

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 30, 2017
TO: All Faculty Senate Members
FROM: William Self
Chair, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting on December 7, 2017

Meeting Date: Thursday, December 7, 2017
Meeting Time: 4:30 - 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Student Union Key West, Room 218

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes of *November 16, 2017*
4. Announcements and Recognition of Guests
5. New Business
 - Discussion of resolution brought forward by Steering on November 3, 2017.
 - Resolution 2017-2018-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and Tenure Committee and Procedures
6. Other Business
7. Adjournment

Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of
November 16, 2017

William Self, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of October 19, 2017 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Linda Sullivan, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Knowledge Management
Andre Watts, Associate Director, Institutional Knowledge Management
Debbie Hahs-Vaughn, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Excellence and Professor,
College of Education and Human Performance
Sarah Lovel, Assistant Director, Human Resources
Maria Beckman, General Counsel's Office
Nancy Myers, Director, Office of Institutional Equity
Keisha Hoerrner, Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning and the College of
Undergraduate Studies
Kim Schneider, Assistant Dean, College of Undergraduate Studies and Director of
Undergraduate Research
Elizabeth Dooley, Vice Provost and Dean of Teaching and Learning and College of
Undergraduate Studies
Lucretia Cooney, Associate Director, Faculty Excellence
Paige Borden, Associate Provost of Academic Program Quality and Associate Vice
President for Institutional Knowledge Management

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Self welcomed Alfons Schulte as a College of Sciences senator, replacing John Lynxwiler. Dr. Schulte will be serving on the Undergraduate Course Review Committee.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

Dean Searches

Last month, UCF announced Dr. Sheila Amin Gutiérrez de Piñeres as the dean of the Burnett Honors College. Dr. Piñeres was previously the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Special Initiatives and Dean of the Faculty at Austin College. She will start July 2, 2018 and was a previous ACE Fellow at UCF.

The Rosen College of Hospitality Management dean search committee has identified semi-finalists. Two internal candidates completed on-campus interviews including Dr.

Youcheng Wang and Dr. Sevil Sonmez. Dr. Christian Hardigree from Kennesaw State University will be on campus interviewing November 21.

Chairman Marchena has charged the Presidential Search committee. The first meeting is scheduled for November 20 at the Fairwinds Alumni Center. The search committee meetings will be open to the public and live streamed at www.ucf.edu/leadership/presidential-search/ to keep everyone informed.

Task Forces

The Academic Health Sciences Center (AHSC) and the Urban, Innovation, and New Media task forces are finalizing recommendations and will present multiple scenarios. If recommendations are submitted by the end of the Fall semester, progress towards implementation will take place in the Spring semester with the new academic structure starting in July. Updates can be found at <https://www.cohpa.ucf.edu/envisioning-academic-future/>.

The Faculty Excellence and UCF Global task force was formed to make recommendations on how these two units' leadership should be organized. Dean Michael Johnson is leading the task force and recommendations are anticipated by the end of the Fall semester.

UCF Downtown

Construction is scheduled to start next month. Tours are being offering every Friday morning. The tours target the faculty scheduled to be relocated to the downtown campus, but are open to any faculty interested. If interested, contact Isabel Hagan.

Collective Impact Community Challenge

There is a section in the Collective Impact Strategic Plan about choosing an issue that is acute in our community that can be scaled or replicated for global impact. We are now looking for a second challenge. Applications can be submitted at <https://www.ucf.edu/strategic-plan/> until November 17.

Provost Forums

The provost forums held last year are being scheduled for 2017-2018. These forums will be repeated in 2017-2018 to provide updates on collective progress. The four forums include Research and Graduate Studies, Faculty Excellence and Prominence, Student Success, and Funding and Philanthropy. The first two forum scheduled are:

Research and Graduate Studies, Liz Klonoff
November 17, 2017
9:00 – 10:30 a.m.
Morgridge International Reading Center

Faculty Excellence and Prominence, Jana Jasinski
December 6, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
Morgridge International Reading Center

If you are unable to attend in person, the forums will be live streamed from the provost's website.

