

*Faculty Senate Steering Meeting
March 8, 2007*

Dr. Manoj Chopra, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:11 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures. The minutes of February 8, 2007 unanimously approved.

Steering Officers present: Drs. Manoj Chopra, Ida Cook and Pamela Ark.

Steering Committee Members present: Drs. Alain Kassab, Aubrey Jewett, Dawn Trouard, Glenda Gunter, Henry Daniell, Kalpathy Sundaram, Keith Koons, Robert Pennington, Rufus Barfield, and Subir Bose.

Steering Members and Administrators absent: Drs. Arlen F. Chase, Provost Terry Hickey, John Schell, Paul Maiden, Christopher Muller and Jim Moharam.

Administrators present: Dr. Huff-Corzine

Guests: Dr. Patricia Bishop and Patricia MacKown

PROVOST REPORT

No Report - Provost Hickey not in attendance today.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Update on TIP - Dr. Huff-Corzine announcement

There is a new deadline for submission of TIP Portfolios necessitated by the change in faculty evaluations from an academic year to a calendar year; most of colleges use evaluations from previous years; i.e., spring 2006 evaluations are due to be given and back to faculty member no later than March 30th. All TIP Portfolios are now due April 2, 2007.

Board of Governors Update - Dr. Chopra reported

The meeting of the BOG was here at UCF; FAMU came and spoke against being undergraduate school.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution from Graduate Council on Conflict of Interest - Dr. Bishop presenting as Dr. Lieberman is in class and Dr. Moharam was unable to attend today's meeting.

Steering Committee members reviewed the proposed Resolution on Graduate Faculty Conduct and Conflict of Interest. Dr. Bishop stated that the graduate committee was not certain if this document should be considered as a resolution or as a clarification with examples from the training sessions; thus the review this date by the FS Steering Committee. Ms. Yondi Cook also gave legal expertise on the document.

- Item A deals with conflict of interest in regard to private relationships as they may intersect with professional life; there is a need for elaboration and clarification of professional behavior.
- Item B addresses unequal power in relationships; evaluative or authoritative role with a focus on graduate faculty and graduate students- example is not written anywhere at the university; the document is lengthy so as to provide examples and potential conflicts of interest - the Graduate Committee is asking for endorsement and clarification as the policy exists already in FI statutes and handbook.

FS Steering Committee members questioned why the language addressed only graduate level; the consensus was that the information was applicable to the undergraduate program. Dr. Bishop noted that graduate students were the focus of this committee and that there is a need to provide guidance for faculty right now. This could be applicable to other faculty on campus and may evolve later however graduate faculty members need this now.

*Faculty Senate Steering Meeting
March 8, 2007*

Dr. Huff Corzine stated that there is another committee working on general conflict of interest that would most likely be introduced next year to Senate.

Dr. Bishop stated that at the present time there has not been Incubator input nor from M. J. Soileau; only Ms. Yondi Cook as general counsel. Dr. Bishop does not view this resolution as a policy, there is agreement that others could benefit from these guiding examples. Motion was made seconded and unanimous approved.

Motion to endorse adherence to Conduct & Conflict of Interest:

1. Recognizing that Florida Statute Chapter 112, Part III, known as the Code of Ethics for Public Officers and Employees which mandates the Policy on Professional Conduct and Conflicts of Interest, the Faculty Senate endorses the development and promulgation of examples that elaborate guidelines interpreting the specific aspects of actual and potential Conflicts of Interest and the management of such, and encourages the appropriate University entities to disseminate such guidelines to the university community.

Steering committee also endorses the examples in Section B of the March 5, 2007 statement of the Graduate Council regarding conduct of personal relations between university employees and employers, and employees and students as an example of such promulgation. This item will be added to the agenda for Section B. for Faculty Senate meeting on March 22nd. Dr. Bishop will make suggested changes in Part B as a stand alone document and forward to Dr. Chopra.

