

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes of
March 3, 2011

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of February 3, 2011 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded with the addition of several scrivener edits.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Dr. Cook announced that UCF is developing a committee to look at a non-smoking policy for the university. Drs. Liberman and Oetjen agreed to serve on the committee.
- The Student Government approved a resolution to create an "Eternal Knights Moment of Silence", which would honor those who passed away in the past year. The moment of silence would be on Wednesday, March 30, 2011 at 3 p.m. This resolution has received support from President Hitt and Provost Waldrop. Motion made to endorse this recommendation. Motion seconded. Discussion followed. The moment of silence will be held as the Eternal Knights ceremony is taking place. Motion carried.
- State Representative Dwayne Taylor (Daytona Beach) will be on campus on March 4th as part of his statewide tour to discuss the possible negative consequences of legislation impacting the Florida Retirement System. Rep. Taylor will be at the Fairwinds Alumni Center at noon.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Kevin Haran, Associate Professor and Chair of the Personnel Committee
Joel Hartman, Vice Provost of Information Technologies and Resources
Dan Holsenbeck, Associate Vice President for University Relations
Michael Stern, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

Provost Waldrop announced that he has finished reviewing Promotion and Tenure files and was pleased by the quality of the faculty at UCF. He recognized Dan Holsenbeck, Associate Vice President for University Relations, who will be presenting a legislative update, and acknowledged his work on behalf of UCF.

OLD BUSINESS

Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI)

Dr. Cook alerted the committee that the discussion of SPoI was tabled at the February 17 Senate meeting and is expected to continue at the March 17 Senate meeting. A draft of the SPoI incorporating the changes approved on February 17 was emailed to the Senate. She asked Steering Committee members to pass the information to their colleagues and to encourage them to send feedback.

Dr. Cook asked Dr. Joel Hartman for his report on the completion rate of SPoI, which had been requested by the committee at the last meeting. Dr. Hartman stated that the response rate of the electronic SPoI was typically the same or higher than in paper format. The university has historically experienced 55-59% response rates for paper delivery. Since we went to electronic delivery the

response rates have been in the 60s, with the exception of fall 2010. Due to a set-up error in fall 2010, students had only one week to complete the SPoI, rather than the normal two weeks. The response rate for fall 2010 was in the 50s range. Dr. Hartman expects response rates to return to the 60s range with future surveys, and noted that the fall 2010 response rate was similar to the rate using the paper format. A question and answer period followed:

- A committee member asked about the response rate for written comments, stating that his college has noticed a dramatic decrease in the number of student comments. Dr. Hartman did not have statistics regarding the free response portion of the SPoI. He noted that the university is considering a revised format so that each student's written comments are grouped together.
- A committee member expressed concern that the low response rate in fall 2010 could impact faculty evaluations and TIP applications. Provost Waldrop stated that this would not impact promotion and tenure as the process reviews the entire career and not just one semester.
- A question was raised regarding whether it is problematic if the SPoI response period runs over Thanksgiving. Dr. Hartman replied that the schedule for SPoI is based on the end of the semester and the beginning of finals. Specific issues can be brought to the Registrar's office. A committee member added that the university needs to be more aggressive in telling students that they will have the opportunity to complete the SPoI.
- A request was made for the breakdown of response rates by college and graduate/undergraduate.

Outlook Email Migration

Dr. Cook has heard many questions and comments on the campus email migration to Exchange and Microsoft Outlook, and asked Dr. Hartman to field questions on the topic. A committee member noted that the web client is unusable on a phone. Dr. Hartman responded that faculty and staff could purchase a subscription for the ActiveSync service and software at the campus computer store. Several committee members felt that since email is core to faculty doing their jobs, the university should either purchase the necessary software for faculty or enable us to use free alternatives (e.g., POP and IMAP) to access email via phones and portable devices. Dr. Hartman provided a document explaining that previous free methods had information security issues and the new method was put in place to protect university data from potential of exposure. There is not funding to provide ActiveSync to all employees for free. Further conversation addressed why departments do not purchase subscriptions and Dr. Hartman stated that colleges and other units can make the decision to purchase ActiveSync software for their employees. In order to accommodate Dr. Holsenbeck's schedule, the email discussion was paused until after Dr. Holsenbeck's presentation.

