

Faculty Senate Personnel Committee

Wednesday, September 20, 2017

11:30 am – 12:30 pm

Location: Millican Hall room 395E

AGENDA

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Roll Call
- 3) Selection of minutes taker for the meeting
- 4) Review and approval of minutes of April 12, 2017 meeting
- 5) Announcements and recognition of guests
- 6) Meeting schedule for remainder of 2016/2017
- 7) Old Business-*none*
- 8) New business- *Topics assigned by Faculty Senate Steering Committee*
 - a. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines: (Blake Scott)
 - b. Emeritus Policy: (Steve King)
 - c. Notice of teaching assignments: (Steve King)
 - d. On-line courses policy: (Karol Lucken)
 - e. Out-of-unit Parental leave policy: (Steve King)
 - f. Salary study follow up: (Steve King)
 - g. Evaluation of endowed chairs: (Steve King)
- 9) Other topics
- 10) Adjournment

Faculty Senate Personnel Committee Meeting

March 8, 2017

1. Meeting called to order at 11:33 am

2. Members Attending: Stephen King (chair), Mindi Anderson, Robert Folger, David Harrison, Richard Harrison, Waldemar Karwowski, Peter Jacques, Jonathan Knuckey, Karol Lucken, Eric Merriam, Valerie Storey, Linda Walters

3. Minute taker: Mindi Anderson

4. Minutes from Feb. 8, 2017 meeting: Approved.

5. Announcements: None

6. Old Business:

a. Salary study

- Discussion centered on where we are; Provost discussed at the last senate meeting.
- Salary has to be bargained.
- Members discussed that a resolution may not help with this issue.
- Salary compression is still a concern.
- Members discussed we will continue to bring up the issue.
- Salary discussed in relation to TIPs, RIAs, and SoTLs. See c.

b. Evaluation of endowed chairs; update on completion

- Lucretia Cooney was not in attendance; discussion tabled.

c. TIPs, RIAs, and SoTLs/Provost comments at Feb Full senate meetings

- Discussion by members that these awards are not available to all (i.e., those teaching small classes)
- One member discussed not needing additional levels of evaluation - causes increased anxiety.
- One member discussed background - TIA awards were started to encourage teaching large classes.
- One member discussed that the bargaining unit doubled the number this year.
- One member discussed we are the only school left doing these awards.
- One member discussed we still have PhD faculty making \$33,000/year. Concerns with hiring good faculty, as well as, faculty retention.
- Discussion centered around initiating a survey/surveys to look at the:
 1. Impact of having the TIP, RIA, and SoTL system with current faculty.
 2. What other universities do/why they took away these type of awards.
- Question or survey may want to look at the impact of what salaries would look like if these awards disappeared.
- Also, want to look at how many faculty are excelling but missing out on these awards.
- Linda discussed that we have access to Institutional Knowledge Management (IKM) that can do these types of studies, such as being done on gender and salaries.
- Stephen discussed we need to have someone draft questions - Waldemar volunteered. He will send to Mason and the rest of the group for input.
- With surveying faculty, Mason said the bargaining unit will be sending out a faculty survey in the next few days with related questions.

- A concern was brought up by one member that the College of Medicine is not included in the faculty to be surveyed, as they are not under the bargaining agreement.

d. Faculty gender survey (Linda)

- Linda discussed the faculty gender survey; results are to be available by IKM mid-March.
- This is an internal study; the Berkley model was used.
- Ethnicity is being added to the study.
- Data will look at the last 10 years (2006-2016) as this is when the data was good; older data may not be as good.
- To be in the study, faculty had to be employed in 2016 (approximately 1700 people)
- Deans/Directors classified as administration, not faculty.
- Using payro

7. New Business:

- Linda brought up Faculty Development Conference.
- There has been an increase in applicants, but not in monetary support.
- Having to get more selective on who goes.
- Funds controlled by budget.
- Funds should be tied to an increase in faculty.
- Mason made a resolution, which was approved by all.

whereas we support a resolution to encourage administration to increase the budget to support the Faculty Development Summer Conference

whereas the number of faculty has increased but the budget has not

whereas faculty attendance at the conference is important to support faculty teaching

- will see if this can get on agenda for steering committee tomorrow.

