

Senate Trip to UCBA

The Faculty Senate meeting and presentations by the UCBA Dean & Student Government President will be held in the Science and Allied Health Building (SAHB) Room 100. Refreshments will be served. The schedule will be:

- 2:30 – 3:00 Campus tours—faculty interested in tours will convene in the SAHB lobby; tours will be conducted by UCBA Student Ambassadors
- 3:00 – 3:15 Presentation by Dean Cady Short Thompson
- 3:15 – 3:20 Presentation by UCBA Student Government President Corey Hampton
- 3:20 – 3:30 Break and opportunity to view multi-media presentations highlighting UCBA faculty and the campus
- 3:30 – 5:00 Faculty Senate meeting

Faculty who drive to the campus should park in the white lined spaces and parking is free. Here is the link to information about the shuttle service between the Main Campus and UCBA:

<http://www.uc.edu/af/facilities/services/shuttle.html#ucba>

Faculty Senate Agenda November 10, 2011

Approval of the Oct. 6 minutes	3:30-3:31
Discussion of Faculty Chair's Report	3:31-3:35
Report of the University President	3:35-3:50
Discussion of Reports of Standing Committees	3:50-3:52
Discussion for input on decision-making structure	3:53-4:15
Action Items: Vote on At Large Senator	4:15-4:18
Report of UG Student Body President Report of the GSA President	4:18-4:25
Report of the AAUP (John McNay)	4:25-4:30
Provost Input Session	4:30-4:55
New Business	4:55-4:59
Announcements	4:59-5:00
Adjournment	5:00

Faculty Senate
Preparatory Packet
November 10, 2011 meeting

Our Agenda will have one action item and one major discussion item. These are listed below in that order and then are followed by the Chair's report and standing committee reports.

ACTION ITEM

Open At Large Senate Seat

We have a vacancy in an At Large Senate seat. The cabinet has produced two faculty to recommend to Senate. Before voting, Senators may add a nominee from the floor or move to close the ballot and vote on these two cabinet nominations. I will forward statements from the candidates by Wednesday.

Ana Vamadeva, Math, UC Blue Ash
Stephanie King, Nursing, UC East

DISCUSSION ITEM

In my annual report to the faculty at the Oct. 25 AUF, I stated the following:
"The shared governance system in place at UC – a decision-making model involving active faculty engaged with key administrators, staff and student representation, I can report to you is, in my assessment, working very well. For those not familiar with the system, it can look rather cumbersome with its multitude of committees and reporting trees; however, it is a system that, because it builds in early input from every level of the institution actually positions the university for more effective and efficient implementation of key decisions. We make less mistakes because we draw in internal expertise more widely and we can advance forward because key constituencies have been at the decision and advisory-level tables from the outset."

This system was a major advance over where the university was previously in the 1990s and earlier. Now that we have had a number of years of working with the system, it is an appropriate time to examine whether we can make it even better.

We wish to have a preliminary conversation about the decision-making flow and structure. We will dedicate about 20 minutes to have a Senate discussion and then use that discussion to engage the Provost during our input session. Here are several questions to consider:

- Can communication flow more effectively?
- Are we efficiently organized so that expertise is directed via committees to a decision flow that can act on that expertise?
- Do we need to consider different committee membership mixes anywhere? Different membership processes?
- Are committees serving their intended function?

The president has asked the leadership representatives of the Admin division, Deans, faculty, undergrad and grad students to form a taskforce to begin this analysis and conversation, so Senate input now would be a most helpful grounding for me as faculty rep. I ask that all Senators prepare thoughts and re-read our governance book which can be downloaded from the front page of our Senate website or via this direct link:

http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/facultysenate/senate/docs/generalusedocuments/governance_briefing_book_2011_2012.pdf

The core principles and fundamental overall structure is sound—how can we make it even better?

