

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 29, 2011
TO: Members of the Steering Committee
FROM: Ida Cook
Chair, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: **STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING on October 6, 2011**

Meeting Date: Thursday, October 6, 2011
Meeting Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: College of Arts and Humanities, Room 192A

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Minutes of September 8, 2011**
4. **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
5. **Report of the Provost**
6. **Old Business**

None.
7. **New Business**
 - Resolution 2011-2012-2 Senate Committee to Oversee Computing and Networking (*from Budget and Administrative*)
 - Ad Hoc Senate Ethics Task Force
 - Seven Solutions discussion
8. **Committee Reports**
 - Budget and Administrative Committee – *Arlen Chase*
 - Graduate Council – *Jim Moharam*
 - Parking Advisory Committee – *Reid Oetjen*
 - Personnel Committee – *H.G. Parsa*
 - Undergraduate Council – *Kelly Allred*
9. **Other Business**
10. **Adjournment**

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes of
September 8, 2011

Dr. Ida Cook, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures.

MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of August 11, 2011 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Diane Chase, Executive Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
Patricia MacKown, Director, Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities
Maribeth Ehasz, Vice President, Student Development and Enrollment Services
Sheila Gutierrez de Pineres, Fellow in the American Council of Education, Dean of Undergraduate Education at the University of Texas, Dallas
Elliot Vittes, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Vivian Ortiz, Student Development and Enrollment

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Members of the Integrity Review committee introduced themselves.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

Provost Waldrop reminded members that he is conducting five-year reviews for two of his direct reports, Patricia Bishop (chaired by Jana Jasinski) and Diane Chase (chaired by Jose Fernandez). In addition, he is starting the search for Vice Provost of Regional campuses and Dr. D. Chase will be chairing the committee to review the function and structure of the regional campus.

The provost expressed his frustration that the budget, which was delivered to the deans yesterday, was being distributed so late in the term. Just under \$20M was is being distributed, which is not enough, but given that we had \$20M in cuts, we are doing well. The provost is working with a committee to see how the budget process can be made more efficient. Dr. A. Chase gave a brief report regarding the budget process at UCF to illustrate the complexity of the current process.

The provost said that the university and UFF union have been having discussions about the process of determining rank for instructors and lecturers and they hope to bring this to the next meeting. This does have to be collectively bargained, but we will need faculty input. He will also be sharing this with the deans.

The final issue that Provost Waldrop addressed is promotion for non-tenure track for research and clinical track. He would prefer that we use the language of "non-tenure track" rather than research and clinical track. In addition, he mentioned that they will need committees to review

the language. The current promotion language governing the composition of the committees allows for inclusion of tenured and tenure track faculty, but does not address promotion of non-tenure track faculty.

Dr. Cook asked if there were any objections to allowing non-tenure track faculty (providing there are members available) to serve on these committees. The committee agreed that there were no objections, especially as it pertains to the research and clinical tracks. Dr. Cook said that we will be discussing this at future meetings and we will continue to address this issue.

A question was raised about whether instructors and lecturers will go through the existing promotion and tenure process. Provost Waldrop stated that their credentials will be reviewed by their departments and colleges, but not the university committee. Currently, there are three distinct levels of review for each of these positions.

A senator asked if Academic Affairs or the colleges will be picking up the costs of promotion. The provost stated replied this has not been discussed yet.

OLD BUSINESS

Senate & Joint Committee Appointments

Dr. Cook acknowledged the work of Lisa Sklar, administrative assistant for the Senate, in getting the committees staffed. Vacancies remain on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for the College of Sciences and College of Health and Public Affairs. In addition, there are several openings in the College of Education. Dr. Cook stressed the importance of having these appointments reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Your role as members of the Steering Committee is that your college has the best representation possible.

Dr. Cook asked the Committee on Committee members to forward suggestions for a member of the graduate faculty to serve on the University Admission and Standards Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

Academic Expectations of Athletes

Coach O'Leary was scheduled to discuss academic expectations of athletes; however, he was unable to join us. He hopes to join us at next month's Steering Committee meeting as academics is important to him.

