Tuition aid part of plan for faculty

By Jaimie Schwartz
Lantern staff writer

A change in the tuition benefits for children of faculty and a new faculty tax deduction plan are among the proposals that the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee will submit to the University Senate Saturday.

S. Leslie Blatt, chairman of the committee, outlined the recommendations of his 15-member panel. The proposal will be presented before the Senate, along with a synopsis of the faculty benefits changes over the last five years.

The proposal includes three main provisions: an increase in tuition benefits for children of faculty members, a change in payroll deductions which would give faculty more take-home pay and an increase in disability benefits.

Presently, OSU pays half of the tuition for up to 12 quarters of faculty member’s son or daughter. The committee is requesting that OSU pay all tuition if the student attends OSU, or pay the equivalent of OSU’s tuition at any other school the child attends.

“Our committee looks on this (tuition benefits) as a sort of professional courtesy,” Blatt said. “A lot of other universities will pay full tuition (for children of faculty).”

The change in payroll deductions would result in more take-home pay for faculty at no cost to OSU.

Under the present payroll system for faculty, federal income tax and the State Teachers Retirement System are each deducted from gross pay.

Under the new system, the retirement payment would be deducted before the federal tax, with the federal tax levied against the remaining amount. This insures more take-home pay for the teachers, Blatt said.

The committee is also proposing an increase in disability benefits, Blatt said. Presently, if a faculty member becomes disabled, he receives 40 percent of his pay for up to 27 months. If he is still disabled, but capable of performing another job, the benefits stop.

“If they’re in good enough shape to become a typist, the benefits are cut off,” Blatt said.

Blatt said the committee is recommending that the disability pay be raised to 60 percent, and if the faculty member is not capable of teaching, the benefits be extended until he or she recovers.

Stephen W. Stoffel, assistant vice president of personnel services, said the proposals are already being studied by President Edward H. Jennings’s staff.

Jennings said the proposals are part of a package that includes the benefit recommendations and a request for an 8 percent salary increase which was made in March. He said the package is being considered.

However, Jennings said analysis on the package is not finished. A recommendation will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the June 9 meeting.

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee consists of 12 members who are elected by the University Senate and three more members representing retired faculty, the provost’s office and personnel services.
FCBC calls for 10.2 percent pay raise

By Greg Brown

A report by the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee (FCBC) recommends a 10.2 percent salary increase for faculty beginning July 1.

The recommendation was in a report accepted by the University Senate at its April 4 meeting. The proposal includes a 3 percent increase across the board, 6 percent for merit and 1.2 percent for equity and excellence.

The equity and excellence fund would be distributed to colleges by the provost on a competitive basis. Its purpose is to improve the salaries of continuing faculty who earn less than newly hired faculty; improve affirmative action salary adjustments; be competitive with other universities; reward further outstanding work; upgrade vacant positions; and fund promotions.

FCBC calls on the provost to notify deans and chairpersons about the criteria for receiving equity and excellence fund monies.

Charles Smith, professor of physiology and FCBC chair, presented the report to the senate.

The report acknowledges that salaries have bettered the pace of inflation over the last few years, bringing spending power back in line with the 1976-77 inflation-adjusted base year.

Ohio State ranks third in the Big Ten with an average salary for all faculty positions at $43,610. The University of Michigan is the highest with an average salary of $45,530, and Michigan State University ranks lowest at $37,950.

However, the report notes that compared to the other 172 major doctoral degree granting institutions in the United States, Ohio State ranks below the 80th percentile for the first time in nine years. To get back to the 80th percentile, which this year is $44,260, a 9.5 percent increase is necessary. To return to the percentile where Ohio State was in 1985-86, a 10.2 percent increase is required. And to reach the 1984-85 level, a 12 percent increase is needed.

“To maintain a competitive posture in attracting and recruiting new faculty, and to protect the University from faculty turnover due to ‘raids’ from competing institutions, Ohio State must be competitive in the market for faculty,” according to the report.

The report also recommends a continuation of the workshops for chairpersons and administrators on merit pay, and that administrators notify faculty about the criteria used to determine merit increases.
Officials fear low salaries will harm faculty quality

By Lisa Cayton-Stockdale
Linen staff writer

If OSU professors do not start taking home bigger paychecks, some university officials fear Ohio State may lose its competitive edge.

Charles W. Smith, professor of physiology and chairman of the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee, said Ohio State will be in "grave danger" of losing faculty members and the ability to attract new members if professors' salaries do not become competitive with those at other universities.

"All universities are in competition with each other for the best faculty members," Smith said.

"Salary is obviously an important factor in deciding whether or not to stay with a job or look for a new one."

Smith said Ohio State has not lost many faculty members yet, but if the situation doesn't improve, faculty members will be forced to look elsewhere for work.

Ohio State is usually compared with two other groups — Big Ten universities and Category I institutions, which are 172 colleges and universities that award higher degrees than the bachelor's degree, he said.

The salaries of OSU professors rank about third or fourth among Big Ten universities, but on a larger scale Ohio State has shown a constant and rapid decline, Smith said.

In comparison to Category I institutions, Ohio State has been on a steady decline since the 1985-86 school year.

Last year Ohio State fell below the 80 percentile rating. This means Ohio State is no longer competitive with the top 20 percent of Category I institutions in regard to salaries.

Smith said Ohio State is not remaining competitive with other universities because the state is not providing enough money.

David H. Boyne, associate provost of academic affairs, said eventually Ohio State will have to raise tuition in order to stay competitive with other universities.

Boyne explained the university operates on funds provided by the state and by student fees.

Although Ohio State did not raise tuition last year, there is no way to avoid raising it in the next two or three years, he said.

Last year the Faculty Compensation and Benefit Committee requested a 9 percent increase in faculty salaries but only received a 6.5 percent increase.

This year the committee has requested a 10.2 percent increase, but there is no word yet as to what can be expected, Smith said.

The state legislature has not yet decided on a budget for Ohio State, but Herbert B. Asher, special assistant to President Ed- ward H. Jennings, said he expects a decision to be made by July 1.

Asher said the budget just passed through the House and has started through the Senate.

The Faculty Compensation and Benefit Committee has recommended the proposed 10.2 percent increase be distributed in three ways:

# A three percent increase in every professor's salary.
# A six percent raise distributed according to merit or job evaluation.
# A 1.2 percent of the money set aside for an equity and excellence fund.

The equity and excellence fund is money set aside to make up for any inequalities that might exist in the pay of women and minorities or to support programs of excellence, Boyne said.

Last year about $500,000 was set aside for this fund. The proposed 1.2 percent increase is equal to about $1.2 million.
FCBC calls for changes in benefits

By Gemma McLuckie

A University Senate committee has recommended Ohio State conduct a survey of faculty to determine if pregnancy benefits should be established.

Like most Big 10 schools, Ohio State does not offer pregnancy leave. Mothers or fathers may use accumulated sick leave, vacation time or personal leave without pay.

“We believe that pregnancy is not, by definition, an illness,” said Charles W. Smith, chairman of the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee. He reported on the committee’s recommendations to the University Senate at its June 5 meeting.

The committee also suggested an in-depth survey be conducted to show exactly what benefits faculty want.

In its report, the committee proposed several new benefits be considered. Among them are: Raising the ceiling for major medical payments from the John Hancock insurance company to at least $1 million in order to match coverage provided by the Alternative Health Care Plan, tuition fee waivers for faculty, and offering a benefits package to some visiting professors.

Also, the committee suggested that the early retirement incentive and the faculty buyout be extended and combined. Retirees then could return to the University to teach. Also it proposed eliminating the mandatory retirement age now. By law, the mandatory retirement will end in 1993.

In addition, Smith said the committee would like to know why the University implements some of its recommendations but not others.

