

Some comments extracted from the Survey on BOT proposal to introduce 3–4-week intersession courses at UCF

Would these inter sessions be subject to the restriction that 9m faculty cannot be paid more than their 12m equivalent? For example, I am 9m faculty and teach summer a (+2m) and have an administrative appointment (+1m). I would not be eligible to teach an inter session, correct?

There are many questions that are unanswered about the intersessions.

First, how is it to be funded. The university indicates that it does not have money to properly address faculty salary issues but has funds to support new intersessions. Second, is it to be funded fully.

Will funding for the intersessions be enough to support some or all faculty who wish to teach in the intersession. Or is it to be another version of summer where there is insufficient funding to support faculty who may wish to teach but who are unable to do so because of budgetary limitations.

Third, what is the workload that is expected for the intersession to receive a month's salary? Is it to be based on credits and what will that look like in a truncated term?

Fourth, what are the curricular opportunities to be available in the intersessions or will faculty be squeezing in a standard semester course in to three weeks?

Is this a program for new course opportunities or is it a "opportunity" for unsuccessful students to complete a failed course in there weeks.

When did the university ever discuss this change with faculty outside of the context of UCF-UFF?

if I took the winter intrasession, I should just make a reservation at the funeral home during finals because I would be dead but I'm sure there are people who do not have to do research who might be tenured. I say yes to this for instructors who might be able to avail themselves of additional money. Or perhaps a younger tenure track person who might be able to actually pull this out without drafting their obituary.

Most financial aid will not work during intersession so most students will have to pay out of pocket which needs to be part of the conversation. Why does UCF want to offer this?

(1) What are the university's expectations regarding the availability of 12-month faculty/staff from units such as the Libraries and CDL to support students and teaching faculty during these intersessions? For example, is the intent that the Libraries would remain open throughout the entirety of the Winter Intersession so that Interlibrary Loan service and access to print materials is maintained, research consultations are available, and troubleshooting is available when there are access issues with online resources?

(2) Although it won't impact me directly at this time, I don't understand why there is a carve-out denying tuition waivers for these intersessions. It seems like these compressed semesters might be ideal opportunities for some employees to squeeze a course in during a block of time when they don't have as many demands on them from their regular work responsibilities.

How will these Intersessions affect accreditation, grade forgiveness and likely use for GEP classes? When would enrollment occur? How will Bright Futures and financial aid work for these? Will all modalities be offered? Can independent studies or internships be done in these?

I taught classes like this when i was an adjunct at XXXXX. These classes have some very specific shortcomings that would take too long to go through here, but the most limited aspect is the required reading in such a short period of time. However, the real problem with this will be the pressure put on departments to offer these courses since they will increase student enrollments which is how everything is judged these days. That pressure to offer classes will lead to pressure to get people to teach them which will inevitably translate into pressure on instructors/lecturers to teach them. If this does happen credit should be given on AESPs for teaching the courses.

My concerns with this are less about compensation for the time spent teaching during the proposed sessions and more about the sessions themselves. 1) I'm concerned about the ability of faculty to prepare for converting classes to such an accelerated model. I'm wondering if there's going to be support of some kind for that pedagogical transition. If not, it means that the overload will begin much sooner than the compensation as the faculty member will need to prep the course in advance of teaching it. I know this is always the case -- we are being asked to do more and more labor in advance of our term start dates given the expectations and requirements of virtual and online teaching and the use of CANVAS for course materials. But this seems to be a bigger shift as it is a term scope that we have not encountered. 2) Additionally, I'm concerned about the abilities of students to learn 3 credits worth of material during an accelerated session during what is for many a holiday season in the winter, and I am wondering what the repercussions will be for faculty (and for student learning) if the students are not successful. 3) I'm concerned about the variation in course duration for terms. We will have a 3 week winter intersession, a 4 week May intersession, 6 week summer sessions, and 15 week semesters. Most institutions that have a winter term (usually a J term) have a later spring term start date in late January or February. But this seems 4) I'm also worried about faculty burnout and who will feel like they can decline/accept teaching in this overload situation. 4) I'm also wondering how these will count within annual reviews as they have not been part of that process in the past. 5) And I'm wondering if this means the university will no longer close in the winter as faculty and students still need support even when courses are being offered asynchronously. I have a lot of questions and concerns that the proposed pay percentages don't address.

