Budget & Administrative Committee

A G E N D A

Meeting Date: **December 07, 2016**

Meeting Time: 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Meeting Location: College of Sciences Building, Room 221

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of Minutes of** *November 02, 2016*
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
5. **Old Business**
    - New Budget Model – How does Credit Hours based budgeting incorporate the level of classes
6. **New Business**
    - Cluster Hiring Decisions (Guest Speaker – Dr. Chris Parkinson)
7. **Adjournment**

UCF Faculty Senate
Budget and Administrative Procedures Committee
Meeting Minutes - November 2, 2016, Room CSB 221

ATTENDEES
Linan An, Pradeep Bhardwaj (chair) Melissa Dodd, Romain Gaume, Glenda Gunter, Florencio Hernandez, Nan Hua, Anthony Kong, Jacqueline LaManna, Laszlo Marosi, Nina Orlovskaya, Kimi Sugaya, Anna Valdez, Keri Watson.

REMOTE ATTENDEES
Nan Hua, Xin Yan and Tracy Clark (Ex Officio, Finance & Accounting)

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS
Kelvin Thompson (Director, Online Design & Development Strategy Center for Distributed Learning)

AGENDA
1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of minutes of October 5, 2016
4. Announcement and Recognition of Guest
5. CDL Training for Faculty presentation
6. Adjournment

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES
Motion to approve the minutes of October 5, 2016 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

PRESENTATION BY KELVIN THOMPSON ON THE CENTER FOR DISTRIBUTED LEARNING (CDL).
Kelvin Thompson talked about the mission, purpose and achievements of CDL at UCF. CDL provides a service to the university that brings satisfaction to approximately 14,000 students. The comparative data on face-to-face; blended; and online courses showed evidence of the success and benefits of online courses. There are three different courses (IDL6543, ADL5000 and TCL), at different intensities, to help faculty develop online courses at UCF. A more advanced course, IDL7000, for faculty development has recently been designed for instructors with extensive experience in the design of online courses. Currently, for IDL 6543 there are a total of 100 training seats (40 in Fall, 40 in Spring and 20 in Summer semester). CDL works with Colleges to prioritize the allocation of these seats. Differences between the mission of CDL and FCTL were addressed during the presentation. A few examples of adaptive learning were presented, with data indicating that students' perceived that their learning and engagement was higher with adaptive learning course content.

There were questions about the purpose of online teaching from an institutional business model and the academic mission of the university. There were concerns raised that such an approach would have a lower

impact in the success of our student population compared to the more traditional and interactive face-to-face approach. It was suggested that the successful applicability of online teaching depends on disciplines and on the online modality employed in each particular case. There was discussion about whether we could create a database of courses that have effectively used adaptive learning. This could be done by reaching out to other institutions too. The presenter courteously addressed all the questions and informed that CDL was very willing to assist faculty with training.

ADJOURNED: 4:05 pm.

Submitted by Florencio Hernandez (November 2, 2016)

Faculty Cluster Initiative 2.0: Proposal Evaluation

I. FCI Background

Included in the University of Central Florida's five goals is achieving international prominence in research and key programs of graduate study. To help realize this goal, we must establish new models of research, teaching, and learning that blur the boundaries of traditional disciplines to allow for discovery in critical areas of excellence that reflect UCF's academic priorities and enhance our unique potential for impact.

The Faculty Cluster Initiative, first introduced in 2014, is designed to foster the development of strong, diverse transdisciplinary academic teams focused on solving tomorrow's most challenging scientific and societal problems. Transdisciplinary research combines and builds from discipline-specific theories, concepts, and methods for a comprehensive understanding of a problem being examined and generates readily translatable solutions to the problem. Areas of focus, developed by faculty with support from department chairs, directors, deans, and vice presidents, should advance knowledge at the intersection of traditional disciplines through transformative, large-scale collaborative efforts in research and teaching. Clusters are expected to be locally relevant while having an impact regionally, nationally, and internationally. They must be innovative, timely, and complement or build upon existing strengths, and, within their research focus, help to develop a critical mass of skills/personnel that gives UCF a competitive advantage. Clusters can integrate from all areas of the University, including the biological and physical sciences, social sciences, humanities, arts, technical disciplines, interdisciplinary centers, and professional schools.

II. Science of Team Science and Cluster Hires

In their reports on cross-disciplinary research teams, the National Academy of Sciences notes that such research demands more than just complementarity. Working across disciplines requires that team members combine or juxtapose concepts and methods from different disciplines. This includes integrating information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge. The goal is to advance fundamental understanding and to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or field of research practice (NAS, 2004; 2015).