Faculty Chair's report November 10, 2011

Chief Information Officer Search

Bob Ambach and the President have appointed me to Chair the search for a permanent VP CIO (we have had an interim for over 2 years). This is an important precedent to have a non-administrator serve as Chair of a vice presidential search. According to by-laws the Chair must be a member of the president's cabinet, which I am, but usually this would be chaired by a VP or minimally a Dean. As you know I publish on national cybersecurity policy and have won the State's innovator award for classroom use of IT, so I have some background on some issues, but importantly this was a signal that the IO area needs to support the academic mission as a priority, so I accepted. I requested that Senate's IT Chair Eric Anderson be appointed and BJ Zirger as a long-time senator and IT expert as well. I thank both of them for accepting. There are three deans and staff from admin-finance as well.

Cybersecurity, Education, and Economic Development

The House of the Ohio State General Assembly is proposing the creation of a council to advise on policy related to Cybersecurity, Education, and Economic Development. The current bill calls for 2 representatives from higher education to be appointed along with other constituencies. I have been called to testify on Nov 17th to the House committee as an expert witness in favor of the legislation. I will be formally speaking based on my research and as a faculty member in political science and as Faculty Chair.. I hope that my testimony might position UC for one of the two Higher Ed slots on the council. The council is charged with writing a report due to the Governor in December 2012, if the law passes. If there was a chance that I could contribute to that report I would seek to do so, so that Higher Ed's role was given support and prominence. For those interested the bill is short and direct and can be read at: http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/bills.cfm?ID=129_HB_331

New Athletic Director

Over the past month, the president conducted a search for the new Athletic Director. I can report that a major element of the decision-making was informed by the previous Taskforce on Athletics report and a focus on responsible fiscal balance.

UC Foundation Strategic Review and Change

I continue my work co-chairing one of eight sub-committees reviewing the UC Foundation from top to bottom. This review, which will be delivered to the Provost, President, and Trustees of the UC Foundation in January, is ultimately meant to increase the support UCF can provide to the academic mission of the university at an increase from about \$85 million a year in annual fund-raising to a sustained \$125 million. I plan to request that the recommendations be shared with our Planning committee as we seek to have that committee

become attuned to development efforts. As you may know, Mike Carroll resigned as President of the Foundation and Steve Wilson has been appointed as interim.

Bicentennial Commission

Tom and Marty Humes (BOT) have launched a full-planning structure to support events celebrating our 200th year anniversary in 2019. This will be a comprehensive celebration, which in their words, will be the greatest the university and the city has seen. It will be supported with separate private donations outside of usual University giving and university budgeting. I have been asked to co-chair with Gigi Escoe a planning committee focused on teaching and research accomplishments, which will have representatives from every college. Mr. Humes and the President are appointing these faculty. In addition, they are reaching out to others to serve as advisors with the event (Marla Hall, for example). This appointment is not as Faculty Chair, but as we move forward one of the aspects that will be celebrated via the committee I chair is our strong shared governance environment.

AMP

The AMP Coordinating Committee is going through every recommendation and I literally sit there and make suggestions of language changes based on the Senate's standing committee reports and full meeting. Of course this is competing with Decanal reports and other work group input, but I can report that direct changes are being made based on Senate work, so well done to everyone!

Capital Master Planning

The process has begun to consider a new capital master plan for the campus. The main focus of this plan is not new building (with exception of Law), but sustaining what we have through strategic renovation. Some very old structures will be recommended for demolition most others for renovation. These renovation costs could be in the \$40 million per year for ten year range. The State budget for capital projects remains uncertain. We have not had one for two years. Our Planning committee will be engaged into the process as it moves forward and an overall executive steering committee will be proposed with faculty representation.

USquare Project

University will lease space for new construction of a facility on McMillan that will have retail, living, and office space. We will lease office space for 10 years. The plan is to move some university offices to that space to free up space on campus to function as "swing" space for when departments have to move during renovations. Lease option is less costly than new building and gives flexibility for renovation moves at lower cost.