I think there are not many classes that can be taught with decent pass rates in such an abbreviated time. There is currently no funding in departments to do this. These short semesters are biased against complex, information dense classes which could not be done in this time period. Many faculty use these time periods for research. I do not think many students will take the winter intersession, as is too brief. My fear is that this starts out voluntary and goes to mandatory later on. The adm. would be better off to provide more funding for summer classes. We could teach much more then, but never have enough class funding to do it all in summer.

I don't see why there is a need to start this type of course. Are we a university, or a shady for-profit "school"?

These courses sound utterly horrifying to me but if some people want to teach them I'm glad there will be an MOU. My only concern is that someday in the future someone in Millican will decide we need to make all teaching-faculty teach such courses. So this better not be the camel's nose.

What courses will be offered? What will preserve voluntariness if these are specialty courses? How will equitable allocation occur if many volunteer? How will academic integrity be preserved in 3 week 3 credit courses?

Further eroding any semblance of academic standards.

Faculty need a break. It is vital to their physical health, mental health, and general well-being. Going forward with this proposal will further contribute to an already burnt out faculty. Having the winter and May breaks forces faculty to have downtime/prep time that they don't often realize they need. In this money-driven industry that is higher education people need to be given permission to take a break. Shame on everyone involved for trying to capitalize on the backs of faculty that are already undersupported legislatively, undersupported with adequate staff, and when faculty morale in this State is at an all time low. While you state that these are "voluntary" positions they are not voluntary for faculty whose job it is to schedule the courses, whose job it is to staff the courses, and the immense pressure that faculty will feel to "take one for the team" and take an intersession course during a much needed respite. Shame. On. All. Of. You.

This leaves more questions on UCF's position toward faculty especially since the MOU does not allow tuition exemptions

I do think however, that some of our faculty will be inclined to take this on as a chance to earn more, help their students and department, but later be penalized for lack of research. It would be nice if there was some kind of commensurate reduction in research expectations for anyone taking on these classes, which presumably are more a benefit to UCF and its students than doing mediocre research to check off a box.

There is no way in hell that they are budgeting to pay anyone on faculty for these courses. They 100% will be funneling money into adjunct only sections like they are doing now for summer. As a department we get our standard base summer funding and then "extra money" is magically showing up after that and they are saying the university is requesting multiple sections of high demand/high enrollment courses but saying they are only funding them at adjunct rates instead of using that money to pay permanent faculty. Maybe some guarantee that at least 50% of courses offered by each department/school during intersessions will be covered by full time **faculty vs. adjuncts**? I've already been told by my chair that if they ever need extra summer classes taught that I'm "too expensive" and they won't schedule my classes even if there is high demand.

Also, these will be pretty crappy educationally and demoralizing for instructors because students are not going to want to do an entire semester in 4 weeks so there will be even higher rates of cheating and higher rates of failing grades and they are going to tear the instructors apart for unrealistic work loads

and for not understanding that they have lives outside this class, yadda, yadda, yadda. And if a lot of these classes are GEP then the instructor also has to meet GEP assessment requirements. Yuck to all of this.

Also--can there be a cap on the number of intersession courses a student can take at one time? Like, only 1 course at a time?

I am happy there is an opportunity for faculty to earn more money; however, I still resent that we are not being fairly compensated for a base salaries currently. The timeline suggests that faculty essentially would not have any breaks through the academic year, if they so choose, just so they can earn a livable wage. It's insulting.

The Intersession course will impact library and CDL faculty and non-teaching employees who support the courses. Will they be eligible for the additional compensation?