Based upon theory and research in the *Science of Team Science*, cluster evaluations will consider the degree to which faculty have proposed a novel/gap filling and transformative area of inquiry that will advance UCF's academic and research capacity. In this context, clusters are expected to be transformative in the sense that they produce an educational and research environment that could not exist without the cluster initiative. In evaluating the strength of the clusters, two primary dimensions will be considered: (1) The **Idea** (Transdisciplinary/Innovation/Transformative/Impact/Unique/Strength) which will be evaluated by a panel of internal and external stakeholders selected by the Provost as defined in section IV; and, (2) **Collaboration Readiness** which will be evaluated by a small panel consisting of experts in the science of team science, FCI leads and others and is detailed in section V.

III. Evaluation Approach

All FCI proposals will have two separate evaluation scores by two independent evaluation panels.

The Idea (Transdisciplinary Innovation)

Following research on the scholarship of interdisciplinarity and how thinking across disciplines contributes to the development of knowledge, *transdisciplinary innovation* means more than just uniting collaborators from a variety of disciplines. **A successful cluster proposal will describe the**

idea/problem and then document the need and importance for the area of inquiry utilizing transdisciplinary innovation. This should be accomplished by explaining how the cluster is conceptualizing the problem and then melding disciplinary boundaries in such a way that the cluster is addressing societal questions not feasible without the integration of ideas/approaches from multiple disciplines. To document how a cluster proposal is integrating disciplines, it should explain: (1) how it is developing new fundamental questions or interesting gap filling directions for research at the interface of disciplines; (2) how it is combining concepts and/or methods from multiple fields; (3) how it is developing collaborations that will lead to insights that advance methodologies and/or technologies for conducting research; and, (4) how it is proposing research that requires a comprehensive and integrative approach to address complex societal problems/issues.

Collaboration Readiness

Based upon research in the Science of Team Science, we consider a set of inter-related factors to assess a cluster's collaboration readiness. To the extent possible, clusters should make explicit how their team and the academic infrastructure proposed demonstrate collaboration readiness along the following dimensions.

(1) *Contextual–environmental Conditions*—this includes institutional resources available to the cluster, the proximity and connectivity of the faculty (e.g., co-location or digital connectivity through web-based systems), administrative support designed to foster cross-departmental collaboration (e.g., charters specifying collaborative agreements, overhead disbursement, teaching requirements, etc.), and the commitment of participating departments/faculty to accept and evaluate the scholarship of faculty on the edges of, and/or crossing over traditional disciplinary boundaries, as well as support of the transdisciplinary curricula associated with the cluster.

(2) *Intrapersonal Characteristics*—this includes factors such as the research orientation of faculty (for example, documentation of their prior experience in working across disciplines), motivation of faculty to participate in the cluster, and the leadership qualities of the cluster members (e.g., documentation that cluster leads have expertise in managing projects crossing disciplines).

(3) *Interpersonal Factors*—this includes consideration of a reasonable size for the proposed cluster and the number of core faculty committed to serving and supporting the cluster, the range of disciplines represented across the cluster, and a history of prior collaboration by cluster members.

IV. The Idea (Transdisciplinary Innovation) Rubric

With the information provided in Sections I and II as foundation, the ***Transdisciplinary Innovation and Effectiveness*** of each FCI proposal will be evaluated using the following ratings for each question below.

- (5) Extremely Well – the cluster proposal does an outstanding job demonstrating this dimension.
- (4) Very Good – the cluster proposal does a very good job demonstrating this dimension.
- (3) Satisfactory – the cluster proposal adequately, but not fully, addresses this dimension.
- (2) Fair – the cluster proposal demonstrates this dimension but lacks critical components.
- (1) Not very well – the cluster proposal does not demonstrate this dimension well at all.

1. How well does the cluster proposal build upon existing strength and/or fill important gaps to develop a critical mass of faculty to enhance our potential for distinct competitive advantage?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

2. How well does the cluster proposal address an issue that is locally relevant but has the potential for regional, national or international impact?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

3. How well does the cluster proposal develop new fundamental questions for research among disciplines in multiple colleges?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

4. How well does the cluster proposal bring together faculty from diverse backgrounds (disciplines, funding sources and availability, life experiences) to address complex research topics?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

5. How well does the cluster proposal develop the ability to develop a robust, diverse, and recurring funding base that is commensurate with the proposed scholarly area?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

6. How well does the cluster proposal address the unique nature of the institution in order to harness the power of scale?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

7. How well does the cluster proposal advance the goals of the University and align with the 2016 Collective Impact Strategic Plan?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

8. How well does the cluster proposal address an academic need at UCF or an emerging academic area?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

9. How well does the cluster proposal strengthen the preparation and success of our graduate and/or undergraduate students and potentially post-doctoral scholars?						
Not Very Well	1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Well

Overall Ranking of proposal: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor using definitions below.

