

OSU Newark Faculty Assembly Minutes
Tuesday, December 2, 2008
Hopewell 64

In Attendance:

Derek Alwes, Miroslav Asic, Katherine Borland, Jose Cabral, Jill Coleman, Robert Cook, Virginia Cope, Jerry Curtis, Diana Erchick, Harding Ganz, Karen Goodell, Angela Harvey, Theresa Hessler, Julie Hupp, Melissa Jungers, Daniel Leavell, Mitchell Lerner, Bill MacDonald, Kenneth Madsen, Bruce Mainland, Howard Marcum, Renee Patrick, Adrian Rodgers, Paul Sanders, Richard Shiels, Matthew Stenzel, Asumon Turkmen, Dionisio Viscarri, Liz Weiser, Shauna Weyrauch.

Meeting called to order at: 3:35 PM

Presiding: Dan Leavell

Secretary: Adrian Rodgers

Approval of Minutes: Dick Shiels moved to approve the minutes and Derek Alwes seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

Dean-Director Bill MacDonald

Dean-Director MacDonald introduced Susan Scott. Susan Scott shared :

- her enthusiasm regarding her new appointment, and her enthusiasm regarding the facilities provided at the Warner Center.
- the availability of group meeting rooms in the Warner Center.
- that her correct extension is X 513.
- that she is collaborating with the new IT director on an updated www page and seeks faculty input.
- that text can be displayed on large screens in the library, and that faculty who want to share information in this way can send it to her.
- that faculty should take the opportunity to order books for the library.
- that librarians are available to visit class, and that reference librarians are 'on duty'.
- That laptops are available for student check-out.

Dean-Director MacDonald introduced Howard Imhof. Howard Imhof shared:

- He was undertaking an assessment of IT resources and services.
- He has met with each staff member in IT.
- He has worked to meet with many OSU and COTC faculty.
- His enthusiasm in working with the academic issues that are related with IT.
- His passions are high customer service, communications, and academic and business partnerships. These would be at the core of the IT Dept.
- Consideration of the organization will be important to realize these goals. Also, outsourcing of some work such as printer maintenance might be an option to streamline work.
- Prioritizing work with the goal of quality project management will support customer service.

- Consideration of the role of an ‘academic analyst’ with high degrees of technical expertise and an understanding of how this relates to customer needs will be important.
- His thanks for patience from faculty, and his support in building morale of IT staff.

Dean-Director MacDonald emailed faculty this report:

Plan for Maintaining Financial Stability in FY2009

TOPIC: Plan for Maintaining Financial Stability in FY 2009

CONTEXT: As today’s *Columbus Dispatch* reported, Ohio’s budget may have a budget shortfall of over \$7 billion and may have to cut approximately \$640 million from the current budget. Anticipating that economic problems in Ohio would cause the state to cut subsidy for universities, Provost Alutto and Vice President Shkurti strongly encouraged units to hold back 3.5% of the subsidy they expected to receive this fiscal year. For us, that amounted to a little over \$200,000, which we would have used to fund new positions. Unfortunately, even though one can hold out some hope that the state will spare universities as it makes budget cuts, the current economic situation forces us to prepare for a much worse outcome.

SUMMARY: David Brillhart and I have identified funds for items that we believe are the least critical to our mission (i.e., cutting them would not hinder our day-to-day operations). We have prioritized the areas from least mission-critical to most mission-critical as follows:

Area	Funds available (approx.)
1. 3.5% SSI contingency	\$200,000
2. Over-the-cap tuition dollars for financial aid and technology support	\$600,000
a. This money comes from two consecutive 3.9% tuition increases that the state permitted universities and regional campuses to enact only if the institutions used the money for technology support and financial aid. The restrictions no longer apply, and we can reallocate them.	
b. The funds have supported upgrades to classroom technology, direct need-based financial aid. We have put year-end surpluses of these funds into the endowment for scholarships and tuition grants.	
3. Capital-budget contingency	TBD
4. Lecturer contingency	TBD
a. Associate Dean Sanders has increased the precision of budgeting for this area, which might now have a small contingency that we could sacrifice.	
b. The contingency in this area is likely to be less than \$100,000	
5. PBAs and startup funds	TBD
a. We have budgeted very conservatively for these items to ensure that there are enough funds for everyone. This has resulted in a modest annual surplus of funds.	
b. David and I believe that we can shrink the overall budgets for these areas without changing the maximum PBA spending limit or reducing the amount of our typical startup package.	
6. Vacant positions	TBD
a. Searches are underway in history, education, classical studies, political science, and psychology	
b. The positions in classical studies and political science are the least critical to our mission.	
c. If any of these searches are cancelled to adjust for a budget cut, they would remain at the top of the list of positions to be reintroduced to the budget	

CONSIDERATIONS: We are optimistic that we not have to look beyond the first two items in the list of areas most likely to receive cuts. Our plan is in draft form, and David and I welcome your feedback.

REQUEST: Please be exceptionally judicious in spending university funds, and prepare for possible additional cutbacks

Dean-Director MacDonald commented that the Dept. of English search, and a modestly budgeted position in Athletics were inadvertently omitted from the report. He also invited input from faculty.

Liz Weiser asked what the 'SSI' was.

Dean-Director MacDonald explained the SSI was the 'State Shared Instruction', and that a percentage had been held back. He also elaborated on how other funds had been allocated.

Karen Goodell asked about new searches and whether no new searches should be expected.

Dean-Director MacDonald felt that the replacement of faculty lines opened up by retirements should remain safe.

Associate Dean Paul Sanders

- Those working with schedules in Departments will soon be provided with 2009 – 2010 information.
- Spring 2009 will go live in the next few weeks. That will be the last schedule prepared with old software.
- University Chorus performs Friday at 7:30. There will also be a harp performance at 6:00.
- The Afropop Ensembles performs on Saturday at 7:00 in Founders.

Assistant Dean Katey Borland

No report

Francesca Amigo Public Relations

Francesca reported she is working with Ann Donahue on a video project. The goal is to use students in the project. The project is aimed at reaching those we want to attend OSU-N. Faculty are invited to email or call her regarding students who may have compelling stories.

Faculty with other interesting stories are also requested to contact her.

Executive Committee Report, Dan Leavell

Chair Leavell reported committee replacements had been made and they would be emailed to faculty in the upcoming week.

Chair Leavell announced that Cristine Warner would be Vice Chair for the remainder of this year.

University Senator: Nath Rao & Liz Weiser

Nath Rao submitted the following report to the Secretary:

The November meeting of the University Senate was canceled as there were

no substantive items for the agenda.

I was unable to attend the 11/20/08 Faculty Council meeting because the Ohio State Newark Deliberating Committee meeting was scheduled at the same time. Unfortunately this is not the first time such a conflict has occurred. I believe that placing our senators (it will be both of us next year) in this dilemma is counterproductive if we want to ensure that our views and concerns are heard. It is also problematic as last year the Steering Committee instituted a policy of letters to College Deans that list the meetings the senators attended and those they did not attend.

Respectfully submitted
Nath Rao

Liz Weiser reported to the Assembly that the Senate did not meet last month but that discussions continued over email related to calendar conversion. Some of these discussions involved revisiting conversations from 2001 when calendar conversion was considered. As a part of these discussions, faculty at the Mansfield campus will be voting on a resolution next week that has been circulated by Liz Weiser to Newark faculty. The intent of the resolution is to make other faculty members aware of challenges that are unique to a regional campus. There are special challenges posed by 5 credit hour courses and a lot of these kinds of courses are taught on regional campuses. The jist of the resolution is that these issues be considered up front in considering calendar conversion.

Dan Leavell explained that the Mansfield resolution had been shared with Newark faculty with the view to having Newark faculty 'sign on' to the Mansfield resolution. The executive committee had felt it would be best to not address the resolution at this time, and retain the option to sign on later, or to hold a special meeting later to address the resolution.

