

**Faculty Senate Agenda
February 9, 2012**

Approval of the January minutes	3:30-1
Discussion of Faculty Chair's Report (includes next year plans) --Organization of Nominating Committee and Steering Committee	3:31-5
Report of the University President	3:35-3:50
Discussion of Reports of Standing Committees	3:50-5
Discussion of Common Application	3:55-4:05
Report of UG Student Body President	4:05-8
Report of the GSA President	4:08-11
Report of the AAUP (John McNay)	4:11-15
Provost Input	4:15-4:55
Announcements	4:55-4:59
Adjournment	5:00pm

There are no action items that have been submitted for the Senate meeting at this time that would lead to resolutions. There will be several at our March meeting. We do have some planning issues to get in order for next year and I provide updates on a number of key issues.

REPORTING AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

Provost and AMP

The Provost will roll out the AMP and FY13 funding. This will be the major portion of our agenda for discussion.

FY13 Budget lines

The proposed FY13 budget has attempted to strike a balance between thresholds that colleges will need to meet (about 7%) and strategic priorities funding (about \$6 million base funding). Our Budget & Priorities Committee will have a full report at the March meeting. I met with Chair of the Council of Deans to discuss decanal views of the FY13 and see where possible alignment of views exist on any lines in need of discussion moving forward. We will continue those discussions.

Joint Governance Session

Our session will be held on March 8th as an extended Faculty Senate meeting. We will begin at our normal time of 3:30 and ask senators to plan to stay until 5:30. The first 45 minutes will be our normal session. This will take place in Swift 500. Two joint resolutions are under development on the Smoking Taskforce's recommendation and the proposed safety council. Both will be vetted in the Human Relations committee with student representatives attending. I had a meeting with our new Public Safety Director, Chief Michael Cureton that covered how shared governance works at UC. Good meeting.

The smoking resolution will be based on the TaskForce created last year. A separate packet will be prepared for you by end of week.

Decision-making Taskforce

The president convened the taskforce on which Jeff Bauer and I are representing faculty governance. The president's charge of the committee to update our decision framework was set on three principles:

1. Shared governance is working and the basic principles of our decision-making framework shall remain unchanged;
2. We are an academic institution, so our decision flow should make the Senior VP for Academic Affairs and provost central to the framework.
3. With revisions to composition of committees in mind, reduce the multiple 'bites at the apple' that occurs now with same people repeating. Could we have less steps, but actually more eyes on issues?

Both Jeff and I feel that initial discussions are cementing faculty senate's role as well as faculty representation to the key steps relative to current framework.

Tenure Celebration

Last year we recommended to the provost that a celebration event and cohort workshop be created for faculty that receive tenure. This was generally agreed to in principle by the provost, but fell through the crack of the transition from Wayne Hall to Ryan Hays. Santa asked me this week to work directly with Ryan to make this happen. I will meet with him and consult with Jeff Tilman as we move forward on implementation.

Senate meeting at Clermont

To accommodate the President and coordinate with an event out at Clermont, we will hold our spring on the road senate meeting on May 10th. Detail planning will get in place shortly.

Website Update

Senate website has been updated and linked to AUC pages. A further update will occur once we have the taskforce done.

Gift

A framed copy of our resolution of commendation and a crystal vase was presented to Chair Sandy Heimann at the last BOT meeting. She was very touched and in fact asked for a second

resolution, which I framed and delivered to her yesterday. I want to thank Marla for the effort on the vase and presentation. She really was moved by our action.

Planning for Next year

Due to semester conversion, reserving large spaces like TUC is now underway and we need guidance on major Faculty Senate events (regular meetings are set as normal)

1. 2013 Faculty Awards in Great Hall will take place between March 31 to April 5, 2013 and is being settled through the President's Office.
2. The President's State of the University Address, now separate from AUF, will take place Sept. 25, 26, 27 and is being finalized by President's office. Senator's attendance will need to be coordinated, but this should be expected.
3. AUF meetings need to be determined. Our revised by-laws now state the following:

"The regular meetings of the university faculty shall be held during the fall and spring terms prior to exam week. The date of the meeting shall be fixed by the president of the university and the chairperson of the university faculty. Notices of the meetings shall be given to the members of the university faculty two weeks in advance of the meetings."

