

**Faculty Senate**  
**Steering Committee Meeting**  
**Minutes of January 12, 2017**

Keith Koons, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

**MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of November 3, 2016 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

**RECOGNITION OF GUESTS**

Lucretia Cooney, Associate Director of Faculty Excellence

Sherry Andrews, Associate Provost and Associate General Counsel

Kristy McAllister, Coordinator, Academic Affairs Information and Publication Services

Stephen King, Associate Professor for the College of Medicine and chair of the Personnel Committee

Fernando Rivera, Associate Professor, Sociology and 2015-2016 Provost Faculty Fellow

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

During the November meeting, Nina Orlovskaya commented on the dangers of walking in the D parking lot. We contacted Curt Sawyer regarding the issue. Kris Singh, Director of Parking & Transportation Services and John Weaver, Associate Director of Construction Services surveyed the lot and current construction. They responded indicating that Parking Services began exiting the busses via the College of Optics and Photonics to the south of garage C. This alleviated them cutting through the parking lot with the exception of two small buses for park and ride. The main issue is vehicles cutting through the parking lot now that the south lanes have been configured into a roadway. We don't see much relief until construction ends. Several comments made how you are always walking in the road since there are no crosswalks for pedestrians.

On behalf of Naim Kapucu, the Director of the School of Public Administration, Claire Knox distributed the School of Public Administration's 2015-2016 annual FOCUS publication celebrating 40 anniversary of the school.

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**REPORT OF THE PROVOST**

The report of the provost was delayed until after the resolutions were discussed due to a prior commitment.

Data Breach

Starting January 29, 2017, employees will start receiving notifications that the one-year ProtectMyID coverage provided by the insurance carrier will be expiring. The lifetime support will continue to assist in handling ID theft. In the last consultation, UFF asked

the administration to consider extending coverage. We are halfway through the negotiation process and have determined a price point of \$15.00 for a year of extended coverage, versus \$15.00 per month.

#### Provost College Visits

I have enjoyed the half day college visits as part of institutionalizing the Collective Impact – Strategic Plan. It's been a good opportunity to meet the people, facilities, and learn about the programs at each college. My two favorite activities have been meeting the students and faculty hired within the last year and a half. Upcoming visits include:

- College of Health and Public Affairs – January 18
- Burnett Honors College – January 27
- College of Engineering and Computer Science – February 9
- College of Education and Human Performance – March 20
- College of Medicine – April 3
- College of Optics and Photonics – April 17
- College of Nursing – April 20

We intent to repeat visits annually for the next five years.

#### Collective Impact – Strategic Plan

A new award, the Marchioli Collective Impact Award was emailed to the UCF community recently. There is a \$1,000 award for innovation; and a \$2,500, \$1,000, and \$500 award for ideation. See the website <http://www.ucf.edu/strategic-planning/> for details.

#### Diversity and Inclusion Commitment

Tuesday, Dr. Hitt sent an email renewing his commitment to diversity and inclusion. The statement was initiated by UFF resulting in the joint statement Tuesday. As part of my provost comments at the Senate meeting, I will try to differentiate the boundaries between divergent views and discriminatory views; boundaries between free speech and hate speech; boundaries between academic freedom; and our ability as individuals to speak as an individual.

#### Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Program

Dr. Hitt and approximately five hundred other presidents signed a letter directed to the incoming U.S. Presidential administration to support and encourage the administration to extend DACA. Some institutions have gone further by declaring their campus a sanctuary for undocumented students. UCF can't act illegally by violating a Florida Statute, but is committed to about 140 undocumented students that have registered with DACA.

#### UCF Ranking

For the first time in UCF history, the university is ranked in the top 100 institutions in the National Science Foundation's Research and Development Expenditures ranking list. UCF is ranked 99.

### Information Request

The Provost solicited examples or questions of situations of free speech, versus threats, versus religious gray areas to use as test cases on principles.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### Resolution 2016-2017-12 Availability of Lactation Rooms for UCF Women

Linda Walters introduced the resolution on behalf of the Personnel Committee. The lack of rooms has been an issue on campus for decades. We have steadily been pushing for more rooms. We are now up to seven rooms, with five being on the main campus. We are not near the Federal recommendations for the number of lactation rooms based upon our faculty and staff. The goal of the resolution is to increase the number of rooms in new buildings or retrofit existing buildings. We were notified by Facilities and Safety that they are now starting to look into the issue.

Question: What makes getting the rooms difficult?

Answer: The rooms require a sink, making retro-fitting difficult. Space is at a premium on campus and it's difficult to give up any space.

Question: What about modular pods?

Answer: That's a possibility, but someone has to pay for the pods and decide it's a good idea.

All of the existing rooms are in one corner of the main campus. Nursing women are not supposed to walk more than five minutes to a lactation room. From admissions, it's a fourteen minute walk one-way to the Global UCF building.

Question: Off campus rooms?

Answer: Rosen had a room, but it was redesigned for other use. The College of Medicine has one room, and so does the College of Nursing off campus.

Question: How much of the campus is not covered?

