



# Faculty Senate

## Steering Committee

Minutes for meeting of Thursday, February 1, 2024, 3:00 pm

Location: In person in the Charge on Chamber, Student Union Room 340

Recording Link:

[https://ucf.zoom.us/rec/share/y\\_AsjukmmctI5DIVMvn2IxUS1tsPcOIN5OJMxPKNbSYNDwaadp8nTm-GUoBnxBYU.wM1nvkldqTAVWj8i](https://ucf.zoom.us/rec/share/y_AsjukmmctI5DIVMvn2IxUS1tsPcOIN5OJMxPKNbSYNDwaadp8nTm-GUoBnxBYU.wM1nvkldqTAVWj8i)

Passcode: ayL75\$k\$

- 1) Quorum reached and Chair King called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm
- 2) Roll Call via Qualtrics. Faculty Senate Chair Stephen King, Vice Chair Keri Watson, Secretary Kristine Shrauger, and Acting Past Chair William Self were present.  
*(See meeting materials for list of participants)*
- 3) [00:00:23] Approval of Minutes of January 4, 2024 - Approved.
- 4) [00:00:24] Recognition of guests
  - a) Michael Johnson, Provost, University of Central Florida
  - b) Joe Harrington, Interim Associate Vice President for Research and Scholarship
  - c) Jana Jasinski, Vice Provost, Faculty Excellence
  - d) Joe Adams, Senior Communications Director
  - e) Lucretia Cooney, Associate Director for Faculty Excellence
- 5) Announcements
- 6) [00:00:48] Report of the Senate Chair–
  - Reminder of 2 more Senate meetings.
  - Senate leadership will be meeting senators from each academic unit to get unit specific perspectives and to chat about issues outside of senate.
  - March 28th Steering meeting will be occurring at the Lake Nona campus.
  - Information about the summer course issue of having 2 courses in summer A or Summer B.  
*(For report, please see materials.)*
- 7) [00:06:00] Report of the Provost – Vice Provost Jana Jasinski spoke on Provost Johnson’s behalf.
  - The provost noted the Florida Board of Governors approved regulations on prohibited expenditures and general education core courses.
  - Each year universities will have to submit their portion of the GEP to their Board of Trustees for approval and then on to the BOG for its approval.
  - Annual state legislative session is underway.
  - The fourth COACHE faculty job satisfaction survey is coming in the next few weeks.  
*(For report, please see materials.)*



# Faculty Senate

## 8) Unfinished Business

## 9) [00:21:00] New Business

- a) Chair Report on Recent Activities
  - Chair King reported on his recent Tallahassee activities as a Board of Trustee member. Discussion ensued.
- b) Chair Report on Senate Elections and Apportionment.
  - Chair King discussed how many Senators units will have in the upcoming term and other related topics. Discussion ensued.
- c) Resolution 2023-2024-7: Faculty Involvement and Transparency in the Hiring of Tenured/Tenure-Earning/Research (T/TE/R) Faculty
  - Discussion. Motion to send back to the Personnel Committee. Motion Approved.
- d) Resolution 2023-2024-8: Evaluating Faculty Instruction
  - Discussion. Motion to send back to the Personnel Committee. Motion Denied. Discussion Ensued. Motion made to send to the Faculty Senate. Motion Approved.
- e) Senate Agenda for February 15, 2024
  1. Research Space Utilization.  
Discussion.
  2. Letter Grade Policy.  
Chair of the UPCC Committee spoke on the Letter Grade Policy.  
Discussion ensued.

## 10) [01:30:06] Motion made to select members for the nominating committee before committee reports. Motion Approved.

- a) Discussion. Nominations to make Bill Self Chair of the Nominating Committee. Tina Chiarelli and James Gallo were also nominated for the Nominating Committee. All nomination were approved.

## 11) [01:33:00] Committee Reports –

- a) **B&A Committee:** Keri Watson, Chair of B&A Committee
- b) **IT Committee:** Joe Kider, Steering Liaison for IT Committee
- c) **Personnel Committee:** Kristina Tollefson, Steering Liaison for Personnel Committee
- d) **Research Committee:** Linda Walters, Chair of Research Council
- e) **Graduate Council:** Danny Seigler, Steering Liaison for Graduate Council
- f) **Undergraduate Council:** Tina Chiarelli, Chair of UCRC, Steering Liaison for Undergraduate Council

The Steering Committee heard reports from each of the committees.



# Faculty Senate

12) [01:46:05] Adjournment: 4:47 pm.

