

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE STEERING AD HOC COMMITTEE ON AWARDS  
MARCH 2016**

Note: For each recommendation a rationale is given below in italics

A. Base Number of Awards, Creation of New Teaching and Clinical Education Awards, Recycling and Award amount

1. Increase or maintain the number of TIP, RIA and SOTL awards available each year; maintain an increase that reflects the increases in faculty numbers (5 year rolling increase to account for eligible new faculty); An initial overall increase in RIA as compared to TIP and SOTL is suggested based on the number of applicants vs. awards in each category in the past 3 years.

*The number of awards in all categories has remained stagnant for over a decade, and the number of faculty being hired is accelerating.*

2. Develop new faculty **awards** for faculty (as defined by faculty senate) who are not generating student credit hours through undergraduate or graduate courses, but contribute significantly to the mission of the University. This should include units such as the Libraries, the Medical Education Department within the College of Medicine, and clinical faculty in COHPA and Nursing, amongst others. The same salary structure (\$5000 permanent increase in base salary) would be used.

- a) *Faculty in some units (e.g., College of Medicine, Nursing, and COHPA) do not generate SCH, but should be awarded for their excellence.*
- b) *Librarians have been long left out of the award process with exception of a one time \$2000 excellence award.*
- c) *Faculty with substantial clinical teaching do not generally generate SCHs, and so they are not eligible for existing awards, and yet clinical education should be recognized at the University.*

3. Given the importance of service in the academy, a new award (base salary increase of \$5000 per year) should be developed that is University wide.

*Like librarians, service has been undervalued in the award process, and service is a critical part of the academy and should be appreciated.*

4. Add a final recommendation for all awards at the level of Dean (given the selection process within the colleges) and the Dean of the College of Undergraduate Studies (SOTL). If an award is not recommended at the Dean level, it can be recycled back to the same unit only one time (the next cycle) before it is returned to the overall pool and apportionment. This information should be included in each committee charging document (see recommendation C-2 below).

*There are concerns that in some cases faculty are eligible for an award and are recommended for the award by the committee even without meeting a level of excellence that would merit the award.*

*The ability to recycle a single award within a unit for one year will allow for some critical decision-making by the Deans without penalizing the unit unduly. It is possible that the 'use it or lose it' mentality could alter the rigor of the Dean's process for decision making.*

5. When a faculty member retires or leaves UCF, awards will be recycled into the overall award pool for the next year in order to increase award numbers.

*Recycled awards within units will over time skew the apportionment of the awards over time and this allows for awards to be fairly distributed.*

6. For all Excellence Awards (given on Founder's Day) – increase the one time award from \$2000 to \$4000.

*The award amount has been stagnant and given that these are one time awards a \$4000 award is more substantial for the faculty member.*

#### B. Eligibility and Formatting of awards

1. Awards are NOT a replacement of raises – and they should NOT be included in the base salaries of any faculty when the University is carrying out a salary study, NOR should they be used in determining how much of an increase a faculty member should get based on the results of a salary study, for example, to address equity and/or salary compression issues. ***This is a critical issue that faculty are concerned about and needs to be addressed openly by the administration.***

*Awards should not be seen as raises – they are awards. Winning an award should not penalize a faculty member when it comes to salary increases for which they would otherwise qualify.*

2. Eliminate tenure-earning in the eligibility of RIA awards.

*This will allow for instructors and lecturers, some of whom carry out substantial research, to be eligible for RIA.*

3. Establish an additional TIP eligibility category – undergraduate or graduate degree program or major; determine the median for SCH production by degree program (graduate or undergraduate) rather than by department so that small programs are not disenfranchised if they are housed in the same department or unit as large program(s). This would not alter the current eligibility system by department or college at undergraduate or graduate level.

*We appreciate that more than 80% of faculty are eligible by the current guidelines, but this additional layer could include faculty that might be excluded by the size of their degree program within a department or school.*

4. Standardize and simplify all award applications to be concise and to include only salient materials that support a strong case for excellence in teaching, research or SOTL. For example, a full CV, a one-page statement of strengths in the application and an appendix of materials to support this case.