Answer: About three fourths of the campus is not covered.

Question: Are there any downsides outside of cost?

Answer: No.

Motion and second to place the resolution on the Senate agenda for January 26, 2017.

Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

Resolution 2016-2017-13 Fair and equal enactment of the UCF Employment of Relatives Policy

Stephen King introduced the resolution. This resolution addresses inconsistency in current UCF Policy 3-008.2 Employment of Relatives. The majority of the policy provides guidelines in identifying what would be a potential conflict of interest and what mitigating steps you would take if hiring a relative at all levels. Dr. King read section B.h.:

*“in those instances when a research project requires unique skills or attributes of an individual that is not available in another candidate besides that of the employee’s relative, a plan to mitigate and monitor the conflict of interest must be submitted to the Research Conflict of Interest Committee for review and approval. Under no circumstances will a principal investigator be permitted to directly or indirectly supervise his or her relative.”*

The main issue is that the principal investigator as supervisor is the only instance singled out as not being allowed. In all other cases (e.g., a chair and a dean) a supervisor can be relatives and have a mitigation policy. The resolution asks for the last sentence to be removed to allow for the same concerns and same process to handle relatives working on a research project.

Comment: An example would be a spousal hire with two people that work in the same field that might already share a grant. This is fairly common.

Question: Have you investigated Federal requirements?

Answer: The Federal requirement is that you must have a policy.

Comment: Can understand why the policy exists. Most cases of spousal direct chain of command interactions are very visible. A research grant is not as visible to others in the university community and probably a more sensitive area.

Comment: In response to the previous comment, yes, except it is ruled out in totality with no exceptions.

Question: The provost commented that it’s hard to get resolutions that he can’t support that might otherwise be supportable if we engaged other people earlier. Have you consulted with Cynthia Young and Rhonda Bishop?

Answer: Contacted Rhonda Bishop twice with no response. Did not contact Cynthia Young since the policy is through Rhonda Bishop’s office. Provost offered to take back questions to Rhonda Bishop. Dr. King indicated that the question was regarding the rationale behind the language.

Question for Provost: This policy came out of the blue late last year. We already had a policy on conflict of interest. This policy seems severely worded. What was going on that prompted the policy to be developed so quickly?

Answer: Can't answer that. I can say I'm more worried about wide scale abuse that was concentrated about that time and had been going on for a long time. It could have been a reaction or response to that. The provost will make sure Rhonda Bishop gets back in touch with Dr. King.

Motion to place the resolution on the Senate agenda for January 26, 2017. Since the resolution comes from the Personnel committee, no second is required. Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

#### Resolution 2016-2017-14 Guidelines for Academic Structure at the University of Central Florida

William Self introduced the resolution. Last year, the provost asked the Provost Fellows to review UCF policies regarding academic structure. UCF has not developed any guidelines regarding academic structure. We reviewed what other institutions have developed and requested a report from the Education Advisory Board (EAB) in regards to interdisciplinary research. The guidelines are rooted in tenure track faculty that teach, research, and serve. The language in the guidelines leaves room for variation. The guidelines are brought forward as a resolution to communicate and give faculty an opportunity to review. In addition a 2004-2005-5 (<http://facultysenate.ucf.edu/resolutions/2004-2005/index.asp#res5>) resolution encouraged administration to consult with the Faculty Senate when creating colleges, schools, or other degree granting units.

Question: How does this impact center faculty without a unit?

Answer: This wasn't developed with a targeted program or unit in mind. This is more of a forward looking document.

Question: Will the Faculty Clusters be like nanoscience?

Answer: Didn't address Faculty Clusters specifically. The document defines the opportunity for growth and possible placement.

Comment: A handful of faculty in nanoscience have tenure in the center and not an academic unit. This presents issues in the tenure and promotion process. The decision has been handled through the research office, where the head of research has acted as the dean. This also presents a problem when apportioning the Faculty Senate since senators represent an academic unit. When faculty are outside of an academic unit they don't have Senate representation.

Provost Comment: This brings up a similar question with the new budget distribution model. This was prompted when I was working through promotion and tenure documents. I started wondering what the consistency is among Nanoscience, the Institute for Simulation and Training (IST), and what was previously known as CREOL. What is the evolutionary path from a grouping of interested people to a grouping of people that

may have a research center? Because of history we have pieces of inconsistency. Going forward, there is value in having descriptions of what consistency would look like. What does it mean to evolve to an academic unit? The intent is to provide an opportunity for groups of faculty with guidelines and a foundation for what defines a school, department or academic unit.

Question: Is dual tenure in the guidelines?

Answer: Dual tenure was in the EAB document, not in the guidelines.

Question: The guidelines are written as if you starting with nothing, but we have entities that might want to be redefined in some way. It would be good to recognize that you don't necessarily have to go through a probationary period. For example, my group has been granting degrees in Planetary Science since 2009. We are one of the top groups in the country and bigger than many departments. A probationary period doesn't seem necessary.

Answer: I think the document indicates "should", so it's not an absolute. We can look to make sure it's flexible.