Reviewed and submitted for approval by

*Kristine J. Shrauger*      *02/05/2024*

Kristine J. Shrauger

2022-2023 Steering Committee Attendance

Last Name	First Name	08/24/23	09/21/23	10/19/23	11/16/23	01/04/24	02/01/24	02/29/24	03/28/24	Total Meetings Attended
<b>Faculty Senate Leadership</b>										
King	Stephen	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
Watson	Keri	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
Shrauger	Kristine	1	1	1	1		1			5
Self	William	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
<b>College of Arts and Humanities</b>										
Cash	Mason	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
Tollefson	Kristina	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
<b>College of Business Administration</b>										
Gallo	James	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
<b>College of Community Innovation and Education</b>										
Seigler	Daniel	1	1	1	1		1			5
<b>College of Engineering and Computer Science</b>										
Kauffman	Jeffrey	1	1		1	1	1			5
Proctor	Michael	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
<b>College of Graduate Studies</b>										
Kider	Joe	1	1	1		1	1			5
<b>College of Health Professions and Sciences</b>										
Lopez Castillo	Humberto	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
<b>College of Medicine</b>										
Chiarelli	Tina	1	1	1		1	1			5
<b>College of Nursing</b>										
D'Amato-Kubiet	Leslee	1	1	1	1	1				5
<b>College of Optics and Photonics</b>										
Schulzgen	Axel	1	1	1	1	Sabbatical-Dogariu subbing				4
Dogariu	Aristide			*Alternate		1	1			2
<b>College of Sciences</b>										
Schulte	Alfons	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
Walters	Linda	1	1	1	1	1	1			6
<b>Rosen College of Hospitality Management</b>										
Semrad	Kelly	1	1	1	1		1			5
<b>University Libraries</b>										
Murphey	Missy	1	1	1		1	1			5
<b>Total Present</b>		19	19	18	16	16	18	0	0	

1=Present

\*Summer meetings do not count for or against a senator's attendance

## **February 1<sup>st</sup> steering committee: chair announcements**

**First,** I want to remind everyone that we finish up in just 2 more senate meetings before the next term of the senate begins at the April senate meeting.

No Bylaw resolutions can be brought and considered this senate term as we have run out of time unless there is an emergency declaration.

Non-Bylaw resolution should come to steering today, but can also be considered if brought by February 29<sup>th</sup>.

**Second:** In the next few weeks the senate leadership will be meeting senators from each academic unit to get unit specific perspectives and to chat about issues outside of senate. Many senators indicated how useful these meetings were last year, and I'm looking forward to them again this year.

**Third:** Our March 28<sup>th</sup> steering meeting will be occurring at the Lake Nona campus. I will be working with Dean German to identify different ways we can learn more about the campus during our on-site visit.

**Fourth:** I have some information about the summer course issue of having 2 courses in summer A or Summer B. If you teach a course in summer C, you are at 37.5% effort. If you teach a course in summer A, you do the same amount of teaching in ½ the time so its 75% effort for a single class. Which leads to 150% effort if you teach two classes in A or two classes in B. That isnt illegal, but it does create what's called an overload ....and there are a variety of issues the university is working through based on the overload situation.

**Finally:** As I said the day after the last senate meeting, I will be limiting everyone to a single question when the provost or president speaks, with no follow ups. We have a lot of senate business to complete at the end of the year, and I am initiating this update starting today

# **Update from UCF Provost Michael D. Johnson**

Faculty Senate Steering

Thursday, February 1, 2024

## **New regulations**

- The provost noted the Florida Board of Governors approved regulations on prohibited expenditures and general education core courses. He said the university is continuing to work through how to apply these in consultation with the BOG. For example, the general education program core courses are split between a core determined by the state and remaining courses determined by each university. The BOG removed sociology from the state-determined GEP core. He said he did not yet know whether it can be moved to UCF's portion of the GEP. He suggested remaining optimistic as UCF consults with BOG staff with more information to come.
- In a related change, he said each year universities will have to submit their portion of the GEP to their Board of Trustees for approval and then on to the BOG for its approval.

## **Legislature**

- Johnson said the annual state legislative session is underway. UCF's priorities include obtaining major state investments to boost our funding per FTE, which is the lowest among the six research universities in the SUS, and to boost investment in the university as Florida's premier engineering and technology university.
- The session is scheduled to end March 8, and Johnson said UCF will know more about how it's faring as the session unfolds.
- He said this week's UCF Day at the Capitol festivities to advocate for our funding and policy priorities went very well. The contingent found widespread support for the direction UCF is going.

## **COACHE survey**

- The fourth COACHE faculty job satisfaction survey is coming in the next few weeks.
- An advance email about what to expect is coming soon to the nearly 1,500 faculty eligible for the anonymous survey. He asked Senators to please take a few minutes to respond and encourage their colleagues to do so.

- The feedback matters. As UCF has done before, it will evaluate the responses and faculty committees will help us understand priorities to focus on and strategies to implement.
- The provost closed out his remarks and then fielded questions.

## **Chair update on Elections and apportionment**

We are now in senate election season: all senate eligible faculty were counted across campus and senate seats were apportioned following what's written in constitution and bylaws.

The table sent in your meeting materials shows which units gained, lost or have same # of seats.

On the plus side: Our two newest units, CDL and College of Undergraduate studies now have their required 2 senators. Furthermore, I want to congratulate the College of Nursing as they went from having 2 senators to now, for the first time I'm aware of, having 3 senators!

On the minus side: to make up for the 5 senators going to those units, when we did the apportionment math, it turned out that 5 units lost a single senate seat.

