

**UCF Faculty Senate
Budget and Administrative Procedures Committee
Meeting Minutes – January 11, 2017, Room CSB 221**

Attendees: Pradeep Bhardwaj (Chair), Tina Buck (Library), Steve Kuebler (Chemistry), Florencio Hernandez (Chemistry), Laszlo Marrosi (Music), Keri Watson, Linan An (Mater. Aerospace Eng.), Jacqueline LaManna (Nursing), Romain Gaume (Optics), Nina Orlovskaya (Mater. Aerospace Eng., ex officio from Steering Committee), Kimi Sugaya (College of Medicine), Anthony Kong (COPA, Communication Sci. and Disorders)

Remote Attendees: Melissa Dodd, Glenda Gunter, Jackie LaManna

Ex Officio: Tracy Clark (Finance & Accounting)

Guests: Ronnie Korosec (Assoc. Provost and Chief of Staff for Academic Affairs)

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes of December 07, 2016
4. Announcements and Recognition of Guests
5. New Business
 - Staffing Needs for New Faculty (Guest Speaker – Dr. Ronnie Korosec)
6. Adjournment

Meeting convened at 3:00 pm

Motion to approve minutes

Motion to approve minutes for meeting of 7 Dec 2016: Buck

Seconded: Hernandez

Approved by unanimous voice vote

New business

Ronnie Korosec discussed how staffing needs for new faculty are being handled. Academic Affairs is presently looking only at faculty facing staffing. The university completed staffing hiring based on feedback from Deans. The positions are centrally funded for duration of position. She discussed the salaries, rubric for proposal evaluation, process of hiring, number of proposals and their handling, and how the process changed between years one and two of the program. In response to questions, Korosec and Clark explained how several staff positions support grant writing and pre- and post-award administration. The group also discussed whether the staffing initiative could be used to hire a person who could offset costs for small-scale repair and renovation across campus. Clark explained a Facilities Budget committee is being convened at the Provost level to review this issue. Korosec explained that there were templates available for writing the proposals and that the description of specific job titles could be obtained from the HR Office. While there was large variance in the number of proposals sent from Colleges, it was explained that Academic Affairs did not look into why this was the case as the request for staffing was the responsibility of the Deans.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm

Respectfully submitted by Stephen M. Kuebler

**Presentation to the Faculty Senate Budget and Administrative
Committee Meeting**

January 11, 2017, COS 221

**Dr. Ronnie L. Korosec, Associate Provost & Chief of Staff for
Academic Affairs**

A. Highlights of the two rounds of staff hires—general philosophy:

Colleges and units regularly make decisions based on their own strategic plans on whom to hire, and at what level.

The Provost and President wanted to provide some funding to ensure that as our numbers of students and faculty grew, we also had a related focus on the need for staff to assist them.

Staff positions were expected to be primarily faculty-facing.

The positions were centrally funded for the duration of that specific hire (not line).

The salary cap was firm. Any overages were the responsibility of the unit.

Cost savings were recycled in the 2015-2016 round of hires, and we plan to do the same in the 2016-2017 round, if possible.

B. The Process:

Round 1 was announced in the late summer of 2015, Round 2 was announced in the early fall of 2016. Both allowed the colleges/units approximately one month to submit proposals.

Round 1 (2015-2016 hiring year): Process was open to academic colleges, only. Colleges were not asked to rank their proposals, although many did. Also, there was no limit on the number of proposals a college could submit.

Round 2 (2016-2017 hiring year): Process was open to academic colleges and those units that directly support faculty. The number of proposals was limited to 5 per unit/college, and they were asked to rank order their requests.

*my 11 COMPA
mir 0*

did not support other entities

Colleges/departments coordinated the requests for positions, vetted them internally, and sent them to Academic Affairs.

A 3 person team in Academic Affairs each used a template to review and rank each proposal. They then met as a team to further discuss and create a final ranking. The Provost reviewed their work (including the justification and logic for each award) and made final decisions.

C. Highlights of the 2015-2016 staff hiring process: focus was to support units with new faculty hires (i.e. from the 100 new faculty hires). Twenty-five (25) positions budgeted for, up to \$50,000 each. Twenty-eight were actually funded. (\$1,250,000.00).

