

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 29, 2012
TO: Members of the Steering Committee
FROM: Ida Cook
Chair, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: **STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING on April 5, 2012**

Meeting Date: Thursday, April 5, 2012
Meeting Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: College of Arts and Humanities, Room 192A

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Minutes of *March 1, 2012***
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
5. **Report of the Provost**
6. **Old Business**
None.
7. **New Business**
 - Nomination of slate of Officers
 - Call for topics for Senate committee action
8. **Committee Reports**
 - Budget and Administrative Committee – *Arlen Chase*
 - Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*
 - Parking Advisory Committee – *Reid Oetjen*
 - Personnel Committee – *Arlen Chase*
 - Undergraduate Council – *Kelly Allred*
9. **Other Business**
10. **Adjournment**

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes of
March 1, 2012

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to order at 4:04 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of February 2, 2012 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Michael Stern, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies

Niels da Vitoria Lobo, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science and Chair of the Personnel Committee

Foard Jones, Interim Dean of the College of Business Administration and Chair of the Commencement, Convocations, and Recognitions Committee

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

Provost Tony Waldrop noted that Cook represented the faculty well in her comments at the President's 20th Anniversary Gala.

Board of Trustees (BOT) Workshop

Because several members of the BOT are relatively new, a workshop was held to educate members regarding items of import, including promotion and tenure. Kevin Belfield, Chair of the Chemistry Department, represented the department chairs and gave a presentation on the P&T process. Marwan Simaan, Dean of the College of Engineering and Computer Science, spoke about the deans' evaluation process. Waldrop felt that the BOT understood the seriousness of the process and how seriously the process is taken; however, he was not sure if minds were changed.

Budget Update

The news from Tallahassee is not good and we expect a budget cut of \$32-72 million. Waldrop stated that there is no certainty regarding how this will be distributed, but the SUS can expect a \$299M cut. If this cut is distributed according to the Senate proposal, UCF will take a huge cut. Distribution would be more equitable with the House proposal, but still daunting. This cut would be non-recurring; however, in the future the legislature could make it recurring. There is also speculation that if there is a tuition increase, it will be all differential. Because differential tuition is restricted in its uses, this would reduce some of the offset to the budget cuts.

Waldrop stated that the university has looked at all pools of money for the university in attempt to reduce the impact on the academic side of the house. Without final numbers from the legislature, it is hard to start planning yet. The message from the Senate was that UCF and FAU were being targeted because of the size of their reserves. In response to a question, Waldrop stated that he does not believe that the closure of programs will be necessary, but given the magnitude of the cuts, all options are on the table. Waldrop asked the members of the Steering Committee not to share this information yet, as the budget has not been finalized and he does not want to rumors to spread. Cook expressed her expectation that before program closures are considered, the faculty would be included on the

conversations and have the opportunity to provide input. Waldrop stated that the university will attempt all other options prior to program cuts, and he does not believe that they will be necessary.

OLD BUSINESS

Strategic Planning Council Update

Cook reported on the activities of the Strategic Planning Council. The faculty members on the council have tried to ensure that the concerns expressed in Senate and Steering meetings have been addressed. The Imperatives, Initiatives, and Measures subcommittee is working on the final piece so that the plan can be assessed. Cook stated that she would like to invite Ross Hinkle, chair of the council, to discuss the strategic plan at a Faculty Senate meeting. Cook stated that drafts of some of the changes have been posted to the website, but the plan has not been updated to reflect the changes.

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution 2011-2012-6 Emeritus Policy Revisions

Niels da Vitoria Lobo, Chair of the Personnel Committee, explained that the resolution came in response to questions that were presented to the Commencement, Convocations, and Recognitions Committee (CCRC). There was concern about the lack of clarity on the eligibility of faculty to be granted emeritus status. He provided an overview of the changes proposed.

