

Faculty Senate Personnel Committee

Wednesday, February 08, 2017

11:30 am – 12:30 pm

Technology Commons 102B

<http://facultysenate.ucf.edu/meetings/PersonnelMeetings.asp>

AGENDA

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Roll Call
- 3) Selection of minutes taker for the meeting
- 4) Review and approval of minutes of December 14, 2016 meeting
- 5) Announcements and recognition of guests
- 6) Old Business
 - a. UCF UFF will not meet with the Personnel Committee – brief discussion
Steve King
 - b. Salary study (gender-based addition)- discussion
Linda Walters
 - c. Evaluation of endowed chairs: update on compilation
Lucretia Cooney
 - d. TIPs, RIAs, and SoTLs –discussion
handouts from 2016 Steering ad hoc committee were sent
- 7) New business-
- 8) Other topics
- 9) Adjournment

Senate Personnel Meeting
12/14/2016.

Meeting called to order at 11:35 am.

Members: Mindi Anderson, Mason Cash, Robert Folger, Paul Giordano, Richard Harrison, Kim Myunghee, Stephen King (chair), Jonathan Knuckey, Karol Lucken, Eric Merriam, Vladimir Solonari, Michelle Upvall,
Guest: Keith Koons

Minutes: approved.

Announcements:

Policy for Emeritus status have been approved. Thanks to this committee for contributions to this.

Old Business:

a. **Salary study** (gender-based addition)- discussion Linda Walters

Gender disparities: Linda Walters not able to attend. But reported that they are looking at gender breakdown of salary studies of other universities. Designing a study would look at gender-based differentials within UCF.

Salary compression: A salary study (March 31, 2016) focused on people with low salary (compared to others with similar position in the field). Large pool under 30% of what others make at other universities. Provost reported in 3/31/2016 at faculty Senate meeting that it would take \$3.72M to bring all faculty in this category up to the 30%.

Committee considered inviting a conversation with UFF regarding these disparities in salary. Stephen King will invite UFF to discuss this.

Question about whether to count TIP RIA SOTL in salary studies. A: These are counted as Salary for the purposes of this study.

b. **Evaluation of endowed chairs:** update on compilation Lucretia Cooney.

Lucretia Cooney could not attend. No new information. Still assembling list of endowed chairs.

c. **Summer compensation:** update on CBA Stephen King

Handout on Section 8.6 from CBA. Can people be required to perform service over summer? Faculty can perform such duties, but cannot be required to do so. But there is no liability issue with meeting with graduate students, attending meetings, etc. when on a 9 month contract.

No requirement for other duties if not assigned teaching and service. But those assigned teaching can also be asked to normal other duties.

Concern with those paid on grant over summer. Meeting with graduate students during summer is not part of one's duties. Some interpret grants as restricting meeting with graduate students that are not involved with the grant.

Teaching summer abroad. Discussion of recent concern about people being pressured to teach study abroad without salary. Seems to be covered by 8.6.

New business-

a. TIPS, RIAs, and SoTLs [from committee]- discussion

Discussion of concerns about time involved in application (as contrasted with regular assessment and merit based salary increases). Also difficulty and time involved assessment of portfolios. Competitiveness of the system seems inherently unfair.

Difficult to make changes on this. But important to try to improve it. Maybe a conversation with UFF would be productive, to help understand the impediments to making changes, and what our committee can do to improve things.

Application process is now enforcing policy to enable faculty to correct minor problems.

b. Employee contribution to retirement plans:

Keith Koons: Steering discussed 403(b) plans. University is consolidating number of vendors, improving the quality of offerings. UCF participation is comparatively low. Idea is to encourage more faculty to take advantage of these additional benefits (in addition to FRP).

Highlights from Recommendations

History of award resolution -2013-2014 – Establishment of an Awards Procedures Review committee

(approved March 27th, 2014 by senate; Approved by interim provost Diane Chase July 29th 2014
(copies available)

- 1) More awards – a suggested one time increase in RIA relative to TIP based on data for applications vs. awards
- 2) Develop new awards to reflect all the contributions from faculty that don't fall under TIP and RIA (e.g. clinical, librarian, new service award, etc)
- 3) Add final recommendations are reviewed by the Dean (or VPR, or FCTL) to determine whether the award is truly merited (or just given out since there were applications)
- 4) Recycles should go back to the general pool for awards (no arguing about units)
- 5) Double the Founder's day awards to \$4K
- 6) discussion of issues around salary studies and merit raises vs. 'awards'
- 7) remove tenure-earning requirement for RIA
- 8) Standardize and simplify all awards – and electronic
- 9) Generate more lenient policies on word counts
- 10) make excellence award applications parallel to TIP/RIA/SOTL etc.
- 11) Use all years since last award in application (not just last 4 or 5)
- 12) SOTL is redefined and made more specific (appendix)
- 13) Eligible faculty should not be involved in any aspect of award review – review committee made up of past winners and faculty not eligible or applying – conflict of interest should be recognized as it relates to award review and process.
- 14) Committee Charging document – for all awards – that reminds committee members of their role, and what is allowable to discuss and what is not (salary, kids, tenure track vs non etc)

