Order of Business – Faculty Senate
December 6th, 2012 – Great Hall TUC; 2:00 PM
1) Call to Order
2) Approval of the Minutes of the October 11th meeting
3) Report of the Faculty Chair
4) Committee Reports
5) Report of the President of the AAUP (Loving)
6) Report of the President of the Graduate Student Governance Association (Hutchings)
7) Report of the President of Student Government Association (Hart)
8) Old Business
9) New Business
REPORT OF THE FACULTY CHAIR:

Provostal Search Committee

The search committee for a provost will consist of the following:

Four presidential appointments:

Two faculty members, one of whom must be from the provostal area and one of whom must be a member of the bargaining unit.
Jason Heikenfeld (CEAS); Suzanne Masterson (LCOB)

One dean
Peter Landgren, CCM (Also Chair)

One open appointment.
Tom Humes, Trustee

Three faculty elected by the faculty senate:
John McNay (UCBA); Melanie Cushion (COM); Willard Sunderland (A&S)

One dean elected by the council of deans:
Greer Glazer, Nursing

One undergraduate student elected by the undergraduate student senate:
James Avant

One graduate student, elected by the graduate student association:
Sarah Hutchings

The composition of the above committee shall reflect special needs (e.g., affirmative action and special interest off-campus groups). If these needs are not met, then up to two additional members may be added by the president. The President has appointed:
Bob Ambach (Admin); Eric Abercrumbie (Libraries)

Budget:

FCC is considering several different scenarios. They range from assuming a 10% cut in SSI and no tuition increase to SSI remaining steady and a 2.5% tuition increase. There is a “0%” threshold scenario, but that would be done by asking Colleges to pay certain costs rather than pooling the costs and passing it down as a cut. Please refer to the Budget and Priorities Committee report for more information.

No decision has been made about SSI, but there are hopeful signs that UC will not get a cut in SSI. This may not be true across the State. Some Colleges/Universities may see reductions in SSI. However, it is important to emphasize that none of this is finalized.
Toledo has announced a 0% tuition increase for next year and a reduction of dormitory fees for sophomores. The dormitory fee reduction is tied to underutilization. The reasons for the 0% tuition increase are not entirely clear. There is a concern that this would create a pressure on all the other Ohio colleges/universities to follow suit or perhaps cause the Legislature to mandate a 0% increase.

**Budget Committees:**

The Provost has formed three new committees to look at the budgetary structure of the University. Strategic Enrollment Management will be the 4th committee looking at the budget structure. I was asked by Larry to either be on the Committee or provide someone in my place. Since I cannot be on all the committee, I have asked the following to serve in my place:

- Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) - I am already on the committee so I will stay.
- Role of Regionals – Vice Chair Tracy Herrmann (UCBA) and Senator Jeff Bauer (Clermont)
- Efficiency Council – Senator Rina Williams (Representing the Planning Committee on Recommendation of Chair Tilman)
- Financial Planning – Budget and Priorities Committee Chair Daniel Langmeyer

There will also be committees under Bill Ball in Research.

**Meeting with Interim-Provost Johnson:**

I meet with the Provost once a month. This last month we discussed budget issues. It seems that Faculty do not completely understand Performance Based Budgeting. I have asked the Interim-provost to provide information about PBB at the Fall AUF.

I expressed concern about our ever expanding administration. I also expressed concern that while faculty are evaluated by both our students and our Department Heads, Faculty never have the opportunity to provide input on the effectiveness on of the administrative unit we deal with. Interim Provost Johnson indicated that he looking at ways for Faculty input on the effectiveness of administrative unit.

**Compliance:**

A consultant has been hired to assess the University’s risk and exposure in compliance issues. I am scheduled to meet with them on December 11th. Compliance remains a major concern as the Federal Government is continually adding new, complex rules. I am exploring ways to provide information and training to Faculty to avoid compliance issues.

