

Faculty Senate
Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes of March 17, 2016

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 February 11, 2016 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Stephen Kuebler, Budget and Administrative Committee member

Anna Jones, Quality Enhancement Plan Director

Kristy McAllister, Academic Affairs Information and Publication Services

Paul Whalen, Graduate Student Association President

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Due to the anticipated need for the conference room 192 for the new Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, the Steering committee will meet in the Pensacola boardroom in the Student Union in the Fall. The August Steering meeting will be held at the Rosen College of Hospitality Management.

A textbook affordability bill has passed the House and Senate and is awaiting the Governor's approval. Richard Harrison distributed copies of the bill and provided an overview. Question: Does it change the deadline for faculty to report textbooks? Yes, not sure what it is; we'll need to look into that and communicate change.

At the last Senate meeting, there was a question regarding the search committee members for the Vice President for Research and Dean of the College of Graduate Studies. The list of committee members was passed around the room. The search committee includes:

Committee Members:

Committee Chair, Bahaa Saleh, Dean,
College of Optics and Photonics
Lisa Barkley, Associate Dean for Diversity
and Inclusion, College of Medicine
Deborah Beidel, Director of UCF
RESTORES, Psychology
Jana Jasinski, Associate Dean, College of
Graduate Studies
Chester Kennedy, Chief Executive Officer,
ICAMR
Rudy McDaniel, Assistant Dean, College of
Arts and Humanities
Donna Neff, Associate Dean, Research
Programs and Services, College of Nursing

Griff Parks, Director, Burnett School of
Biomedical Sciences
Edward Ross, Chair, Internal Medicine,
College of Medicine
Winston Schoenfeld, Director, Solar
Technology Research Division, Florida
Solar Energy Center (FSEC)
Sudipta Seal, Director, Nanoscience
Technology Center and Advanced Materials
Processing and Analysis Center
Beverly J. Seay, Chair of the CECS Dean's
Advisory Board
Sandra M. Sovinski, Associate General
Counsel, Office of Research and
Commercialization

Eleazar "Trey" Vasquez, Associate Professor, Department of Child, Family, and Community Sciences
Richard Zraick, Professor, Communication Sciences and Disorders

Provost Staff:
Ronnie Korosec, Associate Provost and Director of Operations
Parker Executive Search Firm
Representatives:
Laurie Wilder, President,
Porsha Williams, Vice President

OLD BUSINESS

None.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

Ronnie Korosec reporting on behalf of the Provost. The Provost is traveling back from the Board of Governor's meeting.

Research and Graduate Education

The external consultants on research and graduate education will be meeting on the UCF campus March 28 and 29. They will be meeting with 143 different stakeholders over two days, not including the open forums. There will be an open forum for faculty on March 29 from 10:30 – 11:30 a.m. in the Graduate Student Center in Colbourn Hall, room 146. There will be a livestream of the forum for those that can't make the meeting. There is also an opportunity to listening to the debriefing sessions on March 29 from 2:30 – 3:30 p.m. via <http://www.gotomeeting.com>.

In April, there will be a campus forum for faculty discussing the search for the Vice President of Research and Dean of the College of Graduate Studies. Parker Executive Search firm is working on a position description and announcement. The search committee is formed. We hope to have maximum faculty input before the advertisement is posted and during candidate visits. The search firm is reaching out to 38 people to invite to apply for the position. They expect 80-100 strong candidates to apply. The search will occur now. If the campus interviews happen after the Spring semester, we plan to offer livestream opportunities. The position start date is July 1.

College of Arts and Humanities Dean Search

The search is underway. Three candidates will be visiting campus in the next couple of weeks. The three candidates are Giovana Summerfield, Auburn University; Tom Foster, DePaul University; and internally, Jeff Moore from the School of Performing Arts. There will be opportunities for faculty open forums. This search will be concluded before summer with a start date of July 1 or August 1.