WebCT Vista Concerns and Problems - Dr. Cook reported

There is a meeting schedule with Dr. Hartman and CDWS on March 9, 2007 to discuss the timing of the switch from WebCT to Webcourses @ UCF. Dr. Cook reported that her department is collecting comments from faculty on problems. Steering committee requests a reliable computer infrastructure and timely, valid responses.

Academic Suspensions Report (Follow-up) - Patricia MacKown (OSSR Department) reported

This item is a follow up from the fall semester when Faculty Senate had received statistics on academic misconduct and faculty action; the Steering committee requested specific data on actions. Ms. MacKown outlined the differences between academic action: reducing grade; removing from class; assigning a grade of F; and the disciplinary action: expel, suspend; she noted that either side cannot cross over; i.e., with cheating, plagiarism in classroom.

Faculty can take immediate action as academic; student can appeal through academic side; if faculty take the matter to the disciplinary side: can do as information only - the matter can be reported to office with no request for action rather only a record made. Another possible action is that the student attends the ethics seminar. There could also be pursuit of disciplinary action; that process cannot be done until the academic side is completed.

Last fall, 48 reports went through and confirmed; then those 48 resulted in the actions that are followed; some student opt not to go any further on academic side.

If faculty lowered a grade, and the office was not informed then those numbers are not known to include in the department statistics.

Faculty can only elect to put student through discipline, then the panel makes the decision on warning, suspension, and then expulsion. The only time there is a notation on the transcript record is if student is expelled. There is a separate notation in another file in the office.

Last semester faculty completed the survey on academic integrity while this semester students are completing the survey on academic integrity.

The Ethics Committee is compiling the results of the survey: developed plagiarism statement; in a form that goes in to the syllabus. Faculty sit in on every case - 40 faculty - they make the recommendations on the sanctions; there is no anonymous reported. Ms. MacKown's office works with faculty on whether or not to proceed with a situation. Dr. Chopra extends thanks to Ms. MacKown for the information.

*Faculty Senate Steering Meeting
March 8, 2007*

Intellectual Property of Online Classes - Dr. Gunter reported

The major question is "who do courses belong to?" Joel Hartman has stated previously that the courses belong to both the faculty and the university. If faculty left the university, UCF could continue to teach the course however faculty can take the content. There is content in the CDWS manual regarding copyright in relationship to creation of a course as contractual/work for hire; the university has the copyright however there could be a discussion of sharing or faculty maintaining copyright. This comment is inconsistent with previous information and needs further review. This item will be placed on the docket for Personnel Committee next academic year. Will need a legal opinion.

Differential Tuition for Graduate Programs - Dr. Jewett reported

There are Graduate Program departments in need of more money due to high costs of the majors. Richard Harrison sent examples: art, nursing and physical therapy. In these majors, the tuition is not enough to cover costs and there are no mechanisms available for keeping up to date with the needs and currently there is limit by the BOT. Dr. Bishop is working on a study for the Provost on income and expenditures.

Update on Senate Website - Dr. Chopra reported

Dr. Chopra presented a draft of new website. Ms. Latrecia Rice is assisting in this project.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Budget and Administrative Committee - Dr. Trouard reported
Bookstore is still under construction.
- Graduate Council Committee - Dr. Jewett reported
See previous item on Graduate Council; Patent discussion from graduate council should be ready to come forward soon; could bring next session, but most likely not until next academic year.
- Personnel Committee - Dr. Barfield reported
The committee met and revised a drafted report on the recommendations for Promotion and Tenure. Will need to review.
- UPCC - Dr. Pennington reported
No report.

OTHER

RIA update - Dr. Cook reported

The subcommittee continues to work on RIA and will work closely with the union on this item. Dr. Huff Corzine working on a model to dispense the awards equitably by college. Dr. Cook ask the committee members to please review the draft and send comments to Dr.Cook.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion made seconded and approved. The meeting adjourned at 6:35 pm.