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

We had been planning for a visit from the President and CEO of the Foundation since September. However, we were pleasantly surprised when both Bill and Melinda Gates visited the campus for a day and a half. While on campus they learned more about UCF online and blended courses, DirectConnect, UCF Online, first time in college students, and transfer students.

Puerto Rico Faculty Support

Hurricane Maria is still being felt heavily by the community. UCF received 900 applications from Puerto Rican students for the Spring semester. So far, 130 students have been admitted, while other students are finding it difficult to get transcripts or records. UCF has qualified as being a Hispanic serving institution and is the number one destination for Puerto Ricans after the hurricane. Dr. Whittaker presented the following requests:

1. Puerto Rican Faculty – If you are willing to share room in a research lab, room, or office space with faculty that can't access their facility; can offer a post-doc, adjunct position, or other temporary position email helpresearcher@ucf.edu.
2. The Latino Faculty and Staff Association (LaFaSA) – Looking for faculty and staff proficient in Spanish to help in the transition of faculty and students. If you are able to help email LAFASA@ucf.edu.
3. UCF Faculty – If you need to travel to Puerto Rico for military or family purposes, contact Jana Jasinski to discuss issues involving extending the tenure clock, modified instructional duties, online course replacement for future semesters. In addition the Employee Assistance Program is available.

Questions

There have been a couple of presentations regarding the changes in how overhead return is paid out to the departments and colleges going forward. However, there is a gap in time with the overhead that was generated and not returned. In the past, overhead was paid on a 2-year moving average. Right now we are getting overhead from the end of 2015-2016. We have been told the rest of the money is gone. We would like to know where the money went and why we aren't getting it back?

The provost will find out more information.

NEW BUSINESS

Amendments/vote on resolutions brought forward by Steering August 17, 2017.

Resolution 2017-2018-2 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum and Undergraduate Course Review Committees; Resolution 2017-2018-3 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Undergraduate Common Program Oversight Committee; and Resolution 2017-2018-4 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Admissions and Standards Committee were developed over the summer based on conversations with the College of Undergraduate Studies. The changes accurately reflect the duties of the committees.

Motion and second to approve Resolution 2017-2018-2 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum and Undergraduate Course Review Committees. No discussion.

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second to approve Resolution 2017-2018-3 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Undergraduate Common Program Oversight Committee. No discussion.

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Motion and second to approve Resolution 2017-2018-4 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Admissions and Standards Committee. No discussion.

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Resolution 2017-2018-5 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units
An informal working group led by Kevin Coffey revised resolution 2016-2017-9 that was denied last year. This resolution is now up for discussion prior to possible amendment and vote at the January meeting. Open for discussion.

Question: What is the rationale for specifying “senior faculty” on line 51?

Answer: An executive committee may have to disagree with a chair, therefore, it could put tenure-track faculty in a bad position.

Question: What is senior; tenured associate or full professor?

Answer: That is left to the departments and college to define.

Question: Line 46, what does posted online mean and what kind of support will be given?

Answer: Section B. suggests what should be included in the bylaws. It’s the responsibility of each department to make those decisions.

No other questions.

Advance notification of resolution brought forward by Steering for the December 7 Senate meeting

Resolution 2017-2018-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and Tenure Committee and Procedures was distributed November 3. The Steering Committee established a December 7 Senate meeting devoted to discussing the resolution prior to amendment/vote. Any process change requires modification to the regulation and Board of Trustees approval prior to the next promotion and tenure cycle that starts in the spring. Any questions regarding the resolution?

Question: Have you considered providing a course release to handle the volume instead of changing the process?

Answer: Not discussed, but it seemed better to remove the unanimous applications. Most of the work of the committee occurs over the winter break and in the Spring semester.

Question: Didn't the Steering Committee report on the 3-year history of unanimous applications? Does anyone remember the percentages?

Answer: About half.