Resolution 2015-2016-3 Appointment and Evaluation of Department Chairs/Unit Heads

The provost appreciates the work of the senate. The Provost has approved the resolution with an addendum to provide clarification; no change in intent. First, the paragraph that references the President and Provost are the final approvers; the clarification is that the decision to hire was the Dean contingent upon the approval of the President and Provost. Secondly, when chairs/unit heads are appointed for a period of time (e.g., 5 years) they are not reappointed every year; the amendment clarifies this language indicating there is

always an opportunity to reevaluate if necessary, but reappointment happens at the end of the term.

March 31 Senate Meeting

The Provost will sponsor a sundae bar at the final senate meeting of the year to recognize the work of the Faculty Senate and Steering committees.

Questions

What is the status of 2015-2016-4 Paid Family Emergency Leave? This resolution must be collectively bargained. This year only chapters 23, Salaries and 3, UFF rights and privileges are open for negotiation. The resolution can't be considered until next year. The Provost will send the resolution back not approved contingent upon collective bargaining.

Dr. Koons thanked the Provost on behalf of the Senate for approving Resolution 2015-2015-3 Appointment and Evaluation of Department Chairs/Unit Heads. The process started last May with the disapproval of Resolution 2008-2009-1. The Personnel committee worked hard on the resolution. We are encouraged that we can get this process standardized and moving forward, and not readdress the same issue every four or five years.

NEW BUSINESS

Motion to amend the agenda to consider a resolution from the Budget and Administrative committee that didn't make it on the agenda; Resolution 2015-2016-6 Faculty Involvement in Evaluating and Improving the Services, Training, and Resources Offered by the Office of Research and Commercialization. Motion and second made to consider the resolution. All in favor; motion passes.

Resolution 2015-2016-5 Recognition of the 2016 Quality Enhancement Plan

Dr. Anna Jones indicated the team is finalizing the proposal to send to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) onsite committee that will be at UCF in April. The website is up and running; postcards and banners are complete. Postcards were distributed. The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) focuses on Integrative Learning and the resolution is presented for the Faculty Senate to recognize and support the effort.

This resolution is from the Steering committee. Recommended a slight grammatical change on line 4: "Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) **is** to improve undergraduate education."

Motion and second to put the resolution 2015-2016-5 on the March 31 Senate agenda. All in favor; motion passes. The resolution as approved reads:

Resolution 2015-2016-5 Recognition of the 2016 Quality Enhancement Plan: What's Next: Integrative Learning for Professional and Civic Preparation

Whereas, the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is an integral part of UCF's decennial reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of College and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC);

Whereas, the aim of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is to improve undergraduate education;

Whereas, the University of Central Florida is committed to providing the best undergraduate education in Florida, as evidenced by the first of President Hitt's five visionary goals;

Whereas, planning, development, and implementation of the QEP topic—*integrative learning for professional and civic preparation*—is a joint process involving faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni and stakeholders across the UCF community;

Whereas, recent surveys and listening groups conducted with UCF students, faculty, staff, alumni, and employers demonstrate that cross-cutting skills such as communication, problem-solving, and the ability to work in teams are valuable and useful for our undergraduates, both while they are at UCF and beyond the university;

Whereas, integrative learning—defined as the process of developing skills and knowledge across multiple experiences and the ability to adapt these to new contexts—has been shown to help students prepare for “real-world” challenges post-graduation;

Whereas, the vision of the 2016 QEP is that *UCF undergraduates will graduate with integrative learning experiences that foster important cross-cutting, transferrable knowledge and skills; that our students will graduate with the ability to persuasively articulate and demonstrate their skills; and that they will develop the capacity to transfer their skills and intentional learning strategies to new contexts. Consequently, graduates will be able to successfully enter and participate in the next steps of their professional and civic lives;*

Therefore, be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Central Florida endorses UCF's 2016 QEP initiative, *What's Next: Integrative Learning for Professional and Civic Preparation*, and offers our support for its continued development and implementation.

Resolution 2015-2016-6 Faculty Involvement in Evaluating and Improving the Services, Training, and Resources Offered by the Office of Research and Commercialization

Motion and second made to discuss the resolution. Stephen Kuebler from the Budget and Administrative committee presented the resolution on behalf of the chair, Joseph Harrington.

