



Faculty Senate Office
Ashe Administration Building, #325
1252 Memorial Drive
Coral Gables, FL 33146

facsen@miami.edu
web site: www.miami.edu/fs
P: 305-284-3721
F: 305-284-5515

MEMORANDUM

To: Donna E. Shalala, President

From: Richard L. Williamson
Chair, Faculty Senate

Date: April 30, 2014

Subject: Faculty Senate Legislation #2013-41(D) – Faculty Senate Administrative Services
Committee Report

The Faculty Senate, at its April 23, 2014 meeting, voted unanimously to accept and endorse the Faculty Senate Administrative Services Committee Report and Recommendations with the exception of item VIII, “Experiment in Allowing the Same Class Admission and Deadline Date.”

The report is enclosed. The recommendations will be taken up in August in so far as they require changes to the *Faculty Manual*.

This legislation is now forwarded to you for your information.

RLW/rh

Enclosure

cc: Thomas LeBlanc, Executive Vice President and Provost
William Green, Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education
Charlotte Rogers, Chair, Administrative Services Committee
Karen Beckett, Registrar

The Administrative Services Committee: Report for 2013-2014

Committee Guidelines

The *Faculty Manual*, Section B4.4: THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE monitors and reviews, either on its own, upon request by the Chair of the Senate, or upon request of a faculty member, the administrative services of the University. One of the committee's goals shall be to improve the efficiency of administrative services. In order to avoid lengthy delays, the chair of the committee may deal directly with the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost on procedural matters.

Committee Members

Thomas Curtright
JoNell Potter
Marcus Wagner

Igor Kamenkovich
Vanessa Rodriguez
Jonathan West

Deborah Mash
Charlotte Rogers
Pedro Ruiz

Goal, Issues, and Recommendations

The committee's nine members--working under the Senate's guidelines "to improve the efficiency of administrative services"—received ten issues, researched each situation, and made recommendations for resolutions. The summary follows:

I. Merger of Administrative Services and Facilities and Planning Committees

Both committees at the first 2013-2014 meetings voted unanimously to retain the separate two. The two current committees allow more faculty to participate, to understand issues, and to fit meetings of smaller groups into individual schedules. Distinctive duties, though sometimes overlapping, exist. But both committees continue to work well across important issues.

- We recommend retaining the current division.

II. Faculty Clubs for Both Main and Medical Campus

In 2013, Chartwells, the current major contractor for campus food services, planned remodeling of IBIS cafeteria and taking the current space of the Faculty Club on Main Campus. IBIS began remodeling that summer of 2013 and continues through summer of 2014. After work and negotiations by members of Administrative Services and Facilities and Planning, the Faculty Senate Chairperson, Chartwells, and University of Miami administration, we now have the Schematic Design of the proposed Faculty Club. The designated space adjoining Ibis triples the current Faculty Club's space, now with space for improved dining, group meetings, conversational centers both inside and outside the club, and color schemes for a professional environment. From the Schematic Design are (a) rendering-view 1, (b) rendering-view 2, and (c) finish plan in the Appendix of our committee's report, pages 9, 10, and 11. Phase II of the Dining Master Plan, which includes the Faculty Club, is projected, according to Chartwells' University Executive Director, to be ready the beginning of this fall semester of 2014.

But the Medical School remains without a faculty club on its campus. In February of 2014, the Senate Chairperson met with the University President who asked that the Senate submit ideas, ideally by the end of spring semester 2014. Subsequently, the Senate Chairperson called a meeting with chairs of Administrative Services, Facilities and Planning, and Medical Council. These meetings continue.