Question: What is the process for amendments to the guidelines?

Answer: The way the resolution is written, we didn't intend to allow amendments, but we are making notes to handle feedback. We would prefer an informal process for feedback and changes to the guidelines.

Comment: The word "draft" on the guidelines is problematic for the Senate. If you are asking for the Senate to vote on something, it shouldn't be a draft.

Motion and second to revise and submit the final edited resolution to the Senate on January 17, 2017. Remove the word draft from line 16 and 20. Vote: All in favor; motion passes.

#### Resolution 2016-2017-15 Cumulative Progress Evaluation (CPE) Requirement for Promotion to Full Professor

William Self introduced the resolution. The resolution is a result of the COACHE process based on negative feedback regarding the promotion process from associate to full professor. We held a forum at the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (FCTL) conference on the issue. Unlike the promotion process from assistant professor, this is a curriculum vitae (CV) and a one-page statement of accomplishments to receive feedback. This would only be required one time prior to applying for promotion. This is only a requirement for those associate professors after 2014. We are trying to institutionalize this going forward. However, this is a bargained issue. Cynthia Young suggested the resolution be modified to "recommended". Not sure recommending the process would have an impact, but at the same time it could take two years to get through the bargaining process.

Question: Is this meant to be completed at the department level?

Answer: Yes, through the chair.

Question: Are there more issues at the departmental level versus at the college and university level?

Answer: In some cases the feedback from the departmental level will not be the same as the college or university level.

Question: What about the timing?

Answer: There is a schedule for the cumulative progress evaluation (CPE). Whatever the results of the CV review, you don't have to put the results in the promotion binder.

Question: Would this hinder counter offers by requiring the process prior to applying for promotion?

Answer: If it goes through as a bargained issued as "must" be completed, then yes they would have to wait until the process is complete. If the language is changed to "recommended", then no it wouldn't hinder.

Comment: Don't see the value in completing this process if the feedback is not completed at least every other year. Feedback should be timely and regular.

Comment: The reduced version of the CPE process is not stated in the resolution. Maybe add a sentence in the Be it Resolved. The determination of whether the process should be required or recommended should be addressed on the Senate floor. Also, the timing is specified as 2016, which has already passed. The resolution should probably state 2017 or later.

Question: Have you thought of using a different name?

Answer: It's a bargaining question.

Motion and second to table the resolution to add details and bring back to Steering. Vote: All in favor, motion passes.

Proceeded to the report of the Provost.

#### Appointment of selection committee for the University Excellence in Professional Service Award

Requested three Steering members to volunteer to review and select the University Excellence in Professional Service Award. The chair of the Senate is the chair of the selection committee. Michelle Kelley, Claire Knox, and Nina Orlovskaya volunteered for the committee.

#### TIP, RIA, SoTL Approval Process

Every Fall semester the Steering Committee approves date changes to the documents. Sherry Andrews provided a brief overview of the history. The State of Florida originally funded the awards programs. When the State phased out funding, UCF was the only university to continue the programs. Additionally, bargaining was conducted at the State level. Prior to having a local bargaining contract, the Senate handled criteria and

procedures. Since the awards are a term and condition of employment, UFF has the right to bargain the awards. This past year, UFF wanted to bargain the criteria. At this point, the Senate doesn't have a role in the programs.

Question: TIP, RIA, and SoTL are bargained for in-unit faculty, what about out-of-unit?

Answer: The College of Medicine criteria and procedures are voted on by the unit, but nothing prevents the Senate from getting involved.

Question: Does the Senate have a role for out-of-unit?

Answer: It's undefined. Suggested that the Senate wait to see if the out-of-unit faculty want the Senate involved. Committee members asked William Self to check with out-of-unit faculty to see what they prefer and report back to Steering.

#### Provost Response to Resolution 2016-2017-10 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Restore Section V.I. Resolutions

The Provost approved the resolution with an addendum that removes the Board of Trustees as the final appeal of a Senate action. Steering can either accept the addendum or reject the addendum and start over.

Question: The objection is based on the chair of the Senate being a member of the Board of Trustees. If two thirds of the Senate disagrees with the president, what is wrong with taking it to the board?

Answer: If you disagree, you can make the view of the Senate known at the microphone during public comment at any Board of Trustees meeting. The Board of Trustees delegated executive powers to the president.

Question: So why strike the language?

Answer: Because this is taking a resolution to the board and asking for a vote to be overturned. That is very different then expressing a view during public comment.

Comment: This issue is very disturbing and troubling. It doesn't make sense that we have to vote on correcting a clerical error. If it wasn't for a clerical error, the language would still be in the Bylaws and the president or provost would not have the opportunity to remove.

Provost Question: Can you clarify the history of the language and how it was removed?

Answer: Dr. Koons reiterated that the Faculty Constitution used to be a single document and required a Faculty Assembly for any change. In 2010, the Faculty Constitution was divided into two documents, the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws. The Constitution retained the core structure and high standard required for changes. The Bylaws represented all committee details that are more easily changed and automatically updated due to title changes, etc. Splitting the Faculty Constitution was a laborious process, and unfortunately this language was accidentally left out.