Dr. Kuebler indicated that as UCF moves toward greater recognition in research, the use and expectations of the Office of Research and Commercialization (ORC) are going to increase. The committee felt faculty should have an opportunity to substantively and knowledgeably have input in the reevaluation and have input into some of the potential

changes. The resolution acknowledges the changes occurring and recommends a committee comprised of faculty and other stakeholders be formed to help in the evaluation process and potentially propose improvements or changes.

Discussed the current Research Council. There are three ex officio members from the ORC on the committee. The committee does not meet often; typically addresses awards. Reviewed the duties of the Research Council. The concerns in the resolution are already duties of the Research Council. Dr. Kuebler noted that regardless of a specific committee, the resolution is a statement that more needs to be done and goes to the Provost for action.

The committee wants faculty involvement in the near-term ORC changes. More faculty input is needed in regards to any change in service to ensure a change doesn't hamstring the institution's ability to achieve the primary goals. If approved, the resolution can be directed to an existing committee or a new committee.

Question: Will the external consultants charge include any of the issues in the resolution? At a higher level. The consultants will identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges that the ORC and the College of Graduate Studies are facing and make suggestions on how UCF can elevate both areas to a higher level of prominence. This may or may not include involving faculty more.

Comment made that the search committee list circulated does not have any faculty. Everyone on the list is a director or above, and is disappointing.

Discussion continued around what committee should be charged with this task or if a new committee should be formed. The resolution does not specify what committee. The Steering committee only checks the resolution for clarity and in proper form. Debate on whether the resolution is needed occurs on the Senate floor.

Recommended a slight grammatical change by adding a comma on line 13: "...selected through their Senate representatives, be involved..."

Motion and second made to put Resolution 2015-2016-6 on March 31 Senate agenda. All in favor; motion passes. The resolution as approved reads:

Resolution 2015-2016-6 Faculty Involvement in Evaluating and Improving the Services, Training, and Resources Offered by the Office of Research and Commercialization

Whereas, the Federal grant rules are complex and can vary from agency to agency and grant to grant within an agency; and

Whereas, the training and tools for managing multiple grants are inadequate; and

Whereas, faculty principal investigators are responsible for research management and are the principal consumers of services offered by the Office of Research and Commercialization (ORC); and

Whereas, faculty have valuable insights to offer regarding what new research management tools, training, and information resources would be most effective in ensuring a higher level of compliance with federal grant rules; therefore

Be it Resolved that 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.

Steering Ad Hoc Committee on Awards Update

William Self, chair of the Steering Ad Hoc Committee on Awards provided an overview of the issue. The Senate previously passed Resolution 2013-2014-5 Establishment of an Awards Procedures Review committee to have a committee review TIP, RIA, SoTL awards programs. In 2015, Academic Affairs formed a committee. The large committee broke into three sub-committees for each award, and recommendations from each sub-committee were submitted to Steering. The recommendations were sent to the Personnel committee to synthesize, but the committee sent the request back to Steering due to a lack of time to work on the issue. Steering formed an Ad Hoc committee to resolve differences across the three sub-committees. The Ad Hoc committee met twice and now brings submits the recommendations to Steering for acceptance. Dr. Self provided a summary of the recommendations being presented.

These recommendations are part of implementation of 2013-2014-5. This is the end product of the committee charged to review awards.

Motion and second made to accept and approve the recommendations submitted by the Ad Hoc committee. All in favor; motion passes.

As the Ad Hoc committee's task is complete; the committee is formally discharged. The Senate chair will be send the recommendations to the Provost for consideration.

Appointment of Nominating Committee

This is an annual committee formed to present the slate of officers for the 2016-2017 Senate. The committee is chaired by the Senate past chair and two additional Steering committee members. Deborah Breiter Terry and Bari Hoffman-Ruddy volunteered to serve.