**Research:**
Research funding at UC is down. While this could be due to decreased funding and increased competition, there is a feeling among some in the Administration that it is probably due lack of new faculty which prevents the critical mass from forming that is needed to be competitive in Research.

**Graduation:**

President Ono had suggesting having a single Commencement Ceremony in Nippert Stadium, similar to the Ohio State ceremony. He asked Lane Hart, Sarah Hutchings and I survey students and Faculty. We created a survey on Survey Monkey. Lane Hart compiled the results. Overwhelming, the sense was to keep the current system of 2 ceremonies at 5/3rd. The proposed outdoor ceremony was not favored. The survey showed that students valued the individual recognition of walking across the stage and having their name announced. There were numerous fears about weather, parents not being able to see the graduates and length of time in the outdoor ceremony. There was also sentiment to cut back on speeches. The survey is provided in a separate document.

I raised the issue of the Faculty being shuffled off to the side during the ceremony. The people running Commencement are agreeable to moving Faculty to the front, but only if we can get faculty to show up. Empty seats look bad. There is a limit to the number of Faculty that could be accommodated, but our last year no more than 65 showed up for any ceremony. I am going to work with Debra Merchant and the students to see if we can come up with some ideas. It is too late to change the Fall Ceremony so changes would occur for Spring.

**Faculty Awards and Spring AUF:**

Marianne Kunnen-Jones has asked if the Faculty Awards could be done before the Spring AUF. Her suggestion:

2 p.m. Awards Celebration  
3 p.m. Reception  
4 p.m. All-University Faculty Meeting

The AUF meeting is now scheduled for April 16th Rooms 400 ABC, TUC. Marianne in the process of negotiating to trade with other groups to try and get the Great Hall for April 16th. If her negotiations are not successful, she may have to try to swap for another date with another group for the awards, but we would still be able to have the AUF on April 16th without the awards ceremony.

She indicated that we have experimented with doing the meeting prior to the awards and that has never worked out. It leads to problems with our awards ceremony production & technology, and with crowds forming at the back of the room to disrupt the faculty meeting.
### Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2012-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee:</th>
<th>Budget and Priority</th>
<th>Prepared By:</th>
<th>Langmeyer</th>
<th>Date: November 14, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Members at the Meeting:</td>
<td>Langmeyer, Said, Gilligan, Hodges, Boyce, Shearn</td>
<td>Guest: Interim Provost and former Dean Larry Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics Discussed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My own (Langmeyer) description of the Interim Provost’s background that informs his current thinking. Prior to Zimpher, Provost Johnson was the dean of the college of education (now criminal justice and human services) who grew that college’s enrollment, financial stability, programs and ability to being able to turn sows’ ears into silk purses. For many years he felt punished or not rewarded for his success never sharing in the fruits and often having to pay for the mistakes, shortfalls, reordered priorities and dreams of other deans, provosts and presidents (although he did grow the size of the college substantially). When Zimpher became president and Monica Ramai was put in charge of finance there was a shift in thinking about budgeting, college finances and things like that. Dean Johnson was identified as an exemplary financial manager. We were asked to develop a budgeting model that would provide incentives for growth at the college level, put more authority in the hands of college, and provide “transparency” to resource allocation. Dean Johnson did not invent Performance Based Budgeting but he was a champion of it and without his leadership and consistent attention it would have died shortly after birth. I know, I was there manning the ramparts with him and still hold a commission in the PBB army. He becomes interim provost with the charge of bringing sustainable financial model to the university. He believes we do not have one or not operating with one now. A model where our resources will match our expenses, where what we pay for is what we decide is what we want to be, where decisions about programs or activities are mindful and not just out of inertia, where we are conscious of our future and the competitive environment in which we work (live). Not just about making money but recognizing that different units and functions are valuable for different reasons and that we do have to pay attention to where the resources will come from to support the enterprise (UC). One major effort is putting together an effort titled “Supporting The Transformation” (2019 transformation but more broadly our financial future). This effort focuses on efficiencies, financial planning, relationship of regionals to the rest of UC, research both funded and unfunded, the foundation. Another is dealing with an unexpected shortfall in resources after moving to semesters (this year). Three colleges are meeting their thresholds or surpassing them (making a profit from what their bogeys were set at) but others are not meeting their thresholds, a few by very wide margins. The Provost’s office is engages colleges in developing plans for how to meet thresholds through economy (cuts) and increased enrollments. The shortfall may not be as great as the Provost originally thought but it is still a very large problem. Plans for “bridging” the shortfall are being worked out but colleges are being held accountable and must be planful. Colleges that consistently meet thresholds will be left alone. Colleges that consistently miss thresholds or do not have adequate plans will be coached and monitored. Another is budgeting for FY14 (next year). For the first time different scenarios are being developed for different assumptions about tuition increases, state subsidies and initiatives. One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
very interesting scenario is how do we get to a 0% threshold (no increased expectations for “profit” and no reallocations, living within our means). The Provost does not believe this is realistic but it is a lovely exercise. Provost Johnson described pressures put on colleges and administration from putting in new programs and initiatives at the top that had to be paid for by the bottom (colleges and administration through “thresholds”). He specifically described the growth of the Provost’s office over the past few years at the same time that colleges were being squeezed. Perhaps there are other central administrative offices doing the same. 

