

Minutes of the FAC 02-15-07 meeting

The meeting was called by the Chair of the Committee at 3 pm. In attendance were:

Jack Mecholsky, Chair
Dave Bloomquist, Secretary
Eric Wasman
Oscar Crisalle
David Mazyck
Jacob Chung
James Klausner
Tim Davis
Jenshan Lin

ITEM 1. The first item on the agenda dealt with the Chairs' Survey. There was a 60% - 80% return rate. Unfortunately a reminder to the eligible faculty listed two links and there was a slight concern that a faculty in one Department would survey another's Chair. However, there was only a few additional people that took it so, it is probably not an issue. However, in the future, CRC will handle the entire process. In addition, they can keep track of the number of people that voted so as to prevent voting twice. The results will be sent to the various chairs as well as those that voted.

A question arose on whether the results would be posted on the FAC Website. The decision was to not to do it, but that if a particular faculty member wanted to share his or her Department results with someone from another Department, that was their prerogative.

Jack said he has had several comments – such things as “what if I want to vote 5 time?” or “why didn't we include comments”? Perhaps in the future, we will have a comment section, but for now no.

The conclusion was that we learned a lot and will avoid these potential mistakes in the future.

ITEM 2. The T&P best practices item was postponed until Jim Klausner arrived.

ITEM 3. IT Infrastructure. Jack suggested that we be aware of what is going on. A concern is that decisions will be made and implemented without adequate feedback from the stakeholders. The concern is the centralization of IT infrastructure across campus, the “one shoe fits all” concept.

ITEM 4. Tim Anderson was invited to attend, but could not make it. He wants to get the FAC to help identify nominees for the Distinguished Faculty Award and the UFRF (Research Fellow). He wants a procedure. One idea is for each Department to nominate a person. Then the list would go to Tim and the previous winners would select the recipients College would rank them and send them on to Tigert.

ITEM 5. The current procedure of holding Graduate and Undergraduate Graduating Ceremonies separately was brought up. The FAC felt this was doing a disservice to both groups. Eric wondered what could be done to re-combine the two events, and Jack said perhaps a letter to the Provost would be a possibility.

[A brief discussion about market equity raises ensued. In particular that virtually everyone is eligible if they can prove they are underpaid relative to their peers. However, there is no funds for this program and that the departments are responsible. Since this will be a permanent program, it may prove problematic for departments and could affect whether or not to accept new hires. The College of Business's model was explained. By not filling vacancies, they have a small, well paid faculty that utilize distance learning and large video aided assembly courses. This allows them to provide market equity raises when appropriate.]

David B. told the group that he understood that the President would ultimately approve the minus grades, but that he was waiting for more input from students and the Curriculum Committee before signing off on it. Oscar agreed stating that if we want to promote shared governance, we need to make sure it applies to all UF constituents.

Jack brought up the issue of plagiarism. This is a major problem. We need to alert faculty to report problem students (Office of Judicial Affairs) so that a written record is made. Then if a student repeats the offense, there is documentation that it had occurred in the past.

Oscar reminded the group about the Buckley Amendment – privacy issues and that one should never tell a colleague so and so cheated. If there is fallout from so and so not getting a job, he or she could claim defamation of character – resulting in a \$50,000 lawsuit against the faculty member! Thus, he favors the proactive stand, i.e., prevent situations where cheating may occur.

Jack asked how should we deal with disseminating this information to the faculty? Oscar suggested a short narrative that could be posted on our Website, or at least, have the Chairs remind their faculty to read the Code of Ethics to their students periodically and during the first day of classes, tell them that you will not tolerate cheating (giving them examples of what you consider cheating) and that there will be consequences.

ITEM 1. Was revisited. Jim said he received feedback stating that they wished there had been a comments section. Jack explained that this was on purpose to allay the concerns of the Dean and Chairs about comments being publicized or disseminated. Jim said another wanted a question, "Do you support your Chair, Yes or No".

Jack said that we had a 60 – 80% return rate from the 6 Dept. Surveys. The plan is to supply a link to the surveys at CRC and only those faculty that were eligible to take the survey can sign in and see their respective Department results. The COE averages will also be available for comparison.