Constitutional Amendment Process

At the last Senate meeting we got off track with the incorrect assumption at the start of the meeting. Dr. Koons apologized for his part in the confusion. Flow charts for the By-law and Constitutional changes have been created and distributed prior to the meeting. We need to make a distinction between the resolution, by-laws, and constitutional process. For a resolution, any part of the resolution can be amended. When we have a By-law only change, there is a special process to amend the By-laws, including the requirement of appearing on two successive Senate agendas; no Faculty Assembly is required. A constitutional change requires a more lengthy process, requiring the faculty assembly approval as part of the process. We were attempting to follow the Constitutional process since changes were recommended to both the By-laws and

Constitution. At the last Senate meeting, we should have only been considering changes to the list of changes and not allowing any changes that were outside of the list of revisions. Dr. Koons apologized to the Parliamentarian for being put on the spot during the process. Since we still have items that need to be changed, it was proposed to create another Ad Hoc Constitutional Revisions Committee. The committee can start with the changes already proposed and consider additional changes for next year. Since an Ad Hoc committee is not constrained by a Senate year, the committee can be appointed now even though the work will continue into next year. No immediate volunteers for the committee; Dr. Koons will identify volunteers.

Motion and second to establish an Ad Hoc Constitutional Revision committee. All in favor; motion passes.

Question: Why are Department Chairs considered general faculty since they are out of unit and not subject to the collective bargaining agreement, yet the Center for Distributed Learning faculty are not eligible? The term “faculty” has different meanings. Some are in-unit, some are out-of-unit. Historically, the chairs have been included as faculty and teach. It doesn’t matter if the chair is in-unit or out-of-unit. The Ad Hoc committee looked at the CDL request and determined they should not be included because they don’t teach students. Chairs are specified in the Constitution. How the Senate, Human Resources, and UFF define faculty are different.

LIAISON COMMITTEE REPORTS

Budget and Administrative Committee – Robert Cassanello

The committee met twice this month. Resolution 2015-2016-6 was an output of the meetings.

Parking Advisory Committee – Bari Hoffman-Ruddy

They have not met since previous meeting. The next meeting will be in mid-April. Steering members asked what the net gain/loss was for faculty and students when the D lots were shifted for the new building. Also questioned if parking at the softball lot if free or if parking decals/hangtags are being enforced. Also asked if the faculty lot near Colbourn Hall will be limited once the new Trevor Colbourn Hall construction is started. An additional question is the impact on parking for the new faculty starting in the Fall.

Personnel Committee –Linda Walters

The committee has met twice. We discussed COACHE implementation and fact finding going on this semester. The search for actionable recommendations has a long way to go. There will be some open forums over the summer. We received a report on salary compression issues. Approximately 30% of faculty are lower than they should be. Instructors and lecturers were doing better than every other group. Associate and full professors have the highest number of salary compression. We asked for full report with more detail. The Senate has already addressed the Emeritus criteria in a previous resolution. If Steering feels it’s still an issue, we may be a need for additional clarification on this policy. The committee would like an update on UCF Policy to determine if the resolution is being considered in official policy.

Motion and second made to request Dr. Paige Borden be invited to the March 31 Senate meeting to make a presentation on salary compression study. All in favor; motion passes.

Graduate Council – Jim Moharam

Sub-committees continue their meeting schedule. Policy made two changes. The first change is to allow those students that completed all coursework and thesis/dissertation hours to enroll for one credit hour per semester until they graduate with the understanding that they are not full-time students and financial aid may be impacted. We also currently have a 3-year and 7-year certificate. We eliminated the 3-year certificate.

Undergraduate Council – Hyoung Jin Cho

The Undergraduate Course Review Committee discussed and approved a course revision item. The final outcome on materials and supply fee requests was communicated to committee members. There were questions and answers regarding the outcome of the M and S fee requests since no increase was approved by the Provost's office. The Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee meeting for March 15 was cancelled since there were no agenda items.

OTHER BUSINESS

Dr. Thad Seymour is requesting to make a 30 minute Strategic Planning update at the March 31 Senate meeting.