Provost Question: How do you know it was accidentally omitted and not intentionally taken out?

Answer: It's nowhere in the minutes or committee notes.

Question: Has Dr. Hitt expressed an opinion on this issue?

Answer: Yes, but I don't think he has a strong opinion either way. It's probably more important to discuss with the Trustees, and I have not discussed this with Trustee Marchena. Dr. Koons noted that this process has never been used.

Question: Can we ask the Provost to reconsider?

Answer: The provost would like some time to think about the issue of undermining the authority of the president and to discuss it with Dr. Hitt and Trustee Marchena. Dr. Koons asked the provost to informally let him know if he is willing to reconsider the original resolution.

#### Provost Response to Resolution 2016-2017-9 Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Governance in Academic Units

The provost denied the resolution as drafted with an addendum that will be completed shortly. There were three areas in the resolution that caused issues including: continuity by having the dean and Faculty Excellence review the bylaws, and all records being open just needs some modification so it's within the law. Steering member pointed out the exclusion of records deemed confidential under law or university policy is in the resolution. Steering will wait for the official response.

#### Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Response Rate

A question has been raised regarding the response rate and blank responses. A handout was provided from Lisa Wayte in Computer Services and Telecommunications (CS&T) with data regarding the response rate from 2012 through 2016. Although blank responses are not counted in the overall student responses, we do have data on the number of blank responses. Based on the data, we need to determine if any other action needed.

The issue is particularly important for small classes. When in paper form, the students conscientiously filled them out and the response rate was high. Once the form went online, the pop-up prevented students from registering or accessing MYUCF until the SPoI was completed, resulting in blank responses or not genuine responses to quickly get by. Students are unable to pull the form back up to complete once they submit it blank. In talking with others, this seems to be a wide-spread issue. It was noted that any class with five or less students is not counted or collected. We would like to see a change to ensure the students aren't motivated to ignore the form or not authentically complete the forms. Discussion continued. Maybe small classes can be summed over the course of time. For those that teach graduate level courses, students can graduate and never complete the form, leaving no feedback.

Dr. Koons asked if an Ad Hoc committee should be formed or the issue sent to an existing committee. Committee member suggested we gather national data and review further UCF historical data before proceeding. Dr. Koons noted that he will be taking the response rates to the state level at an upcoming Advisory Council for Faculty Senates meeting January 27 and hopes to see data from other universities.

Suggestions regarding information to gather:

- Alternative ways of accessing effectiveness other than SPoI.
- How to improve collection of data and increasing response rate.
- Obtain a breakdown of response rate by mode of instruction.
- How long does it take for a student to complete?
- When are the students completing the forms?
- What is the difference between providing a block of time to complete and others that had to complete on their own time.

This issue doesn't fall within the duties of an existing committee. There appears to be sufficient cause to look deeper into the issue. Motion and second to form a Steering Ad Hoc Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Response Rate Committee. Vote: All in favor; motion passes. Joseph Harrington volunteered to chair the committee. Additional committee members include Scott Warfield and Kevin Murphy.

## **LIAISON COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Budget and Administrative – Nina Orlovskaya**

Committee met yesterday. Committee was briefed on the process to provide support to colleges and departments.

### **Parking Advisory Committee – Bari Hoffman-Ruddy**

Committee met November 28. The committee continues to discuss options to reduce parking fees. The committee is currently reviewing golf cart and bicycle friendly improvements. Next meeting is scheduled for January 23.

### **Personnel Committee – Linda Walters**

No update outside of resolutions brought forward.

### **Graduate Council – Jim Moharam**

All committees continue to meet and complete normal business.

### **Undergraduate Council – Kelly Allred**

Committees continue to meet and complete normal business. Will be meeting to revise Undergraduate processes.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The committee adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

## **Resolution 2016-2017-12 Availability of Lactation Rooms for UCF Women**

**Whereas**, UCF currently has 7 publicly available lactation rooms: one is on the College of Medicine campus at Lake Nona, one is in Research Park at the College of Nursing University Tower building, and five on the main campus. The main campus rooms are located in the Global UCF Building, Physical Science Building, Engineering 1 Building, COHPA, and the Recreation and Wellness Center. On the main campus, these rooms are clustered on the north and east sides of the campus; and

**Whereas**, UCF Human Resources procedures document entitled, “Break Times and Locations for Nursing Mothers, Effective December 2010”, states that the University of Central Florida will provide a supportive environment to enable breastfeeding employees to express their milk during working hours; and

**Whereas**, UCF currently does not provide sufficient and equitable access to lactation rooms for large population of UCF women who may need to express their milk post-delivery, including UCF women faculty (782), UCF women staff (2363), and UCF women students (35,508); and

**Whereas**, this lack of lactation rooms has economic implications for UCF, as reported by the 2010 University of Rhode Island report of “College and University Lactation Programs”, including a \$3 cost savings for every \$1 invested in breastfeeding support, parental absenteeism is 3X higher for formula-fed infants compared to breastfed babies, companies with an employee lactation support program experience less turnover and lower losses of employees after childbirth, and companies with lactation rooms are also rewarded with higher satisfaction, loyalty and morale; therefore