Please Note: we now have 4 units that pick all senators one year, and none the next. This has the potential to lead to situations where a unit could potential lose all experienced Senators.

Lets take the college of Nursing for example. They now have three senators...but all 3 will be seated in election this spring, and they will not have any elections next spring. If we do nothing this will continue as 3 one year and none the next.

If all 3 senators elected in one year are newly elected for the first time, then they will have a new senator on steering for the first time and will not have experience with how motions are made, resolutions considered, and how debate happens at the full senate.

To change this would require a constitution change to allow a unit to have a rare one-year senate term for the purpose of staggering their terms so to make sure they have at least one senator up for election in a given year.

To be clear, any proposal to do this needs limitations as We don't want this abused by having units do this anytime they feel like it, For example, to prevent someone deciding that a one-year term would be an easy way to put the senate on their CV with minimum effort.

In addition to those 4 units...1 other unit COM, is almost at that point with 1 senator being elected this year and 5 being elected next year.

If COM were to lose a senator due to apportionment in 2 years, then the same thing would potentially happen there with no senate continuity. If we rebalanced when a mid-sized gets to just 1 senator in a year, and a large number the other year, we would be able to prevent the same situation from happening.

I wanted to share some initial thoughts I had on how to do this:



The idea I have is that we would have a **two-step process**.

- 1) **In the first step**, Units that have specific ratios of senators up for election in alternate years would be identified during apportionment by the senate chair, and only those units with significant out of balance seats would be eligible to recalibrate this way
- 2) **In the second step**., any unit identified this way would need to decide for themselves whether they wish to do recalibrate or not using a single one-year senator term. This decision would be made by a vote of the senate eligible faculty in that academic unit.

The expectation is this two-step process would be suited to using this option when it is warranted, and not haphazardly.

What I'd like to do now is get your ideas and feedback on this or other possible ways to recalibrate the senate in these situations.

Anything discussed here can be taken back to the bylaws committee to consider in a constitutional amendment that would be moved forward in the upcoming fall term in the next senate year.

## Report as a Trustee to steering:

I have had members of the steering and senate request to know what I, as a Trustee, and other members of the Board of Trustees, as well as senior leaders of UCF are doing outside of UCF to help address the funding shortfalls that UCF has. In other words, to ask what we are doing to find additional sources of revenue for the university.

There are many interactions I, the other members of the BOT, the president, and the UCF staff have with legislators and the BOG over the course of a calendar year. To give you a flavor of those, I will share those interactions I have had in just the last 2 weeks. This will include two major events: a meeting of the Board of Governors in Tallahassee, and also a meeting with state legislators, also in Tallahassee.

First up... last week, I travelled to Tallahassee for the Board of Governors meeting that was on Wednesday the 24<sup>th</sup>. I want to share a few highlights of that meeting.

First the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates met the day ahead of BOG meetings to identify and discuss the concerns we planned to raise to with the BOG. Another way to put this, is that the ACFS is made up of the faculty Trustee at all 12 SUS institutions, and that although we do not speak for our boards of trustees, we have the insight of our boards and work to find solutions to problems that are happening to all SUS institutions.

The ACFS had a sit-down lunch with the BOG chair, Brian Lamb, the BOG chancellor, Ray Rodriguez, and a few other BOG members. **One** focus of our discussion was the Foreign Influence Screening procedures that are a result of recent state legislation and a recently approved BOG regulation. This is the regulation that requires any agreement between a University and a person from one of 7 countries (China, North Korea, Syria, Venezuela, Russia, Iran, and Cuba) be subject to a much more in depth screening than other agreements. Furthermore, those agreements would ultimately need to go to the University BOT and then the BOG for approval.

We shared the unintended consequences of the legislation and regulation, which treats every single GTA and GRA agreement with a graduate student from those countries the same as a multi-million-dollar agreement between an SUS institution and the Chinese government. After a long discussion on this, the BOG is now aware of the untenable nature of the current situation, which has led to the shut-down of prestigious international partnerships and is stifling recruitment of graduate students into many of our top programs at UCF.

We presented ideas of how the legislature and regulation could be amended so that our Florida Universities can still be sure we are aware of potential risks of working with the 7 countries of interest, but doing it in a way that doesn't handicap our universities. In the last day or two, it appears that the situation has gotten even worse. This is an ongoing situation, and we will know more at senate in 2 weeks.

The other take away from last week's BOG meeting is about monies for faculty salaries, including recruitment and retention. Throughout the meeting we had shared with Chair Lamb and other BOG members the plight the state universities have recruiting and retaining faculty due to a variety of salary issues. I was encouraged that Chair Lamb declared in his state of the system address that he is asking the state legislature for a \$100 Million dollar increase in state appropriations for money to provide monies expressly for faculty retention and recruitment.

**My second interaction** of the last two weeks was Monday and Tuesday of this week when I travelled back to Tallahassee to attend UCF Day at the capitol. I was one of 7 UCF Board of Trustee members that had multiple private meetings with Governor DeSantis and with high-ranking members of the state legislature, including the Florida senate president and Florida speaker of the house. Our emphasis altered based on which exact person we were meeting with, but we had 2 major messages with direct requests to the state legislature.