“We don’t understand the basis of administrative action or inaction,” said Smith, professor of physiology.

President Jennings agreed that the committee should be notified of the reasons. “Most of the compromises (on medical benefits) are based on finances,” he added.

The difficulty lies in “out of sequence proposals,” which are made in late May after the University has set its yearly budget needs, Jennings said. The fiscal year is from July 1 to June 30, while the academic year is from September to September.

Jennings said the committee’s recommendations do influence the administration’s considerations for the next fiscal year.

In addition, the senate:

- Approved the establishment of masters degrees in public health, Arabic and Hebrew.
- Acknowledged the services performed by James Golden, parliamentarian, and James Leitzel, secretary, who are both retiring from their posts. The senate also thanked Ruth Schweiger, recording secretary.
FCBC calls for raise of 6.8 percent

By Jeff Grabmeier

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee has recommended a 6.8 percent salary increase for Ohio State faculty members this year.

This increase would put faculty salaries in a "stable state" in comparison to other colleges and universities nationwide, said Marcus Sandver, chairperson of FCBC. He presented a report to the University Senate during its monthly meeting April 9.

"Ohio State has placed itself solidly in third place in the Big Ten (in terms of faculty salaries), behind Michigan and Northwestern," Sandver said. The proposed increase would keep the University's ranking of third.

It also would keep Ohio State in the top 20 percent of Academe Category 1 schools, which are the 172 colleges and universities committed to doctoral level education, he said.

FCBC has recommended that of the 6.8 percent increase, 2.5 percent go to across the board raises, 3.5 percent go to merit raises, and 0.8 percent go to equity and excellence increases.

In other business, the University Senate heard a report on the cost containment program from Weldon Ihrig, vice president for finance.

While the 1987 effort was a monetary success, saving $12.5 million in reduced annual operating costs, Ihrig said faculty and staff members had legitimate concerns about how cost containment was run.

"The overall issue with regard to cost containment was one of communication," he said. "I would give ourselves a very low grade, probably in the D range, in our ability to communicate to the faculty and staff about the program."

Many people mistakenly perceived cost containment as a policy of retrenchment, he said. "The program's goals were many, however, including reducing costs and involving faculty and staff in the decision-making process. We have listened to your concerns and are making modifications to the University's continuing efforts to contain costs."

"The program attempted this past year needs to be changed, (but) the basic issue remains — we at Ohio State must continually generate internal resources to offset the slowing growth in external resources," he said.

Continued on page 6.
Continued from page 3.

“Our plans for 1988-89 are to incorporate a multiple approach which consists of budget reallocations, complemented by a truly voluntary faculty and staff incentive awards program,” said Ihrig.

“This incentive program will directly recognize and reward individual as well as group initiatives which result in actual cost savings being realized either within single departments or Universitywide. Work on these efforts is in process and details will be announced at the time President Jennings presents his 1988-89 budget guidelines to the Board of Trustees in early May, after consultation with the Senate Fiscal Committee, deans and vice presidents.”

In other action, the University Senate:

• Abolished the University Calendar Committee.

• Tabled a motion which would establish a new faculty rule regarding administrative holds on students who have failed to pay fees or meet other obligations.
OSU puts squeeze on wages

Recommended 7% pay increase called too high

By Tim Doulin
Dispatch Staff Reporter

Faculty members at The Ohio State University will not receive a 7 percent pay raise being recommended by a committee of the University Senate.

"It's clearly too high," OSU President Edward H. Jennings said yesterday, following a meeting in Columbus of the university's board of trustees.

"The committee has done what it was supposed to do. I don't have any trouble with that," Jennings said. "It is clearly a good analysis of what is needed. But the way the budget is, we simply can't afford it."

INSUFFICIENT funding by the state and increasing health insurance costs will make for a "tight budget at OSU" in the fiscal year beginning July 1, said Welder E. Hrug, vice president of finance.

A proposed budget will be submitted to the trustees next month. The proposal will include salary recommendations.

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee recently completed its annual report with recommendations based on OSU's standing compared with other Big Ten schools, 50 major public and private research universities, and the 172 universities and colleges with a commitment to doctoral programs.

At OSU, the average salary is $60,800 for a professor, $44,000 for an associate professor and $36,800 for an assistant professor.

OSU has the third highest salaries in the Big Ten, behind Michigan and Northwestern. The university ranks in the top 20 percent among universities and colleges with a commitment to doctoral programs.

The recommended 7 percent salary increase would enable the university to maintain its rankings, the report said.

"Nobody is sure how big a pay raise faculty and staff will receive. Faculty and staff may receive a "fixed dollar" salary increase rather than a salary percentage increase," Jennings said. Money would be set aside to award select faculty and staff members based on excellence and equity.
Benefits committee opposes faculty, staff raise proposal

By Rebecca Mugler
Lantern staff writer

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee opposes the recommendation made by Weldon Ihrig for faculty and staff raises because it fears the proposal will not keep Ohio State competitive in drawing in and retaining qualified faculty members.

Nancy Zimpher, head of the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee said, “The committee’s position is less a position against individuals with lower salaries than it is a position of concern for honoring a long-time tradition at Ohio State and other institutions like us.”

The tradition Zimpher refers to is one of rewarding faculty members who have excelled in their fields.

Currently, salary increases are part of a three-step process. The first increase is given to all faculty members, regardless of their performance records.

A second increase, based on merit, is awarded to faculty members who are recommended by the dean of their colleges for their contributions in teaching, research and service.

An additional increase may be given to those faculty members recommended by the dean of their colleges for teaching excellence.

The committee objects to the proposal because it eliminates salary increases based on the merit of the faculty members.

Zimpher said the committee is responsible for making salary recommendations that will allow Ohio State to maintain its competitive edge for attracting and retaining quality faculty members who might otherwise seek appointments at other nationally recognized institutions.

Ihrig said a small pool would be set aside for equity and excellence, but increases based on merit for faculty members would have to be eliminated.

Ihrig said when there is a small amount of funds available for salary increases, by giving everybody the same amount across the board, the university will be able to help everyone.

“While the FCBC supports the continued allocation of funds for new programs and program growth,” Zimpher said, “it also encourages allocation to support the work of faculty and maintaining high morale among the faculty.”

Ihrig said he hopes that because other states are having similar problems with support of higher education, it will help minimize any negative impact on Ohio State’s competitiveness.
FCBC recommends 7 percent faculty raise

By Greg Brown

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee called for a 7 percent increase in salaries as part of its annual report issued to the University Senate April 8.

As recommended, the proposed increase would be allocated as 3 percent across-the-board, 3 percent merit and 1 percent equity, excellence and market.

“We believe it’s very important that it be made clear to faculty from which categories their raises are drawn,” said Nancy Zimpher, associate professor of educational policy and leadership and FCBC chair.

In her presentation to the Senate she said this recommendation would help Ohio State move closer to the “big two” instead of closer to the “little eight.” Ohio State’s salaries are third highest in all categories in the Big Ten, behind Michigan and Northwestern.

The average salary at Ohio State for faculty at all ranks is $48,620. Michigan is first at $51,300 and Indiana is last at $43,120.

At Ohio State the average professor earns $60,800, associate professor $44,000, and assistant professor $36,800.

In other business, the Senate unanimously changed the Guest Speakers Rule. The rule’s language put detailed constraints on students’ rights and responsibilities for the organizational structure of a public meeting, and what guest speakers said at those meetings. But Rule 3335-5-06 has been moribund for years. Saturday, the Senate deleted 90 percent of it, including all references to stipulations and penalties. In full, it now reads:

“It is the policy of the University to foster a spirit of free inquiry and to encourage the timely discussion of a broad range of issues, provided that the views expressed are stated openly and are subject to critical evaluation.

