

**Faculty Senate Agenda
January 12, 2011**

Approval of the Dec 1 minutes	3:30-31
Discussion of Faculty Chair's Report (President travelling-no report)	3:31-35
Resolution on Sandra Heimann	3:35-3:40
Discussion of Harassment Module	3:40-3:50
Report of UG Student Body President	3:50-5
Report of the GSA President	3:55-4:00
Report of the AAUP (John McNay)	4:00-4:10
Provost Input (On international focus for UC)	4:10-4:40
Announcements	4:40
Adjournment	

CHAIR'S REPORT

FY 13 Budget and the Academic Master Plan

On the 15th I reported that: "I attended FCC yesterday and the budget process is moving along. Budget & Priorities was briefed by Jim Plummer and it looks like FY13 targets will require Colleges to handle reduced funding in the range of 8-10% (this year it was 13%). The Deans are asking for a small threshold adjustment relative to establishing a strategic priorities budget line to support a reorientation toward a budgeting process that takes into consideration strategic academic priorities outlined in the developing Academic Master Plan. The Executive Budget Committee (Williams, Ono, Ambach) was to take up this planning assumption at a meeting yesterday. My own sense is that this is an open question of how the final number will pan out, but that this really does involve whether we are shifting to a budget process grounded in strategic priorities or one that remains college-centric."

I can update this by saying that it is my understanding that the Provost made a strong representation for the academic budget and requested that thresholds be set in balance with shifting to support strategic initiatives. That is, before reducing the operating budget of colleges further, careful review of all other budget lines and justification for their levels need to be made. This type of balanced framing (yes, support strategic initiatives, but cut colleges the least possible) is guiding the initial FY13 budget discussions. The preliminary focus on AMP priorities is to fund foundational activities that will advance some critical student, faculty, and institutional measures. It appears that the initial AMP permanent funding will also be supplemented with some one-time funding in areas in which either data is needed before plans can be implemented or in areas where colleges might be able to use one-time funds to advance objectives that would find sustained funding in the future. The proposed FY13 action steps was vetted by the coordinating committee on Tuesday, and the Council of Deans on Wednesday. Senate Budget and Priorities and the full Senate is expected to see that vetted document around the 16th of January and we will need to set up a mechanism for feedback so that the AMP is finalized in February. It is likely that the Senate Cabinet will have an extra session to assess Senate feedback on January 26th.

Student Joint Session

I have met with student government leaders to plan a joint session. A priority remains safety and they wish to propose an advisory council to UC Public safety division made up of students, staff, and faculty. They are generating the proposal and we will have it vetted through our Human Relations committee with a target of a March joint session. As we did last year logistically, we will hold our normal Senate meeting in somewhat truncated form and then move into a joint session that will run us likely to 5:30. This proved a viable approach rather than scheduling a separate meeting.

The Students have put together a survey that has been sent to the student body. The question is whether we should send the similar survey to faculty to get a sense of their concerns. The Senate Cabinet considered this and concluded that it would be more effective to establish the advisory council first and then have that council set-up its own mechanism for communication with the university community at large.

At last year's joint session we passed a resolution requesting that the president create a Taskforce to examine the university smoking policy which was adopted five years ago. That

taskforce has just completed its work and made some recommendations to the President. The Office of the President has requested that each of the three governance bodies review the taskforce report and determine whether the recommendations accord with view of the governance bodies. I will circulate the report and we will set-up an mechanism (likely the next Senate meeting) to discuss the recommendations and then bring forth a resolution at the joint session with the students.

Website Communication

We had updated our Faculty Senate website at the beginning of the school year and we will look to increase its utility again with an update that will include more information about All-University Committees and provide a central place to communicate about those committees' activities.

Foundation

The UC Foundation Strategic review continues. I attended a two hour meeting on Dec. 22nd and the basic next steps will be another full steering committee meeting on the 13th to be followed with a briefing of the President and then a Foundation Trustees meeting on the 20th. Plans are still under development, but the Senate Planning Committee and the Cabinet may be invited to a session on the 20th. The Planning committee, likely in January, will also receive the report.

Decision-making

The taskforce on the integrated decision-making structure that we discussed in our November meeting has been expanded to include several faculty including senators and will meet for the first time with the president in late January.

PROVOST INPUT SESSION

One of the objectives of UC2019 is to increase our global connections on the student front via more study abroad opportunities and increased international enrollment. The provost is interested in additional major efforts that might be undertaken to enhance UC as a research university with a global reach. Specifically, he asks that senators come prepared to offer their views on the value of global links between UC and world universities for faculty and students and their views on regions we might focus our attention in the decade ahead.

ACTION ITEMS

We have two action items on the agenda. The first is a resolution of commendation for Sandra Heimann, whose term has ended as Chair of the University Board of Trustees. The Senate cabinet recommends that the Senate go on record to recognize the positive work of Chair Heimann on behalf of students, faculty, and the university at large. We plan to present the resolution and a small gift to her at a reception on January 26th after the next BOT meeting. See resolution below.

The second action is to determine Senate action regarding the on-line harassment and discrimination policy module that all employees will need to complete as part of their

employment responsibilities. I am attaching below a FAQ produced by John Bryan in the Provost Office. I am proposing that the Senate commit to completing the module within one week (both myself and Dan Langmeyer as Vice Chair have completed it). We would then send out a message to the entire faculty announcing the module has been completed by all Senators and that it is the responsibility of all faculty to complete the module by the end of February. In doing so, the Faculty Senate would provide a leadership example.