One suggestion about the comments was to include a question asking what other types of questions would the faculty like to see on the survey. Another idea would be to have questions that consist of multiple "check box" answers – basically having preprinted comments that one could check off.

ITEM 2, that was postponed pending the arrival of Jim, was revisited. He reported back on the T&P subcommittee discussions. His committee focused on the following issues.

- a. Who should be allowed to communicate with the COE T&P committee members regarding a candidate? They were worried about campaigning (pro or con) outside of the formal meetings.
- b. Who can the candidate contact within the T&P committee in order to stay apprised of the deliberations. For example, if he or she wants to provide additional information to the group.
- c. How should Departmental T&P meetings be conducted? Currently there is no across the board standard practice. Perhaps there should be.
- d. Who should preside over Departmental T&P meetings? Most departments have their Chair preside, while Che E does not.
- e. What is a reasonable time frame for faculty to review packets? One example is one Department allows for one day to review them.
- f. What about lobbying for or against a candidate?
- g. When should voting take place after reviewing packets and or Dept T&P meetings?

Tim suggested we put together a list of do's and don'ts (i.e., how the Sunshine law affects meetings/deliberations).

Jim said this is not a black and white issue. He said he would get together with the new General Council to get an updated opinion on what we can and cannot do, vis-à-vis the Sunshine Law.

The most pressing concern was the issue of Due Process. That is to say, there should be written safeguards to ensure that a candidate will be given a fair evaluation towards T&P by all.

He said the group wanted to interview the recent T&P candidates to see if they felt the procedure was fair. He asked if the FAC had other concerns, to please contact.

Tim said another item raised was if a comment or question is brought up during the Depart T&P meeting that could not be answered, then perhaps the meeting should be postponed until it is.

Jim's subcommittee suggested that each candidate have an advocate who is intimately knowledgeable with the packet who can answer any questions that arise. If the advocate does not know the answer, the proceedings would be postponed. Alternatively, the candidate could supply written explanations to the faculty. Oscar mentioned that Che E does the former, with a colleague presenting a PPT on the

candidate's strengths. Jim liked the idea that if a question is not adequately answered, a faculty member can call for a second meeting to resolve it, prior to a vote.

In large Departments, getting everyone together is problematic. This is especially true when a second meeting is called. For example, if in a meeting things are brought up that eventually turn out to be incorrect, and a faculty member misses the second meeting that rectifies it, he or she will vote based on incorrect information.

One idea is to schedule the two meetings at a single time. Then, if the second is not needed, at least it was on everyone's schedule.

Regarding packets, a common problem is how authors are listed in publications. It appears that there is no standard "who goes first". In engineering, typically the senior author is first, but in medicine, he or she is listed last. One idea is for each candidate to provide a short narrative on how he or she lists co-authors. But, this might conflict with UF policies. Jim said there is a place for additional comments in the packet and perhaps this would be a good place for the candidate to explain minor nuances in listing.

Tim brought up another issue. Department faculty members may see one packet, and the COE T&P another. Cammy thinks the best solution is for Jan in the Dean's office to do the packet formatting prior to the Department getting it for review and voting. This way both groups see the same document. Time may be an issue with this idea.

Jim said he would type up these questions/issues and put them on our Website for faculty to provide input. Jack would then relay this information to the faculty saying these are issues from our working group and would welcome feedback via other questions, potential solutions, etc. He would further state that the reason for this effort is to provide a fair T&P process to candidates.

Oscar got the last word on how to get to our Website. It is currently quite convoluted, and it was suggested that Jack and Cammy get together so that our link is included alongside with other Administration offices. It might be labeled, "FOR FACULTY ONLY" and that one would have to sign in with their Gator ID. Once signed in, all FAC issues would be available for viewing, commenting etc.

Oscar closed with a request that Jack ask the powers to be (most likely the Chairs) that people serving on this committee and the Senate, be relieved of teaching on these times and days (our FAC and Senate meeting days). Dave B. was going to look into the "privilege parking for Senators" during Senate meetings.

With no further business –
Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dave Bloomquist
Secretary, FAC

