

Faculty Senate Executive Steering Committee

MINUTES

May 2, 2002

Dr. Michael Mullens, Chair, called the Faculty Senate Executive Steering Committee to order at 4:05 p.m. Minutes of the April 11, 2002 meeting were unanimously approved.

Members present: Drs. Arlen Chase, Diane Wink, Keith Koons, Martha Marinara, Consuelo Stebbins, Cynthia Young, Naval Modani, Jeffrey Kaplan, and Provost Gary Whitehouse.

Members absent: Drs. Ida Cook, Janice Peterson, Ahmad Elshennawy, and Alain Kassab.

Guest: Dr. John Schell

Dr. Mullens welcomed all new and returning members of the Steering Committee and asked that they introduce themselves.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Provost Gary Whitehouse

- Reported on budget negotiations and it appears they are close to resolution. Did receive the expected 4.6 million from excess revenue.
- Expressed appreciation for the letter written by Drs. Mike Mullens and Arlen Chase relative to budget management on campus.
- Reported the five-year reviews for Drs. Thomas Keon and Sandra Robinson have been completed successfully. Each has agreed to continue at UCF for another five years.
- Discussed current issues regarding the Arboretum, particularly the area near the greenhouse where there is a botanical collection. There are no current plans to build in that area or for a proposed parking lot as previously stated. At present there is a proposal to have it expanded. The issue will be addressed at the BOT meeting next month. Expect there will be a study with a compromise. Some concerns have been expressed about the nature of the plants and the possibility of overgrowth of non-native plants in the natural area. The Arboretum issue will be discussed in further detail this fall.

Dr. John Schell

- Announced that the FCTL Summer Institute Workshop was very successful as were other institutes the past week.
- Commented that he receives many questions regarding policies and procedures, many of which refer to Senate resolutions. Draft indexes of resolutions were distributed. Will work with Kathy to display resolutions in alphabetical order on the Senate Website.
- Academic Affairs is in process of developing a procedures manual which will have a link to the Senate website.

Dr. Michael Mullens

- Stated there will be a random State audit for travel at UCF soon.
- Thanked the Provost for his response to the letter sent by Drs. Mullens and Chase regarding salary. A senior faculty member with concerns about the relationship between Senate and Administration will speak to the Executive Steering Committee in the fall.
- The Senate has been invited to take part in a committee regarding free speech rights on campus, particularly where demonstrations are held, the green outside the Math and Physics building. It was suggested that a more appropriate location would be in front of the Student Union. A request by President Hitt that two members of the

Steering Committee be nominated and forwarded to Dr. Beth Barnes for selection to this committee. Nominees: Drs. Cynthia Young and Arlen Chase.

- A book with details about specials being considered this year will be left in the Faculty Senate Office for review and input. There will be a summary sheet distributed to the committee tomorrow. Selection will begin May 10, 2002 for first round of discussion.
- Dr. Kieth Koons worked with Dr. Cunningham to develop a Special on behalf of the Senate: Undergraduate teaching equipment across the university. Deans would be able to accept requests for purchase and repair of equipment needed, but cannot cover by their department budgets. Would need to focus on undergraduate teaching. Amount requested is \$500,000.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

The Steering Committee liaisons for the four Standing Committees were unanimously elected.

Graduate Council	Dr. Alain Kassab
Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum	Dr. Jeffrey Kaplan
Budget and Administrative Procedures	Dr. Arlen Chase
Personnel	Dr. Cynthia Young

The liaisons are non-voting members and cannot chair the committees. Their role is to attend the committee meetings and return to the Steering Committee with a report. The immediate role of the liaison is to coordinate with the Committee on Committees so a viable chair for each Committee is identified.

OTHER

Dr. Arlen Chase distributed a salary resolution from the Budget and Administration Committee. It is a philosophy that would have the possibility of fixing compression in ways that have not been done before. This resolution is to be forwarded to the 2002-2003 Personnel Committee for their consideration.