Dean-Director MacDonald said there were inaccuracies in the Mansfield document, with regard to the reference in the document to the 'one university'. He felt the thrust of the document went to the mission of the regional campus and that this mission was clearly articulated in University rules.

Derek Alwes said this would be a big debate, and that the scholarship required on regional campuses was the same as Columbus.

Mitch Lerner said that the same expectation was true in History.

Dean-Director MacDonald said that this was a violation of university rule, but that this was an argument he would need to make and that he understands the positions of regional faculty.

Jerry Curtis responded that in all of the President's speeches he had claimed there was one campus.

Bruce Mainland noted the Mansfield letter mixes 2 issues: calendar conversion and other relevant issues not related to calendar conversion. Although the number of courses may be important the document misses the central issue

Angela Harvey noted there is no one standard across OSU regarding contact hours.

Karen Goodell noted that the use of contact hours is not always an appropriate measure since many things related to load such as preparation time is not included in contact hours.

Dan Leavell noted the issue of determining load has always been a problem.

Jose Cabral noted there are considerable differences between what is taught on the Newark campus and what is taught on the Columbus campus.

Dan Leavell noted there is much to discuss and proposed a special meeting in January.

Jose Cabral asked if there is an expectation that regional faculty address this.

Dan Leavell noted it was too far out to tell.

Liz Weiser noted it is important to determine exactly what the issues are and to determine what is important for the regional faculty.

Dan Leavell proposed tabling the issue and convening a January session.

Liz Weiser solicited more input from faculty regarding conversion

Dick Shiels noted that his a family member who attended a faculty meeting in 1935 discussed the issue of calendar conversion.

Faculty Senator, Arts and Sciences: Derek Alwes

Derek Alwes announced the new Executive Committee members for A&S:

Arts: Malcolm Cochran (Art); Lesley Ferris (Theatre)

Bio science: Ralph Boerner (EEOB); John Wenzel (Entomology)

Humanities: Kenneth Andrien (History); Judy Wu (Women's Studies)

MAPS: Avner Friedman (Math); Chris Hammel (Physics)

SBS: Barbara Andersen (Psychology); Rick Herrmann (Political Science)

OSU-Newark Faculty Assembly Committee Reports

Academic Affairs: Katey Borland

The committee will meet December 3rd.

Cultural Arts and Events: Derek Alwes

No report. Volunteers to present at the Lunch for the Brain sessions are solicited.

Faculty Representative: Howard Marcum

No report

Faculty Well-Being: Binaya Subedi

No report

Information Technology Services Committee: Matt Stenzel

The committee met today and discussed Howard Imhoff's impression of his time here.

Challenges faced by the IT staff and faculty needs were discussed. Howard Imhoff encouraged faculty to contact him directly if they faced significant problems.

Library Committee: Terri Hessler

It was decided to table the vote on the Library policy. It was noted that Susan Scott has been responsive so far and needs time to understand current practices. Policy will be discussed again in the Winter Quarter.

Ombudsperson: Miroslav Asic

There are 3 cases in process and the surge is likely due to exams.

Professional Standards: Harding Ganz

Harding Ganz read the following report:

Report of the Professional Standards Committee
to the OSUN Faculty Assembly, December 2, 2008
by A. Harding Ganz, Chair

The Professional Standards Committee met Friday, November 21, 2008.

- 1) Mitch Lerner volunteered to be interim Chair to convene the reconstituted Committee in January. Three of the nine members are being replaced.
- 2) Karen Goodell, Chair of the FISAG (Faculty-Initiated Student Assistantship Grants) Subcommittee, reports now that two grants have been awarded for Autumn Quarter. Dean MacDonald had previously allowed raising the grants from up to \$1,500 to \$2,000.
- 3) The Committee would like to have discussion in Faculty Assembly about award criteria, specifically for the Scholarly Accomplishment Award. Following discussion of options resulting from the Chair's discussion with Dean MacDonald on October 29, the Committee recommends the following procedure:

The award subcommittees would actually select the awardees and inform the Dean, though the Dean would be available for consultation if requested. The Committee also feels it appropriate for the Dean to write the congratulatory letters, incorporating wording provided by the subcommittee chairs, and make the announcements at an appropriate occasion.