Summer 2006-Fall 2006 Academic Terms

TOTAL: 48 Academic Dishonesty/Cheating

SANCTIONS: 3 Disciplinary Probation
5 Disciplinary Suspension
1 Disciplinary Expulsion
20 Ethics Only (Professor Initiated)
8 Info Only (Professor Initiated)
10 Intake (Pending)
1 Not In Violation

2005-2006 Academic Year:

TOTAL: 64 Academic Dishonesty/Cheating

SANCTIONS: 16 Disciplinary Probation
22 Disciplinary Suspension (1 semester to 2 years)
16 Ethics Only (Professor Initiated)
10 Info Only (Professor Initiated)

2004-2005 Academic Year:

TOTAL: 104 Academic Dishonesty/Cheating

SANCTIONS: 1 Disciplinary Warning
23 Disciplinary Probation
18 Disciplinary Suspension (1 semester to 2 years)
26 Ethics Only (Professor Initiated)
36 Info Only (Professor Initiated)

2003-2004 Academic Year:

TOTAL: 36 Academic Dishonesty/Cheating

SANCTIONS: 12 Disciplinary Probation
13 Disciplinary Suspension (1 semester to 2 years)
9 Ethics Only (Professor Initiated)
1 Info Only (Professor Initiated)

BELOW PLEASE FIND A REVISED DRAFT of the document discussed at our last meeting.

The Senate Personnel Committee reviewed issues and suggestions submitted by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. After reviewing and discussing those items, the Personnel Committee has reached the following conclusions.

1. A number of the items do not seem to call for action by the Senate. Rather, they are details that can be addressed by Dr. Huff-Corzine, who has a copy of the material from the P&T committee.
2. The following items might be addressed by the Steering Committee or be brought to the full Senate for discussion.

a. Should there be a University-wide policy regarding outside reference letters? Are letters from dissertation advisors appropriate? P&T members also noted that some other categories constituted “problem reference letters” (in categories not listed within the P&T document). Should there be campus-wide guidance regarding categories of letters deemed inadvisable for inclusion?

Committee Recommendation—

A University-wide policy should indicate that at least **four** outside reference letters should be obtained, with no more than 50% of these coming from a list submitted by the applicant. Moreover, outside referees should not include the applicant’s dissertation advisor or person’s who have been the applicant’s co-authors during the immediately preceding four years.

b. The P&T Committee also expressed concern about split votes when nothing in the file provided any grounds for interpreting possible causes. The Personnel Committee could reach no conclusion about what might/should be done to address this issue.

Committee Recommendation—

None; the Personnel Committee could reach no conclusion about what might/should be done to address this issue.

c. Providing only the categories of “+” and “-” to characterize outside letters seemed insufficient for P&T Committee members, who wanted discretion to conclude that these letters were “mixed” in some cases.

Committee Recommendation—

The P&T Committee should not have to designate the set of letters as a whole with a single + or -; rather discretion should allow for clarifying commentary (e.g., “The letters were mixed, with most positive but two very negative”).

d. P&T members expressed a concern about cases in which “only student evaluations” were included as “proof of student learning.”

Committee Recommendation—

The Personnel Committee concluded that such matters should be addressed in a broader context than teaching alone. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the faculty within each unit of a college prepare a document that sets forth guidelines by which research, service, and evidence of student learning should be evaluated as part of the tenure/promotion process. Moreover, that document should always be included in the material transmitted for evaluation during the tenure/promotion process. Those guidelines would be consistent with the recent directive from the Provost’s Office requiring that each unit within a college provide evaluative guidelines for the annual evaluation assessment.

e. P&T members thought that the service and the scholarship categories reflected considerable variation across campus. Variability in the scholarship section of packets included such matters as the grounds for inclusion within that category (e.g., statements that a faculty member was the subject of a “press piece”). The P&T Committee also felt uncomfortable about how to evaluate the category of service, given “wild discrepancies...across campus”—“Some units clearly expect no UCF service at all. Some expect no service beyond the department—and this minimal. Other units are allowing excessive service.”

