

**Personnel Committee**  
**Meeting Agenda**  
**February 9, 2022 – Web (Zoom), 11:30 a.m.**

- I. Call to order and quorum
- II. Approval of prior meeting minutes (1/19/22)
- III. Recognition of guests
- IV. Introduction to the committee and context for the meeting (5 minutes)
- V. Opening Remarks from Vice President for Finance and Administration and Provost (15 minutes)
- VI. Prepared questions submitted to the committee by its members (15 minutes)
- VII. Open question and answer session (15 minutes)
- VIII. Adjournment

# **Faculty Senate Personnel Committee**

## **Meeting Minutes – January 19, 2022. 11:30am (EDT), zoom**

**Members in Attendance:** Janet Andreasen, Luca Argenti, Rodrigo Amezcua Correa, Lucrezia Cooney (ex officio), Nadine Dexter, Mark Ehrhart, Richard Harrison, Jana Jasinsky (ex officio), Jacqueline LaManna, Tamra Legron-Rodriguez, Karol Lucken, Marino Nader, Adam Parrish (vice chair), Michael Proctor, Blake Scott, Edwin Torres (chair), Martine Vanryckeghem

**Absent Members:** Mason Cash, Yoon Choi, Nicole Dawson, Vladimir Gatchev

**Guests:** Jascinth Lindo

Minutes taken by L. Argenti

---

### **Part 1:** Administrative business

- Call to order & Quorum
  - Approval of minutes moved and seconded. No objections, so minutes are approved.
  - Recognition of guests.
- 

### **Part 2:** Discussion on faculty hiring process

Edwin Torres calls for a summary from the subcommittee dedicated to suggest a broader and more systematic faculty involvement in the hiring process of new faculty members. Adam Parrish reports that the three sub-committee members (Luca Argenti, Karol Lucken, and himself) have conferred and identified some main suggestions on how to improve the process and that they are currently drafting a resolution.

Martine Vanryckeghem asks whether the subcommittee has addressed the recommendation of not calling non-listed references.

Luca Argenti answered they are still reviewing the pertinent documentation and that this specific aspect did not yet emerge in the subcommittee discussion but will be examined in the future.

Jana Jasinsky shared a link to the current “Search Screening Guidelines”:  
<https://oie.ucf.edu/documents/SearchScreeningGuidelines.pdf>

Since some members of the committee did not participate to past meetings, Edwin Torres summarized for them the core of the discussion on this topic and the motivation to form a sub-committee.

Jana Jasinsky clarified that faculty positions require three or more reference checks. Two or more must be phone references rather than written. Academic Affairs and OIE strongly

recommend that committee member call non-listed references to develop a balanced profile of candidates' strengths and weaknesses. In A&P, two or more phone references from a supervisor are required; others may supplement this requirement.

Jackie LaManna asks on the constraints on the references for internal candidates, given that in private industry these are strictly regulated.

Chair Parrish says that he does not think that the same restrictions apply to our university.

Blake Scott interjected that in the past chairs and committee members have used non-listed references, in a way that it was concerning.

Nadine Dexter comments on how experience has taught her and her colleagues that a bad hire can be very costly for a very long time, and hence damaging to the function of the hiring unit. In one instance, they missed key information that would have disqualified a candidate that was hired because they did not make some basic inquiries with past colleagues of the candidate who were not listed as contacts. Precluding search committee to reach out to non-listed references, therefore, may just conflict with due diligence to the detriment of the unit mission.

Luca Argenti suggested that while unsolicited feedback from non-listed references should not be admissible, a collective decision on the part of the search committee to identify and contact non-listed reference should be transparent and controlled enough to guarantee that the information gathered is fair.

Adam Parrish commented that the current process followed by the hiring committee already contemplates gathering free feedback from faculty, which inherently implies that non-listed references are contacted (for example, faculty member may know the candidate and interact with them at conferences).

Edwin Torres recommended to investigate the guidelines on how non-listed references are contacted.

---

**Part 3:** Exit and Stay interviews - Report from the sub-committee, led by Blake Scott.

Edwin Torres informed the committee that he reached out to HR, and that he hoped to invite a representative to the next meeting.