At issue for the Scholarly Accomplishment Award is the relative weight to be given to evidence from the nominee's department, and whether the Committee recommends awardees to the Dean, offering to consult as appropriate, as opposed to selecting awardees and informing the Dean. According to the Constitution, Appendix G, the Committee "sets standards and rules." Currently, the letter that has been sent to nominees includes:

"A record of your research accomplishments for any consecutive three-year period, not including materials for which you may have previously received this award. Supporting materials may include, but are not limited to, publications, off-prints, reviews, letters of support, publisher's letters of acceptance, and citations of your work."

We could add: "... research evaluations or letters of support from your department."

A different criteria would be to require consideration of evidence from the department chair, and give that evidence substantial weight.

A possible consideration is that tenure-track faculty are very dependent on their department's evaluations, while tenured faculty may be active in a broader scholarly milieu, where evidence from others in their field might be of greater significance.

The Committee hopes that discussion of these and other points will help inform the procedures and guidelines of the Committee.

In response to Harding's report:

Derek Alwes asked what the rationale was for requiring evidence from the Dept. Chair.

Harding Ganz felt it was because the evaluation of the Dept Chair was important, and that the committee members were from different disciplines, so the Chair would be helpful.

Derek Alwes felt that there were differing levels of understanding regarding nominees.

Jerry Curtis and Harding Ganz discussed the nature of the award, and the ability of Newark faculty to judge the materials of nominees.

Katie Borland asked if there was ever a decision where the Dean had selected someone other than the committee.

Harding Ganz shared that the role of the Deans had been discussed.

Dan Leavell noted that the job of the Professional Standards Committee was to decide on the awardee.

Bill MacDonald discussed some changes in the wording of documents guiding the work of the committee regarding the word 'recommends.'

Harding Ganz asked if the committee recommends to the Dean or informs the Dean.

There was discussion regarding money that accompanies the award.

Paul Sanders noted there were issues with consistency such as the difference between teaching and service as opposed to research.

Mitch Lerner suggested a problem was posed regarding what constitutes scholarly accomplishment in different disciplines but that this was not so with teaching and service. Therefore it made more sense to have external input on scholarly achievement.

Liz Weiser asked if that was the goal, would it be helpful to have letters from other scholarly experts?

Jose Cabral pointed out that some Departments are not forthcoming with support materials and external reviewers provide an alternate source.

Bill MacDonald asked how external experts would be selected.

Jerry Curtis suggested external reviewers provided by the nominee would represent peer reviews useful to the committee.

Harding Ganz read the wording of the current guidance.

Mitch Lerner explain that the committee has found it is the onus of the nominated person to persuade the committee. He requested input as to how the committee should proceed.

Harding Ganz requested email input from faculty.

There was additional discussion regarding the authority of the committee to select a nominee and issues related to wording from the previous year. Potential changes to the constitution were discussed. Appendix G to the Constitution was discussed.

Dan Leavell noted that the feedback the committee members sought had been provided. He recommended the issue be tabled and that the committee could return to a future meeting with specific wording to be voted on by Assembly members if the committee wished.

Student Matters: Dave Williams
No report

Other Committee Reports

Campus Access Committee: Adrian Rodgers
Report of the Campus Access Committee
to the OSU-N Faculty Assembly, December 2, 2008
by Adrian Rodgers, Faculty Representative

The committee renewed its monthly meeting schedule this Fall Quarter after a hiatus of several months.

The committee is comprised of Faculty and Staff from both OSU-N and COTC and seeks student representatives.

