Senate Minutes
March 8, 2012

1. Approval of the February minutes
The minutes for February were approved.

2. Discussion of Faculty Chair's Report
There was no discussion of the Chair's Report.

3. Introduction of Taskforce Report on AI21 (Adrianne Lane)
Academic Affairs had two groups come and talk to them about plagiarism, technology, and resources for detecting plagiarism. Out of these meetings, the Academic Affairs committee put for a senate resolution for a task force to investigate academic integrity. The task force was appointed last spring. The Task Force was made up of students, graduate students, associate deans, faculty and librarians. Adrianne asked us to share the report with our colleagues and get back to her with feedback by March 15, 2012. Those comments will go back to the task force and the report will be brought forth to senate at our next meeting. The report was presented to Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee and did receive that committee's support. The charge was to investigate the prevalence of academic misconduct at UC and to recommend a detailed action plan to address it. The Task Force met with Daniel Cummings from the Office of Judicial Affairs. The Task Force proposed three primary recommendations; Academic Integrity be moved to the Office of the Provost with the office of judicial affairs still handling any instances of violation, academic integrity would be a core value at UC and it would be "a thread in our community". It would be embedded in first year experience. The third recommendation would be that UC join the International Center for Academic Integrity. In their investigation the Task Force found that 20 of the AA universities are members. Senate was asked to please review this report and share with colleagues.

4. Discussion of Report of Budget and Priorities (Daniel Langmeyer)
The Budget and Priorities Committee has developed reports summarizing info from the annual financial report. The committee wanted to point out a few things that they had noticed in the report. The committee also wanted feedback from the senate on the report. The first report was concerned with estimating the out-of-pocket cost of the faculty. This would include things such as salary, money for retirement, medical reimbursement. These are out- of-pocket expenses paid by University. The committee looked at these expenses starting in 1995 and picking up every 4 or 5 years until fairly recently. The committee compared those expenses with the revenues from the report for undesignated funds (These are general funds that can be used for any purpose--- doesn't include Clermont and Blue Ash.) There are also restricted funds that include revenues brought in from research and grants. These two sources of revenue go to pay for the faculty. Revenues have gone up over the years and so have the cost of the faculty. The amount of revenue that the university has to pay for faculty decreased from 1995 to 2010 from 24.6 – 18%. Medical costs for the faculty have become more substantial since 1995 – the university pays more than it used to in 1995. The output for Medical from 2007 to 2010 has pretty much remained flat. The cost of salaries has been pretty flat for the three years between 2007 and 2010. In terms of income, from 1999 to 2009 tuition goes up and state subsidy stayed flat. On the spending side instruction had the lowest rate of increase over those ten years – less than any other category of spending. The committee made note of increases in mandatory transfers – debt service… legal obligations to pay - $50 million off the top last year. The committee believes that this is evidence that what we do today impacts what happens in the budget in the coming years. Senator, Dennis O'Neill suggested that the committee might make a stronger case if they put the report in per capita terms. Arlene Johnson asked if librarian salaries fell in these categories. Daniel Langmeyer said that it might be under Academic Support. Chair Harknett said that we should frame this appropriately as Dennis O'Neill had indicated earlier. We need to fully understand and report out the implications of these numbers. There is a narrative to tell. We have been very productive and we have dealt well with an influx of more students and retention issues.

5. Report of AAUP (John McNay)

Contract reopening negotiations are continuing at present. We also have national and state elections going on right now. John McNay encouraged everyone to vote. He reminded us that since we are one of the largest chapters in the nation and the largest in the state we can have a real impact by voting. Negotiations will be done sometime in April.

Update from Undergraduate Student Body Government on Smoking Task Force Resolution:

Chair Harknett took the time before the Provost arrived to inform us of a change the Undergraduate Student Body Government wants to make to the Smoking Task Force resolution:
Undergraduate Student Body Government wants to amend the resolution to a smoke-free campus instead of a tobacco free campus. Each body will have to amend the resolution for the vote. They will introduce the amendment then speak to it. The Graduate Student Association and Faculty Senate will have to introduce it and amend it so that we are voting on a common resolution. The resolution says that we agree to move forward to build a policy on smoking or tobacco usage at the University of Cincinnati. We are not voting on an actual policy.

6. Provost Input Session (Provost Santa Ono)
Vice Chair Daniel Langmeyer asked the Provost about the operating budget for the colleges for next year. The Provost met with the Deans yesterday at the AOC meeting. As of the last analysis of the budget about half of the colleges were in deficit. Three or four colleges have a surplus. The Provost and the Deans have an agreement that they are looking out for the longevity and interest of the University as a whole. This year our state support is not being cut. We are keeping money on the academic side of the University, and that money is going to help colleges that are in deficit. There is enough surplus in the budget to keep all the colleges solvent. The Provost is optimistic at this stage. He wants to make sure that funds that are imperative to the mission of the University, teaching and research, are protected. Senator Brett Hartnett asked the Provost if he could project of enrollment. President Williams asked the Provost to look at capacity in terms of classroom and lab space. The Provost said that his data suggest that we do have more capacity in terms of classroom and laboratory space. They have also been looking at the Delaware study --- data on faculty to student ratio. Our data suggests that there are some units where the teaching load is excessive compared to our peers and there are other units where the teaching load is less demanding compared to our peers. Expenditure for student and faculty work load are average for a research one institution. This is being used for hiring plans --- for vectoring more faculty lines. There are different results for different parts of the University. It is not a straight forward problem. Chair Harknett brought up data from budget and priorities – we have more students, same faculty, and better retention better graduation rates – speaks to a better productivity rate. Provost indicated that this is a multifactorial problem and it varies by unit.