I think the Intersessions are a terrible idea. I already think that the six week summer sessions (A and B) are too condensed and do not promote effective learning. Students seem to believe that they should be able to spend the same number of hours per week during a six week course as they do during a traditional 16 week semester and that results in them not putting in the time necessary to successfully learn the material. Additionally, I have heard from faculty that they often cut out material to fit the six week summer sessions so these courses end up not being equivalent to their fall and spring semester counterparts, putting students at a disadvantage if the material is built upon in future courses. Condensing even further to a 3 or 4 week session will result in additional material being cut and students will not put in the necessary hours to truly learn the material. Cognitive research shows us that the best way to learn is to space out our learning of material and you simply can't do that in a 3 or 4 week semester.

I think that Winter Intersession is a particularly bad idea because the University is often closed for part of this time. If courses are being offered, University resources need to be open and available for students. It has been proposed that these classes would be fully online, so at the very least we would need to have IT staff available to handle any technical issues that arise. Additionally, I think that student resources (such as Student Care Services) would need to be available in case of other issues that might arise. Faculty are encouraged to reach out to various University offices to offer aid to students, but how does this work if those offices are all closed?

Personally, I would not ever want to teach during the winter break. I need this time off to relax and recuperate. Because of my teaching schedule, I am not able to take time off during the fall and spring semesters to travel or visit family. It is important to me to have the semester break times to be able to

take vacation time and see family. I know that the current proposal says that it would be voluntary, but I worry that faculty may feel pressured to take on these classes when they don't want to. Particularly for those of us instructor/lecturer faculty who are on yearly contracts, we may feel pressured to take these intersession classes or else our contracts might not be renewed in the future. I find it ridiculous that the University closes for several days at the end of December in recognition that staff need time off but then they are turning around and asking faculty to keep working at that time. Don't we need time off too?

I know that the stated goal of these Intersessions is to help students take the classes that they need to graduate on time. However, I think a better means to resolve this problem is to determine what classes are not available to students and then make more sections of those classes available during the already existing semesters, rather than trying to cram these classes into Intersessions.

UCF has bargained in bad faith since the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty have not been treated professionally, nor compensated equitably. The last book's agreement for salaries was a fraction of what we deserve. Across the board increases do not meet the pace of inflation and merit is nowhere near where it ought to be for an R1 facility of our scope. The union should oppose further revenue generation initiatives and seek third party mediation to restore us with what has been denied and withheld. NO MORE COMPROMISES.

Even though I have a generally positive feeling about the concept of the intersessions, I have slight reservations in terms of how successful they may be in terms of long-term student success, such as whether if a student takes a course in an intersession that is a pre-req for a different course, will learning outcomes and carryover to that other course be as successful compared to a course taken over a longer time frame? This feels like it has more benefit to the university (more \$\$, faster graduation rates) than it does for students. Compensation is reasonable but I wouldn't be opposed to more (who wouldn't?) esp for the winter intersession and its disruption of holidays.

Make sure this isn't a prelude for changing semesters to shorter sessions.

I think that the intersession are another way to add burden to faculty while not giving them the correct raises (1% last year). This implies that faculty will be forced more and more to keep working throughout the year without breaks with increasing risk of burnouts and the like. Further, given the recent moves of the legislator, this could be a dangerous path to take. I actually think that at a certain point, the union should propose that faculty stops doing any work besides the 9 month contract that constitute our base salary (or at least, for most of us).

This sounds like yet another measure designed to impact graduation rate metrics. The university is twisting itself into knots with Student Success, predictive analytics, and on and on all for the sake of the holy grail of metrics. We have enough safety nets for students!

I appreciate the opportunity to make money through the intersessions, but not at the risk of the quality of education we are offering. I don't think it's possible to run a semester long course in less than one month. The amount of work required on behalf of both faculty and student while also running a standard semester will inevitably undermine quality.