“Within our prevailing standards of decency and honesty, this policy shall be construed to mean that no topic or issue is too controversial for intelligent discussion on the campuses.

“Restraints on free inquiry should be held to that minimum which is consistent with preserving an organized society in which change is accomplished by peaceful, democratic means.

“To this end, registered student organizations, faculty and others entitled to sponsor a meeting involving the use of University facilities may invite guest speakers to the campuses. The sponsors must take reasonable steps necessary to ensure that the meeting is conducted in an orderly manner.”

The next Senate meeting will be held at 9 a.m. May 6 in 113 Dreese Laboratory.
FCBC submits recommendations on benefits

By David Tull

More education on health benefits and access to more information can make University faculty and staff even more efficient "consumers of health care benefits," according to recommendations presented at the University Senate meeting Dec. 2.

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee gave its report containing 28 recommendations about a wide range of benefits. Those covering health care benefits perhaps took top billing because significant numbers of changes in University coverage have been made or studied in the past year.

Along with health care concerns, the report focuses on retirement issues, faculty leave policies, parking, child and elder care, tenure issues, tuition reimbursement policies for both faculty and dependents, and the concept of extending benefits to specific "named partners" other than those related by blood or marriage.

Following discussion, the Senate voted to distribute the report to all faculty. That can probably be done within a month, according to Joanne Stevenson, professor of life span process, who chairs FCBC.

Various portions of the report already have been discussed with appropriate administration officials and other committees, she says. In several cases, officials have initiated further studies of the committee's proposals.

"The purpose of this committee is to represent faculty concerns," Stevenson stresses. "Other committees on campus are appointed to advise the admin-

Continued on page 8.
The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee sees itself as the watchdog for the faculty in saying what needs to be done.

In recent months, changes implemented in health care coverage have included increasing co-payments under the Ohio State University Health Plan; development of the Buckeye Plan, a lower cost health insurance plan; and the initiation of a Flexible Spending Account Program, allowing employees to set aside pre-tax dollars to pay for specific health costs.

Changes have met the immediate crisis caused by rising health costs in the face of limited increases in University budgets, the report says. However, the committee suggests that longer-term solutions rest with "incentives for individuals to monitor and control their own health care expenditures."

"Instead of decreasing expenditures, (these changes) have only shifted the responsibility for paying increased costs to faculty (and staff)," Stevenson says. "Our recommendations are intended to truly cut expenditures."

Several of the recommendations in the committee's report are aimed at this goal. FCBC recommends that the administration carefully investigate capitation schedules as one way to hold the line on costs. Capitation schedules provide a system of negotiating with providers to establish lump sum payments for expected services, such as laboratory tests or radiology, over a year's time.

The committee also "recommends that the Office of Personnel Services undertake an effort to educate faculty and staff on all aspects of the new Health Benefits Policies and Programs with special attention to the use of flexible spending accounts and the possible consequences to the individual of (designating too much or too little for the account)."

The committee further recommends that faculty and staff be supplied with information about prices of typical health services so that they can make decisions about optional tests and services, choose between services, or decide how often to use services.

FCBC also suggests that:
- Faculty who take the early retirement buyout be permitted to teach part-time; and the mandatory retirement (at age 70) policy be abolished in 1990 rather than in 1993, as the law requires.
- Ohio State seek to "provide a more diverse pool of providers" of health care, that the University actively recruit women and minorities to this pool, and that the University continue to carefully monitor quality of medical care both in and out of "network."
- The University embark on programs to encourage faculty to take professional leave.
- Parking policies be altered to give faculty greater mobility in meeting classes.
- Child care and elder care facilities for faculty be studied and improved.
- The provost study tenure provisions, particularly on the issue of "stopping the tenure clock" and assigning credit for previous service when hiring new faculty.
- Faculty be eligible for tuition reimbursement and that policies be developed for "tuition portability and tuition reciprocity" — processes that permit tuition benefits at other institutions.
FCBC calls for raise of 12 percent

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee has recommended a 12 percent increase in faculty salaries for 1990-91. The raise would be necessary to keep Ohio State competitive with its peer universities, the committee contends.

The 12 percent includes 4.6 percent for an across-the-board increase, 7 percent for merit raises and .4 percent for equity, excellence or market adjustments.

The committee made the recommendation in its 14th annual report to the University Senate April 7.

In the report, it compared Ohio State's faculty pay scale to those in the Big Ten, the Association of American Universities, and the American Association of University Professors.

"...Due to low salary increases during the past two years, our relative position is slipping badly," the report notes. According to the committee's figures, Ohio State is third in the Big Ten, but Michigan and Northwestern have increased their lead. The University's salaries are 27th out of the AAU's 50 institutions, and below the 80th percentile for AAUP.

Also, the committee said, the 1989-90 raise of 2.8 percent for all faculty and 4.2 percent for continuing faculty was lower than the 4.6 percent rate of inflation.

"We should note...that for most of the decade of the '80s we did quite well with salary increases that were greater than the rate of inflation. However, the 1989-90 figures remind us how quickly these gains have disappeared," the report continues.

In addition, the committee recommended study of other concerns: the appeals process for salary grievances; whether to extend its representation to lecturers and other non-regular faculty; policies on pay for summer or fourth-quarter teaching for nine-month faculty; and disparity of salaries across departments and colleges.
By Tim Doulis
Dispatch Higher Education Reporter

A 7 percent increase is needed in faculty salaries at The Ohio State University to maintain standing among Big Ten and other research universities, a university committee reports.

But even some members of OSU's Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee, which compiled the report, admitted that might be too much to ask with the university facing a tight budget.

"The feeling is we want to maintain a competitive position as far as salaries, but there are also the realities of the fiscal situation," said Charles E. Corbato, associate provost for academic affairs and a member of the committee.

"With no planned increases for student subsidies from the state next year, it becomes an impossibility to give salary raises and not cut something," Corbato said.

"Some tough decisions have to be made," he said.

"We are all competing for the same people. Salary is not the only thing a faculty member considers, but it is one of the things we think is important." 

Gerald M. Reagan
OSU committee chairman

The report shows the average nine-month salary for professors of all ranks at OSU is about $33,340, the third highest in the Big Ten.

The average salary for professors in the Big Ten is $33,340, excluding the University of Michigan, which is $34,240.

The report notes that OSU's advantage over other Big Ten schools is slipping, making it more difficult to attract and retain top faculty members.

"We don't expect to be at the top in salaries, but we would like to be at a better competitive position," said Gerald M. Reagan, chairman of the committee and professor of educational policy and leadership.

The report makes two salary recommendations. One calls for an average annual salary increase of 4.1 percent, with a "wise and reasonable expectation for faculty salary increases if adequate resources were available."

The other calls for 7 percent increases, which the committee believes would prevent OSU from losing fourth place among Committee on Institutional Cooperation schools.

The report notes that OSU's advantage over other Big Ten schools is slipping, making it more difficult to attract and retain top faculty members.

OSU maintained its ranking in the Big Ten and committee this year, but the report says OSU is closer in "dollars to the other institutions than to the first-place institution."

The report says OSU faculty salaries have increased an average of 5.11 percent a year from 1985 to 1991. That is the second-lowest percentage increase among the 12 CIC institutions.

Since 1987, OSU's salaries have dropped from 21st to 26th among the top 50 research universities. OSU has dipped well below the 80th percentile among the top doctoral-granting institutions, its lowest ranking in the last 11 years.

"We are all competing for the same people," Reagan said. "Salary is not the only thing a faculty member considers, but it is one of the things we think is important."

The report will be presented Saturday to the University Senate. OSU President Gordon Gee will consider the report when making a recommendation on faculty raises to the board of trustees this year.