Governance and By-Laws

I have asked the committee to consider the issue of calls for secret ballots. Our current structure is not in line with Robert's Rules and common practice, in my view, and seems a bit anti-democratic. If a member of a body calls for a secret ballot it is usually because there is a controversial issue to which voting public creates some peer pressure. To force a public vote on whether to have a secret vote seems to be inhibiting. I assume that our by-laws were structured this way to suppress frivolous use of this option and efficiency, but it seems intuitively

problematic. We will get a recommendation from the committee, but I wanted you simply to know that I made the request.

TWO DISCUSSION ISSUES FOR DECEMBER MEETING

October AUF

I would like to canvass views on the best structure to facilitate the October AUF meeting and the presidential address. Should the current structure of embedding the speech in the meeting continue or should they be separate? I want to have an exploratory conversation about the October AUF in general. What truly is its purpose in an era of constant information communication? Is it an historical artifact based on an era that assumed it necessary to bring faculty together in order to inform them? What does it accomplish distinct from the regular meetings of the Faculty Senate, which serves as the representative body of the All University, when that body does not meet? Those meetings are open to all faculty. What is the point in gathering when primarily the only people who come are the same people who come to Senate? Do we counter-intuitively undermine the importance of the All-University Faculty voice by continually holding a meeting each year to which the university faculty does not attend?

I am at heart a traditionalist, but doing something because we have always done it, when its purposes are served by other means, needs to be examined. Should it become an option to call if an issue rises to require full university voice? Can we not move to a once a year AUF in May at which elections are conducted, business for the full year is reported, and set-up for the next year is established? Would this improve attendance and increase the standing of the AUF meeting itself? While the May AUF has distinct function, what is the distinct function that the October AUF serves that regular Senate meetings do not?

AAU and National Recognition and Marketing change

As you will recall, when President Williams first arrived he asked campus leaders to produce a list of “big ideas.” Faculty Senate pushed the notion that UC should strive for recognition as a top research institution on the level of the Association of American Universities. The President has worked that objective quietly over the past year with invitations to campus and discussions with AAU members. In his address this October, he publicly presented a preliminary case and the reality is that we are operating within the metrics of those elite institutions; that is, we are such an institution. I was quoted in the paper saying, that the reality is that UC is no longer up and coming, but rather we are a top university and the key is that “we have to get comfortable with that fact.” And I would now add, once we do, begin to move higher and higher in recognition and accomplishments. Since we institutionally were a proponent of this idea, what role can Senate play in acculturating the fact – how do we help close the reality-perception gap, which remains about our institution, particularly locally? I would like us to discuss.

As a former Fulbrighter, I wanted to pass along if you did not see it, the fact that for 2011-12, UC ranked ahead of other institutions, including Harvard University, Columbia University, Cornell University and Ohio State University in earning Fulbright awards for international research and teaching.

One structural change in this direction the president is instituting is separating out the office of Governmental Relations from Marketing and Communications and making the later a free standing office. That office will also seek a new communication strategy that combines

university-related efforts (university, foundation, athletics which have not been in sync necessarily in the past).

REPORTING PACK November 3, 2011

	Action Requested	Report only	NO Report
<u>Standing Committee</u>			
Academic Affairs			
Board of Trustees			
Budget & Priorities			
Committee on Committee			
Governance		X	
Human Relations			
Information Technology		X	
Planning			
Research & Scholarship			
<u>All university committees</u>			
Academic Coordinating Committee			
All university Governance Committee on			
International Affairs			
Capital Advisory Committee			
Diversity Council			
Environmental Oversight			
Fiscal Coordinating Committee			
Facilities & Administrative Distribution			
Committee			
Faculty development Committee			
Fiscal Coordinating Committee			
Integrated Core Learning Committee			
Intellectual Property Committee			
President Council			
Ohio Faculty Council			
Rieveschl Award for Creative and/or Scholarly			
Works Committee			
Semester Conversion Steering Committee			
Standing Committee on Conflicts of Interest			
Strategic Enrollment management Policy Council			
University Branding Committee			
University Calendar Committee			
University Graduate Council			
University Library Committee			
University Research Council -			
Subcommittee Arts & Humanities			
University Research Council			x
Subcommittee Behavioral & Social			
Sciences			
University Research Council			