Motion and second for Dr. Thad Seymour to make a 10 minute Strategic Planning presentation at the March 31 Senate meeting. All in favor; motion passes.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The committee adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE STEERING AD HOC COMMITTEE ON AWARDS
MARCH 2016**

Note: For each recommendation a rationale is given below in italics

A. Base Number of Awards, Creation of New Teaching and Clinical Education Awards, Recycling and Award amount

1. Increase or maintain the number of TIP, RIA and SOTL awards available each year; maintain an increase that reflects the increases in faculty numbers (5 year rolling increase to account for eligible new faculty); An initial overall increase in RIA as compared to TIP and SOTL is suggested based on the number of applicants vs. awards in each category in the past 3 years.

The number of awards in all categories has remained stagnant for over a decade, and the number of faculty being hired is accelerating.

2. Develop new faculty **awards** for faculty (as defined by faculty senate) who are not generating student credit hours through undergraduate or graduate courses, but contribute significantly to the mission of the University. This should include units such as the Libraries, the Medical Education Department within the College of Medicine, and clinical faculty in COHPA and Nursing, amongst others. The same salary structure (\$5000 permanent increase in base salary) would be used.

- a) Faculty in some units (e.g., College of Medicine, Nursing, and COHPA) do not generate SCH, but should be awarded for their excellence.*
- b) Librarians have been long left out of the award process with exception of a one time \$2000 excellence award.*
- c) Faculty with substantial clinical teaching do not generally generate SCHs, and so they are not eligible for existing awards, and yet clinical education should be recognized at the University.*

3. Given the importance of service in the academy, a new award (base salary increase of \$5000 per year) should be developed that is University wide.

Like librarians, service has been undervalued in the award process, and service is a critical part of the academy and should be appreciated.

4. Add a final recommendation for all awards at the level of Dean (given the selection process within the colleges) and the Dean of the College of Undergraduate Studies (SOTL). If an award is not recommended at the Dean level, it can be recycled back to the same unit only one time (the next cycle) before it is returned to the overall pool and apportionment. This information should be included in each committee charging document (see recommendation C-2 below).

There are concerns that in some cases faculty are eligible for an award and are recommended for the award by the committee even without meeting a level of excellence that would merit the award.

The ability to recycle a single award within a unit for one year will allow for some critical decision-making by the Deans without penalizing the unit unduly. It is possible that the 'use it or lose it' mentality could alter the rigor of the Dean's process for decision making.

5. When a faculty member retires or leaves UCF, awards will be recycled into the overall award pool for the next year in order to increase award numbers.

Recycled awards within units will over time skew the apportionment of the awards over time and this allows for awards to be fairly distributed.

6. For all Excellence Awards (given on Founder's Day) – increase the one time award from \$2000 to \$4000.

The award amount has been stagnant and given that these are one time awards a \$4000 award is more substantial for the faculty member.

B. Eligibility and Formatting of awards

1. Awards are NOT a replacement of raises – and they should NOT be included in the base salaries of any faculty when the University is carrying out a salary study, NOR should they be used in determining how much of an increase a faculty member should get based on the results of a salary study, for example, to address equity and/or salary compression issues. ***This is a critical issue that faculty are concerned about and needs to be addressed openly by the administration.***

Awards should not be seen as raises – they are awards. Winning an award should not penalize a faculty member when it comes to salary increases for which they would otherwise qualify.

2. Eliminate tenure-earning in the eligibility of RIA awards.

This will allow for instructors and lecturers, some of whom carry out substantial research, to be eligible for RIA.

3. Establish an additional TIP eligibility category – undergraduate or graduate degree program or major; determine the median for SCH production by degree program (graduate or undergraduate) rather than by department so that small programs are not disenfranchised if they are housed in the same department or unit as large program(s). This would not alter the current eligibility system by department or college at undergraduate or graduate level.

We appreciate that more than 80% of faculty are eligible by the current guidelines, but this additional layer could include faculty that might be excluded by the size of their degree program within a department or school.

