

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 16, 2006

Dr. Manoj Chopra, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. The roll was circulated for signatures. The minutes of *January 26, 2006* were unanimously approved.

RECOGNITION OF GUEST

Dr. Chopra introduced guests Drs. Lin Huff-Corzine, Lynn Hawkins and Dennis Dulniak and Ms. Charlie Piper.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- ◆ Rumblings in Tallahassee about proposed 5% tuition increases. May be less.
- ◆ Lists for election for Faculty Senate for 2006-2007 have gone to Deans.
- ◆ Need to have another meeting next week so this meeting will be recessed for a continuation meeting next week at originally scheduled time.

Provost Hickey

Provost commented on the tuition issue. If less of tuition increases, there may be less new state support for enrollment growth. Percent increase may not impact number of students or applications but student government association is advocating for a lower tuition increases. We are 49th or 50th lowest tuition in the country. We have room to increase undergraduate instate tuition if needed and still remain highly competitively. Any increase in tuition also has an impact on Bright Futures and Tuition and Graduate and Out of state tuition meets or exceeds market.

Old Business

Ad-hoc committee UCF-TIP/RIA/SoTL- Dr. Cook

We will have a 45 minute discussion on this item if needed. Purpose of discussion is to provide input to ad hoc committee and steering committee. Ad hoc committee members were recognized and thanked for work on this project. The committee has been meeting to look at procedures for UCF TIP and address questions and concerns raised. Major change is to be more inclusive of faculty with assignments which have made them ineligible for awards in the past.

Retained original eligibility criteria based on good quality teaching of large numbers of students (high FTE generation) with an added option to allow those not meeting eligibility on this basis in a new ad hoc category. Encourage inclusion of criteria other than the student perception of instruction as evidence of quality teaching. Make eligibility every five years. But, if on sabbatical or other leave or non teaching assignment can use a prior year.

Some suggestions for portfolio were made but nature of most of portfolio must be determined by the college. Ad hoc category: If a college has only one award, will still have only one award with ad hoc and median category submissions being considered together. Internship issues: No teaching occurs. Amount of work for these is minimal. Leave it up to the college selection committees.

Will new colleges be reflected? Yes. Questions about letter for students currently enrolled. Any college can consider what criteria they will use. Contextualization of student perception data can be part of the

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 16, 2006

criteria suggestion. Optional criteria for colleges for credit hours for internships. Instructors who are not eligible for SoTL may be allowed to put in for TIP here since they can not get a SoTL.

Question asked about the TIP criteria procedures committee. Who has ultimate authority of documents? Answer: The provost and oversight of college criteria. Eligibility review committee by Senate. Need information on voting on committees in colleges.

Apportionment issue: College-given criteria can apportion between nominal and ad hoc group. Total to any one college set but college can determine how many they give in each group. Committee members discussed over time. Objection that in some departments there will be disproportion because some departments have such small teaching loads. Would be better if College can determine number of ad hoc?

Question asked why all the titles are used (schools, departments). To reflect all possible titles for the academic unit. Traditionally about 65% of all faculty are eligible to apply each year. Materials which evaluate teaching must go beyond SPoI. Delete 10 % phrase. (In part B). Need college selection committee statement and how to vote on them. Criteria 5 (c) does already give ability to shift if not enough qualified candidates are found in a category.

Institutional research office did get data about eligibility and what caused faculty to drop out of eligibility. Final authority of who gets awards – provost and president's role. Punctuation corrections need to be made. The next meeting of the subcommittee will take place in Phillips Hall, Room 406I on March 1st at 11 AM. If only allocate 10% in the ad hoc category, it will discourage faculty from applying. Reallocation of awards in section 5 (c).

Contract says will not be rolled over so does that need or to be omitted consistent with contract. Contract says it will go into general wage increase pool for that year. Current contract does not allow roll over as included in the revised criteria. Suggested we leave this in to give sense of the Senate as to awards consistent with the role of the Faculty Senate. Rollover is not related to those who retire. It is only if not all awards given. If someone retires the award comes back to be awarded the next year. Please communicate with Ida Cook or other committee members with comments.

New Business

Proposed move of Liberal Studies program to Office of Undergraduate Studies.

Background: Dr. Schell informed the Senate that The Office of Undergraduate Studies was original home of Liberal Studies. When Office of Undergraduate Studies was abolished, the Liberal Studies program was moved to College of Arts and Sciences. With recent changes in CAS, we now see the value of moving it back to Office of Undergraduate Studies since it is reflective of many colleges. Dr. Schell is bringing this issue here in consulting mode. Interested in questions and discussion.