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE STEERING AD HOC COMMITTEE ON AWARDS
MARCH 2016**

Note: For each recommendation a rationale is given below in italics

A. Base Number of Awards, Creation of New Teaching and Clinical Education Awards, Recycling and Award amount

1. Increase or maintain the number of TIP, RIA and SOTL awards available each year; maintain an increase that reflects the increases in faculty numbers (5 year rolling increase to account for eligible new faculty); An initial overall increase in RIA as compared to TIP and SOTL is suggested based on the number of applicants vs. awards in each category in the past 3 years.

The number of awards in all categories has remained stagnant for over a decade, and the number of faculty being hired is accelerating.

2. Develop new faculty **awards** for faculty (as defined by faculty senate) who are not generating student credit hours through undergraduate or graduate courses, but contribute significantly to the mission of the University. This should include units such as the Libraries, the Medical Education Department within the College of Medicine, and clinical faculty in COHPA and Nursing, amongst others. The same salary structure (\$5000 permanent increase in base salary) would be used.

- a) *Faculty in some units (e.g., College of Medicine, Nursing, and COHPA) do not generate SCH, but should be awarded for their excellence.*
- b) *Librarians have been long left out of the award process with exception of a one time \$2000 excellence award.*
- c) *Faculty with substantial clinical teaching do not generally generate SCHs, and so they are not eligible for existing awards, and yet clinical education should be recognized at the University.*

3. Given the importance of service in the academy, a new award (base salary increase of \$5000 per year) should be developed that is University wide.

Like librarians, service has been undervalued in the award process, and service is a critical part of the academy and should be appreciated.

4. Add a final recommendation for all awards at the level of Dean (given the selection process within the colleges) and the Dean of the College of Undergraduate Studies (SOTL). If an award is not recommended at the Dean level, it can be recycled back to the same unit only one time (the next cycle) before it is returned to the overall pool and apportionment. This information should be included in each committee charging document (see recommendation C-2 below).

There are concerns that in some cases faculty are eligible for an award and are recommended for the award by the committee even without meeting a level of excellence that would merit the award.

The ability to recycle a single award within a unit for one year will allow for some critical decision-making by the Deans without penalizing the unit unduly. It is possible that the 'use it or lose it' mentality could alter the rigor of the Dean's process for decision making.

5. When a faculty member retires or leaves UCF, awards will be recycled into the overall award pool for the next year in order to increase award numbers.

Recycled awards within units will over time skew the apportionment of the awards over time and this allows for awards to be fairly distributed.

6. For all Excellence Awards (given on Founder's Day) – increase the one time award from \$2000 to \$4000.

The award amount has been stagnant and given that these are one time awards a \$4000 award is more substantial for the faculty member.

B. Eligibility and Formatting of awards

1. Awards are NOT a replacement of raises – and they should NOT be included in the base salaries of any faculty when the University is carrying out a salary study, NOR should they be used in determining how much of an increase a faculty member should get based on the results of a salary study, for example, to address equity and/or salary compression issues. ***This is a critical issue that faculty are concerned about and needs to be addressed openly by the administration.***

Awards should not be seen as raises – they are awards. Winning an award should not penalize a faculty member when it comes to salary increases for which they would otherwise qualify.

2. Eliminate tenure-earning in the eligibility of RIA awards.

This will allow for instructors and lecturers, some of whom carry out substantial research, to be eligible for RIA.

3. Establish an additional TIP eligibility category – undergraduate or graduate degree program or major; determine the median for SCH production by degree program (graduate or undergraduate) rather than by department so that small programs are not disenfranchised if they are housed in the same department or unit as large program(s). This would not alter the current eligibility system by department or college at undergraduate or graduate level.

We appreciate that more than 80% of faculty are eligible by the current guidelines, but this additional layer could include faculty that might be excluded by the size of their degree program within a department or school.

4. Standardize and simplify all award applications to be concise and to include only salient materials that support a strong case for excellence in teaching, research or SOTL. For example, a full CV, a one-page statement of strengths in the application and an appendix of materials to support this case.

