

Faculty Senate Meeting March 26, 2009

Dr. Manoj Chopra, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures. The minutes of February 19, 2009 were approved with revisions.

Revisions: Under New Business: Student Perception of Instruction, change Stinard's title to "Ms." and add "Mr. Harrison" as one of the presenters.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

This is the last meeting of the 2008-2009 Senate. To nominate someone as an officer candidate for the 2009-2010 Senate, the senators were asked to contact Dr. Arlen Chase, who chairs the nominating committee. A motion is made to thank Dr. Chopra for his service as Chair. Motion seconded and approved.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

David Kuhn (Faculty Affairs); Drs. Poole, Bishop, and Stern (Graduate Studies); Diane Jacobs (Medicine); Tace Crouse (FCTL); Tracy Dietz for Diane Chase (Academic Affairs); Elliot Vittes (Undergraduate Studies); Dennis Dulniak (Registrar); Joel Hartman (Information Technologies); Christopher Niess (Theatre); Dawn Trouard (UFF); Linda Futch (CDWS); Lisa Wayte and Elizabeth Hale (Computer Services).

Provost's Update

The provost thanked Dr. Chopra for his service to the Senate and commended him for his service as a Trustee.

The provost has just returned from the Board of Governors (BOG) meeting in Tallahassee. Last week, the governor's office announced that they will be withholding 15% from the last quarterly transfers to all state agencies, including state universities. This is because of the cash flow problem in the state. Shortly thereafter, the BOG relayed that the reduction will actually be 16.6%. The reductions will total \$9.6 million, which the provost will cover entirely with reserves. There is the hope that the federal stimulus money will arrive before the end of the fiscal year and make these cuts unnecessary. If UCF did not have the reserves to draw upon, units would find themselves unable to make payroll in the last six weeks of the fiscal year. The Senate budget recommendation came out, and the House budget recommendation is due out next week. The Senate budget cuts university budgets by 9%, effective July 1, with cuts totaling \$154 million across all universities. That money is then replaced with \$129 million of non-recurring funds. The net impact is a 1.4% cut as of July 1st. The downside is that they are taking recurring money and replacing it with one-time stimulus money. President Brogan of FAU has said that the stimulus money is not like a bridge, but rather like a pier. The stimulus money props us up for a year, maybe two, but it's impossible to know what state the economy will be in when the money runs out. This time next week we will know more, because the House budget recommendation will have been released. The Senate budget provides 90% of the requested funds for the medical school, and most of that is recurring. The efforts to protect Florida's two new medical schools appear to have been successful, at least for the Senate budget.

Question: Are we going to be in a position where we can't make payroll? Answer: It's not that we aren't going to be able to make payroll, but that 80-85% of the budget is tied up in

personnel. We've lost 16% of our budget, so there may be a risk of that employees are affected. UCF should get through 2009-2010 with relatively small cuts compared to what was anticipated, but a great deal depends on the state of the economy once the stimulus money runs out. The state has lost about 25% of its revenue, and it continues to loose.

Question: What is the status of increased and differential tuition? Answer: The governor's budget presented an increase of 5% and Senate presented an 8% increase in tuition. UCF will raise our differential tuition to make up the difference to the maximum of a 15% increase. Another problem is that the Bright Futures funds could be running out, and the state-mandated increases are covered by Bright Futures.

Question: How far does a tuition increase go toward covering the deficit? Answer: Each percent cut in our budget is a \$2.6 million cut, but each percent of tuition increase is only 1.2% coming in, and 30% of all differential tuition is mandated to go to need-based aid. We cannot offset the impact of state budget cuts with tuition.

The receptivity in Tallahassee toward higher education is dramatically different this year. Legislators are accepting the importance of the universities as the economic engine of the state. Question: What prompted this attitude change? Answer: The legislators see the intellectual property coming out of the universities as a way to diversify the economy and generate new revenue. Also, the anticipated economic impact of the medical city at Lake Nona is being considered a bright spot in the state economy.

NEW BUSINESS

Webcourses Taskforce

Joel Hartman has proposed the formation of a joint faculty/Information Technologies taskforce to look at current Webcourses issues and the future direction of online courses at UCF. Dr. Chopra called for volunteers to serve on this taskforce. The taskforce members will be: John Lynxwiler, Glenda Gunter, Sharron Douglass, and Alain Kassab.

OLD BUSINESS

Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) forms

The current SPoI form will be moving online to allow the new online system to stabilize. Once that occurs, the revised SPoI forms will replace the current one. The agenda item today is for a vote on the content of the new instrument. A motion was made to approve the new SPoI forms. Discussion of the proposed forms followed. Concerns were expressed about the scale used in many of the questions. Senators questioned how they could vote on the content of the forms without understanding how they would be implemented. On the issue of moving the current forms online, concerns were expressed about the methods of implementation and how compliance will be encouraged. Dr. Hartman spoke briefly about the different options available for online implementation. Motion made to table the issue and have next year's Senate take it up. Motion seconded and carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Revised Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Regulations

The revised P&T regulations were presented from the Personnel Committee. The floor was opened for discussion.

