FCBC
MINUTES
April 17, 2019
3:30
Room 156 University Hall

Present: Kay Wolf, Joanne McGoldrick, Stephanie Seveau, Dana REnga, Crichton Ogle, Harold Moellering, Stephanie Schulte, Smita Mathur, Brent Sohngen, Julia White,

Non members: Mark Larmore, Pam Doseck, Kelly Hamilton, and Jeff Lieback

1) 3:30 Minutes and announcements
Potential people to run

Joanne moved to approve. Smita seconded. All in favor.

2) 3:35 IPEDS Discussion – Crichton Ogle

Crichton presented data from his analysis, as provided to the committee.

Concern about the data raised by Joanne and Kay. Discussion ensued. These concerns revolve around how various employees are classified (as instructional or non-instructional; or as managerial versus non-managerial). The way the codes are used to classify jobs changes from year to year, depending on many factors both within and external to the university. And finally, universities may interpret jobs and job classifications differently, thereby coding individuals who do the same job at different places under different codes. This can create some of the differences observed across universities, so there should be some caution used when interpreting this data and using it for analysis.

Smita suggested to acknowledge the error and potentially include error in the analysis.

Brent suggested the following recommendation

OSU should re-allocate resources to increase full time instructional staff per student FTE with a target of being in the upper third of the distribution within 5 years. When achieving this goal, OSU should predominately hire full time tenure-track faculty members. We estimate that achieving this goal will take XXX net new faculty (total FTE = XXXX) and $XX/yr in funding.

Such a recommendation would require using the IPEDS data over time to quantify any changes. As noted above committee members had some reservations about using the data given differences in how universities implement their responses to the IPEDS survey. The group agreed that the recommendation should be made slightly less quantitative and that it should acknowledge the uncertainty in the data. Also it was suggested that to recommend that osu work on getting the data correct and figuring out the differences across institutions.

Smita: Discarding the data is probably not an option. Seems to provide some useful information.

Crichton noted that the data is provided to the federal government as official reporting so institutions should be getting the information they report correct.

3) 4:10 Discussion of faculty salary comparison by HR – Susan Basso

Looking at this after two years, looks like the process for assessing salaries is quite insular, using AAU data, analyzing it and reporting out.

Asking the question: How do we bring and external lens to the faculty compensation process?

Have discussed with Mercer, a university consultant on other faculty salary issues, to do an analysis of faculty compensation issues.

This alternative approach may be useful because we need to develop a philosophy at the university:
Who are our peers?
Who do we compete with?
How is salary and compensation changed at the university?
Need faculty to understand all the components of pay: stipends, overload, etc.
How do we gather market data by rank and discipline?
Etc.

Smita: If university undertakes a study, it should put a pot of money on the table to make sure any recommendations are implemented.

Dana: Would like to clarify that this work would become part of the work that this committee does, e.g. that the work of this consultant would be shared with the committee and discussed within the committee.

4) 4:20 Quality of Health Care Report Discussion – Stephanie Schulte
Presentation of report by Jeff Leibach from Navigant
See powerpoint presentation.
Many questions raised. We will need to make some assessment of the proposed tiered network plan soon as it will be in front of the President again soon.

5:15 Adjourn