

# MEMORANDUM

**Date:** January 3, 2011  
**TO:** Members of the Steering Committee  
**FROM:** Ida Cook  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** **STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING on January 6, 2011**

---

Meeting Date: Thursday, January 6, 2011  
Meeting Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.  
Meeting Location: College of Arts and Humanities, Room 192A

## A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Minutes of November 4, 2010**
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
  - Provost's update
5. **Old Business**

None
6. **New Business**
  - Resolution 2010-2011-2 Revision of Regulation 3.001, Non Discrimination; Affirmative Action Programs (*from Personnel*)
  - Distributed Learning – *Tom Cavanagh*
7. **Standing Committee Reports**
  - Budget and Administrative Committee – *Arlen Chase*
  - Graduate Council – *Stephen Goodman*
  - Personnel Committee – *Jeffrey Kaplan*
  - Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee – *Marie Léticée*
8. **Other Business**
9. **Adjournment**

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting

**Minutes of  
November 4, 2010**

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to order at 4:03 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

Motion made to amend the agenda to allow Vice President Al Harms to present the University Strategic Plan. Motion seconded and carried. The presentation of the strategic plan became the first order of business.

University Strategic Plan

Dr. Cook welcomed Admiral Alfred Harms, Vice President for Strategy, Marketing, Communications and Admissions, who was present to discuss the University Strategic Plan. Admiral Harms distributed a handout with a one-page version of the most recently updated plan and provided a brief overview of the progress that has been made on the strategic plan. The aim has been to keep the plan at a strategic level rather than a compilation of tactical dreams.

Admiral Harms will be briefing the Board of Trustees on November 10 and providing them with a draft of the strategic plan. He stressed that the information provided today was a draft, not a final product. Admiral Harms solicited feedback from the Steering Committee. Committee members raised the following issues:

- Under "Research Excellence", the emphasis appears to be on revenue-generating items, with no mention of scholarship. The suggestion was made to include wording like "increase visibility and quality of scholarship" to that section.
- It was suggested that "increase number of patentable finding disclosures" should only be listed as a measure, not under both measures and initiatives. An initiative might instead read, "expand opportunities for intellectual property".
- A question was raised about how the challenges the university faces fit into the strategic plan, as the document does address them. Admiral Harms explained that the document will be accompanied by a narrative that will detail the challenges.
- Measureable outcomes should include post-graduate education acceptance in addition to job placement.

Admiral Harms asked feedback on whether the strategic plan could help attract (1) top faculty, and (2) large donors. Feedback from the committee included:

- Measures should include the number of faculty receiving prestigious fellowships, and initiatives could include increasing the number of faculty with prestigious research credentials and increasing the number of endowed chairs.
- A question was raised regarding the lack of references to linkages to the community and to being a partnership university. Admiral Harms explained that the measures listed on the handout are representative, and there are many others not shown.
- The strategic plan could be enhanced by highlighting the ways in which UCF is demonstrating excellence, perhaps showcasing the best from each college. Admiral

Harms stated that it is good to include excellence, but there is a need to balance between specificity and inclusion.

- The plan needs to acknowledge the regional campuses. Admiral Harms stated that this will appear under the measures on the more detailed portion of the plan.
- The plan needs to include outcome measures that address the percentage of terminal degrees and other measures that allow us to compare UCF to other universities.
- The plan needs to mention real accomplishments in order for this to be a sales piece for potential donors.
- It was suggested that an outcome be included regarding building a vibrant intellectual community at UCF and in Central Florida.

Dr. Cook directed the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to send any further suggestion for the strategic plan to the Office of the Faculty Senate or to Admiral Harms.

Motion made to invite Admiral Harm to present at the Faculty Senate meeting on November 18, 2010. Motion seconded and carried.

The question was raised whether a committee exists to review old strategic plans to see whether previous aims have been met. Answer: Previous plans were not written in such a way that allowed for measurable tasks and outcomes. This new plan represents a change in the way strategic plans are going to be used.

## **MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of October 7, 2010 made and seconded. It was requested that the minutes be amended to enhance the definition of "Polycom". Minutes approved as amended.