### Faculty Pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$60,450</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>$58,550</td>
<td>$73,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$57,560</td>
<td>$70,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>$53,240</td>
<td>$66,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$52,800</td>
<td>$64,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>$52,650</td>
<td>$66,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>$51,890</td>
<td>$65,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$51,620</td>
<td>$63,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$51,270</td>
<td>$62,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$49,570</td>
<td>$61,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>$49,750</td>
<td>$60,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$49,040</td>
<td>$62,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee
Faculty seek salary increase

Budget cuts make request seem unlikely

By Erin Watterson
Lantern staff writer

The OSU Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee is asking for a seven percent faculty salary increase in order to maintain Ohio State's fourth place ranking among the Big Ten and other research universities.

Stephen W. Stoffel, associate vice president of personnel services, doubts the committee's recommendation will be approved.

"With the realities of the fiscal situation, it is hard to be optimistic," Stoffel said.

The committee's report shows $53,240 as the average nine-month salary for OSU professors. Included in this figure are full, associate and assistant professors on the main campus with the exception of library, cooperative extension, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and clinical and pre-clinical medicine faculty members.

OSU's salaries have dropped from 21st to 26th in the top 50 research schools since 1987, according to the report. In addition, its salaries have fallen below the 80th percentile among leading doctoral-granting universities, its lowest ranking in 11 years.

Although its average salary places OSU third among Big Ten universities, the report states the dollar figure of this amount is closer to the lowest ranking school than the highest.

Ohio State is losing its ability to attract and retain the best faculty because of the low increases in salaries, according to the report. Since 1985, salaries have increased an average of 6.11 percent a year, which is the second lowest increase among Committee on Institutional Cooperation schools. This committee is comprised of the eleven Big Ten institutions and the University of Chicago.

The committee makes two salary recommendations. One of the suggestions is a 12 percent faculty salary increase. Stoffel said that this would bring Ohio State back to a competitive position.

The second recommendation asks for a seven percent increase, which will keep Ohio State's ranking from slipping any further, Stoffel said. The committee must look at faculty salary and benefits and how they compare with other institutions in order to be competitive, Stoffel said. He also said that committee members must understand funding is limited and an increase in faculty salary would involve a decision to make other cutbacks.

"I don't see that with the budgetary position that is out there that either one of these recommendations will be met," Stoffel said.

William J. Shkurti, acting vice-president of finance, said, "Next year will be a very difficult budget for us in terms of resources."

Gov. George Voinovich has proposed a $13 million cut in state appropriations to Ohio State next year. Currently, OSU's main campus receives about $270 million in student subsidies from the state, Shkurti said.

"State appropriations are our biggest single source of income," Shkurti said.

In addition to the salary recommendations made by the Faculty Compensation Committee, the University Senate's Fiscal Committee will submit a salary report this spring.

"It will all unfold over the next 90 days," Shkurti said.

Fredrick E. Hutchinson, vice president of academic affairs and provost, is in favor of giving priority to salary increases because of the competition with other universities, and said a seven percent increase is a reasonable range to consider.

"I would hate to see us lose ground on that respect," Hutchinson said.

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee compared OSU faculty salaries with those of other schools in the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, the top 50 major research universities, and 172 of the best doctoral institutions in the country.

The report will be presented to the University Senate on Saturday.

See RAISE: Page two
By Gemma McLuckie

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee, in a report submitted to the University Senate April 6, made two alternate suggestions for faculty raises in 1991-92.

One recommendation, a 12 percent increase, would enable the University to regain some lost rank in relationship to salary levels at comparable research institutions, according to the committee.

The second, a 7 percent "maintenance" raise, will continue a decade-long "slow slide" in the University’s ranking based on salaries, reported Bernard Rosen, chair of the FCBC subcommittee on salaries. It only will cover increases in the cost of living, he said.

Rosen, associate professor of philosophy, explained the rationale behind the two recommendations to the senate.

The 12 percent suggestion was "budget-crisis blind," made without regard to the availability of funding, although the committee members "know perfectly well the limit of funds." The second was made with budget constraints in mind.

The salary subcommittee each year gives a report to the senate. FCBC recommendations are considered by the University budget administrators advising the president. The president in turn makes final salary recommendations in June to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Over the last seven years, Rosen reported, the committee has seen "a steady decline" in Ohio State’s rank in comparison to faculty pay scales at institutions in three groups: the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, the Association of American Universities and the American Association of University Professors’ Category I.

The committee calls this "slippage." For instance, it reports Ohio State’s third-place position in the CIC is in jeopardy. Also, the University is below the 50th percentile of AAU institutions and "has fallen further below the 80th percentile of AAUP Category I institutions."

"FCBC is concerned about...the possible effects of that slippage on our ability to attract and retain the outstanding faculty needed to maintain and enhance the excellence of The Ohio State University," the committee wrote in its report.

Another consideration is the effect of inflation. "The 6.1 percent in the CPI (consumer price index) in 1990 was greater than the percentage increase in all faculty salaries for 1990-91," the report notes.

"Taken together, slippage and erosion from inflation are ominous signs," Rosen told the senate.

FCBC also suggested changing distribution categories. Across-the-board increases would be designated "competence increases." Merit pay would fall into the "meritorious" category. And equity, excellence and market increases would be combined under a "provost’s flexibility fund."

Based on these three categories, the committee suggested the 12 percent raise be broken down into a 6.1 percent competence increase, a 5 percent meritorious adjustment, and .9 percent for the provost’s fund.

A 7 percent raise would consist of a 6.1 percent competence increase and a .9 percent increase for the provost’s fund.

Competency, as defined by the committee, is "the usual standard, which actually is rather high, involving, at a minimum, research every year, teaching that meets high standards, and University service," Rosen said.

The committee felt faculty who are judged incompetent by their deans and peers should not receive competency raises, he added.

FCBC also recommended that:

- Salary increases for lecturers or non-regular faculty be tied to increases for graduate teaching associates. These faculty often are paid very low wages and do not receive health benefits, Rosen noted.
- The University clarify its policy for paying salary during summer or off-duty quarters.
- The University remind faculty of channels of appeal regarding salaries open to them. Appeals must be made to chairpersons, then deans, the provost and finally the president.

After two years of preparation, the senate voted to form a Research Committee that will help formulate and implement University policy.

The 26-member group will report to both the University Senate and the Council on Research and Graduate Studies. The council agreed to reorganize its research committee to include this dual role.

The research committee’s duties include:

- Reviewing policy, recommending change and reviewing proposed changes in practices and policies. Included are federal policies and University policies for grants, contracts administration and academic research centers.
- Advising the vice president for research.
- Making recommendations to the Council on Research and Graduate Studies about establishing, affiliating with or abolishing academic centers.

The next senate meeting will be held May 4 at 9 a.m. in 113 Dreese Laboratory.
Benefits for faculty ranks well in Big 10

By Lulu Danan
Lantern staff writer

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee found that Ohio State's benefits program ranks well compared to those of other Big 10 universities, according to a report released by the University Senate Wednesday.

The report provides faculty with information about the status of the benefits program, said Michael L. Smith, chair of the benefits subcommittee.

"Ours is clearly not the worst," said Smith, a professor of finance. "I feel it is better than average."

Eight of 26 faculty benefit proposals were approved by the Office of Human Resources.

See REPORT / Page two

according to the report.

Seven other proposals are under consideration, six are being studied by university committees and offices, and five were not accepted.

The five proposals that were not accepted include: elimination of the cost to faculty for saving space in the child care program during professional leave, reciprocal tuition reduction agreements with other Ohio universities for faculty dependents, and recommendation that the university analyze the prospects of a "spousal equivalency" program which would provide benefits to dependents who cannot be defined as a legal spouse.