*The applications are burdensome to both the applicants and the review committees. Excellence can be described in a succinct manner without losing critical information to judge the applications. This will lighten the burden on faculty of time spent assembling the application, and also on committees, who are perceived to have an incentive to relieve this burden by rejecting applications based on technicalities.*

5. Make all applications electronic.

*This is obvious in 2016.*

6. Word count rules must have a 10% margin of error.

*This will eliminate the disqualification problems that have occurred in the past.*

7. Develop a similar application for Excellence awards (Founder's Day awards) so that the materials for these awards are in line with the TIP, RIA and SOTL and to minimize the time faculty spend on preparing these applications.

*This will reduce the time that faculty spend on developing all applications.*

8. For each award the applicant is required to include as evidence either the past five academic years, or more, since the date of hire at UCF or since the submission of the last successful application.

*Faculty should be able to point to all their accomplishments in an area, with a limitation only if they are a previous awardee.*

9. There should be an emphasis on the review of SOTL awards that demonstrates that the same activities, by and large, would not be used for both a TIP and a SOTL (see changes to SOTL in appendix).

*Faculty who by definition work in this area (SOTL) as their creative activities should not be 'double-dipping'. Some overlap in research, teaching and service is also expected but this will clarify that SOTL and TIP are unique and different.*

10. Grant funding and percent effort on grants should be documented by the applicant from the Office of Research databases, or other official sources (e.g. UCF Foundation, contracts processed through auxiliary accounts).

*The funding amount and role of a faculty member is critical in assessing their contribution on a funded project. This will also align with the current dossier requirement for promotion and tenure that now requires the ORC report to be included in the dossier.*

11. All applications should clearly show (and committees should consider) the FTE assignment for the applicant for any years of service included in the application.

*The amount of time a faculty member has to do research, teaching and service should be taken into account by the review committee.*

12. Eligibility for awards is based on faculty as defined by the Faculty Senate.

*A number of groups who have been deemed as faculty by Human Resources are not recognized as faculty by the Senate, yet have been seeking this designation in part to obtain awards.*

13. Detailed changes are suggested for the SOTL application (attached appendix A).

14. Applications for all awards should provide more explicit information on eligibility. For example, define 'full-time' as 1.0 FTE and define 'continuous service'. Clarity on what constitutes continuous service is a concern to this committee. For example a faculty member who had a part-time teaching commitment for a number of years and then is hired into a full time position – are they eligible? Should all years of teaching be considered for continuous service? What about sabbatical, medical leave or parental leave? Neither of these should disqualify you for in our opinion.

#### C. Committee Structure, Charges to Committees, and Conflict of Interest

1. The faculty should elect committees from a pool of faculty that are not currently eligible for the award and should include past winners.

*Eligible faculty should play no role whatsoever in the process, including Chairs or Directors that can submit applications.*

2. Develop and implement a committee-charging document that will be used for all awards. The document will remind committees that only the application is to be discussed and that the award is based on merit. No additional outside information or discussion of position (e.g., instructor vs. tenure-track faculty member, past awards, current salary, etc.) are to be considered during review.

*Committee members have discussed that some past occurrences that invoked issues outside of the application have occurred. This will remind each committee each year about the importance of remaining focused on the applications and their merit.*

3. Develop a conflict of interest statement as a reminder to faculty who are eligible for and applying for TIP that they are not to be part of the process of committee development or in a decision-making capacity in the award system.

*Chairs and Directors are eligible for awards (and should remain so). However some faculty disagree with this eligibility. Distance between the process and the Chair/Director should be clear to all faculty in each case. The reason for disagreement on the eligibility of Chairs/Directors is that they make decisions that affect faculty eligibility (e.g. teaching assignments in large courses) and they could be competing with those faculty for the same awards.*