Committee Recommendation—

As is the case with teaching (see “d” above), the Committee recommends that the faculty within each unit of a college prepare a document that sets forth the relevant guidelines of the unit—and again, that document should always be included in the material transmitted for evaluation during the tenure/promotion process.



Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine

S
S

istant Vice-President,
Faculty Relation

Division of Academic Affairs

Millican Hall, Ste 351

Phone: 407-882-0077

Fax: 407-823-5407

E-mail: lcorzine@mail.ucf.edu

DRAFT-6

Research Incentive Awards (UCF-RIA) Program 2006-07 Procedures

(Approved by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on date)

I. Program Overview

The RIA award recognizes faculty with outstanding research or creative records that advances the body of knowledge in their disciplines. This program was designed to encourage and reward faculty who can demonstrate exemplary disciplinary specific scholarship. Nominations for the awards may be made by faculty, students, staff, alumni or by self-nomination.

The Office of Academic Affairs provides the funding for these awards and for academic year 2006-2007 will sponsor up to 20 new RIA awards. Two of these awards are set aside for nominations from units*, defined in this document as institutes and centers, and an additional two are set aside for at-large award candidates. The remaining sixteen are allocated to each of the colleges and the library in proportion to their eligible faculty (see section III). There shall be a minimum of one RIA award available per college and the library. In addition, in any given academic year, if any former recipients of RIA awards leave their employment at UCF, the award(s) will become available for "recycling" as additional RIA awards for the following academic year revert to the College and the library. Regardless of contract length (9-months or 12-months), award recipients receive a \$5,000 increase to their base salary retroactive to August 8², 2006, the start of the 2006-2007 academic year contract.

This award is authorized in the UCF BOT/UFF 2004-2007 Collective Bargaining Agreement. (Need footnote needed to indicate the proportionate allocation of awards?)

The numbers of new and "recycled" RIA awards will be communicated to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee as soon as this information becomes available.

II. Application Deadline

Nominees who are candidates for a UCF-RIA award must submit their RIA Applications to their dean's or VP's office by the date specified in each year's UCF-RIA schedule.

III. Eligibility Criteria

1. To be considered eligible for the UCF-RIA award, the faculty member must be:
 - a. On a full-time 9 or 12 month tenured or tenure-earning track appointment with the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor, or a non-tenured librarian at the rank of university librarian, associate librarian or assistant librarian.
 - b. The faculty member must have at least four years of continuous service at UCF. Specifically, a faculty member must be employed at UCF on or prior to August 8?, 200x.
2. The following types of faculty are not eligible for these awards:
 - a. Faculty who are on a full-time appointment as an instructor or a lecturer
 - b. Faculty who are under a multi-year non-tenure-track appointment
 - c. Faculty on visiting (or similar temporary) appointments
 - d. Faculty on less than full-time appointments
3. No faculty member may receive the award more than **once every five years**. Specifically, any faculty member who received a UCF-RIA (or PEP, a predecessor to the UCF-RIA program) increase that became effective August 8?, 2002 or later is not eligible for this year's UCF-RIA. Further, any faculty member who received a UCF-RIA (or PEP) increase that was effective August 8, 2001, or earlier is eligible for this year's UCF-RIA.
4. A faculty member who is not a member of a college or unit may apply for the at-large UCF-RIA award.

IV. Award Criteria

The criteria for evaluating applications for a UCF-RIA award in order of importance, are:

1. Publication and presentation of research and creative efforts
2. External grant and contract support for the research and creative efforts appropriate to the candidate's discipline
3. Value or impact of research and creative efforts both within the discipline and to society
4. Recognition of research and creative efforts by the individual's peers in the same or related disciplines
5. The above criteria will be considered in terms of the fraction of time assigned (FTE) for research for the applicants
6. All award selection committees will have a data base provided by the Office of Research and Commercialization for review of applicant's grants/awards information.

V. Application Materials and Required Sections of the Application/Portfolio

A standard portfolio is not required to apply for the UCF-RIA award. Instead, the accompanying application form [Please provide copy of application form.] must be used for all nominations. Documentation and materials supporting the nominee's research or creative accomplishments, as indicated on the form, must accompany each application.

