

2014-2015 SENATE COUNCIL ON RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP  
AGENDA

SEPTEMBER 10, 2014

1:00 – 3:00 p.m. Tigert 202

1. Approval of May minutes (see attached)
2. Election or appointment of new chair for 2014-2015
3. Past year's highlights and discussion topics

**Research & Scholarship Council Minutes (DRAFT)**  
**May 14, 2014 10 a.m.**  
**Norman Hall Room 158**

**Attendees:**

Edith Kaan  
Irene Cooke

Paul Mueller  
Mirka Koro-Ljungberg  
David Hahn

Jorge Peters  
Sue Alvers

Mirka Koro-Ljungberg called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and introductions were made.

**Election or appointment of new contact for 2014-2015**

Jorge Peters volunteered to be the “contact” for the summer until a new chair can be elected in the fall. Most of the members are rotating off due to change in duties and/or transferring to another university. Because of this, there is no one who has served that can take over as chair. SCORS decided the best way to handle this is to have a “contact” until August when the council can then elect an official chair.

**Past year’s highlights**

Mirka distributed a short report on the SCORS highlights from the past year. A long discussion ensued with old members explaining the council’s accomplishments and reasons for decisions and suggestions for future topics. Old members asked that the new members to follow up on several topics

- Academic Analytics - it would be good to get faculty viewpoint on the table and ask administration how it will be used.
- Open Access – Follow up with Christine Fruin about the impact.
- Women in Research - This is a joint issue that SCORS has worked with Welfare Council. What is the data from other institutions?

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

## SCORS 2013-2014 Highlights and discussion topics

### **Discussions**

#### Ongoing:

Effort reporting, sponsored research, and grant assistance activities (e.g., UFIRST, MyInvestigator)

The role of women in funded research

- Recent focus on associate professors. Some institutional data was collected. In April 2014 Paula Fussell and Angel Kwolek-Folland generated a report about associate professors and their status (including discipline, hire date, ethnicity, date of tenure etc.) Mirka has the report.
- Planned follow-up in the fall in collaboration with the Senate welfare council. Maybe conduct a survey to be sent to all (women) associate professors

Academic analytics and its' potential impact on the work of the university, faculty, and staff

Open access

#### Accomplished:

A discussion on human subject payment

- No action taken, information sharing only

A discussion on undergraduate education

- Need to increase faculty participation in undergraduate research activities. Suggestion was made to ask DSR to waive the IDCs when undergraduate students are added to a grant. It was also noted that the program could benefit from highlighted publicity.

A discussion on the role of 1) UF press and 2) UF journals:

- List of UF published journals was created. This list is available for potential distribution.

Discussions on international and interdisciplinary research

- No actions taken, discussion only

APB restructuring proposal (memo)

Distinguished professor process and selection (memo)

- A brief survey was sent to all deans to collect college specific data. Mirka has the survey results.

### **Produced materials and memos**

#### Memos to the Senate chair Marc Heft (see attached):

- 1) Distinguished professor processes improvement suggestions
- 2) President's proposal to expand and reorganize the APB

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Marc Heft

**FROM:** SCORS

**DATE:** April 25, 2014

**SUBJECT:** Distinguished Professor process improvement suggestions

SCORS believes that the distinguished professor awards are an essential part of UF's Top 10 initiative because they recognize and promote excellence and pre-eminent scholarship on campus. These awards can also help with the retention of nationally and internationally recognized scholars, as well improve the university's overall visibility.

Prior to making these recommendations SCORS carried out a review of various current materials and some previously created materials. For example, Angel Kwolek-Folland provided us with a DRAFT MEMO from the Distinguished Professors suggesting improvements to the process and "Comparisons of Procedures for distinguished professors" from other universities (October 15, 2008)). Members of SCORS also carried out a review of processes at eight peer public institutions as well as UF colleges/units. SCORS also sent questionnaires to the deans of UF colleges querying perceptions of the UF review process, the college processes, the colleges' histories with candidates, primary qualifications each candidate should possess, etc.