What is rationale for gauging the number of students for criteria for where program is housed? There are no budget implications for any college in this move. All credit hours go to the college of faculty teaching the course taking by students in Liberal Studies. Only two GIS courses are taught in Liberal Studies. Desire is to have those courses based in a Department or School and therefore in a college.

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 16, 2006

What is the role of Advisory Council for Undergraduate Studies? This is not the council. It is an Advisory Council for Liberal Studies. Their function will not change. Details of administration not determined.

Dr. Koons raised the point that the issue of degree granting programs not in colleges has been addressed in past. Is that going to happen here? We would have a degree granting program in a college and missed that level of administration and supervision. Bachelor of Applied Science is also in Office of Undergraduate Studies. Office of Undergraduate Studies has a council which meets regularly and would continue to do that for liberal studies. Group with associate deans from all colleges would look at any new tracks.

Question rose about interdisciplinary studies groups remain in college of Arts and Humanities. Will be under the dean in that college. Initial concern with programs not in colleges was also a concern with faculty. There are no faculty in this entity.

There was an AS/BS program in Photography with faculty which was related to Liberal Studies. This program has been moved to College of Arts and Humanities. Faculty were housed in art department. Other individual faculty do have clear home in a department. What about graduate program in Liberal Studies. That will go to Office of Graduate Studies. It was suggested that most of courses in sciences should be housed in College of Science.

Question rose about why the Office of Undergraduate Studies was abolished in past. It was in response to SDES and thought that Office of Undergraduate Studies was redundant. It lacked academic integrity and rigor. This was corrected by move to a college where curriculum addressed as part of the work of the college. It had an academic committee and accommodated minors and concentrations. The masters' degree grew out of these efforts. Colleges gave the program academic respectability. Because the program is made up of minors and concentrations in departments, it will give the program overview.

Liberal studies does generate dollars via Pegasus model which looks at number of majors as well as enrollees. The college that has these students will get this money. If in Undergraduate Studies, the cost of salaries in the office to monitor this far exceeds income per major.

Office of liberal studies was interdisciplinary work in addition to simple liberal studies. Data based on intents to graduate. Have an N of 372 on which the data presented was based. It is not clear how percentages per colleges are determined. It reflects coursework done in major degree. Initial suggestions were to go to the new College of Arts and Humanities. But, then Dr. Schell came to realize that the students are from many areas. Ran the data and found this to be true.

Dean Siedel commented that this was a done deal. It was a broad discussion. Some in the sciences were concerned about some of the sciences based programs being reviewed by College of Arts and Humanities in the past.

Provost Hickey commented that when this came to his office it came from the Liberal Studies advisory office and the data supported the proposals to place it out of any one college. It could go to the college where most students host the program. Question: Would this mean that the program would be moved as the average change over time. Provost commented that his office did not go looking for this program. The program came to the Provost Office. Drs. Schell and Bishop will provide administrative home. Academic home is departments of majors and concentrations where the courses are housed.

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 16, 2006

It will go to the advising program of liberal and interdisciplinary studies in a fixed location. If a decision is made to do this, there will be a home for liberal studies in space on 3rd floor of classroom building (CL).

Discussion: Another strong program with no faculty and that is Honors. Could this program be placed in the honors college? Yes, this was considered because there was a feeling these are very different programs. Both have the same issues in getting instructors to teach in some of the programs in the college. Addressing this in a way of purchasing instruction for Honors College. Have talked about using a similar model for Liberal Studies and interdisciplinary studies program. There is a need to provide the director with means to implement program.

Dr. Cook asked for additional information with better data about where most of courses are taken not just intent to graduate. Students need to have a sense of a home. If and when any faculty hired for this program, the Senate needs to be informed. Dr. Schell said that if that happens, he will come to the Senate. No intent to hire faculty to this program just as there are none hired to honors college program faculty. Provost Hickey stated agreement with this statement. This concluded discussion on this topic.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Budget & Administrative** – Dr. Charles Kelliher
Will report on Feb 23rd.
- **Graduate Council** – Dr. Stephen Goodman
Will report on Feb 23rd.
 - **Policy and Procedures Subcommittee** (chaired by Stephen Goodman)
No report
 - **Graduate Curriculum Subcommittee** (chaired by Ram Mohapatra)
No report
 - **Graduate Appeals Subcommittee** (chaired by Jana Jasinski)
No report
- **Personnel** – Dr. Jeff Kaplan
Dr. Kaplan presented a resolution from the committee on Travel Reimbursement. He read as follows. The resolution was unanimously approved.

Resolution 2005-2006-4 Travel Reimbursement

Whereas, the University expects faculty to travel as an essential part of their duties and responsibilities - for the enrichment and enlightenment of their professional development in teaching, service and research.

