

## **Budget & Administrative Committee**

### **A G E N D A**

Meeting Date:       **November 1, 2017**

Meeting Time:       2:30 – 3:30 PM

Meeting Location:   The College of Sciences, dean's conference room 221

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Approval of Minutes of October 4, 2017**
- 4. Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
- 5. Old Business**
  - Need for teaching assistants and support staff issue
  - Insufficient funding for faculty travel program.
- 6. New Business**
  - None
- 7. Adjournment**

**UCF Faculty Senate**  
**Budget and Administrative Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes for October 4, 2017**  
**Research Pavilion, Suite 300**

**Attendees:** Kimi Sugaya; Glenda Gunter, Anthony Kong; Romain Gaume; Tim Bottorff; Dmitry Kolpashchikov; Linan An; Thomas Cox; Tracy Clark; Keri Watson; Ann Miller; Nina Orlovskaya; Xin Yan; Tina Buck

**Approval of minutes** from September 6, 2017.

**Guests:** Office of Research & Commercialization, Ami Zulich

**Old Business:** Obtaining information pertinent to last month's discussion about teaching assistants and support staff is in the works.

**New Business:**

Topic: Regarding the issue of insufficient funding of faculty travel program

Ami Zulich presented an overview of the current travel awards program.

The University Travel Award Committee evaluates applications for the travel funds. There have been many changes to the faculty travel awards over time. This program started in 1991. Over the years, there has been an average of \$32,000 in the fund, annual. This year, it's about \$31,000. It was originally meant only to assist with transportation costs only, now more elements are covered, so long as they are paid out of E&G funds. The number of applicants changes from year to year. Examples: 129 applications in 2006; 99 apps in 2015. Current funding award levels are \$500, \$1000, or \$2000, depending on whether the travel is local, national, or international. The awards are open to all faculty. Cynthia Young initially changed the criteria to only cases where faculty were receiving recognition or a prestigious award and thus by association, UCF was getting recognition. However, the Faculty Senate said presentations couldn't be disregarded, so those were added back in. Ami hasn't met this year's committee yet. She has 10 application so far, and expects 50-60.

Questions and discussion followed:

The new review process includes rating from chair. What are the criteria?

Ami: Verification of what the faculty application is saying. For instance: how prestigious is the award? There is a ranking according to whether it's local/state/regional, national or international. Ami looks it up online. The rubric for assessment of applications includes: level of recognition of awarding body (local/state/regional - 1, national - 2, or international - 3); travel (domestic - 1; international - 2); how much the prestige of UCF is enhanced (local/state/regional - 1, national - 2, or international - 3); prestige of the recognition (ranked 1-5, and based on factors such as whether you were invited to present or are being awarded/recognized.) Total points impacts amount of award, along with how much money is available and how many applicants.

Usually keynote and invited speaker gets hotel and travel paid, and sometimes receive an honorarium too. Why is UCF money also given?

Ami: Not for her to say. The applicant has to have department support; the travel award reimburses the department, not the individual. Ami gets all of the receipts, and sees what department pays out. There will be transfers from one E&G account to another. Not all invitations to present are reimbursed. There's a lot of confusion around this.

Opinion: \$2,000 is too high. The award doesn't need to cover everything, given the limited amount of funds.

Ami: Such things as musical performance are covered; that gives UCF recognition. That's not well known. She would like people to have more clarity about how this works.

Multiple comments that if you're invited for a high level recognition (such as award or keynote), then a truly prestigious conference will pay your way. No need for travel funds for that.

Suggestion for a change in intent: support junior faculty who don't get their way paid and are earning less. Senior faculty have more funding available to them, such as attaching travel funding to grants. Assign these awards to junior faculty. Counterpoint: some departments support travel for junior faculty to a greater level than for senior faculty. For instance, a senior faculty can get no more than \$750 but a junior member can get up to \$1500. Also, there are some grants aimed specifically at juniors. Don't limit to them. Not all senior level faculty have grants to pay for travel.

Ami: one suggestion was to cut the fund and disperse it to all departments.

Suggestions: Make it a matching grant, dependent on department support. Recipients get the award funding plus the department money.