While both appreciative and excited about the prospect of the needed faculty clubs, Administrative Services makes three recommendations for continued improvements:

- The Main Campus Faculty Club needs designated spaces or visitor passes in the area for off-campus faculty and guests. Handicapped parking should also be nearby.
- Administrative Services recognizes the Medical Campus' needs for a faculty club. This committee should continue to work with the Senate Chairperson, Facilities and Planning, and Medical Council. Our committee agreed unanimously to support the medical faculty in obtaining this on-campus club. But we leave details to the medical faculty knowing their unique needs—whether architectural design to landscaping, location, space, or facilities for group meetings or dining.
- We also recommend those involved—including this committee—with these plans for both clubs assure the negotiations go forward and the plans be fulfilled.

III. Discrepancies in Students' Faculty Evaluations

"Why are more students evaluating my classes at the end of the semester than are on my official class rolls?" This question came to the Senate office from several faculty members. For example, "Fourteen students received letter grades, but eighteen students were allowed to submit feedback." Both professors and department chairs writing evaluations recognize the importance of these evaluations. Subsequently, the Program Coordinator for Testing and Evaluation Services reviewed the problem with specific professors. The evaluative process involves submission of two reports in spring and fall semesters and one during summer session. Reports allow Evaluation Services to match and to correct the lists. "We rely on your feedback to improve our process," continued the coordinator. Later, the follow up of fall semester 2013 with the original professors reporting discrepancies confirmed their number of letter grades matched the student evaluators.

- We recommend that both coordinator and faculty continue to communicate if any further issues appear.

IV. Facilities in Two Classrooms in Cox Science Building

Having received so many complaints about the facilities, technology, and help available in handling problems in the two classrooms in Cox Science Building, the University last fall of 2013, renovated both rooms and installed new technology. Presently those two classrooms contain the most modern technology in both Cox and Memorial. As the technology differs from prior installations, one challenge remaining is to instruct the professors for efficient use. The second challenge concerns planning renovations of classrooms, particularly the lighting installations for a teacher's control in varied lesson needs. The third challenge arises from both location of Cox and limited technological personnel responsible for both Memorial and Cox.

- In planning and equipping professors' classrooms, consider involving a committee of professors in the specific discipline—or disciplines—using those classrooms.
- Consider the ratio of technological personnel to faculty needs, distance and time required for response when problems occur, and more periodic checks, replacement, or repair of malfunctioning equipment.

V. Medical School Research Grants—the Cry for Help

In both renewing and applying for new medical research grants, some medical faculty are experiencing problems both in communication and in help from its Office of Research Administration (ORA). Two examples, representing several, clarify this issue: (1) While seeking to renew a research grant and speaking to NIH in Washington, D.C, that NIH representative asked, "Doesn't the University of Miami want this money?" And in March of 2014 when a faculty researcher—knowing the process at NIH for Sponsored No-Cost Extensions-- completed papers correctly for the final processing from ORA and Office of Research and Compliance (ORC), these processors added to the plea for help. NIH responded: "This is done wrong." (2) Two medical faculty, with million dollar grants and experiencing frustrating attempts for efficiency with the University's designated channels for help, remain trying to arrange meetings to clarify this situation with the responsible personnel at ORA—after two semesters of trying. Faculty from other UM colleges have either not experienced similar and as many problems or not brought them to the attention of the Senate office.

Although medical research and its awards in grants and contracts have earned national recognition and although the Office of Research Administration has its expertise and online models including those clarifying its Management Chain of Command, Preparing Proposals with Proposal Transmittal Forms, selecting Training Podcasts, and providing Uask FAQs, medical faculty researchers have current needs which should be addressed. These recommendations are made:

- First establish the communication connection. One model could involve a representative committee of faculty involved in medical research meeting with the appropriate deans who in turn would represent the faculty in communicating with Office of Research Administration.
- Recognize and accept important needs of some researchers. Possible solutions come from some medical faculty requests to this Senate Committee:
 - Designate medical campus staff at ORA who can meet with faculty to solve issues.
 - Avoid frequent turnover of staff and re-assignments of submissions and post award.
 - Identify lines of communication.
 - Include faculty in correspondences with NIH.
 - Meet with faculty. Answer faculty queries.
 - With constant errors in effort reporting and needed contract accuracy, review staff training in both areas.
 - Develop a culture of communication with the faculty.
 - Modernize processing of ORC compliance.
 - Also develop IT support involving a systems review for faculty needs.
- Support and reinforce the communication network. For example, use monthly emails such as the "Survey from Office of Research Support Services and Administration" mailed in April to faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences.

