

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 10, 2011
TO: All Faculty Senate Members
FROM: Ida Cook
Chair, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Meeting on November 17, 2011

Meeting Date: Thursday, November 17, 2011
Meeting Time: 4:00-6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: Student Union Key West, Room 218

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of Minutes of *September 22, 2011***
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
5. **Report of the Provost**
6. **Old Business**
 - Update on Student Perception of Instruction pilot testing – Daniel Harpin and Lisa Wayte
 - Update on Electronic Promotion and Tenure files – John Weishample
7. **New Business**
 - Change to the *Bylaws* of the *Faculty Constitution*: Resolution 2011-2012-2 Modification of the Membership of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee
8. **Committee Reports**
 - Budget and Administrative Committee – *Michael Moshell*
 - Personnel Committee – *Niels da Vitoria Lobo*
 - Parking Advisory Committee – *Cory Watkins*
 - Undergraduate Council – *Kelly Allred*
 - Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*
9. **Other Business**
10. **Adjournment**

Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of
September 22, 2011

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of August 25, 2011 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Diane Chase, Academic Affairs
Maribeth Ehasz, Student Development and Enrollment Services
Sheila Gutierrez de Pineres, American Council of Education Fellow
Jerry McMillan, National Society of Black Engineers
Patti MacKown, Student Development and Enrollment Services
Eric Main, Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning
Ann Marie Palmer, Office of Student Conduct
Max Poole, College of Graduate Studies
Dominic Spence, Student Government Association
Elliot Vittes, Undergraduate Studies

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Cook announced that the Steering committee approved the formation of an ad hoc committee on computer technology, distance learning, and ADA compliance. Senators Lisa Mills and Joe Harrington have already volunteered to serve, and others interested in serving should contact Dr. Cook.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

Dr. Diane Chase reported on behalf of Provost Waldrop, who was unable to attend.

- The university is revising the requirements for Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) and a team from Faculty Affairs and United Faculty of Florida will be visiting all units to discuss the changes.
- UF, FAMU, and UCF presented dental school proposal to the Board of Governors. The BOG asked all of the universities to come back to the November meeting with revised proposals.
- Provost Waldrop is interested in the graduation and retention of our students. Institutional Research is working to provide programs with statistics on their students.
- Faculty Affairs is working with deans to make changes in internal review documents in order to ensure that faculty are included in the review committees. This is being done due to the Faculty Senate resolution that was passed last year (Resolution 2010-2011-5 Revision to Policy Concerning Appointment and Evaluation of Chairs and Directors).
- Faculty Affairs is working to test the electronic submission of Promotion and Tenure files and will be asking for volunteers to assist in this effort. Folders tested will be from those who have already been promoted, not those currently in the process.

Dr. Chase then fielded questions from the floor:

Q: Has the administration taken a stand on the governor's agenda regarding higher education?

A: Yes. Dr. Chase explained that Academic Affairs is formulating a response to the "Seven Breakthrough Solutions" document. The administration clearly is in favor of tenure, and the presidents of the state universities will be working together to prevent detrimental changes. Dr. Cook added that the university will respond in a judicious manner so as not to offend. A large part of any response will involve educating the legislature on measures currently in place. Dr. Cook noted that there has been a change in the Board of Governor's membership and the universities we will need to familiarize the new members with how education works and what we do.

Dr. Cook will send out information to the senators regarding the Seven Breakthrough Solutions. She mentioned that Advisory Council of Faculty Senates, which is composed of the chairs of the Faculty Senates from the state universities, will be planning a statement or a plan to approach this.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution 2011-2012-1 Feedback on Student Performance Prior to the Withdrawal Deadline

Dr. Niels da Vitoria Lobo, chair of the Personnel Committee, read the resolution:

Resolution 2011-2012-1 Feedback on Student Performance Prior to the Withdrawal Deadline

(from the Personnel Committee)

Whereas, it is important for faculty to provide students with feedback on their progress in a course prior to the withdrawal deadline, and

Whereas, beginning Fall 2011, the semester withdrawal deadlines have been moved, thereby allowing students additional time to make informed decisions about withdrawing,

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends that faculty provide feedback on progress to undergraduate and graduate students prior to the semester withdrawal deadline.

Dr. Lobo explained that the purpose of this resolution was to allow students to get feedback in their classes prior to the withdrawals deadline so that they could make informed decisions about whether to stay in the class.