4. Standardize and simplify all award applications to be concise and to include only salient materials that support a strong case for excellence in teaching, research or SOTL. For example, a full CV, a one-page statement of strengths in the application and an appendix of materials to support this case.

The applications are burdensome to both the applicants and the review committees. Excellence can be described in a succinct manner without losing critical information to judge the applications. This will lighten the burden on faculty of time spent assembling the application, and also on committees, who are perceived to have an incentive to relieve this burden by rejecting applications based on technicalities.

5. Make all applications electronic.

This is obvious in 2016.

6. Word count rules must have a 10% margin of error.

This will eliminate the disqualification problems that have occurred in the past.

7. Develop a similar application for Excellence awards (Founder's Day awards) so that the materials for these awards are in line with the TIP, RIA and SOTL and to minimize the time faculty spend on preparing these applications.

This will reduce the time that faculty spend on developing all applications.

8. For each award the applicant is required to include as evidence either the past five academic years, or more, since the date of hire at UCF or since the submission of the last successful application.

Faculty should be able to point to all their accomplishments in an area, with a limitation only if they are a previous awardee.

9. There should be an emphasis on the review of SOTL awards that demonstrates that the same activities, by and large, would not be used for both a TIP and a SOTL (see changes to SOTL in appendix).

Faculty who by definition work in this area (SOTL) as their creative activities should not be 'double-dipping'. Some overlap in research, teaching and service is also expected but this will clarify that SOTL and TIP are unique and different.

10. Grant funding and percent effort on grants should be documented by the applicant from the Office of Research databases, or other official sources (e.g. UCF Foundation, contracts processed through auxiliary accounts).

The funding amount and role of a faculty member is critical in assessing their contribution on a funded project. This will also align with the current dossier requirement for promotion and tenure that now requires the ORC report to be included in the dossier.

11. All applications should clearly show (and committees should consider) the FTE assignment for the applicant for any years of service included in the application.

The amount of time a faculty member has to do research, teaching and service should be taken into account by the review committee.

12. Eligibility for awards is based on faculty as defined by the Faculty Senate.

A number of groups who have been deemed as faculty by Human Resources are not recognized as faculty by the Senate, yet have been seeking this designation in part to obtain awards.

13. Detailed changes are suggested for the SOTL application (attached appendix A).

14. Applications for all awards should provide more explicit information on eligibility. For example, define 'full-time' as 1.0 FTE and define 'continuous service'. Clarity on what constitutes continuous service is a concern to this committee. For example a faculty member who had a part-time teaching commitment for a number of years and then is hired into a full time position – are they eligible? Should all years of teaching be considered for continuous service? What about sabbatical, medical leave or parental leave? Neither of these should disqualify you for in our opinion.

C. Committee Structure, Charges to Committees, and Conflict of Interest

1. The faculty should elect committees from a pool of faculty that are not currently eligible for the award and should include past winners.

Eligible faculty should play no role whatsoever in the process, including Chairs or Directors that can submit applications.

2. Develop and implement a committee-charging document that will be used for all awards. The document will remind committees that only the application is to be discussed and that the award is based on merit. No additional outside information or discussion of position (e.g., instructor vs. tenure-track faculty member, past awards, current salary, etc.) are to be considered during review.

Committee members have discussed that some past occurrences that invoked issues outside of the application have occurred. This will remind each committee each year about the importance of remaining focused on the applications and their merit.

3. Develop a conflict of interest statement as a reminder to faculty who are eligible for and applying for TIP that they are not to be part of the process of committee development or in a decision-making capacity in the award system.

Chairs and Directors are eligible for awards (and should remain so). However some faculty disagree with this eligibility. Distance between the process and the Chair/Director should be clear to all faculty in each case. The reason for disagreement on the eligibility of Chairs/Directors is that they make decisions that affect faculty eligibility (e.g. teaching assignments in large courses) and they could be competing with those faculty for the same awards.

