

DRAFT—R. F.—2/8/19

Faculty Senate Personnel Committee

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 6, 2019

11:30 am – 12:30 pm

Location: Millican Hall Room 395-E

Members present: Stephen King (chair), Scott Carter, Mason Cash, Yoon Choi, Robert Folger, Jonathan Knuckey, Karol Lucken, Michael Proctor, Alfons Schulte, Blake Scott, Kelly Semrad, Vladimir Solonari, Martine Vanryckeghem, John Venecek, Linda Walters, Nora Warshawsky, Kendall Cortelyou-Ward.

- 1) Meeting called to order by King at 11:30am.
- 2) King asked for minute-taker volunteer and Rob Folger agreed.
- 3) Rob Folger made motion to approve 1/9 minutes, Martine Vanryckeghem seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
- 4) King recognized guests Lucretia Cooney and Jana Jasinski from Faculty Excellence.
- 5) Committee discussed resolution recommending that all NTE Research, Clinical, and Medical Librarian faculty bypass the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Various suggested changes led to clarification of the exact wording that should be used. King also noted that he had discussed the resolution with various faculty likely to be affected.
- 6) Walters made motion to approve resolution with the agreed-upon clarifying changes, Folger seconded, and motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
- 7) Committee discussed COACHE results based on report by Jasinski, who noted that responses from Associate Professors represented an area of some concern.

Issues discussed included various matters regarding promotion to Full Professor, such as lack of clarity of the criteria, role of department chairs in attending to the process, ambiguous nature of relevant time-period (“nebulous”), and possible inconsistency in implementation of the process. Committee members suggested that it might be time for self-reflection about the way the University has evolved with respect to criteria and their application. Jasinski noted having a list of 19 names for committee(s) looking into these, and King asked her to report back at the Personnel Committee’s next meeting.
- 8) Committee discussed issues related to the payment structure for University awards, addressing comments and concerns listed on a document prepared by Lucken and Carter.

With respect to TIP awards, Lucken questioned their validity because in some instances there have been “predetermined winners.” Another question was whether the differential financial impact of these awards is warranted. Also questioned was whether faculty teaching small classes should be excluded from consideration.

With respect to SOTL awards, some members expressed concern about possible narrowness of scope and applicability primarily to one particular unit. Scott, on the other hand, said he had looked at past awards and found that they had been reasonably dispersed across various schools and colleges. Walters, however, thought they had outgrown the justification that had been the basis for their original adoption.

With regard to RIA and perhaps the other awards as well, King pointed to two general questions: (a) are such awards a good idea? and (b) is their implementation flawed? The opinion was

expressed that many more people are deserving of these awards than might ever receive them, creating an unwarranted skew to salary distribution. Another question was what would happen to the available funds if they were not used for these awards (e.g., consequences observed at other state universities that have done away with them). Some members were able to report ways the awards process was handled well within a particular college.

9) King adjourned meeting at 12:33pm.

Assigned Topics for 2018-2019 Faculty Senate

Steering #	Committee Assignment	Topic	Description	Referred By	Status
1	Personnel	Faculty Excluded from Awards.	Faculty with minor administrative roles (out-of-unit) are now excluded from awards based on the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The impact on the faculty evaluation based on the inability to apply and be selected for an award. <i>Response: Pegasus Award now includes out-of-unit.</i>	Steering 4-5-18	Committee monitoring
2	Personnel	Payment Structure for Awards.	Excellence and Pegasus Professor awards should be more prestigious than individual accomplishment awards such as TIP, RIA, and SoTL and the financial benefit should be more than a one-time payment.	Steering 4-5-18	Continuing issues regarding TIP, RIA, SoTL, etc
12	Personnel	Faculty Salary Compression Study	Update to study for all faculty.	Self 8-8-18	Not addressed
14	Personnel	Faculty Retention	Colleges are struggling with faculty retention.	Dean meetings 8-8-18	Faculty Excellence is examining via COACHE response TF
2016-2017-34	Personnel	No regular process of evaluation for endowed chairs; should a process be instituted, and what should it be? <i>(Regulation 3.010, CBA Article 10)</i>	Need to review the process.	Dean Sole CON 7-19-16	Suggestions for review provided to Faculty Excellence
2016-2017-35	Personnel	Committee chairs, reward and accountability for service (including service during the summer).	Modest number of faculty that do a very high amount of service (30-40%). They get credit for 10 – 15% assignment of service. Anything over that amount doesn't count. Give appropriate benefit or payment.	Harrington 8-11-16	Referred back to Steering 10-11
2017-2018-38	Personnel	Telecommuting Policy http://hr.ucf.edu/files/telecommuting_man.pdf https://hr.ucf.edu/files/telecomm_forms.pdf	Work-Life Balance Faculty Excellence Advisory Group requests a transparent and fair policy, especially for the non-teaching/research faculty (CDL, library, etc.) <i>Response: Policy is good; policy not communicated.</i>	Walters – Steering 1-11-18	CLOSED
2017-2018-16	Personnel	Spousal Conflict of Interest Resolution; Resolution 2016-2017-13	Keep informed of progress the UCF Research Conflict of Interest committee is making on issue. Policy didn't resolve specific issues.	Personnel Committee	Waiting for UCF research Col committee
2017-2018-37	Personnel	Joint Appointments with COM <i>(https://provost.ucf.edu/files/Joint_SecondaryJoint-Instructions-Form-07.29.16.pdf)</i>	Difficulty in arranging joint appointments between CREOL and COM because COM faculty are out-of-unit. This will be an issue with the Academic Health Science Center.	Dean Saleh 2016	CLOSED % determines in or out of unit