## **RECOGNITION OF GUESTS**

Diane Chase, Executive Vice Provost Faculty Affairs.

Alfred Harms, Vice President for Strategy, Marketing, Communications and Admissions

Elliot Vittes, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Lin Huff-Corzine, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Mark Allen Poisel, Associate Vice President for Student Development and Enrollment Services

Michael Stern, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

Kevin Haran, Assistant Professor and Personnel Committee Chair

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### Provost's Update

In order to allow for a comprehensive discussion of the Strategic Plan, Provost Waldrop had deferred his report until the next Steering meeting.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### Submitted Constitutional Revisions

The committee had received via email copies of the suggested revisions to the Constitution that had been submitted during the review period. The items were:

#### Library Advisory Committee

Revision proposed by Barry Baker, University Libraries, to address who appoints the graduate student member of the committee. The graduate student had been appointed by the deans of the colleges on a rotating basis. The change as submitted was:

"Other members include one undergraduate student (appointed by the president of the Student Government) and one graduate student (~~appointed by the dean of the student's college). The graduate student appointment rotates annually and alphabetically by college~~(appointed by the vice provost and dean of the College of Graduate Studies based on recommendations made by the president of the Graduate Student Association and the dean of the student's college)."

A suggestion was made to delete "and the dean of the student's college", as the rationale for this change is the historical difficulty in getting the deans to appoint a student. A brief discussion followed. The suggestion was formerly made as a motion. Motion seconded. Motion carried. Motion made to adopt the remaining changes. Motion seconded and carried. The adopted language was:

"... and one graduate student (appointed by the vice provost and dean of the College of Graduate Studies based on recommendations made by the president of the Graduate Student Association)."

#### University Master Planning Committee

Bill Merck, Administration and Finance, suggested the following change regarding the appointment of the chair of the committee:

"The ~~vice president for Administration and Finance, president who~~ shall appoint the chair of the committee. will identify other members and will make every effort to ensure that areas relating to University Master Planning are represented."

It was discovered that the proposed wording change was based upon old constitutional language which had been addressed in the most recent version of the revised Constitution. The version that had been passed by the Senate on October 14 was read aloud. After a brief discussion, a motion was made to not accept the suggested changes. Motion seconded and carried.

#### University Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee

Bill Merck, Administration and Finance, suggested the following change to the membership of the University Parking Advisory Committee:

"The committee shall consist of two faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate Parking Advisory Committee, two students (appointed by the president of Student Government); two staff members (nominated by the USPS Council in consultation with the vice president for Administration and Finance); and one administrative and professional employee (nominated by the vice president for Administration and Finance). The vice president for Administration and Finance will appoint one

additional member to serve as chair. A vice chair will be elected from within the membership. Terms of service shall be one year."

Motion made to strike the requirement that the USPS representatives to the committee must be made in consultation with the vice president, with the rationale that the USPS Staff Council should be allowed the same agency as the Faculty Senate and the Student Government. Motion seconded and carried. Motion made to accept the other proposed changes. Motion seconded and carried.

### Admissions and Standards Committees

Maribeth Ehasz, Student Development and Enrollment Services (SDES), and Patricia Bishop, Graduate Studies, had proposed that the functions of the Admissions and Standards Committee be extended to include appeals for graduate record changes (in addition to the undergraduate appeals that the committee currently addresses). Mark Poisel and Michael Stern were present to provide information in support of the proposal.

This change would offer an appeals process for graduate students on decisions for administrative record changes (e.g., medical withdrawal, late adds/drops). At the graduate level, such decisions are made by the College of Graduate Studies and there is currently no appeals process in place. Drs. Poisel and Stern explained that, as the Admissions and Standards Committee has the expertise to rule on these kinds of decisions, their divisions feel that it would be appropriate for the committee to handle graduate student appeals. These decisions are of an administrative, not academic, nature.

Elliot Vittes, dean of Undergraduate Studies, expressed concern that the agenda of the committee was already quite heavy with undergraduate issues and participation by faculty was sparse. Adding graduate appeals would further tax the faculty. The discussion continued and it was estimated that graduate cases would represent approximately 4% of the student issues (20 graduate cases per year versus 500-600 undergraduate cases per year).