Approval of TIP/RIA/SOTL documents

Dr. Diane Chase noted that there is one additional award for the College of Medicine due to the increased numbers of faculty. In addition, there is a typo on College of Medicine SoTL Award – it should read 2012.

A question was raised about whether there is a need to review the process by which awards are reviewed.

A: Because these awards are subject to the bargaining agreement, we need to keep them in the same form. For instance, some deans would like more input on TIPS and other awards, but this must be part of the collective bargaining process.

Rich Gause, senator from the Libraries, pointed out that the way the criteria are worded, librarians are currently excluded from TIP, SoTL, RIA awards. The library would like this inequity addressed. Dr. Cook suggested that the Personnel Committee look into this. Mr. Gause stated that they have attempted to address it via this committee each year. Dr. Cook stated she would like to see this issue addressed and referred it to the Personnel Committee.

A question was raised about whether clinical track and non-tenure earning faculty are eligible for TIP/RIA/SoTL. Dr. Diane Chase said she would address this question via email.

Motion made to approve the TIP, SoTL, and RIA awards as written with the date change was made and seconded. Motion passed.

Academic integrity

Maribeth Ehasz shared the results of the committee to promote academic integrity. Dr. Ehasz thanked the Faculty Senate Steering Committee for the opportunity to address this important topic. She also thanked the task force for their work in evaluating the academic integrity policies and the misconduct process at UCF. The members of the task force are Jean Leuner, Michael Frumkin, Tom Cavanaugh, Melody Bowden, Max Pool, Patricia MacKown, Elliot Vittes, and Ida Cook.

The new Alleged Academic Misconduct Report (AAMR) includes the following five stage process:

1. Identification of academic misconduct and development of course related sanctions
2. Formal meeting with student and signing of the alleged academic misconduct report (AAMR)
3. Review of the incident and possible imposition of conduct-related sanctions by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) and the new academic integrity council
4. Invocation of course-related sanctions and possible program-related sanctions – one communication with student
5. Appeals Process – The appeal must be filed within seven days after the student receives the notification of the sanctions.

If students are undergraduates they will receive a z-grade designation, which can be removed by attending a workshop. If students disagree with the sanctions, they can appeal via the academic integrity council, a subset of the current Student Conduct Board. If students are found to be in violation, the incident would go forward for further action and review.

The information then would be filtered back to the faculty.

Dr. Ehasz entertained questions from the Steering Committee:

Q: If students are caught cheating on the first exam, do they remain in class while the process is completed?

A: This depends on syllabus statement; however, due process would typically allow the student

to continue until the resolution of the incident.

Dr. Cook added that the committee wanted to ensure that the process was fast, efficient, and provided feedback regarding sanctions in a timely manner. This new process enables faculty to get feedback on these cases.

Q: During the first stage, what is notification process within the college?

A: The faculty member informs the chair, who then informs the dean.

Q: Regarding the Office of Student Conduct, will the new committee deal with just cheating, or all academic integrity issues?

A: All academic misconduct issues.

A senator recounted a student misconduct case in which the faculty member was not informed that the student was dismissed from the university.

A: The process has changed since that issue took place and faculty are now informed.

Q: If student agrees with the charge, do they go through the student conduct process?

A: Yes.

It was suggested that the word “student” be added prior to misconduct as printed in the current stage one wording.

Dr. Ehasz addressed the second purpose of the committee, which was to change the culture of the university regarding academic misconduct. The committee is working with the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning and the Center for Distributed Learning to provide pedagogical training. In addition, Dr. Vittes will be working with the Faculty Senate Ethics Committee to review definitions. In addition to changing the process, the university is developing student resources and support to help them understand these resources.

Violations of academic integrity are on the rise. As a result, all new UCF students are required to complete two (2) modules on academic integrity. So far, 16,000 students have completed this training during summer and fall 2011.

