Dr. Manoj Chopra, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

The roll was circulated for signatures. The minutes of the *January 25, 2007* meeting were unanimously approved with minor changes and clarification of information about multi-term registration. Dr. Schell clarified that the students who will be allowed to register for three semesters are those in the honors college and those with a UCF cumulative GPA of 3.5 or above. Other students still can register for summer and fall only.

### RECOGNITION of GUESTS and ADMINISTRATION

Guests included: Dr. John Schell, Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar, Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine, Dr. Dennis Dulniak, Mark Gumble and several members of the Library staff.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### Dr. Chopra announced:

- ➤ UCF will host the BOG meeting on Tuesday, February 27, 2007 from 10-3 p.m. This meeting will be a public hearing on the Pappas report. Dr. Chopra encouraged everyone to attend. Senators can visit their website at <a href="www.flbog.org">www.flbog.org</a> to submit questions for the meeting.
- ➤ At the last meeting, the Faculty Senate approved Resolution 2006-2007-2 Electronic Thesis and Dissertations Dissemination Policy. This resolution has been pulled back and returned to the Graduate Council until certain legal and other issues that were raised after the meeting are addressed. Graduate Council will resubmit the resolution at a later time.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

NONF

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### Academic Progress and Faculty Mentors for Student Athletes - Mark Gumble

Mr. Gumble distributed handouts regarding the Student-Athlete/Faculty/Staff Mentoring program and the Faculty/Staff Appreciation reception on Wednesday, February 28 from 6-7:30 p.m. in the UCF Arena Skybox. This event is just prior to the Men's Basketball Game that begins at 7:30 p.m. He stated that the success of student athletics is something we all can share. ASA is making great progress. For the third consecutive semester student athletics had an average GPA above 3.0. This past semester 54% of student athletes (276 of 508) earned a GPA above 3.0. UCF finished #1 conference USA in terms of scholar-athletes. One hundred and ninety student athletes had a cumulative GPA above 3.0. All faculty are encouraged to attend the reception and the basketball game.

Another focus of the ASA is the enhancement of the life skills program which helps student athletes with their career and personal development. A faculty mentoring program for student-athletes is currently under development. This is an excellent way for faculty who want to get involved to participate. There is a plan to pilot a program for incoming freshmen

football and mens/women basketball athletes in Fall 2007. If anyone is interested in this program, please email or fax the interest form to Mark Gumble by Friday, March 9, 2007. Question asked if the program is matching majors. ASA will look at majors and interest of the faculty but focus is on life skills, not necessarily related to major.

Question raised about the academic progress reports which are sent out to faculty. ASA has tried at a different approach last semester (distributed via campus mail) but it did not work well and had a return rate just over 50%. They have now modified this approach so there are individual letters to faculty with more time to get forms returned.

It was noted that there seems to be better communication between faculty and ASA staff. Student-athletes do not have control over the number of times they have to miss class because of competition.

### Pre-discussion on Academic Career Path Models- Drs. Schell and Morrison-Shetlar

Before the presentation and discussion, Dr. Chopra laid out the background and limits of this discussion and stated that there is no new policy on academic career paths or any new model which has been chosen for UCF. The purpose of this presentation and discussion is to give senators an opportunity to share any ideas or suggestion that would benefit faculty at UCF. Any task force would have members from each college and the regional campuses.

Dr. Schell began the discussion with members of the Faculty Senate about possible alternate career path models for faculty. Goal is to talk about possibilities and ideas of different career path models which might better serve our faculty and students. Dr. Schell stated there are no hidden agenda, no preconceived plan, and no thought that any alternative models would be applied to existing faculty. This discussion is about creating alternate ways to reward faculty, help faculty be successful, and examine ways to meet needs in our future growth as an institution.

Dr. Morrison-Shetlar is creating a website where information on career path models from other universities can be accessed. If the faculty come to a conclusion the tenure track system we have now serves our faculty well and it is what best meets our needs in the future then no change will be made. Question was raised if there are other ways to promote successful professional faculty career paths in the future that would better serve the needs of the university. Why do this or why even talk it? Dr. Schell stated that many faculty have had some sense of dissatisfaction with the one size fits all tenure-track mode. The motivation is to find a better system that can better serve our faculty and students.

There were many issues in the past. For example excellent faculty were denied tenure despite high quality teaching. The goal is to have a faculty-wide conversation about the possibility of providing other kinds of career tenure tracks, career non-tenure tracks and career models for our faculty who might want different kinds of professional career inside the university. This reflects that we are indeed an academy of scholar-teachers. There may be other ways to focus on a person's strengths and relieve them of the duties that they may not want to do or do not do well with the everyone being a more productive and more successful professional inside university setting. For example there may be a tenure track assistant, associate, full professor career model for people who wanted to do all teaching. They would come in with the required terminal degree, strong teaching credentials, curriculum credentials and strong advising credentials.

Several approaches were briefly discussed e.g. clinical faculty, faculty with focus on teaching not research, and faculty with focus on research not teaching. A comment was made that the optimal approach is to have accomplished researchers teaching undergraduate, graduate and doctoral courses.

