

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
Minutes of  
**November 17, 2011**

Faculty Senate Chair Ida Cook called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

**MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of September 22, 2011 was made and seconded. Motion carried.

**RECOGNITION OF GUESTS**

Lucretia Cooney, Assistant Director, Faculty Affairs

John Weishampel, Faculty Fellow, Academic Affairs

Lyman Brodie, Interim Director, Faculty Affairs

Lisa Wayte, Operations Manager, Enterprise Technology & Infrastructure Support

Daniel Harpin, Applications Systems Analyst/Programmer Senior, Enterprise Application Development

Dominic Spence, Academic Affairs Coordinator, Student Government Association

**REPORT OF THE PROVOST**

Provost and Executive Vice President Tony Waldrop reported the following:

- **IRB Expert**: A national expert on institutional review boards visited UCF, trying to assist us in streamlining the process for institutional review for faculty who are doing research Florida Hospital. Currently, faculty need IRB approval from both institutions.
- **Board of Governors (BOG)**: Waldrop reported the following items of interest from last week's BOG meeting:
  - The BOG approved moving UCF's Health Care Informatics program from a cost recovery model to market based tuition.
  - UCF retracted the dental school proposal that had been sent to the BOG, as feedback from the governors had indicated that it would not pass at this time. We will be taking it back in the future.
  - State senator J.D. Alexander spoke on behalf of allowing University of South Florida Polytechnic to become a standalone institution. The BOG voted not to do so at this time, but agreed to revisit the issue if Polytechnic reaches certain accomplishments in student numbers and accreditation.
- **"A to Q" Letter**: Governor Scott had requested a wealth of data from the SUS presidents in the "A to Q" letter. UCF responded by the deadline. Waldrop recognized Drs. Diane Chase, Tace Crouse, and Paige Borden for their hard work.
- **Board of Trustees Meeting**: The trustees voted unanimously to approve same sex partnership benefits. This is the first step in the process and now it will need to go through the collective bargaining process.
- **State Budget**: Considerable hints are coming out of Tallahassee forecasting cuts to the university system from 5-10%. UCF still has 3% held back, so we will be in good shape in the event of a 5% cut.

- Tenure: It appears that tenure will not be a subject for the legislature this year, but it will most likely be brought up in the following year. UCF President John C. Hitt has and will continue to strongly support tenure.
- College of Business Dean Search: The search committee conducted nine videoconference interviews last week and has identified four candidates who will be visiting UCF in the near future. It was an outstanding pool of applicants.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### Update on Student Perception of Instruction (SPoI) Pilot Testing – Daniel Harpin and Lisa Wayte

Daniel Harpin, Applications Systems Analyst/Programmer Senior for Enterprise Application Development, provided a demonstration of the SPoI for face-to-face, web, and mixed modality classes. Students will be notified on Monday, November 21<sup>st</sup> that the survey is available and can access it through MyUCF. The SPoI being pilot tested is appended to the end of the current SPoI, but students are not notified that they are separate surveys. The current SPoI is saved and submitted prior to moving on to the test SPoI. Students who do not complete all questions are asked to confirm that they want to submit. Harpin provided a demonstration of the surveys for web and mixed mode modalities classes.

In a question and answer session, Harpin relayed that students will be receiving frequent emails to encourage completion. In a class with two instructors, the students will see separate surveys for each instructor. Students can simply answer one question and then submit, but based on previous semesters, students tend to complete the majority of the questions. The Senate requested that Harpin try to find a way to prevent student from completing a survey that hasn't been filled out.

A question was raised about the average response rate. Cook replied that an estimate is 60-70%; however, she will get a specific number to members of the Senate. During summer 2011, over 70% responded.

Lisa Wayte, Operations Manager for Enterprise Technology & Infrastructure Support, discussed the analysis of the data from the pilot SPoI and explained the results report that faculty will receive. They are proposing one set of printed results for each modality. The results data for the current SPoI will be completely separate from the pilot SPoI. Wayte displayed a sample of the report that will be delivered and provided an overview of the features and changes. The use of a grand standard mean has been eliminated. For the free response section, responses from each student will be grouped together.