As there is an undergraduate student on the committee, a motion was made to add a graduate student to the committee, using language similar to that added to the Library Advisory Committee, above. Motion seconded and carried. A motion was made to not accept the addition of "University" to the name of the committee. Motion seconded and carried. The motion to accept the proposed language as revised carried. The approved changes in the Constitution are as follows:

" The Admissions and Standards Committee considers appeals ~~for~~ of admissions; readmissions of undergraduate students. Additionally, the committee considers appeals of decisions concerning administrative record changes made by the Office of Undergraduate Studies for undergraduate students and the College of Graduate Studies for graduate students. ~~and waivers of undergraduate academic policies or standards."~~

The approved changes in the Bylaws are as follows:

#### **"B. Admissions and Standards Committee**

##### **1. Duties and Responsibilities.**

- a. To consider all undergraduate student admissions that do not meet the minimum university admissions standards and that are referred to it by the Undergraduate Admissions Office.

- b. To consider all undergraduate student appeals of readmission decisions or academic standing.
- ~~e. To consider all undergraduate student appeals of university academic policies or standards.~~
- c. To consider undergraduate student appeals of decisions that have been made by the Office of Undergraduate Studies concerning late withdrawals, late drops, late adds, and medical withdrawals.
- d. To consider continuation of undergraduate students ~~that~~ who fail to meet CLAST requirements in accordance with appropriate rules and regulations.
- ~~e. To recommend undergraduate admissions policy to the Faculty Senate.~~
- e. To consider graduate student appeals of decisions that have been made by the College of Graduate Studies concerning late withdrawals, late drops, late adds, and medical withdrawals.

2. Membership.

The committee shall consist of six faculty members, at least three of whom are graduate faculty, selected by the Committee on Committees (in consultation with the vice president for Student Development and Enrollment Services), one undergraduate student nominated by the president of the Student Government, one graduate student nominated by the president of the Graduate Student Association (in consultation with vice provost and dean of the College of Graduate Studies), and six members from the professional staff (selected by the vice president for Student Development and Enrollment Services). A representative from the professional advising office for each college may serve as a non-voting resource person to assist the committee members. The vice president for Student Development and Enrollment Services (or designee) will serve as chair and identify other ex officio members. The chair will make every effort to ensure that areas relating to Admissions and Standards are represented. Terms of service shall be three years, staggered, with the exception of the student member, who shall serve for one year."

Wording clarifications

While the Constitution was undergoing editing in the Senate office, several items were flagged as possibly requiring clarification. Changes to the wording was proposed for each item.

Apportionment

Motion made to accept the proposed wording change to the Constitution, Article II.B was seconded and carried. The adopted language was:

"The number of elected members of the Senate will be apportioned among the academic units based on the number of faculty in each unit, ~~with the restrictions~~ Specific restrictions are that each academic unit shall have at least two elected voting members and no academic unit will have a number of voting elected members larger than one-fifth of the total elected voting membership of the Faculty Senate."

## Steering Committee

Motion made to accept the proposed wording change to the *Bylaws*, Section VI, was seconded and carried. The adopted language was:

### "A. Steering Committee

#### 1. Composition

- d. ~~Vacancies on the Steering Committee are filled by election from and by the senators of the vacating member's academic unit.~~ In the event of a vacancy on the Steering Committee, the senators of that academic unit shall elect a replacement from amongst its membership."

## Senate Curricular Committees

Motion made to delete the redundant language in *Bylaws*, Section VII, was seconded and carried. The adopted language was:

" Certain committees shall be designated as Senate curricular committees. ~~The list of committees and councils shall be updated as necessary. Committee membership selection shall be made in accordance with the bylaws.~~ Even though there is no voting by proxy for Senate meetings, Senate curricular committees may adopt policies at the start of the year to allow voting by proxy."

