Minutes of the University of Cincinnati Faculty Senate meeting.

Held at Clermont Campus, March 13th, 2014.

A marvelous tour was given by Blaine Kelley (Director, Enrollment and Student Services –acting). Thank you.

Refreshments were provided prior to the meeting, courtesy of Dean Sojka. Thank you.

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by the chair (AL) at 3.30 pm.

2. Welcome by Dean Sojka
Dean Sojka gave a heartfelt welcome and introduction to Clermont Campus. He described the history of the college, its typical student population and its unique role within UC regarding adult learners, veterans and serving the Appalachian communities. More information can be found online at http://www.ucclermont.edu/ “The power of UC; close to home”

3. Approval of the February 13, 2014 Minutes.
Approval forwarded by RL; Seconded by JG.
Unanimous approval.

4. Report of the Faculty Chair
Due to time constraints, AL will post her chair report on the Faculty Senate web page. Faculty Senate Standing Committee Chair reports will also be available online.

5. President’s Report
President Ono was unable to attend this meeting.

6. Committee Reports
   a. Nominating Committee—Marla Hall
      ----presentation of slate for election/nominations from the floor/confirmation of the slate

MH presented Margo Lambert as chair of the Nominating Committee. Seconded by PS, none opposed. Let it be so noted.

Some self-nominations from the floor were taken at this point:
Chia-Chi Ho (West Campus Professionals; CEAS Grievance)
Gail Pyne-Geithman (COM-Grievance)
These individuals will provide their statements of interest to MH within the next week or so.

Call for Standing committee member nominations will be sent out after Spring Break.

Really need a lot (7) of members for the library committee.

Q. What about the senate elections? Some terms will be ending this year?
A. Colleges elect their senators.
   b. Committee on Committees---Marla Hall
MH presented the positions that need to be filled, and the current nomination slate for those positions. There are several that still need to have sufficient candidates to go to election. Open until April 1st (with statements of interest) or nominees can be accepted at the AUF, but they may not have a statement of interest to support their election.

c. Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee (FSAAC) Motion—Rebecca Leugers (see motion)
This motion was included in the agenda of this meeting and is posted online.
The FSAAC has been busy working on the best practices in online teaching and distance learning.
The motion was read aloud by RL.

Q. Why do we need to have a committee to produce a best practices document?

AL: The provost (BD) is charged with having eLearning be a part of the 3rd Century. AL stated this is an opportunity for faculty to effect policy. By creating a Faculty Senate Task Force, the Senate can make recommendations regarding this most important issue.

RL: Effective online earning requires administration, IT, instructional design and faculty facilitators to work together. We must standardize the process.

ML: UCBA has always been concerned that BD wants increased enrollment in online learning because it makes money, but it will not make much more money if you do it PROPERLY.

AL: This is the kind of feedback we need. This committee can be used to establish policy.

Q. What is the division of labor on this large task?

RL: The task force would report back to faculty senate for approval. Any amendments and policy changes will have to be approved by the faculty senate.

Q. What is the rationale for the faculty chair (AL) to be the one choosing the composition of the committee?

RL: The FSAAC believed it would be best comprised of members appointed, to avoid bias on the committee (discipline, college etc.) and to ensure there is adequate and appropriate expertise and experience on the committee.

AL: I have extensive experience of developing and running online and distance-learning educational programs in College of Nursing. I have been involved in online learning at the university from its inception at UC.

Q. What about conflict between campuses, perhaps running the same/similar classes?

DH: This is where the CCC comes in, to ensure that there is no duplication or redundancy.

Q (Clermont): At Clermont, we have a vetted program. Before you can teach online classes, you must qualify. We have been doing that here for years.
AL: Faculty who are paid for online learning worry that they lose academic freedom and intellectual property over the materials they produce to run the class.

Q (Clermont): The online course we take to qualify does not impinge on academic freedom.

All in favor of this motion: No objections, passed unanimously.

RL: Academic Advisory Committee has been examining the Emeritus Status. Emeritus status will be brought back. A recommendation from Emeriti faculty was submitted to the Provost Office. The Provost Office has shared this letter with the Faculty Senate Chair. AL has been sent the recommendation to Academic Affairs for review.

7. New Business:
   a. Motion: Support of Creating the 3rd Century...Tracy Herrmann, Vice Chair
   In response to the roll-out of President Ono’s 3rd Century Strategic plan, cabinet thought it appropriate to provide our support. See the 3rd Century Plan here. [http://president.uc.edu/thirdcentury/](http://president.uc.edu/thirdcentury/)

   The resolution was read out, and opened to the floor for questions/comment.

   CG. The selection of the areas of proposed focus for pathways A and B in the 3rd Century plan are not based on anything. At least at A & S, Department Chairs were not asked about strengths. These choices are not based on studies.
   RL: My perspective is that Pathway B was amorphous on purpose and that there were links to all disciplines.

   CG. But there have been no studies to actually show what the strengths of existing programs are.

   PS. I submit that the foci are amorphous and broad in order to allow flexibility.

   CG. So the foci are not at all important then? They are just for marketing and never mind if they are based on substantive studies?

   GJP. I agree, there is no data, there has been no research.

   AL: Specific clusters were not chosen, the wording allows for clusters to be identified.