Questions were raised about the rationale for excluding the student members of the CCRC from voting on emeritus status. Lobo explained that the committee wanted to exclude the students from this decision because when it comes to emeritus status, students do not have the background to appreciate the achievements made over the course of a career or the requirements involved in being a faculty member.

Cook noted that, although the Personnel Committee had provided suggested revisions to the emeritus policy, that language is not part of the vote. The Senate will be voting only on the resolution. The Senate will provide the general guidelines in the form of the resolution, and the administration will formulate the policy based on those guidelines. The decision before the Steering Committee is whether the resolution is ready to go forth to Senate for a vote.

Resolution 2011-2012-6 Emeritus Policy Revisions (from the Personnel Committee)

Whereas, the current policy governing emeritus status does not address the status of individuals who are on phased retirement, DROP, or who have been re-hired, and

Whereas, the current policy governing emeritus status does not consider the diversity of faculty titles, and

Whereas, the Commencements, Convocations and Recognition Committee has requested clarification on the qualifications to be considered when awarding emeritus status,

Be It Resolved, that the Policy 4-502.1, Faculty Emeritus Status, be revised to reflect the following changes:

- Applicants for emeritus status must apply no later than five years after retiring from UCF
- Applicants must be fully retired from UCF (not in DROP or phased retirement)
- Applicants must have been a permanent employee at UCF for a minimum of five years

- The policy should not specify the titles/positions of those who are eligible to apply
- Non-tenure track faculty should hold the equivalent rank of eligible tenured faculty
- Qualifications for eligibility should include that applicants must have made major professional contributions in research/scholarship or teaching or service (including contributions and service to UCF and the UCF community)

Be It Further Resolved that:

- Applicants must provide their unit head with materials supporting their application
- Only faculty may vote on applications for emeritus status

Suggested wording is provided in the attached.

Motion to add the resolution to the March Senate agenda carried.

Resolution 2011-2012-7 Student Perception of Instruction Administration Period

Cook noted that this resolution came forth as a result of a discussion at the last Senate meeting about low response rate.

Resolution 2011-2012-7 Student Perception of Instruction Administration Period
(from the Steering Committee)

Whereas, faculty have expressed concern over the low response rate to the online Student Perception of Instruction (SPOI), and

Whereas, Resolution 1987–1988–16 currently mandates that SPOI be administered in the final ten days of instruction each term, and

Whereas, Faculty Senators have expressed concern that the SPOI not be administered during final exams,

Be It Resolved, the online SPOI be administered during the last 15 days of instruction in each term, closing one hour before the official final exam period begins.

Motion to add the resolution to the March Senate agenda carried.

Graduate Faculty Policy – Jim Moharam

Jim Moharam, chair of the Graduate Council, provided an overview of the new policy governing graduate faculty status. The main changes are:

1. Previously, there were two categories of graduate faculty, associate and full. The new policy eliminates the separate categories.
2. A subset of the graduate faculty will be designated as eligible to serve as the chair of a dissertation committee. Each program will develop its own criteria, which it will submit to the Graduate Studies. The Graduate Program Review committee will review the criteria.
3. Previously, a faculty member serving as the chair of a dissertation committee for the first time could only serve as co-chair. This was not fair for service credit. The new proposal allows the

faculty member to serve as full chair, and requires that another member of the committee who has previously chaired a committee be designated to serve as a vice chair.

Members of the committee commended the Graduate Council on their work. Michael Stern added his appreciation for tackling these very complex issues.

Motion to add this to the agenda of the next Faculty Senate meeting as a report item carried.

A question was raised about whether UPCC and Graduate Council policy changes go to the provost as resolutions or recommendations. Cook explained that they go as recommendations, and are announced at the Faculty Senate meetings in the committee reports.