The budget for this needs to increase. We need information about how many people plan to travel and where to. With data, we would be better able to negotiate. Ami: how often do you know ahead that you're accepted to present.

Who evaluates the prestige level? It should be someone in the field who knows that area. Ami: she will Google the event, learn the attendance, whether is it international/national/local. So it is based on her opinion.

What is the turnaround time? Ami: she replies to applicants that their file was received and is to be reviewed by the committee. They meet once at the end of the "travel year" which runs from April 1<sup>st</sup>- March 31<sup>st</sup>. The goal is for departments to get money in time to repurpose it before the end of the fiscal year.

The amount of money hasn't increased with increase in faculty in recent years.

Ami has lots of data about numbers of applicants, percent awarded, number of awards. 42 faculty were awarded last year, and at that point they ran out of money. Applicants have felt discouraged sometimes, that's why numbers of applicants have dipped some years.

Responsibility to pay is primarily on the colleges, this award is supplemental. The focus should be on college requirements. The budget is out in the colleges. There's not a central faculty travel budget. We are coming up on 1200 tenure track faculty.

This needs to be restructured. Don't need \$2,000. International travel should be funded at \$1,000, with this fund and the department each paying 50%. The department needs to pay to show they value it. The fund should be matching. Considering the increase in number of faculty, the total amount available should increase. Question as to whether the process for an additional budget request should go to the Office of Research & Commercialization or to the Office of Faculty Excellence.

That topic will be continued.

Topic: location of meeting

On campus would be a lot easier. Kimi wants to see faces. Will reconsider meeting place and time (due to member conflicts). Expect a Doodle poll.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tina Herman Buck

## Faculty - 12 & 9 month

<u>Row Labels</u>	<u>Tenure/Tenure</u>			<u>GA</u>
	<u>Earning</u>	<u>Non Tenure</u>	<u>Total</u>	
AA-COLLEGE OF ARTS and HUMANIT	189	139	328	12
AA-COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMIN	76	56	132	1
AA-COLLEGE OF EDUCATION	78	54	132	23
AA-COLLEGE OF ENGR/COMP SCI	149	42	191	7
AA-COLLEGE OF HEALTH & PA	111	82	193	1
AA-COLLEGE OF HOSPITALITY MAN	48	24	72	
AA-COLLEGE OF NURSING	24	33	57	
AA-COLLEGE OF OPTICS AND PHOTO	29	5	34	
AA-COLLEGE OF SCIENCES	234	129	363	1
AA-COM-SCH OF BIO SCIENCES	40	25	65	
AA-UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES	4	14	18	4
AA-COLLEGE OF GRADUATE STUDIES	3		3	5
AA-INFO TECHNOLOGIES & RES		27	27	
AA-OFFICE OF RESEARCH	2	17	19	
AA-RESEARCH-AMPAC	4	3	7	
AA-RESEARCH-FSEC	3	29	32	
AA-RESEARCH-I4		2	2	
AA-RESEARCH-IST	3	49	52	
AA-RESEARCH-NANOSCIENCE	18	2	20	
AA-SDES-STUDENT GOVERNMENT			0	17
AA-STUDENT DEV & ENROLL SVCS		4	4	45
AA-UCF GLOBAL		10	10	1
Grand Total	1015	746	1761	117

### GA's by type

<u>GRA</u>	<u>GT GRADER</u>	<u>GTA</u>	<u>GA Hourly</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% of GA's to total Faculty</u>	<u>% of GA's to T/TT Faculty</u>
13	7	92	15	139	42%	74%
47	13	58	5	124	94%	163%
21	4	48	32	128	97%	164%
190	39	125	74	435	228%	292%
32	2	25	34	94	49%	85%
		15	12	27	38%	56%
2	1		1	4	7%	17%
84	3	3	1	91	268%	314%
80	15	313	24	433	119%	185%
50	2	31	7	90	138%	225%
		1	3	8	44%	200%
				5	167%	167%
3			1	4	15%	
2				2	11%	100%
9		1		10	143%	250%
				0	0%	0%
				0	0%	
29		1	10	40	77%	1333%
42			2	44	220%	244%
			42	59		
		1	46	92	2300%	
		3	1	5	50%	
604	86	717	310	1834	104%	181%