Dr. Chopra asked if there is a need to establish a taskforce, either senate related or separate from the senate. Either approach would need broad faculty representation. Suggestion made that an adhoc committee be established composed of faculty who are willing to serve on this committee. Question asked if the FCTL would call a forum for all faculty to see what the issues are and discuss. It was determined that FCTL would not be the appropriate place and entity to hold this discussion. Question was addressed to Dr. Schell about whether this approach is taking away department prerogative. He replied there is no plan yet so it's hard to say what the plan's repercussions or consequences might be at the local level. It is not expected any plan which is developed would negate the department's role. Rather, it is expected there will be different possibilities so the departments would have more flexibility.

Dr. Pennington commented that the Senate is responsible for any concerns which involved more that one or more college in a broad educational policy as the basic legislative body of the university. He brought forth a resolution for the formation of a study group to explore the possibility of any new academic career path models.

Motion was made that an adhoc subcommittee be formed to examine the concept of alternate faculty tenure career tracks and report back to the senate at some date in the future. A friendly amendment was made to ask Dr. Schell to chair this group. Dr. Cook suggested that the motion does not need to include where this group is housed. Dr. Schell will coordinate its operations with Dr. Morrison-Shetlar. All faculty members should be encouraged to come forth with their opinion. Dr. Schell will solicit participation from different parts of the faculty and regional campus faculty. Participants should come from each college and academic entity.

The question was called and seconded. Unanimously approved. Motion (see above) was then voted on and unanimously approved.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

### ➤ Budget & Administrative - Dr. Bernadette Jungblut reported

The Budget and Administrative Procedures Committee met earlier this month and selected 33 proposals to be funded for a total of \$403,025.21.

Seven (7) colleges and two (2) additional units received funding.

Colleges and Additional Units Funding Breakdown:

Burnett College of Biomedical Sciences 19,867.20 Burnett Honors College 5,200.00 College of Arts and Humanities 112,812.77 = College of Education 32,030.00 College of Engineering and Computer Science 58,874.00 College of Health and Public Affairs 60,577.54 College of Sciences 99,813.70 Office of Undergraduate Studies 3,000.00

University Libraries = 10,850.00

The Undergraduate Teaching Equipment RFP for 2006-2007 has been discharged.

The committee will meet with the bookstore to discuss issues with textbook orders. Please forward any problems with bookstore to Dr. Jungblut. The committee will produce a report with recommendations.

> Graduate Council - Dr. Aaron Lieberman reported

The council is continuing work on three resolutions. One resolution was passed and approved by the senate but not the Provost and was sent back to the committee. The Council will continue the work on other resolution Graduate Faculty Conduct and Thesis Dissertation. Next meeting is scheduled for March 1<sup>st</sup>.

Personnel - Dr. Jeff Kaplan reported

Dr. Kaplan had no report at this point. There are two issues on the agenda and will have a report at the meeting in March.

➤ Undergraduate Policy & Curriculum - Dr. Bob Pennington reported

At the February 13, 2007 meeting, the committee passed degree policy statement in terms of degrees being revoked. The committee also approved a plagiarism policy statement which is being sent to all faculty for possible inclusion in their syllabi. Question asked if there were other places to include the policy on plagiarism. Dr. Schell commented that there were two parts that were approved, a short statement that faculty may or may not have in their syllabus. The second is a longer discussion of plagiarism that will be posted on FCTL website. Undergraduate Course Review Committee meets on March 6, 2007. A meeting scheduled during spring break has been postponed.

### **O**THER

### Parking Advisory meeting - Dr. Cook.

Dr. Cook encouraged faculty who are representatives on this committee to attend the meetings and voice opinions regarding parking. The chair of the committee Dr. Gunter would like to ask that administration take into account that this committee does exist and respond to its many recommendations.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

### DRAFT

### A Consideration of UCF Academic Career Path Models

As UCF matures, the mission of our university has become more complex. We continue to emphasize access and solid undergraduate teaching while also encouraging research and the growth of our graduate programs. Faculty experience the tension caused by these two goals and may not be well served by our present workload, evaluation, and promotion and tenure system.

For instance, some of us who give priority to our teaching have found it difficult to earn tenure and promotion. Some think that our criteria for teaching in our existing promotion and tenure process are insufficiently developed.

Some of us who are research faculty face teaching expectations that hinder our research efforts. Or we carry reduced teaching loads and are replaced with full-time instructors or part-time adjuncts in the classroom.

Here is our dilemma: How do we encourage research while also supporting professionals in the classroom? Are there alternative faculty workload, evaluation, and promotion models that could support the goal of "the best undergraduate education in Florida" and also develop our national reputation for excellence in research?

We would like to initiate a faculty-wide discussion about career track options. Here are some models to consider:

- A formal, university-wide, work-load differentiation plan, in which faculty are assigned to either a research or a teaching track, keeping existing promotion and tenure criteria
- A tenure-track for teaching professionals (terminal degree required) that parallels our existing research tenure track, with new promotion and tenure criteria correlated to teaching success
- A track for teaching professionals (terminal degree required) that parallels our
  existing research tenure track. Which replicates the tenure track in all matters but
  does not provide tenure, with new promotion criteria correlated to teaching
  success
- Maintaining the current system

In addition, we might also consider other academic professional career tracks, such as:

• Clinical professionals

We might also think about a career-track for some of our non-professional colleagues:

• Teachers who do not have terminal degrees, whom we now refer to as Instructors.

Thanks.