Friendly amendment: the words "creative activity" were omitted from mentions of "research and scholarly activity." Motion to amend that phrase to "research, scholarly, and creative activity." Motion seconded and approved.

Friendly amendment: The word "tenured" has been left out of certain items. In the Promotion document under 5.h.1, motion to amend the second sentence to reflect that professors must be tenured. The change would be: "Committee members must ~~hold the rank of professor~~ be **tenured full professors** and be active scholars within their particular disciplines." Motion seconded and approved.

Scrivener's errors:

In the Promotion document, there are two sections labeled 5.g. The second "g" should be an "h".

In the Tenure document, some words are missing from section 9. It should read: "Administrators holding academic appointments and who do not directly supervise the candidate and who meet the requirements of the previous section and who will ~~otherwise not recommendation~~ **not otherwise make a recommendation** may participate on the college promotion and tenure committees."

In the Tenure document, under section 8.c, strike the second "register" in the first sentence.

Friendly amendment: In the Tenure document under 9.b, does the "vote of the tenured faculty in the original department" include the chair of the original department? Motion to amend 9.b to specifically include the chair. Discussion: That may be redundant because 9.a requires the agreement of the chair to even proceed to 9.b. The amendment is withdrawn.

A question was raised on whether it the intention of 9.a that the chair have veto power over whether or not the faculty member can apply for expanded tenure. A discussion occurred on the process involved in expanding tenure. The provost noted that the dean on the receiving end has input, but there's no role for the dean of the originating college. Should the processes for the receiving and transmitting units be identical? The tenure documents require that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) be written that is signed off on by the faculty member and chair of each unit, but the deans are not mentioned. A discussion followed on the nature and purpose of dual tenure. The provost recommended that the MOU clearly spell out the financial responsibilities of both departments/colleges involved.

Friendly amendment: In the Tenure document, motion to add the following after 9.b (the first instance of b): "**c) The department chair, school director, or unit head shall register his/her recommended vote with the dean or dean's representative. d) The dean or dean's representative shall review the materials provided and register his/her recommendation vote with the provost, who makes the final decision.**" The motion is also to amend section 9.g as follows: "A Memorandum of Understanding shall be completed that outlines the rights and responsibilities, **including financial responsibilities**, of the faculty member in each unit and be signed off on by **all deans involved**, the department chair, school director, or unit head from each unit and the faculty member." Motion carried.

A question was raised regarding whether expansion of tenure should remain in the document at all. A representative from the Personnel committee noted that this issue had been debated at the committee level, and their final recommendation is what is contained in the document. A discussion followed about the potential advantages and disadvantages of dual tenure, and how dual tenure differs from a joint appointment. (*At this point, Dr. Chopra, who had to leave early, turned the meeting over to Dr. Cook.*) Motion made to strike the expansion

of tenure from the Tenure document. Discussion followed. The question was called. A voice vote was held, and then repeated with a show of hands. The motion failed.

Scrivener's errors: Correct the numbering in the Tenure documents so that there aren't repeats (e.g., there are two different instances of 8.a). This appears to be primarily in sections 8 and 9.

The question was called to vote on the approval of both documents. Vote carried. Both documents are approved as amended.

Graduate College Policy Revisions

As an informational item, Dr. Moharam provided an overview of policies revisions from the Graduate Council. The policies revised are:

- Graduate Policy #09-3, version 09-3.1.12 UCF Graduate Program Requirements
- Graduate Policy #09-2, version 09-2.1.5 Course Category Definitions
- Graduate Policy #09-4, version 09-4.1.6 UCF Transfer of Credit Policy
- Graduate Policy #09-5, version 09-5.1.13 University-Wide Qualifications for Participation in Graduate Education.

Mr. Gause, senator from the Libraries, asked that the policies make explicit that librarians are eligible to serve on committees. Dr. Stern, representative of the Graduate College, replied that they plan to clarify the documents to include as eligible "ranked faculty with multi-year contracts."

Security and Panic Alarm Monitoring

As an informational item, Dr. Cook noted that as of July 1 the UCF Police Department will no longer be responsible for monitoring security and panic alarms. Units must now pay for this monitoring, which will be conducted by an outside agency.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Budget and Administrative – *Dr. Belfield reporting*

None.

Personnel

The above P&T discussion served as the report.

Graduate Council – *Dr. Moharam reporting*

The Appeals committee reviewed awards for Masters and PhDs. The Policy committee is working on policies. The Program Review committee is reviewing a new MA in Real Estate.

Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee – *Dr. Pennington reporting*

Next meeting is April 14th. On the consent agenda is changing the athletic trainer track into a degree, changing a chemistry track to a biochemistry track, and changing some course requirements for an Anthropology minor. At the March meeting, the American Sign Language minor was suspended due to a lack of faculty.

OTHER BUSINESS

On behalf of Dr. Chopra, Dr. Cook thanked the Senators for their service.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made at 5:50. Motion seconded and approved.