At the October meeting Connie Zang, Chair, reported:

- A walk-through of the Warner Center to ensure ADA compliance had been completed.
- More left-handed chairs have been ordered.
- An evacuation plan for disabled students is under review.

At the November meeting a draft of a mission statement for the committee was considered. The usefulness of enhancing the Committee's web presence was discussed.

The December meeting is scheduled for 12/12.

Diversity Committee: Christine Warner
No report

Earthworks Center: Dick Shields
An Art exhibit depicting the Earthworks is on display until December 31st.

Old Business

New Business

Announcements

Adrian Rodgers reminded outgoing Committee Chairs to highlight work of the committees for the incoming Chairs, in preparation for annual committee reports submitted in June.

Bill MacDonald noted faculty seeking SRAs could request Department Chairs email him their recommendations.

Motion to adjourn: Derek Alwes moved to adjourn and Dick Shiels seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at: 5:12 PM

**OSU Newark Faculty Semester Conversion Forum
Unapproved
Monday, January 12th, 2009
Hopewell 65**

Meeting called to order at 3:35 pm.

Presiding: Virginia Cope

Secretary: Adrian Rodgers

Motion: The forum agrees to dissolve into a committee of the whole.

Passed: 17 – 0.

It was agreed notes would be made regarding conclusions reached by those attending.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:15 pm.

OSU Newark Faculty Semester Conversion Forum
Unapproved
Tuesday, January 13th, 2009
Hopewell 64

Meeting called to order at 3:35 pm.

Presiding: Virginia Cope; Liz Weiser

Secretary: Adrian Rodgers

Motion: The forum agrees to dissolve into a committee of the whole.

Passed: 12 – 0.

It was agreed notes would be made regarding conclusions reached by those attending.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:40 pm.

OSU Newark Faculty Semester Conversion Forum
Unapproved
Notes made from the discussions held on
Monday, January 12th and Tuesday, January 13th, 2009

An Agenda was circulated:

1. Chism Report – Questions and comments
2. Mansfield letter – Should we sign it?
3. General concerns regarding course load

Faculty discussed the agenda and related items:

Likelihood of conversion to semesters and its implications

Faculty seemed to feel that the issue of whether or not OSU will convert to semesters is beyond the control of Newark faculty.

It is likely that semester conversion will have considerable financial implications, especially for a regional campus. It is unclear how this burden will be addressed and how the impact will be felt by central administration, the regional campus, and the Departments.

Semester conversion will also raise implications for physical facilities, such as labs and classroom space.

The Chism Report

Much of the ground work related to semester conversion issues has been discussed in the Chism Report which was written in 2001. A summary of the Chism Report, as summarized by Virginia Cope, was circulated by her to faculty via email prior to the Forum. Her summary is attached. An important feature to note is that the Chism Report argues against using contact hours as a way to convert load from quarters to semesters.

With regard to the summary of the Chism Report:

- Differences in the politics, the finances, and the OSU Student Information System, between when the Chism Report was written in 2001 and the present were discussed. Additionally, it was acknowledged that there were significant differences in policy regarding what ‘contact hours’ means across Departments and campuses.
- An important point of the Chism Report is that work loads between the quarter and semester systems should remain the same. The Chism Report refers to this as ‘neutrality.’ A neutral model means fundamental indicators such as contact time and course load remain unchanged.
- There was considerable discussion and multiple views regarding what ‘neutrality’ would mean on the Newark Campus. Some faculty felt neutrality might best be considered by looking at contact hours, while others felt it might best be

