

Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Minutes  
Meeting on 15 February 2017

Present: Wolf, Carr, Lisa, Goerler, Sohngen, Saltzman, Renga, Doseck, McGoldrick, Seiber, Swenson, Lemberger.

1. Minutes from the FCBC meeting, January 2017, were accepted unanimously.
2. The report on administrative salaries at OSU, with one small edit, was accepted unanimously. Lemberger will make the edit and submit the report to the OSU Senate office for publication to their website
3. Pam Doseck took the committee through a multi-slide presentation of a proposal outlining recommendations for changes to same-sex domestic partner benefit coverage and health plan subsidy for spouses. One part of the proposal is to phase out over two years benefits to domestic partners not married to the OSU employee. Another part is to reduce the subsidy of health costs of spouses. These recommendations will go to the President's cabinet for consideration, and then if agreed that they should move forward, they will go to the Board of Trustees Talent and Compensation Committee. Notes from the ensuing conversation include:

Now that same-sex couples have the opportunity to marry in Ohio, they will be held to the same restrictions as opposite-sex couples, namely, they should be married in order to qualify for spousal health benefits.

How much do health plan benefits affect people's decision to accept a job at OSU? If there is already a health issue for the employee or his/her spouse, then the health plan may be a major concern. Otherwise, it's unclear. Salary may be more of a factor.

What criteria are relevant to evaluating the proposed changes to spousal health benefits? The changes represent a decrease in benefits to employees, but health costs are rising at such a rate that some benefit must be reduced in order to sustain the program. Reducing spousal benefits is a direction that many large institutions, public and private, are taking. The proposed reductions will still leave OSU providing more spousal benefits than most other large concerns.

Spouses tend to be more expensive than employees in terms of health care because they are more likely to be unable to work because of a health issue.

Providing quality, cost-efficient care to participants is a fiduciary responsibility of HR.

When health costs are held down, saved money can flow back to deans.

4. Retirement plan issues:

HR reported that STRS is willing to send a representative to talk with FCBC, but we decided not to extend an invitation at this time. It was pointed out that reducing expense ratios at STRS is a way to improve retirement benefits and perhaps lead to a reduction in mitigating rate.

It was suggested that if OSU is to be encouraged to take a position on the mitigating rate that is now law, a resolution to that effect should go to Faculty Council rather than starting with FCBC.

5. Identification of issues that we want to discuss with President Drake and Provost McPherson at our meeting with them in March.

The dichotomy between numbers of executives and their compensation and numbers of tenure track faculty and their compensation has been an issue for at least six years. What concrete steps will be taken to address the issue? What are the goals for number of tenure track faculty and average compensation? In this regard, what comparison group (AAU, AAU publics, CIC, etc.) is most meaningful to central administration?

Where can money be found for new faculty and salary increases, given that tuition will be held fixed again this year – Discovery Themes money, sale of energy?

Decreases in health benefits have essentially cancelled the small salary increases over the past several years. What role does this have in planning?

How can the main campus be shielded from a downturn in income at the Medical Center?

6. We need to schedule two more meetings in May. Lemberger will work on this.