8. Other topics:

None

9. Adjournment: 12:35 pm

Faculty Senate Personnel Committee
Meeting Minutes for Wednesday April 12, 2017

1. Meeting called to order at 11:30 am
2. Members in Attendance: Stephen King (Chair), Robert Folger, Mason Cash, Karol Lucken, Waldemar Karwowski,
3. Minutes Taker: Karol Lucken
4. Minutes from March 8, 2017 approved with modifications to the record concerning those in attendance.
5. Announcements: None
6. Old Business:

- a. Discussion of Provost Whitaker's written response to Faculty Senate Resolution 2016-2017-12: Availability of Lactation Rooms for UCF Women. The Provost's approval of the resolution was predicated on a change of language in the Resolution from "should" to "should attempt to" and "a room be added at" to "and will work to identify space at both."

A motion/proposal was put forward to replace the Provost's requested revised language of "should attempt to" with the stronger language of "should endeavor to." The committee voted 8 to 4 against this motion, thus leaving the requested revised language as is.

- b. Discussion of Provost Whitaker's written response to Faculty Senate Resolution 2016-2017-13: Fair and equal enactment of the UCF employment of relatives policy. The resolution was disapproved by the Provost with no recommendations other than to wait until the Research Conflict of Interest Committee had concluded its' work on this topic. Our committee closed discussion on this topic because no action on our end could be taken at this point in time.
- c. The UCF faculty gender equity study was revisited in light of the presentation by the IKM (Institution of Knowledge Management) to the full Senate. The committee agreed there was much confusion surrounding the research questions that guided the study, the methodology employed, and the meaning of the preliminary findings. Based on the presentation, committee members came away with different interpretations of the scope and conclusions of the study and the

rationale for further research by IKM. It was decided that next year's committee should follow up on this issue.

- d. Faculty awards (TIP, RIA, & SOTL) were discussed, particularly in relation to understanding why UCF is the only state university in Florida to retain these types of awards. It was noted that when the SUS BOG structure (the funding mechanism for TIP) was dissolved in 1998-1999, the incentive awards were subsequently defunded. The committee agreed that the following two questions should be answered: (1) Why did other universities choose not to perpetuate these incentive awards under their own budgets? (2) Did universities find alternative ways to incentivize, reward, or compensate faculty and, if so, what did they do? This would be business forwarded to next year's committee.

7. New Business

- a. Earlier in this Senate year, President Hitt issued university-wide guidelines for granting faculty Professor Emeritus status. A committee member has now proposed that perhaps the issue could be revisited next year. Upon speaking with other faculty, she found that many universities grant this status automatically.
- b. Discussion was initiated about the university-wide development of departmental AESP's (Annual Evaluation Standards & Procedures). While it was recognized that such a document must generally reflect the norms and will of each department and field, there was concern expressed about continuously escalating publication demands. Specifically, the issue of structuring AESP criteria so that fewer faculty could receive an "Outstanding" evaluation and therefore merit raises etc.... was raised. It was decided that next year's committee should look into this matter.

1 **Resolution 2017-2018-X Faculty Senate Bylaw Change, Joint Committees and Councils**

2
3 **Whereas**, Faculty Senate Resolution 2011-2012-2 is unclear and has not been consistently interpreted
4 or followed (e.g., has not resulted in non-tenure earning University Promotion and Tenure Committee
5 representatives from all colleges forwarding applications by non-tenure earning assistant and associate
6 professors); and

7
8 **Whereas**, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee has reported that it feels ill equipped, in its
9 current configuration, to evaluate applications by non-tenure earning assistant and associate
10 professors; and

11
12 **Whereas**, removing non-tenure earning applications (12 out of 79 applications in 2016-2017) by
13 assistant and associate professors from the University Promotion and Tenure committee’s caseload
14 would contribute to making this caseload manageable;

15
16 **Be it resolved** that, beginning in the 2018-2019 promotion and tenure cycle, all non-tenure earning
17 promotion applications by assistant and associate professors will bypass this committee and be
18 forwarded directly from the Dean’s review to the Provost unless and until the Faculty Senate develops
19 a new, clearer bylaw about how non-tenure earning faculty should be evaluated by a university level
20 committee; and