Comment: If the percentage was spread evenly across the colleges that would be one thing, but if one college is harsher, it puts that college under more scrutiny. The committee doesn't see what was passed to the provost.

Comment: Line 23, all unanimous positive votes at all levels before the the University Promotion and Tenure Committee review were approved by the Provost and the Board of Trustees. I don't see what happen to all that received positive votes and the departmental and college level at the committee? Seems like a piece of information is missing.

Comment: Personnel Committee also looked at information that compared university committee votes versus provost votes and different thresholds down to 60% positive votes at the department and college level. The committee is recommending unanimous as the threshold.

Comment: Line 43, instead of "assigned", maybe indicate that the committee has the right to waive a review. This way all applications remain with the committee and doesn't create a permanent change. Especially when work load is no longer an issue.

Response: This would still require a change in the process. Good comments, reminder that if you want to recommend a change, have the language ready.

Comment: Seems like changing the process due to a work load issue may result in a lot of consequences in the long-term. We talked about changing assignments so that not all committee members would have to review all applicants. It seems like we are setting up two different tenure and promotion processes.

Question: Has anyone addressed the letter from the union to the Steering Committee that indicates the Senate doesn't have the right to make this change?

Answer: Haven't had an opportunity to respond, but we are fairly sure we have the right to change the bylaws.

Comment: The Personnel Committee looked at the contract. The promotion and tenure articles allow the university a lot of discretion. We looked at the role of the university promotion and tenure committee and how other universities define that role. As an advisory committee to the provost, the committee helps sort out decisions with mixed votes and advise the provost on those cases. This would allow the committee to spend more time on those cases.

Question: Do other universities skip the committee?

Answer: Yes, and we looked at the different ways universities handled the work load issue. We took this route for uniformity.

Comment: The contract section relevant is 15.4 (a) Modifying Criteria which states the University may modify the criteria for tenure as long as the union has been notified of the proposed changes and offered an opportunity to discuss such changes.

Response: This isn't a criteria change, it's a process change.

Response: This resolution has to be accompanied by a regulation change which goes to the union for review.

Question: This might make the role of the committee more uniform, but fundamentally it makes the whole process nonuniform by having some go to the committee where others don't. It creates two different tracks.

Answer: We looked at two alternatives. Giving the committee the alternative to decide which unanimous cases go forward or two parallel university committees which can result in two people from the same college on two different committees looking at different thresholds. These seem less uniform than what is being proposed.

Comment: When the Personnel Committee looked at the data, every application that had 80% or higher unanimous vote were all giving tenure or promoted by the provost. Making the threshold 100% doesn't change the ultimate outcome.

Question: Why can't the university committee internally provide less time reviewing unanimous cases?

Answer: Even a cursory review involves accessing and reviewing all the decisions that led to the recommendation. In addition to reviewing the dossier, the different criteria, and writing a draft recommendation that is distinct from the previous recommendations. The discussion may be shorter, but the time is significant.

Comment: But the procedural change doesn't require a bylaw change.

Response: But the procedural change wouldn't have enough impact to save time.

Comment: This was raised in the summer emergency meeting and a concern was raised that if the regulation was not changed that law suits would ensue.

Question: Don't you have to know what a good case looks like?

Answer: We look strictly a review of the file and the written criteria. It's not a comparison between people, which would be inappropriate.

Comment: When you are reviewing someone outside of your field, it's helpful to see other applications.

Question: If the threshold is 100%, wouldn't that encourage votes to ensure a review?

Answer: If the vote was 98% or 90%, the outcome would probably be approved because historically, anything over 80% was approved.

Comment: The human behavior aspect was discussed over the summer. Anytime someone votes no, they have to have a written justify of the vote.

Comment: The vote is anonymous.

No other discussion.

Faculty Salary Gender Study - Presentation

As an extension of the Faculty Salary Study presented in 2016, the Senate Personnel Committee requested an equity study. The initial presentation of the study was presented this past March. Since then, Institutional Knowledge Management and a working group has been working on the model and reviewing the analyses. A Faculty Salary Equity Study handout was distributed. Linda Sullivan presented the summary results.