The cabinet is recommending that we hold the AUF during the first week in October 2,3,4, which would be the 6th week of the semester and combine it as a Faculty Assembly to deal with some major intellectual institutional issue.

For the Spring semester in which we hold elections a later meeting toward the end of the year might make sense. We will look at a 11th-12th week (no later than first week of April)..

4. Bootcamp scheduling: school now begins on Monday Aug 27. New Student Convocation is being moved to Friday morning the 24th in the hope that more faculty will attend than a Sunday event. Cabinet recommendation would be to encourage attendance and have the Senate bootcamp follow the Convocation, so faculty can make one trip for the day and participate in both.

Common Application

Time will be set aside on the agenda for a discussion with Caroline Miller on consideration of moving toward a common application process for admission, which OSU is also adopting. The full presentation is attached below. Please review this document and letter from Santa. The session will be Q&A with VP Miller, not a presentation, so please prepare questions you might have or reactions to the proposal.

2012 Election Calendar

According to our by-laws:

“At the first meeting of the faculty senate in each calendar year, the chairperson of the university faculty, with the consent of the faculty senate, shall appoint a member of the faculty senate to chair the nominating committee. At the same time, the chairperson of the university faculty shall present the election calendar which shall include the following deadlines:

- (i) convening of the committee,
- (ii) announcement of recommended nominees to the faculty senate,
- (iii) announcement of the confirmed slate,
- (iv) dates for additional nominees, and
- (vi) the election.”

2012 Calendar of Faculty Senate Elections

February 9 --Convene the nominating committee: Chair Dennis O’Neill and all first year senators

--four first year senators will be selected to serve as coordinating committee

No later than Feb 29th --Nominating committee will meet and organize the nominating process.

No later than March 9 --Nominating will release the call for nominations via email with all positions available detailed and begin actively seeking candidates for open positions.

May 1st--Slate of confirmed nominees will be submitted from the committee to the Faculty Chair and the slate shall be announced to the faculty.

May 4th--nominations by petition due

May 14th--Nominee statements due to the Chair of the Nominating Committee. These shall be organized into the ballot by position.

May 24 --All University Faculty meeting. Nominations from the floor are accepted. Slate is finalized.

June 1st Election is opened with electronic ballot notification to the faculty

June 6th Election is closed

January, 2012

Proposed Implementation of The Common Application at the University of Cincinnati

UC 2019 and the Academic Master Plan establish aggressive goals associated with enrollment and the academic profile of our students. One strategy suggested is to explore implementation of The Common Application as an additional application mechanism for students. Potential benefits include increased out-of-state applications as well as an increase in the academic quality of applicants using The Common Application.

What is The Common Application?

The Common Application is both an organization and an admissions application process. It is a membership organization consisting of nearly 500 colleges and universities. Institutions must make application for consideration as a common application school and agree to several conditions, some of which we do not currently meet. We submitted the membership application materials in November due to a deadline, with the understanding that we needed to further assess the academic and technical requirement.

The admissions application (Common App) allows students to complete one application and submit it to several schools. Many schools require a supplement to obtain additional information from applicants. UC would require a supplement because we admit directly to academic programs and students are requested to select three majors for consideration. Students would have two options to apply to UC. Students could use UC's On-line Apply or the Common Application.

Why go this direction?

Many reasons – Ohio State has applied to become a common app school; they are our biggest “crossover” school for applications. Several large publics that are viewed as peer/aspirational schools are Common App schools. Because of the wide-reaching availability and familiarity with The Common Application and the ability for students to apply to UC together with other Common App schools, UC 2019 goals related to increasing out-of-state applications/enrollment would be addressed. There is a perception of academic quality associated with Common App schools that could aid in increasing the academic profile of the freshmen class. (Please see attached partial list of Common App schools)

What are the implications for UC? For colleges?