21
22 **Be it further resolved** that the *Bylaws of the Faculty Constitution* be amended as follows, and the full
23 Faculty Senate will consider a revised version of Resolution 2011-2012-2 Modification of the
24 Membership of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee:

25
26 Section VIII. Joint Committees and Councils
27 O. University Promotion and Tenure Committee

28
29 ~~2b. Committee membership for review of non-tenure-earning ranked faculty, clinicians and~~
30 ~~researchers for promotion:~~

31
32 ~~Whenever a non-tenure-earning faculty member, clinician or researcher, hereafter referred to as non-~~
33 ~~tenure-earning faculty, is a candidate for promotion, the University Promotion and Tenure committee,~~
34 ~~as constituted in part P2A, shall be augmented by the addition of non-tenure-earning faculty who hold~~
35 ~~a rank higher than those faculty who are being reviewed. The role of additional committee members is~~
36 ~~limited to the review and evaluation of non-tenure-earning promotion candidates. Non-tenure-earning~~
37 ~~faculty shall not comprise more than one-third of the augmented total University Promotion and~~
38 ~~Tenure Committee membership. The non-tenure-earning committee members from each college that~~
39 ~~has non-tenure-earning faculty are to be elected at large by the non-tenure-earning faculty of that~~
40 ~~college. If there are fewer than ten non-tenure-earning faculty in the college, the tenured and tenure-~~
41 ~~earning faculty will also vote. Each additional member shall be an active teacher, clinician, or~~
42 ~~researcher within his/her particular field. No member of the committee may be a member of any~~
43 ~~college or department/school promotion and tenure committee. Also exempted from service are~~
44 ~~faculty who served on the committee within the last two years, unless a college has only one eligible~~
45 ~~professor, and those who are candidates for promotion unless otherwise specified in UCF Regulation~~
46 ~~3.0175. Terms of service shall be two years, staggered.~~

Faculty Senate
Steering Committee Meeting
Minutes of **July 19, 2017**

William Self, chair, called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. Dr. Self explained that the Steering Committee serves as the Faculty Senate as needed over the summer. The meeting was called to address proposals brought forward by the University Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee.

The roll was circulated for signatures. Recognized Steering Committee members Margaret Ann Zaho and Damla Turgut, participating via conference call. Quorum was established.

MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of April 6, 2017 was made and seconded. The minutes were approved as recorded.

RECOGNITION OF GUESTS

Stephen King, College of Medicine, Senate Personnel Committee
Konstantin Vodopynov, College of Optics and Photonics, Senate Personnel Committee
Paul Giordano, College of Arts and Humanities, Senate Personnel Committee
Kristy McAllister, Academic Affairs, Coordinator of Information/Publication Services
Charlie Piper, Associate Director of Contract Compliance and Administrator Support
Ashley Connors, Academic Affairs Contract Compliance and Administrator Support
Elizabeth Klonoff, Vice President for Research and Dean of the College of Graduate Studies
Ronnie Korosec, Associate Provost and Chief of Staff for Academic Affairs
Blake Scott, College of Arts and Humanities, University Promotion and Tenure Committee
Lucretia Cooney, Associate Director of Faculty Excellence
Peter Jacques, College of Sciences, Senate Personnel Committee
Mason Cash, College of Arts and Humanities, Senate Personnel Committee
Obi Nwakanma, College of Arts and Humanities, Faculty Senator
Michele Upvall, College of Nursing, Senate Personnel Committee (phone)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

None.

NEW BUSINESS

William Self communicated the purpose of the emergency meeting was to discuss recommendations from the 2016-2017 University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The proposals were distributed to all invitees via email prior to the meeting. A three page handout to support the proposals was distributed to the attendees reflecting Projected Applications for Promotion for 2017-2018 through 2021-2022, Promotion and Tenure Application Recommendations data, and Non-tenure Earning Applications data reviewed by the committee.