- considered by looking at course load or credit hours. For example, in Sciences, credit and contact hours are very different. Therefore, it might be beneficial for those faculty to think in terms of contact hours.
- Based on these conversations, the consensus was that language embracing the ratio of two-thirds (in other words, 3 quarter hours would equal 2 semester hours) while also acknowledging the needs of specific departments regarding issues around contact hours would best capture the multiple views expressed by faculty. The consensus was that this language would be used in a draft of a letter that might be signed by Newark faculty.
 - Questions regarding comparisons to other institutions were discussed, and it was noted that the Chism Report offers these comparisons. Faculty also offered a number of their own comparisons that they have investigated between OSU-Columbus and OSU-Newark, between OSU and other universities, and between OSU-Newark and other OSU regional campuses. These comparisons included duration of class meeting time, contact time, course load, expectations regarding student work, limitations regarding research assistants and field technicians, additional burdens on regional campus faculty, and varying physical facilities. Vast disparities were noted.
 - The relationships between disparities of load across campuses, how those loads might change under the semester system, and what that means for P&T were discussed.
 - It was suggested that more women serve on regional campuses and that equitable work load across campuses is essential to the interests of gender equity.

The Mansfield Letter and how Newark faculty might respond

- There was discussion whether OSU-N faculty should sign the Mansfield letter. It was generally felt the Mansfield letter did not fully address the concerns of Newark faculty.
- The principal issues identified in the Mansfield letter were enumerated. Modifications to the Mansfield letter were discussed with the view to providing more specificity to the Mansfield document, and also identifying concerns.
- Alternative wordings were piloted and wordsmithed in the Forum and were distributed by email.
- It was agreed that any letter that might come from Newark faculty would be sent to Brian McEnnis, Regional Campus Representative on the ad hoc committee on semester conversion, and Tim Gerber, Chair of the committee.
- It was decided that, before the letter is put to a formal vote by Newark faculty, it be circulated to other regional campuses for input. After the vote it can then be returned to other regionals who might want to adopt it as well.

General concerns regarding course load

Considerable discussion was devoted to how courses would be delivered using a semester model. The following issues were discussed:

- Most semester institutions do not have 5 hour courses.
- If work currently spread over 3 quarter courses is integrated into 2 semester courses there will be considerable work imposed on faculty in re-writing and re-designing syllabi, especially if there are additional factors in play such as credentialing issues. This work may vary depending on whether the course is a junior division, senior division, or graduate course.
 - If faculty teach more courses valued at fewer semester hours, such as teaching 3 courses simultaneously, then the quality of teaching and research will suffer. There will also be less concentrated research time with potential detrimental effects on research. It was felt that, especially in some fields, it was very challenging to keep up with recent research advances because of significant emerging research. In other fields, student work is expressed in 15 – 20 pp papers.
 - Although the semester system offers the opportunity for faculty and students to engage in deeper and sustained reading, writing and research over time, things such as increased student papers has the effect of increased work load.
 - Three or more courses per semester would represent a load that would make it difficult to attract and retain faculty.

Recognition and Appreciation

Recognition and appreciation was extended to Virginia Cope for her work in hosting the Faculty Forums.

Appendix 1 – Resolution of the OSU-Mansfield Faculty Assembly being referred to as the Mansfield Letter.

Resolution of the OSU-Mansfield Faculty Assembly
Regarding the Proposed Calendar Conversion

We urge acceptance of the following principles in planning any proposed conversion to semesters:

1. The ratio of teaching workloads between regional-campus faculty and Columbus-campus faculty should not increase in a conversion to semesters.

Rationale: Regional-campus faculty members produce high-quality scholarship consistent with the intellectual mission of the university. The ratio in teaching workloads between the Columbus campus and the regional campuses already creates a difficult hurdle for regional-campus faculty in meeting this objective. An increase in the ratio will lead to a greater disjunction between campuses and undermine scholarship. It would also be deleterious to the quality of teaching, and therefore adversely affect students on the regional campuses. To fulfill the aspirations of the One University model, overall workload parity between Columbus-campus and regional-campus faculty should be considered in the current exploration of a conversion to a semester calendar.

2. Regional-campus faculty must be integrally involved in a conversion to semesters.

Rationale: The effect of any proposed shift to semesters on the overall workload of regional-campus faculty is best appreciated by regional-campus faculty, who therefore should have representation at the university level in planning any such conversion.