The university rejected the five proposals based on budget constraints and low cost-effectiveness.

"This is a difficult year. We did not make any recommendations for expensive proposals," Smith said. "It would not be responsible in a year with budget constraints."

However, the committee submitted new and previous requests it thought should be repeated or clarified.

Among those were the issues of mandatory retirement, spousal equivalency, and early retirement incentives.

"These are the areas we felt were especially deserving," Smith said.

The committee strongly recommended that the university policy mandating retirement at age 70 be repealed prior to 1993 when it will be eliminated by federal law, according to the report.

"There are a number of individuals that could provide useful service after age 70," Smith said.

In reiterating the spousal equivalency recommendation this year, the committee affirms its support, said Susan L. Josephs, professor in Labor Education and Research Service and spousal equivalency task force member.
OSU Senate rejects ‘spousal equivalency’

By Lulu Danan
Lantern staff writer

Ohio State rejected a request to look at the cost of implementing a “spousal equivalency” program, which would extend benefits to partners of faculty members who cannot be legally considered a spouse, a Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee report of the University Senate released Wednesday stated.

As an addition to the university’s present benefits program, a spousal equivalency program would include gay and lesbian faculty members living with partners as well as heterosexual couples living in common-law marriages.

Budget constraints did not allow the adoption of such a program in light of the tentative nature of cost estimates, according to the report.

“I don’t see budget constraints as a legitimate issue,” said Eunice Hornsby, member of the steering committee for the Association for Gay Lesbian Bisexual Faculty and Staff. “We’re talking about equity of benefits for all faculty and staff."

“This issue affects everybody. It’s not just an issue for gay, lesbian and bisexual folks. This is an issue for people in long-term relationships anywhere,” Hornsby said. “It’s an equity issue that cuts across all levels of staff.”

Jerry Bunge, chairman of the Ohio ACLU Gay Lesbian Rights Project and board member of the Ohio and Columbus American Civil Liberties unions, said this is an issue that is becoming heavily debated.

“It’s an issue of fairness throughout society,” Bunge said.

“I can’t deny that it (the program) would add cost,” said Bunge. “But you have to consider public policy and who we are trying to protect.”

This program would give benefits to an unmarried couple who live together, are financially interdependent and are raising a family together, Bunge said.

Some people simply choose not to get married or can’t get married, Bunge said.

No state recognizes gay and lesbian marriages, he added.

Robert Lee Eblin, author of “Domestic Partnership Recognition in the Workplace,” an article in a 1990 issue of the Ohio State Law Journal, said nothing legally prevents the university from implementing such a program.

“The university can structure its benefits the way it wants,” said Eblin, managing editor for the law journal. “Just because you’re married, you effectively get more money. It’s an artificial thing,” Eblin said. “The employer has no basis deciding what relationship has more value than another.”

Although cities such as San Francisco and other employers have adopted benefits for named partners, Eblin said no university wants to be the first to adopt such a program.

“The university is an employer,” Eblin said. “What’s frustrating is universities are logical places with freedom of expression. Yet they throw out issues that are not ‘good’ issues.”

In a spousal equivalency program, the benefits can be “reshuffled,” Eblin said. “That may mean married people would have to give up something.”

To prevent the fraudulent naming of a partner, Eblin said a spousal equivalency program could require partners to fill out affidavits and could include penalties for falsifying documents.

THE OHIO STATE LANTERN, Thursday, July 11, 1991
The story that ran Thursday, July 11, incorrectly stated that Ohio State rejected a request to look at the cost of implementing a "spousal equivalency" program. It should have stated that the University Senate looked into the status of "spousal equivalency" but believes "the time is inappropriate for proposing new additions to the OSU benefits program if they involve substantial new costs," according to a report released by the University Senate.

The Office of Human Resources was reconsidering an August 1990 report of the OSU Spousal Equivalency Task Force. On Thursday, an article will run about this report.
FCBC recommends 2.1 percent for across-the-board and for merit raises
by Gemma McCluckie

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee is recommending salary increases of 2.1 percent across the board, and .5 percent for promotions and equity, excellence and market adjustments.

"The recommended distribution recognizes the importance of rewarding individuals on the basis of relative merit along with the fact that the vast majority of faculty do their jobs well and therefore should not lose purchasing power due to the inflationary pressures on the economy," a report by the FCBC explains.

FCBC also recommends forming an ad hoc faculty committee to propose guid-

elines for the salary recommendation process for lectures and non-regular faculty members. Also, FCBC requests an examination of the policies and procedures for paying faculty who have nine-month appointments but teach in summer or their off-duty quarter.

FCBC chairperson Robert G. Lundquist will present the committee's report to the University Senate April 4. The meeting begins at 9 a.m. in 103 Kottman Hall.

The recommendations "balance our desire to match ahead with the difficult economic conditions in the country, the state of Ohio and the University," the FCBC report says. "We understand that the increases may not be obtainable targets in such situations. On the other hand, FCBC is also convinced that a continuing loss of real purchasing power over the last years is already creating a morale problem among OSU faculty."

Salary levels have an impact on attracting and retaining faculty, the committee adds. "An adequate compensation and benefit package is the main factor that convinces new faculty to join otherwise comparable institutions and motivates our flight senior people to move from one institution to another."

"FCBC's annual recommendations are considered by University officials as they formulate budgets."

Fiscal officers have indicated that the University may not be able to give any raises to faculty or administrative and professional staff for 1992-93 because of the massive cuts in state funding since February 1991.

In its report, FCBC says Ohio State's faculty salaries have slipped in comparison to peer institutions in the top 50 institutions of the American Association of Universities, the 172 Category 1 institutions in the American Association of University Professors, and the 12 members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. The CIC comprises the Big Ten, including Penn State, and the University of Chicago.

For instance, between 1983-84 and 1987-88, Ohio State's average salary for all ranks "was generally higher than the 80th percentile of (AAUP) Category I," the report says. Since 1988-89, the faculty's average salary "has fallen progressively further behind the 80th percentile."

"Even in 1991-92, when financial stress across the country caused faculty salary increases at many universities to be reduced from recent years, OSU's salary levels fell even further behind the 80th percentile (AAUP Category I) institutions," the committee says.

Also, the committee reports, the salaries for associate professors were ranked first or second in the CIC until 1987-88. Now they are ranked fourth behind the University of Chicago, Northwestern and Michigan.

"An important observation is that although OSU is in the fourth place in the CIC, in terms of actual 'dollar differences' we are more like the bottom eight universities than like the top three in each professional category and in rank-adjusted overall average," the committee reports.

The average salary in 1991-92 for nine- and 12-month appointments, converted to a nine-month base and not including clinical and pre-clinical medicine, are: $68,448 for professors, $49,026 for associate professors; $41,341 for assistant professors; and $29,681 for instructors. The average nine-month base salary for all ranks is $55,382.

Rises the last three years have not kept pace with inflation, the committee says. The Consumer Price Index was 6.1 percent in 1990, while the overall increase for faculty in 1991-92 was 3.28 percent, it reports.

President Gee will present budget guidelines to the Board of Trustees on May 1, and final recommendations — including those concerning faculty and staff raises — on June 5.
OSU faculty members may not receive pay raises

By Tim Doulin
Dispatch Higher Education Reporter

Facing the prospect of further budget cuts, The Ohio State University may have to forgo salary increases for faculty members this year, university officials said.

The university's Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee is recommending an average 4.2 percent raise for faculty members. But the head of the committee acknowledged that the university may not be able to afford any faculty raises.

"No pay raises is definitely a possibility," said committee chairman Robert G. Lundquist, associate professor of industrial and systems engineering.

"I think we all realize the budget is in bad shape. I think it would be unfortunate if we got zero raises. But I would be the first to recognize why it would happen."

