed towards graduate education is adequate to meet these needs remains to be seen. The faculty looks forward to hearing from Dean Osmer his

preliminary assessment of how much is needed to address the ambitious goals of the university as well as how much money is currently available to meet those same goals. I have a nickel bet with Barbara that the 17 million in annual rate that OAA currently allocates will have to be increased. I hope I will owe her a nickel. But either way, we believe that there is nothing more critical to the future of Ohio State and the State of Ohio than improving the graduate programs at Ohio State.

Let us turn to the third major initiative of OAA, economic access. The faculty at Ohio State believes in our bones that knowledge is power, that the pursuit of it is the key both to flourishing as a human being, and equally the key to the flourishing of the community. We do not believe that Ohio State should be open to every student who wishes to matriculate, realizing, as we do, that only students with high academic potential have the opportunity to flourish here and that failing others, as we have done in the past, is neither good for them or for us. We do believe that no student who is academically qualified to be admitted to Ohio State should be prevented from enrolling due to lack of resources. While the vast majority of us believe that the State government, for prudential if not moral reasons, should provide the monies to these students, we are resigned to the reality that tuition hikes are needed if Ohio State is to achieve its goal of becoming a world-class university. We hope, however, that through a collaborative effort between the administration and the state (and federal) government, we can find a formula that asks those families that can afford to pay to pay a tuition commensurate with the quality of education they receive, and allocates sufficient resources to those who cannot afford to pay to enable them to come to Ohio State. The quid pro quo that we the faculty can promise to all families is that, for every step we take towards achieving our goal of becoming world-class, your child's education will be that much better, their degree will be that much more valuable, and the economic environment of the state will be that much more vibrant so that the jobs for which they will be qualified will be available here in Ohio.

Competitive Compensation, Graduate Education and Economic Access are all priorities. In the light of the budgetary environment at the state and Federal level, we

believe that the next administration will have to focus on just these priorities. At present, we may very well not have the resources to accomplish all three. Currently OAA spends 71 million dollars in annual rate for student financial aid and merit aid. To date, we do not know what percentage of that figure goes towards merit, but preliminary indications are that more than 20 million is in the merit category, a figure much higher than that of our peers. The difference between the average ACT of the entering class, approximately 26 and ½, and the required honors ACT of 29 is too small to justify the burgeoning numbers of freshman honors students and the attendant costs in faculty resources and OAA dollars. The difference between a 27 and a 29 on an ACT is just as likely explained by when you went to bed the night before as it is by anything else. As a parent of 2 Ohio State Students, as someone who has devoted considerable time to the Honors Program at Ohio State, especially the Honors Collegium, and as a regular instructor in our largest Introduction to Philosophy course, L 101, I think it is absurd that 20 to 25 percent of the incoming class is labeled honors. The Faculty calls upon OAA to implement next fall the recommendation of the External Review Committee to begin to shrink the Honors Program at Ohio State to reach its target of no more than 10 percent of the student body. OAA monies currently spent on merit should, steadily over a period of time, be diminished and reallocated to the three priorities we have described. Over the intermediate and long run, offering merit incentives to attend Ohio State will have the same result as Ford's incentives to car buyers to buy a Ford instead of a Honda or Toyota. Ohio State will attract the state's best students only if we are a much better academic institution. While huge outlays in merit money may have been needed as we made the transition to selective admission, we should now emulate the practice of Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Penn State and Texas, whose honors programs are much smaller than ours, whose outlays are much less and whose average ACT is much higher.

We believe that there are other opportunities throughout the university to redirect dollars towards our priorities. Over the course of the last three years Faculty Leadership has requested of OAA, Human Resources and The Office of Finance, figures pertaining to head counts of faculty, staff and administration broken down by college and support unit, and by source of funds, i.e., general or non-general funds, over a fifteen year span. We

have requested raise and salary figures for assistant and associate deans, and vice-presidents, as well as faculty for that same time frame. We have tried to gather comparative data from peer institutions such as Wisconsin, Illinois and Texas. Let me say first that every request of Vice-Presidents Larry Llewellyn, Bill Shkurti and Provost Snyder was met, and almost always in a timely manner. We sincerely thank you. We cannot say enough good things about transparency, and we especially laud the effort, beginning with OAA and hopefully soon all the colleges and support units, to make available their budgets whether on-line or through more traditional media, e.g., hard-copy. Second, let me say that we have a long-way to go in understanding all the numbers, a long way to go in properly coding the different administrative, staff and faculty titles and salaries, a long way to go in, to use the phrase that the Deans and Larry beat me over the head with, scrubbing the numbers, both to put them in the proper context within Ohio State and in comparison to our peers. Let me give one such set of numbers: Between 1990 and 2005 the total dollars spent on Faculty salaries from general and non-general funds, excluding the medical center, grew from 191 million to 302 million, a 57% increase. Staff salary expenses grew from 232 million to 462 million, or almost 100 percent. We have no idea what to make of this number or even if it is a valuable number to have. But it gives us something to start from: Why the disparity? How does OSU compare to other peer institutions? How much of staff growth is attributable to new mandates from the state or federal authorities? How much is the result of conscious choices? How much is due to the fact that we at Ohio State are much better at creating new initiatives than we are at reviewing what we have done and closing down failed initiatives or realigning old configurations of staff to meet new needs? You have heard from my predecessors, as well as various speakers to the presidential search committee, that Ohio State suffers from a stifling bureaucracy. We all, faculty, administration, staff and the Board are going to have to work collaboratively to shrink the bureaucracy where possible, to make transparent how we spend our money; to confront hard choices about our priorities and to face the fact that we do not and will not have the money to do everything we wish. Let us emphatically state that we are not exempting the faculty here. As Bill Shkurti told me when I first joined the Senate, if you ask the faculty what they want, you'll get 17 answers, beginning with free parking and ending with Harvard