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### Resolution from Personnel Committee

Kevin Haran, chair of the Personnel Committee presented a resolution on the promotion of non-tenure earning assistant and associate professors. He provided an overview of the history of the resolution and the accompanying recommended procedures. Dr. Cook reminded the committee that the Senate will not vote on the recommended procedures, only the resolution itself. A question was raised about whether the resolution should recognize that this will need to be bargained. Dr. Huff-Corzine noted that many of the clinical and research faculty are out-of-unit and not subject to bargaining. Mr. Haran accepted a friendly amendment that language be added recognizing that, for those faculty who are in the bargaining unit, this will be need to be bargained.

Motion to add the revised resolution to the agenda of the next meeting of the Faculty Senate carried. The resolution as revised read:

### **Resolution 2010-2011-1 Promotion of Non Tenure-Earning Assistant and Associate Professors**

(From the Personnel Committee)

**Whereas**, Non Tenure-Earning Assistant and Associate Professors are actively engaged as teaching or research or clinical faculty at UCF, and

**Whereas**, Non Tenure-Earning Assistant and Associate Professors are integral parts of many UCF departments, and

**Whereas**, Non Tenure-Earning Assistant and Associate Professors should have incentives to excel, and

**Whereas**, such promotions would make UCF competitive for the highest quality professionals, and

Recognizing that for those faculty who are in the bargaining unit, this resolution will need to be bargained between the UFF and the UCF Board of Trustees,

**Be It Resolved**, that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee recommends that the UCF administration develop policy and procedures giving all Non Tenure-Earning Assistant and Associate Professors an opportunity for advancement.

#### Senate Agenda Item – "Study Union"

Suzi Halpin, director of the Student Union, has requested time to speak to the Senate regarding the "Study Union" program, which offers support mechanisms for students during finals week. Motion to add this item to the agenda of the next Senate meeting seconded and carried.

### **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### Budget and Administrative Committee

On behalf of committee liaison Arlen Chase, who could not attend, Dr. Cook relayed that the committee is planning to meet soon.

#### Graduate Council – Stephen Goodman

As he could not attend, Dr. Goodman reported the following by email:

The Graduate Policy Committee has met twice since the last Steering Committee meeting. This committee has been reviewing policies regarding the use of split level classes, policies related to candidacy exams, and policies related to faculty participation in thesis and dissertation defenses.

The Graduate Curriculum Committee has met twice since the last Steering Committee meeting. This committee reviewed 13 proposals for various graduate program refinements, modifications, etc. and 44 course action requests.

The Graduate Appeals and Awards Committee has met three times since the last Steering Committee meeting. This committee reviewed a total of 23 graduate appeal petitions.

The Graduate Program Review Committee met twice since the last Steering Committee meeting. This committee is involved with the ongoing review of graduate faculty credentials in assorted departments.

For more detail on Graduate Council committee agendas and minutes, visit the Graduate Council website at <http://www.graduatecouncil.ucf.edu/GraduateCouncil.aspx>



Personnel Committee –Jeffrey Kaplan

The committee met in October to discuss the above resolution. The committee will be meeting in November to discuss 1) the evaluation of chairs, and 2) faculty handling of students who have difficulty with discrimination and bullying on campus.

Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee – Marie Léticée

Nothing to report since the last Steering meeting. The committee will be meeting next Tuesday.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Dr. Chopra reported that he learned at that day's Board of Governor's meeting that there is the possibility of another special session to discuss faculty benefits. The Personnel committee was advised to pay close attention to this matter.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:39 p.m.



## Center for Distributed Learning

New Initiatives Update

Spring 2011

For additional CDL information: <http://online.ucf.edu>

Contact: Tom Cavanagh ([cavanagh@mail.ucf.edu](mailto:cavanagh@mail.ucf.edu) or 407-823-4913)

### **IDL6543 Redesign**

While the IDL6543 program has been successful at preparing faculty to develop and deliver online and blended courses, it has remained largely unchanged since its introduction in the mid 1990s. Based upon feedback received from deans, associate deans, department chairs, and instructional faculty, CDL decided to conduct an analysis of the program's current curriculum and delivery and determine what changes should be made.

During the Spring of 2010, CDL formed a committee of faculty and administrators from across the university to drive the program analysis and provide recommendations for revision. The committee consisted of Dawn Trouard, Susan Wegmann, Alicia Janowski, Max Croft, Ronnie Korosec, Tad Hara, and Kevin Yee. CDL faculty/staff on the committee were Tom Cavanagh (co-chair), Linda Futch (co-chair), Nancy Swenson, and Baiyun Chen.