APPENDIX A – SOTL CHANGES
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FACULTY SENATE STEERING AD HOC COMMITTEE
ON AWARDS – MARCH 2016

I. Program Overview

The Office of Academic Affairs provides the funding for these awards. For the academic year 2014–2015, UCF will sponsor 10 awards for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). In any given academic year, if any former recipients of SoTL awards leave their employment at UCF, the award(s) will be “recycled” as additional SoTL awards for the following academic year.

For the purpose of this award, SoTL is defined as follows: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) uses discovery, reflection, and evidence-based methods to research effective teaching and student learning in higher education. These findings are peer reviewed and publicly disseminated in an ongoing cycle of systematic inquiry into teaching practices. This work benefits students and colleagues and is a source of personal renewal (UCF FCTL).

While the implementation of SoTL outcomes in individual classrooms and through curriculum development can result in teaching excellence and increased teaching effectiveness, this award recognizes not teaching excellence but scholarly efforts. Application materials should not include matter related to teaching unless it is part of a peer-reviewed publication, presentation, grant, or other peer-reviewed innovation (e.g., published software).

II. Funding

Regardless of their contract length (9 months or 12 months), awardees will receive a \$5,000 base salary increase retroactive to August 8, 2014, the start of the 2014–2015 contract.

III. Eligibility Criteria

For the purposes of this award, faculty members are defined as professor, associate professor, assistant professor (including faculty members with clinical or research appointments), university librarian, associate university librarian, assistant university librarian, senior lecturer, associate lecturer, lecturer, senior instructor, associate instructor, instructor. Faculty members are considered “eligible” for the SoTL award if all the following criteria are met:

1. The employee must be on a full-time 9- or 12-month appointment.
2. The employee must have at least four years of continuous full-time service at UCF. Specifically, she or he must have been employed at UCF on or prior to August 8, 2010.
3. No faculty member may receive the award more than once every five years. Previous award recipients who received a SoTL increase that became effective August 8, 2010, or later are not

eligible for a SoTL award this year. Employees who received the award in 2009–2010 or earlier are eligible to apply for the 2014–2015 award.

IV. Award Criteria

The criteria for evaluating applicants' portfolios include recognition of the value or impact of the applicant's SoTL efforts both within their core discipline and for the teaching and learning community as a whole in every case. Examples include:

1. Publication of papers that describe SoTL research or implementation of teaching approaches based on SoTL.
2. Grant and contract support for SoTL activities. The emphasis in this area should be on disseminated research rather than on program development and implementation.
3. Presentations of SoTL research results at academic or professional conferences and other forums within and outside UCF.
4. Dissemination of SoTL research through innovations such as patents and software program publication and distribution.
5. Peer recognition of SoTL research and creative efforts by way of awards and other honors. (This does not include teaching awards.)
6. Service as an editor or a peer reviewer for a SoTL journal or a journal where SoTL papers are regularly published.

V. Application Materials and Required Sections submitted digitally (numbers 1–7) and in a 1-inch Portfolio (number 8). [Or preferably all materials could be submitted digitally.]

If a nominee received the SoTL award at UCF in the past, accomplishments since the last award should be clearly identified. Items in progress (e.g., grant proposals, publications, or presentations still in review) should also be clearly indicated.

1. Title page.
2. Table of contents.
3. Nomination letter from the dean, director, chair, or a colleague written specifically in reference to this award. Self-nominations are also accepted. The letter should stress the nominee's achievements in dissemination of knowledge relating to SoTL and should not focus on teaching performance.

4. Applicant's definition of SoTL and description of SoTL research methodology/ies. This document should not be a teaching philosophy. (250 words maximum, 12-point font). Word count must be included.

5. List of the nominee's SoTL accomplishments during the award period (100 words maximum, 12-point font). Word count must be included. This list should include a short overview of the number of publications, grants, presentations, awards and honors, patents, software publications, and editorial efforts.

6. Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae (no more than 5 pages, 12-point font) focusing on the nominee's SoTL accomplishments, including publications, grants, presentations, awards, patents, software development and distribution, and editorial efforts. Each entry should be clearly identified as peer reviewed, editor reviewed, invited, etc. Optional information could include acceptance rates, citations, circulation rates, and audience details. Applicants are encouraged to include annotations that describe each included entry in such a way that readers can easily determine whether and how it meets the UCF definition of SoTL.

7. Narrative describing the impact of the applicant's SoTL research. This document should address the ways in which and the extent to which the applicant's SoTL research and creative activities have impacted teaching and learning outcomes at UCF and beyond (500 words maximum, 12-point font). Word count must be included.

8. Supporting Material: Evidence of SoTL accomplishments, including copies of book covers with tables of contents, book chapters, SoTL articles or other publications, executive summaries of grants and grant reports, documentation of awards related to SoTL, editorial board and review appointments, as well as other appropriate materials that provide evidence of SoTL accomplishments.

VI. Evaluation and Award Process

The award winners will be determined by a university-level committee consisting of one faculty member as defined in Section III elected for a two-year term from each of the colleges, one member from IT&R, and the executive director of the FCTL. The elected faculty members should have demonstrated SoTL-related accomplishments and should preferably be previous SOTL winners. All committee members shall be voting members for the purposes of these awards. Faculty candidates for the award are not eligible to serve on this committee. The executive director of the FCTL will convene the first meeting of the committee, at which the committee chair shall be elected. Each award winner will be invited to submit a SoTL-focused article for publication in the FCTL's Faculty Focus.

**Resolution 2015–2016-5 Recognition of the 2016 Quality Enhancement Plan:
*What’s Next: Integrative Learning for Professional and Civic Preparation***

Whereas, the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is an integral part of UCF’s decennial reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of College and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC); and

Whereas, the aim of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is to improve undergraduate education; and

Whereas, the University of Central Florida is committed to providing the best undergraduate education in Florida, as evidenced by the first of President Hitt’s five visionary goals; and

Whereas, planning, development, and implementation of the QEP topic—*integrative learning for professional and civic preparation*—is a joint process involving faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni and stakeholders across the UCF community; and

Whereas, recent surveys and listening groups conducted with UCF students, faculty, staff, alumni, and employers demonstrate that cross-cutting skills such as communication, problem-solving, and the ability to work in teams are valuable and useful for our undergraduates, both while they are at UCF and beyond the university; and

Whereas, integrative learning—defined as the process of developing skills and knowledge across multiple experiences and the ability to adapt these to new contexts—has been shown to help students prepare for “real-world” challenges post-graduation; and

Whereas, the vision of the 2016 QEP is that *UCF undergraduates will graduate with integrative learning experiences that foster important cross-cutting, transferrable knowledge and skills; that our students will graduate with the ability to persuasively articulate and demonstrate their skills; and that they will develop the capacity to transfer their skills and intentional learning strategies to new contexts. Consequently, graduates will be able to successfully enter and participate in the next steps of their professional and civic lives; therefore*

Be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Central Florida endorses UCF’s 2016 QEP initiative, *What’s Next: Integrative Learning for Professional and Civic Preparation*, and offers our support for its continued development and implementation.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee March 17, 2016.

1 **Resolution 2015-2016-6 Faculty Involvement in Evaluating and Improving the Services,**
2 **Training, and Resources Offered by the Office of Research and Commercialization**

3 **Whereas**, the Federal grant rules are complex and can vary from agency to agency and grant to
4 grant within an agency; and

5 **Whereas**, the training and tools for managing multiple grants are inadequate; and

6 **Whereas**, faculty principal investigators are responsible for research management and are the
7 principal consumers of services offered by the Office of Research and Commercialization (ORC);
8 and

9 **Whereas**, faculty have valuable insights to offer regarding what new research management
10 tools, training, and information resources would be most effective in ensuring a higher level of
11 compliance with federal grant rules; therefore

12 **Be it Resolved** that the Faculty Senate requests that faculty, selected through their Senate
13 representatives be involved in the ongoing re-evaluation of services provided by and training
14 offered by ORC.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee March 17, 2016.