Faculty Eligibility for RIA Awards – Patrick Murphy

Patrick Murphy brought forth an issue about the eligibility for Research Incentive Awards (RIAs) on behalf of the faculty in his college. Currently, some department chairs are serving on RIA committees and applying for the awards. Department chair eligibility is not explicitly addressed in the RIA guidelines. Murphy asked the Steering Committee to consider whether their chairs' participation goes against the spirit of the award. He suggested that the Faculty Senate address this, as chairs do not compete on an equal basis.

A discussion ensued about the history of these awards (TIP/RIA/SoTL) and whether they were awarded by the provost or were a part of the collective bargaining agreement. The senator from the Libraries reminded the committee that the current language for RIA excludes librarians, even though they engage in the eligible research activities. Librarians would like to be considered for these awards, and revisions to the RIA document should take that into account.

The Steering Committee approves the TIP/RIA/SOTL guidelines every year. Cook suggested that an ad hoc committee be created to address this issue and draft revisions to the guidelines. Addressing this issue when the guidelines come to committee will not allow for the time needed to consider this and invite discussion with the UFF.

Motion made to establish an ad hoc committee to review the criteria for TIP, RIA, and SoTL. Motion seconded and carried. Patrick Murphy, Rich Gause, and Henry Daniell volunteered to serve on the ad hoc committee.

2012-2013 Joint Committee Vacancies

The committee members received spreadsheets containing the joint committee vacancies that their colleges will need to fill for 2012-2013. Cook explained that the official request for filling the vacancies will not be made until after the new Committee on Committees is constituted in April. However, members of the Steering committee had suggested that it would be helpful to have the list of vacancies in time for their colleges' last faculty meeting of the year, so the spreadsheets are being provided as a head's up. The handout will also be distributed electronically.

Cook reminded the committee that the purpose of the Committee on Committees is to ensure that we have the best representative, and not simply the deans' recommendation. Cook stressed the importance of making sure that potential committee members are both eligible and willing to serve.

Appointment of a TIP Eligibility Appeals Committee

Three volunteers are needed to serve on the TIP Eligibility Appeals Committee. In the event of a dispute over eligibility, the committee determines if candidates have the necessary student credit hours to be eligible for the award. Bob Pennington, Bobby Everett, and Patrick Murphy volunteered.

Appointment of the Nominating Committee

Manoj Chopra, chair of the Nominating Committee, solicited two volunteers to serve on the committee and help determine the slate of officer candidates for the upcoming Senate election. Bob Pennington and Ahmad Elshennawy volunteered to serve.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*

Nothing to report other than the graduate faculty policy revision that was previously mentioned.

Parking Advisory Committee – *Reid Oetjen*

The committee did not meet.

Personnel Committee – *Ida Cook (for Arlen Chase)*

Cook reported on behalf of Chase, who was out of the country. The committee had no business to report other than the resolution regarding emeritus status that was previously mentioned.

Undergraduate Council – *Kelly Allred*

Nothing to report.

Budget and Administrative Committee – *Ida Cook (for Arlen Chase)*

Cook reported on behalf of Chase, who was out of the country. The committee has been looking into concerns raised by a faculty member regarding departmental bylaws not being followed. Cook raised the question of whether this question should be taken up by the Personnel committee instead. A senator suggested that this be put on the agenda for next year's Personnel committee. It was speculated that this may lead to a resolution to urge all departments to develop bylaws.

OTHER BUSINESS

Dual Compensation

There have been changes in rules for the Office of Research and Commercialization regarding the payment for dual compensation. A notice went out that there will not be retroactive payment of dual compensation, although exceptions are being considered on a case-by-case basis. Waldrop stated that all deans and business managers were notified of the change with sufficient time to implement the new policy. Waldrop noted that they are currently looking at what dual compensation is, which will require each department to have workload policies.

A question was raised about whether the upcoming changes to dual compensation are related to the 25% rule. Waldrop explained that they are not; part of the problem was that dual compensation and overload compensation were being used synonymously, but they are quite different.

Waldrop emphasized that, at this juncture, the only thing that has changed is retroactive payment.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m.