Legislative Update

Dr. Dan Hollenbeck, Associate Vice President for University Relations, thanked the Steering Committee for meeting with him. He cautioned that he will be providing information based on what he has heard, but the budget has not yet passed and so he cannot provide definitive answers as to what will happen. He reminded the committee that per state law, state employees cannot use public resources to get involved with the political process unless they're invited and coordinate with the university. Public resources include university email, phone, stationary, secretary's time, etc.

Dr. Holsenbeck distributed a handout prepared for the Senate Budget Committee on the Florida State Group Insurance Program and a list of the pending Senate bills by topic. He discussed three issues of concern for UCF employees:

1. The Gun Bill

Dr. Holsenbeck addressed Senate bill 234, which would authorize the use of concealed weapons on campus for those licensed. The university's position is that this is not a second amendment issue; it is simply improper for students to carry in class. The state universities are working together for a change to the portion of the bill relating to college campuses.

2. The Status of the Benefits

Dr. Holsenbeck discussed Senate Bill 1130. The full text of the bill is available at the Online Sunshine website (<http://www.leg.state.fl.us/>). Dr. Holsenbeck anticipates the following changes coming into effect, although to what extent he doesn't know: State employees will have to contribute to their retirement. (The bill has no specific recommendation for the amount of the contribution. It says the contribution will be determined by the viability of the economy and the need for making the retirement system actuarially sound.) Several options that the state may consider is changing the percentage of payouts, adopting a defined contribution plan rather than a defined benefit plan, and altering how retirement pay is calculated. All of these changes can be made without breaking the contract.

In addition, changes could be made to our insurance programs such as requiring state employees to pay more out of pocket for premiums or requiring participation in managed care. Dr. Holsenbeck predicted there will be some contribution required by all of us to retirement and insurance. He has observed that members of the legislature seem to want to protect individual employees. Any changes passed would go into effect July 1, 2011. Dr. Holsenbeck entertained questions from the Committee:

- In response to a question about the possibility that they will eliminate the Optional Retirement Plan, Provost Waldrop commented that doing so would make it hard to retain and recruit faculty.
- Q: Will changes be made retroactive?
A: The state cannot take away what you have earned, but can change future earnings
- Q: What about faculty who made retirement decisions, including DROP, based upon promises from the state? If DROP is discontinued, are those who have not yet retired or entered DROP just not going to get it?
A: Yes, that is how Dr. Holsenbeck interprets it. The future of DROP looks precarious.

3. The State Budget

Dr. Holsenbeck has reviewed the budget worksheets from the higher education committee. The total higher education budget is approximately \$7 billion. Out of this amount, the committee was tasked with reducing the budget by 15%, or \$913 million. The cuts will most likely come from the three biggest portions of the budget: (1) state colleges (approx. \$1 billion budget), (2) state universities (approx. \$3 billion budget), and (3) financial aid programs. He guesses that we may need to reduce our recurring base 3-5%. If cuts are in 3% range and we are able to increase tuition by 15%, this will more than cover the 3% cut. In addition, we already have held back 3% so we should be in good shape financially.

In response to a question about whether the state is interested in decertifying the union, Dr. Holsenbeck said that he has seen no indications of movement in that direction. Dr. Holsenbeck thanked members of the committee for the opportunity to address them and for their help and continued support.

Outlook Email Migration – Continued

Dr. Cook stated that Dr. Hartman had to leave, but he agreed to continue the discussion at a later date. Dr. Cook expressed her hope that more effort will be made to help faculty and keep us informed about

changes and any threats to electronic security. A committee member reiterated that one of the primary issues is that faculty have been asked to bear the cost of having secure access on mobile devices. A committee member suggested that the university consider faculty input regarding the timing of changes such as this. Provost Waldrop recommended that the faculty use a consolidated voice when addressing IT issues. A committee member requested that the university allow faculty to use clients on the Exchange Server other than Outlook. Dr. Cook offered the Senate office as a central location for collecting and forwarding IT concerns.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

In the interest of time, committee liaisons were asked if there was any additional business coming forward or any issues out of the ordinary to discuss prior. No business was presented.