Summaries based upon modalities, class level (graduate/undergraduate), and class size will be provided. There will also be department summaries and college summaries for the same variables. Faculty will receive the pdf results and a .csv file with the data.

A question and answer session followed. Wayte agreed to also provide summaries by lower level and upper level courses. Regarding the propriety status of the data, the first eight questions are private; however, questions 9-16 are public data that were mandated to be published at the library. That data is now available at the Computer Services website. For the new versions of the form, the propriety status of the data has not yet been determined.

Cook noted that it is currently not possible for faculty to access their SPoI results through a secure site like MyUCF, but she will ask Computer Services explore this option. Harpin noted that once the SPoI

period opens, faculty will see a tab in MyUCF through which they can access a live count of the numbers of students who have completed the survey.

#### Update on Electronic Promotion and Tenure files – John Weishampel

John Weishampel, Professor of Biology and Academic Affairs Faculty Fellow, reported on the development of the electronic Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process. The team has conducted several simulations to help troubleshoot the uploading process and will now be working on the simulation of the workflow process. All of the forms used in the P&T process will be completed and transferred electronically. UCF plans on implementing this for the new cycle of P&T. There will be a series of workshops in spring and summer to help faculty who are going through P&T and others involved in the process. They hope to have the system ready for faculty to upload their files by late spring or early summer.

A question and answer session followed. Weishampel explained that the system will be accessed through the MyUCF portal. The portal itself is secure, but there are concerns that people involved in the process might inappropriately download information. Faculty will be able to work with the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning and the Faculty Multimedia Center to convert files to be uploaded. Currently the system can only accommodate documents, but they will be looking into methods of uploading video and other digital files into the system. Weishampel estimated that it will take faculty 20-30 minutes to upload their files, but they have not yet tested extremely large files. They are considering hyperlinking to sites like Google Scholar so that faculty do not have to scan and upload books and articles. They envision that their system will be further developed in the future to allow for tenured faculty to access and maintain their records.

#### **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

Cook presented the resolution on behalf of Personnel Committee Chair Niels da Vitoria Lobo. She offered an overview of the proposed changes to the membership of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

A motion was made to edit the end of the first sentence of P2B to replace the phrase "who hold the rank of professor, where available" with the phrase "who hold a rank higher than those faculty who are being reviewed." Motion seconded. Discussion followed. A member of the Personnel committee explained the rationale behind the original phrasing, which was to ensure that non-tenure-earning (NTE) full professors participate in the evaluation process if they are available.

A question was raised whether this language is intended to cover the Assistant, Associate, and full Scientist rank. It is. A motion was made to amend the motion on the floor to change the language to "who hold the top rank in their track, where available." Motion not accepted by original motioner.

Waldrop expressed his concern that the original language using the phrase "where available" could be interpreted to mean that if no full professor is available, it is not necessary to add any NTE faculty to the committee. A senator from the Libraries cautioned that the Senate should be careful that the amended language doesn't unintentionally apply to librarians, who have their own promotion process.

The vote was held. Motion carried. The phrase will read: "who hold a rank higher than those faculty who are being reviewed."

A question was raised about how many people will end up on the committee. The committee can have up to fifteen members, as one third of the augmented total can be NTE faculty.

A question was raised about how the NTE committee members are elected. Cook noted that elections for the tenured committee members are to be held at large (P2A), but that is not specified for the NTE committee members. Discussion followed on whether NTE committee members should be elected at large by all of the faculty of the college. A senator noted that this would mean faculty from departments without NTE faculty would be voting on the NTE representative for the college. A senator commented on the importance of enfranchising all of the faculty. Motion made to specify that NTE elections shall be held "at large" in section P2B. Motion seconded.