A: we asked for \$40 Million, recurring, to accelerate our efforts to become Florida's premier hi tech and engineering university. These monies would allow for additional recruitment of faculty, and a way to develop and enhance a broad array of hi-tech programs including the capacity and infrastructure to educate more students in this area.

B: we asked for an \$80 Million recurring increase to our base budget from state appropriations. We shared with legislators that our state appropriation is approximately \$6 thousand 4 hundred per student FTE. One FTE is basically one full time student attending our university.

In contrast, the three preeminent universities range from \$11 thousand dollars to over \$13 thousand dollars per student FTE. Let me bluntly sum that up: the preeminent universities basically get almost double the money we get per student educated.

Furthermore, if we compare our state appropriation to that of FAU and FIU, the two other large sized SUS universities, our appropriation of \$6 thousand 4 hundred is significantly below that of FAU (\$9 thousand) and FIU (\$7 thousand 8 hundred).

We emphasized that these differences in appropriation shows that UCF is extremely efficient at providing degrees to our students with low expenditures. However, that amount of underfunding also means we cannot maintain our high level of accomplishment with the current budget, especially when you factor the inflationary pressure we face with our lower state appropriation.

So: why did we ask for \$80 million dollars to address this shortfall?

If we take the difference between our funding per FTE to the lowest of those peers, and multiply by our FTE headcount (and then round up!) we would need an additional \$80 Million dollars just to be tied with our lowest peer. This is what we asked for and that we heard favorable feedback on.

So, to sum up, the UCF administration, the UCF Board of trustees, and I myself as a faculty member and as a trustee are all working to educate the BOG, the Governor's office and the legislature so they understand why additional investments in UCF make sense for Florida.

Will these efforts be successful? I frankly don't know, and nothing will be finalized until June or July after the legislature has finished session and the governor has signed the final budget. Until then, please understand that I, as a faculty member, as your senate chair, and as the single faculty Trustee at UCF, will continue to work to help UCF in all the ways I can.

## Apportioned Senators by College

	2023	2024	Change	Ratio
CAH	13	12	-1	7 to 5
CBA	6	5	-1	3 to 2
CCIE	9	8	-1	6 to 2
CDL	*	2	+2	2 to 0
CECS	10	10	0	6 to 4
CGS	2	2	0	2 to 0
CHPS	4	4	0	2 to 2
COM	7	6	-1	5 to 1
CON	2	3	+1	3 to 0
COS	15	15	0	9 to 6
CREOL	2	2	0	1 to 1
CUGS	*	2	+2	2 to 0
RCHM	3	2	-1	1 to 1
UL	2	2	0	1 to 1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>0</b>	

## **Resolution: Faculty Involvement and Transparency in the Hiring of Tenured/Tenure-Earning/Research (T/TE/R) Faculty**

**Whereas**, studies have consistently and overwhelmingly found that faculty across the U.S. believe in shared governance as an integral part of their institution's values, identity, and culture (Tierney & Minor, 2003; see also Williams et al., 1987; Gore et al., 1987, Miller 2002); and

**Whereas**, shared governance has been recognized as a central feature of higher education since the 1966 *Statement on Government in Colleges and Universities* (SGCU) from the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. The SGCU stipulates the responsibilities and authority that should be conferred upon faculty and legitimates their involvement in institutional governance (Birnbaum, 2004 as cited in Jones, 2011). This includes the proviso that "*faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, granting of tenure, and dismissal;*" and

**Whereas**, this responsibility and authority stems from the recognized expertise of faculty that is cultivated through the publication and peer review of research and creative activities, preparation and acquisition of grants, and national/international conference research/creative presentations; and

**Whereas**, the recruitment, hiring, and retention of the best talent depends on the input of those who have direct and current knowledge of and expertise in the discipline and other responsibilities expected of the hire; and

**Whereas**, the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) and Human Resources (HR) search, screening, and hiring guidelines do not specify certain important aspects of transparency and faculty involvement in faculty searches; and

**Whereas**, a substantial majority of unit bylaws defer to the OIE and HR search, screening, and hiring guidelines and/or do not specify important aspects of transparency and faculty involvement in faculty searches; and

**Whereas**, the current search and hiring process makes the process vulnerable to misinformation and/or arbitrary decision making (e.g., not collecting or sharing faculty input, search committees neglecting to provide search updates to relevant unit faculty, allowing staff to vote on faculty research cluster appointments); and

**Whereas**, per the Chief Human Resources Officer, the posting of faculty search committee meetings to the UCF Human Resources website only requires that the notice "should be sent to Talent Acquisition a minimum of 48 hours prior to the meeting via a Workday Help ticket," thus preventing a reasonable amount of time for other faculty members to schedule attendance, and "there are no other requirements to post meeting notifications beyond the UCF HR website;" and