Chair Self opened the floor to Blake Scott to summarize the need for the proposals based on the 2016-2017 work load. Dr. Scott discussed the anticipated increase in applications for the committee in the upcoming years and what a reasonable work load would be for the committee. The committee consensus was that the committee work load was above their capacity in 2016-2017. The number of applications had almost doubled in 2016-2017 as compared to 2015-2016. An additional issue raised was the committee configuration, in that the committee did not feel qualified to review institutes and center applications, as there was not a committee member to provide representation of the institutes and centers. This was discussed as an issue that can be addressed in the *Bylaws*. Dr. Scott further indicated that the issue in the UCF Regulation 3.0175 Promotion of Full-time Non-tenure-earning, Research and Clinical Faculty has been addressed, but not for the tenure-earning faculty regulation. The University P&T committee also had difficulty assessing non-tenure earning applications with only one representative from the College of Medicine representing all of the colleges' non-tenure earning applications. There was also confusion regarding the *Bylaw* for the University Promotion and Tenure Committee membership, in that any college sending a non-tenure earning application to the Promotion and Tenure Committee needs to have a non-tenure earning representative on the committee, which has not been the practice in the past.

Chair Self thanked the leadership of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for their hard work and for bringing the issue to the Senate's attention. He mentioned that in a couple of years we will peak (estimated) applications at around 120. There are several proposals that have been put forward. The Faculty Senate leadership has met with college leadership in the past days and weeks and discussed the University P&T workload issue with them. Other institutions operate differently to efficiently review applications. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee plays an important role in oversight of the college department and college process.

Dr. Scott indicated the committee discussed their role in the promotion and tenure process and the consensus was that the committees' most important role was to serve as an advisory committee to the provost to sort out cases where there were conflicting votes. Chair Self noted the floor is open for discussion.

Clarification: You are suggesting that anything with 80% or more positive vote from the department and college should bypass the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and go directly to the provost for approval?

Remarks: The consensus among other stakeholders in the university was that they were the most comfortable with 100% positive votes instead of the other thresholds.

Question: In the working of the committee, how much time is spent on each unanimous application and discussion?

Answer: Every person on the committee reviews the file whether 100% unanimous or not, but it takes less time than those applications with conflicting votes. The time is incremental in how the time adds up. It's the review of the initial and secondary reviewer in developing the draft review comments that takes time. Regardless of the conflicting or 100% agreed votes, it still takes the same amount of time to review.

Clarification: There are two reviewers that write up the draft of the University Promotion and Tenure comments to a single application. Then, the comments are brought to the committee for discussion and finalization. If there is a formal bypass, then there is no write-up on the review.

Answer: Only if there was a caveat that the provost can ask for clarification.

Question: This is only for unanimous positive votes?

Answer: Yes.

Clarification: In terms of non-tenure earning promotion, you are suggesting that all applications bypass the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Will there still be a provision for conflict review? In other words, can the college committee request review by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee?

Answer: I can see the benefit of that and a parallel committee to handle. Based on updated data, it appears this last year was an anomaly for non-tenure earning applications. Non-tenure applications don't result in increased workload.

Response: In the future, the College of Medicine might be significantly increasing clinical hires due to the new hospital. It is likely to increase numbers in the future.

Comment: Likewise, the provost wants to increase post-doc's that may transition permanent non-tenure hires in the future.

Chair called for other discussion.

Comment: When you look at a process and try and reduce the application load, when you completely remove a category of applications, you remove a certain level of the perspective of the other applications. That is true for the positive and the non-tenure earning applications. The applications are supposed to be held to the same standards. It might make more sense to make a sub-group and split-up the workload and not have everyone on the committee review every application and not necessarily have everyone vote on every application. If there is a separate committee, there is a little bit of danger that the two would get out of synch.

Remarks: We went back and forth between a parallel committee rather than bypassing the committee. There were substantial concerns about the equitable nature of the process and the susceptible process of having different types of reviews. The university committee is foremost focused on comparing the application against the written standards and not against individuals.

Question: What is the normal process? Are applications reviewed at random, most unanimous, by college?

Answer: Last year, we had a designated time to handle non-tenure earning so that the additional non-tenure earning reviewer didn't have to sit through all applications. Otherwise, it was mostly alphabetical. But there may be ways to streamline the process if we reviewed by college.

Comment: There have been a lot of suggestions, but the bottom line is the write-up. Let's say there is a 110 applications with 45 applications that are unanimous. There isn't a formal bypass, but the first meeting might be more like a NIH review in that the 45 unanimous applications are being presented to the committee as all positive. After reviewing the applications, the committee is asked if any need to be discussed. If no, then a standard write-up is presented to the provost, but they are still reviewed by the committee members. As a faculty member, I would be concerned if there was a bypass and a different level of review.