3. A conversion to semesters should not occur as an unfunded mandate.

Rationale: The report of the 2001 Ad Hoc University Calendar Committee attests that the costs of converting to a semester calendar “would be distributed unequally across the university, concentrated in the regional campuses” (pp. 5-6). Any proposed conversion should include specific plans for budgetary restructuring so that regional campuses can fund any changes in teaching demands or accommodate research leaves (i.e., SRAs and FPLs).

Appendix 2 - The Chism Report Summary by Virginia Cope

Summary of the Ad Hoc University Calendar Committee, 2001 (that is, Chism report on semester conversion)

For a quick hit, read the executive summary plus the “conclusions and recommendations” for the sections, especially the Faculty issues section (pp. 38-46). Or just read this.

The report advocates strongly that the conversion have a “neutral” impact in terms of class sizes, faculty research opportunities, the intellectual content of programs and students’ breadth of experience, and on teaching loads (6). Of course the conversion offers the opportunity to improve on such areas, but the guiding goal was to figure out how to make the conversion “neutral.”

The greatest faculty concern expressed concerned teaching load. After exhaustively reviewing the various ways in which quarter vs. semester teaching loads could be analyzed, the report concludes with a formula:

a neutral conversion would mean reducing by one-third the number of courses taught per year per faculty member. Teaching loads could be adjusted over a three-year period to make any teaching load conversion neutral for this 2/3 courses per year model.(6)

They do admit that although a 2/3 semester conversion would be “neutral” in terms of teaching load it would adversely affect the flexibility and actual time available for research, and the costs for providing leaves (6). SRAs and FPS would be more costly to provide for a semester than a quarter release “without infusion of additional funds” (7). Consequently, they recommend that additional funds be provided to provide faculty research time (34).

They emphasize that to maintain neutrality, using the 2/3 model, class size cannot go up or teaching load will be effectively increased. They said OSU should maintain the same enrollment caps in all but perhaps large lecture classes.

They note that the time faculty will spend making the conversion will be “very significant.” “Whether the administration compensates faculty for this cost varies...but the cost is real nonetheless” (32).

Some departments now offer mostly 5-credit courses; others offer 3- and 4-credit courses. Those relying on 5-credit courses will take the biggest financial hit with conversion. They conclude that conversion costs therefore will be borne unequally by regional classes and departments that now have the 5-credit norm because more instructors will need to be hired. They strongly state that we should not increase faculty teaching loads or class sizes to save money, or the impact will not be “neutral” for students or faculty.

They reiterate several times that in those departments in which 5-credit classes now predominate, there will be great financial pressure to increase faculty teaching load (probably by using a contact hour or credit hour comparison to argue that faculty should teach the same number of classes under semesters as they do under quarters), but they concluded that a 2/3 model would be the equivalent teaching load and “neutral” in impact on faculty and students (6). Increased classes sizes or teaching loads would negatively impact the quality of instruction provided students, so the solution must be to hire more instructors, and factor that cost into the conversion expense.

Although teaching load would look technically the same if compare in terms of contact hours if comparing, say, 5-credit hour courses with 5 3-credit hour courses, “most faculty members define teaching load in terms of number of courses assigned, not contact hours” (34). The report therefore recommends against a contact hour comparison.

Other points:

The report assumes a 15 week, Aug-Dec and Jan-May calendar, with 8-week summers and possibly two 4-week mini-semesters between spring and summer; among semester universities, class time ranges from 70-76 days; with shifting start and end times (11)

85% of universities are on semesters and in most Research 1 institutions (15 of 88), so the conversion will bring us in line with our peers

Assumes that number of credit hours to graduate would be reduced from 191 (as it was then) to 120 semester hours.

They discovered no short- or long-term fiscal benefits to conversion or clear pedagogical benefits.

There are two possible models of conversion: Constant content (teach the same classes but reduce the credit hours); Constant Format (increase the content, keep same credit hours). Few semester systems use a 5-credit model so they recommend a hybrid, dependent upon what credit level the department uses now (pp. 15-19).