VI. Blackboard, the Vital Teaching-Learning Resource

Frequent users of Blackboard returned fall semester to new systems and experienced difficulty without directions—and with directions. First was the accessing, second the filing of class materials, and third the uploading of multiple files “such as 100 pdfs “used in some classes. Once in, faculty experienced problems efficiently using Blackboard. Changes, without notification had been made, which professors had to know and to learn quickly for starting fall semester. Our committee found a professional help desk with online contact, fast feedback, direct phone connections, clear video directions later in the semester, and clarified entry code. The system has improved this semester. But glitches remain, including inconsistent access, inability in the system to handle common—and previously used—efficient entry codes (particularly needed for access during class). The problems seem to stem from several variables: the electronic system itself with limited choices for paths and codes, confusion by faculty in incorrectly viewing CaneLink and Blackboard as same systems, and faculty’s choice of web browser—Internet Explorer, Firefox, Chrome, or Safari, for example. But glitches in access with passwords and identification still appear periodically. Consider these four faculty needs:

- Continue to instruct new users of Blackboard. Even those facing initial and continuing challenges acknowledge and appreciate the professional help available.
- When changes are made, communicate to all faculty expected to use the systems.
- Have technological experts at Blackboard explain the systems to users in group meetings and to individuals, including access for individual help and for professors with their lap tops going to the expert’s office for instruction.
- Increase personnel if needed, especially student help.

VII. Faculty Concerns and Responsibilities in Implementation of Electronic Education

“Computer glitch”—this important phrase was often uttered with the introduction of CaneLink in fall of 2013 and less so in spring of 2014. The phrase became popular when faculty arrived to begin class preparation, turned on the computer, and failed to access as expected. “What’s happening?” Our committee’s research was quickly enriched by the Assistant Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Academic Technology attending our November meeting. This attention to specific faculty problems and subsequent help is appreciated.

Do glitches remain in the now-not-so-new technology? Reports include making IT aware on multiple times of problems without attention to needed solutions, inconsistent access, lack of knowing where to seek help for specific glitches, lack of communication in conveying what capabilities and programs are on CaneLink, and limited conveniences including class attachments on email. Three selected faculty reports follow: (a) With CaneLink, how do we print in readable pages both class and grade rosters which allow the roster for a large class to print on more than one page? One faculty member contacted Enterprise Resource, whose team worked to make the printing needs available through Internet Explorer; then the faculty member shared with the department. But do other departments have the same information? (b) How do sequences of priorities on the wait list get skewed, including number five moving ahead of number one or two? Although waiting lists are out of faculty hands and in control of CaneLink, certain people seem to have access to change those lists. To suggest waitlisted students attend the class seems unfair to both faculty and student, especially if unable to predict chances of enrollment. (c) What happened in spring of 2014 in Honors registrations?

The Honors Program attracts many outstanding students. The glitch in registration for spring semester enrolled unqualified students in Honors classes. Sometimes half a class were not honors students; sometimes three-four quite weak students enrolled and chose to stay when advised of incorrect registration. When evidence—both written and oral—suggested struggling students, class rolls were checked with the Honors office. “What is the policy?” “Check with the appropriate associate dean of your department. Registration was a “computer glitch.”