Another would be a need for deans and department heads to have more training and opportunities to share in financial management. This is a new role for academic leaders and unfortunately (at least I think it is unfortunate) colleges and departments are expected to run more as businesses caring much for their accounting sheets.

Committee comments and concerns A few of us commented that the benefits of PBB did not seem to get down to the unit level. Faculty are not as aware of what we gain from increased effort or modifying our work. Departments in most colleges are doing business as usual with Deans making requests or demands that just seem tied to demands from the administration without local ownership. A few of us commented that faculty felt that they were being asked to make money for others be it expansion of the Provost’s office, centrally mandated initiatives that were not supported by the faculty or non academic units like athletics.

Take Away This Provost is focusing on the economics and resources needed to fulfill our mission. He has the experience and history to provide leadership. Some concerns about what may be lost with a focus on “bottom line”. That may involved a broader concern about how higher education is valued and how that has changed since Governor Reagan started to undo the social contract about public education back in the 60’s.
### Faculty Senate/All University Committee Report (2012-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee:</th>
<th>Academic Affairs Committee</th>
<th>Prepared By:</th>
<th>Adrianne Lane</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>11/26/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Faculty Members at the Meeting: | B. Reigle, M. Magazine, T. Roig-Torres, L. Graeter, A. Lane, (Chair) |