**Whereas**, per the Chief Human Resources Officer, "the responsibility for forwarding information to HR about the upcoming meeting varies, as it can be submitted by the search chair, search assistant, and/or the HR Business Center/HRBC, in the College," thus creating the potential for uncertainty, delays, and discrepancies in reporting; and

**Whereas**, per the Chief Human Resources Officer, “search meeting minutes are not posted and only added as part of the hire documents for the selected candidate,” therefore

**Be it Resolved** that the University of Central Florida OIE and HR delineate and expand its’ search, screening, and hiring guidelines for new or appointed Tenured/Tenure-Earning/Research (T/TE/R) faculty who will be required to conduct research and prepare and/or publish research-related [or discipline specific] deliverables, such as academic publications, as part of their annual assignment of duties in the following ways:

- The hiring official shall notify all full-time faculty in the unit before commencing a search or an appointment for T/TE/R faculty.
- The hiring official shall appoint members of the search committee who are preferably T/TE/R faculty and/or faculty who are best positioned to gauge the potential success of the candidate, are best informed about the criteria used for tenure and promotion and will be responsible for the decision making on the tenure and/or promotion of that faculty member, unless unit bylaws expressly state that other faculty may serve on search committees for T/TE/R faculty positions.
- The chair of the search committee shall notify the members of all units involved (e.g., in cases of cluster hires), via e-mail or other readily accessible means, of all search committee meetings as soon as they are scheduled but not less than 48 hours in advance of the meeting to allow faculty members to schedule attendance.
- Following candidates’ on-campus (or virtual) visits, all full-time faculty, support staff, students, or community members who have met with the candidate or attended their presentations shall be given the opportunity to provide written feedback to the search committee on the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate.
- Upon receipt of all the feedback noted above, and upon request of a faculty member who will ultimately be responsible for voting on the tenure and/or promotion of the new hire, the feedback shall be made available for review.
- The search committee shall invite all T/TE/R faculty and/or faculty who will be responsible for voting on the tenure and/or promotion of the new hire to the search committee meeting where the committee will review and discuss the survey input and finalize the list of strengths and weaknesses for each visiting candidate that will ultimately be presented to the hiring official.
- Understanding that any committee has an advisory role, if a consensus view is expressed by T/TE/R faculty or the search committee in the final recommendations on the hire, and the hiring official departs from the consensus view, then the hiring official shall provide faculty with an explanation for the departure.

**Be it Further Resolved** that a unit vote shall be taken for other forms of faculty hiring with the potential for tenure (e.g., academic partner hires, dual unit appointments, research cluster or administrator appointments), and that unit voting privileges on any matter concerning the potential hiring shall only extend to T/TE/R faculty and/or faculty who are responsible for deciding on the tenure and/or promotion of faculty.

November, 2023

## **Resolution on Evaluating Faculty Instruction**

**Whereas**, despite UCF Regulation 3.010 indicating that Student Perceptions of Instruction (SPIs) should not be the only source of evaluating teaching, SPIs remain one of the primary and most convenient methods of evaluating faculty instruction for purposes of annual evaluation, tenure and promotion, and teaching awards at UCF; and

**Whereas**, empirical research has shown that SPIs are biased against women, with women being judged more harshly than their male counterparts (Boring, 2017; Centra & Gaubatz, 2000; Kogan, Schoenfeld-Tacher, & Hellyer, 2010; Laube, Massoni et al., 2007; Mitchell & Martin, 2018). Empirical research has equally shown that SPIs are biased against ethnic and minority groups, resulting in African American professors being rated, on average, as 21% more mean spirited and 24% harder as compared to Caucasian faculty ratings (Harlow, 2003); and

**Whereas**, a recommendation of the 2020 report of the UCF SPI Task Force states: “As one of the largest and most innovative universities in the U.S., a designated Hispanic-Serving and Minority Serving institution that is committed to access, inclusion, and diversity, UCF should discontinue the use of SPIs, which perpetuate race- and gender-based biases, in the process of Faculty Performance evaluations” (p.6). The rationale for this recommendation was based in part on an argument that appeared in an issue of Inside Higher Ed, which stated: “Relying on biased instruments to evaluate faculty members is institutional discrimination.” (Owen, 2019); and

**Whereas**, empirical research, including a recent meta-analysis (Uttl, White & Gonzalez, 2017), has shown that SPIs are a poor measure of teaching effectiveness, primarily measuring perceptions of students who are not experts in pedagogy, and are influenced by non-teaching based factors like time of day, subject, and class size (Boring, Ottoboni & Stark, 2016; Flaherty, 2020; Lederman, 2020; Stroebe, 2020); and

**Whereas**, empirical research has shown that students rate teaching methods that have been proven effective [such as active learning] as less effective than passive learning strategies (Deslauriers, McCarty et al., 2019); and

**Whereas**, UCF research has shown that less than 60% of students complete SPIs, despite continuous reminders and subsequent barriers to enrollment and other university activities for those failing to complete them (Dziuban, Moskal, Self, & Hubertz, 2022); and

**Whereas**, UCF research has shown that 66.1% of students from 2017 to 2021 straight lined their SPI responses (Dziuban, Moskal, Self, & Hubertz, 2022); and

**Whereas**, empirical research has shown that “up to a third of students use instructor ratings to get revenge on instructors they do not like, even to the extent of submitting false information” (Clayson & Haley, 2011; as cited in UCF SPI Task Force Report, 2020:7).