- Consider the users’ needs including choice of hardware, directions for using new hardware, and feedback and recognition of the faculty’s ongoing needs.
- Increase the personnel—or efficiency of personnel—to have technology experts explain clearly to users in group meetings and to individuals with the access for individual help.
- An email help desk, like that for Blackboard, would also contribute.
- If one user identifies problems and if IT solves that problem, assume other users can experience the same problem. Communicate to all the solution.
- Clarify the sources and the communication paths for technological solutions. These communication lines—established, available, and communicated to all faculty members—are needed for all levels in the process in obtaining technological information, help, and mastery.

VIII. Experiment in Allowing the Same Class Admission and Deadline Date

[The Faculty Senate voted to *not* endorse this recommendation.]

Last year the Faculty Senate agreed on this experiment for one year: to allow the deadline for dropping and the registration for a class to be the same date. Consequently during spring semester, the deadline for both comes 22 January 2014. Faculty identified possible problems with identical dates: Students missing the first class must cover the missed material, students sitting in class waiting for registration create admission expectations, and problems are posed for sections where further enrollment is ill-advised and where no way exists for a faculty member to close one’s class. But these were the same problems previously experienced when dropping and registering occurred on different dates. Our committee—casting the majority vote after considering alternate options and showing faith in solutions--makes the following recommendation:

- Continue the same add-drop days with refined solutions.
- To refine solutions, first control the issue: the yes/no answer can neither please all interests nor solve the problems.
- Solve variables in the larger problem. These include the following:
 - Rules about wait lists online which are violated when changing the priority sequence by too many with access to the wait list,
 - Glitches in online registration which send students needing registering help to departments and faculty,
 - Abuse of overrides when specific class numbers have been based on special needs previously identified,
 - Confusion on drop-add dates when faculty, administration, and students should be on the same page for drop-add,
 - Denial that classes with different subject matter require both faculty and students to adjust differently for late-add dates,
 - Lack of communication and lack of departmental control on closing class enrollments,

- Need for feedback—surveys with occasional open-ended questions, committees, communication of results—from faculty experiencing both workable and unworkable results of add-drop decisions.
- Arbitration of this important decision of drop-add from overlapping interests of faculty, administration, and students.

IX. Faculty Concerns, Responsibilities, and Implementation of Electronic Education

In November of 2012, the Office of the Provost emailed to all faculty an announcement proposing “a strategy for the future of on-line education at UM. The Task Force on On-Line Education was established, consisting of a 13-UM-wide committee under the Provost’s direction to “propose a strategy for the future on-line education at UM.” Subsequently, March of 2013, the Task Force emailed a questionnaire asking faculty “to engage the university community in a conversation about the role of online education as a core mission” of UM.

So that the Faculty Senate could stay both informed and involved, our committee in 2012-2013--among other groups-- was asked, according to its guidelines in the Faculty Manual, to consider this exciting and important development so that the Faculty Senate could stay both informed and involved. Although our committee noted research, concerns, and expectations—both in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, we awaited the report from the Task Force. Receiving and studying this official report on 10 February 2014, Administrative Services, in respect for the expertise of the Task Force with these challenging and important changes proposed for the University, considered how to respond to this issue expected by our committee. We decided on two responses:

- Continue to consider and to respond to the twenty-plus questions asked the Task Force by the Senate Council, General Welfare Committee in its meeting 13 December 2013. including significance of updates.
- We applaud the work of the Task Force on On-Line Education and look forward to its recommendations evolving.

X. Revision of the Faculty Manual, Section C4.6

The Faculty Senate Chairperson asked this committee to revise and update one section of the Faculty Manual: Section C4.6 (b).

These are the recommended revisions: (1) addition of *continuation of UMail Account*, (2) deletion of the words *purchase of* in parking permit and addition of both *at no charge* and *unrestricted lot access*, (3) addition to “purchase of prescriptions—(*cannot accept Medicare*) at the University *Pharmacy*, replacing the general “Health Center” with the specific word *Pharmacy*” (4) removal of *Associated Faculty* from heading C4.6(b), (5) alphabetical listing, and (6) slight stylistic changes for parallel listings and for consistency with the dominant style of the *Faculty Manual* . The offered revision—in its required and official revising form--appears on the next page--6.