Points to consider for next salary study:

The last salary equity Study was based on 2016 to 2017 data. The Study indicates reviews every 3 to 5 years, inferring 2019-2020 data may be used in the next review. To insure that the model and the process used are providing the most accurate inferences before the model's next use, we need to study objectively the outcomes of the past use as well as review the model methods. Please add to the long list of agenda items, the following questions with respect to Faculty Salary Equity model and its recent use as reported in the October 2017 Study.

1. Why aren't the authors of the Study listed on the report itself? Why isn't a lead author identified so that post study questions that emerge may be addressed and feedback incorporated into future applications of the Faculty Salary Equity model? Listing just the organizations of the authors is highly unusual. Working groups are well known to be flawed by "group think" particularly when the working group is composed of self-selected members.
2. The Study admits its own inadequacies when it states, "This research does not analyze salary changes over time and does not intend to provide an exhaustive list of factors that contribute to salary differences." Further the analysis techniques used are NOT causal but inferential. Hence administrative review is key to any valid application of the model in order to adjust faculty salary. Unfortunately, the BCLP investigation revealed that at UCF, at least some higher level administrators were not challenging or questioning perceived more influential leaders. Were administrative reviews ever done? If so, were any of the 107 faculty members referred by the model for salary adjustment rebutted by Deans or unit leaders most likely to conduct the review? If so, how many were rebutted? What was the range and median size of the salary adjustments for the 20 faculty member category and separately for the 87 faculty member category identified in the Nov 16 2017 minutes?
3. The Study inferences are based on "a multivariate regression model". However the Study makes no mention of adjustments to the reported p value thresholds to correct for multiple comparisons such as the Bonferroni, Scheffe, Sidak-Holm's or other correction comparisons methods. Did the Study correct reported p values for multiple comparisons? And if so, how and why wasn't the adjustment methods stated in the Study?
4. The Study uses prediction intervals to identify faculty members for further investigation. An extra term in the standard error of the prediction interval, "makes them wider". This appears to be quite arbitrary and without citation of the technique. What sources are the basis of this technique? In terms of degree of impact, what was the difference in size of the identified "outside" populations between the prediction interval and the confidence interval techniques?

Travel Policy Guidelines for Faculty

Whereas faculty travel on official business requires strict following of University policy and involves considerable paperwork and approvals at various levels, and

Whereas the UCF Travel Manual is intended for use by faculty who travel on official University business, by members of the faculty's unit that approve and oversee over see travel, and by members of the UCF Finance and Accounting Department that oversee travel procedures across the University, and

Whereas the UCF Travel Manual does not provide sufficient clarity for many situations that arise or may arise specifically for faculty as they perform their duties while traveling on official business, and

Whereas the application of UCF travel policy differs significantly between units in areas such as the issuance of University Purchasing cards (P-cards) to traveling faculty, booking air fare tickets and hotel rooms in advance of travel with UCF-approved funds, advance payment of 80 per cent of estimated lodging and meals expenses for faculty traveling for more than five days, and the level of flexibility allowed for the initially planned budget, and

Whereas such lack of clarity and inconsistencies in travel policy application creates unnecessary burdens and difficulty for the travel faculty, therefore

Be it resolved that the UCF Finance and Accounting Department conduct a study as to the uniformity and consistency with which UCF travel policy is implemented throughout university units, and

Be it further resolved that the Finance and Accounting Department will elaborated a set of Guidelines for faculty traveling on UCF business, that will clearly explain to the faculty what procedures, information and documentation they must supply while requesting approval of their travel and what reimbursements and under what conditions faculty are entitled to them when submitting a report after travel completion.