   RL: There are connections between the circles, which is better than separate structures; coming together makes us stronger

   PS: The presentation given to the faculty at large was not as specific or complete as the one SO gave to the COM audience. In the COM presentation, specific clusters were identified. In this last presentation he focused more on the connections.

   MH: Part of the reason behind cluster hires is to foster collaboration among disciplines. The next steps with require a lot of input from faculty and administration.
SM: We can’t always attend the meetings held on main campus. Feel like CEHS does not matter, enough I try to represent.

TH: Vote as it stands?
4 nays.

JG: We should support the president in this effort. Perhaps we can amend the wording?

MH: We are really showing support for SO in making these changes, not the changes specifically.

JG: The names of Drs. Ball and Davenport were removed to make the support more of the idea of positive change, rather than a ratification of the details of the plan.

TH: Are there any other discussions on the original bill?

CG: Changes better, but not strong enough.

AL: I am going to call this vote on the version as amended.
SM: Do we have a quorum?
DH: Yes.

1 abstain, 2 nays. Passed by majority vote.

b. Senate house bill 472

TH: In April of 2013, faculty senate passed a motion to request that verbiage be removed from House Bill 59 which would have restrain UC from setting its own workload policy.

TH presented a Motion for the faculty senate to reaffirm the statement:

“Therefore, be it resolved: The Faculty Senate of the University of Cincinnati asks that the Ohio General Assembly remove language from any legislation which constrains the ability of a University to set its own workload policies and allow the effective, current workload policies to continue at the University of Cincinnati.”

The resolution on HB59 workload was dated April 11th, 2013 and can be found on the Faculty Senate Webpage.
http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/facultysenate/senate/docs/resolutions/House%20Bill%2059%20Workload%20policy.pdf

ML: Does the verbiage from the previous motion cover this bill?
TH/DH AL: Is there a motion to: temporarily suspend the portion of the bylaws requiring prior notification of a motion to consider a motion on HB472 (Article II # 5g)?

TH: I move to insert new language into Agenda Item 7, such that House Bill 472 becomes a. and the existing items are b., c. and d. respectively.
Seconded: JG
No objections. New numbering will be used in these minutes.

PS: The previous iteration wanted to raise us from 40 hours to 44 hours per week (general laughter ensued).

RL: Selected individuals went to the Statehouse.
AL: We have a government liaison, Margie Roth.
PS: Last time, SO said to leave it to him and to other University Presidents, and they came through. SO will likely repeat those efforts.
AL: We will, so we won’t get too involved. Are there any other questions?
All in favor, none opposed.

\[c\] Efficiency Council Discussion with Senate…Efficiency Council Representative

A PowerPoint presentation was given by Scott Page and Kenneth Stidham. The presentation is available from the chair or secretary.
Under discussion was the tremendous savings that could be made if vacation time was shortened and rollover proscribed, mandatory vacation days are taken between Christmas and New Year’s, and buildings put on minimum maintenance at this time.

Those with accrued vacation beyond the new limits will be grandfathered in.

Q. Some buildings require key access; if these buildings are licked we will not be able to work. This is not acceptable.

A. Research-heavy buildings will not be shut down.

Q. But those of us who work from an office must be able to work between Christmas and New Year; there are agency deadlines, end of year deadlines and preparation for the next semester to be performed.

Q. What about graduate students? They don’t take vacation? What about cold weather if you reduce the heating, pipes may freeze and burst like they did this past winter?

A. Clearly there are many questions and we want and welcome your input.

\[c\] Faculty-Staff Campaign—Phillip James

Phillip introduced the YouTube video “Proudly Cincinnati”.
http://www.youtube.com/user/ProudlyCincinnati

Donations can be directed to specific funds (research, student support etc.). Any donations today get a free hot/cold mug.

8. Report of the AAUP- Greg Loving AAUP President
The new contract passed with 94% approval; over 50% of the Union membership voted (more than in 40 years). All contract-mandated back-pay will appear in the April 30th paycheck (from 7/1/2013). Timing means that deadlines for merit-based pay raises and faculty development council monies are approaching fast. These deadlines and details are in the next issue of works.

MH: Compression increases?

GL: 0.25% of the aggregate faculty salary divided by years of service in the contract. FDC is gone. Now, each college will have to have a committee that awards FDC monies. Requests for <$2500 for conference attendance are supposed to be fairly rubber-stamped. AT Clermont this committee is already in place. Half the committee is elected by the dean, the other half are elected. Dean breaks ties. This process eliminates the FDC paperwork and gives on a rolling basis per year at the College level.

The money cannot be linked to the AAUP, and should not replace existing monies. Colleges need to make responsible use of the funds to prove we are right. It is now only 2 years until we need to come to the table again.

RL: What about faculty funds now?

GL: Existing funds through FDC apply through August 2014.

MS: What about ProPel? It’s an academic unit, not a college. How will the new system work?

GL: This is outlined in Works, it’s too complex to describe right now. Funds are being distributed on a per capita bargaining unit basis.

9. Next Faculty Senate Meeting—
   April 10 following All-University Faculty meeting in TUC400B – 1 hour max
   Action Items: Vote on University Committees; Budget and Priorities White Paper on University Budget Priorities; Emeritus Status Guidelines; Academic Calendar; FS Meetings—May?, June?, July?

10. Recap and Adjournment

TH: Move to adjourn.
Agreed, adjourned 5.25 pm.

---
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