Physical Sciences & Engineering
University Research Council
Life Sciences
University Faculty Grievance Committee

Faculty Senate Committee Report Only

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

Committee:	Academic Affairs Committee	Prepared By:	Adrienne Lane	Date:	09/28/11
-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	----------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	Yin Jung, Mike Magazine , Teresa Roig-Torres, A. Lane (Chair)
--	---

Topics Discussed:	<p>1. The sole focus for this meeting was to review the Academic Master Plan. The 2 key areas focused on (although there were many discussed) were as follows:</p> <p>A. The AMP focuses on funded research...our discussion supported a broader focus to include non-funded research and an expansion beyond research to include various types of scholarship as defined by Boyer.(Principle 2 Discovery)</p> <p>B. The AMP is constructed on 9 Principles..there is a lack of 'intersection of these principles'...the intersection is critical and should be highlighted.....i.e. Research + Sustainability+Mission Based Healthcare or Learning+Community, etc.</p> <p>2. Adrienne will email all committee members and request additional input prior to Friday at 2 PM. 3. Adrienne will request the following:</p> <p>A. Please read (re-read) the AMP Vision Document released last April: . http://www.uc.edu/provost/priorities/uc2019-amp.html</p> <p>B. I am asking that you review the AMP Vision Document plus each of the Recommendation files that I emailed you in an earlier email dated September 27.</p> <p>C. You should review each of the 9 Recommendations according to the following criteria: Red Flag, Green Flag. ...</p> <p>Red Flag: a recommendation and action steps that as structured might not succeed without "X" observation being considered (red flag). Provide the refinement that would lead to successful implementation of the recommendation (refine the recommendation itself or actions steps) Green Flag: a recommendation that is so critical or important as to be highlighted for its synergies that might connect with other recommendations. The refinement is to point to any explicit linkages that do not seem to be recognized in the wording that should not be missed.</p> <p>D. Please clearly denote your Red Flag/ Green Flag for me...highlight or use colored font or BOLD or track changes or hand-write and scan or another method of your choice.</p> <p>Red Flag: a recommendation and action steps that as structured might not succeed without "X" observation being considered (red flag). Provide the refinement that would lead to successful implementation of the recommendation (refine the recommendation itself or actions steps) Green Flag: a recommendation that is so critical or important as to be highlighted for its synergies that might connect with other recommendations. The refinement is to point to any explicit linkages that do not seem to be recognized in the wording that should not be missed.</p> <p>3. Adrienne will compile comments and forward the FSAAC report to Richard</p>
--------------------------	--

	<p>Harknett, FS chair.</p> <p>4. Next meeting: Adrienne will doodle FSAAC for Fall Quarter meetings. First regularly scheduled meeting will be in October.</p>
--	--

<p>Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background</p>	
---	--

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? Uptown 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:	11/1/11
-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	---------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	J. Gill, L. Graeter, A. Lane (Chair)
--	--------------------------------------