(5) Excellent—Outstanding proposal in all respects; deserves highest priority for support.
(4) Very Good—High quality proposal in nearly all respects; should be supported if at all possible.
(3) Good—A quality proposal; worthy of support.
(2) Fair—Proposal lacking in one or more critical aspects; key issues need to be addressed.
(1) Poor—Proposal has serious deficiencies.

Please give us your overall impression/rating of proposal (use above rating descriptions).						
Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Excellent

V. Collaboration Readiness Rubric

With the information provided in Sections I and II as foundation, the ***Collaboration Readiness*** dimensions of each FCI proposal will be evaluated with the following criteria:

- (4) Exceptional—the cluster proposal does an excellent job demonstrating this dimension.
- (3) Acceptable—the cluster proposal demonstrates this dimension.
- (2) Promising—the cluster proposals shows promise on this dimension but needs clarification to document that it is adequately addressing this dimension.
- (1) Not Acceptable—the cluster proposal has little or any documentation of this dimension.

Conceptualization of space needs and connectivity within the cluster			
Not Acceptable (1)	Promising (2)	Acceptable (3)	Exceptional (4)

Administrative support to foster cross-department and cross-college collaborations			
Not Acceptable (1)	Promising (2)	Acceptable (3)	Exceptional (4)

Commitment of participating departments/faculty to accept and evaluate the interdisciplinary scholarship and curricula associated with the cluster?			
Not Acceptable (1)	Promising (2)	Acceptable (3)	Exceptional (4)

Strategic vision for attracting diverse faculty through a balanced hiring plan and a plan for faculty development of new hires.			
Not Acceptable (1)	Promising (2)	Acceptable (3)	Exceptional (4)

Quality of leadership and prior experiences of cluster leads in managing cross-disciplinary projects			
Not Acceptable (1)	Promising (2)	Acceptable (3)	Exceptional (4)

Size of the core cluster faculty and prior experience of faculty working across disciplines and collaboratively			
Not Acceptable (1)	Promising (2)	Acceptable (3)	Exceptional (4)

VI. Total Scores and Decision Making Process

The FCI Leads will compile the Idea rubric scores and present to the Idea Evaluation panel. The panel will then discuss each pre-proposal and determine which pre-proposals are suitable for moving onward. Then, the Collaborative Readiness Panel will evaluate pre-proposals on this list and finalize the invitation list to full proposal.

It is conceivable that there will be FCI proposals that are evaluated very high on "idea" but low on "collaboration readiness" and vice versa. As such, these summaries and scores will also include feedback/suggestions for strengthening both the idea and the collaboration readiness. Successful proposals will be competitive on both fronts: idea and collaboration readiness. The Provost will seek feedback from Deans, VPs, Chairs, and Directors on the proposals under consideration.

Upon the Provost's selection of successful proposals for funding, the leads of proposals not funded in this cycle will receive feedback on how to strengthen both the idea and collaboration readiness for future FCI proposals.

Faculty Cluster Initiative—Evaluation Panels

Faculty Cluster Initiative—Evaluation Panel Members for the Idea/Transdisciplinary Innovation	
John Weishampel • College of Sciences/College of Graduate Studies	Betsy Cantwell • Nominated by the Provost's Office
Shibu Yooseph • College of Engineering & Computer Science	Jerry Johnson • College of Education & Human Performance
Jesus Jara • Nominated by College of Education & Human Performance	Lori Walters • College of Arts & Humanities/Institute for Simulation & Training
Liz Grauerholz • College of Sciences	Linda Walters • College of Sciences/Center for Success of Women Faculty
Daleen Penoyer • Nominated by College of the Nursing	Judy Albertson • Nominated by College of Arts & Humanities
Latha Ganti • Nominated by College of Medicine	Dinender Singla • College of Medicine
Jennifer Kent-Walsh • College of Health & Public Affairs	Erik Halleus • Nominated by College of Science

Faculty Cluster Initiative—Evaluation Panel Members for Collaborative Readiness
Debra Reinhart • Office of Research/College of Engineering & Computer Science
Cynthia Young • Vice Provost/College of Sciences
Eleazar Vasquez • College of Education & Human Performance
Christopher L. Parkinson • Provost Office/College of Sciences
Manoj Chopra • Provost Office/College of Engineering & Computer Science
Steve Fiore • College of Arts & Humanities/Institute for Simulation & Training