The committee polled colleagues who had completed IDL6543, benchmarked alternative practices at other institutions both local and national, and provided a list of recommendations to CDL. Among the many recommendations included suggestions to place more of the curriculum online, expand the role of the Web Veterans, allow more flexibility to accommodate varying levels of technical competence, increase the enrollment cap, and focus less on pure pedagogy and more on how instructional design can be applied specifically in an online environment.

The curriculum is currently being revised and the pilot for the revision is targeted for a Summer 2011 delivery.

### **Online Faculty Readiness Assessment**

Based upon conversations with deans and department chairs, CDL understands that more and more faculty are being hired with experience teaching online, thus prompting a question about whether or not they need to participate in IDL6543. However, because there are numerous models for teaching online, there is no clear definition of what "prior online teaching experience" means. UCF prides itself on developing the highest quality online courses (as evidenced by numerous awards) and must ensure that new faculty who are exempted from IDL6543 meet the university's (and SACS's) expectations for quality design and delivery of online courses.

As a result of these requests from deans and department chairs, CDL developed an online form intended for selected faculty to determine if their experience, competence, familiarity with the Blackboard Vista platform, and teaching philosophy meet CDL standards. The submitted information and course design artifacts are evaluated by instructional designers according to a

defined rubric. It is expected that a final assessment will result in one of several possible results: IDL6543 equivalency, a requirement to complete specific elements from IDL6543 or other programs (including technical instruction on the course management system), a requirement to complete a different professional development program, or a requirement to complete IDL6543 in its entirety. The time commitment from a faculty member to complete the instrument is not trivial—it expected to take several hours to prepare and submit. However, this is a fraction of the 80 hour time commitment required by the IDL6543 program. (<http://www.cdl.ucf.edu/ofra/>)

### **Faculty Seminars in Online Teaching**

These are advanced topics “beyond IDL6543.” They can be pedagogically-oriented (e.g., how to facilitate groups in online courses, how to facilitate large online classes) or technology-oriented (e.g., integrating iTunes U, using Gradebook formulas).

They will be workshop based, available live or online, short, and flexible (we will come to colleges and departments to facilitate). They will be co-facilitated by an instructional faculty member and a CDL instructional designer. Departments can choose from one of several pre-developed seminars or can develop a custom program.

First session is January 27 (*Designing Effective Online Assessments*: Bobby Hoffman and Denise Lowe).

### **New Online Student Orientation**

Current orientation within Webcourses is exclusively technical. The revision will also include expectations for online students, success strategies, video tips from fellow students, etc.

### **Learn 9.x Migration**

A new LMS platform is coming within the next 18 months. Several expanding pilots starting in the 2011/2012 Academic Year.

### **Webcourses for All**

With the new LMS we hope to be able to provide a default Webcourses shell for all university courses, regardless of modality, that the faculty may elect to choose without a training requirement. However, certain features/tools may be unavailable until Essentials training is completed. The expectation is that this will replace *myUCF Grades*.

### **Mobility**

Mobile Central and Mobile Learn (Blackboard products) are in development and will be deployed in the near future.

### **Pedagogical Repository**

This is a collection of effective online instructional practices, to include a description, examples, scholarly references, etc. Would faculty be interested in working with CDL to contribute? The vision is to become like the Purdue OWL for online learning.

**Resolution 2010-2011-2 Revision of Regulation 3.001, Non Discrimination; Affirmative Action Programs**

(From the Personnel Committee)

**Whereas**, the UCF Board of Trustees has recently approved a revision to extend the non-discrimination policy to include gender identity and gender expression as categories that are protected from discrimination, and

**Whereas**, peer and aspirational peer institutions have expanded their non-discrimination policies and regulations to include these two categories of individuals,

**Be It Resolved**, that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee recommends that the UCF faculty endorse these revisions to **Regulation 3.001, Non Discrimination; Affirmative Action Programs**, as approved by the UCF Board of Trustees.