A senator suggested that instead of comprising one third of the committee, NTE faculty should comprise half the committee. A question was raised about the fairness of allowing NTE faculty to vote only on NTE committee members but allowing tenured and tenure earning faculty to vote on both the tenured and NTE committee members. The discussion was put on hold as there was a motion on the table. After a vote, the motion carried. The phrase in section P2B shall read: "are to be elected at large by the tenured, tenure-earning and non-tenure-earning faculty of that college."

Discussion returned to the rationale for allowing tenured and tenure earning faculty to vote on the NTE committee member. Motion made to remove the words "tenured, tenure-earning and" from the sentence in section P2B that addresses who elects the NTE committee member. Seconded. Discussion followed on the number of NTE faculty and whether a vote could be dominated by tenured and tenure earning faculty. A senator suggested that the NTE faculty in a college should hold their own election for the NTE representative. A senator from Nursing noted that there are so few clinical lines in that college that it would be difficult to hold an election. Motion amended to add the sentence, "If there are fewer than ten non-tenure-earning faculty in the college, the tenured and tenure-earning faculty will also vote." Secunder accepted as a friendly amendment. Motion carried.

After a vote, the revised resolution was approved. The approved resolution reads:

**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~~ a rank higher than those faculty who are being reviewed. 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 at large by the ~~tenured, tenure-earning and~~ non-tenure-earning faculty of that college. If there are fewer than ten non-tenure-earning faculty in the college, the tenured and tenure-earning faculty will also vote. 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.

Dr. Cook announced that because the resolution involves a change to the *Bylaws* of the *Faculty Constitution*, the Senate will need to revisit it at the January meeting.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### Budget and Administrative Committee – *Michael Moshell*

No action since last report.

#### Personnel Committee – *Niels da Vitoria Lobo*

No action other than work on the above resolution.

#### Parking Advisory Committee – *Reid Oetjen* (for Cory Watkins)

Mr. Adam Brock, Vice President of the Student Government Association, discussed student issues with parking and transportation including problems that students encounter with purchasing parking passes before financial aid is received. This creates a problem for students as parking services typically offers a two-week grace period which results in citations being delivered during the last two weeks of September. The committee made some suggestions as to perhaps issuing temporary passes could be issued.

The committee proposed the development of “Sustainable Parking and Transportation Solutions”. The remainder of the meeting revolved around discussions on exploring ways to reduce cars on campus, by examining a bike sharing program, examining a ride share (HOV) program for faculty, staff, and students, and increasing the use of shuttle service by faculty, staff, and students. A motion was put forth and seconded to research this issue, work with student government, and bring the committee’s findings to the University Parking and Transportation Committee Meeting scheduled for October 28<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 am.

#### Undergraduate Council – *Kelly Allred*

The committee worked on the academic misconduct model and report form and suggested revisions are being compiled.

#### Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*

Moharam could not be present, but submitted his report by email:

Detailed activities of Graduate Council Committees (meeting schedule, agenda, and minutes) are available at <http://www.graduatecouncil.ucf.edu/>

The four Graduate Council committees have been very busy. Each committee met three times during the reporting period. Appeals Committee met three times on 10/6, 10/27, and 11/11. Next meeting is scheduled for 11/22. Curriculum Committee met three times on 10/12, 10/26 and 11/16. Next meeting is scheduled for 11/30. Program Review and Awards Committee met three times on 10/14, 10/21, and 11/4. Next meeting is scheduled for 11/18. Policy Committee met three times on 10/12, 10/26, and 11/9. Next meeting is scheduled for 11/30.

- The Committee's recommendations for revisions to the proposed academic misconduct review process have been transmitted to Cook.
- The Committee is discussing minor revisions and clarifications to the Graduate Faculty Policy.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

The university Strategic Planning Council will be meeting on December 7. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee will be December 1 at 4:00 p.m. to discuss the strategic planning documents that were sent to the BOT so as to be able to provide faculty feedback at the December 7 meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.