**Whereas**, empirical research has shown that student grade satisfaction, receiving expected grades, perceived and actual grading leniency, and/or “consumer satisfaction” are important drivers of [positive] faculty evaluations (Johnson, 2002; Eizler, 2002; Felton et al., 2008; Braga et al., 2014; Stroebe, 2020); and



**Whereas**, empirical research has shown that SPIs, especially when used in high-stake personnel decisions, encourage grade inflation (Johnson, 2006; Shouping, 2005), ultimately affecting the credibility of institutions and creating dubious impressions of student learning and teaching effectiveness; and

**Whereas**, at UCF, from 2018 to 2023, in lower-level undergraduate courses, 46.8 percent [range of 42.3 - 49] of grades were A's (A/A-) and 26.2 percent [range of 25.3 – 28.2] were B's (B+/B/B-). From 2018 to 2023, in upper-level undergraduate courses, 47.2 percent [range of 44 – 48.9] of grades were A's and 26.1 percent [range of 25.7 - 27.9] were B's (Source:IKM); and

**Whereas**, at UCF, from 2018 to 2023, the average percentage of A's received in upper-level undergraduate courses was at or exceeded 55 percent [range of 55 – 65] in 6 of 10 colleges. In the remaining 4 colleges, which are responsible for 62% of all grades at UCF, the most commonly reported percentage of A's for upper-level undergraduate courses was 45 percent [range of 31 – 46] and 26 and 36 percent for B's (Data Source: IKM; College of Medicine and Graduate Studies, and Honor's College, where 80 percent of grades are "S," are not included in these figures).

**Whereas**, research by scholars from Brigham Young, Purdue, and Stanford University (Denning, Eide, Mumford, Patterson & Warnick, 2023) found that the "no direct cost to the university" practice of grade inflation [not changing enrollment patterns, better performance on standardized tests, student-to-faculty ratios or instructional expenditures] is most responsible for increased graduation rates ("The Grade Inflation Conversation We're Not Having .....", April 13, 2023 issue of Chronicle of Higher Education); and

**Whereas**, four other universities (Colorado-Boulder, Southern California, Oregon, and Kansas) have made substantial changes to the evaluation of faculty teaching, which includes elimination of SPIs as a primary source of evaluating teaching (UCF SPI Task Force, 2020:8-9)

**Be it Resolved** that UCF abandon use of SPIs in faculty annual evaluations, promotion and tenure, and awards, and require committees, unit/department heads, deans, and other university personnel to employ more objective measures of *teaching quality and commitment* in assessing faculty instruction. Examples of alternative measures include, but are not limited to:

- quality course designations from IDL
- use of evidence-based practices or innovative or FCTL recommended teaching strategies
- creation of new courses for department curriculum
- syllabi, classroom assignments, exams
- grade distributions
- students supervised on independent studies/theses/dissertations
- publications, presentations and/or research with students
- In-class peer observation

**Be it Further Resolved** that UCF retain use of SPIs for faculty members' personal use in guiding their instruction and in post-tenure review, which complies with current BOG regulations and policies.

# UGGradeSystem Grade System

Under Review | Fall 2024

## Proposal Information

---

### Workflow Status

In Progress

**Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee (UPCC), Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee (UPCC)**

expand ▲

Waiting for Approval | Committee Chair

Jeffrey L. Kauffman

### Changes

- participants
- Policy Text
- Effective Date
- Rationale
- Catalog Activation Date

---

Proposed

#### Effective Date

Fall 2024

Existing

#### Effective Date

Fall 2023

### Code

UGGradeSystem

### Title

Grade System

### Academic Level

Undergraduate

### Policy Family

Academic Regulations and Procedures

Changes

### Policy Text

The University uses an alphabetic system to identify student grades and other actions regarding student progress or class attendance. Beginning Fall 2001, a plus/minus grading system became effective, with a grade point equivalent per semester hour as follows:

Grades	Grading Points Per Semester Hour of Credit
A	4.00
A-	3.75
B+	3.25
B	3.00

B-	2.75
C+	2.25
C	2.00
<del>C-</del>	<del>1.75</del>
<del>D+</del>	<del>1.25</del>
D	1.00
<del>D-</del>	<del>.75</del>
F	0.00
NC - No Credit*	

\*Available only in CHM 1032, CHM 2040, CHM 2041, CHM 2045C, CHS 1440, ENC 1101, ENC 1101H, ENC 1102, ENC 1102H, MAC 1105CH, MAC 1105H, MAC 1114C, MAC 1140C, MAC 1140H, MAC 2147, MAC 2233, MAC 2241, MAC 2253, MAC 2281, MAC 2281H, MAC 2311C, MAC 2311H, MAT 1033C, and STA 2014. In these classes NC replaces the use of ~~D+~~, ~~D~~ and ~~D-~~.