VI. Selection Committee Membership

- a. Selection Committees:
 1. All selection committees shall be comprised of tenured and tenure-earning faculty
 2. Tenured and tenure-earning faculty will be elected by tenured and tenured-earning faculty in the college. The committee shall have no less than three members.
 - a. The faculty pool from which selection committee members are to be chosen are those former recipients of the award who are not eligible for the award
 - b. Any faculty member who is not a candidate for the award is eligible to be elected to the selection committee.
- b. Composition of Committees
 1. College Committees
 - a. Tenured and tenure-earning faculty members are eligible to serve on their College RIA selection committees
 - b. Members of the college RIA selection committee will be elected by tenured and tenure-earning faculty in the college. The committee shall have no less than three members
 - c. Any faculty member from the college who is a former recipient of the RIA award and not a candidate for the award is eligible to be elected to the college RIA selection committee

d. Any faculty member who is not a candidate for their college award is eligible to be elected to the college RIA selection committee

2. Library Committee

a. Full time librarians at the rank of university librarian are eligible to serve on the librarian RIA award selection committee

b. Members of the librarian RIA award selection committee will be full-time librarians at the rank of university librarian. The committee should consist of no less than three members.

c. Any faculty member from the library who is a former recipient of the RIA award and not a candidate for the award is eligible to be elected to the library RIA selection committee

d. Any full-time librarian at the rank of university librarian who is not a candidate for the library RIA award is eligible to be elected to the library RIA selection committee

3. At-Large RIA Awards Committee (to review files from faculty in institutes, centers, or not a member of a college, runners-up from each college and unit, and any faculty or unit who desires to apply for a RIA).

a. The Chair of the Research Council will convene the At-Large RIA award selection committee.

b. Tenured and tenure-earning faculty in institutes, centers, library and colleges are eligible to serve on the At-Large RIA award selection committee

c. Members of the At-Large RIA Awards selection committee will be elected by tenured and tenure-earning faculty on the Research Council

d. Any tenured and tenure-earning faculty member who is a former recipient of the RIA award and not a candidate for the award is eligible to be elected to the At-Large RIA award selection committee. The committee should consist of no less than three members.

e. Any tenured or tenure-earning faculty member from a college, unit or institute who is not a candidate for the RIA award is eligible to be elected to the At-Large RIA awards selection committee.

c. Evaluation and Review Process

i. The college and library selection committees will review files based upon criteria in Section IV, Award Criteria and will:

1. Forward the names of recommended faculty to the Provost and Vice President for Research.

2. Forward the names of one runner-up to the At-Large RIA Awards Review Committee for review.
- ii. Review for At-Large RIA Awards
 1. The At-Large Awards Review Committee will review files to the committee that are submitted from institutes, units and runners-up whose names have been forwarded by the colleges or library review committees.

_____The President, on recommendation from the Provost and Vice President for Research, will give the final approval for award recipients. After the approval by the President, each college, institute, and center will notify all nominees of the results, including an explanation of the unit's reasons for its recommendations.

VII. Schedule

UCF-RIA 2006-07 Schedule

February 28, 200 <u>x</u>	Distribute Guidelines to All Faculty - Distribution F and Campus e-mail
March 4, 200 <u>x</u>	Colleges and units to have elected UCF-RIA College or Unit Review Committee
March 21, 200 <u>x</u>	UCF-RIA Portfolios due in Dean's or VP's Office
April 4, 200 <u>x</u>	College Review Committees' recommendations due to Academic Affairs
April 18, 200 <u>x</u>	University Review Committee's recommendations due to Academic Affairs
April 28, 200 <u>x</u>	Office of Academic Affairs to notify award winners. Colleges to notify all applicants of the outcome

*For purposes of this document an institute or center is defined as a unit at the university with individuals in faculty lines who do not hold appointments in a College at the university.