Rubric:

1. Justification for position in relation to the 100 new hires, and to the mission of the university and college. **60% weighting.**
 - a. We looked at the number of new hires per each college for last year, and the proposed allocation for that year.
 - b. We also looked at the type of position and the justification for it to ensure that it would alleviate the administrative burden associated with the new faculty hires.
 - c. Some of the positions that we funded had the same or similar titles to others that we did not fund. *Why?* Our team carefully read each justification to ensure that these new hires (despite their similar titles), met the expectations contained in the rubric. *equitable*
 - d. While some colleges listed their requests in order of priority, those choices did not always correspond with the rubric. Therefore, it was possible that a college with multiple requests may not have received their top choices, as they did not align with the spirit of these staff hires. For example, several colleges requested positions that were entirely focused on student needs. These were not highly ranked in our assessment, even if they were highly ranked by the college, as they were outside of the stated intent of this particular hiring process.

What happens for existing

2. Indication of why the college needs central funds to hire this position, along with confirmation that the college cannot provide funding with its current budget or resources. **40% weighting.**
 - a. We assessed the college's logic in requested the funding, given the budget, carry forward/reserves, and other funding sources they have.

38 proposals:

CEHP:	^{recd / reqst} 2/2	
CAH:	3/3	
COB:	0/0	
CECS:	*2/6	(* 3 additional positions funded with <u>residual funds</u>)
COHPA:	6/11	
COM:	1/1	
CON:	2/3	
COS:	**5.5/5.5	(** <u>shared a position with CREOL</u>)
CREOL:	2/2	
RCHM:	1/1	
UGS:	0/3	
CREOL:	** .5/.5	(** shared a position with COS)

D. Highlights of the 2016-2017 staff hiring process: focus on those positions that support all faculty. Twenty-five (25) positions funded at up to \$60,000 each (\$1,500,000.00).

Rubric:

1. Justification for the position in relation to supporting *faculty facing* activities. What is the position? Why is it necessary? How will the addition of this position help the strategic direction of the department/unit in relation to faculty facing efforts? **30% weighting.**
2. Indication of why the college/unit needs central funds to hire this position, along with confirmation that the college/unit cannot otherwise provide funding with its current budget or resources. In

addition, the college/unit must confirm that they do not have any staff lines that were allocated last year through this process that remain unfilled. **35% weighting.**

3. Evidence of growth in students, SCH, and/or programs in the college/unit that have not already been addressed with other central resources. **35% weighting.**

56 proposals:

Req / Rec.

CEHP: 5/2

COHPA: 5/1

COM: 4/2

CON: 4/1

FE: 3/1

IAGS: 2/1

IKM: 2/1

CST: 2/1

T&L/UGS: 4/2

CECS: 5/2

COS: 5/1

CAH: 4/2

RCHM: 2/1

ORC: 5/3

→ FCI: 4/4 *cluster initiative*

COB: 0/0

CREOL: 0/0

BHC: 0/0

2016-2017 Staff Hiring Request Process

Once again we are delighted to announce that we have 21 centrally-funded staff lines to allocate to the colleges/units. These positions will be funded at \$60,000 per year. If the position salary goes over this amount, the college/unit will be responsible for covering the residual. For example, if the staff position is hired at \$60,000, the department/unit would be responsible for covering the residual—which would be the cost of benefits. The criteria this year will include:

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Each college or unit (such as ORC, etc.) should coordinate the requests for proposals centrally, rank those requests, and then submit them as a package to the Provost's Office using the template provided.
- Each college/unit may request up to 5 staff positions.
- Individual requests submitted directly from a department or sub-unit within a larger unit will not be evaluated, but will be returned to the central entity (such as the Dean's Office or unit).
- Deadline for submission of requests is **Wednesday, August 31, 2016**.

Helpful hints in preparing the proposals:

- Please make sure that the proposals are thoroughly reviewed and that there are clear responses to all criteria listed below.
- Remember that there will be many requests. As such, we ask that you clearly indicate the priority of your requests.
- Clarify how the position is a faculty-facing role.
- Because this funding process places the most emphasis on those staff positions that would directly support faculty, requests to fund primarily student-facing roles or community partnership (for example) may not be ranked as highly as those that made a clear justification for supporting faculty needs.

The proposals will ranked by a team (Ronnie Korosec, Helen Sterbach, and Megan Diehl) using the following criteria:

1. Justification for the position in relation to supporting *faculty facing* activities. What is the position? Why is it necessary? How will the addition of this position help the strategic direction of the department/unit in relation to faculty facing efforts? **30% weighting.**
2. Indication of why the college/unit needs central funds to hire this position, along with confirmation that the college/unit cannot otherwise provide funding with its current budget or resources. In addition, the college/unit must confirm that they do not have any staff lines that were allocated last year through this process that remain unfilled. **35% weighting.**
3. Evidence of growth in students, SCH, and/or programs in the college/unit that have not already been addressed with other central resources. **35% weighting.**