The applications are burdensome to both the applicants and the review committees. Excellence can be described in a succinct manner without losing critical information to judge the applications. This will lighten the burden on faculty of time spent assembling the application, and also on committees, who are perceived to have an incentive to relieve this burden by rejecting applications based on technicalities.

5. Make all applications electronic.

This is obvious in 2016.

6. Word count rules must have a 10% margin of error.

This will eliminate the disqualification problems that have occurred in the past.

7. Develop a similar application for Excellence awards (Founder's Day awards) so that the materials for these awards are in line with the TIP, RIA and SOTL and to minimize the time faculty spend on preparing these applications.

This will reduce the time that faculty spend on developing all applications.

8. For each award the applicant is required to include as evidence either the past five academic years, or more, since the date of hire at UCF or since the submission of the last successful application.

Faculty should be able to point to all their accomplishments in an area, with a limitation only if they are a previous awardee.

9. There should be an emphasis on the review of SOTL awards that demonstrates that the same activities, by and large, would not be used for both a TIP and a SOTL (see changes to SOTL in appendix).

Faculty who by definition work in this area (SOTL) as their creative activities should not be 'double-dipping'. Some overlap in research, teaching and service is also expected but this will clarify that SOTL and TIP are unique and different.

10. Grant funding and percent effort on grants should be documented by the applicant from the Office of Research databases, or other official sources (e.g. UCF Foundation, contracts processed through auxiliary accounts).

The funding amount and role of a faculty member is critical in assessing their contribution on a funded project. This will also align with the current dossier requirement for promotion and tenure that now requires the ORC report to be included in the dossier.

11. All applications should clearly show (and committees should consider) the FTE assignment for the applicant for any years of service included in the application.

The amount of time a faculty member has to do research, teaching and service should be taken into account by the review committee.

12. Eligibility for awards is based on faculty as defined by the Faculty Senate.

A number of groups who have been deemed as faculty by Human Resources are not recognized as faculty by the Senate, yet have been seeking this designation in part to obtain awards.

13. Detailed changes are suggested for the SOTL application (attached appendix A).

14. Applications for all awards should provide more explicit information on eligibility. For example, define 'full-time' as 1.0 FTE and define 'continuous service'. Clarity on what constitutes continuous service is a concern to this committee. For example a faculty member who had a part-time teaching commitment for a number of years and then is hired into a full time position – are they eligible? Should all years of teaching be considered for continuous service? What about sabbatical, medical leave or parental leave? Neither of these should disqualify you for in our opinion.

C. Committee Structure, Charges to Committees, and Conflict of Interest

1. The faculty should elect committees from a pool of faculty that are not currently eligible for the award and should include past winners.

Eligible faculty should play no role whatsoever in the process, including Chairs or Directors that can submit applications.

2. Develop and implement a committee-charging document that will be used for all awards. The document will remind committees that only the application is to be discussed and that the award is based on merit. No additional outside information or discussion of position (e.g., instructor vs. tenure-track faculty member, past awards, current salary, etc.) are to be considered during review.

Committee members have discussed that some past occurrences that invoked issues outside of the application have occurred. This will remind each committee each year about the importance of remaining focused on the applications and their merit.

3. Develop a conflict of interest statement as a reminder to faculty who are eligible for and applying for TIP that they are not to be part of the process of committee development or in a decision-making capacity in the award system.

Chairs and Directors are eligible for awards (and should remain so). However some faculty disagree with this eligibility. Distance between the process and the Chair/Director should be clear to all faculty in each case. The reason for disagreement on the eligibility of Chairs/Directors is that they make decisions that affect faculty eligibility (e.g. teaching assignments in large courses) and they could be competing with those faculty for the same awards.

APPENDIX A – SOTL CHANGES
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE STEERING AD HOC COMMITTEE
ON AWARDS – MARCH 2016

I. Program Overview

The Office of Academic Affairs provides the funding for these awards. For the academic year 2014–2015, UCF will sponsor 10 awards for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). In any given academic year, if any former recipients of SoTL awards leave their employment at UCF, the award(s) will be “recycled” as additional SoTL awards for the following academic year.

For the purpose of this award, SoTL is defined as follows: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) uses discovery, reflection, and evidence-based methods to research effective teaching and student learning in higher education. These findings are peer reviewed and publicly disseminated in an ongoing cycle of systematic inquiry into teaching practices. This work benefits students and colleagues and is a source of personal renewal (UCF FCTL).