The application review and admissions decision making process would fundamentally change. A condition of membership as a Common Application university is to review applications “holistically;” that is, reviewing all aspects of the student’s application and not simply making an admissions decision based on quantitative criteria. Our procedures would need to change to allow for information supplemental to quantitative criteria (ACT/SAT scores, high school GPA, class rank) to be used in making the admissions decision. While academic criteria can still be heavily weighted, each student’s application will be assessed based on responses to the essay question, teacher recommendation, strength of high school, as well as other qualitative factors. Further, the Common App requires students to respond to questions regarding prior criminal convictions academic disciplinary violations. For the colleges, guidelines would need to be established regarding qualitative factors that can be used to either positively or negatively impact admissions consideration by the reviewers.

Proposed timeline:

February-March, 2012 – colleges approve implementation of holistic review for fall 2013 applicants

March, 2012 – discussion of changes needed to On-Line Apply for fall 2013 applicants to aid in holistic review

- Addition of prior conviction and academic discipline questions (CCM application? Graduate application? Others?)
- Revamp essay/personal statement
- Revamp/expand co-curricular section

April, 2012 – UCit begins development of changes to On-Line Apply

Spring, 2012 – conversations with Ohio State regarding rollout of Common App to Ohio high school counseling community

May, 2012 – develop procedures for holistic review

June, 2012 – testing of On-Line apply

Summer, 2012 – begin recruitment of additional admissions officers and temp file reviewers

July, 2012 – final review/approval of changes to On-Line Apply

August 1, 2012 – launch On-Line Apply for Fall 2013 applicants, incorporating changes

August - September, 2012 – training for holistic review

September, 2012 – reminder regarding UC's intent to implement the Common App to counselors

October - December, 2012 – file review for scholarship eligible students

October - November, 2012 – reapply for membership to The Common Application

January, 2013 – review of progress with colleges toward meeting target enrollments and quality measures

February, 2013 – membership approval by The Common Application

February - May 2013 – technical changes in UniverSIS for On-Line Apply and Common App

June, 2013 – final testing of changes in UniverSIS and Imaging

July, 2013 – final reviews

August 1, 2013 – launch Common App for Fall 2014 applicants

What are the costs?

Fixed costs will vary based on the number of applications received via The Common Application. Should we implement the Common App exclusively the costs would be approx. \$163,000 annually given our currently application volume.

Staffing costs – we do not have the staff to implement holistic review to the level required. Each application will require a read by two staff members. Additional full-time and part-time admissions officers/reviewers will be needed with estimated costs of approximately \$300,000 annually, plus one-time costs for furniture/equipment.

Programming changes will be required for both On-Line Apply and UniverSIS with approximate costs of \$60,000.

Total implementation cost: approx. \$523,000. Initial annual costs: approx. \$450-\$500K.

What's next?

Decisions are necessary by the colleges to amend the application review and admissions decision process to allow for information supplemental to quantitative criteria (ACT/SAT scores, high school GPA, class rank) to be used in making the admissions decision. While academic criteria can still be heavily weighted, each student's application will be assessed based on responses to the essay question, teacher recommendation, strength of high school, as well as other "holistic" review factors.

Additionally, decisions are necessary regarding required questions on a student's criminal history and school disciplinary history. UC does not currently ask these questions following review and discussion of this topic in 2009 with several campus colleagues.

To: Deans of Baccalaureate Colleges, Clifton Campus

From: Santa J. Ono, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Re: Admissions Processes – Action required

UC 2019 and the Academic Master Plan establish aggressive goals for enrollment with regard to the academic profile and diverse make-up of our incoming freshmen. To enhance our progress to achieve these goals, changes to admissions review processes will be required. The University has been accepted as a member of The Common Application, with plans to implement this for the admission of the fall 2014 freshmen class. Action is required now by each of the colleges to adopt admissions standards for the 2013 entering class that incorporate "holistic" review of applications (versus the exclusively quantitative criteria currently used in most colleges). The adoption of holistic review one year in advance of implementing The Common Application will help to ensure a successful transition.