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution 2010-2011-5 Revision to Policy Concerning Appointment and Evaluation of Chairs and Directors (from the Personnel Committee)

Whereas, the existing language concerning “Review & Reappointment of Chairs and Directors” in the Faculty Handbook (p. 70) needs clarification, especially regarding which departments/school faculty are to participate in the review of these administrators, and

Whereas, the current language may limit the participation of faculty from the departments/school conducting the review, and

Whereas, the committee agreed that the sentences should also be reordered to clarify that the above change refers to the fifth year review,

Be It Resolved, that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee recommends that the entry under “Review & Reappointment of Chairs and Directors” in the Faculty Handbook (p. 70), be revised as follows:

CURRENT VERSION: “Department/school faculty and others whom the dean deems appropriate will conduct the review.”

PROPOSED REVISION: “The review committee will consist of faculty from the Department/school conducting the review and others whom the dean deems appropriate will conduct the review.”

FINAL REVISION: “The review committee will consist of faculty from the Department/school conducting the review and others whom the dean deems appropriate.”

PROPOSED REORDERING OF HANDBOOK ENTRY:

The faculty of the school/department will evaluate directors/department chairs annually.

A full review for reappointment will take place during the fifth year. The review committee will consist of faculty from the Department/school conducting the review and others whom the dean deems appropriate. The dean at his or her own initiative or as a consequence of a request by the school/department faculty can institute an interim review.

Mr. Kevin Haran, chair of the Personnel Committee, explained that the committee felt that the existing policy on the review and reappointment of chairs and directors is vague concerning the level of faculty involvement in the review. This resolution aims to revise the language to specify that faculty should be part of the review committee.

Dr. Cook stated that if the intent is to say that we want to include faculty as part of the review committee, perhaps it would be best to address general policy and not specific wording. A discussion of how to clarify the resolution to specify faculty involvement ensued. It was the overwhelming opinion of the committee that faculty needed to be included in the process to review chairs so that they are not omitted from the process. A friendly amendment was offered that the resolution be revised to speak to the general policy rather than wordsmithing the current language. The friendly amendment was accepted. Mr. Haran will work with the committee on the revisions.

Motion made to add the revised resolution (forthcoming) to the March Senate agenda. Motion carried.

Resolution 2010-2011-6 Graduate Training Requirement in Academic Integrity and the Responsible Conduct of Research (from Graduate Council)

Dr. Jim Moharam, chair of the Graduate Council, presented the resolution and stated that the Graduate College is developing a training program for PhD students on academic integrity and the responsible conduct of research. This resolution is to make this training a requirement for all students entering in fall 2011. Prior to candidacy, students must complete two components: (1) online CITI training; and (2) face to face ethics seminars. If a specific program has its own form of training, that would substitute for the face to face component.

A discussion followed as to whether the Senate should be involved in establishing policy. A suggestion was made that the resolution should endorse the concept of the training but remove the policy portion in the last paragraph. A friendly amendment was made to end the resolution after the first sentence of the "Be it Resolved" clause. Friendly amendment accepted. Motion to add the resolution to the March Senate agenda. Motion carried. The resolution as revised read:

Resolution 2010-2011-6 Graduate Training Requirement in Academic Integrity and the Responsible Conduct of Research

(from the Graduate Council)

WHEREAS the central activities and missions of a university rest upon the fundamental assumption that all members of the university community conduct themselves in accordance with a strict adherence to academic and scholarly integrity; and

WHEREAS all UCF students are expected to adhere to the essential standards of academic integrity, as outlined in the Golden Rule and its associated UCF regulations (UCF-5.008); and

WHEREAS to maintain this atmosphere in the UCF graduate community, it is crucial that all students are made aware of the expectations of academic integrity, the responsibilities associated with research and scholarly work, and the consequences associated with the failure to abide by these expectations; and

WHEREAS the advanced nature of graduate education, the higher level of scholarly and research activity associated with graduate work, and the higher level of expected behavior of students who have been awarded a bachelor's degree make it essential that additional training in the areas of academic integrity and the responsible conduct of research (RCR) be provided to graduate students at UCF; and