**Be It Resolved** that the Faculty Senate encourages the administration to follow the guidelines put forth by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, US Office of Personnel Management, and National Institute of Health as well as the US Department of Labor for working women which recommends 6 lactation rooms for every 1000 women employees (Attachment 1), and there be lactation room access within a 5-minute walk for the employee. At a minimum, UCF should triple the number of lactation rooms available to women employees on the main campus through designating space in planned constructions and retro-fitting rooms in existing buildings, especially on the west and south sides of campus; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that the Faculty Senate additionally recommends that the lactation rooms at the College of Medicine and the College of Nursing (Research Park) be maintained, a room be added at Rosen College and at regional campuses where UCF has a presence (if not currently available), and rooms be added to the new downtown campus construction designs based on expected campus enrollment and employment projections.

## **Attachment 1:**

### **Recommendations from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and National Institute of Health for working women (womenshealth.gov)**

**The number of spaces needed depends on many factors.** For example, companies will want to consider how many women are employed, the number and size of buildings, and the work schedule and job settings of employees. A general rule is to provide at least one permanent milk expression space for every 50–100 women employed by the company, and adjust as employee needs increase. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) compiled a formula for identifying the number of spaces needed, and estimate that at least six milk expression stations for every 1000 female employees should be the general rule. This number is based on a pregnancy rate of 5–7 percent among the female population, a breastfeeding initiation rate of 75 percent, and an assumption that most nursing women cluster milk expression periods around a similar period from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. during a standard work day. The chart below is based on their general guide:

<b>Milk Expression Spaces</b>	
<b>Number of Female Employees</b>	<b>Number of Stations Needed</b>
Under 100	1
Approximately 250	2
Approximately 500	3
Approximately 750	4
Approximately 1000	6
For every additional 1000 employees	6 additional stations

**Seek locations that employees can reach within a 5-minute walk.** This means that spaces should be evenly distributed within large buildings, as well as evenly distributed across a large campus in easily accessed locations. Limiting an employee's travel time minimizes the overall amount of break period women need to express milk. Centralized locations also make it possible for the greatest number of employees to access the space. Within a building, spaces can be located near a central bank of elevators, the

66 entrance to a facility, or the employee lounge or eating areas. **Look for space near**  
67 **running water for washing hands and breast pump parts.**

68

69 **Women will feel comfortable and safe when the door into the milk expression room**  
70 **can be locked.** A keypad lock or electronic key provides privacy, and nursing moms can  
71 use a key, key card, or code to enter the room. If a lockable door is not possible, provide  
72 a sign outside the door with a well-communicated policy to help prevent others from  
73 entering the space. Curtains or partitions by the door might be needed to provide an  
74 additional layer of privacy when the door is opened from the outside.

1     **Resolution 2016-2017-13 Fair and equal enactment of the UCF Employment of**  
2                                     **Relatives Policy**  
3

4     **Whereas**, UCF has a broad interest in maintaining an open and transparent conflict  
5     of interest policy, including disclosing the employment of relatives, to ensure all  
6     stakeholder that the actions, policies, and decisions made by UCF faculty, staff, and  
7     administrators are in the best interests of the University; and  
8

9     **Whereas**, research projects at UCF may require the unique skill sets or attributes of  
10    research personnel that may be related to the principal investigator of the project;  
11    and  
12

13    **Whereas**, UCF has in place a conflict of interest policy that requires all relationships  
14    to family members to be reported as part of the annual conflict of interest  
15    assessment, and for mitigation plans to be set up and enacted when potential  
16    conflicts of interest are identified; therefore  
17

18    **Be It Resolved** that the Faculty Senate endorses fair and equal enactment of the  
19    policies for identifying and mitigating potential conflicts of interest via the  
20    employment of relatives at UCF. In particular, employment of skilled researchers on  
21    a research project should not be singled out as the sole instance in which family  
22    members cannot utilize the mitigation procedures open to all other cases involving  
23    the employment of relatives. Therefore the second sentence of paragraph h in the  
24    Employment of Relatives Policy 3-008.2 should be removed from that policy.

1     **Resolution 2016-2017-14 Guidelines for Academic Structure at the University**  
2                                     **of Central Florida**  
3

4     **Whereas**, the University of Central Florida is now an emerging preeminent  
5     University in the State of Florida; and  
6

7     **Whereas**, Interdisciplinary research has emerged as a driving force in the academe  
8     in recent years; and  
9

10    **Whereas**, academic unit structure can enable stronger interdisciplinary research;  
11    and  
12

13    **Whereas**, clear definitions will streamline the process for academic unit structure  
14    at UCF; and  
15

16    **Whereas**, the attached ~~Draft~~ Guidelines for Academic Structure at the University of  
17    Central Florida have been developed by Provost Fellows based on consultations  
18    with the administration and college deans; therefore  
19

20    **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate supports the attached ~~draft~~ guidelines for  
21    academic unit definitions for institutionalization and to promote both traditional  
22    disciplinary academic units and the establishment of interdisciplinary academic unit  
23    structures.