Be it resolved that the University of Central Florida will relentlessly pursue avenues that will lead to:

- a) an increase in the per diem rate for meals to be consistent with the current federally established guidelines.
- b) an increase in the mileage rate for faculty using their own vehicles to be consistent with the current federally established guidelines.
- c) a streamlining of the procedure to file a claim for reimbursement of expenses incurred while on university business.

Faculty Senate Meeting
February 16, 2006

- **Undergraduate Policy & Curriculum** - Dr. Bob Pennington
Will present at next meeting.

Other

NONE

ADJOURNED

Because of time of day, it was suggested by Dr. Chopra that the Senate recess after this discussion and continue with the rest of agenda next week. Motion made seconded and approved. The meeting recessed at or around 6:30 pm.

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 23, 2006

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

RECOGNITION OF GUEST

Dr. Cook introduced guests Drs. John Schell, Patrice Lancey and Leslie Lieberman.

Old Business

Resolution 2005-2006- 5 Constitution Revision – Dr. Pennington

Dr. Pennington reviewed work which has been done on Faculty Senate Constitution because reapportionment from each college must be made for both number of senate members and also committee members. It now reads one member from each college for the constitution. Process for doing this is already covered in sections 3.3 and 5.1 of existing constitution. He brought forward the following resolution to accommodate the needed change in number of colleges and other wording in the Faculty Constitution.

Resolution 2005-2006-5 Apportionment and Committee Membership Changes Resulting from the Division of the College of Arts and Sciences

Where As, a result of the division of the College of Arts and Sciences into two new colleges, (the College of Arts and Humanities and the College of Sciences), and Following Sections 3.3 and 5.1 of the existing Faculty Senate Constitution which provide for such changes by a simple majority vote of the Faculty Senate. Therefore,

BE it resolved, that the Senate acknowledges the changes in the number of colleges and recommends the automatic adjustment in committee representation and wording as provided for in the existing constitution be made to reflect those changes.

The relevant sections of the constitution are reproduced below with critical sentences in **bold font**: **“3.3 Apportionment**. The number of elected members of the Faculty Senate will be apportioned among the colleges and units as follows:

(Number of eligible faculty in a college or unit)

Number of senators = 60 x -----

(Number of eligible faculty in the University)

The number of senators representing a college or unit will be determined by rounding the above calculated value to the nearest whole number. A unit is defined as any degree granting academic unit, not within an established college, and shall have proportionate representation on the Faculty Senate as defined above.

3.3.1 Each college will have a minimum of two representatives in the Faculty Senate. The professional librarians shall have two voting representatives in the Faculty Senate to be elected by the professional staff of the library.

3.3.2 Apportionment will be made only once each year, based on the number of individuals with full-time tenured, tenure-earning, or multi-year appointments who are listed as faculty on official records of the University on the first day of the spring semester of that year.”

“5.1 Amendments to the Constitution may be considered by the Faculty Senate upon (1) recommendation of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee or (2) written request of ten percent of the members of the Faculty Assembly. The text of a proposed amendment must be made available electronically to the members of the Faculty Senate at least thirty days prior to the meeting at which it will be considered. For provisional adoption, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative majority vote of the members of the Faculty Senate who are present.

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 23, 2006

After provisional approval of the proposed amendment, the text of such amendment shall be made available electronically to all members of the Faculty Assembly for their review, consideration, and input to the Faculty Senate within fourteen days of notification. At a subsequent meeting of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, all input from the members of the Faculty Assembly shall be considered for potential revisions to the amendment. The text of the proposed amendment, with any revisions based on the input of Faculty Assembly members, shall be made available electronically to all members of the Faculty Assembly at least thirty days prior to the meeting of Faculty Assembly to consider adopting the proposed amendment. For final adoption, the proposed amendment must receive an affirmative two-thirds vote of those who are present. If a quorum is not achieved at this meeting of the Faculty Assembly, a subsequent called meeting of the Faculty Senate shall consider the proposed amendment for final adoption. At this called meeting of the Faculty Senate, all members of the Faculty Assembly shall be invited to attend and participate. For final adoption, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative two-thirds vote of the members of the Faculty Senate who are present. **If there is a change in the designation of an office or in the title of an official included on a standing or reporting committee, the membership representation on such a committee and in the Constitution will be automatically adjusted to reflect the change. Such changes will be presented to the Faculty Senate for its approval."**

The other constitution-related item dealing with the change in the name of General Education Oversight Committee will be brought forward later since they will need a long timeline. That issue needs approval of the Senate for ratification. There was no discussion or questions on Resolution 2005-2006-05. Motion made seconded and approved. Vote carried unanimously.