OSU has had about $30 million in state support trimmed from its budget in the last 14 months. With the state budget still ailing, public universities and colleges are bracing for more cuts this summer, possibly as much as 20 percent.

OSU President Gordon Gee said it is too early to say if faculty members will go without pay raises this year.

"I think before we make a determination on faculty salaries, we have to have a much clearer picture of the budget," Gee said.

"The highest priority is remaining supportive of the faculty, but we have to be realistic. We are in the middle of a major battle, and we have to stall any kind of commitments we are making to anything until we find out where we are on the budget."

Last year, several state-supported universities did not give pay raises to employees, citing budget constraints. The University of Cincinnati recently announced that vice presidents and deans will not receive pay raises this year.

The OSU committee, made up of faculty members, provides data on OSU faculty salaries and compares them with those at other Big 10 and major research universities. Gee will make a final recommendation to the OSU Board of Trustees.

OSU faculty salaries continue to rank fourth among other Big 10 schools and the University of Chicago. The committee reported, however, that OSU salaries are slipping, having failed to keep pace with the rate of inflation the last three years.

Salaries average $54,960 for a full-time OSU faculty member on a nine-month contract, the report said. Faculty salaries vary greatly among departments. In the finance department, salaries range from $37,440 to $137,040. Salaries for faculty in the Spanish and Portuguese department range from $31,080 to $88,630.

"The committee is highly concerned about these adverse trends in faculty salaries and the possible effects of the salary slippage on our ability to retain and recruit the best and brightest faculty members in our quest for enhanced excellence," the report says.

The recommendation calls for a 2.1 percent across-the-board pay raise. Additional money would be available for merit, promotion, equity and market adjustments. That would provide average raises of 4.2 percent.

The recommended pay raise is designed to keep OSU competitive with similar institutions and not giving raises would hurt faculty morale and the quality of the university, said Prem K. Goel, a committee member.
Faculty benefits compare well with Big Ten

By Gemma McLuckie

As far as faculty benefits go, the picture is good at Ohio State, a University Senate committee reported June 6.

"There’s good news," Robert G. Lundquist, chairperson of the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee, said at the Senate meeting in Kottman Hall. "Ohio State’s benefits program generally compares quite favorably with the Big Ten."

The committee compared University premium costs to those at Big Ten schools for "what appear to be roughly similar plans" for health care, group life insurance, dental and vision coverage, disability programs, retirement programs, early retirement incentives, and tuition remission for faculty. It also examined the rate of premium increase, and compared out-of-pocket limitations and other measures.

The picture is good but not perfect. The committee made several recommendations to the University administration, which each year considers two FCBC reports while making decisions concerning compensation and benefits for faculty.

High priorities, Lundquist said, are dependent care issues. The committee asked the Office of Human Resources and Relations should clarify policies about using paid or unpaid leave to care for elderly or disabled relatives, continue and expand an educational series on caring for dependents and elderly, and issue an annual report on the status of services.

The committee also suggested the Office of Academic Affairs coordinate the interests of emeriti faculty with University programs and needs. In addition, it recommends continuing retirement incentive programs.

Other recommendations call for the University to continue to pay attention to cost containment for health care programs, expand the employee tuition waiver program to include faculty, enable faculty over 40 to have annual eye examinations, and make tuition remission "portable" so dependent children of faculty can get a tuition break if they attend selected Ohio universities.

In other matters, the Senate passed a resolution "affirming in the strongest possible terms" that the University take "extreme care to insure confidentiality, to the extent permitted by law, and to protect the rights" of faculty who are under University investigation for scholarly misconduct.

Careers can be ruined even if allegations of misconduct are dismissed, pointed out Joseph Verducci, chair of the Research Committee. Also, people may not make even rightful allegations if they fear their charges will be made public, he said.

The Research Committee in its report proposed that guidelines for misconduct be rewritten to include sanctions. The 1989 Council of Graduate and Research Studies guidelines do not provide for disciplinary action if a faculty member is found to have violated scholarly ethics or procedures, Verducci said.

The Senate also approved changing the Department of German to the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures, and the Department of Physical Medicine to the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation; approved changes in the Code of Student Conduct; passed a resolution to oppose a bill passed by the Ohio Senate that requires universities to provide student placement services even to companies or governmental agencies that discriminate against certain groups of people; and heard a report on the Office of Human Resources and Relations from Linda Tom, vice president of human resources and relations.

Senators also said farewell to Nancy M. Rudd, secretary of the Senate for six years. Rudd has resigned to accept an appointment as associate provost. The Steering Committee will accept nominations from regular faculty for the position of secretary until June 19. For more information, call chairperson Larry B. Anderson, associate professor of chemistry, 292-3500.

The next Senate meeting will be held at 9 a.m. Oct. 3 in 103 Kottman Hall.
FCBC suggests benefits programs

Faculty sense lack of respect, less help in getting job done

By Gemma McClure

The quality of life for faculty, both active and retired, "is diminishing," the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee warned University Senate in its annual report on benefits. The report was submitted at the June 5 Senate meeting.

One problem, the Benefits Subcommittee indicated, is that faculty feel the concept of "academic support" is dying, and lack of respect from administrative and service units is increasing.

FCBC thinks it is important for every administrative unit to focus on the function of the University administrative network — assuring the faculty in the pursuit of fulfilling the mission of the University," it noted.

"FCBC does not suggest that all units have lost their focus on courteous service, only that FCBC perceives that a problem with service to faculty exists, is increasing and needs to be addressed."

In addition, faculty feel they are caught in the dilemma of increased pressure for professors and scholarship at the same time "the level of support for research has decreased." For example, budget cuts mean there are fewer graduate assistants and technical and research staff. Also, travel funds have been reduced "so significantly in many instances that they will not cover the expenses for attendance at even one professional conference annually."

While not a panacea for these difficulties, implementing some low-cost benefit programs would profit the University in good will, Vincent Verduin, chairperson of the Benefits Subcommittee and assistant professor of law, told the Senate.

"Some things are doable," he said. "They cost almost nothing but would boost faculty morale."

Among the low- or no-cost recommendations are:

- Short-term faculty-only parking close to buildings, and a faculty parking decal. Now both faculty and administrative and professional staff have "A" stickers.
- A comprehensive review to see how costs for services or benefits impact faculty. For instance, decisions are made independently when the Athletic Department sets ticket prices, the Office of Human Resources decides health care premiums and the Division of Traffic and Parking sets charges for "A" decals, Verduin explained. A review would give the University a better picture, "particularly since salaries have not increased, but costs of services have gone up."
- Offering group insurance for short-term and partial disability, with faculty paying the total premium. The University does offer insurance to cover total disability.
- Tuition waivers, on a space-available basis, for faculty who want to take classes at a campus to expand their knowledge. Staff already can enroll in courses; however, they first must be accepted into a degree program.

Other recommendations include:

- Reevaluating the life insurance program. Now, the amount of coverage drops when a University employee reaches 55, and ends completely when a person reaches 70. FCBC suggests increasing coverage past age 55 because many people are living longer; some are having children later in life and must have assurance to cover their family's needs if the faculty member dies; and faculty no longer are required to retire at age 70.
- Extending benefits to domestic partners. Preliminary estimates are that the cost would be $400,000 to $1.6 million for medical insurance benefits, FCBC noted. "The costs are not substantial when equity issues are considered," Verduin said.
- Supporting retirement incentives, "which will help to maintain faculty strengths and ensure continuing support for ongoing programs," the subcommittee noted in its report.

University officials, such as Office of Human Resources staff, consider the recommendations in the annual benefits report when making decisions about personnel policies.

The Senate also heard reports from the Fiscal, Legislative Affairs, Steering and Rules committees.

