

## 2025 President-Elect Candidate

**Jacob Hamblin** (at OSU since 2009), Professor of History, School of History, Philosophy, and Religion, College of Liberal Arts

FACULTY SENATE SERVICE: Faculty Senator, 2020-2022; Curriculum Council, 2017-2020; Undergraduate Admissions Committee, 2010-2013; and Faculty Senate Executive Committee (2022-2023)

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS SERVICE: Director, Environmental Arts and Humanities Initiative, 2014-2024; Marine Studies Initiative Undergraduate Design Committee, 2014-2020; Personnel Committee, 2016-2017; Search Advocate for Faculty Search in English, 2010-2011; Bill and Caroline Wilkins Award Committee, 2011; and Budget Committee, 2011-2013

UNIVERSITY SERVICE: Advisory Board, Research Advancement Academy, Office of Research Advancement (2023-2025); OSU Press Advisory Board (2020-2023); College of Business Unit Review Committee, 2020; Sustainability Program Review Committee; Linus Pauling Legacy Award Committee, 2018-2019; OSU150 Futures Focus Symposium Planning Committee, 2018; Graduate School Travel Award Committee, 2013-2015; Center for the Humanities Advisory Committee, 2012-2014, chair 2013;

SEARCH COMMITTEE SERVICE: Baccalaureate Core Director, 2021

**Candidate Statement:** I would like to serve in this capacity because I believe a comprehensive university should reject one-size-fits-all approaches to education and research, and it must respect methods and best practices that differ across STEM fields, the social sciences, the arts, and the humanities. My interdisciplinary background and experiences at OSU have made me sensitive to a range of needs and differences across units. In addition, we need a president who will commit to dynamic approaches to the large structural changes that have shaped us for better or for worse. I can think of three big ones, discussed below.

CRITICAL ISSUES: If the following three issues don't resonate with you, please don't vote for me! I feel strongly about them and would push hard for them. Their general philosophy is to embrace a dynamic approach rather than accepting structural changes as set into stone.

The first is that we have been working under a budget model that is deeply challenging to program building and to transparency. Its most egregious failing is that administrators are in the position of having to promise to fix any perceived inequities on an *ad hoc* basis. What do we need instead? We need the Faculty Senate to research and vote on resolutions recommending best budget practices based on OSU's ambition to be a high-level comprehensive university. These best practices need to take into account the impacts of policies (such as financing of GTAs, unit budgets based on SCH, among

others) across all colleges. If we complain about it (as many do), we need to know exactly what kind of model we would prefer.

Second, we need to commit to fixing problems with the new Core Education as we go. Despite the herculean labors of all the involved faculty (thank you!), already there are major issues on the horizon, such as the shortage of categories that allow students to satisfy Core Ed requirements with upper division classes (currently, only the Seeking Solutions and DPO-A categories allow this, despite decades of doing it very differently at OSU). This may put juniors and seniors in the position of taking remedial 100- or 200-level classes, when they could be taking more appropriate upper division courses. The shortage of upper division options in the Core Ed also is widely perceived as a threat to the diversity of upper division offerings at OSU, reducing the viability of upper divisions classes that rely on enrollment by non-majors. And that's just one issue. The Core Ed should not be "set in stone," but instead should be evaluated and adjusted by the Faculty Senate as we implement it.

Third, let's remember that we are workers, with the power to assert our voices about how we are paid. As the Faculty Senate, we should research, discuss, and adopt a resolution about how we want to see our salaries structured in the future. For example, one option is to move OSU to a step system akin to that of the University of California system, the California State University System, and the federal government's "GS" system. This might have the advantage of making COLA raises easier to envision, would simplify merit advances, and would take budgetary decisions about specific raises for individuals out of the hands of academic units. This is only one possibility, but it is time that the Faculty Senate discussed its preferred salary structure, voted on a resolution, and put it to the university administration as an approved goal for the university.

As I remember from my time serving on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, I realize there will be many issues the officers will confront. But the above are some short- and long-term challenges that I know we'll need to address in the coming years, and I would prioritize them. Thanks for reading! -Jake Hamblin