Student Perception of Instruction – Dr. Wink

Process of data collection (possible fully online) being examined by a group headed by Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine. Examination of content and types of analyses done on data done by a committee looking at Academic Rigor at UCF after hearing multiple faculty concerns about problems with current form and how outcomes used. The committee will need to form a workgroup to look at the context and data instruction tool. It needs volunteers for the process of looking at the tool. Please be sure to contact Diane Wink, if you are willing to volunteer.

New Business

Quality of Life/Climate Survey – Drs. Lieberman and Lancey

Issues discussed in presentation; background and survey methodology, key findings and preview of results, UCF directions and Faculty Senate directions. Analysis Strategy defines significant differences between faculty, A&P and staff. Significant differences within faculty; tenured and tenure-earning and non-tenure-earning. Tenured faculty issues are gender differences, ethnic group differences and college differences. When group sample size was small; applied following rule to explore group differences; negative scale score was 20% or more and negative scale score difference between groups was 10% or more.

In the key findings, all personnel are generally satisfied in their departments and units; A&P are the most satisfied. Faculty who are mentored (in many areas) are satisfied with their mentoring. There are some gender and ethnic minority group differences among faculty. All personnel indicated their departments and united are tolerant of all groups. Further discussion and illustration with graphs and charts in the presentation. Additional EAS websites and more detailed data.

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 23, 2006

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

➤ **Budget & Administrative** – Dr. Charles Kelliher

In the fall we had several productive meeting with Ed Neighbor regarding the Pegasus model. He always seems receptive to discussing the details of the Pegasus model, Steering may want to invite him to a future Senate meeting. Have not called the committee together for our January & February meetings since there hasn't been any action items forwarded from the Steering Committee.

Have received the RFP's regarding the Undergraduate Teaching Equipment Program. A summary to date:

- * Amount to be awarded \$400,000.
- * This year we received 93 proposals asking for nearly \$1,200,000.
- * Last year we received 99 proposals asking for \$1,000,000.
- * Dr. Kelliher is forming a sub-committee (1 representative from each college) out of the full committee to evaluate the proposals (waiting to hear from several individuals regarding potential meeting times).

➤ **Graduate Council** – Dr. Stephen Goodman

○ **Policy and Procedures Subcommittee** (chaired by Stephen Goodman)

Met three times since the last Senate meeting. At these meetings the subcommittee has continued its involvement with a variety of issues that have previously been brought to the attention of the Senate. Among those issues are:

- ◆ Providing competitive stipends and tuition support for graduate students.
- ◆ Establishing a consistent and uniform definition of full time status for graduate students.
- ◆ Establishing procedural guidelines in the use of spilt level classes.
- ◆ Ensuring that sufficient graduate hours are contained in master's programs of study to remain complaint with SACS accreditation requirements.

This subcommittee has forwarded to the Steering Committee, a resolution draft related to this last issue. The Steering Committee is reviewing this, and reviewing input from interested parties. It is quite likely that we will see this resolution on the floor of the next Senate meeting. This subcommittee will continue to meet weekly throughout the semester.

○ **Graduate Curriculum Subcommittee** (chaired by Ram Mohapatra)

Has met twice since the last Senate meeting. During those two meetings the subcommittee death with the following:

- ◆ 15 Course Action Requests (5 additions and 10 revisions)
- ◆ Requests for material and supply fees in 8 courses
- ◆ Proposals for 3 new graduate certificate programs
- ◆ Revisions to 2 master's programs
- ◆ Proposed name change to master's program
- ◆ Deactivation of 2 master's program

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 23, 2006

- **Graduate Appeals Subcommittee** (chaired by Jana Jasinski)
Has met twice since the last Senate meeting. This subcommittee has been presented with 24 student petitions, and was able to accommodate 15 of them at the first meeting. The second meeting (which was held earlier today) was devoted to the review of petitions that were not able to be addressed at the earlier meeting.

- **Personnel** – Dr. Jeff Kaplan
Made report on Feb 16th. Committees are free to identify issues which can be addressed. All do not have to come from senate steering committee.

- **Undergraduate Policy & Curriculum** - Dr. Bob Pennington
Have met and approved multiple new or modified curriculum changes as well as changes in and completely new certificates programs. Some changes are being made. Looking at issues of split level classes (4000/5000) which have been brought up at graduate level Internship criteria.

Guidelines for UPCC and what must be looked at by this committee. March 21 is next meeting. Agenda items due next week. Will also be meeting in April. Have sent to various colleges lists of faculty to verify eligibility so apportionment can be done. Business and BCBS still need to send back. Next month will be last meeting of this senate. Anything not done will be brought forth to next senate.

Other

NONE

ADJOURNED

Motion made seconded and approved. The meeting adjourned at or around 5:30 pm.