Dr. Cook called for discussion. Hearing none, the Senate proceeded to vote. Motion to pass the resolution was approved.

Academic integrity – *Maribeth Ehasz*

Dr. Maribeth Ehasz, Vice President for Student Development and Enrollment Services (SDES), thanked the Senate for opportunity to present findings from the Academic Integrity Task Force, which has been meeting since January 2011. The main focus of the task force was to (1) review the current method for resolving academic integrity issues and (2) look at proactive methods to enhance the culture of UCF in terms of academic integrity.

The former process had two tracks that occurred at different times, in which the student conduct board and the academic unit worked separately to resolve all alleged instances of academic integrity. The new model will bring these two processes, creating one unified, streamlined process.

Dr. Ehasz provided an overview of the new, proposed process. A faculty member who believes academic misconduct has occurred would first address it with the student. If the student agrees, the faculty member identifies the sanctions. If student disagrees with allegation or sanctions, then the incident goes to the Academic Integrity Council, a subset of the Student Conduct Board, which has faculty, staff, and student members. In addition, students who have already been involved in academic misconduct will go directly to the Academic Integrity Council. Departments will have the opportunity to suggest program related sanctions, and the student will receive all of the sanctions in a single communication. Students may appeal, and appeals will now go through the provost's office. Formerly, they had gone through the vice president for SDES.

Dr. Ehasz discussed the committee's recommendations to effect a culture change at UCF, including faculty teaching and learning resources; policy and reform; and student resources and support. The issue would be under constant discussion, rather than only being addressed in response to a negative incident.

The new process is currently under review by the Graduate Policy Committee and will be going to the Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee shortly.

Dr. Ehasz entertained questions from the Faculty Senate:

Q: Is there a mechanism to change a student's grade after graduation if no grade is awarded?

A: A student cannot graduate without a grade. The diploma and transcript would be withheld after the situation was resolved.

Q: What is the role of the faculty in the new process: witness, defendant, or prosecutor?

A: Patti MacKown explained that faculty serve as a witness. The case is presented and both the student and faculty have a chance to ask questions. Faculty do not have to appear – they can just send the paperwork

Dr. Cook noted that the proposal will ultimately come back to the Senate as a resolution.

Q: Will an administrator be present at the meeting between the student and faculty member?

A: An administrator need not be present. The department chair will sign the form.

Q: Will the faculty have the ability to access the student's previous history prior to deciding whether to allege academic misconduct?

A: No, faculty will not have this information. This comes into the process later. Additionally, the Office of Student Conduct cannot share that information, as it is protected.

The senator expressed concerns about having to make a decision without access to all the relevant information. Dr. Cook said that it was a good question and suggested that the Graduate and Undergraduate councils examine this issue during their reviews.

Q: At the end of the year, do we get a summary report for incidents by college?

A: Yes, this information is located on the Student Conduct website.

Q: If you do not file the paperwork, can you still provide an academic sanction?

A: Yes, but the hope is that faculty will use this process. Currently many faculty avoid the process because they do not want the hassle. Dr. Ehasz hopes the new process will be easier.

Q: If it is not documented, how will that affect grade appeals and other appeals?

A: That is an open question that still needs to be considered.

Dr. Ehasz invited senators to contact her with any further questions.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Budget and Administrative Committee – *Michael Moshell*

Michael Moshell was elected chair of the committee. The committee is working on four items:

- looking at indirect costs on research
- submitted a draft resolution to the Steering committee
- working with Finance and Accounting to see if it's possible to put student time sheets online
- looking at the possibility of finding a common time for meetings when no classes are scheduled

Personnel Committee – *Niels da Vitoria Lobo*

Niels da Vitoria Lobo was elected chair of the committee. The Personnel Committee is looking at the procedures for the promotion process for non-tenure earning research and clinical faculty. Faculty Affairs will be at the next meeting to discuss models from other institutions. Later in the year, the committee will be reviewing the process for emeritus professors.

Parking Advisory Committee – *Cory Watkins*

Cory Watkins was elected chair of the committee. The committee met and elected two representatives for the university committee, Cory Watkins and Boris Zeldovich. Kris Singh, director of Parking Services, and Ross Wolf, chair of university parking committee, were present to educate the committee members about current parking issues. The committee learned about the new Zipcar service and ZimRide, an automated ride sharing board. In addition, Saturday shuttle service to the College of Medicine is undergoing a two-month trial. Lastly, there are new faculty and staff spots in Garage H and the university committee is discussing the possibility of similar spots in other garages.