**Draft Guidelines for Academic Structure at the University of Central Florida**  
**Fall 2016** – Fernando Rivera and William Self  
(Provost Faculty Fellows: 2015-2016)

**Background**

Universities are complex and integrated institutions that at their core are founded upon the faculty that carry out the research and creative activities, engage in the teaching and learning enterprise, and serve both their discipline and the broader university community to build a strong institution. Shared governance relies on strong communication between the faculty and the administration, and therefore the organization of the academic units is key to how well faculty can function and leadership can govern. UCF has grown substantially in the past fifty years and expanded its academic and research units based largely on the strengths of the community and opportunities to expand in key areas such as optics, medicine, modeling and simulation, among others. This document is forward looking and should be viewed as a general set of guidelines for academic unit structure.

Interdisciplinary research has emerged as the driving force in science in recent years (Ledford, 2015). Creating academic structures that can facilitate interdisciplinary research has been the focus of many recent studies (Sa, 2008; Gumpert and Snyderman, 2002; King, 2010). A recent best practice report from the Education Advisory Board (EAB summary) wrestles with the issues of how to support faculty who are truly interdisciplinary through traditional academic structures, silos (departments and schools) within traditional colleges. Harvard University carried out an extensive self-study that led to the recommendation of inter-school departments (at Harvard, Schools are equivalent to colleges at UCF). This analysis, entitled “Enhancing Science and Engineering Education at Harvard” was derived from a shared governance study that informed a change in academic structure (UPCSE report, 2006).

The following guidelines for academic structure attempt to bring together best practice findings from outside of UCF, as well as an internal analysis from within UCF, to guide a foundation of principles for academic unit definitions. These definitions are based upon a core principal that an academic unit is rooted in the three-legged stool of teaching, research and service, and therefore is anchored with tenured and tenure track faculty. These definitions also recognize that supporting faculty including but not limited to: instructors, lecturers, research faculty and clinical faculty are key constituents to the faculty at a very high research institution. These guidelines should be viewed as recommendations when proposing to change existing or to create new academic units. Generally the process would be initiated by the Deans and/or the Provost and would include a proposal describing the rationale for a change in existing unit(s) or establishment of a new academic unit. The Office of the Provost and the Office of the President will have the ultimate authority and responsibility for any academic structuring or restructuring.



## **Departments**

An academic department is the basic administrative unit at the University to carry out the core missions of teaching, research and service. A department should have a general focus within a national or internationally recognized discipline. It is normally expected that a department would have both undergraduate and graduate education programs. A department should be housed within a single College or School, and have a Chair that serves as a leader who is responsible for the organization and function of the department. A department should consist of tenure-track or tenured faculty whose tenure is held within the department. Normally a department would be expected to have a critical mass of faculty in relation to the discipline and the ranks of the faculty should be balanced. With the Chair, the faculty within the department should have a role in governance of academic programs and curricula, departmental resources, and representation to the University community.

## **Colleges**

A college is an academic unit that consists of multiple departments as defined above. Academic departments should be within a focus or foci or be in line with national structures that are historical in nature (e.g. College of Arts and Sciences). Although the number of faculty is naturally defined by the number of departments, it would normally be expected that a college would consist of multiple academic units that each have a critical mass of disciplinary faculty. The college should be headed by a Dean who serves as a leader and is responsible for oversight of the organization to achieve the goals of the college and to spearhead the core missions of teaching, research and service. In the case of the College of Medicine this overall mission is Teaching, Research and Patient care.

## **Schools – Disciplinary (Intra-college)**

A disciplinary school is defined as a school that resides within a single college (intra-college structure). Some colleges by the nature of their diversity of disciplines could conceivably have a school that is interdisciplinary in nature but disciplinary (intra-college) in structure. A disciplinary school is, like a department, a unit at the University to carry out the core missions of teaching, research and service. A disciplinary school should have a focus within a national or internationally recognized discipline or closely related group of disciplines. It is normally expected that a disciplinary school would have both undergraduate and graduate education programs. The school should have a Director that serves as a leader who is responsible for the organization and function of the school. A school should consist of tenure-track or tenured faculty whose tenure is based within the school. Normally a disciplinary school would be expected to have significantly more faculty than an academic department, and the ranks of the faculty should be balanced. A school is different for a department as it carries a broader mission and its designation is not only a result of larger faculty numbers. A disciplinary school could have divisions and these divisions could mature into Departments. Schools may also develop academic research centers or house research centers or institutes. Divisions could be organized around research, teaching or service. A school could

have multiple academic programs at either the undergraduate or graduate level. With the Director, the faculty within the school should have a role in governance of academic programs and curricula, school resources, and representation to the University community.