Dr. Sullivan thanked the working group including Mason Cash, Bridget Rubenking, Tian Tian, Linda Walters, Grace White, Debbie Hahs-Vaughn, Ana Leon, Sarah Lovel, Nancy Myers, Zack Merritt, Amanda Miller, and Andre Watts. Discussed the timeline, study data and methodology and key findings. Discussed the study timeline, data and methodology, and key findings. The working group made five recommendations, based on the study.

Provost Whittaker thanked the Senate and Institutional Knowledge Management for the careful and detailed study. The provost discussed and responded to the five recommendations:

1. Perform salary equity analyses every 3 to 5 years to monitor diversity and equity in faculty salaries over time, consistent with the UCF mission for equality.
Response: Excellent methodology is in place. In the future, it is possible that other variables will be explored. Committed to the recommendation in conjunction with Faculty Excellence, Faculty Senate, and Institutional Knowledge Management.
2. The university commit to a plan to impose a salary floor by rank and degree attainment.
Response: Would consider, but has to be discussed in bargaining.
3. Conduct administrative review of individual faculty whose salary fall below the lowest bounds of predicted salary intervals, based on the control factors, and commit to alleviating any potential salary inequities among existing employees.
Response: Committed to the recommendation and will do an individual review for each faculty members shown outside of the bounds.
4. Conduct a similar analytic salary study of non-tenure-earning instructors and lecturers, and a follow-on study of salary compression for tenured/tenure-earning faculty.

Response: Committed to a similar study for non-tenure-earning instructors and lecturers. Once completed, we will consider doing a salary compression study. The top issue right now is equity.

5. Implement required training for faculty search committees to contribute to the diversity efforts consistent with the UCF mission.

Response: Committed and effort has already started.

Provost discussed planned action items including:

1. Bring salaries up to the lowest predicted level who are at the 90% confidence level. This requires the review of about twenty faculty members.
2. Close the female and underrepresented minority equity gap demonstrated in the study. This will impact about 87 faculty members.

The action items will be accomplished using administrative discretionary increases (ADI) which was bargained last year. The amount will be taken off the top of the ADI pool as soon as bargaining is completed and assuming the union again provides ADI for equity. UCF would like to solve this issue once and monitor going forward.

Question: The report last spring showed a higher percentage for all ranks. Why is it different?

Answer: This initial study used a different data set and didn't include awards. We went back to peoplesoft for a more accurate data set.

Question: Wouldn't you want to remove the awards? Women and women of color apply for and win the awards more frequently. They may have been hired at a lower salary and are only at the right range due to the awards.

Answer: The initial data didn't include the awards. Awards were asked to be included.

Question: Can you do a run without the awards?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Based on the different models, the outcome would be different?

Answer: Based on 3-4 different Faculty Salary Equity study models conducted at other universities. The sub-committee felt these were the appropriate models.

Question: What did we learn that we didn't know before?

Answer: Re-enforced what we thought.

Comment: The scholarly literature has been communicated for the past 30-years.

Question: What about the intersection of women and women of color?

Answer: Deferred to the full report for the details.

Comment: Awards are a salary increase when they get a \$5,000 award added to their salary permanently. Somewhat object to compression not being an issue. It is still an equity issue if you are doing the same work.

Comment: The study and the methodology was good at identifying the problem, but not identifying the cause. This won't help prevent the issue from happening again.

Comment: We have talked about search committees needing training, but the hiring official make the offer and should include additional training.

Question: What happened to the Cynthia Young group that meet with minority faculty? Many of the issues of why this happens were being discussed.

Answer: Dr. Dooley indicated that based on insights from the Spring and Summer meetings, UCF is bringing on-board a faculty fellow to help us understand. We have identified the faculty fellow and an announcement is forthcoming.

High Impact Educational Practices – Presentation

Dr. Self introduced Elizabeth Dooley, Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning and Dean of the College of Undergraduate Studies and Kim Schneider, Assistant Dean of the College of Undergraduate Studies. A handout was provided with the agenda.