Legend	Action	Grade Points
G	Repeated Course (Grade Forgiveness, multiple attempts)	-
I	Incomplete	-
K	Repeated course (Latest Attempt)	-
N	No grade reported by instructor (followed by grade)	-
P	Repeated Course (Not Grade Forgiveness)	-
R	Repeated course (Grade Forgiveness)	-
S	Satisfactory (w/credit)/Satisfactory Progress (Research, Thesis, or Dissertation)-	-
T	(followed by grade) Subsequently repeated (no credit)	-
U	Unsatisfactory (no credit)	-
W	Withdrawn	-
WL	Late Withdrawal	-
WH	Health Form Withdrawal	-
WM	Medical Withdrawal	-
X	Audit (no credit)	-

The designation of "N" will be assigned temporarily by the Registrar's Office only in the case when a grade has not been submitted by the instructors by the grade submission deadline. The designator will be replaced by the earned letter grade at the earliest opportunity in the term that immediately follows and prior to graduation. The "N" designator may not be assigned by the instructor.

In the event of academic dishonesty, instructors may assign a Z in front of a final course grade on a student's academic record. For further information regarding the addition, removal and appeals process of the Z designation, see <https://goldenrule.sdes.ucf.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/64/2020/10/2020-2021-Golden-Rule.pdf#page=67>

The Grade Point Average (GPA) is the average number of grade points per semester hour attempted. **GPA is computed by dividing the total number of grade points assigned by the total number of credit hours attempted, less hours resulting from NC, W, WP, S, U, and I grades.** GPA is recalculated after each term; for Summer GPA is recalculated only after all Sessions and end of term. The GPA for graduation requirement is a minimum UCF 2.0 ("C").

**Example:** A student has completed 13 credit hours for a given term. To calculate the Term GPA:

1. Multiply the number of credit hours per course by the number of grade points per grade. Then add each amount to arrive at the total number of grade points earned for that term:

Course #1 B+3 credit hours X 3.25 grade points=9.75  
+ Course #2A- 3 credit hours X 3.75 grade points=11.25

+ Course #3A 4 credit hours X 4.00 grade points=16

+ Course #4B 3 credit hours X 3.00 grade points=9

---

=13 credit hours=46 total grade points

1. Divide the total number of grade points by the total number of credit hours earned that term:

46.00 total grade points / 13 credit hours = 3.54 GPA for that term.

**UCF Cumulative GPA.** If prior to this term the student had earned a total of 162 grade points for a combined 54 term hours of coursework, his or her cumulative grade point average entering this term would be  $162/54= 3.00$ . Including this term of coursework, the cumulative grade point average would be  $(162 + 46) / (54 + 13) = 3.10$ .

**Catalog**

Include in Catalog

Proposed

**Catalog Activation Date**

2024/08/01

Existing

**Catalog Activation Date**

2023/08/01

Changes

### Rationale

Allows The in C- specific grade instances causes students a tremendous amount of receive confusion. and Many S/U majors grade require in students lie to of earn at least a letter grade 2.0 To in provide major students courses. the This ability means to that minimize a negative C- impacts equates to GPA an and/or unsuccessful to completion try of new a courses course.

To add to this confusion, since the +/- system is optional, the current system leads to a situation where students with the exact same average could have vastly different results for their academic career. This is best explained with examples.

Student A takes AMH 4170 in spring 2022. Their professor does not use the +/- system. They earn a 72 in the course and receive a C. The class counts for the History major.

Student B takes AMH 4170 in summer 2022. Their professor does use the +/- system. They earn a 72 and receive a C-. The class does not count for the History major.

Also, imagine if Student A and B were both on probation. Student A would remain on probation while student B would be dismissed from UCF.

In theory, this could even happen if the students took different sections of the same class in the same semester.

Similarly, as we expand the use of the S/U system, the C- (which equates to U) is potentially going to cause more problems.

Eliminating the C- would also help improve our graduation rate (as students are not forced to retake these classes.) While this might be seen by some as "watering down" our requirements, in reality, many professors who award C- do not realize the consequences of the grade. And, we must consider whether the current policy makes sense: does a C- reflect an unsuccessful completion of a course? It is easy to make an argument that instead it reflects a minimally successful completion of a course.

Perhaps because of these complications, the C- is rarely used. In Fall 2021, only .51 percent of all grades at UCF were C-. (D- and D+ are used even less-- .14 and .49 percent). So, in total this change only impacts 1.14 percent of the grades given at UCF.

Note: At least one of our fellow SUS institutions (FIU) does not use the C-/D+/D- grades. They stopped using these grades in 2016.