## **Interdisciplinary Structures**

### **Interdisciplinary Academic Research Center**

An interdisciplinary academic research center is an organization of faculty that are derived from multiple existing academic units with shared research interests that hold tenure in an existing academic unit (department or school). In order to establish an interdisciplinary academic research center, faculty from multiple academic units must be integral to the mission of the center. This type of interdisciplinary center is likely to be formed from smaller interdisciplinary groups or units. Formation of a new interdisciplinary center requires approval through the Office of Academic Program Quality.

### **Schools – Interdisciplinary (inter-college)**

An interdisciplinary school is defined as a school that resides between two or more colleges (inter-college). An interdisciplinary school is, like a department, a unit at the University to carry out the core missions of teaching, research and service. An interdisciplinary school resides at the interface of several unique disciplines. It is normally expected that an interdisciplinary school would have both undergraduate and graduate education programs that have matured through an incubation period in either the College of Graduate studies or the College of Undergraduate studies (see process below). The school should have a Director that serves as a leader who is responsible for the organization and function of the school.

Because of the unique nature of an interdisciplinary school, having faculty who hold appointments and tenure in multiple colleges, the reporting structure for the Director of the School becomes a vital component to shared governance. All Colleges involved in the School will have representation on the Council. Generally, the school Director should report to a Council that consists of: 1) each of the college Deans involved in the school; and 2) an equal number of faculty representatives from the school. The school faculty will elect these faculty representatives in at large election regardless of the structure of the units within the school. Once elected, these faculty representatives on the council shall serve a two year term, and will be limited to two consecutive two year terms. Deans are not elected but are members de facto based on the faculty present within the School. Thus an equal number of faculty and Deans will oversee the leadership of the School.

The Chair of the council, one of the Deans on the council, will be elected by the council to a three-year term. This Chair will also serve as the primary contact between the council and the Director and will facilitate the annual evaluation of the Director. The Director, or a 2/3 majority vote of the faculty of the School can request a meeting of the council for any matter that needs attention of the council.

The school should consist of tenure-track or tenured faculty whose tenure is NOT based within the school but held in a disciplinary department or school. An interdisciplinary school has in general fewer faculty than a disciplinary school, especially early in its development, yet attempts to have some balance in the rank of faculty will again be important for a healthy unit. An interdisciplinary school could have multiple academic programs at either level, and as with a disciplinary school can house divisions, departments or centers with a broader mission than would be present in a typical academic department. With the Director, the faculty within the school should have a role in governance of academic programs and curricula, school resources, and representation to the University community.

### **Academic program development – Interdisciplinary**

The development of an academic program that resides between two or more established disciplines ~~should~~ would normally be expected to proceed through a pilot period. This period allows for recruitment, development and expansion of a degree program, graduate or undergraduate, with direct oversight from the College of Graduate studies or the College of Undergraduate studies. For example, an interdisciplinary research center could develop an undergraduate program jointly with the College of Undergraduate studies over a period of time (likely 3-5 years), however the program would reside officially within the College of Undergraduate Studies. To move the program to the center would require the Center to mature into an Interdisciplinary School (above).

### **Literature cited:**

Ledford, Heidi (2015) “How to Solve the World’s Biggest Problems” *Nature* (17 Sep 2015) 525: 308-11

Sa, Creso (2008) “‘Interdisciplinary Strategies’ in U.S. Research Universities,” *Higher Education* 55: 537–552

Gumport, Patricia and Stuart Snyderman (2002) “The Formal Organization of Knowledge: An Analysis of Academic Structure,” *The Journal of Higher Education* 73: 375-408

King, C. Judson (2010) “The Multidisciplinary Imperative in Higher Education” Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California Berkeley (September 2010)

Harvard University, *Enhancing Science and Engineering at Harvard* (Dec 2006)

**UCF Student Perception of Instruction (SPol) Response Rate Report**  
**Counts & Response Rates by Year & Terms from Spring 2012 to Fall 2016**