Provost Whitehouse stated that he has been reviewing three resolutions from the Faculty Senate. Discussed questions on one resolution regarding errors in the faculty evaluation process. The resolution has an appendix attached from the Personnel Committee. The current procedure needs to be formalized. An error is rare and the solution in this resolution may actually cause other problems. Dr. Whitehouse will continue to review the resolution and get back to the Senate.

Dr. Mullens asked about use of Turnitin software, especially with the known level of plagiarism on campus. Dr. Marinara discussed issues on plagiarism and what actions may be taken. She stated that it is covered in both the Faculty Handbook and Student Handbook. A statement in syllabus is needed. Can also refer to honor court. The issue is also covered in student orientation. Suggested we develop a standard honor code statement for students to sign. There is also a program run by the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (FCTL). Dr. Cook suggested FCTL work on the issue.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

No meetings in June or July

RESOLUTION 2001-2002-2 Distinguished Professorship Awards

Whereas, senior professors significantly contribute to the University and the College goals and objectives, and

Whereas, senior professors are often role models for other faculty; and,

Whereas, senior professors are evaluated in the areas of research, teaching and service; and

Whereas, senior professors should be recognized by the University for their outstanding performance,

Be It Resolved that the following annual awards be established for faculty at the rank of Professor: Distinguished Professor of Research, Distinguished Professor of Teaching and Distinguished Professor of Service.

Approved by Faculty Senate on October 25, 2001

Forwarded to Provost Whitehouse on October 26, 2001.

Resolution 2001-2002-7 Computer Generated Evaluation Scoring Errors

Whereas, all faculty utilize computer generated evaluations to assess annual teaching contributions,

Whereas, these evaluations are often used as supporting information to support faculty efforts toward promotion, tenure and numerous award criteria; and,

Whereas, there is no formal policy for either addressing or recognizing computer generated errors when and if such errors should occur;

Be It Resolved that a policy to address this problem with computer generated student evaluations be created allowing faculty recourse creating a formal procedure available to faculty to address or grieve this situation. See Appendix A for a sample of such a procedure.

Approved by the Steering Committee on February 7, 2002

Approved by the Senate on February 21, 2002.

Forwarded to Provost Whitehouse on March 5, 2002

Reply by Provost on May 2, 2002 that resolution is under discussion.

**Appendix A:
Modified Suggested Procedure to handle Problems With Computer Generated
Student Evaluations**

Rationale:

The results of student-generated evaluations of faculty are very important aspects supporting the evaluation of teaching content and effectiveness. These evaluations are often used to support faculty efforts toward promotion, tenure and numerous award criteria. Previously, when problems with computer generated student evaluations were noted there was no formal procedure available to faculty to address or grieve this situation. This did not allow faculty a clear path for re-course. To address this problem, the following policy is suggested.

Proposed Policy:

When a faculty member reviews his/her own student evaluations and believes that an error has occurred in the way the evaluations were administered and/or score, the following steps need to be followed:

- A) The faculty member needs to identify and write a letter that outlines the suspected problem. The letter needs to clearly state the problem, and what is being requested to address the situation (e.g., requesting for the data to be rerun, for procedure to be reviewed).
- B) Included with this letter must be all of the original computer coded evaluations.
- C) The letter and supporting information need to be sent to the Chair in his/her department or school. The Chair will either address the situation directly or send the request to the Dean of the college. The Dean of the college may either address the request directly or appoint a representative.
- D) The Dean of the college or designee will review the request and all supporting materials. A meeting with the faculty member should be held to discuss the issue. If the problem can be resolved at this level the process may stop here.
- E) If it cannot be resolved at the college level, the information should be sent forth to the Provost's office (or the Provost's designee) for attention.
- F) The faculty member should be kept apprised of the appeals process and be available to provide further information if needed.
- G) The Provost or his/her designee will decide whether the evaluations will be sent forth and re-run or whether a meeting with the faculty member will be needed to further discuss or resolve the request.
- H) The faculty member will be made aware in writing of the outcome of the request.