Undergraduate Council – *Kelly Allred*

The committee elected Kelly Allred chair of the Undergraduate Council, and therefore chair of the Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum Committee. Jeff Kaplan was elected vice chair of the council and therefore chair of the Undergraduate Course Review Committee.

Graduate Council – Jim Moharam

Dr. Moharam could not be present, but had sent his report via email:

The full Graduate Council met on September 1 and elected Dr. Jim Moharam chair of the Graduate Council and chair of the Policy Committee, and Dr. Tosha Dupras vice chair and chair of the Curriculum Committee. Drs. Moharam and Dupras selected Dr. Winston Schoenfeld as chair of the Appeals Committee and Dr. Mary Little as chair of the program Review and Awards Committee.

- **Appeals Committee** met once on 9/8. Next meeting is scheduled for 10/6.
- **Curriculum Committee** met once on 9/21. Next meeting is scheduled for 10/12.
- **Program Review and Awards Committee** met once on 9/16. Next meeting is scheduled for 10/14.
- **Policy Committee** met twice on 9/14 and 9/21. Next meeting is scheduled for 10/12.
 - Reviewed the proposed academic misconduct review process.

No issues that may require review/action by the Steering committee or the full Faculty Senate are under consideration at this time. Detailed Graduate Council activities (meeting schedule, agenda, minutes, actions, etc.) are available at <http://www.graduatecouncil.ucf.edu/>.

OTHER BUSINESS

COHPA University Promotion and Tenure Committee representative

A senator from COHPA briefly discussed an issue in that college with the process for nominating and electing a representative to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Questions have been raised regarding what is required by having an “at large” election, and there is a proposal circulating in that college to restructure the election. Dr. Cook noted that she has been in communication with COHPA faculty and the dean’s office to help clarify the election guidelines in the Faculty Constitution.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Resolution 2011-2012-2 Modification of the Membership of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee

(from the Personnel Committee)

Whereas, the Faculty Senate endorsed the promotion of non-tenure earning faculty members, clinicians and researchers, and

Whereas, the review of such faculty falls under the purview of the University Promotion and Tenure committee, and

Whereas, the current membership of the University Promotion and Tenure committee is comprised of only tenured faculty, and

Whereas, non-tenure earning faculty members should be involved in the review of their peers

Be It Resolved, that the *Bylaws* of the *Faculty Constitution* be amended as follows to allow the inclusion of non-tenure earning faculty members, clinicians, and researchers on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee:

P. University Promotion and Tenure Committee

1. Duties and Responsibilities.

- a. To review and evaluate all applications for promotion and/or tenure and make recommendations to the provost and executive vice president.
- b. To maintain the confidentiality of all personnel records and matters under its jurisdiction.
- c. To function as an advisory committee to the provost and executive vice president.
- d. To submit all policy concerns to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the provost and executive vice president.
- e. To submit an annual report of the committee's activities to the chair of the Faculty Senate by the end of the spring semester, while complying with the rules set out by the Collective Bargaining Agreement relating to confidentiality.

2. Membership.

- A. [Committee Membership for review of tenured and tenure-earning faculty for tenure and promotion:](#)

The committee shall consist of one faculty member from each college. Each member shall hold the rank of tenured professor and be an active scholar within his or her particular field. The committee members are elected at large from their respective colleges by tenured and tenure-earning faculty. The chair is elected annually by the committee members. No member of the committee may be a member of a college or department/school promotion and tenure committee. Terms of service shall be two years, staggered.

B. Committee membership for review of non-tenure earning ranked faculty, clinicians and researchers for promotion:

Whenever a non-tenure earning faculty member, clinician or researcher, hereafter referred to as non-tenure earning faculty, is a candidate for promotion, the University Promotion and Tenure committee, as constituted in part P2A, shall be augmented by the addition of non-tenure earning faculty who hold the rank of professor, where available. The role of additional committee members is limited to the review and evaluation of non-tenure earning promotion candidates. Non-tenure earning faculty shall not comprise more than one-third of the augmented total university promotion and tenure committee membership. The non-tenure earning committee members from each college that has non-tenure earning faculty are to be elected by the tenured, tenure-earning and non-tenure earning faculty of that college. Each additional member shall be an active teacher, clinician, or researcher within his/her particular field. No member of the committee may be a member of any college or department/school promotion and tenure committee. Terms of service shall be two years, staggered.