Topics Discussed:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome to Linda Graeter and Julie Gill, new members. Thank you for joining the FSAAC. Adrienne provided an overview of the committee’s annual report and plans for this academic year. 2. Minutes: Minutes of June 7 and September 28 with AMP Report will be re-distributed. Adrienne suggested that the FSAAC continue with the minute procedure from last academic year in which the “ FSAAC determined that minutes would be written, distributed for comment to FSAAC with provision of 4 business days for feedback, appropriate changes would be made, request concurrence of acceptance via email and then submit to Chair and FS for posting.” 3. AMP Follow Up: A. Lane provided a follow up of the AMP. The report of the FSAAC was shared at FS Cabinet. The FSAAC report along with other standing committee reports were then shared with Faculty Senate. Senators engaged in a type of Nominal Group Technique on each of the AMP Principles including standing committee comments. The result of this action at Faculty Senate was forwarded to the AMP Coordinating Committee as input into the next update of the AMP. 4. Information Literacy and Media Literacy Follow Up: As a follow up to the FSAAC resolution last academic year recommending an Academic Integrity Task Force, Richard Harknett (chair of Senate) appointed such a taskforce this academic year. The Taskforce for Academic Integrity in the 21st Century is chaired by A. Lane and is made up of students, faculty, administrators, and librarians. The charge is as outlined in the resolution passed by Senate on June 9th. The recommendations from the taskforce will be delivered to FSAAC by February 6, 2012 and FSAAC will report to Senate on March 8, 2012. The taskforce is meeting every two weeks and is on target to meet it timeline. Nelson Horseman, FSAAC member last academic year, is on this taskforce as faculty. Nelson and Adrienne will be the faculty representatives to an upcoming Academic Misconduct taskforce out of the Office of Judicial Affairs. 5. UC Grading Policy Follow Up: As a follow up to the FSAAC 2011 Annual Report recommendation, the committee will initiate a thorough review of the current UC grading policy and procedure. FSAAC discussed the process for this action. Those present were in favor of A. Lane soliciting volunteers from our committee to serve on a sub-committee with the following charge: 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 2012. Adrienne will request volunteers via email for this sub-committee. 6. Other Topics form FS Boot Camp and Beyond: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A. Lane shared the listing of potential FSAAC topics from boot camp---these included Semester Conversion, Large Classrooms & their impact on students and faculty, Capacity
--------------------------	---

	<p>for online testing across campus. Those in attendance agreed that these may be topics for further discussion.</p> <p>A. Lane went on the share 3 topics submitted by J. Gill from Blue Ash. These topics included the following: 1) Semester final exam schedule: under the quarter system, each course final exam is scheduled for 2 hours; to ensure equity, each semester course final exam should be scheduled for 3 hours – Yet, I don’t believe that anyone at the university is looking at this. Should we discuss and make a recommendation? 2) The department chairs at Blue Ash College would like us to consider a motion regarding a new web-based course scheduling system instead of the current system that leads to multiple data entry errors, 3) It appears that there are no formal procedures in place for the creation and submission of new semester courses. With the same course needing to be the same across all colleges, shouldn’t there be a cross-college creation, submission, and approval mechanism with representation from all colleges?</p> <p>FSAAC determined that A. Lane will take all 3 to the next Semester Conversion Steering Committee meeting for comment. Feedback from SCSC will determine FSAAC next steps which may include formation of a subcommittee to address Semester Conversion Concerns for Regional Campuses, a formal resolution, or other actions to be determined.</p> <p>b. A. Lane shared that Marla Hall had also sent 2 items for the FSAAC to review. These were deferred to next meeting.</p> <p>7. A. Lane will doodle for next meeting focusing on 11/21, 22, 23, 28, 29. The afternoon of 11/23 looks good. All would like a ‘smart room’. All have such rooms available in their college. Room will be determined after date is set.</p> <p>8. Meeting adjourned at 3:45.</p>
--	--

<p>Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background</p>	
---	--

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

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 (2011-12)

Committee:	Information Technology	Prepared By:	Eric Anderson	Date:	10/27/11
-------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	----------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	Eric Anderson, Lisa Beckelhimer, Michelle Conda, Anton Harfmann, Ken Hirsh, Brett Harnett, Maureen Schomaker, Hazem Said, Paul Foster (UCit)
--	--

Topics Discussed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blackboard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Upgrade to v9.1 will be happening on 12/16/11 ○ Discussed the need for faculty to have time to try the new features of 9.1. A “sandbox” version will be installed on 11/13/11 for faculty to try everything out. ○ Current version of Bb is very slow for some people ○ Some UCit student workers have administrator accounts in Bb that gives them access to Instructor areas like gradebooks. We helped Paul Foster create a policy to audit the admin account activity and give instructors a notification letter that one of their students has an admin account. ○ UC provides Bb to several other educational institutions in the area. There is a potential conflict of interest if Bb goes down because our contracts give us a financial incentive to fix the outside groups before UC. We discussed changes to the contracts that would be fair to all parties involved. • Blue Ribbon Task Force Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reviewed the Blue Ribbon Task Force report and the new action teams that will be formed to implement its recommendations. ○ We are interested to see who will be appointed to these action teams and believe it might be an issue for discussion in the future.
--------------------------	---

Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
---	--

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	___ By Faculty Senate ___ By Cabinet ___ Others (List-)
Next Meeting Date? – End of November. Date TBD.	