Reviewed the Collective Impact Strategic Plan metrics, the benefits of high impact practices to students, current high impact initiatives, the Institutional Knowledge Management portal, current status at UCF, signature experiences, and high impact practices course desination.

Comment: Effective practices don't seem to move forward because they are disconnected with tenure and promotion. It would be wonderful if high impact practices were apart of the annual evaluation.

Question: Does this change the zero credit hour option?

Answer: No, we still have the zero credit hour option for undergraduate research and internships.

Question: It's not only the zero credit hour, students can take up to six credit hours for research as an elective. Does that count?

Answer: It depends on the program. We would like faculty to build the high impact practices into the courses. This is up to the departments and the faculty to make these decisions.

Question: How does this become possible when the decisions are up to the chairs and directors?

Answer: We have been talking with the deans.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Budget and Administrative Committee – Tina Buck

The committee has been discussing the issue regarding travel awards.

Information Technology Committee – Reid Oetjen

No report.

Parking, Transportation and Safety Committee – Ahmad Elshennawy

No report.

Personnel Committee – Stephen King

The committee discussed the issue of short notice to faculty regarding teaching assignment (summer, night class, or mode), not allowing enough preparation time. There are policies in existence and the committee believes this might be a training issue for faculty and chairs and directors. Also discussed coursework materials given to other faculty. We are looking into the contract and this may also be a training issue.

Graduate Council – Jim Moharam

Committees are meeting and conducting normal business.

Undergraduate Council – Charles Kelliher

No report.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

1 **Resolution 2017-2018-7 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, University Promotion and**
2 **Tenure Committee and Procedures**

3
4 **Whereas**, the university has, in recent years, markedly increased the number of tenure-line faculty
5 hired, resulting in an increase from 43 to 79 applications reviewed by the University Promotion and
6 Tenure committee between 2015-2016 and 2016-2017; and

7
8 **Whereas**, Faculty Excellence projects the University Promotion and Tenure committee’s caseload to
9 steadily increase to over 120 applications by 2020-2021; and

10
11 **Whereas**, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee estimates the maximum number of
12 applications to review to be around 50 for a reasonable caseload; and

13
14 **Whereas**, one of the primary roles of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee is to advise the
15 Provost about applications that have received conflicting evaluations and votes at earlier steps of the
16 review process; and

17
18 **Whereas**, applications forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee having received
19 unanimous positive votes at all previous levels comprise a substantial percentage of the University and
20 Promotion Committee’s caseload (38 out of 79 in 2016-2017) and would not need this committee’s
21 evaluation of conflicting evaluations; and

22
23 **Whereas**, all applications between 2013-2017 that received unanimous positive votes at all levels
24 before the University Promotion and Tenure Committee review were approved by the Provost and UCF
25 BOT; and

26
27 **Whereas**, bypassing the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for all applications that have
28 received unanimous positive votes at all previous levels—that is, forwarding such cases directly from
29 the Dean’s review to the Provost—would enable the University committee to maintain a reasonable
30 workload and focus on applications that most need its evaluation; therefore

31
32 **Be it resolved** that, beginning in the 2018-2019 promotion and tenure cycle, all tenure-line promotion
33 and tenure cases that receive unanimously positive votes at all levels before the University Promotion
34 and Tenure Committee will bypass this committee and be forwarded directly from the Dean’s review
35 to the Provost. The Provost may still ask the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to review
36 any such tenure-line cases if he/she needs the committee’s advisement about them; and

37
38 **Be it further resolved** that the *Bylaws* of the *Faculty Constitution* be amended as follows:

39
40 Section VIII. Joint Committees and Councils

41 **University Promotion and Tenure Committee**

42 1. Duties and Responsibilities.

- 43 a. To review and evaluate all **assigned** applications for promotion and tenure and make
44 recommendations to the provost and executive vice president.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on November 2, 2017.