

UCF Faculty Senate

Budget and Administrative Procedures Committee

MEETING MINUTES – March 16, 2016, Room PSB 445

ATTENDEES: Joe Harrington (chair/COS), Stephen M. Kuebler (Chemistry and Optics), Florencio Hernandez (Chemistry), Linan An (Engineering), Kevin Roozen (CAH)

REMOTE ATTENDEES: Lisa Nalbone (CAH); Jeffrey Bedwell (COS), Lei Wei (CECS), Nan Hua (RCHM); Robert Cassanello (CAH/Steering Comm. Liaison)

EX OFFICIO: Tracy Clark (Finance & Accounting)

GUESTS: None

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of minutes of March 2, 2016
4. University-wide staffing model
5. Procedure for an external complaint against an employee
6. Adjournment

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 2:14 pm.

TOPICS DISCUSSED

Minutes of previous meeting

- Kuebler moved to approve minutes, seconded by Roozen, and approved by majority vote.

University-wide staffing model

- Harrington invited discussion on what tasks/activities are done by faculty for which additional staff are needed.
- Harrington asked committee members to submit any daily logs of activity they might have, so these could be used to assess where staff may be needed to do tasks currently undertaken by faculty.
- Committee discussed issue that staffing at ORC is actually decreasing, with some tasks being transferred to faculty.
- Tracy Clark: ORC is reviewing their best practices.
- Harrington: Compliance has also become a bigger issue for ORC and the university.
- Nalbone: Staff could assist with visits for new hires and gathering assessment data.
- Bedwell: Good staff support in Psychology, good GTA support for grading.
- Discussed COACHE survey and its relevance to staffing.
- Discussed ORC best practices, forms faculty complete to initiate a proposal, and who can do those tasks best.

- Harrington: There are no university-wide vehicles for gathering data on processes or for designing policy. Faculty need to be much more involved in policy making.
- Kuebler: Staff need to be more effective in their jobs, which includes being more helpful to faculty, more knowledgeable about their jobs and university procedures, and more willing to think with faculty about how to address challenges and needs.
- Harrington: Staff need to protect time of faculty so faculty can do their jobs best.
- Hernandez: Do not like defining the function of staff as only protecting time of faculty.
- Bedwell: Agrees with Hernandez, that staff do not work primarily for faculty and we need to consider their satisfaction, too.

Procedure for external complaints

- Harrington invited multiple people to attend the BAPC meeting as guests to discuss procedures for handling external complaints. None could attend but many offered input during multi-hour discussions with Harrington, summarized below.
- Harrington Spoke with Debbie Reinhart (ORC and former NSF program manager, PM), and USF professor and former NSF program manager Maria Womack about how external complaints are handled by NSF. Problems are not always worked out exclusively by PM. Once OIG raises an issue, PMs cannot work with PI, but Program Directors can. There is also a difference in permissible activities for rotator and permanent PMs at NSF. Learned about the kinds of penalties people can get for violating NSF/federal rules. Spoke to Douglas Hudgins, PM at NASA. Practices at NASA are very different from those at NSF.
- Harrington spoke with Rhonda Bishop. She explained how this process works at the university level when a complaint comes in from an agency. It can initially involve collation of data, financials, etc. University works with employee, essentially defending them. OIG makes a finding and then university is left to respond.
- Harrington: Concluded there is not a process that is clear to faculty for handling complaints or for identifying when the university stops defending an employee and assumes an adversarial role toward the employee. A process is needed for formally notifying an employee when this shift occurs so that the employee can seek external counsel and an independent review before "sentencing".
- Clark: Do other universities have such a policy?
- Harrington's response: We need to investigate what policies other institutions have. Believe UC Berkeley does have such a policy.

[Added after meeting, here it is: http://apo.chance.berkeley.edu/faculty_misconduct_015.pdf

Note specifically the detailed procedure for notifying faculty of an imminent accusation, the period of time for the accused to formulate a response, hearing before a panel, etc.; compare to our instant reprimand and sentence, with grievance procedure initiated only after sentencing.]

- Harrington: Said he and Bishop also discussed specific examples of things that are not permitted by funding agencies and whether or not staff are properly trained in this regard.
- Harrington: Concludes that training is inadequate because Bishop indicated several things we can't do which were not known to Harrington. Example: Cannot hire a graphic artist to prepare plots for publications because this is considered a "printing cost".
- Harrington: Bishop is preparing a slide deck for further training faculty. This may not be best for communicating issues to faculty in a way they can remember years later.
- Harrington: Proposed we write a resolution that would ask the University to review the issue. Some committee members disagreed that we should try to do this now, and perhaps defer to fall.

- Harrington: Proposed wording for a resolution to direct to Steering Committee as follows:
"The Faculty Senate requests that faculty selected through their senate representatives be involved in the ongoing re-evaluation of services provided by and training offered by ORC."
- Kuebler moved to approve the resolution as worded. Seconded by Linan An. Motion approved by vote, 6 in favor, and 1 opposed.

ADJOURNED: 3:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by S. M. Kuebler (March 16, 2016)