Resolution of Commendation

The Faculty Senate of the University of Cincinnati commends SANDRA W. HEIMANN for her outstanding service to the students, faculty and alumni community of the University of Cincinnati.

WHEREAS, SANDRA W. HEIMANN in completing her nine-year appointment as a Trustee of the University of Cincinnati showed exemplary dedication to her role as Chair of the Board over two terms, and

WHEREAS, MRS. HEIMANN, continuously sought the improvement of opportunities for students and faculty through additional service as a member of the UC Circle of Honor, the Advisory Board of the UC Medical Center Fund, the Board of Directors for UCATS, as well as the Business Task Force Committee of the Honors-PLUS program in the University's Carl H. Lindner College of Business, and

WHEREAS, she and her husband Bob Heimann increased directly the research potential of the faculty with an endowment of a chair at the University in Molecular Science for the study of diseases including Alzheimer's and Juvenile Diabetes, and

WHEREAS, she has consistently acknowledged the importance of shared governance and supported decisionmaking involving all stakeholders at the university,

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Cincinnati commends and expresses its appreciation to SANDRA W. HEIMANN for all of her dedicated efforts on behalf of the University, and while wishing her all the best on her retirement from the Board of Trustees, encourages

her to continue to lend her expertise and passion in advancing the University as we move forward in our role as a public research university of the highest standing.

Preventing Harassment at UC: Frequently Asked Questions

The University of Cincinnati recently engaged New Media Learning, LLC, to provide a custom training program, "Preventing Harassment in the Workplace and on Campus." The interactive online program outlines current laws on harassment and uses examples to illustrate words and behaviors that might reasonably be regarded as discriminatory. In addition to describing behavior that is discriminatory, the program describes the legal obligations of UC employees to report discriminatory behavior that they observe or hear about.

The following information provides responses to what are likely to be questions frequently asked about the program.

- 1. Is the program required of all UC employees?**
Yes. All employees—even those employed only occasionally or only for a few hours a week must complete the training program. This requirement applies to every class of employee, including faculty, staff, graduate assistants, and student workers. The University is also developing a plan for all students to receive the training.
- 2. Why is the program required?**
The University of Cincinnati is committed to preventing behavior that discriminates against protected classes as defined by federal or Ohio law (behavior that discriminates on the basis of age, color, disability, genetic information, national origin, race, sex, sexual orientation, affiliation, association, cultural traits or apparel, perception, ancestry, military status). Not only does the University wish to prevent such behavior on legal and ethical grounds, it wishes to do so in order to promote an optimal environment for work and learning. Finally, the University bears a legal responsibility for providing such training; failing to take appropriate action to prevent illegal behavior yields the University vulnerable to legal liability if instances of such behavior do occur.
- 3. How will the University know whether the training has been successful in achieving its learning objectives?**
The online program concludes with a "mastery test" that assesses the employee's understanding of the concepts presented. The passing score on the mastery test is 80%.
- 4. What is the deadline for employees to complete the training?**
All current employees must complete the training and pass the mastery test no later than February 29, 2012. New employees will complete the training as part of the onboarding process.
- 5. Is this a one-time requirement?**

The University has a one-year contract with New Media Learning, but whether future years' training programs come from that or another vendor, the program will continue. Laws and governmental regulations change. Employees change roles. Memories fade. We envision the need for periodic updates of the training.

6. **How will the University know when an employee has completed the training?**

New Media Learning will provide the University with periodic reports listing those people who have completed the training program.
7. **What happens if I don't pass the mastery test?**

You may take the test as many times as necessary to achieve a passing score.
8. **To whom will my test score(s) be reported?**

The Department of Human Resources and the Office of the Provost will receive comprehensive data from New Media Learning, but test scores will not be distributed to colleges or departments. Instead, they will receive only lists of employees who have and have not successfully completed the mastery test; such data will not distinguish between those who have not taken the test and those who have taken but not passed the test.
9. **Is the training so generic that I won't find it relevant to my working environment?**

The training has been customized to the academic environment, and it includes four tracks that are customized for different roles: faculty, supervisory, staff, and student. These tracks attempt to make the training relevant to your role at UC.
10. **What if my role bridges more than one of these roles? For example, what if I am both a faculty member and am a department head (supervisory)?**

In such cases, you have a couple of alternatives: Either complete both the faculty and supervisory modules or opt for the role with the greater institutional responsibility (supervisory in this case).
11. **How long will the training take?**

The self-guided, self-paced training and mastery test will likely take between 45 and 75 minutes. The duration will depend on various factors, including your initial familiarity with the concepts presented in the program.
12. **Must the training and test be completed in one sitting?**

No. The online program is subdivided into sections that may be completed in as many sittings as necessary.
13. **What will happen to employees who refuse to participate in training or who fail to pass the mastery test?**

As with the Outside Activity Report, the University will attempt to achieve 100% compliance. The University's goal is not to browbeat people but rather is to educate members of our community so that we achieve a campus environment free of discriminatory behavior. Administrative responses available for failure to comply vary depending upon employee category and may include discipline.
14. **Who will have responsibility for achieving compliance?**

Compliance will be monitored and promoted by vice-presidential area.
15. **Will this become another compliance burden on deans and department heads?**

We hope not. The extent to which monitoring and promoting compliance becomes a burden will depend greatly on the response of employees to this initiative.