As a result of the review of these documents we found the selection process limiting and the number of professorship awarded small and not representative of the range and diversity of excellent scholarship existing on the UF campus. More specifically, incumbent distinguished professors representation does not reflect the breadth of academic disciplines of UF Faculty (almost 50% of the distinguished professors are from CLAS and Engineering and five colleges do not have faculty of that distinction). In addition, the pre-selection process at the college level appears to not be favorable and/or equitable to all qualified candidates. Based on the dean's survey responses there might also be gaps in the ways in which processes and purposes of the distinguished professor award are being understood and applied at the college level.

In the light of these limitations we would like to put forward some suggestions to improve the process and award both distinguished research professorships and distinguished service professorships. We suggest that recognition of both distinguished performance in research and service is appropriate and that having both designations may be preferable to a single award. In short, the goals and mechanisms of awarding distinction to individual faculty should be reviewed.

### Financial consideration

- Distinguished professor awards should be funded centrally- not from the college budgets

- We recommend the award to include \$ 5000 increase in base salary, not a percentage

#### Process consideration

- Process could be similar to the standard promotion process including the department and college votes and external letters
- Nominations would be reviewed by APB
- Each college could be awarded up to 1% of their tenure acquiring faculty
- No limit on the number of nominations and self-nominations would be accepted
- Awards due in the fall to avoid overlap with T & P
- Diminish biases and misconceptions associated with the process through education and information sharing (e.g., college quota, weak candidates prohibiting future awards, eligibility criteria)

#### Future considerations

- Awarded faculty members could serve as UF ambassadors of excellence who are expected to share their scholarship within and outside the university including possible consultation with other higher education institutions

January 7, 2014

From: Senate Council on Research and Scholarship

To: Dr. Marc Heft, Senate chair

Re: Presidents' proposal to expand and reorganize the APB

SCORS acknowledges current problems and dilemmas associated with the assignments and tasks of the Academic Personnel Board as outlined in the Presidents remarks to the Senate. It is clear that APB members' workload (cases reviewed/week) has expanded as the University has grown. In addition, some APB members find it challenging to evaluate tenure and promotion cases across disciplines and cultures as individuals with more diverse assignments are reviewed. The SCORS members support the expansion as the only feasible way to reduce the workload on individual APB members and retain the necessary level of review the Board should be providing the President and the applicants.

SCORS believes that expanding the membership from 6 to 10 or 12 members will clearly reduce the workload for individuals, but only if each applicant's file is not reviewed by each board member. This is a major change in how APB has traditionally functioned and raises additional questions about how these new board members will be selected (e.g., elected at large, fixed representation, appointed, etc.), how many there will be, how assignments will be allocated, etc. What appears simple on the surface (expanding membership, especially if it is to two separate groups) is a major, fundamental change that would benefit from examination in the broadest possible context.

Looking forward, for example, there will likely be additional changes needed if the APB is to continue to function in a fair and rigorous manner. SCORS would like to point out that the President's expansion proposal may be best viewed as the first step toward more extensive restructuring plans for the APB and we recommend the faculty senate work with the President to establish an Ad hoc committee to address APB restructuring in more detail and to review the fairness and appropriateness of current processes associated with T & P review. We realize the magnitude of this suggestion, and do not see this as a task to be completed in the time frame suggested by the President for expansion of APB. We suggest the ad hoc committee consider the entire process as currently employed at UF and at our peer institutions, but should at a minimum examine the following topics:

- Effort reporting and faculty assignments need to be aligned and applied uniformly to each T & P applicant (e.g., 3 contact hours = ?FTE)
- Appropriateness of a single format for all T/P/Permanent status applications
- Role and impact of open access and self-publishing in T & P

- Declining response rates for student evaluations
- How on-line instruction/instructors will be evaluated and FTE assigned (including when on-line activity is an overload, rather than an assignment)
- Role of peer-reviews of teaching
- Constitution of membership, method of selection, and viability of discipline or assignment-based sub-committees
- Conflicts between Unit policies and University policies, particularly regarding external letters
- A review of these and other topics by an Ad Hoc committee does not preclude a temporary expansion of APB as the President suggested. Longer term, however, the process would likely benefit from a thoughtful review of all policies and procedures in the awarding of promotions and tenure/permanent status at the University.