WHEREAS this additional training will serve to guide their conduct as graduate students at UCF and provide the requisite ethical background for their future roles as leaders and educators,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT starting with the Fall 2011 term, all students newly admitted to doctoral programs will be required to complete training designed to inculcate an awareness and understanding of the fundamental issues of academic integrity and the responsible conduct of research (RCR) in a manner that is consistent with federal regulations. ~~This training will include: the on-line Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) "Responsible Conduct of Research" training module in the appropriate disciplinary area; and face to face ethics/RCR workshops coordinated by the College of Graduate Studies and the Office of Research and Commercialization, or an approved alternative training offered as a program requirement for all students in the program.~~

Resolution 2010-2011-7 Policies and Procedures Concerning UCF College of Medicine Out-of Unit Tenure-Earning and Tenured Faculty (from the Personnel Committee)

Whereas, UCF College of Medicine faculty are outside the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the UCF Board of Trustees and the United Faculty of Florida, and

Whereas, policies and procedures for the out-of-unit tenure-earning and tenured UCF faculty are not clearly defined compared to that for the in-unit UCF faculty

Be it Resolved, that policies and procedures of the out-of-unit UCF tenure-earning and tenured UCF faculty will be similar to the in-unit UCF faculty of the same rank. These include:

1. Nine-month, full-time equivalent contracts.
2. Ability to generate additional summer salary support through teaching, funded research, or service.
3. Promotion and Tenure Criteria, annual evaluations, sabbatical leave, and academic freedom.
4. Promotion salary increases in a rate amount parallel to in-unit faculty.
5. RIA, TIP, and SOTL incentive award program.
6. Excellence Awards.

The grievance and associated appeal process for UCF College of Medicine faculty should be the same as that utilized by other non-unit faculty.

Mr. Haran explained that this resolution was made at the request of the College of Medicine (COM), and is intended to ensure that out-of-unit tenured or tenure-earning faculty be considered as in-unit faculty for promotion and tenure. Dr. Henry Daniell, senator from Medicine, provided the following

background on the issues involved: The in-unit faculty in COM agreed to become out-of-unit based upon a memorandum of understanding (MOU). This MOU has now been cancelled, and thus there are no promotion and tenure standards for them.

Provost Waldrop stated that the MOU was cancelled because it was a stumbling block in integrating the departments of the college. There existed a situation where COM functionally had two deans, the dean of the college and the director of the Burnett School of Biomedical Sciences (BSBS). Provost Waldrop is not opposed to a resolution, but believes it is premature to bring it to the Senate. This is a college matter, and committees are being formed within the college to develop the necessary guidelines. In addition, the resolution comes primarily from the BSBS faculty but would cover all of the COM faculty.

Motion to table consideration of the resolution seconded and carried. Dr. Cook asked Mr. Haran to relay to the Personnel Committee that the Steering Committee agreed that this is an important issue but believe that COM should have a chance to work it out internally first.

Resolution 2010-2011-8 Concerns Regarding E-mail Migration to Exchange (from the Personnel Committee)

Whereas, prior to the migration to Exchange, faculty were forwarding their UCF emails, or using IMAP or POP protocols, to overcome the severe limitations of the UCF email system

Whereas, with the new Exchange system, the policies have not changed appreciably, but the limitations have rendered the system less effective for many. Faculty are no longer able to access or forward their emails to an external account using IMAP or POP protocols.

Whereas, Faculty are now charged a fee to connect smart phones and devices (e.g. iPhones, iPads, etc), while this service was free before using IMAP or POP. For those departments, which do not have the funds to support the charge for these devices for all faculty, this fee is being passed on to the faculty member.

Be It Resolved, that the use of IMAP, POP, access and forwarding to external accounts be restored for the faculty community. This could be in the form of a simple “opt-in” policy.

Mr. Haran explained that this resolution is coming from Personnel because the issue of email access impacts the ability of faculty to do their jobs. Committee members noted that, based on Dr. Hartman's earlier comments, it appears that the university will not go back to IMAP/POP due to security concerns. It was suggested that if a resolution is necessary at this time, it should instead be a resolution that the university absorb any additional costs instead of passing them down to the faculty. Questions were raised about whether there is time to send this back to committee and bring it back to Senate this year.

Motion to return to the Personnel Committee and refer it to the Budget and Administration committee. Motion seconded and carried.

Nominating Committee

Dr. Chopra solicited members to serve on the nominating committee. Kevin Belfield, Mason Cash, and Henry Daniell volunteered to serve.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:53 p.m.