Provost Waldrop spoke about the old process which was disjointed. He thanked the committee for their hard work and especially Maribeth Ehasz. Dr. Cook invited Dr. Ehasz to the Senate at the September 22nd meeting. Members of the Steering Committee suggested that she show the academic conduct video and then address questions from the Faculty Senate. In addition, Dr. Ehasz was asked to send the forms in advance.

Withdrawal policy resolution

Resolution 2011-2012-1, Feedback on Student Performance Prior to the Withdrawal Deadline, was read into the minutes. Motion was made to send the resolution forth to the full Senate. Motion seconded. Discussion followed on whether the resolution needed to include the specific numbers of days the deadline had been moved. The consensus of the committee was that it did not, and that the language to that effect should be struck.

The motion carried. The resolution as amended will be added to the agenda for the September Senate meeting.

**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, ~~from the 50% point in the semester to the 60% point plus one day~~, 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.

Ad hoc Committee on Technology Issues

Dr. Cook and Dr. A. Chase recently met with DeLaine Priest, the Associate Vice President of Student Development and Enrollment Services to discuss issues related to distance learning. These issues are coming to the forefront, especially as pertaining to the Americans with Disability Act (ADA). The current guidelines state that faculty need to provide additional time and access on course materials and assessments for such students.

The adhoc committee will be tasked with gathering information to help faculty to more efficiently address student needs. The use and application of the \$18 per credit hour fee was mentioned to help fund efforts. This is a serious issue as the federal government mandates that we address the needs of our students. There are four different entities working on this issue including FCTL, SDES, and CDL without faculty input. It is critical that faculty input be included on how the funds are used and applied.

Motion was made to establish an adhoc committee to look at Technology and Distance Learning. Motion seconded and passed.

Dr. Cook solicited topics for this committee to address. The Steering committee suggested that the committee investigate cracks in the system regarding who qualifies for student disability services and look at growing pains with the university and online learning.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Budget and Administrative Committee – Arlen Chase

Michael Moshell is the new chair and the committee will be meeting before the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Graduate Council – Jim Moharam

The Council met and Jim Moharam was elected chair. Tosha Dupras was elected Vice Chair.

Parking Advisory Committee – *Reid Oetjen*

Dr. Cook charged the committee with two fundamental responsibilities: (1) elect a chair for the committee, (2) elect two representatives from this committee to serve on the University Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee.

Dr. Cory Watkins agreed to chair the committee, and he and Dr. Boris Zeldovich will serve on the university committee. The next meeting of this committee is scheduled for September 13, 2011 at noon in HPA1, Room 304. The committee was asked to investigate if Zip Car took two faculty parking spots.

Personnel Committee – *H.G. Parsa*

Niels da Vitoria Lobo was elected chair. In addition to working on the resolution regarding the withdrawal deadline, the committee is reviewing the process for naming an emeritus professor, the guidelines in the Faculty Constitution for promotion of non tenured faculty, and the rules for final exam policy.

Undergraduate Council – *Kelly Allred*

Kelly Allred was elected chair and Jeff Kaplan was elected vice chair.

Dr. Cook reminded Faculty Senate Liaisons that they cannot vote unless they are serving as members of the committees.

OTHER BUSINESS

Because Dr. Chopra is vice chair of the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates in Florida, he will also be attending the Board of Governors meeting.

Provost Waldrop announced that UCF, FAMU, and UF will be presenting dental school proposals to the Board of Governors in September; however, we do not expect an announcement until November or December.

ADJOURNMENT

The committee adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Resolution 2011-2012-2 Senate Committee to Oversee Computing and Networking
(from the Budget and Administrative Committee)

Whereas, the university puts a heavy emphasis on computing and all aspects of communication;
and

Whereas, there are issues with ADA compliance; and

Whereas, there have been a series of issues in preparing and delivering courses; and

Whereas, there are issues in the various departments with platforms in use; and

Whereas, some faculty are unable to access e-mail; and

Whereas, there is currently no 24/7 support for computing, networking and system management:

Be it Resolved, that the Faculty Senate should expeditiously act to constitute a standing committee of oversight for all aspects of computing and networking.