The goal of holistic review is to assist with the continued improvement of UC's academic profile while addressing enrollment goals for honors students, diversity, in-state/out-of-state mix, international students and other aspects of UC 2019. Clearly, readiness for study in baccalaureate programs requires students to have a strong academic foundation, generally measured by high school grades and standardized test scores. These criteria will continue to be important factors in the admissions process. Holistic review will involve a review and assessment of additional, qualitative factors to determine admissibility.

Established procedures at UC call for colleges to set their own admissions standards. In that context, we are requesting your faculty's endorsement of holistic review.

Factors to be considered in addition to high school grades and standardized test scores may include (but are not necessarily limited to):

- Profile of high school (% college bound, AP/honors course offerings)
- Strength of curriculum taken by the student (has the student attempted to take advantage of the academic rigors available at their school?)
- Letters of recommendation (references to motivation, academic preparedness, character, clarity of purpose)
- Essay/personal statement (Why is the student interested in UC? Why is the student interested in a specific academic area?)
- Co-curricular activities (level of engagement, leadership roles, ties to academic interests, work experience, study/service abroad, research experiences)
- Demographic factors that contribute to the overall attributes of the freshmen class (ethnic diversity, first generation, geography)
- Recognition at a regional or national competition (academic or activity-based)

The Admissions Office will work with each college prior to the review of applications to address academic criteria and qualitative factors to be considered in determining admissibility. Tom Canepa, Associate Vice President for Admissions, and Caroline Miller, Sr. Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, are available for consultation with you and your faculty as needed.

To reiterate: We are seeking your college's approval to adopt holistic review for the incoming freshmen class of 2013. Please notify the Provost's Office of your college faculty's approval by April 15, 2012.

Best wishes,

Santa Ono

Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2010-11)

Committee:	FS Information Tech	Prepared By:	Eric Anderson	Date:	1/11/12
-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	---------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	Eric Anderson, Ken Hirsh, Andy Curran, Anton Harfmann, Dan Milz, Brett Harnett, Hazem Said, Maureen Schomaker, Paul Foster, Lisa Holstrom, BJ Zirger, Peg Buttermore, Robert Rokey
--	--

Topics Discussed:	<p>Lisa Holstrom and Paul Foster updated us about the actions of the Distance and On-Line Learning Support action team.</p> <p>Anton Harfmann gave us a report about the IT Governance Action Team. In February they will deliver the two different recommended governance structures that they have developed. The numerous problems with our current form of IT governance were also discussed.</p> <p>Eric Anderson gave an update about the CIO search process.</p> <p>There have been several reports that Apple devices (iPhones, iPads, iPods, Macs) are having difficulty connecting to the wireless network. There was speculation that the new wireless transmitters that are being installed around campus are causing the problem.</p> <p>Problems caused by the upgrade to BlackBoard 9.1 were discussed. We recommended a faculty incentive program to find the bugs before a new version is deployed.</p>
--------------------------	--

Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background	
---	--

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom:
	<input type="checkbox"/> By Faculty Senate <input type="checkbox"/> By Cabinet <input type="checkbox"/> Others (List-)

Next Meeting Date?	

Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2010-11)

Committee:	Academic Affairs Committee	Prepared By:	Adrienne Lane	Date:	01/25/2012
-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	------------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	J. Gill, B. Reigle, T. Roig-Torres, L. Graeter, J. Ying, N. Tsurui, A. Lane (Chair)
--	---