While the implementation of SoTL outcomes in individual classrooms and through curriculum development can result in teaching excellence and increased teaching effectiveness, this award recognizes not teaching excellence but scholarly efforts. Application materials should not include matter related to teaching unless it is part of a peer-reviewed publication, presentation, grant, or other peer-reviewed innovation (e.g., published software).

II. Funding

Regardless of their contract length (9 months or 12 months), awardees will receive a \$5,000 base salary increase retroactive to August 8, 2014, the start of the 2014–2015 contract.

III. Eligibility Criteria

For the purposes of this award, faculty members are defined as professor, associate professor, assistant professor (including faculty members with clinical or research appointments), university librarian, associate university librarian, assistant university librarian, senior lecturer, associate lecturer, lecturer, senior instructor, associate instructor, instructor. Faculty members are considered “eligible” for the SoTL award if all the following criteria are met:

1. The employee must be on a full-time 9- or 12-month appointment.
2. The employee must have at least four years of continuous full-time service at UCF. Specifically, she or he must have been employed at UCF on or prior to August 8, 2010.
3. No faculty member may receive the award more than once every five years. Previous award recipients who received a SoTL increase that became effective August 8, 2010, or later are not

eligible for a SoTL award this year. Employees who received the award in 2009–2010 or earlier are eligible to apply for the 2014–2015 award.

IV. Award Criteria

The criteria for evaluating applicants' portfolios include recognition of the value or impact of the applicant's SoTL efforts both within their core discipline and for the teaching and learning community as a whole in every case. Examples include:

1. Publication of papers that describe SoTL research or implementation of teaching approaches based on SoTL.
2. Grant and contract support for SoTL activities. The emphasis in this area should be on disseminated research rather than on program development and implementation.
3. Presentations of SoTL research results at academic or professional conferences and other forums within and outside UCF.
4. Dissemination of SoTL research through innovations such as patents and software program publication and distribution.
5. Peer recognition of SoTL research and creative efforts by way of awards and other honors. (This does not include teaching awards.)
6. Service as an editor or a peer reviewer for a SoTL journal or a journal where SoTL papers are regularly published.

V. Application Materials and Required Sections submitted digitally (numbers 1–7) and in a 1-inch Portfolio (number 8). [Or preferably all materials could be submitted digitally.]

If a nominee received the SoTL award at UCF in the past, accomplishments since the last award should be clearly identified. Items in progress (e.g., grant proposals, publications, or presentations still in review) should also be clearly indicated.

1. Title page.
2. Table of contents.
3. Nomination letter from the dean, director, chair, or a colleague written specifically in reference to this award. Self-nominations are also accepted. The letter should stress the nominee's achievements in dissemination of knowledge relating to SoTL and should not focus on teaching performance.

4. Applicant's definition of SoTL and description of SoTL research methodology/ies. This document should not be a teaching philosophy. (250 words maximum, 12-point font). Word count must be included.

5. List of the nominee's SoTL accomplishments during the award period (100 words maximum, 12-point font). Word count must be included. This list should include a short overview of the number of publications, grants, presentations, awards and honors, patents, software publications, and editorial efforts.

6. Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae (no more than 5 pages, 12-point font) focusing on the nominee's SoTL accomplishments, including publications, grants, presentations, awards, patents, software development and distribution, and editorial efforts. Each entry should be clearly identified as peer reviewed, editor reviewed, invited, etc. Optional information could include acceptance rates, citations, circulation rates, and audience details. Applicants are encouraged to include annotations that describe each included entry in such a way that readers can easily determine whether and how it meets the UCF definition of SoTL.

7. Narrative describing the impact of the applicant's SoTL research. This document should address the ways in which and the extent to which the applicant's SoTL research and creative activities have impacted teaching and learning outcomes at UCF and beyond (500 words maximum, 12-point font). Word count must be included.

8. Supporting Material: Evidence of SoTL accomplishments, including copies of book covers with tables of contents, book chapters, SoTL articles or other publications, executive summaries of grants and grant reports, documentation of awards related to SoTL, editorial board and review appointments, as well as other appropriate materials that provide evidence of SoTL accomplishments.

VI. Evaluation and Award Process

The award winners will be determined by a university-level committee consisting of one faculty member as defined in Section III elected for a two-year term from each of the colleges, one member from IT&R, and the executive director of the FCTL. The elected faculty members should have demonstrated SoTL-related accomplishments and should preferably be previous SOTL winners. All committee members shall be voting members for the purposes of these awards. Faculty candidates for the award are not eligible to serve on this committee. The executive director of the FCTL will convene the first meeting of the committee, at which the committee chair shall be elected. Each award winner will be invited to submit a SoTL-focused article for publication in the FCTL's Faculty Focus.