Year & Term	Total Possible SPI forms	Total Submitted		Total Submitted - All Responses		Total Submitted - At Least 1 Response		Total Submitted - All Blank	
<b>2012:</b>									
Spring 2012	202496	125883	62.17%	108362	53.51%	113000	55.80%	12883	6.36%
Summer 2012	76420	53663	70.22%	46912	61.39%	49095	64.24%	4568	5.98%
Fall 2012	215672	118005	54.72%	102849	47.69%	106772	49.51%	11233	5.21%
<b>2012 Total Counts &amp; Rates</b>	<b>494,588</b>	<b>297,551</b>	<b>60.16%</b>	<b>258,123</b>	<b>52.19%</b>	<b>268,867</b>	<b>54.36%</b>	<b>28,684</b>	<b>5.80%</b>
<b>2013:</b>									
Spring 2013	202391	123940	61.24%	113982	56.32%	115694	57.16%	8246	4.07%
Summer 2013	76356	63627	83.33%	57616	75.46%	58830	77.05%	4797	6.28%
Fall 2013	218724	138063	63.12%	128168	58.60%	129927	59.40%	8136	3.72%
CMMS Fall 2013	4783	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>2013 Total Counts &amp; Rates</b>	<b>502,254</b>	<b>325,630</b>	<b>64.83%</b>	<b>299,766</b>	<b>59.68%</b>	<b>304,451</b>	<b>60.62%</b>	<b>21,179</b>	<b>4.22%</b>
<b>2014:</b>									
Spring 2014	204695	137020	66.94%	128242	62.65%	129966	63.49%	7054	3.45%
CMMS Spring 2014	4610	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Summer 2014	74380	56202	75.56%	52955	71.20%	53882	72.44%	2320	3.12%
CMMS Summer 2014	3930	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Fall 2014	223026	158928	71.26%	150803	67.62%	152671	68.45%	6257	2.81%
CMMS Fall 2014	6064	2987	49.26%	2939	48.47%	2977	49.09%	10	0.16%
<b>2014 Total Counts &amp; Rates</b>	<b>516,705</b>	<b>355,137</b>	<b>68.73%</b>	<b>334,939</b>	<b>64.82%</b>	<b>339,496</b>	<b>65.70%</b>	<b>15,641</b>	<b>3.03%</b>
<b>2015:</b>									
Spring 2015	214206	148162	69.17%	138676	64.74%	140669	65.67%	7493	3.50%
CMMS Spring 2015	3594	406	11.30%	392	10.91%	402	11.19%	4	0.11%
Summer 2015	77275	49984	64.68%	47604	61.60%	48517	62.78%	1467	1.90%
CMMS Summer 2015	2137	94	4.40%	88	4.12%	92	4.31%	2	0.09%
Fall 2015	234274	144031	61.48%	135770	57.95%	137520	58.70%	6511	2.78%
CMMS Fall 2015	1839	685	37.25%	679	36.92%	685	37.25%	0	0.00%
<b>2015 Total Counts &amp; Rates</b>	<b>533,325</b>	<b>343,362</b>	<b>64.38%</b>	<b>323,209</b>	<b>60.60%</b>	<b>327,885</b>	<b>61.48%</b>	<b>15,477</b>	<b>2.90%</b>
<b>2016:</b>									
Spring 2016	224866	159051	70.73%	149485	66.48%	151496	67.37%	7555	3.36%
CMMS SP 2016	1047	220	21.01%	219	20.92%	220	21.01%	0	0.00%
Summer 2016	83634	69518	83.12%	65849	78.73%	67065	80.19%	2453	2.93%
OTHR Summer 2016	487	439	90.14%	432	88.71%	439	90.14%	0	0.00%
Fall 2016	240772	149653	62.16%	142588	59.22%	144396	59.97%	5257	2.18%
OTHR Fall 2016	914	673	73.63%	665	72.76%	673	73.63%	0	0.00%
<b>2016 Total Counts &amp; Rates</b>	<b>551,720</b>	<b>379,554</b>	<b>68.79%</b>	<b>359,238</b>	<b>65.11%</b>	<b>364,289</b>	<b>66.03%</b>	<b>15,265</b>	<b>2.77%</b>

**UCF Student Perception of Instruction (SPol) Response Rate Report**  
**Counts & Response Rates by College/Academic Group from Spring 2012 to Fall 2016**

College/ Academic Group	Total Possible SPI forms	Total Submitted		Total Submitted - All Responses		Total Submitted - At Least 1 Response		Total Submitted - All Blank	
AFIA	25118	3487	13.88%	3419	13.61%	3471	13.82%	16	0.06%
BCBS	13	10	76.92%	8	61.54%	8	61.54%	2	15.38%
BHC	11878	4350	36.62%	3965	33.38%	4023	33.87%	327	2.75%
CAH	371160	241051	64.95%	226755	61.09%	230579	62.12%	10472	2.82%
CAS	1	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
CBA	328616	211819	64.46%	194827	59.29%	199009	60.56%	12810	3.90%
COHPA	344935	233976	67.83%	217339	63.01%	221799	64.30%	12177	3.53%
COM	94646	61677	65.17%	55594	58.74%	56679	59.89%	4998	5.28%
CON	82034	48936	59.65%	46303	56.44%	47198	57.53%	1738	2.12%
COS	724181	488154	67.41%	455444	62.89%	463521	64.01%	24633	3.40%
EDUC	189591	122342	64.53%	115936	61.15%	117978	62.23%	4364	2.30%
ENGR	253034	175333	69.29%	154873	61.21%	157805	62.37%	17528	6.93%
GRDST	1489	809	54.33%	783	52.59%	796	53.46%	13	0.87%
HSPMG	146475	93841	64.07%	85627	58.46%	87468	59.72%	6373	4.35%
IAGS	4287	2017	47.05%	1995	46.54%	2017	47.05%	0	0.00%
OPTIC	2421	1489	61.50%	1433	59.19%	1453	60.02%	36	1.49%
UGST	18706	11942	63.84%	10973	58.66%	11183	59.78%	759	4.06%
<b>Total Counts &amp; Rates</b>	2,598,585	1,701,234	65.47%	1,575,275	60.62%	1,604,988	61.76%	96,246	3.70%

Prepared by Lisa Wayte, CS&T January 2017