## Changes

### Policy Text

The University uses an alphabetic system to identify student grades and other actions regarding student progress or class attendance. Beginning Fall 2001, a plus/minus grading system became effective, with a grade point equivalent per semester hour as follows:

Grades	Grading Points Per Semester Hour of Credit
A	4.00
A-	3.75
B+	3.25
B	3.00
B-	2.75
C+	2.25
C	2.00
<del>C-</del>	<del>1.75</del>
<del>D+</del>	<del>1.25</del>
D	1.00
<del>D-</del>	<del>.75</del>
F	0.00
NC - No Credit*	

\*Available only in CHM 1032, CHM 2040, CHM 2041, CHM 2045C, CHS 1440, ENC 1101, ENC 1101H, ENC 1102, ENC 1102H, MAC 1105CH, MAC 1105H, MAC 1114C, MAC 1140C, MAC 1140H, MAC 2147, MAC 2233, MAC 2241, MAC 2253, MAC 2281, MAC 2281H, MAC 2311C, MAC 2311H, MAT 1033C, and STA 2014. In these classes NC replaces the use of ~~D+~~, ~~D~~ and ~~D-~~.

Legend	Action	Grade Points
G	Repeated Course (Grade Forgiveness, multiple attempts)	-
I	Incomplete	-
K	Repeated course (Latest Attempt)	-
N	No grade reported by instructor (followed by grade)	-
P	Repeated Course (Not Grade Forgiveness)	-
R	Repeated course (Grade Forgiveness)	-
S	Satisfactory (w/credit)/Satisfactory Progress (Research, Thesis, or Dissertation)	-
T	(followed by grade) Subsequently repeated (no credit)	-
U	Unsatisfactory (no credit)	-
W	Withdrawn	-
WL	Late Withdrawal	-
WH	Health Form Withdrawal	-

WM	Medical Withdrawal	-
X	Audit (no credit)	-

The designation of "N" will be assigned temporarily by the Registrar's Office only in the case when a grade has not been submitted by the instructors by the grade submission deadline. The designator will be replaced by the earned letter grade at the earliest opportunity in the term that immediately follows and prior to graduation. The "N" designator may not be assigned by the instructor.

In the event of academic dishonesty, instructors may assign a Z in front of a final course grade on a student's academic record. For further information regarding the addition, removal and appeals process of the Z designation, see <https://goldenrule.sdes.ucf.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/64/2020/10/2020-2021-Golden-Rule.pdf#page=67>

The Grade Point Average (GPA) is the average number of grade points per semester hour attempted. **GPA is computed by dividing the total number of grade points assigned by the total number of credit hours attempted, less hours resulting from NC, W, WP, S, U, and I grades.** GPA is recalculated after each term; for Summer GPA is recalculated only after all Sessions and end of term. The GPA for graduation requirement is a minimum UCF 2.0 ("C").

**Example:** A student has completed 13 credit hours for a given term. To calculate the Term GPA:

1. Multiply the number of credit hours per course by the number of grade points per grade. Then add each amount to arrive at the total number of grade points earned for that term:

Course #1	B+	3 credit hours X 3.25 grade points =	9.75
+ Course #2	A-	3 credit hours X 3.75 grade points =	11.25
+ Course #3	A	4 credit hours X 4.00 grade points =	16
+ Course #4	B	3 credit hours X 3.00 grade points =	9
		= 13 credit hours	= 46 total grade points

2. Divide the total number of grade points by the total number of credit hours earned that term:  
46.00 total grade points / 13 credit hours = 3.54 GPA for that term.

**UCF Cumulative GPA.** If prior to this term the student had earned a total of 162 grade points for a combined 54 term hours of coursework, his or her cumulative grade point average entering this term would be  $162/54= 3.00$ . Including this term of coursework, the cumulative grade point average would be  $(162 + 46) / (54 + 13) = 3.10$ .

## **Rationale**

The C- grade causes a tremendous amount of confusion. Many majors require students to earn at least a 2.0 in major courses. This means that a C- equates to an unsuccessful completion of a course.

To add to this confusion, since the +/- system is optional, the current system leads to a situation where students with the exact same average could have vastly different results for their academic career. This is best explained with examples.

- Student A takes AMH 4170 in spring 2022. Their professor does not use the +/- system. They earn a 72 in the course and receive a C. The class counts for the History major.
- Student B takes AMH 4170 in summer 2022. Their professor does use the +/- system. They earn a 72 and receive a C-. The class does not count for the History major.

Also, imagine if Student A and B were both on probation. Student A would remain on probation while student B would be dismissed from UCF.

In theory, this could even happen if the students took different sections of the same class in the same semester.

Similarly, as we expand the use of the S/U system, the C- (which equates to U) is potentially going to cause more problems.

Eliminating the C- would also help improve our graduation rate (as students are not forced to retake these classes.) While this might be seen by some as “watering down” our requirements, in reality, many professors who award C- do not realize the consequences of the grade. And, we must consider whether the current policy makes sense: does a C- reflect an unsuccessful completion of a course? It is easy to make an argument that instead it reflects a minimally successful completion of a course.

Perhaps because of these complications, the C- is rarely used. In Fall 2021, only 0.51 percent of all grades at UCF were C-. (D- and D+ are used even less--0.14 and 0.49 percent). So, in total this change only impacts 1.14 percent of the grades given at UCF.

Note: At least one of our fellow SUS institutions (FIU) does not use the C-/D+/D- grades. They stopped using these grades in 2016.