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 (2011-12)

Committee:	Governance	Prepared By:	Tracy Herrmann	Date:	10/31/11
-------------------	------------	---------------------	----------------	--------------	----------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	Carlee Escue, Stephanie King, Kathryn Lorenz, Joni Torsella, Linda Quinlin and Tracy Herrmann.
--	--

Topics Discussed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee discussed the list of items in the AAUP Works bulletin (Vol.18, No. 11) that would no longer be protected through contractual guarantees after expiration of the current collective bargaining agreement if Issue 2 is not defeated on November 8, 2011. • The committee discussed and approved the use of a sub-committee structure to work more efficiently in the review of the University faculty bylaws and the Faculty Workload Task Force Report 4-1-92. The sub-committees will include Joni, Kathryn, and Stephanie to review and identify issues in the workload document and Linda, Carlee, and Richard to review and draft by-laws changes. Tracy will work with both groups. • An initial review identified the following potential areas for by-laws revisions : the educator title, ballot voting at university faculty meetings, definition of quorum throughout the document, committee chair appointments, description of All-University Committees, vacancies for all positions and committees, and the descriptions of the balloting process (paper, electronic, etc.) • An initial review identified the following potential issues regarding the work load document: timing for re-evaluation of the document, need for policy related to buyout for research grants, need for updated house bill information, format (policy vs. report), educator title, completeness of knowledge areas, on-line teaching, assessment, degree levels, doctoral advising and chairing, definition of graduate faculty, accuracy of description of role of research, dated research grants and contracts data, number of students, timeframe for review of university and unit guidelines, and effect of semester conversion. • Subcommittees will conduct a more thorough review of the workload and bylaws documents and report findings at the next meeting.
--------------------------	--

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? November 30, 2011, noon – 1:30 p.m.	

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 (2011-12)

Committee:	Human Relations	Prepared By:	Jean S. Anthony	Date:	October 11, 2011
-------------------	-----------------	---------------------	-----------------	--------------	------------------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	J. Anthony, Chair, A. Ardehali; M. Sharma; A. Woods
--	---

Topics Discussed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Importance of setting priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Safety issues- a supportive and safe environment is key to academic success ii. Clarification of the term “Diversity”. What does it mean here at UC? iii. Educate the UC constituents about the Diversity Plan- education brings people together and create a sense of community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do we create a culture of inclusion within the university and surrounding community? 2. Annual award for faculty, staff and student organizations that exemplify inclusion and goals of cultural diversity 3. Diversity Plan: Goal IV strategies 6, 7, 8 & 9
--------------------------	---

Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background	As indicated in the agenda above
---	----------------------------------

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom:
	___ By Faculty Senate ___ By Cabinet ___ Others (List-)
Next Meeting Date: November 22, 2011	

Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2011-12)

Committee:	Research & Scholarship	Prepared By:	Henry A. Nasrallah	Date:	October 31, 2011
-------------------	------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------	------------------

Faculty Members at the Meeting:	H. Nasrallah, E. Bragg, H. Kloos, L. Wang, J. Ying, K. Grace
--	--