| Topics Discussed: | 1. Review of Agenda by Adrianne.  
2. Charge of Committee statement  
3. Provost Committee on Teaching Excellence (PCOTE) Report—FSAAC held an in-depth discussion of this report as shared and presented by Howard Jackson at the October FSAAC meeting. In preparation of this in-depth discussion FSAAC members reviewed the Report of the Faculty Development Review Committee dated Spring 2012 and submitted to John Bryan, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, and Deborah Herman, Executive Director, UC Chapter AAUP; the mission of the UC Academy for Fellows of Teaching and Learning (AFTL); the mission of the Center for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CET&L); purpose of the Faculty Development Council (FDC); and Article 24 of the AAUP-UC Collective Bargaining Agreement. Members acknowledged the merit of the overall goals of the report and the contributing members. Even so, several concerns were voiced and discussed. Among the concerns were 1) an apparent lack of clarity regarding the organizational structure being recommended within the report, 2) potential duplication of mission with existing UC entities, 3) financial implications of proposed expenditures leading to a reduction in the total amount of contractual faculty development funds that would be accessible to all faculty, and 4) potential or realized impact on faculty evaluation via annual review and/or RPT. The FSAAC expressed concern that, in this era of scarce resources, allocations and expenditures should be targeted to strengthening existing entities and made accessible to all faculty. Members did not support the creation and funding of a new organizational structure that duplicates the missions and purposes of existing services. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed that the FSAAC did not endorse the report in its present form. Adrianne will provide a formal FSAAC comment concerning this report to FS Cabinet at the next meeting. The FSAAC did support the inclusion of standard all university questions on the student course evaluations, but did note that college and faculty must have the opportunity to also include college and course specific questions to these evaluations. Adrianne will forward this course evaluation feedback to Howard Jackson.  
4. Academic Integrity Task Force Update—Adrianne reported that the Academic Committee had reviewed the report at their last meeting on the second Thursday of November. The AC, chaired by Kristi Nelson, appointed a sub-committee charged with addressing and determining next steps for recommendations outlined in the report. Adrianne is a member of AC and the subcommittee. Adrianne will provide |
updates to FSAAC.
5. Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee—Next meeting 11/28/12, any member is welcome to attend.
7. Ohio Faculty Council Update—Adrianne shared that the revised SSI formula was due to Governor Kasich by Thanksgiving; to date Adrianne has received no information specific to the revised formula. Adrianne also did submit the FSAAC comments regarding the Ohio faculty credentialing draft to the Provost Office upon request: comments provided were the same comments she shared with the OFC earlier this academic year.
8. Complete College Ohio Report—Adrianne distributed this report prior to the meeting for members to conduct a preliminary review and prepare to discuss next steps of FSAAC relative to the report. Members briefly discussed highlights of the report and noted overall issues and concerns. A Lane will investigate with Kristi Nelson if any university group is reviewing or planning to review this report. A Lane suggested that the January meeting of FSAAC be devoted to a discussion of the report relative to implications for UC faculty. A FSAAC review of this report is within the charge of this committee.
9. Next meetings: During Spring semester FSAAC will meet the 4th Monday of the month from 8:45 to 10:15. Mike will investigate scheduling LCOB 537.
10. Meeting adjourned at 10:15.

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

FSAAC comments relative to PCOTE report to FS Cabinet.

Describe action needed on items above (discussion and input, vote, etc):

By Whom:

___ By Faculty Senate
___ By Cabinet
___ Others (List-)

Next Meeting Date? Monday, January 28, at 8:45 am at LCOB, room 537.
Faculty Senate University Service Award — Nominations due December 7, 2012

Two Faculty Awards for Exemplary Contributions in Service to the University of Cincinnati

Description

The University of Cincinnati will continue its tradition of honoring faculty for “Exemplary Contributions in Service to the University of Cincinnati.” The awards (two) are sponsored by the UC Faculty Senate. The awards will be given to full-time faculty members who have made significant and sustained service contributions to the University during their career at UC.

University Service is defined as participation and leadership in activities other than teaching and research that contribute in important ways to the mission of the University of Cincinnati.

Criteria for Nomination

Faculty members eligible for the award are full-time faculty who have exhibited sustained, significant, and impactful University service activity over several years and who have provided significant leadership within the University. Their contributions should be further evidenced by substantial time commitments and significant accomplishments related to their service activities. All individuals entitled to vote in the All-University Faculty Elections except previous winners are eligible for this award.

University Service activities might include, but are not limited to:

- Significant participation on departmental, college, and university committees.
- Leadership in service as evidenced by election or assignment to head committees and in assuming leadership roles.
- Participation in committees and/or groups related to the University’s governance, growth and improvement, and its image.
- Work on programs or activities to promote faculty development.

Details and Info: [http://www.uc.edu/facultyawards/awards_nomination/faculty_senate.html](http://www.uc.edu/facultyawards/awards_nomination/faculty_senate.html)

Questions:

Dalila Juram
Chair of the Faculty Senate Human Relations Committee
dalila.juran@uc.edu 513-556-0328