Comment: As soon as you do something different, the department and college will vote differently.

Response: It opens the process up for one member of the committee to create an inequitable scrutiny on an application.

Comment: This is the one major instance where faculty sue the university.

Comment: I came from a union university that only resolved conflicts and it wasn't an issue. It's really about the culture. Everyone was glad that the university committee never looked at their application.

Response: It would be good if the University Promotion and Tenure Committee had examples of how other universities handle the process and bring examples. Some universities review the total number of applicants no matter what the number.

Response: We looked at major research universities and we were surprised at the number that either bypass unanimous applications, treat the college level as the final review, or had duplicate committees at the university level.

Comment: Most of the important context is going to occur at the department or college level; comparing apples to apples to those that know the criteria. It may be a concern, but I think it will be taken care of at the department and college level.

Response: Also, if the collective impact Strategic Plan is integrated in the criteria, it will be reviewed at the department and college level.

Response: But it would be potentially the unanimous applications. If it was a discussion over interdisciplinary research not being to the same level as disciplinary research you would expect a mixed vote or negative vote for the committee to review.

Question: What are the restrictions on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee changing its' own internal process?

Response: We are bound by the University Regulation.

Question: Does that mean that everyone on the committee must review every application?

Response: I believe so. The language is parallel to the department, college, and university level. Especially whether a member can vote or not. The member has to review the file and be present for discussion in order to vote.

Comment: But the language refers to all applications must be reviewed, not that each individual committee member must review each application.

Question: So for the unanimous applications you could have partial committee vote?

Response: Technically, probably.

Comment: That would need to be addressed in the *Bylaws* of the committee.

Response: The committee is ready to address regulation changes, but felt the first step was to bring the issue to the Senate.

Comment: Don't think you can just leave the decision to the college, as different departments may result in different standards based on the size of the unit. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee is the quality check.

Response: One college informed the Senate that they are now multiple departments specifically for this process.

Response: It's the "who," not the structure. Larger colleges don't know everyone in every department, where a smaller college probably knows everyone.

Question: With Dr. Young leaving the university what impact will this have on the proposals?

Response: Asked to clarify.

Question: It appeared that provost Young was the driving force behind the shortened Cumulative Progress Evaluation (CPE) for Associate Professors and was in favor of a more streamlined process for promotion and tenure. With Dr. Young leaving, do we know who her replacement will be and are they in line with the same thinking?

Answer: The idea was presented by the provost because of the large work load in the future and his interest in ensuring that all applications were carefully reviewed and vetted. The provost tasked Dr. Young with the role of creating the language and idea behind the issue. There are multiple areas that provided input and reviewed the proposals. Dr. Young has already identified Dr. Jana Jasinski to serve in an interim role until the national search is concluded and is adequately prepared to step in for Dr. Young.

Comments: Ensuring equity and a high standard is important, but looking at the data, it looks like what is driving this is the applications that receive very high reviews at the department and college level are always being approved by the university committee. Most of the work is already being done at the department and college level only to have the university committee spend a lot of time reviewing the same applications. Also, the standards submitted by the colleges and departments have to be approved by Faculty Excellence.

Chair noted that the Steering Committee doesn't have a resolution and asked for any motions by the Steering Committee?

Motion and second to make the issue a top priority for the Senate Personnel Committee in August.

Comment: This would be acceptable for this year since the projections don't show a major increase for the next year and this will allow for any change to go into effect the following year.

Vote: All in favor; no opposed; no abstained; motion passes.

Request: The minutes from this Steering Committee meeting be sent to the Personnel Committee.

Question: The smaller recommendation that is less controversial is having the Office of Research elect an Institutes and Centers faculty member as a voting member of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. That would be a big improvement for next year.

Response: It's in the purview of the Personnel Committee and can be added to the agenda item, but would require a resolution for a *Bylaw* change.

Question: Why add a faculty member from the ORC?

Answer: The Institutes and Centers do have tenure line applications housed at nanoscience.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made and seconded. The committee adjourned at 12:40 p.m.