The following page 7 contains the purpose, the list of appropriate people with whom Administrative Services confirmed mutual understanding, and the required format for submitting revisions.

Purpose

The Faculty Senate Chairperson asked the Administrative Services Committee to update one section of the *Faculty Manual: Privileges and Benefits of University Faculty, Emeritus*, Section C4.6(b), page 47. This committee has checked both accuracy and mutual understanding of the prior privileges and benefits prior to the General Welfare Committee's two recent recommendations: Add "no charge" (though prior policy honored without wording) and "unrestricted lot access" for emeritus parking.

We confirmed with the Associate Director of Faculty Affairs, Director of Office of Faculty Affairs on Medical Campus, Richter and Calder Medical Librarians, Executive Director of Chartwells at UM, Director of Lowe Museum, Executive Director of the Wellness Center, Manager of UM Pharmacy, Assistant AD for Ticket Operations at UM Athletics, Parking Service Manager at UM Parking, and Manager of UM Bookstore.

The proposed language is written below in underline/~~strikeout~~ format:

Faculty Manual

BEGIN TEXT:

C4.6 Privileges and Benefits of University faculty, Emeritus and Associated Faculty¹

- (a) UNIVERSITY FACULTY are entitled to the benefits and privileges described in the Faculty Benefits section of this Manual.
- (b) EMERITUS are entitled to the following privileges and benefits:
1. access to the University libraries, the Faculty Club, the Lowe Museum, and the Wellness Center.
 2. continuation of UMail account.
 3. any To receive discounts that UNIVERSITY FACULTY are eligible to receive including such as bookstore purchases and tickets to sports events, and other discounts as permitted by law or contract,
 4. an identification card.;
 5. ~~access to the University libraries, the Faculty Club, the Lowe Museum, and the Wellness Center.~~
 6. ~~any discounts that UNIVERSITY FACULTY are eligible to receive including bookstore purchases and tickets to sports events~~
 7. purchase of prescription medicines (cannot accept Medicare) at the University Pharmacy, and
 8. purchase of UM parking permit, and at no charge with access to unrestricted lots.;
 9. ~~purchase of prescription medicines at the University Health Center.~~

¹ [#2009-19\(D\)](#)

10.9. continuation of UMail account.

- (cb) ~~EMERITUS AND~~ ASSOCIATED FACULTY are entitled to the following privileges and benefits:
1. an identification card;
 2. access to the University libraries, the Faculty Club, the Lowe Museum, and the Wellness Center.
 3. any discounts that UNIVERSITY FACULTY are eligible to receive including bookstore purchases and tickets to sports events
 4. purchase of UM parking permit
 5. purchase of prescription medicines at the University Health Center.

In addition, the following Associated Faculty categories are eligible for the benefits listed below in accordance with University policy:

- (d) VISITING FACULTY who are full-time regular are eligible for:
- health insurance for themselves and their eligible dependents
1. life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance,
 2. tuition remission for themselves and their eligible dependents
 3. the Voluntary Retirement Plan

VISITING FACULTY are not eligible for University contributions to the retirement plan;

- (e) LECTURERS and SENIOR LECTURERS who are full-time regular are eligible for:
1. health insurance for themselves and their eligible dependents
 2. life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance,
 3. tuition remission for themselves and their eligible dependents
 4. the Voluntary Retirement Plan
 5. University contributions to the retirement plans.

END TEXT.

In regard to these revisions of the *Faculty Manual*, Administrative Services Committee makes these three recommendations:

- Adopt the proposed revised Section C4.6 of the *Faculty Manual*.
- Insist that all listed benefits now identified free be retained free.
- Communicate the benefits in the revised *Faculty Manual* to all departments in all colleges—including updates to Emeritus who may have missed renewing these benefits.