Topics Discussed:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of Agenda by Adrienne. On target. 2. Minutes: November 29, 2011. All agreed accurate as distributed 3. UC Grading Policy--Update: Julie Gill is chairing the sub-committee. Group meeting today at 4 PM. Benchmarking with 15 AAU institutions. Suggestion to involved W. Lambing from Registrar's Office; will be contacting W. Lambing. 4. Semester Conversion Issues: Adrienne provided follow up specific to Uptown and Regional Campus Pre/Co Requisite Issues. Associate Deans Joanna Mitro (A&S), Marlene Miner (Blue Ash) and Mary Stearns (Clermont) are working on the issue. A probable solution is the listing of PreReq appropriate for regional campuses or a PreReq of a particular SAT/ACT score. Adrienne shared that she took the FSAAC recommendation of a 2 hour exam block for semesters to FS Cabinet. FS Cabinet supported the recommendations and instructed Adrienne to take to Semester Conversion Steering Committee. 5. Academic Integrity Task Force Update: Adrienne reported that the task force is finalizing their report and should be submitting to FSAAC within 2 weeks. FSAAC will address the report at the February 22nd meeting. 6. Faculty Submissions: Adrienne shared two requests for review of faculty members. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Request for resolution specific to requiring students complete a survey about employment or graduate school acceptance prior to receiving diploma from UC. FSAAC did not support this was in line with FSAAC charge. This may be appropriate for Registrar. Adrienne will report to Chair. b. Request for resolution specific to requiring each unit to capture data specific to faculty activity related to student nominations for awards, scholarships, internships, etc. and subsequent student achievement of such. FSAAC did not support this was in line with FSAAC charge. A Lane to send to FS Human Relations Committee and John Bryan in Provost Office. 7. Ideas for future Agenda: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Invite Doug Burgess to provide update on Textbook regulation and issues related to semester conversion that are specific to faculty. Adrienne will invite Doug to next FSAAC meeting.
--------------------------	--

	b. Follow up with Ombuds Office to determine if an overall review is being conducted specific to the Undergraduate Grade Grievance Policy as recommended by FSAAC when FSAAC supported alignment of the policy with semester calendar. Adrienne will follow up.
Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background	None for Cabinet.

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom:
	<input type="checkbox"/> By Faculty Senate <input type="checkbox"/> By Cabinet <input type="checkbox"/> Others (List-)
Next Meeting Date? February 22 from 2 to 3:30 Location: TBA	

When complete, save your report with the committee name and report date as the file name. Please send the file to Faculty Senate (Faculty.Senate@uc.edu). Thank you!

Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2010-11)

Committee:	Academic Affairs Committee	Prepared By:	Adrienne Lane	Date:	11/29/11
-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	----------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	J. Gill, B. Reigle, T. Roig-Torres, A. Lane (Chair)
--	---

Topics Discussed:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of Agenda by Adrienne. On target. 2. Minutes: November 11, 2011. All agreed accurate as distributed 3. UC Grading Policy: The charge of the sub-committee is as follows: 1) Review the current UC Grading Policies and Procedures, 2) Benchmark our P&P with other AAU universities, 3) Make recommendations for Revisions to the FSAAC by first meeting in March 2011. Linda Graeter and Bev Reigle have agreed to be on this sub-committee. Julie Gill volunteered to join them. 4. Agenda setting for academic year: After much discussion the FSAAC identified the following areas for focus this academic year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Issues related to Semester Conversion from a faculty perspective: This area will include follow up on issues that are of concern to faculty such as 1) semester workload, 2) semester pay, 3) summer pay under semesters, and 4) concerns regarding course pre-requisites for A&S that may differ from the same course pre-requisites at the regional campuses. Adrienne will take these issues forward to Semester Conversion Steering Committee and report back. B. Distance Learning – Academic Issues: FSAAC will look at University policies related to DL and get more information about the Office for DL at UC. FSAAC is particularly interested in the Role of Faculty and the relationship between DL teaching and RPT criteria. C. UC Grading Policy Review 5. From our last meeting Adrienne followed up informally with key members of SCSC on the following issues: 1) a concern that Universis may well be outdated and needs to be replaced---D. Burgess and P. Krekler are actively involved in investigations related to a replacement system after conversion to the semester calendar is completed, 2) the final exam schedule time blocks under semesters---Doug Burgess has commented that it will most likely be a 2 hour block as it is now. 6. A. Lane shared that Marla Hall had also sent 2 items for the FSAAC to review. These were deferred to next meeting. 7. A. Lane will investigate rooms in University Hall on the 3rd Floor (HR) or 4th Floor for next quarter. Adrienne will doodle for next meetings focusing on Wednesdays 9 to 10:30 am. Meeting . Adrienne will request from Noriko times that might be good for her. 8. Meeting adjourned at 3:45.
--------------------------	---

Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background	
---	--

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom: ___ By Faculty Senate ___ By Cabinet ___ Others (List-)
Next Meeting Date? TBA	

When complete, save your report with the committee name and report date as the file name. Please send the file to Faculty Senate (Faculty.Senate@uc.edu). Thank you!

Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2011-2012)

Committee:	Budget and Priority	Prepared By:	Langmeyer	Date:	January 11, 2012
-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-----------	--------------	------------------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	Langmeyer, Hodges, Said, Vamadeva, Gilligan
--	---

Topics Discussed:	<p>ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was noted with curiosity that on the summary of expenses expenditure for instruction actually went down from fy2010 to fy2011 by about \$11M while expenses for almost every other category (except for operation and maintenance of plant) went up. 2. The overall financial health of the university is described by the auditors as improving including cash balances, net assets (now in positive numbers) and total revenues that has gone from \$692Million to \$1.03Billion to \$1.3Billion over the past 3 years. 3. There is reference to “equity interests in UC Health” that contribute to resources and income that we would like to have explained. <p style="text-align: center;">We await the publication of the fy2011 Redbook to see more refined analysis of our finances.</p> <p>JANUARY 19TH VERSION OF THE FY2013 BUDGET</p> <p>The revised budget reflects changes from the last by reducing the projected deficit between income and expenses. Unlike this year (fy12) we do anticipate in actual increase in revenue for general funds (only uptown revenues and expenses for the budget, not regionals or other funds). Bottom line is currently a 7% “threshold” for the cuttable general funds base (remember that half of the uptown general funds funds are not eligible for cuts/thresholds). Among the changes are a reduction in money put aside for a rainy day fund, reduction in estimates of increases to cost of faculty and unrepresented faculty (B&P had noted that the actual cost of faculty was flat from one year to the next and not increasing as budgeted), stretching out costs over multiple years, reducing the “strategic initiatives” for 2019 and non revenue generating academic support services.</p> <p>But the surprise and kicker was that athletics will receive an INCREASE in funding from general funds of \$1.5Million in each of the next 2 years. Currently \$14+Million goes from general funds to athletics. About \$9Million is from student fees but the rest come from everyone else who uses general funds. This amount has increased over 3 fold since 2005 (the good old days was around 2001 when Athletics did not run a deficit).</p> <p>Finance and others say that the funds transfer is not as awful as it looks because scholarship money for athletes come back to colleges where students are enrolled, that over the years some other funds (Shoemaker for instance) has been incorporated into athletic responsibilities, and that some of the debt service goes for classrooms in the athletic buildings.</p> <p>Including Shoemaker does make comparison from one year to the next difficult but when it had its own balance sheet Shoemaker ran deficits even with \$1-4Million transfers from general</p>
--------------------------	--

funds. One can understand including Shoemaker with Athletics because Shoemaker is used primarily by Athletics. 5/3 is used for graduation and convocations otherwise as a practice court and games.

The claim that money going to athletics comes back to general funds in the form of scholarships would be fine but the last reported scholarship expense (from year to year the format for reporting expenses change) was for fy2012 and was only \$1,218,615. Very little of the general funds that transfers to athletics comes back to college budgets.

Both Shoemaker and athletics reduces its deficits in through generous transfers from general funds and require more crippling transfers of general funds to cover their expenses and to look financial healthy.

It is recognized that attendance at football and basketball games at levels that have been achieved at times would do much for the balance sheet but there surely needs to be a plan and accountability as there are for other operating divisions at UC except, of course, that Athletics has a higher priority and external competitive benchmarks.

We have heard that TV money from the Big East may increase substantially. Why is that not being projected to reduce the needs for general funds transfers?