In business, senators approved changing the names of two departments in the College of Nursing. The changes rename the Department of Life Span Processes to the Department of Adult and Illiness Nursing, and the Department of Family and Community Nursing to the Department of Community, Parent, Child and Psychiatric Nursing.

The reorganization will group together disciplines that had been scattered, such as the obstetric and pediatric programs, explained Carole A. Anderson, dean of the College of Nursing. The proposal for the name changes now goes to the Board of Trustees for final approval. A new sexual harassment policy for students was tabled for the second time.
FCBC proposes 15% over 3 years
Plan seeks to bring OSU back to top 25

By Gemma McClure

The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee has drawn a bleak picture of how Ohio State faculty pay scales have continued to slip in comparison with peer institutions. Also, for the first time FCBC has compared salaries within the University. It found that differences are widening between some disciplines and between high- and low-paid faculty.

In order to bring the University back up to the top 25 in national rank, faculty salaries should be increased the equivalent of 4.97 percent annually for the next three years, FCBC recommended in its 18th annual salary subcommittee report. The report was presented to the University Senate April 9.

In order to better achieve equity, the committee suggested that 1994-95 raises be divided into two parts.

- A flat $1,500 across-the-

board increase ($500 to offset unanticipated rises in health care costs and $1,000 to offset salary differentials between low- and high-paid faculty)

- The equivalent of a 2.28 percent increase in the overall average salary, to be distributed on the basis of merit.

University fiscal officers and senior administrators take FCBC's annual recommendations under advisement when determining increases. William Shkurti, vice president for finance, told Senate that a pay package, recommendations for tuition increases, and targets for further reallocation of budgets are scheduled to be presented to the Board of Trustees at its May 6 meeting.

Marcus H. Sanders, FCBC chair, acknowledged the financial difficulties that higher education in Ohio, and the University in particular, have faced. Because of $80 million in reductions in state funding, smaller than anticipated revenues from tuition, and the need to meet long-term commitments, Ohio State gave no raises to most faculty and staff for 1992-93, and small increases for this fiscal year.

See FCBC, page 8

Sander, professor of management and human resources, noted that Ohio State is in the second year of its funding initiative, and administrators do not expect new funds to be available. The proposed three-year plan would allow budgetary flexibility, he said.

"Our national ranking has declined in the last 10 years in such a way that Ohio State compares unfavorably," William A.T. Clark, chair of the FCBC salary subcommittee, told senators. Clark is professor of materials science and engineering.

FCBC argued that raises totaling about 15 percent over three years are necessary to keep the University competitive in hiring and retaining faculty.

The committee also said the increases are needed to meet the goals outlined in the University's new functional mission statement, which calls for Ohio State to be "ranked in the top 10 of the Big Ten universities and among the top 20 public research universities" by 2000.

"The data clearly show that (the purchasing power of) overall faculty salaries are below 1976 levels," the report reads. "Columbus is one of the more expensive places to live in the Big Ten," Clark reminded the Senate.

A comparison of overall average salaries for members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation shows an alarming and continuing decline in the University's position," FCBC noted. The CIC is composed of the Big Ten institutions and the University of Chicago. Ohio State's average faculty salary of $55,800 is ranked seventh overall, but the situation worsens by faculty rank. The average salary for Ohio State professors is 15th; for associate professors, ninth; and for assistant professors, 10th.

Between 1983-84 and 1988-89, the average Ohio State faculty salary was above the average for the Association of American Universities, which includes most of the Ivy League, Big Ten, Pac 10 and Big Eight schools. Now the University average pay has dropped 9.2 percent below the AAU average. In 1983-84, Ohio State's overall average salary ranked 14th among the 54 AAU members. In 1993-94, the ranking sank to 37th. Average pay for full professors ranked 26th, and 46th for associate and assistant professors.

Within the University's own pay ranges, when small percentage raises are given, "people at the high end of the salary spectrum do considerably better than those at the low end," Clark said. High salaries in some disciplines skew averages, so the difference between the mean (or middle) and mean salaries at the professor level is almost $3,000 per year, or 3 percent, FCBC reported.

In addition there are widespread disparities between salaries paid to the same ranks in different colleges, FCBC continued. In data adjusted to compare the equivalent of nine-month appointments for assistant, associate and full professors, the University Libraries, regional campuses and College of the Arts faculties have the lowest median salaries. The College of Law consistently has the highest median salaries at all three professorial levels.

"No doubt the market value of the various disciplines has impacted the salary levels for the various units. However, such dramatic differences as the data show send signals to faculty in units receiving the low salaries that what they are doing is of little significance," the committee wrote.

During discussion after the FCBC presentation, a faculty member from the Department of English asked if the committee had studied "the curious way salaries are distributed" within departments. He said that "after seven years and two books I am making (only) $1,000 more than (junior) faculty who are coming in." Ed Ray, senior vice president, told the Senate that the Office of Academic Affairs has been considering the distribution of salaries. He added, "There already have been a number of cases where deans and department chairs have brought (the Office of Academic Affairs) proposals in specific cases."

FCBC had debated recommending minimum salaries, but in the end did not feel that it wanted to specify pay scales.

Sander said.
PrimeCare successful in first year, FCBC reports

By Gemma McLuckie

Providing financial incentives such as lower monthly premiums to encourage employees to sign up for PrimeCare has saved money, so the University has had more funds for salaries, the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee told the University Senate in a June 3 report.

It cost Ohio State $232 per month for employees enrolled in PrimeCare from July 1994-January 1995, compared to $328 per month per employee enrolled in the OSU Health Plan. Persons enrolled in PrimeCare are required to use University providers and facilities.

Sally Rudmann, chair of FCBC, gave the report, which had been prepared by a subcommittee led by Vinceene Verdun, associate professor of law.

Even though OSUHP and the Traditional Plan cost Ohio State more than PrimeCare, FCBC felt it important that the University continue to maintain more than one plan. Employees then can make choices based on their financial situations and their personal circumstances, Rudmann said.

Employees do pay higher premiums for plans that are more expensive, so the lower cost plans do not subsidize the higher costs plans, the report noted.

Respondents to a winter quarter survey of PrimeCare users showed they "perceived PrimeCare as very successful" in its first year of full implementation, Rudmann said.

Respondents did express concern about whether OSU physicians had offices everywhere patients needed them. Because some communities may have fewer doctors available for the number of potential patients, FCBC suggested that the Office of Human Resources study the geographical distribution of physicians and patients.

However, more than 90 percent of respondents from both the PrimeCare and OSUHP groups said they were able to get needed medical care.

The survey did find that OSUHP users found it more difficult to get access to specialists and had more difficulty getting referrals from their primary physicians. In its report, FCBC suggested that since OSUHP users can call specialists directly, they may be dissatisfied because they do not know what kind of specialist to consult, may have to wait for appointments, or have additional costs when they go out of network if a network doctor is not available.

The amount of time patients and their children waited to see physicians was judged slightly better by PrimeCare respondents.

Two FCBC recommendations concerned beefing up dental benefits and offering them to new faculty and those who retire.

The committee recommended that newly hired employees receive full first-year dental benefits. "The reasons for delaying one year have been lost in the institutional memory and now are outweighed by the benefits gained by early diagnosis and treatment, and preventive care," the report noted.

Setting up group dental insurance for retired faculty "would provide substantial savings" for them, FCBC noted. Retirees would pay for the insurance policies offered by the University.

The benefits subcommittee also recommended:

• Establishing a wellness program to encourage healthy life choices. Forums to discuss the idea have been held this quarter.
• Extending emeritus benefits to all retiring faculty. Departmental chairpersons now can recommend emeritus honors for faculty with more than 10 years of service. Benefits include a free campus parking decal, athletic tickets and library privileges.
• Negotiating agreements to reduce tuition and fees for faculty and staff dependents who attend other colleges and universities.