Blake Scott summarizes the subcommittee findings on the best practices used to conduct exit and stay interviews at other institutions:

- Central unit that at least coordinates with DEI and HR offices
- Interviewers not faculty supervisors and have specialized training
- Faculty given choice of interview type(s)
- Conducted while faculty member is still engaged with university
- Questions can vary for faculty leaving for different reasons (denied tenure, retiring, etc.)

- Info/data used in retention and DEI efforts

Most of the places doing exit interviews use as a guide the work by Richard P. Finnegan who has a couple of books on this subject.

Karol Lucken asks whether the stay interviews are justified, given that there are already CPE binders, tenure and promotion processes, and annual reviews.

Blake Scott says that there are evidences that asking questions to justify staying allow institutions to identify their points of strength.

Blake Scott and Michael Proctor intervene to state that they believe there is a usefulness to both exit and stay interviews.

---

**Part 4:** Preparation of the invitation to Senior Vice President for Administration and Finances (CFO) Gerald Hector, who is supposed to speak to financial issues impacting UCF personnel.

Michael Proctor offers a list of questions to ask VP Hector:

Since the last across the pay raise in September 2019, UCF has had record enrollments while also tremendous success in areas where faculty have a direct impact on University success. Yet Wage Erosion of 8.585% as of Dec 2021 has impacted everyone but degraded the real compensation level of over 70% of the faculty (everyone who has not received a promotion, ADI, TIP, RIA, or SoTL). Overhead cost and Research spending from E&G funding impacts the amount of money available for faculty raises.

1. What amount and percentage of E&G went to University overhead in 2015?
2. What amount and percentage of E&G went to University overhead in 2021?
3. Do we know the sub-buckets in which this funding goes?
4. What amount and percentage of E&G went to these remote, non-E&G funding generating "world class" faculty in 2015?
5. What amount and percentage of E&G went to these remote, non-E&G funding generating "world class" faculty in 2021?
6. Do you plan to recommend to the President increasing the amount of E&G funds available to address the afore mentioned wage erosion by cutting research subsidies drawn from E&G funds? If so, how much?

With the extraordinary large and novel 18% tax on Academic Colleges unrestricted revenue, not profits, financial control and risk selection are transferred from the College Deans to the Provost resulting in the Provost and Central Support accounting for 40% of the Academic College revenues.

7. Did any Deans or Trustees object to this unprecedented centralization of financial power? If so, who and what did they say or do?

According to careful reading of the Sources and Revenues slide in the Dollars and Sense presentation, all the Academic College but one are making a gross profit on revenue relative to direct expenses. However this budget creates an artificial situation where after Tax and before Subvention only four Colleges are not in deficit. All the rest of the Colleges are technically in default. This year, in your words (SVP Hector), Colleges are being “held harmless”. But based on Budget Chair Trustee Mills words, next year and in future years Colleges can expect “harm” if they are in deficit using this new budget model. Past actions taken to remedy University deficits include: class sizes were increased in Colleges, College summer class offerings were cut, or funds were taken from College and Faculty accounts.

8. Should Colleges of the future expect these forms of “harm” to address deficits in New Budget Model?
9. If other forms of “harm” exist, what are they?
10. Does the Board agree with the President not to seek tuition increases?
11. Has any UCF Trustee communicated to the BOG a request to increase tuition or increase flexibility in setting tuition?

Without Fl legislative funding to pay for our high-priced "world class" faculty - whether located in Academic Colleges or in the Administration or elsewhere, SCH and even research funding does not likely cover their salaries. Unless endowed in some manner, we are left with the subvention policy to try to cover their cost by taking money from funds intended to support student education.

12. If we are unable to get any funding help from the State specifically for this purpose, is there any process or effort to reduce from our rolls untenured, not endowed so called "world class" faculty?

Karol Lucken asks where the \$40M donation went.

Luca Argenti said he remembers President Cartwright saying it would mostly go towards increasing the endowment.

Marino Nader asks whether we have a timeframe for how and when the new increase will be. (There is still no set timeframe, since bargaining is still ongoing).

Jackie Lamanna laments the lack of replacement of faculty lines.

Karol Lucken, Luca Argenti, and Edwin Torres confirm similar trends at their units.

---

At 12:30pm a motion was made, seconded, and approved to adjourn the meeting.