Topics Discussed:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Mission and Vision of the Committee 2. The frequency of meetings [quarterly at a minimum plus at the call of the chair] 3. Searchable e-Professional as a mechanism for faculty to know each other's areas of expertise for possible collaborations 4. The need for an OPEN ACCESS policy. Discussed adopting an existing policy VS creating our own. The Emory OA policy seemed like a reasonable one to emulate. 5. Nominations for Honorary Degrees: members will think of qualified individuals and submit their names for consideration 6. Academic Master Plan (AMP): members were asked to read the AMP draft and provide feedback /additional ideas 7. Different Committee members will liaise with various research groups within the university and report back to the Committee
--------------------------	---

Action Items: List item and attach supporting document if action requires such background	As indicated in the agenda above
---	----------------------------------

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):	By Whom:
As per agenda items above	<input type="checkbox"/> By Faculty Senate <input type="checkbox"/> By Cabinet <input type="checkbox"/> Others (List-)
Next Meeting Date? Mid December 2011	

University of Cincinnati
Academic Coordinating Committee (ACC)
Date: September 8, 2011
Place: 610 University Hall
Chair: Kristi Nelson, PhD
Recording Secretary: Mary Ann Rosensweet

Present: A. Allen, J. Denton, G. Escoe, W. Fant, R. Miller, N. Hertlein, A. Lane, R. Mehta, K. Nelson, S. Ritter, S. Saelinger, N. Vincent. T. Whalen, R. Zierolf

Excused:

Guests: N. Oliver, Z Osborn, A. Strecher

Agenda Topic	Synopsis of Discussion
Approval of Minutes	1. Motion was made to approve the June 9 th minutes by R. Zierolf, 2 nd by S. Saelinger, and motion approved.
Professional Practice Certificate	2. Professional Practice Certificate: International Academic Internship and Practice Certificate – visitor Z. Osborn and A. Strecher presented. This certificate is very similar to the International Co-op certificate which is in existence. It is intended to allow students to be formally recognized for completing language and an international intern experience, and bringing that together with a Capstone course. This is a 12-hr internship on-line, free elective. Discussion of the certificate – need to be clear about the pathways available, needs to be monitored, and credit hours need to be inserted on the proposal, as well as correcting typing errors. Motion made by W. Fant to accept with changes and monitoring, 2 nd by R. Zierolf. Motion carried.
College of Law LL.M proposal	3. N. Oliver presented the Master of Laws (LL.M.) proposal. Have received OBR approval for PDP, incorporated changes requested by ACC and other groups. With approval by campus committees, Board of Trustees, RAGGS and the Chancellor by the end of the year, hopefully will be able to offer next fall. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masters program aimed at training foreign-trained lawyers in the fundamentals of US law • Build relationship with US lawyers, business and other US agencies • Better able to represent US clients • Open with 5 students, designed to scale up over 5 years to ~15-20 students • Some will take Ohio Bar Exam • Increasing demand (50-90/yr) • No similar programs in Ohio • Minimum of 24 credits in one academic year; Three required courses for 8 semester credits • Benefits the community • Enrich learning environment , • new source of revenue • Marketing materials are being completed
DAAP – PhD in Architecture – final proposal	Motion to accept by A. Arthur, 2 nd by B. Fant. Motion approved. Now to FCC, AOC and to Board of Trustees. 4. We looked at this full proposal last spring and had questions re: how were admissions going to work, how was financial aid going to work, as this was not clear in the proposal. We sent these questions, and K. Nelson and B. Zierolf met with Naamdi Ellah, major architect of the proposal. Revised proposal has been submitted. He has clarified what the market is for this program i.e. students who apply for PhD’s in architecture, for the most part, already have a masters degree earned somewhere else, worked for a couple of years, and then they apply for the PhD. Very different from traditional programs.

October SCSC Minutes Available at
http://www.uc.edu/conversion/faculty_staff/leadership/meeting_minutes.html

Semester Conversion Steering Committee
Monday, October 10, 2011
6th Floor Lindner College of Business
4:00 – 5:30 pm

AGENDA

- 1) Sub Committee Updates - ALL
- 2) Semester Conversion Summit: November 9 (registrations, etc.) – B. Whitaker
- 3) Announcements – ALL

NEXT MEETING: November 14, 2011

