

Faculty Senate Personnel Committee

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 6, 2019

11:30 am – 12:30 pm

Location: Millican Hall Room 395-E

Members present: Stephen King (chair), Scott Carter, Mason Cash, Yoon Choi, Robert Folger, Jonathan Knuckey, Karol Lucken, Michael Proctor, Alfons Schulte, Blake Scott, Kelly Semrad, Vladimir Solonari, Martine Vanryckeghem, John Venecek, Linda Walters, Nora Warshawsky, Kendall Cortelyou-Ward.

- 1) Meeting called to order by King at 11:30am.
- 2) King asked for minute-taker volunteer and Rob Folger agreed.
- 3) Rob Folger made motion to approve 1/9 minutes, Martine Vanryckeghem seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
- 4) King recognized guests Lucretia Cooney and Jana Jasinski from Faculty Excellence.
- 5) Committee discussed resolution recommending that all NTE Research, Clinical, and Medical Librarian faculty bypass the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Various suggested changes led to clarification of the exact wording that should be used. King also noted that he had discussed the resolution with various faculty likely to be affected.
- 6) Walters made motion to approve resolution with the agreed-upon clarifying changes, Folger seconded, and motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
- 7) Committee discussed COACHE results based on report by Jasinski, who noted that responses from Associate Professors represented an area of some concern.
Issues discussed included various matters regarding promotion to Full Professor, such as lack of clarity of the criteria, role of department chairs in attending to the process, ambiguous nature of relevant time-period (“nebulous”), and possible inconsistency in implementation of the process. Committee members suggested that it might be time for self-reflection about the way the University has evolved with respect to criteria and their application. Jasinski noted having a list of 19 names for committee(s) looking into these, and King asked her to report back at the Personnel Committee’s next meeting.
- 8) Committee discussed issues related to the payment structure for University awards, addressing comments and concerns listed on a document prepared by Lucken and Carter.
With respect to TIP awards, Lucken questioned their validity because in some instances there have been “predetermined winners.” Another question was whether the differential financial impact of these awards is warranted. Also questioned was whether faculty teaching small classes should be excluded from consideration.

With respect to SOTL awards, some members expressed concern about possible narrowness of scope and applicability primarily to one particular unit. Scott, on the other hand, said he had looked at past awards and found that they had been reasonably dispersed across various schools and colleges. Walters, however, thought they had outgrown the justification that had been the basis for their original adoption.

With regard to RIA and perhaps the other awards as well, King pointed to two general questions:

(a) are such awards a good idea? and (b) is their implementation flawed? The opinion was expressed that many more people are deserving of these awards than might ever receive them, creating an unwarranted skew to salary distribution. Another question was what would happen to the available funds if they were not used for these awards (e.g., consequences observed at other state universities that have done away with them). Some members were able to report ways the awards process was handled well within a particular college.

Proctor reported that past analysis of research grants indicated the median number of faculty receiving an outside grant processed through the UCF Office of Research in any given year was zero or near zero. Grants themselves were skewed with approximately 10% of the faculty receiving 90% of the total value of grants awarded to the University. Likewise teaching load also tended to be skewed with approximately 20% of the faculty teaching 80% of the students. Ratings on faculty evaluation are not a good indicator of comparative performance as evaluations do not reflect that skew in the data. To determine if the level of evaluations, research grants and teaching load are currently skewed, additional data would be needed from the University.

9) King adjourned meeting at 12:33pm.

Promotion Procedures for Non Tenure Earning Faculty

Whereas, Non Tenure Earning Assistant and Associate Professors, as well as Assistant and Associate Medical Librarians, who are candidates for promotion currently undergo a review by the UCF University Promotion and Tenure Committee after Dean or Unit Head review but before Provost review, and

Whereas, all other Non Tenure Earning faculty with titles including Instructor and Associate Instructor, Lecturer and Associate Lecturer, Assistant and Associate Librarian, and Assistant and Associate Instructional Designer do not undergo a review by the UCF Promotion and Tenure Committee after Dean or Unit Head review but before Provost review, and

Whereas, bypassing the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for all Non-Tenure Earning Faculty regardless of title – that is, forwarding such cases directly from the Dean's/ Unit Head's review to the Provost – would enable the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to maintain a reasonable workload and focus on tenured and tenure track applications; therefore

Be it Resolved that all Non Tenure Earning Assistant and Associate candidates for promotion will bypass the University Promotion and Tenure committee and their cases will be forwarded directly from Dean or Unit Head review to the Provost, and

Be it Further Resolved that Section VIII of the University of Central Florida Bylaws be amended to remove paragraph 0.2.b.