7. Opening of Concurrent Governance Session (Harknett, Hagerty, Penzvalto)
We are in a concurrent session as of 4:39 pm with Undergraduate Student Government and the Graduate Student Organization. We will vote as separate bodies. If there is time, people who are not members of the three bodies can sign up to speak. The Undergraduate Student Body Government opened its meeting with a roll call at 4:41 pm. Paulette Penzvalto called the Graduate Student Association meeting to order at 4:44 pm. All three governing bodies were in session at that time.

8. Introduction and Consideration of Resolution on ACOPS
There was discussion on the Advisory Committee on Public Safety. The charge of the committee is to advise the Director of Public Safety on safety issues. (Please see the resolution.) There was a motion to close discussion from the Undergraduate Student Government. It carried. The Graduate Student Association and the Faculty Senate also moved to close discussion and those motions carried. Captain Rodney Chapman from the Department of Public Safety was in attendance at this meeting. The Department of Public Safety is excited about this commitment to public safety. All three governing bodies voted on this resolution. The resolution was voted in with a majority vote in all three bodies.

9. Introduction and Consideration of Resolution on Smoking Taskforce Report

The Undergraduate Student Government opened the discussion. Alan Hagerty, President of Undergraduate Student Government gave a short history of the resolution and the task force. The original resolution and report called for a Tobacco Free campus. Undergraduate Student Government has decided that they will support a smoke free campus not a tobacco free campus. One reason given for this change is that only second hand smoke affects others. Alan Hagerty asked for feedback on this change. Marla Hall, Board of Trustees Representative to the Faculty Senate, asked about accepting money from tobacco industry for research. She believed that this was an important issues that should be considered before going ahead with this resolution. Janine Hartman (Senator from Arts and Sciences) asked if they knew how much money comes from tobacco sources.

Chair Harknett pointed out that all three bodies were supposed to vote on the same resolution at this meeting. He asked if the Faculty Senate and Graduate Student Association would amend the resolution as well to reflect a smoke free versus a Tobacco Free campus.

Tobacco free would consist of every type of tobacco whereas smoke free would be cigars and cigarettes. The rationale is that tobacco does not harm others whereas smoke does. Undergraduate Student Body Government does not want to infringe on personal freedoms. Chair-Elect, Richard Miller asked if these changes are consistent with the original report we are being asked to accept. Because we are being asked to vote to accept a report that reaches certain conclusions, the change in the resolution has to be consistent with the results of the report. The report on page 4 recognizes both smoke free and tobacco free. Marla Hall, Board of Trustees Representative, asked about medical marijuana usage. This could be affected by a smoke free campus. Senator Arlene Johnson indicated that we as senators got information from our constituents based on the original resolution not the one being proposed now. Senator Adrianne Lane, indicated that on page 5 of the report the references are to tobacco free not smoke free. Thus, the report is not consistent with the resolution. The original thought was to have consistent policies on both the medical and academic campus in order to accomplish that we have to go with tobacco free not smoke free. Senator Brett Harnett believes we should be tobacco free because we are sending a message that smokers should use chew which is worse. A Student Senator said the point is that chewing would not be harming others and would not impinge on individual rights. The Undergraduate Student Body Government voted to change the resolution to smoke free from tobacco free. The Graduate Student Government Association voted unanimously to not accept the amendment to the resolution and will vote on the original resolution. Faculty Senate unanimously decided to vote on the original resolution not the amendment. Thus, the Undergraduate Student Government Body will vote on a smoke free campus while the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Student Association will vote on a tobacco free campus.

The undergraduates suggested that we should move to this policy over time – reduce smoking areas etc. This would allow the entire UC community to be adequately informed. It was then brought up that implementation is a separate issue. The discussion should center on the issue of whether or not we want to move into this direction. A Faculty Senator reminded the groups that the response rate for the survey was low – to come up with a policy based on that small amount of response is not prudent. We should just enforce the rules we have now instead of trying to make new rules. An undergraduate said that the current policies are difficult to enforce, and the response rate was good enough in comparison to national surveys.

Marla Hall, Board of Trustees Representative, said that enforcement of non-smoking policies is not good at other institutions and that we need effectiveness data. We also need to consider research dollars from tobacco industry that could be lost. An Undergraduate Student Senator said that the University of Kentucky passed their policy with only 3% response rate to their survey and they have passed a tobacco free campus resolution and have been able to enforce it. Marla Hall, Board of Trustees Representative, asked if tobacco products can still be sold on campus. President of the Undergraduate Student Body, Alan Hargerty said no. Erin Johnson, an undergraduate student, stated that the analysis in the report is a misrepresentation of the data. He believes that the report is biased. Undergraduate discussion of the resolution closed. Graduate Student Association – discussion – called the question. Faculty Senate called the question. Ready to vote… Undergraduate Student Government – roll call vote – 19 yes and 2 no – passed in favor of a smoke-free campus. Graduate Student Association - 23 against 0 for it – the resolution on a tobacco-free campus did not pass. Faculty Senate also voted on the resolution on a tobacco free campus– 8 for and 10 against – did not pass. In conclusion, the resolution was defeated.

10. New Business

There was no new business.

11. Announcements
There were no announcements.

12. Adjournment
Motion to adjourn carried.

Respectfully submitted by Wanda C. McCarthy, Ph.D., ***Secretary Faculty Senate***