Discussions of possible tuition remission are under way with the University of Akron. President Gee reported to the Senate that the Big Ten presidents were scheduled to discuss the issue June 4 at their annual meeting in Chicago.
OSU faculty paychecks fall below average

Salaries lowest of Big Ten schools

By Mike Montooth
Lantern staff writer

Over the past five years at Ohio State, student tuition has steadily gone up while faculty salaries have stagnated when compared to other universities. March is budget time, and as OSU gears toward its plans for the next fiscal year some faculty members are wondering if their salaries and benefits are going to increase. If the past five years are any indication, the answer could be, "Not by very much."

"The Board of Trustees proposes a raise package, one of many packages," said Ed Ray, senior vice provost of Academic Affairs. "(OSU President E. Gordon) Gee has an executive board which he consults with, he talks to a lot of groups."

One of those groups is the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee (FCBC) which will release its annual report on salary levels at OSU at the end of March. Gee also talks to the Department of Human Resources, college deans, department chairs, and the University Fiscal Committee. It is during this process that the decision is made as to what goes where financially.

"We try to protect the core academic units most," said William Shikurti, vice president of Finance. The process starts with the Senate Fiscal Committee, then moves to Gee and the Board of Trustees before it is finalized. The money is then given to the various colleges to be distributed by the deans throughout the departments.

Money is set aside for more than the budgeted money given to departments which excelled in the last budget year. Colleges targeted last year were Business, Law, Engineering, Humanities, and Dentistry, Ray said.

OSU tries to avoid losing the good faculty it has and tries to attract higher quality faculty, he said.

"There is this mind set here that certain people who need to be recruited deserve an exorbitant amount of money," said David S. Washburn, associate professor of entomology, and OSU chapter president of the American Association of University Professors. "Prestige is in the pocketbook," she said. "This is on recruiting new and better faculty while keeping better" old faculty increases the prestige of OSU, which creates a residual effect. But this process is both long and complicated. Attracting people with salary is a long-term process," said Linda Tom, vice president of human resources. "We are paying people for what they have accomplished. We are trying to get people of that higher caliber by looking at other universities."

In determining salaries, the consideration of what is going on in the faculty member's field correlates directly with his or her salary. This comparison with what is going on out there is a residual effect. But this process is both long and complicated. Attracting people with salary is a long-term process," said Linda Tom, vice president of human resources. "We are paying people for what they have accomplished. We are trying to get people of that higher caliber by looking at other universities."

The Association of American Universities provides a listing of the top 50 universities in America. Here, OSU ranks 56th overall. This is an average of all salaries which includes professors, associate professors, and assistant professors. However, the individual ranking of any one subdivision taken individually paints an even worse picture.

Among the 50 universities, OSU is ranked 57th with an average salary of $72,000. Among associate professors, the university is ranked 49th with an average salary of $50,000. And among assistant professors, it comes in 44th with an average of $42,000.

"The primary goal here should be to educate undergraduate students," Wrench said. "It seems like the most important person here is not the student. Would this place be here if it wasn't for undergraduates?"

FCBC figures suggest the problem is getting worse. Over the past 13 years, OSU has slipped from being ranked 14th overall in 1983-84. In 1983-84, OSU ranked ninth in salaries for assistant professors. Now, OSU ranks 44th.

According to the report, OSU's "declining position at these ranks suggest that we will incur even greater difficulty in the future than we have had in the past unless these trends can be reversed."
Salary report is central to decisions, fiscal officials say

By Gemma McCullie

Appearances can be deceiving. It felt like an anticlimax when Tony Mughan, chair of the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee, rose to present recommendations to the University Senate April 5.

Senators knew that FCBC was recommending a 6.27 percent raise for faculty, but the Board of Trustees was considering a proposal for 4 percent, with another 1 percent for exceptional merit.

Financial officials had presented the proposal for raises to the Board of Trustees on April 3, three days before FCBC formally released its report.

What many senators and others did not know was that the FCBC report completed in mid-March, provided critical information for the salary debate. And, just as it had in the past, the FCBC report had a strong impact on decision-making.

"It's unfortunate that, to people not up close to the salary recommendation process, there was a possible appearance that FCBC did not take a central role," said Edward Ray, senior vice provost for academic affairs and a member of FCBC.

In fact, President Gee made sure he read a draft of the 1996 report and met with the entire Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee before finalizing the salary proposal on April 1. The committee also met with William J. Shkurti, vice president for finance.

"We are in contact with FCBC throughout the year," said Linda Tom, vice president for human resources. "We were really fully informed of their salary report, and their recommendations were an important consideration in the budget deliberation process."

In addition, the Senate's Fiscal Committee, the President's Executive Council and the Council of Deans discussed the report's contents, especially the comparisons of Ohio State faculty salaries to those paid at peer institutions, before the recommendations were finalized.

The confusion occurred because of a change in the usual timeline for making a salary proposal to the Board of Trustees. In order to give trustees and administrators as much time as possible to consider the details, financial officers decided last fall that April rather than May would be the best time to present salary recommendations. That set up the possibility of a public misconception that FCBC did not play a central role in salary discussions because the FCBC salary report, as always, was not released until early April.

For next year, FCBC will consider formally releasing its salary subcommittee report in March, and then presenting it to the Senate in April for general discussion.
Faculty raise recommended to Board of Trustees

By Natasha Mak
Lantern staff writer

To keep up with competition from Big Ten schools and raise Ohio State’s professional ranking, faculty salaries must be ahead of the pack. That is the message the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee has for the Ohio Senate and the Board of Trustees.

The committee suggested a three-year salary increment package, beginning with a 4 percent raise next year.

“This is a justifiable recommendation with inflation at around 3.33 percent,” said Ted Napier, professor of resources sociology and environmental policy. “Anything less would be a net loss in purchasing power.”

Napier, who chairs the Salary Subcommittee of the benefits committee, said the group recognizes that to attract the best young scholars and to keep the best faculty, “you have to pay” top dollar, or OSU will lose them to other Big Ten schools.

“It is almost essential,” Napier said.

The salary adjustment package was based on OSU’s 1994 functional mission statement: to be ranked among 25 universities as measured by U.S. News and World Report.

Napier said most faculty at OSU are motivated to achieve the best for the students and should be compensated.

“When I was a freshman, I would have really been against a pay raise, because almost none of my professors spoke English” said Nicole Smith, a senior majoring in marketing. “This year I’m learning more than I ever did in the previous three years, and I think some professors really deserve it.”

Jeff Rogers, professor of geography, said he likes the idea because OSU has fallen behind in comparison to some other Big Ten schools.

“We are almost never compensated according to committee recommendations,” he said, reflecting upon his 17-years teaching experience at OSU. “If 4 percent is recommended, we’ll probably get 2 percent.”

Napier is positive that the faculty might get the full 4 percent proposed. He said in the last three years, OSU has been keeping up with the competing salaries of other universities in the region.

Rogers said the university has generally raised faculty salaries enough to keep up with inflation.

Napier said the committee is aware of the university’s budget.

“I don’t think it is realistic to raise faculty salaries at the cost of students,” he said. “The committee is not supportive of that at all.”

Instead, Napier is hopeful that the Ohio legislature will recognize the contributions the university faculty has made and provide the resources to meet the pay raise objectives.

Smith said she will lose either way because salary increments, if not compensated through tuition, will be compensated through tax payers’ money.

“Whatever it is, I end up paying,” she said.

The committee recommendations will be reviewed and considered by the Board of Trustees at its meeting Friday.

William J Shkurti, vice-president of finance said he will not be able to comment on the committee recommendations until it is approved by the board.