With conversion, the pattern tends to be a spike in credit hours as students rush to finish before conversion, then a drop afterwards for 3-4 years. University will lose in state subsidy and tuition initially (first 3-4 years) and must plan for such loss (36).

To achieve neutral impact, central administration should recognize that some departments and campuses will take a bigger financial hit and therefore “differentially allocate the Conversion Fund” – this is, give some groups (such as regionals) more money (37).

Conversion would mean a reduction of courses offered by departments, of some amount they estimate to be less than one-third; this will likely mean fewer specialized courses, but that loss could be offset by “mini-semester” offerings.

Appendix 3 – Draft of a letter by Virginia Cope based on the discussions of the Monday, January 12th Forum circulated by email to faculty.

Resolution of the OSU-Mansfield Faculty Assembly
Regarding the Proposed Calendar Conversion

We urge acceptance of the following principles in planning any proposed conversion to semesters:

- 1. The ratio of teaching workloads between regional-campus faculty and Columbus-of Newark campus faculty should not increase in a conversion to semesters; we endorse the proposed formula of the 2001 Ad Hoc University Calendar Committee, which concluded that reducing the number of classes taught annually by 2/3 in converting from quarters to semesters would produced a “neutral” outcome in terms of workload, while recognizing that some variation might occur between departments.**

Rationale: An increase in teaching workload would be deleterious to the quality of teaching as well as to the scholarship of faculty and therefore adversely affect students and faculty, as well as violating the university mission. [deleted: rationale concerned with ratio between Columbus and regionals]

- 2. Regional-campus faculty must be integrally involved in a conversion to semesters.**

Rationale: The effect of any proposed shift to semesters on the overall workload of regional-campus faculty is best appreciated by regional-campus faculty, who therefore should have representation at the university level in planning any such conversion.

- 3. A conversion to semesters should not occur as an unfunded mandate.**

Rationale: The report of the 2001 Ad Hoc University Calendar Committee attests that the costs of converting to a semester calendar “would be distributed unequally across the university, concentrated in the regional campuses” (pp. 5-6). Any proposed conversion should include specific plans for budgetary restructuring so that regional campuses can fund any changes in teaching demands or accommodate research leaves (i.e., SRAs and FPLs). Specifically, the central administration should recognize that some campuses and departments will face a greater financial loss in the conversion and should be compensated accordingly.

Appendix 4 – Second draft of a letter by Virginia Cope based on the discussions of the Monday, January 12th and Tuesday, January 13th Forums circulated by email to faculty, with minor revisions at the word level.

Resolution of the OSU-Newark Faculty Assembly
Regarding the Proposed Calendar Conversion

We urge acceptance of the following principles in planning any proposed conversion to semesters:

- 1. Because teaching workloads of regional campus faculty should not increase in a conversion to semesters, we endorse the proposed formula of the 2001 Ad Hoc University Calendar Committee, which concluded that reducing the number of classes taught annually by 1/3 in converting from quarters to semesters would produce a ‘neutral’ outcome in terms of workload.**

Rationale: An increase in teaching workload would be deleterious to the quality of teaching as well as to the scholarship of faculty and therefore adversely affect students and faculty, as well as violating the university mission.

- 2. Regional campus faculty must be integrally involved in a conversion to semesters.**

Rationale: The effect of any proposed shift to semesters on the overall workload of regional campus faculty is best appreciated by regional campus faculty, who therefore should have representation at the university level in planning any such conversion.

- 3. A conversion to semesters should not occur as an unfunded mandate.**

Rationale: The report of the 2001 Ad Hoc University Calendar Committee attests that the costs of converting to a semester calendar “would be distributed unequally across the university, concentrated in the regional campuses” (pp. 5-6). Any proposed conversion should include specific plans for budgetary restructuring so that regional campuses can fund any changes in teaching demands or accommodate research leaves (i.e., SRAs and FPLs). Specifically, the central administration should recognize that some campuses and departments will face a greater financial loss in the conversion and should be compensated accordingly.