

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
FROM: Faculty Senate Office  
DATE: July 19, 1993  
SUBJECT: Minutes of Faculty Senate Steering Meeting - June 14, 1993

=====

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Naval Modani, Chair, at 9:00 a.m. The role was passed. The minutes of May 4, 1993 Steering Committee Meeting were approved. Members present were Drs. Armstrong, Cook, Hosni, Leckie, Rungeling, Sepulveda, Sheridan, and Taylor. Dr. Gary Whitehouse, Dr. Frank Juge, and Dr. John Gupton were also in attendance. Dr. Modani welcomed Provost Gary Whitehouse to his first Steering Committee meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Dr. Modani brought up the first item for discussion, a draft entitled "Selection of Candidates for the SUS Undergraduate Teaching Incentive Program" (referred to as the Lombardi Plan.) In order to recognize, promote, and stimulate high quality and productive undergraduate teaching, this pilot program provides for a competitive award of \$5,000 increase in the base salary of recipient faculty. Each university is to submit, for approval, its plan to the Board of Regents by August 15, 1993. It is anticipated that these plans would then be brought before the Board of Regents at the next scheduled meeting on September 10, 1993.

Dr. Juge indicated that UCF would have 95 awards based on the proportion of undergraduate student credit hours generated by the SUS. Dr. Whitehouse said that the draft plan for UCF is based on the legislative language and the report of the task force of the Council of Presidents. The UCF criteria for determining eligibility are proposed to be: (1) hired on faculty status on or before August 1990, (2) must have taught undergraduates each of the last three years, (3) did not previously receive this award, and (4) must be in the top quartile of undergraduate student credit hours (UG-SCH) generated by the department OR by the college. Dr. Whitehouse wanted input from the Steering Committee on this initial draft proposal and indicated that he will keep the Steering Committee informed as the proposal becomes more definitive.

Discussion followed on the emphasis on productivity (UG-SCH); lack of emphasis on graduate teaching; and possible inequities across colleges, departments, or individual faculty members. Dr. Whitehouse indicated that the emphasis on UG-SCH is based on the legislative language and the report of the task force of the Council of Presidents. Dr. Juge said that if UCF does not present a plan acceptable to the Board of Regents, its share of the awards may be reallocated to other universities. Dr. Whitehouse anticipated that the legislature would fund this program for the subsequent years and this should decrease any perceived inequities across individual faculty as a faculty member receiving this award in one year would not be eligible in the following years.

Regarding lack of emphasis in this plan on graduate teaching, Dr. Juge mentioned that the intent of the legislature is to reward undergraduate teaching under this program. Also, each department and college would have the same proportion of their faculty in the eligible pool. Dr. Juge also indicated that each eligible faculty would be asked to submit a portfolio of their teaching related activities and that final selection of recipients would be made by the respective colleges. Each college should have a faculty committee to establish the selection criteria and submit this for approval by administration.

Dr. Kathleen Sheridan asked that the colleges be sensitive to issues such as rewarding those who have been at UCF for a long time and devoted their efforts to teaching but have not been rewarded. Dr. Gupton remarked that the portfolio approach is desirable as it allows people to make judgments. Dr. Taylor urged that college selection committees be composed of those who are not candidates for the award.

The next item on the agenda was BE 2000 and issues related to it. Dr. Modani said that the newspaper article was erroneous and it generated a lot of negative sentiment among faculty. Dr. Juge said that the reporter had not talked to him or Dr. Whitehouse and the article did not accurately reflect what was done. It actually generated confusion. Dr. Modani appreciated Dr. Juge writing a memo to him with copies to the members of the Steering Committee and the members of the Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee (UGPCC). This helped in clarifying some of the misunderstanding. Dr. Modani also supported Dr. Juge's offer to write an article for the UCF report to clarify the matter for all faculty.

Dr. Juge proceeded to explain the circumstances leading to the decision. He stated that the process was followed. The recommendation of the UGPC was not overruled. The UGPC had recommended that the two special topics courses not be approved and that consultations and discussions be undertaken between College of Business and affected departments. The administration agrees with the UGPC that consultation should and needs to occur. This was conveyed to Dean Huseman. The two special topic courses were not approved. Dean Huseman's memo of June 2, 1993 suggested a major compromise in pursuing serious consultations and discussions with the other departments and in using, for the time being, two existing courses to cover six of the nine hours of the special topics courses. Dean Huseman also planned to return to the UGPC in Fall 1993 for approval of permanent courses. Dean Huseman's memo also indicated his desire to keep enthusiastic support of the four corporate sponsors and to implement the new curriculum which has near unanimous support of business faculty.

Dr. Juge stated that a decision on Dean Huseman's compromise proposal had to be made in 24 hours as fall class schedule was due to the printers. There was not enough time to convene a meeting of the Steering Committee. Further, this compromise does maintain the momentum of the new curriculum with the College of Business faculty and with the corporate partners in the project while providing time for serious discussions, consultations, and ultimate review by the UGPC. There was no intention or desire to circumvent the Senate. Based on the above reasons, a decision was made to approve Dean Huseman's compromise proposal.

Dr. Kathleen Sheridan raised a concern about disregard for faculty governance and remarked that the Steering Committee should have been included in the decision making process. Dr. Whitehouse and Dr. Juge said that they support faculty governance and the Senate. In this situation, however, there just was not enough time. Dr. Sepulveda charged that the College of Business may have wanted to create a time bind. Dr. Modani remarked that while he appreciated the comments by Dr. Sheridan and Dr. Sepulveda, he did not think it was premeditated on the part of Business Administration. Part of the blame should go to the Senate because the UGPC could not get a quorum at a meeting earlier and this caused a further delay in the process.

Dr. Whitehouse and Dr. Juge stated that consultations between Business and other departments have started and they hope that an accommodation would be reached. Dr. Armstrong said there is confusion about the whole issue of consultation and about the quantitative requirements for a business major.

Dr. Modani reported that the Committee on Committee has made selections for the four Standing Committees and their two subcommittees. Almost all of the non senate faculty members have consented to serve. A very few slots remain to be filled. Dr. Modani also informed the members about the visits by four candidates for the position of Athletic Director and urged the members to attend the sessions scheduled for faculty. He also asked the members to suggest names by June 22 for Faculty Senate representatives and Grand Marshals for the two ceremonies for August commencement.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.