salaries. He is correct: you will get a lot of answers. Yet it is also true that in the past all too infrequently have the faculty been asked, whether in departments, colleges or in university settings, whether they would trade, say a secretary or a server, for a graduate fellowship or additional research funds. If we are to wring cost-savings from the 3 billion dollar budget of Ohio State, we will need a collaborative effort. While not every cost-saving idea is a good one, we are convinced that real gains can be achieved if transparency becomes the norm, if all parties affected by decisions are made aware of the consequences of their choices, and if we work collaboratively in achieving our goals.

Finally, let us turn to what has happened in the University Senate over the past 18 months, for we truly think that they are examples of what can be done through collaborative efforts. Working with Bill's office, we reached agreement on a Fiscal Fraud policy in June 2005. Working with Larry's office we created a new policy on consensual relations last year. Working with the Office of Academic Affairs and the Women's' Place we have created a new policy on Flexible Faculty. Likewise, we have created a new leave policy, making our sabbaticals for the first time competitive with our peers. Through the back and forth of challenge and cooperation, we have made substantial progress on Your Plan for Health and improved salaries. Jointly with Bob McGrath and the Office of Research, a special ad hoc on the Social Science Institutional Review Board will report out next month new policies that are liable to be trendsetting for the entire country. After extensive conversations with Vice-President Sanfilippo, Deans Bornstein, Souba and their colleagues in the Health Sciences, the faculty and Deans will soon initiate an ad hoc committee to address the fundamental question of governance rights for Clinical and Research Faculty. The nature of the faculty member in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is changing, and it is our obligation as faculty to confront these changes. Along with OAA, and especially Vice-provost Matt Platz, we have created ad hoc committees to address the use of clinical titles, reconsideration of tenure and promotion decisions to ensure that when recommended by the Provost and the Faculty Hearing Committee they are 'new, fair and impartial, and an ad hoc to study the sticky issue of tenure and promotion policies for faculty with interdisciplinary appointments. This spring we will cooperate with OAA in the review of the Federation of the Arts and Sciences. Lastly, as promised five years ago,

in cooperation with OAA and the Office of Business and Finance we shall soon name an ad hoc committee to qualitatively review the budget process and budget model adopted in 2002. I trust that every one of the individuals mentioned here will agree that these are all the product of compromise and a growing trust between faculty and administration.

You will no doubt notice that we have made no mention of 181. I had hoped to be able to tell you that we will be ready to bring the proposal for 181 hours to this Board for approval next month. However, the proposed template for the Bachelor of Science General Education Requirements differs in at least two significant aspects from the Bachelor of Arts template, and this difference is proving to be controversial. We will continue to work with the provost to persuade our colleagues in the sciences that the general Education requirements are designed to prepare the student to be a well-rounded citizen in an increasingly globalized world, that while the skills are different, the BS degree is no more dependent on skill sets than any other degree, and finally that students freely choose their majors knowing that certain majors have less flexibility than others.

Again, I want to thank the board for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the faculty. The times-they-are a-changing. I am an optimist by nature, so I think change should be viewed as opportunity, not crisis. I think that Ohio State is better than it has ever been. Furthermore, I think that while we face a host of challenges, we are uniquely poised to take advantage of them like never before. Obviously if we are to achieve our priorities, if we are to become a world-class research university accessible to the best undergraduates in Ohio regardless of their socio-economic status, it will take the combined efforts of the Board, the Administration, The Faculty, the Governor and the legislature. It will require a successful development campaign focused on undergraduate scholarships, graduate fellowships and additional faculty and faculty resources. It will take hard decisions on the part of all of us at OSU to generate cost-savings and to redirect funds within the university. And it will take, god-willing, the recognition of the leaders of the state government of Thomas Jefferson's fundamental insight into the nature of our American Democracy, that only a well-educated citizenry can make it work. We are happy to take questions.

